

PLANNING BOARD  
FOR THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

GENERAL HEARING

Tuesday, May 5, 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

Iram Farooq, Acting Assistant City Manager

**Community Development Staff:**

Liza Paden  
Jeff Roberts  
Stuart Dash  
Suzannah Bigolin

---

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

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

Update from the Acting Assistant City  
Manager for the Community Development 3

Adoption of the Meeting Transcript(s) 10

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. 13

PB#296, 57 JFK Street, extension for filing  
the decision. 10

KeyWord Index

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

\* \* \* \* \*

H. THEODORE COHEN: Good evening everyone. Welcome to the May 5th meeting of the Planning Board. We basically have one item on the agenda this evening. We're continuing discussion of the PUD in the KS District in the Volpe Center, but we will start with an update from the Acting Assistant City Manager.

IRAM FAROOQ: Thank you so much, Mr. Chair. So in terms of the Board's upcoming agenda, on May 19th you will have a public hearing on a green roof proposal for Bay Square on Mass. Ave. And the 130 Cambridge Park Drive project will be back for style revision.

On May 26th, the Webster Avenue housing project will be back for their continued

hearing.

And on January 2nd, there will be a public hearing on --

H. THEODORE COHEN: January?

IRAM FAROOQ: Sorry, June, June. We were all on vacation. Car share, car share zoning. You might recall a couple years ago we discussed car share zoning and then it ended up not moving forward because of concerns from -- so from folks in residential neighborhoods where people were worried about people parking in neighboring driveways. So that seems to have -- I mean, we don't know, Councillor Cheung has actually filed this petition. Our staff from Transportation Division Stephanie Groll who works most closely with parking, transportation demand management program has been -- actually a few months ago went out to all of the

neighborhood groups in Cambridge and talked to them about car sharing, and we feel like there is -- the climate is a little bit more receptive now. And certainly Councillor Cheung seems to feel that way as well, and so he has filed this petition. And that the first hearing -- I mean, the hearing at Planning Board will be on June 2nd. The petition does not expire until -- well, for a while. I'm sorry, I don't have a date. I thought I did, but I don't. But that will be your first hearing. So it will be roughly 90 days after that. I don't have the date of the Ordinance Hearing.

May 12th the Ordinance Committee will hear the Chestnut Hill Realty abatement proposal which the Board commented on positively the last time.

And then on June 8th there is a City

Council roundtable on citywide planning.

So while we're on the topic of citywide planning, the scope and deliverable elements for the requests for qualifications that we are hoping to file is out for public comment right now. If you have any comments, those are due back by Friday.

Last night at City Council the Council advanced the -- approved the proposal for the Foundry Building in Kendall Square and supported the city forming an agreement with the CRA so that we would be able to lease the Foundry Building to the CRA who would then work on a further sublease to either a for-profit or a non-profit development entity who would then develop and program the building as per the goals that have been identified through the public process.

And finally, wanted to let the Board

know that the housing committee last week voted to advance the incentive zoning petition to the full Council. And where they landed was up -- increasing the incentive payment from the current four plus dollars to twelve dollars a square foot with a one dollar increase for the next three years, and then having a study done after that to evaluate how that's working and whether further changes are needed.

So with that, I think those are all of -- well, that will go back to City Council and the full Council has to endorse that proposal. And then we will -- Jeff will be working on Zoning language which we would forward to Council and then it will come back to the -- come to the Planning Board as well for a discussion.

So that's something to keep in mind as

we think about the Volpe proposal, because, you know, we've talked here often about how this particular parcel has -- there's been a desire in the city for a long time to see redevelopment on the parcel. And it hasn't happened over the last several decades, and here is kind of an opportune moment for all -- the stars are in alignment and the Federal Government is actually interested in doing a land transaction and an exchange transaction with a developer who would then have the development rights to develop the parcel in exchange for building a turnkey state-of-the-art facility for the Volpe Center. So they will -- the development here, while today we're going to be talking about the proposal that largely stems from the K2 planning, but has obviously been modified based on the Board's discussion.



But, you know, the additional thing to keep in mind as there is a payment for Kendall Square that is proposed that is a ten dollar per square foot payment. And then in addition, any development there would also be subject to the -- whatever the new incentive percentage is.

We also are working on a, on changes as we've mentioned to you, to the inclusionary Zoning Ordinance, and that's still in process, but our intention is that we would have recommendations from that study in June or so. So while the Board and City Council are deliberating on a petition here, they would have the benefit of whatever recommendations emerge from that inclusionary process as well.

With that I'm going to turn it over to Jeff to talk about the Volpe process.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, before we do that, let me just check, Liza, are there any transcripts?

LIZA PADEN: We have three transcripts that have come in: March 10th, March 24th, and March 31st. And they've all been certified.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Could we have a motion to accept the transcripts?

STEVEN COHEN: So moved.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Second?

AHMED NUR: Second.

H. THEODORE COHEN: All those in favor?

(Show of hands).

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Liza, there's later on the agenda a request for an extension for 57 J.F.K. Street.

LIZA PADEN: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Is that something we can take up now?

LIZA PADEN: Yes.

So we have a request from Raj Dhandra who is the proponent for 57 J.F.K. Street, and he's asked for an extension, and I suggested a 60-day extension for filing the decision which would take it to July 17th. He -- we are working with him and have a meeting scheduled to discuss the revisions for the rooftop mechanicals and to talk about the progress he's made on the use and control of uses I guess you would say on Winthrop Street.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And is this scheduled to come back to us before the 17th?

LIZA PADEN: Of July?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes.

LIZA PADEN: Yes. As soon as we have the next meeting with him, he'll submit the revisions and we can start advertising it for a new public hearing.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And we envision that will happen before July 17th?

LIZA PADEN: I envision the decision will be made and filed by the 17th.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Any discussion?

(No Response.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: Motion to accept to agree to the extension to July 17th?

AHMED NUR: So moved.

STEVEN COHEN: Second.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Second?

All those in favor?

(Show of hands).

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

LIZA PADEN: Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Now, we will proceed to the continued discussion of the potential Zoning changes of the PUD-KS District.

This is not a public hearing this is a continuation of the discussion amongst the Planning Board members and the staff. It is conceivable that we might opt to take some public comment, but no one will be excluded because if we end up voting to file this petition with the City Council, it will come back to us. It will come back to us for a public hearing and a recommendation and it similarly will go to the Ordinance Committee and then ultimately back to the City Council. So the public will have an opportunity at a public hearing to comment on it if this petition is forwarded.

Jeff, could you fill us in on where

things stand now and the proposed changes in light of our prior discussions?

JEFF ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Jeff Roberts, Community Development back on this very important subject.

So I just wanted to start reflecting on a comment that was made in some discussion at the last Planning Board meeting that we're doing Zoning here and it's very enticing, and certainly we've spent a lot of time -- I know a lot of people in the community have spent a lot of time imagining how this project idea or development idea is going to play out, but I just wanted to start -- and we're going to focus mostly on the changes that were made. But wanted to make sure that we remain grounded in -- back in 2012 I guess and continuing into 2013 where we were with the Kendall Square study. And at that time the

notion was we were looking to implement a set of Zoning recommendations that would apply -- in principle would apply throughout this Kendall Square area, but in particular would apply to this area with the hope that at some point it might enable a project and help guide a project to -- towards fruition. And we're seeing that come up, but we don't -- in light of that, we don't want to lose sight of the goals and the priorities that were part of that study which were to increase the capacity for growth in Kendall Square to encourage active ground floors, to encourage an element of innovation space as part of new commercial development, to have a true mix of uses, and to activate ground floors, to promote high levels of sustainability and other goals. We covered those the last time, but I just wanted to make sure that we still

remember that those are what this started with.

And in terms of the vision for the site, at the time we had this somewhat water color notion of how this site might take form. It's still a fairly water color notion of what might take form. We will have the opportunity to -- if this is -- if this Zoning is able to enable a project to move forward in the way that's been described by -- by the folks that have been working closely with us at the federal GSA and DOT, then we'll be able to refine that vision and talk about some of the details. More will be known at that point about the physical constraints and how those will come into play as well as the economic constraints and how those will come into play. But at this stage we are really looking to do smart,



responsible planning and zoning and to see where that takes us.

So on to the changes that have been proposed. They're fairly simple to review, and I'm going to go through some of the details, but we made some changes to the -- how the density, the overall FAR of the site is calculated. We made changes to the affordable housing requirements. We made changes to the allowed heights. We made changes to the open space requirements. And I'll go through, just explain what the changes are, and then after I've done that, Suzannah is going to talk a little bit about some of the thinking behind some of the work that we've done to look at these urban design questions particularly behind height and urban space.

This is the overview of what the FAR

changes do. And in that first row you see that the -- we've noted that while the base FAR is for -- as it was initially proposed, was 4.0. When you applied the inclusionary housing bonus to that, you end up -- that bonus results in a FAR of about 0.48 which would be applicable only to residential use. So we've added -- for sake of comparison, we've sort of added those together and said that under the initial proposal we had a 4.48 FAR limit and we have recommended changing that to 4.5 and removing the inclusionary housing bonus. And because the inclusionary housing bonus is entirely for residential use, by changing the FAR and keeping that 60 percent commercial, 40 percent residential, it results in some reorientation of what the resulting maximum commercial FAR and residential FAR would be on the site.

So then the -- so the next piece is the changes to the inclusionary housing. And like we did above, we've, we've done a straightforward comparison calculating the net result of what the -- of what the affordable housing requirements are. So under the initial proposal, the net would be about eleven and a half percent of the total housing. And that's, again, the total housing, not the total project. And then under the proposal we could have made that a more straightforward requirement of 13 percent, and 13 percent required to be affordable units under the current definition which includes low to moderate income households. And then two percent requirements that would be for middle income households totalling 15 percent -- a full 15 percent of the residential use in the project

being dedicated to low, moderate, and middle income households.

The way we framed this requirement is as a floor area rather than a unit requirement. And this is something that we've been investigating for sometime internally, and we've also discussed it in several occasions with the City Council and with others that there has been a desire to encourage more of an orientation of those -- of that affordable housing towards larger unit sizes, two- and three-bedroom units. And in doing that by making the requirement based on floor area provides the opportunity to create more of a balance that's more weighted towards larger units even in cases where the housing overall that's being -- the market rate housing that's being reduced might be oriented more towards studios,

one-bedrooms, and smaller units.

So we wanted to show you just if you played out everything on the 14.2 acre Volpe parcel, what the results would be. And on the top line you could see just the overall change in floor area. Again, it's in general it's a change from 4.48 to 4.5 FAR. It doesn't substantially increase the amount of total development. We're still talking about three million square feet of development and that's not including any new federal facility. And we'll talk a little bit, as Suzannah talks, we can talk a little bit about why we think given the constraints of the site and some of the considerations regarding height and open space, we felt most comfortable staying with that total amount of development and not trying to press for a higher density. So the -- so the -- you can

see below that in the next two lines that what was represented in the previous slide, the commercial development capacity goes up by about 200,000 square feet. This is all in square feet. I should have said that in the first place. I thought it might be obvious.

The market residential is really what balances that out. It's a decrease of similar amount, about 200,000 square feet in market residential. But overall the amount of affordable housing that would be required goes up. In terms of low and moderate income housing, it goes down a very small amount. Actually our goal was to try to keep that the same. And this was as close as we could get it to be the same while keeping it in whole number percentages, that's really where that difference is coming from. But we do substantially increase, we increase the

middle income requirement, and then we have an overall increase of 18,000 square feet dedicated to low, moderate income housing and middle income housing.

And, again, we're just showing -- we've showed this before, just a kind of a comparison how this lines up with other mixed use in the area. The key difference here when we're comparing it to other projects that might have other affordability requirements as a portion of the housing is really that this is a much more substantial amount of housing even as we've adjusted a little bit and created a little bit more capacity for commercial use. A little less required residential use. We're still in that range where we're going to be creating a substantial amount of new housing, over a million square feet of housing which would be

required.

And, again, the same thing just shown in percentages. And the -- this is the -- this bar -- this is very hard to read. This bar here is the initial proposal, and this is the alternate that we're suggesting here. We just wanted to show what those differences were.

One thing to note that's sort of interesting and maybe gets lost a little bit, is that while we're increasing the direct affordable housing requirement, we're also -- because we're increasing the commercial development, we're increasing the amount of square footage subject to the incentive zoning payments. Under the housing committee recommendation which Iram mentioned at the beginning of the meeting, we looked at a number of -- we looked at twelve dollars per



square foot of required payments that would actually -- under the recommendations it would increase and the payment would actually be based on a CPI adjusted figure. And so we're looking at that in sort of present dollars. So the increase in commercial development results in an increase of about \$3 million of payment taking it to a total of over \$20 million of direct cash payments to the affordable housing trust.

And we talked the last time about how that funding can be used in interesting ways. It can be used -- one of the nice things about those payments is that they can be used for what is needed most, when it's needed most. So there are options where the trust could look at buying additional affordability units that are being created in a project like this, but if the need is for

preservation of units elsewhere in the city, that might have affordability restrictions that is are expiring, and where the city could really get more value for the money by doing that, that's another thing that can, that can be done. So this, this amount really does contribute substantially to the ability for the affordable housing trust to implement their programs.

I'm trying to remember, because we discussed it when we met the last time what the CPA contribution is currently. I'll let you know if Iram finds it.

Yes, it's -- so this is -- this compared to the contributions of the housing trust that come from CPA. This is a very substantial number.

IRAM FAROOQ: I think it's around eight million.

JEFF ROBERTS: Yes, it's in the range of maybe -- ballpark of maybe ten million a year of the affordable housing trust through CPA. So these payments would be spread out over time as buildings get built, it would be again a very large contribution to that and supplement, that funding stream.

Height, Suzannah is going to talk about height a little bit more, but I wanted to show the map. And we included this map in the package. The key differences are here in this portion of the district where we previously had 120 feet. We changed it to 140 feet. It doesn't seem like much, but it does match what is allowed further down on Binney Street, and it matches what some of the new development along Binney Street has been, has been built to.

On this portion of the lot we have included a provision that allows some, with some limitations allows buildings to exceed the 250-foot limit to a maximum of 350 feet, and that would be for all uses. So based on -- there would need to be review, but buildings that are either say residential or office could be allowed to reach those heights.

The open space, I just -- we've kind of taken an interesting journey with open space, and I just wanted to keep -- just to keep that progression in mind. We started with a Zoning that had a total open space requirement and a public open space requirement where the relative sizes were a little bit strangely conceived. And we made a proposal that changed those, but kept the two sort of the two number requirement and

then we moved to, in the third column, we moved to a system or proposal where we said well, let's just pick one number but let's make it the total open space. And at the last Planning Board meeting I think we moved to let's pick one number and have it be the public open space. That's where we've landed at this point. And I'm sure as this petition goes on and hearings go on, there will continue to be discussion about that. We feel comfortable with a simpler approach as the Planning Board had suggested.

The Planning Board did also talk the last time about how -- the particulars of how federal open space might integrate with the notion of public open space. And this is the current definition of public open space in the Zoning. We've added some underlining with emphasis, that space that is intended

for public use and controlled by the City or any other public entity, and the United States is certainly one of those, would qualify as public open space. We felt comfortable doing this based on discussions we've had with the GSA and DOT and looking at their guidelines and looking at the -- just the way they view open space in their facilities. I think it's -- I think we would feel comfortable saying that it's our goal to make open space on the federal site act as an integrated portion of the open space system within the area, and if we looked at the alternative and said well, we want to split those two out and really have different -- and really treat them in different ways in the Zoning, then I think the concern is that we might end up in a situation where we're actually discouraging that from happening.

We might in fact be creating a regulation that encourages open space on the federal portion of the site to be tucked away or separated from or minimized in some way from the rest of the open space.

So that is a sort of simple walk through of the requirements. And Suzannah is going to talk a little bit about the thinking that went into some of the height recommendations.

IRAM FAROOQ: While Suzannah sets up, the allocations to the affordable housing over the last few years have ranged from eight to ten million dollars.

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: Thank you.  
Suzannah Bigolin, CDD.

So since the last Planning Board discussion we did start to look at the building heights. And as part of that

process, we looked at some of the existing building heights in Kendall Square in East Cambridge and the floor plates as well. We went back to the K2 recommendations and did some of our own analysis and have been proposed these revised building heights that Jeff mentioned. And then also looked at some of the implications for design review as part of that process.

So in Kendall Square and East Cambridge there are many tall buildings. A lot of those were developed prior to 2001, and that was part of either a Variance or a Comprehensive Permit or Commonwealth and Federal Government exemptions. And since 2001 there also have been a number of tall buildings built or permitted during the Special Permit process.

So looking at the existing -- and I'll



just run through some of these existing buildings. The existing Volpe building, it's at a height of 193 feet and the floor plate is around 16,000 square feet. These are estimates as well. They're not obviously exact.

Eastgate's another prominent building right in the heart of Kendall Square. That's 270 feet and it has very small, tight floor plate of around 6,000.

And then looking at the Green Building at MIT, that's around 295 to 300 feet. And, again, the floor plate is very tight in that building. So around 7,000 square feet.

Everyone's familiar with the courthouse, and that's around 300 feet and it has quite a large floor plate of around 21,500. And what's notable about the courthouse, is that it does have a very long

dimension which makes it appear like a bar or a slab-type building when you see it from different viewpoints. And it also has the podium as well.

Some of the newer buildings that the Planning Board's probably familiar with, the second Broad Institute building. With the mechanicals, it's around 250 feet and it also has quite a large floor plate. So a lot of the office and lab buildings do like the larger floor plate. So that's around 38,000 feet, and it fits really tightly on the site.

Also the Watermark housing is another newer building. It has a smaller floor plate. It's obviously residential and L-shaped form, and that's around 15,000 square feet. And that's a height of 250 feet.

And looking at the Ames Street, the

recent approval there, that is 250 feet. And then obviously opposite the Volpe site we have the Marriott Hotel which is 275 feet with the mechanicals. And interestingly it has quite a small floor plate. It's just a long sort of facade faces Broadway, so that gives it kind of a sort of prominent sort of feel for many of the street views. But if you do sort of walk around the building, you'll get a narrower perspective and it narrows out.

So part of the K2 recommendations that was obviously building heights, and we established height for commercial buildings as 250 feet and for residential it was 300 feet and that was part of the middle income density bonus.

The 300 feet for residential, that extra 50 feet is recommended in the design

guideline to have quite a small floor plate. So around 8,000 square feet. Otherwise the guidelines do sort of establish minimum plan dimension or minimum building separations and then plan dimensions. So the form is quite sort of structured with the design guidelines. And some of the examples are sharing their result.

This is a 3-D perspective of a form that might arise out of the design guidelines.

What's interesting I guess is the, this end building that would be considered the residential building, so it has the point towers or a narrower tower and a larger podium. That's the desired intent of the design guidelines.

So following the last hearing, we've kind of looked at some of our own work and

approaches and started to sort of analyze the form and what could be accommodated on the Volpe site. We've looked quite closely at the design guidelines and the impacts that has them built form, and then we've also tried to be quite generous in building heights when we've been looking at what can be accommodated on the site. So generous in the floor to floor heights.

We also assumed the new Volpe building would have 400,000 square feet accommodated and a 50-foot buffer and looked at how the podiums more than likely accommodate commercial space, so either office or lab. We then looked at the need for street connections and we talked about that a lot last time in terms of access extending most logical connections through and that equates to around 2.6 acres. And then we considered

the open space and looked at connections interfaces in the various locations. And as Jeff mentioned, that has come out at about 25 percent of the site. So 3.5 acres.

And then as part of this process, we looked at the FAR and the sort of square footage that we needed to accommodate on-site. And the results indicated -- it's quite -- once all the constraints are considered, it is really quite a dense development that needs to be squeezed in on the site. The preferred location for taller buildings is Broadway, that's always been in the K2 recommendations. Part of our analysis was that we wanted to make sure that it was sort of a soft transition from the south side of Broadway across to the north side. Also slender towers are the preferred sort of building form above 250 feet. So the taller

the building, the smaller the floor plate needs to be. That's part of the design guidelines and it's still a relevant consideration that we've noted from our framework. And the result of this sort of analysis is that by increasing the floor heights, you don't really get a lot of floor area. We're going above 250 feet, we want a slender tower, so it does kind of balance out to be not a lot happens on the ground as a result of that, so we're not sort of tightening up the ground floor area or the podiums, because the podiums are where most of the square footage is accommodated.

So, therefore, looking at the revised height on Broadway, going up to 400 feet didn't really sort of result in a lot of floor area, and it also was quite of sort of drastic contrast to the south side of

Broadway and the Marriott buildings or the building heights there. So 350 seems a bit more comfortable and fits into the streetscape quite a bit easier.

And then following that analysis it did help us that to sort of provide 350 feet does provide some flexibility and it does clarify how much our open space sort of percentage needs to be and can be if we need to accommodate the FAR.

The modest sort of increase on Binney Street is still maintaining that mid rise scale. Binney's quite a large street in the tree scale, and that seems like a good approach and it doesn't have any sensitive interfaces.

And so that's the revised building heights map that Jeff's already mentioned.

The idea with the 20 percent maximum



for building heights above 250 is that we want to sort of make sure the floor plates are smaller, and that the whole sort of site on the Broadway site isn't covered with the taller buildings. So there is a limitation that we maintain sky views and openness between buildings. And we thought that was a good balance providing for the taller buildings but still maintaining a sense of openness and light and obviously creating nicer open space areas in terms of their amenity and their access to sun.

And part of this process, we've started to consider obviously some of the key issues with design review. And as we move forward with further discussions, we would be wanting to evaluate some of these issues as well. So key issues would be revised building heights. Going up to 350 feet is the slenderness of

the tower forms. So looking at the floor plates and the facade with dimensions is really important to achieve the outcomes that the Kendall Square guidelines want and also the Kendall Square study.

The tower profile is really important as well, making sure that it changes from different views and it's not just the slab building. So how the tower form is shaped is -- and configured across the podium is really important.

And then also considering impacts on views, sun, shadow, sky exposure, and wind, that's already part of the building height criteria in the Zoning, and that's something we want to sort of further consider. And then obviously for tall buildings we'd like them to be extraordinary in their architecture and design so that's a key sort

of key consideration.

Looking then at the Kendall Square design guidelines, at the last meeting we did suggest changes in regard to the open space and connections. The guidelines are only considered buildings up to 250 feet for commercial development and 300 for residential, but we obviously need to look at revising those to accommodate this new height. So we want to continue to revise the guidelines as we move forward.

Thank you.

JEFF ROBERTS: So we're happy to answer any questions or hear any discussion from the Board about the -- either the changes or any other aspect of the Zoning proposal.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Suzannah, might you have any images of buildings that would

fit these guidelines, say, the 350 with the larger podium? Whether they're in Cambridge or elsewhere? I mean, when you talk about something that's an extraordinary building, I'm just wondering what type of thing you're thinking about.

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: In terms of the architecture?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes.

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: Obviously these buildings will be landlocked. I believe they will be the tallest building in Cambridge so we want to aim to get really high quality design, and very -- also important of the podiums is that their human scale and they're design data on that level, so there's a mixture of sort of tower element and how that's traded, and then the podium levels are really important considerations. I don't

have any images in my presentation.

IRAM FAROOQ: The Watermark building is a little bit like that.

HUGH RUSSELL: Maybe that's one point tower that MIT is going to tear down.

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: Even Ames Street has the podium element. And then the tallest tower probably stretches out to 16,000 square feet the floor plate. But just the level of the design thinking and detail needs to be very high. These are prominent buildings. So we'd want to make sure our design guidelines encourage high quality and good architecture, because they will be landmarks.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Do the design guidelines, or would this Zoning prohibit somebody not having a podium?

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: No. So the design guidelines are guidelines. They're

not restrictive parameters. So the guidelines actually foresee instances where a tall tower could be the right outcome or maybe a tall tower on certain facades or sides of the site might be a better outcome than trying to cut in with the podium. So they're not restrictive. We've sort of looked at the parameters of the guidelines to see what type of built form results from the guidelines and the floor space that arises as sort of a way to test our own thinking and test the guidelines.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

STEVEN COHEN: Mr. Chair, just a question or maybe -- when there's ultimately a plan, first there's a master plan floor list that comes to us for approval and then there's a design review for each building within the master plan. So we'll have lots

of opportunities down the road.

Now, we're generating the Zoning we'll have design guidelines. Are those intended to be binding on -- how much flexibility do we have in the years to come if, you know, given a particular building proposal before us we want to push one way or the other, which may or may not be perfectly consistent with the design guidelines?

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: The Planning Board has discretion on any of the guidelines. So the guidelines have a sort of an objective and then measures to achieve that objective. If there's another way to achieve the objective, the Planning Board can consider different outcomes.

HUGH RUSSELL: Sort of reminds you of the Genzyme building in Cambridge Research Park. The design guidelines in Cambridge

Research Park called for buildings that were substantially masonry. Genzyme came in at 100 percent glass.

STEVEN COHEN: That's close.

HUGH RUSSELL: Because of the architectural quality and the thoughtfulness and the reasons behind it, you know, we embraced that building. So I think, you know, we just said, well, this is better than the guidelines have anticipated essentially.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Jeff, perhaps it would be helpful if you could briefly go through what the whole approval process would be at the various stages so the Board could have clear understanding of that.

JEFF ROBERTS: Right. So there's -- so that we've included language in this, in this proposal refers to a master plan approval. And what that means is that a



developer, property owner, you know, a proponent, would have the ability to apply for a PUD Special Permit which goes to the two hearing review process. And that when the Planning Board approves a final development plan, it would be essentially, it would be conceptual in nature. And for those of you on the Board who have been part of the North Point, review of the North Point project, the large 20-site, it's the largest in Cambridge, North Point, project, that approval and what the Board saw in approving that in its most recent iteration back two or three years ago, is very much what a master plan entails. It has a layout, it identifies the sites, tells you how much square footage on each site, what the heights are, what the general orientations of the buildings and open space are going to be on the site.

Where the streets and pathways would be. Where pedestrian entrances, vehicular entrances, service entrances, all those big -- large scale elements of the project would come through that master plan approval process. And in this case we've added a few other things that the Board would look at, such as housing. Where the housing is oriented. Where the affordable housing is located. What the unit sizes and types would be throughout the project.

When a project has approval in master plan form, the conditions of that PUD Special Permit spell out how development proceeds and what other approval, steps need to take place in order for projects to actually get built. So what is typically the case is that when a master plan is approved in conceptual form, one of the conditions is that the -- before

any Building Permit is issued, there would be a separate design review process at the Planning Board, and the Planning Board has to approve that design in much the same way the Board would have proven an Article 19 project review Special Permit before the project then can get a Building Permit and proceed to be built.

So it's in the PUD process is envisioned and it's written to anticipate a project that is built over a long period of time but all according to a basic, conceptual master plan that is followed over maybe 10, 15, 20 years.

HUGH RUSSELL: I'm very pleased to see this revised proposal before us because I was -- I wanted the Department to look at the implications of the height, the various areas for uses, and the open space. And that seems

to be what they've done. They've also done something we didn't really ask for, which is a change the way in which the regulations are written. I think this is a huge advantage for a project that's going to be subject to an RFP, that people who are not going to be necessarily talking to the CD Department are going to explain the intricacies of the way we regulate certain things in the City. Now it's, it's out there -- it's much more straightforward and you can find the floor area without doing calculations. You can find the number of, you know, units without calculations. You've got a simple definition of what is open space using the Catherine Preston Connolly principle. And so I feel much more confident that this represents Zoning that is aptitude result in a good favorable outcome of the federal process.

I have one very tiny comment that I wrote to Jeff because there was a calculation that was implied that an architect was going to have to do, and I didn't quite know how to do it because of some wording.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, I wondered there are three or four large issues before staff has made recommendations and written it into the proposal that maybe we ought to talk about them individually and see what we think about it. And I think since Suzannah's just given her presentation, we can start with height.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I mean, you know, we've had Councillor Cheung suggest a thousand feet. So I don't know that any of us goes along with that, but I think we could talk about what we think about the 350 feet

and whether that's an appropriate height. We had talked about 400 before, and now staff is telling us there's not that much benefit from going to 400 feet and that going to 350 does give more flexibility and is, from there point of view, more in keeping with what's across Broadway. So why don't we talk about height for a moment or two and see what people think about that.

Ahmed.

AHMED NUR: Yes, so I'll start to maybe talk about the height with regards to the 350. Suzannah mentioned that it caused, it sort of fits better with existing conditions like the Marriott and the height of the Kendall Square building, and I'm thinking this was a new opportunity, this is a land, this is a place where we actually have a chance to express thoughts. Does

Cambridge want to be a shadow to Boston? You know, you drive Route 2, you're coming in at the Lexington Hill and you look up and see these great skyscrapers to Boston.

You look at the world, you know, Shanghai, Istanbul, you know, who has four seasons? Two of them da, da, da, da and then you look into Boston. And so Cambridge is -- I think this is the opportunity for us now to really look and say can we unlock the limitations to our sky? You know? Because the developers have different opportunities come to the City and when they do, the look -- the first thing they look at is the Zoning. What is Cambridge like? What is the Zoning? What does the City of Cambridge, the Ordinance Committee allow us to build? And I'm not advocating for a thousand feet, but on the other hand, you all know that Dick

Friedman here at the Charles Hotel break ground at the One Dalton Street (phonetic) for a 70 feet tower. And then we're looking at a 350 maximum here. So we're putting a lock on that. And I just wondered do we want to -- is that what we want to do in Bost -- with regard to Boston and Cambridge? Do we want to have --

So what I would suggest personally is I would like to know why not along the river. Very close to Boston, just across the river in Kendall Square and the Volpe Center specifically, since we have all this land, why not actually say that the Zoning maximum not 350 but maybe 500? And then it will come back to the Planning Board and then based on the discretion of the Planning Board and looking at the Zoning language and what they're proposing and the inclusionary and so



on and so forth instead of reducing the housing we can then decide. But I'm finding a little bit, not disappointment obviously, and I think 350 is a step to the right direction, but I just -- part of me is thinking what is the limitation? Why are we not -- why are we afraid to put it on our Zoning? A little higher than that. If Boston across the river is going to 700 feet, and they already have two buildings at the Hancock and the Prudential. And so that's all I have to say about the height.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Anyone else want to talk about height?

HUGH RUSSELL: I'm being drafted I think.

H. THEODORE COHEN: You threw out the 400 last time I think, 400 or 450.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. And I think

I'm still trying to process my colleague's comments because I think they're -- they have added dimension to the discussion that hasn't been in it before. I think the study that was done by Suzannah the staff indicates that we can reach our goals at the height limits that they're proposing. The goals being a thousand units of housing, a new DOT site, significant amount of open space, and another two or three years of potential for more technology growth in Kendall Square.

You know, I wouldn't, I wouldn't be too afraid of saying we can consider even taller residential buildings, but I'm not quite sure how we would do it. What criteria would we apply that would be different than criteria that the staff has applied.

I guess I would treat this, also, as a more personal comment, three years ago my

manager and I spent a lunchtime walking around Kendall Square trying to address the issue of height and we came to the conclusion at the time that the Tech Square buildings which were about 110 or 125, maybe one of them's 150 feet tall, was a very comfortable height, allowed light into the open spaces. And so that was where I started in the K2 height discussion was that, you know, say 125 feet. And then it became clear we couldn't achieve the kinds of goals we wanted to have. And then Kathy Born talked to me and she said, you know, Kendall Square in the 19th century was the economic engine of the city and it expressed through its, you know, prominent buildings say like the clock tower building, and the density of buildings and the kind of industry and the strength of the city, and most of us came to the city at a

time when that had all been lost and indeed most of the fabric got lost in the mere development. But I think she's right. And I think that I was connected to what Ahmed was talking about, that we have to accept Kendall Square is the part of the city that's the economic driver. Now it's not that, you know, the other squares don't contribute, that the residential uses don't contribute, but that's the special part about Kendall Square. I tend to think that Central Square -- Central Square was the second largest retail shopping area in the Commonwealth in the 1930s. And to me that's the -- that's the way we think about what perhaps Central Square -- we should try to keep pushing the enterprise that come together, the commerce in Central Square. Harvard Square is pretty much built out and

it's pretty much dominated by the university. Porter Square is interestingly -- that shopping center lives on, and I suspect it won't change in my lifetime, but with the growth of Lesley University and the grooming of the new art school to Porter Square, there's a future and a vision there around a different kind of academic use.

So can our commercial center, our economic driver center be more vertically expressive? Or is 350 feet plenty to be expressive?

I guess in particular was there one, five-story building or 50-story residential tower there? Would that, you know, like a spire that would be in the middle sort of going like that? That could be pretty cool.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Yes.

HUGH RUSSELL: If it was in just the

right place and it was in great character.

So that's my musings I think.

AHMED NUR: Mr. Chairman, just to... I really appreciate -- I'm sorry to come back on to this. So that brings me into one other thing that I fear of. Is Harvard Square, you said, is dictated by the university. My teenage daughter was just telling me there are two Starbucks in Harvard Square and then there are two CVS's or three in Harvard Square and the height is there and we don't really have control of what goes in and out, whereas Dick Friedman's project here is the one that's rewarded for the 700-foot tower. Just saying that Boston would be the seventh city in the world to have two Four Seasons; Shanghai and so on and so forth. So part of me just thinks that I understand, you know, the world is a small place and so on and so

forth, but think about it, if we have that height or at least we have the language of the height, just reserve, you know, you can come back to us again. We don't know who's going to come and approach us and with what ideas.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Steve.

STEVEN COHEN: Yes, just sticking on the subject of height for a second. As we talk about height, we're not talking about density. You know, we're not talking about increasing the gross square footage of building here. So that being the case, we're really talking about an aesthetic, a design, a purely architectural issue. And maybe to some extent an issue about what does Cambridge represent and what is the face image that it presents to the world. And I guess, you know, while I say it, we're not

really talking about a density issue, it is true that the higher you go and the less bulk, you know, you have down below. So you could be actually increasing openness and decreasing the visual sense of density.

So saying all of that, I mean, I don't know what the right number is and what the height is. And frankly, it being a design, an architectural issue, it's the sort of judgment that I have difficulty in making in the absence of seeing a model and actually getting -- visualizing what we're talking about. I can't say 350 or 400, but I'm not sure there's anything wrong with 500 or 700 either. So one thing that goes through my mind as we're discussing it and picking up on Hugh's example of the Genzyme, you know, the Board at that time apparently had enough flexibility to say well, what you're



proposing is better than our guidelines. Maybe it would be nice on height also. Call it maybe what the lawyers would call a rebuttable presumption. You know, a presumption is 350 feet, but make the case for something taller. It would be nice if we had the discretionary power to be persuaded and to permit something taller.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Catherine? You don't have to.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: I guess I fall into the camp of I don't -- without, you know, specific design, 350 or 500, I have no idea what that looks like. I don't mind the idea that there would be flexibility. What I am encouraged to hear here is that everybody seems comfortable with 350 at least so far. And, you know, that's a good place to start. If we want to make the hard limit

500 and put in the design guidelines that we presume 350 barring some extraordinary architectural statement, that would be totally with the Planning Board's discretion. I don't have any problem with that.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: I guess I'll keep it short on height. I'm not afraid of tall building. You know, the idea --

JOHN HAWKINSON: Could you speak up?

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: It's on.

FROM THE AUDIENCE: Move closer.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: I think this is an area that needs a little special consideration, kind of a landmark gateway to the city. I'm not sure, there's some other things on the tower design with the narrow floor plate. I don't know if that works to go that high. Is there any more flexibility in that? But, again, yeah, I have no problem

with a tall building, and I think economics are going to push which way they go and that's where we'll be. We'll have another look at it.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes, I agree. I think actually, Ahmed and Hugh, you both make very good points. And, you know, I grew up in Philadelphia in the 50s and 60s and it was really a moribund city and I think in part because there was either an official or unofficial limit on heights of buildings in the downtown area. And it was really not until that height limit was broken quite significantly and they built the Liberty Tower and the second Liberty Tower, and now Comcast has built a huge tower and they're building a second tower with a Four Seasons Hotel on something like the 50th floor, that the city is really hopping now and it's

becoming a big economic powerhouse.

And, you know, we're talking about a site that's right across the river as you come over the bridge, which, you know, there aren't any residences right around this particular parcel. I mean there's 303 and there's Watermark.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Those are real residences.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes, I know. There aren't any, you know, single and two-family and triple decker houses.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Right.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: There are, they're commercial.

H. THEODORE COHEN: There are, but we're actually talking about some of these will be residential, too.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Right.

H. THEODORE COHEN: But a tall building could go right here and, you know, the buildings across Broadway are about 250, 300 feet. The Broad's about that. You know, some of the MIT buildings are around it. And I think, you know, what Councillor Cheung said, having some sort of statement here could be good for the city.

And, you know, I'm glad we all seem to be comfortable with 350, but the concept of maybe that is the presumed limit, but that the Planning Board would have the discretion in certain circumstances to go above that to 400, 500, you know, whatever City Council might ultimately think, might not be a bad idea. So that if somebody came in with a spectacular building, you know, it could happen.

So, you know, I don't know how that

gets written into the Zoning but, you know, do we feel comfortable with that concept?

AHMED NUR: We feel comfortable.

HUGH RUSSELL: I would feel comfortable with a single --

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes, one building?

HUGH RUSSELL: One building.

H. THEODORE COHEN: One building in the PUD that could be a real statement.

STEVEN COHEN: So long as we have total discretion over it and we have absolutely obligation to approve anything.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right.

STEVEN COHEN: Then 350 and, you know, the burden would be on the applicant to persuade us.

AHMED NUR: Yes. It's just a matter of a developer from even international to say

what is the highest building I can build in the City of Cambridge? 350. That's it, you can't go any further. Well, you know, there's one parcel that you can go up to this much, but it will be at the discretion of the Planning Board and the City. (Inaudible) and then just go on the other side of the river. 350, that's not what we're interested in.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay?

STEVEN COHEN: Yeah, I like that.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I think the next issue we ought to discuss is the inclusionary zoning where staff is recommending a real 15 percent, it also breaks down between 13 percent and two percent between low and moderate, middle. You know, there had been some discussion, you know, some people throwing out all sorts of numbers. But the way things have been written out, it presumed

15 percent but if the Ordinance should change and require something greater than the 15 percent, then the developer would be required to comply with the greater requirement. So I mean what do we think about that?

STEVEN COHEN: Can I just say something, Mr. Chair?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes.

STEVEN COHEN: First of all, just one, one off comment. The notion that the requirement could change if the City passes something, you know, when a potential buyer makes a proposal and comes up with a price, it's based on certain fixed assumptions. And I don't think you can have a situation where those assumptions and requirements could change later. So I would be a little bit troubled by that concept.

H. THEODORE COHEN: If I could just



jump in there. I think it's been written that way right at this moment in time is because there are studies going on right now to possibly change that amount. And so what we've discussed I think at the last meeting was that we didn't want to be trapped into something lesser than might be changed in the very near future for the rest of the city. And so I agree with you that somebody ought to know what they're able to do, but you know, every developer and every owner takes that risk that, you know, Zoning can change. But I think right now there is an anticipation that this particular provision may change within the next six months perhaps? And so that -- and then probably it will stay at that level for the foreseeable future. And so I think this was just to make sure that we didn't fall behind what the

change might be.

STEVEN COHEN: I understand. And, you know, just hopefully at the end of the day when a bidder comes in here, you know, I'm about to advocate for, you know, making even greater demands on the one hand, but on the other hand, when the buyer comes in, he needs to know what the rules of the game are. And changing the rules of the game midstream is just not a good way to plan, it's not economic, and it's not fair.

But, Iram, before I go off it looks like you wanted to say something.

IRAM FAROOQ: I just wanted to say about the change in Zoning, there are certain citywide provisions that, you know, when they modify, when they're modified, they impact development capacity or development financial across the city. So, for instance, as

we're -- the City Council is likely to change the incentive zoning provisions right now and they will impact everybody else who -- I mean, everybody in the city who up until now thought they had to pay \$4.70 or so and now they will have to pay \$12 if that gets adopted. So when inclusionary gets modified, everybody will be subject to the new provisions. In the Green Building Ordinance we wrote in specifically that you're required to meet the elite criteria at the Silver level that in this proposal will go up to Gold, and also went up to Gold in MIT. But then it also relates to the most current version of LEED which gets modified by the U.S. Green Building Council. So we do have precedent in the Ordinance for things that evolve over time. So I just wanted to put that out.

STEVEN COHEN: And I don't want to belabor it, but, you know, precisely on this parcel whereas we discussed, I mean we are motivated to make it attractive and feasible and make it economic for a developer to come in and develop, you know, the site. If the developer doesn't really know that he can rely on the rules of the game, and that they can be changed in a substantial way that could dramatically change his economics, that's problematic and it could be counter to our goals here. Let me put that aside and then -- could I just address the main thing of the inclusionary zoning?

Look, you know, I and nobody else here, you know, has to make the case that we want and need more affordable housing in the city. I mean, that's, that's a no brainer. So the only question here is that -- in my mind I

think for this Board is to what extent can, you know, we require inclusionary zoning in this project without undermining the economics of the project and without qualifying or compromising the appeal of this project for a developer in the very near future because we don't want to jeopardize that.

And so answering that question, I mean how far can we go without compromising the economics is the critical big question? But I don't think we really we have a whole lot of information before us to make that determination. And, Jeff, I certainly invite you at some point to jump in to help understand that, you know, what that analytical basis is.

Now I've looked at the HRA study which I understand to be the basis for this

calculation of, was it 13 plus two percent, 15 percent, and I could go through it in some detail for you. I've spent sometime on it. And frankly, I do think that we as a Board should be taking the time and having one or more meetings and then hearings to do precisely that, to go through some of this economics in detail. But perhaps this isn't the time. I've gone through it and my conclusion, having gone through it, is that this development -- well, put aside for a moment -- this is a funny development, where it isn't up to the bidder to come up with the purchase price per se. To some extent that purchase price is fixed by the cost of building a new DOT building. And, you know, this IRR analysis is so difficult to begin with. I mean, you know, there are so many ways of messing with the assumptions, you

know, that these analysis are kinds of fuzzy and flexible to begin with. But that whole calculus is further thrown into confusing doubt by the fact that we don't know exactly what it would cost to build the DOT building. But I think we've heard numbers in the neighborhood of \$200 million, and I think that's sort of described to me as sort of semi-reliable, but not clear how reliable.

So, you know, part of the question that we have to ask is, you know, if we're building -- if a developer's going to building 300 -- 3 million square feet here, 40 percent residential, 60 percent commercial. Running through the economic analysis in the HRA study, how much affordable housing can we build in and still generate enough land value to pay the \$200 million or thereabout which is necessary to

build the DOT building? And, again, I've gone through this. You know, mostly what I'm seeing are assumptions and conclusions, and I haven't actually seen the calculations and the pro forma. I mean, but based on the assumptions and the conclusions that I see in the study, it seems very clear to me that, you know, the project has support, a minimum of 20 percent affordable housing. And that analysis is on the assumption, you know, this HRA analysis was done for a different and different circumstances. That analysis was done on the assumption that the full 20 percent is low income housing.

Now if a significant portion of that is in fact middle income housing, that changes the number significantly. Middle income housing generates rents, according to the study, they're 63 percent higher than low



income housing. And so, you know, if a significant component of affordable housing was in fact middle income, I would say that the HRA study suggests that you could support more than 20 percent overall.

So, having said all of that, I mean, you know, off the top of my head based on this, you know, I would say that the 20 percent is the starting point. And as I've expressed previously and continuously in these discussions, I also think that we should have more middle income housing. I think there are needs at every income level, but the fact is, you know, we have a decent amount of low income housing available in the city. Not so much for middle income. And, you know, I would prefer to see something in the order of 50 percent affordable or low income and 50 percent middle income. For me,

unless I'm made aware of something that I haven't seen here, I think 20 percent is the minimum. And I do feel that no matter which way we go on this and whether my colleagues here agree with my suggestions here or not, do I feel strongly that we should have one or more meetings where we really drill into this whole question of the economics of inclusionary zoning and affordable housing so that we can make a reason, analytical, intelligent judgment as to, you know, what we can require in the city. Simply saying we need affordable housing does not advance the analysis and does not support useful decisionmaking. We have to get into the weeds. But that's where I am now. I mean, I think it should be 20 percent, and I would propose, you know, 10 and 10 affordable -- I mean, low income and middle income.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Catherine.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: I don't disagree with Steve that that discussion about affordable housing needs to be had. I think the appropriate place to have that is when we're looking at any inclusionary zoning. It's not when we're looking at Zoning for a particular site, and I really feel like this is also the wrong site to ask something extraordinary of. This is already a great opportunity for us, for whatever developer that comes out there, but it's a costly opportunity. That aside from just the sheer cost of the federal building that needs to be built, it has to be built first. I mean, there's many years of carrying costs that are going to go on there of building that building and having it be completely ready and fully occupied before they can

break ground on anything that is going to make them money.

Therefore, I'd like to see us -- I think a real 15 percent is the right place to be. It's, you know, the community has been crying out for a real 15 percent as the baseline and that they have always assumed we have and learned that well, when we look at the bonuses, it's really 11.5. We're talking about a real 15 percent and that's a meaningful increase over what we have seen in other projects to date. It's a meaningful increase in the low and moderate income housing going from 11.5 to 13, and it's getting some real middle income housing, which is not something that we have required universally. I totally agree that those are things that we should do down the road, and I'm glad that we as a city are beginning

those discussions, we're getting that study, we're going to have exactly the conversation Steve is talking about where we look at it universally and say what is the right number? What are the economics universally? This site is not a place to experiment with that, in my opinion, and it's certainly not a site to put an extraordinary burden on if we do in fact want to see something extraordinary happen here and to happen here now. And I think that, you know, Iram's opening point about it being a unique moment in time, for many, many years the City has wanted something to happen on this site. Not to, you know, get melodramatic about this, but Brian was the first person I ever met who thought, who thought that we could actually have a conversation with GSA and get it done. And he opened up that conversation and found

the people who were receptive there. There is no guarantee that the next GSA administrator or the next, you know, group of folks -- you know, right now we have a project manager who is going to retire after this is done. I mean, this is really -- the time is now and I would hate for us to miss the cycle when we could get this done because we decided that this was the place where in addition to an architectural statement, a statement about this being the economic engine of the city and everything else, we also said well, we don't have the study done yet on what the right proportion of affordable housing is, but we're going to make you do more than we've made anybody else do with the exception of the courthouse where we -- where it had such a small number of units that we could talk about doing a higher

percentage because it was eight and eight units.

STEVEN COHEN: Catherine, can I just ask, how do you know that 15 is the right number? How do you know 20 overburdens --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: I don't.

STEVEN COHEN: And the HRA study, which is only dated March, two months ago, which, you know, is very much on point, you know, evaluating these economics, this isn't a shot in the dark. I'm relying on the HRA study commissioned by the City.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: I understand that, Steve. I'm not saying that 15 is the right number or that 20 isn't. What I'm saying is 15 is the number that A, everybody has been clamoring for a decade or more.

B, is already more than what we have and encoded in the law.

And C, is not asking more than we have already asked other people across the city to do.

Twenty may end up being the number City Council decides on. And that, you know, in which case I think the language in the text as proposed, allows us to then meet that number. I would like -- per your point about predictability, I would like very much for those numbers to be codified in the Zoning as it is complete so that everyone is on the same page. But if that hasn't been finished at City Council, if that discussion is still ongoing, I like the idea that we're not going to end up with something lower than what City Council decides is right across the city, but that we're not going to get ahead of them and



predetermine what the right number here is that is substantially higher than anything we've done today.

STEVEN COHEN: We're not predetermining, we're doing our job.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: That's my feeling.

AHMED NUR: I hear what you're saying, Catherine, in that we should not be looking when it comes to inclusionary -- that we should look at inclusionary but as opposed to PUD, but at the moment we're talking about this particular PUD. And considering this PUD, I think that the City of Cambridge, along with its residents, for example, the Central Square Advisory that I was involved in and the KS-1 all recommended in both of these books, 25 percent inclusionary. For example, inclusionary incentive zoning

requirements continue to apply middle income family required building exceeding over 250 height. Which this might at least have a building that has a residential 250. For 25 percent resident GFI with 80 to 120 AMI. And that the 25 percent would include that two-bedroom and three-bedroom middle income. And these are studies also done at Central Square as well. And I think it's -- there were two years of study in Central Square where every one of us had family and friends that we asked what is exactly needed here for a middle income, for example, what everyone is going for? So 15 is definitely a step to the right direction to what we have now.

IRAM FAROOQ: Mr. Chair, just one -- actually, that 25 percent is not meant for the whole building. It was intended to be just for the delta above the 250 feet. So 25

percent of the space of 250 to 350 which is, which for the total of the project, given the small floor plates, was I think something in the vicinity of 20 units which is where we are ending up a little bit more than that. So we have taken that number into consideration in this 15 percent.

AHMED NUR: I see.

IRAM FAROOQ: Just wanted to clarify that.

AHMED NUR: Fifteen percent is definitely a lot better than what we have now and in the direction. So 20, had we started to hit the height that we wanted for residential and build residential. And so I think you're both right, absolutely. And we know that, we know that we need residential and we need a moderate income residential. And as far as (inaudible) is concerned, and

which doesn't apply here, is that we, it sounds great to have the more the better, you know, to keep --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: The problem is you don't get nothing because you asked for too much.

STEVEN COHEN: Right.

AHMED NUR: Right.

STEVEN COHEN: It's all about economic feasibility.

AHMED NUR: Right.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Lou.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Again, I think the economics are going to drive this anyway. I like the middle number to come up from two percent. It seems way lopsided. I don't know if there's enough room to remove some from the low and then add to that, but the two percent seems to be an awful lopsided

figure.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Hugh.

HUGH RUSSELL: My instincts put me both with Lou and Steve in the sense that I'd like to see a better balance between low and moderate income units, and that maybe it's not one-to-one affordable to moderate, maybe it's two-to-one. Maybe there's a transition as we work into this over the next few years. That's my gut feeling in terms of the unmet need in the city.

My gut feeling is outweighed by all of the housing professionals in the city to say that the need of the people who need the affordable is so acute that we really shouldn't be reducing that amount. You know, the length of waiting lists and the -- which are measured in years to get this kind of housing. I think the financial feasibility

question is the key question, and it's one that we can't answer very well. But I have to believe that our partner in this endeavor, the general services administration, is looking at this question carefully. And so it's my understanding that the proposal that's on the table before us is one that they don't think is a deal killer. That's what I --

H. THEODORE COHEN: The 15 percent?

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Right.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right, the 15 percent is not a deal killer but they're bored.

The \$200 million cost of the facility would be \$500 a feet. But they want a fully equipped and outfitted facility. And if you start putting in the carrying costs to -- and add that to the hard cost, I think it might well be another \$100 million between the

wonderfully productive laboratories that they want to get and the amount that bankers would get to make this happen. I think any kind of pro forma that is being used to look at this and the City's not -- doesn't have the ability, but I think the GSA must be used. They're pretty -- you know, they're in the business of building buildings. And so I believe that -- I guess I support the notion that we probably shouldn't push the -- try to push the envelope any farther based on -- because we don't know enough to do it. Granted we've got an envelope that seems to be acceptable, we probably shouldn't go beyond it.

Now if you want to recommend taking the subsidy amounts that's there and say, well, rather than going from eleven-and-a-half to 13 percent, you know, leave it, leave the

affordable eleven-and-a-half percent and that you might be able to go to 16 percent because there's less -- you can get maybe, you know, five percent or -- of the middle. Playing with that, I would be happy to see -- I'm not sure other people would be, but I think the people on this Board would be happy to see that. And I suspect these discussions will happen as I like to say in the big house on Mass. Avenue. I don't think -- I think Steve has thrown out a challenge to us that we have to become more knowledgeable. But this project is, you also need to move on this to make sure that the Council has time to act, the GSA has time to send out the RFIs evaluate them, send contracts all before the magic date of January 20, 2017.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I have to say, Steve, that my heart is with you and the 20



percent which seems like a good number, but, you know, my head is in the -- we've been looking for a real 15 percent for a long time, and we're finally getting it here. And it's a number that doesn't seem like it would, you know, quash the deal right now. Which I would like to see happen, you know, and happen now. Personally, you know, while I agree the need for low income housing is really great, I think the need for middle income housing is also very great because I think Cambridge has lost most of its middle class and will continue to lose most of its middle class because housing has just gotten too expensive. And I understand the argument that the people at the low end have no other options whereas the middle people can and that they can move. They can move to Somerville which is getting out of their

price now, too. But move to Medford or Malden or some other place. And I'd rather not see a middle class exit Cambridge anymore and stay here. So I would like to see the mix changed a little. I mean, the two-to-one seems like a good number to me. You know, whether things can be pushed a little bit to eleven-and-a-half, you know, eleven and six and five or, you know, somewhere along there. But I think we ought to be staying around the 15 percent and I would like to see the middle number go up a little higher from the two percent. And I certainly agree that we need to get more information about the numbers. And, you know, I'm hoping that the studies coming out of the inclusionary zoning people will come up with something that we all can be comfortable with.

STEVEN COHEN: So first, Hugh, on

the issue of the mixed between the low income and the middle income, and it may be that the housing experts that you cite are pushing for the low income, but they're probably advocates for low income housing. I don't know if middle income families, you know, have the same sort of advocates in the public arena. I mean, I think the fact is that in this and in many cities, that the demand for low or moderate income housing is relatively elastic. There is more demand than we can reasonably supply. And so, you know, saying that there's a lot of unmet demand at the low income, you say well, there's equally a lot of demand in the middle.

So, you know, I don't think it's a question of, you know, how much demand there is or what one particular class of advocates may be saying but rather what do we want our

city to look like. And, you know, do we want it to be sort of donut city that so many have become that serve the rich and that, you know, have facilities to serve the low income and the middle income is lost? And -- it's a rhetorical question because I'm sure every member of this Board would say no, no, we would like to provide for middle income people and families as well. Well, this is our opportunity to try to make policy consistent with that wish and desire. So I do think that, you know, we should be providing for a significant component, I would say 50 percent. You know, in a discussion if it's one third, so I think that we should have a significant component.

And for Catherine's point about whether this is even an ideal location for some of that low income, I mean, that's debatable one

way or the other, but if it's a good location for anybody, it would be for middle income sort of people perhaps --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: I think you misunderstood my point. It was not a question of whether or not it was a good location for low income or middle income people, it was a question of whether or not it was the right place to experiment with the numbers.

STEVEN COHEN: Well, okay, and let me pick up on two other things.

First of all, on the mix between the low income and the middle income, again, I made an important point before which I want to repeat again, because I think it's important to us, and that is the rents and the middle income level are 63 percent higher than for low income. The discount from the

market is half as much for middle income than as it is for low income. Which is to say that to the extent that we include requirements for middle income housing here, it's less risky to the extent that you think there's risk here. It will work better for the developer. And, you know, we could arguably, you know, provide and require more of this sort of affordable housing if we increase the middle income component of that mix.

So for all of those reasons I feel quite strongly that we should be recommending and including an increased middle income component. I would still go 50/50 for discussion. But the second point that we keep saying that we don't have the numbers, and Catherine characterizes my suggestion as experimenting, the City has engaged a

topnotch consultant to do precisely this analysis. More analysis can be done, will be done, applied to different sets of circumstances, but we'll be having a highly detailed analysis here playing with a lot of, you know, different variables. You're doing a very comprehensive and sophisticated discounted cash flow analysis. You're calculating, you know, what sort of numbers are required in order to afford a developer a required 15 percent internal rate of return, and, you know, so, you know, this isn't a question of whether I think 15 sounds good or 20 sounds good or 25 sounds good. I mean, in the absence of financial analysis, you know, that's an irrational pursuit just to say what numbers sounds good. But we have an analysis here and that analysis suggests that a melded land value of \$99 a foot would be supported.

And that's on the assumption of 40 percent residential, 30 percent office, and 30 percent rent. It comes up to 99, say \$100 for round numbers, assuming that we can build three million feet here, that's \$300 million that can be devoted to land acquisition. And that's assuming 20 percent low income, not 10 percent low and 10 percent middle, but 20 percent low income. If you factored in the middle income, it would dramatically change that number and it could support a higher land value.

So, you know, I don't view my suggestion here as, you know, just a random shot in the dark. I don't view it as an experiment. I'm relying on the -- on the only financial analysis that we have and it seems to be a pretty serious analysis. So, look, I mean this is just the beginning of



the process, I guess, but I really feel strongly that, you know, politics might be pushing in one direction and some advocates may be pushing in another, but, you know, we're the Planning Board. We should do what we think constitutes the best planning for the city. Others may take our recommendations or not. They may compromise it or, you know, diminish it or increase it, but I really think that we should get serious about that. I mean, why are we encouraging development in the city if not to meet, to the greatest extent that we can, the needs and priorities that we perceive in the city? And certainly part of it is to make great, you know, monumental architecture and make it a beautiful city, and certainly part of it is to support the industries that support our tax base and so forth. But when possible, I

think we should be doing as much affordable housing as can be economically justified and, you know, based on everything that we have before us, I believe that 20 percent can be economically justified here.

H. THEODORE COHEN: All right. I'd like to move on, but I have a question.

Jeff, assuming that we were to, you know, ultimately make a recommendation, does -- or file a petition I should say with the City Council, does it go with any commentary? I mean, could there be a side letter saying that we have suggested on this issue say 15 percent, but that at least one member or a minority of members of the Board strongly feel that it will should be a different number?

STEVEN COHEN: And also the mix of low --

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right. No, I just want to be clear if, you know, on issues where we're not -- I mean, usually we're fairly unanimous on things, but on issues where we may not be unanimous, can there be a side letter to the City Council saying, you know, there's a difference of opinion on the Board about certain issues and these are the differences?

JEFF ROBERTS: Certainly the -- you want to take it?

IRAM FAROOQ: I was just going to say that there will be a cover letter that goes from the Planning Board with the petition. And I guess I would, I would urge you to focus on the commonality rather than the differences, because really in terms of the spirit of what you want to see, you all actually are in agreement that you want to

maximize the amount of affordability in the project and that you are also trying to increase the middle income component. So I think if we focus on that -- I mean, we can certainly say that is there is a minority opinion, but it's not the strongest case to make in the Board's cover letter with the petition. So that would just be my suggestion. And I think that I would just say if Jeff could talk a tiny bit if you don't mind about the HRNA analysis, because we did take a -- it was commissioned by the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority, and we have been working with those numbers somewhat, but there are certainly some constraints to that. So I'd just like Jeff to speak to that if you don't mind.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Sure. But before you do that, I think where we are is

that we all want to see as much low and moderate and middle income as we can feasibly get without killing the project.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Yes, absolutely.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And so whether, you know, there's a difference of opinion right now between whether 15 percent is the number or whether it's 20 percent or maybe something even higher than that, that, you know, we may have a difference of opinion about what the number is, but we are all in agreement as to what the goal is.

STEVEN COHEN: But also remember the tradeoff, the more middle income you have --

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right --

STEVEN COHEN: -- the more readily you can increase that number.

H. THEODORE COHEN: -- and I think

there may be a difference of opinion as to what the mix is, and, you know, what you say sounds perfectly reasonable to me, that if you have more middle income housing, they're going to pay more for it and so it's less of a cost to a developer than providing low income housing. And obviously there's a balancing point and a tipping point where for the developer it all works and to a point where it no longer works. And obviously we don't want it, you know, hold out to one point so much that we push it beyond the balancing point and overbid the ticket.

STEVEN COHEN: Just one question, Mr. Chair.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes.

STEVEN COHEN: So we heard that the, I don't know what the term is now, inclusionary premium, amounted to \$20

million.

IRAM FAROOQ: The incentive.

STEVEN COHEN: The incentive, exactly. The payments amounted to \$20 million. You know, it would kind of make sense, you've got the incentive payments, you know, generated by this project being allocated to, you know, expand the potential for affordable housing in this project. And we're not even talking about the millions of dollars per year of the additional tax revenue that this project will generate. And so is there some way of, you know, building into this conversation the ways in which the city could help to support the affordable housing component?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, I think it already is -- there's a proposal in the Zoning as to what the funds will be used for

which are ultimately determined by their entities. But it does specify what they are to go for.

JEFF ROBERTS: And we have an affordable housing trust board that's very experienced in finding the best ways to use those funds. If you'll permit me to just make --

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes.

JEFF ROBERTS: I'm going to make a couple of brief comments about things that I'm not qualified to comment on.

First, so the HRNA analysis that's been referred to, this is something that was commissioned by the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority and it was for the purpose of looking at their development deal with their master developer in the production of future housing, and to look at ways that the CRA



could use their particular power as sort of the negotiator of development fees for that new development to generate additional affordable housing. So unlike a normal land deal when somebody's developing under the CRA, they have to pay the CRA on a per square foot basis for the development rights to build that project. And because the CRA's getting that payment, they can look at well, what are some other things that we can do looking at the economic balance of that payment.

So what they -- so what they looked at was the supportable land value on a per square foot of development basis for different types of development in Kendall Square. And one of the things that makes that -- they're looking at it, and they're looking at it now. So they're basically

looking at it in terms of if you're building a residential building now or an office building now or a lab building now, what is that supportable land value under the current market? We looked at that analysis very carefully. We've talked about it with the representatives at Volpe. They've looked at it, too. It's public. It's been on the -- it was released and the CRA's had it on their website since March and various people looked at it and tried to play with the numbers a little bit. We agonized a bit over whether it would be meaningful to include specific analysis based on that in our discussion, and we ultimately decided that there were a lot of issues that it didn't necessarily address in this particular -- for this particular scenario. First of all, this is -- going back to what I said at the beginning, we're

looking at Zoning and District, not looking at a particular project that is, you know, ready to get underway right now. So when we're looking at development of multiple buildings over 10 to 20 years, there's a lot of uncertainty in pinning that to numbers that are, that are -- that have been generated based on a certain set of economic conditions at this particular point in time. Even in that, the numbers that are included in that analysis, are highly variable and they looked at it using a certain set of assumptions about the financial markets both in terms of interest rates and cap rates and it came up with a certain set of numbers, then when they were asked, I think by the CRA to change some of those basic assumptions, they found that it pretty significantly changed the value of those different

projects. So, again, over time there's a lot of variability in those affordable land values.

Similarly there's a lot of variability, I think Hugh was mentioning, in the costs that would be associated in this and in the fact that a lot of those costs, you know, namely the construction in the facility would come up front.

So we did look at those numbers and tried to say well, what would the result be if you started to play with those in modelling this kind of a development? And ultimately found that just a variation was so broad that it was hard to, it was hard to come up to any -- with any conclusions. And it was hard to come up with something that we could stand behind as being specific enough that would allow us to do kind of what's been

suggested, and to try to see how far can we push until we get to a breaking point. We didn't know where that -- we could already be at the breaking point as far as we can tell from running through the numbers. So I think what we were trying to do is come up with a recommendation that was that was reasonable, that does make a significant step forward from what the current requirements are, but also leaves room that through the city's analysis which will look more wholistically at residential development across the city and over a long term, a long period of time, that would put us in a better place to recommend changes.

So I do, and I encourage you if you're interested, to look at that analysis because it is available on the Cambridge Redevelopment website.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Can we get a link to that because I've been trying to find it and I can't find it.

JEFF ROBERTS: We'll provide it certainly.

IRAM FAROOQ: I'm sending it to Liza.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Thank you.

JEFF ROBERTS: So the other thing I wanted to comment on so it doesn't get lost in the discussion is the middle income housing program. Part of the reason why we have been a little more careful about expanding inclusionary type programs to middle income households is not just about a sense of what the need is or certainly what the advocacy is, it's that we don't really have a good sense of how those programs will

work. So understanding inclusionary housing sort of have to get into the details.

Inclusionary housing sets aside units where the income limits are constrained and the cost of renting or of making payments, in case of ownership housing, is fixed at 30 percent of the renting household. And those units are in this case ownership or deed restricted so that it restricts how much an owner can then get in resale. Well, for the middle -- we've had a lot of success and a lot of experience in implementing this program for households within a certain range of incomes. At the middle income level there's still a bit of uncertainty. If we were to generate a lot of units that function the same as inclusionary but are for middle income households, that do have in many cases the choice to look at other housing options

in the market, both in different housing options in Cambridge or housing options in surrounding communities, we don't know if they would choose to accept a unit where they have to pay 30 percent of their income towards that housing or if they would accept buying a deed restricted housing unit that has limits on their resale. So part -- so we do want the programs to be successful, and part of what's being looked at as part of the study is not just expanding the same inclusionary programs to different income levels but looking very carefully at whether we think that is the right approach to serving. And we do have other programs that help middle income households. We have -- the City has down payment assistance and other programs that can, that can help middle income households in a way that's different



from inclusionary type programs. So those were just filling in some information.

STEVEN COHEN: Mr. Chair, if I can just make a comment on the HRA report?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Go ahead.

STEVEN COHEN: And I totally agree with Jeff, I mean there are so many assumptions that have to be made in any sort of discounted cash flow analysis like this if you're off a little bit on some of the key assumptions, have enormous consequences on the bottom line and that's why MBAs are really good at this sort of stuff in making analysis justifying almost anything they want to advocate for.

I would note in this analysis a couple things that struck me. The exit caps were, for residential were assumed at the 5.5 percent, and I think we have experts in this

room who would tell us that -- jump at the opportunity to buy this kind of residential at 5.5 percent cap probably going, you know, closer to four percent nowadays.

Interest rate is carried at six percent out of 25 year amortization schedule. We can readily finance certainly the residential portion of probably any project of this sort depending on how you do it, but probably under four percent or in the neighborhood of four percent. Those two factors alone would make dramatic differences in analysis and generate higher land values. And as I say if you simply assumed a middle income component because the analysis is done strictly at low income component, that too would generate a higher land value. So, you know, in general these analyses are of, you know, limited utility. And in particular this analysis

wasn't done for this particular set of circumstances, but you're really never going to get better data than that. You're always going to be relying on that analyses like this. And, you know, I think this analysis, with pretty good room for error, can justify a sufficient land value to support the sort of 20 percent affordable in a housing that I'm advocating for.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Why don't we move on because we have other issues to discuss and, you know, I think it will be clear any recommendation that we make to City Council that there's a difference of opinion on this and that let's leave it in their hands to decide because I don't think we're going to be able to --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Well, and it will come back to us.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And it will come back to us.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: And there will be a public hearing and we'll get a chance -- at this point we're putting down the marker for discussion in a public forum.

STEVEN COHEN: It would be nice by then if we could have a little bit more data.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: It would be great.

H. THEODORE COHEN: That would be great.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: A little more information.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Absolutely.

HUGH RUSSELL: We did speak about the potential for public comment and there are some expert members of the public who are

in attendance tonight. Maybe after we go through the four issues --

H. THEODORE COHEN: We can ask for comment.

HUGH RUSSELL: -- we can ask if there's advice, that people would give us --

H. THEODORE COHEN: I'd like to get all of our comments out on the table first.

I think maybe the next issue is open space.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: I like what they did. They did exactly what I asked.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Excellent.

AHMED NUR: That was easy.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: If other people have a problem with it, feel free to say so, but I'm happy.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes, right.

Well, we've obviously gone away from, you know, the large multi-acre park somewhere in the process and have gone to what Catherine had suggested. And some of others have suggested to having, you know, connections --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: -- and routes through the parcel that will connect with other areas.

So people have any other comments?

HUGH RUSSELL: I would just support Catherine's comments. The staff did do some studies showing open space and building models and showed, I think, that a network of open space can be created that has some significant open spaces in that district.

AHMED NUR: And I wanted to mention this before, there's all type of open space,

but open green space would be considered a language here of a sort that it would be assigned spaces, especially now that we have the crazy winters when it comes to the summer that we're not planting giant trees or putting the green space behind a tall building where you won't see the sun during the summer months.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: So that's the kind of thing that I think is totally appropriate for the design review phase of this and we should absolutely look at, but in terms of the Zoning I think we're getting the right amount.

AHMED NUR: I'm happy with that.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Obviously if for the review we will get landscaping plans --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: -- and we will

talk about the types of trees and what they do and what they shade and won't shade.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: You know, perhaps there will be a water feature. Perhaps the Broad Canal will now be extended.

Iram, you don't look happy with that.

IRAM FAROOQ: Perhaps.

H. THEODORE COHEN: But if people are happy with the open space, then --

STEVEN COHEN: The open space, just to understand, the way that we're leaving it is that how that open space gets designed and organized and it's just going to be part of the master planning process.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Right.

STEVEN COHEN: We're not requiring, prejudging anything there?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right. And the



open space --

HUGH RUSSELL: They're guidelines.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Right.

H. THEODORE COHEN: -- and the new transportation facility, if it indeed is accessible to the public and open to the public, can be counted in the requirement of open space.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: We're limiting what's included in the open space.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Correct.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: It's public open space. What Jeff had put up the slide there, it says roof gardens aren't counted, sidewalks aren't count -- all those kinds of things. This is real open space.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: I remember reading it. I just wanted to make sure.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And, you know,

we've seen pictures of what JSA has done down in the South Street Seaport where you've got this beautiful walkway, but if they decide to put up a six-foot fence, that makes it inaccessible --

H. LOUIS BACCI, JR.: Right.

H. THEODORE COHEN: -- that's not going to get counted.

STEVEN COHEN: Can I just -- one, I have one question to ask about the affordable so I just --

H. THEODORE COHEN: Could you save it until the end?

STEVEN COHEN: Well, I'd like ask it before we have the public comment if I could.

H. THEODORE COHEN: We'll do it then.

STEVEN COHEN: Okay, just before.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay.

Another area that Catherine would say that she's fine with is the parking requirements. There are, you know, the minimums and maximums now for various types of development, and they seemed appropriate to me in light of what we've been doing and the studies that we've been getting from Traffic and Parking, and of course, you know, when there is an actual proposal there will be a --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: An actual traffic study.

H. THEODORE COHEN: A traffic study.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Right.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And it will be commented on by Traffic and Parking, but, just you know, if you had comments or anyone else had comments about this --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: The

parking hasn't changed since last time,  
right?

JEFF ROBERTS: No.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: I  
didn't think it had.

JEFF ROBERTS: So the parking  
requirements are the same and in affect those  
and subsequent changes in the proposal are  
part of the, are still consistent with the  
Kendall Square --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: That's  
what I thought.

JEFF ROBERTS: -- recommendations.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Okay,  
yes. Then I'm fine with that.

I think the only other new change that  
we haven't discussed I think is the FAR  
change.

HUGH RUSSELL: But on the parking.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Yes.

HUGH RUSSELL: When they come at the master plan level and they do a traffic study, do we have the ability to change those percentages if the study would indicate?

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: So, the way it's written now, there is -- the Planning Board can waive minimum parking requirements except that we can't go below 0.5 per dwelling unit. And I don't think we can go above -- oh, it does require a waiver. So, yes, we can waive either above or below.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And we can approve arrangements for shared parking?

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Yes. And inter use of surface parking to allow those things to vary during construction. No, yeah, I was very comfortable with the

parking arrangements, so which is probably why they didn't change it.

HUGH RUSSELL: One thing that -- is there anything in here that would -- I guess doesn't -- right now there are no parking requirements for the Department of Transportation because the City can't rear the feds to do anything. Right.

So, I'm just wondering, one of the financial issues we've been talking about is that you can't start a commercial development until the DOT moves in. But it seems like there might be a way given that there are some parking garages within the reasonable distance that aren't full, and that they might be able to actually take more parking away from the DOT temporarily, build on those parking lots simultaneously for commercial development or residential development and

the DOT, and they might -- they might help them with their performance with the element.

STEVEN COHEN: Is this a Zoning matter?

HUGH RUSSELL: So I'm thinking that because we don't require the DOT parking, we cannot.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: No.

HUGH RUSSELL: Then they are free to propose that, they have to demonstrate that there is parking available, that it would be a workable situation, and that you wouldn't have, you know, cars triple parked on Binney Street to make it work. So I don't think we don't need to change the Zoning proposal. It seems to me that's a very important thing in the development proposal to give them the flexibility to move faster to get more income into the project.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, I think we can prohibit even though it's federal building to have parking on Binney Street.

HUGH RUSSELL: That we can do.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: I mean we used the temporary parking garage for the Galleria Mall.

HUGH RUSSELL: And we've got, you know, got lots of spaces in that garage that never been used. I don't know whether all of the parking garages for Boston Properties are full or whether they might have 500 spaces that they would be happy to --

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Loan.

HUGH RUSSELL: -- you know, get some income from.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: I have great confidence that whoever develops this will figure out a way to start their



commercial part of this development as fast as possible as long as we don't get in their way.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: As long as we're convinced that this Zoning doesn't preclude from doing, and I don't think it does. I think your suggestion is a very good one, and I expect that they will figure out what is workable with the GSA along those lines to start construction on things that make them money as soon as possible.

H. THEODORE COHEN: All right, do we want to talk about the FAR? It seemed that it barely changed from last time that we had seen it, and I don't recall our having any particular issues with the FAR, questions about it. It's just been rounded up a tiny bit to the 4.5 from the 4.4-something or

other.

HUGH RUSSELL: There is a significant change in that before what we thought was 60/40 really wasn't 60/40.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY:  
Correct.

HUGH RUSSELL: Now it's been adjusted to be 60/40.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right. And it has a slight change, slight diminishment in the residential --

HUGH RUSSELL: And corresponding and increasing --

H. THEODORE COHEN: Corresponding and increasing commercial, but now we have, you know, there is the full 15 percent of whatever the number is in affordable housing, and plus the unit size is not specified and

it's left open for an actual proposal where we can, you know, try to promote more two and three, you know, units for families and other things. So it seems like it was an appropriate tradeoff. I think staff did a great job in coming up with a proposal that seems to incorporate what we're looking for.

HUGH RUSSELL: I mean it could be a middle income that you'd actually produce microunits because you might find the need is for the say the technical, single technical staff level people with businesses.

STEVEN COHEN: And they can't afford \$4,000 a month.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: They're paying 50, 60 percent of their income.

H. THEODORE COHEN: So, those were the main issues I saw.

Now, I did have a lengthy conversation with Jeff earlier today when I went through this in great detail just pointing out areas where I thought there was, things could be clarified a little more. I don't think, you know, and there were questions where I had some clarification for myself of how it all works. I was not involved in the original North Point and hadn't worked through the old PUD in great detail. So, you know, there were some -- I think there would be some small language changes from here. And I don't think we changed anything substantively.

JEFF ROBERTS: Yes, I was just going to state for the record, Mr. Chair, that we did talk about those, and I think those changes were not substantive changes but they're good suggestions to help clarify the

language which is an appropriate thing to do at this stage.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I actually think, though, you know, there was -- may have been the one question about the GFA. And while I'm looking to find it, if anyone else would like to raise issues please go forward.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: I would quickly like to say we went over it so quickly the staff may not have heard the unanimity and appreciation for the way the FAR was handled, and in particular the flexibility with treating the affordable units in terms of GFA. I think that's a really great addition. And the fact that it engendered no debate here tonight is in fact proof of the Board's support of it.

STEVEN COHEN: And simplifying the

language is a direction that we've been advocating and much appreciated.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I think the area, the question I had raised was in the Section 13.12.4 relating to retail business and consumer establishments. That the total, the total amount of retail GFA in the district does not exceed five percent of --

JEFF ROBERTS: Yes. The language ended up being -- must have been edited and re-edited. I think we would -- based on our conversation, I would suggest that we say the retail and consumer service in the PUD rather than in the district be limited to five percent of the total gross floor area in the PUD.

H. THEODORE COHEN: In the PUD.

JEFF ROBERTS: Unless the Planning Board acts to waive that, which we can do

through review.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Which we have the power to do.

Are people are comfortable with that?

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Yes.

(All Members Nodding in Agreement.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: It was left ambiguous. And I think really everything else that I had suggested was just trying to clarify some of the points. So I think those were the issues I could come up.

Does anyone else have any other issues they'd wish to raise?

STEVEN COHEN: I just have the one question I wanted to ask Jeff, and my apologies, I have not read all the details. So if the answer to my question is obvious in there, I apologize in advance. But on the affordable units, what do we say about

location of the units? Are these requirements applicable just over, you know, all the residential or do these percentages have to be met in each building, and within each building do they have to be spread equally throughout the building or can they be concentrated elsewhere? Or could there be a separate structure that provides all of the affordable units, you know, for the site? I mean, what's -- what are the requirements?

JEFF ROBERTS: I think they're required to be -- located in each residential building and distributed throughout each of the buildings. That's been one of the -- for one of the bedrock principles of our inclusionary zoning so far. I think without those provisions it's very easy to slip into situations where the affordable housing is being created becomes very differentiated



from the market rate housing, and that's I think contrary to our goals in making sure that the housing that we get through this program is of the highest quality and we, you know, we've been very straightforward about that. Developers have really, have understood that that's what we demand and they've met that. I think in the case of -- in the case of middle income housing, we did provide in the Zoning text a little bit more flexibility because there may be opportunities. But, again, we don't -- there are certain things about middle income housing programs that we're still trying to learn and we want to have some flexibility built in so that if there is some way to provide units in a different location or a different arrangement of sizes and types, that we have the flexibility to do that with

Planning Board approval. But I think for low to moderate, we're maintaining the same distribution standards that apply to inclusionary.

STEVEN COHEN: I understand. Let me just make a comment. I've gotten feedback from developers which I guess I want to share a little bit. I mean this is especially applicable when we're talking about tall residential buildings, you know, as we are here. You know, the upper units, you know, on the high floors are frequently much more marketable and much more valuable than the units on the lower floors. And to the extent that we're trying to get a deal forthrightly with the economics of providing these units, and guys, I'm the one advocating for more of the affordable housing, but I'm also trying to understand the economics and make it

economically feasible to provide more of these units. You know, to some extent I think we compromise that goal to the extent that requires the equal distribution on the upper floors. I'm not suggesting that the units be ghettoized in a basement or anything, and I'm not suggesting any particular distribution requirement because it would require some more thought and study. But, you know, I think it would make sense to permit something other than a purely equal distribution throughout the building. Again, especially in taller buildings. I think it ends up, you know, compromising our desire to provide the greatest number of affordable units.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Unless I'm mistaken, I thought that when we actually have a proposal before us there would be a

site massing plan, and I thought it was also going to require an explanation of the proposed units and their location.

JEFF ROBERTS: That's correct. This is a -- it's somewhat of a new thing we're introducing with this Zoning District where with a -- in a PUD master plan proposal not only would there be a -- something that indicates the location and square footage of residential buildings, but would also give some indication of the mix of units and how the affordable and middle income units would be provided within that, within that building. But the Zoning still does have -- the language still refers to the requirement to just to have low and moderate income housing in each building and distributed throughout the building.

STEVEN COHEN: But I -- go ahead.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I, I was going to say when a proposal is before the Board, when a developer was making a strong argument that they didn't want to have it in certain floors because of the economics --

STEVEN COHEN: That's my question. Do we have the flexibility or is that an inflexible requirement? If we had the flexibility to verify -- vary that or modify it based on a particular proposal, then I'm good. I think we should have that kind of flexibility if we're persuaded.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: I guess we can't exclude them, right?

H. THEODORE COHEN: It says it shall be reasonably distributed throughout a building and may not have language to a different interior or exterior from the units. An occupant shall have access to

common areas, etcetera, etcetera.

STEVEN COHEN: Well, if the applicant comes in and says, you know, I've got 50 stories here and, you know, I have my affordable units on the lower 25 stories, and say we were persuaded by the argument, do we have the power to say that's okay?

IRAM FAROOQ: Right now -- oh, sorry.

STUART DASH: Our affordable housing folks I think have made, it's probably a key element in our inclusionary zoning, is that the units are distributed throughout the building. And they're aware of the great value of the upper floors and they're not insisting on the penthouse view for those. But on the other hand, they're trying to ensure that we don't have what used to be common with inclusionary housing programs

which was the inclusionary affordable housing get stuck in really bad places.

STEVEN COHEN: Understandable.

STUART DASH: So I think that they are very careful about doing that in a very thoughtful way, but I think it would be a mistake for us to start trying to sort of negotiate placements beyond what they do on a regular basis and working with developers.

STEVEN COHEN: I think there's a middle ground, though, between, you know, having it equally distributed throughout and then putting them all in the basement. And, you know, it sometimes, you know, the perfect is the enemy of the good. And for me the good is to get as many affordable units as we can and to make it as economically feasible for the developer as we can.

IRAM FAROOQ: So if I may just add,

though, the one variation is that in the selection of the units there is usually a little bit of give and take as that discussion is happening because a developer presents a proposal for which units would be the inclusionary units, and then the staff reviews it and sometimes they change because they don't feel like this is sufficiently representative or as it says it ought to be. But there are times when a developer would say, gee, I really don't want to, you know, I would be willing to trade off something better for this penthouse unit because that's really where a lot of my financial gain is. So we try to use that as a leverage point to try to get something like either larger unit of -- family-size unit in exchange for a smaller unit that might be higher up in the building. Or a -- sometimes multiple units



in exchange for a unit that is better located. So I think we want the baseline to be the equally distributed, and if there is deviation from that, that that actually benefits the affordability in the end. So that's -- and I think you're right, that it has to be a case-by-case evaluation in that instance.

STEVEN COHEN: I hear you and, you know, I don't want to beat a dead horse and persevere at infinitum and nauseam on this thing. But I'm about increasing the number of units. And if not requiring that those units be placed in the most valuable locations, it makes it economically more feasible to provide more affordable units, then that's a middle ground tradeoff that I would certainly advocate.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: If you could

trade the more valuable real estate at the top for another unit or two in the lower section of the building?

STEVEN COHEN: But that's what I'm suggesting.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Right.

STEVEN COHEN: Require more units now --

H. THEODORE COHEN: But which you think is factored -- but they're doing -- I mean we have a --

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Two turns into four.

STEVEN COHEN: But it shouldn't have to be ad hoc. You know, require more units but give them more flexibility on where they're placed.

IRAM FAROOQ: Perhaps we put this in with a cover letter along with the other --

STEVEN COHEN: The minority report.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right, minority reports.

HUGH RUSSELL: As an architect of buildings that have affordable units in them, I've never much been a party to these discussions about which units are the affordable units? Occasionally a developer will say, you know, which are the -- which of the particular two-bedroom units are the ones that I -- that you think are the most marketable units? And he'll try to get those in the plan. You know, typically we used to do four-story buildings, and there were never affordable units on the top floor. And, you know, there would be some future units out on the corners of the buildings that had nicer, you know, exposures and those tended to not be affordable.

Now I've not worked in Cambridge. Cambridge is tougher than that. I believe that somewhere between having all the worst units be affordable and the way in which my developers have negotiated things is the right place to be on the spectrum. And if you can leverage more affordable units, because that's where the private market works. You know, if this were a market -- if you decided that you wanted to, you know, as I did when I was say a student, that I wanted to pay 65 bucks a month, and I was willing to live in a microunit in a basement because that was my housing priority, the private market, and 50 years ago, allowed me to make that choice. And I didn't, I felt, you know, like I was smart. And I only had 3,000 bucks a year to live on. And, you know, I needed to conserve resources. Once government gets

involved, things happen.

Another thing that -- one of the things that my developers commonly do is that they will build out the interior finishes to the 1998 standard instead of the 2005 standard which means they'll have formica counters rather than marble or granite counters. Indeed I was told a story of I'm doing a highly affordable building and the governor viewed a highly affordable project like this and it had granite counters and he threw a fit. So we're not, in this project, we're either in the market or the subsidized units, and we're all having formica counters because of the connection to the former governor and his policies. And they're going to test again to see if they can get some really cheap, you know, granite in. Maybe that will pass muster under Charlie Baker that it

wouldn't under the development. But I think the principle is when you go to somebody's door, you shouldn't know what their income is when you knock on the door. You shouldn't know because of where they are, because that's a political, private thing that should be respected. That's the, what the city's trying to enforce.

STEVEN COHEN: But we can honor that principle and still find some flexibility in the process I think.

HUGH RUSSELL: I would like to see more flexibility than the city gives, but I don't believe I want to go out on the political limits and suggest that here. I think that only we -- what Iram suggested was you have a principle that -- of full distribution. And then if you can negotiate a better deal using, you know, somebody says

I want, you know, the top five floors for all market rates, we can say okay, what are you going to give me? And that --

STEVEN COHEN: The only thing I mention is that we're all talking so much about how we want to make this project, the Volpe project feasible, and the developer has to make certain assumptions on the day that he makes the proposal. And being told that there is some possibility that you could make ad hoc arrangements down the road some day maybe, isn't going to help them make those more aggressive assumptions upfront and so he's going to have to, you know, make the worst case assumptions and, again, that may militate against the goals that you're looking for in terms of assuring a successful bid for the Volpe project.

HUGH RUSSELL: I mean, I think I'll

say Twining, who has done a few of these buildings, may have a better sense than somebody who has never done them of what he can get out and maybe he'll get an extra percentage point in his estimate because he understands how the negotiations work. But that's not a huge thing. I think, again, the state of principle is to give somebody an assumption is probably the best --

STEVEN COHEN: I hear you. I think it may be bigger than -- a bigger thing than what you're giving it credit for.

AHMED NUR: Mr. Chairman, can we move on?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes.

AHMED NUR: It's getting late.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Does anyone else have any questions or comments about the petition?



(No Response.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: Is there anyone in the public who would like to have a brief comment about what we have discussed tonight? Or -- there's no need for you to speak if you choose not to because assuming this goes forward, and it will come back before us and we will have further discussions about it. But if anybody really wanted to toss anything out now, now is the moment.

(No Response.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: No?

IRAM FAROOQ: I think Joe is raising his hand.

JOSEPH MAQUIRE: Joe Maguire from Alexandria Real Estate Equities. I wanted to state a couple things as an overview. A couple things that one was pointed out by Catherine in particular.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Could you speak closer to the microphone?

JOSEPH MAQUIRE: In terms of what Catherine was saying earlier tonight was that it's housing, and I'm looking at the housing side of this equation first. Housing side of this equation is one that is very subject to the whims of capital markets. It happens to be a very good time right now. It's very frothy. That's not always the case. We spend more time in our markets, in our market cycles going through times when the capital markets aren't friendly and actually would price housing, you know, out of the reach in most cases. So I think the housing is a very sensitive issue, and so I'll go back to what Catherine was saying.

That being said, Steve, when you're talking about having some flexibility, I

think that family-friendly units that are well placed are -- should be sought after versus necessarily putting, you know, families up at the 28th or the 30th floor of a building. I think there would be a preference where you have children to be down lower in some cases, and there's -- the site has a potential for having various size buildings. So having some flexibility where families are placed in these family-sized units that you will be asking for two- and three-bedroom units. Those were the two observations.

One other observation I had has to do with the size of and the width of a building that's tall. Again, for residential, if that floor plate gets too narrow, it's not -- that building's natural not going to be as stable as others when the wind starts blowing. I

think you have to have some freedom to architecturally design something that looks good and will perform and have this stiffness that you would expect in a tall building for a residential purpose. Office buildings have quite a bit of movement in them. And residential will still have some movement but I just, I would reflect on that as well in terms of the profile of the buildings.

And one other point is commercial buildings, the floor plate sizes are larger and they either want to be above 20,000 square feet, 20, 30,000 square feet in size so I just put that out there.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And just following up on your comment about the structure, I mean there is a new residential tower in New York. It's like 90 stories that I think is one unit per floor. And I have

friends who are architects in New York and they're all wondering what this structure is and how it is standing.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. They're not running with the -- this is one of the buildings that the units go for five or ten or 20 million dollars a piece.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Oh, yeah.

JOSEPH MAQUIRE: They must have resolved the structural issues movement. But it has to be moving.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

STEVEN COHEN: Actually, Joe, while you're here can I ask you a question? As between office and lab, and the abstract lab would appear to be more profitable. If you were to do a project such as this and you had the choice of how to allocate the uses, how do you think it would come out?

JOSEPH MAQUIRE: The way I would do it as a developer is I have to rely upon what's -- what the market will allow me to do. The markets change. Again, the markets today are very, very tight, and it's driving the office market up by quite a bit. The lab market has not moved as much as the lab, but they're both moving now, but there is a crossover point where office is more profitable than lab. We've gone -- we're going through that point right now, and so it runs in cycles. I think you'll -- whatever we do, whatever you do, should reflect the cycles -- allow for the cycles of activity in the capital markets to drive that uses and have that flexibility to what can be done. And, again, getting this Volpe site completed, you're probably going to pass over, you know, two or three cycles.

STEVEN COHEN: Thanks.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Is there anyone else who wishes to comment?

(No Response.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: All right, fine.

Board, are we prepared to move forward with this and ask staff to file a petition with the City Council on behalf of the Planning Board?

STEVEN COHEN: Can I just ask a question? Will there in fact be a minority report?

H. THEODORE COHEN: I'm assuming that if, you know, if there were a motion along the lines of presenting a petition to City Council substantially in the form provided to us with the exception that there would be a provision that one building in a

PUD could be taller than 350 feet in the discretion of the Planning Board upon a significant presentation being made to it by the developer that it should go for about 350, perhaps as high as 500 feet.

And that we would stick with the 15 percent affordable housing, but that there is, you know, some question as to the appropriate mix of low and moderate and middle, and that there would be a clear statement that some members of the Board felt that 15 percent was not the appropriate number and that it should be at least 20 percent and that the mix should be probably 50/50 percent.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: That sounds right.

STEVEN COHEN: Thank you.

HUGH RUSSELL: So you're proposing



that it get submitted under 13 and 2 with the commentary that reflects our discussion and our aspirations?

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right.

HUGH RUSSELL: Which is to get as much --

H. THEODORE COHEN: And that 13 and 2 may not be the right number and maybe it's a two-to-one mix and that some people think it should be a 50/50 mix.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: But that we all agree on the goal to get as much as we can without killing the project.

IRAM FAROOQ: We will absolutely do that, but I just want to remind the Board that just the way that the process works. At this stage the petition will go to the Council and the Council will then refer the

petition to the Ordinance Committee and to the Planning Board. So they're not really going to be making changes at the referral stage. They make the changes generally after the public hearings and the discussions that happen. So the more meaningful comment will be the comment that the Planning Board sends back after the public hearing on the petition itself.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: I still think that given the level of disagreement here, that the Ordinance Committee should know that -- that even though we're filing --

IRAM FAROOQ: Absolutely.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And I think City Council should know at this time, too --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: -- that this is a discussion that we're having --

IRAM FAROOQ: For sure.

H. THEODORE COHEN: -- and, you know, just as they come to talk to us periodically --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: -- we can communicate back to them.

IRAM FAROOQ: Absolutely. Yes.

JEFF ROBERTS: Mr. Chair, not to prolong things too much, but I think if the Board were going to include with a petition some commentary, including what you just stated, it might be helpful to have some more general commentary, too, in terms of just the Board's general view on the goals of this petition and what, and what in the Board's view it does to further the City's planning.

AHMED NUR: Something more specific than what he's saying?

JEFF ROBERTS: I think you made a comments about some uncertainty that with portions of the petition, but I think that it may also be appropriate to state some of the more positive points of agreement that --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Yes.

STEVEN COHEN: Oh, sure. Yeah. The disagreements are a footnotes to the big picture.

H. THEODORE COHEN: We're in agreement with everything else in the petition. And I think that --

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Right.

H. THEODORE COHEN: -- you know, the way it has been drafted now with, you know, a strict FAR, without the bonus provisions, but with the definite requirement for affordable housing.

That the split of the 60/40 that, you

know, really everything else that's in it is something that the Board wholeheartedly endorses absolutely.

STEVEN COHEN: Yes.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: There are just a couple of areas, and that we hope endorse the idea of the way that the open space is being handled. And that, you know, we've had -- and Traffic and Parking that, you know, that we endorse the whole thing but we have it, you know, legitimate difference of opinion on a couple of areas of how far, you know, the City ought to be pushing, you know, to get more affordable housing and what the proper mix is. And that this is all in the context that we do want a development to go forward --

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Absolutely.

H. THEODORE COHEN: -- on the site and we want it to be successful.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Right. Well said.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Sounds good.

AHMED NUR: And those issues will be worked out after the public hearing.

H. THEODORE COHEN: So do you need an actual vote from us now?

HUGH RUSSELL: I guess I'm wondering if rather than forward being 13/2, we should forward a different mix as a challenge to get that discussion on the table.

STEVEN COHEN: Well, I would certainly support that.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I would go with 10/5.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: I could do 10/5, that's great.

AHMED NUR: That's great. High five.

H. THEODORE COHEN: You all agree to what I wanted.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: There you go.

STEVEN COHEN: You two make a great marriage.

AHMED NUR: The Chair and the Vice, they both get what they wanted.

H. THEODORE COHEN: So would somebody make a motion?

HUGH RUSSELL: I move that we submit a Zoning proposal for consideration by the City Council based on the draft we have before us, the technical amendments that have been discussed with Ted, and our discussion tonight which I'm not going to enumerate, but basically only have two points; to change the

10/5 and it's the ability to go above 350 for a single building and there are certain representations that are superior to that.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Second.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Any further discussion?

(No Response.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: All those in favor?

(Show of hands) .

H. THEODORE COHEN: Opposed?

(No Response.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

We are adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 10:00 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 12th day of June, 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> [2] - 94:19, 104:3  <b>\$12</b> [1] - 75:6  <b>\$20</b> [3] - 25:9, 110:19, 111:4  <b>\$200</b> [3] - 79:7, 79:18, 94:14  <b>\$300</b> [1] - 104:5  <b>\$4,000</b> [1] - 139:14  <b>\$4.70</b> [1] - 75:5  <b>\$500</b> [1] - 94:15  <b>\$99</b> [1] - 103:19</p>	<p><b>17th</b> [5] - 11:9, 11:17, 12:6, 12:8, 12:12  <b>18,000</b> [1] - 23:2  <b>19</b> [1] - 51:5  <b>193</b> [1] - 33:3  <b>1930s</b> [1] - 60:14  <b>1998</b> [1] - 157:5  <b>19th</b> [2] - 3:13, 59:13</p>	<p><b>3-D</b> [1] - 36:9  <b>3.5</b> [1] - 38:4  <b>30</b> [4] - 104:2, 119:6, 120:5  <b>30,000</b> [1] - 164:13  <b>300</b> [7] - 33:12, 33:16, 35:15, 35:18, 43:7, 69:4, 79:13  <b>303</b> [1] - 68:6  <b>30th</b> [1] - 163:4  <b>31st</b> [1] - 10:6  <b>344</b> [1] - 1:6  <b>350</b> [25] - 28:4, 40:2, 40:6, 41:19, 44:1, 53:19, 54:4, 54:13, 56:4, 56:15, 57:4, 61:11, 64:13, 65:5, 65:13, 65:17, 66:2, 69:10, 70:15, 71:2, 71:8, 91:1, 168:1, 168:5, 176:1  <b>38,000</b> [1] - 34:11</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>6</b></p> <p><b>6,000</b> [1] - 33:10  <b>60</b> [3] - 18:15, 79:14, 139:17  <b>60-day</b> [1] - 11:8  <b>60/40</b> [4] - 138:4, 138:9, 172:19  <b>60s</b> [1] - 67:8  <b>617.786.7783/617.639.0396</b> [1] - 1:18  <b>63</b> [2] - 80:19, 101:18  <b>65</b> [1] - 156:12</p>	<p><b>accommodate</b> [4] - 37:13, 38:7, 40:10, 43:9  <b>accommodated</b> [4] - 37:2, 37:8, 37:11, 39:14  <b>according</b> [2] - 51:12, 80:18  <b>accurate</b> [2] - 177:17, 178:6  <b>achieve</b> [4] - 42:3, 47:13, 47:15, 59:11  <b>acquisition</b> [1] - 104:6  <b>acre</b> [2] - 21:3, 126:2  <b>acres</b> [2] - 37:19, 38:4  <b>act</b> [2] - 30:11, 96:14  <b>Acting</b> [3] - 1:12, 2:3, 3:9  <b>activate</b> [1] - 15:16  <b>active</b> [1] - 15:13  <b>activity</b> [1] - 166:14  <b>acts</b> [1] - 142:19  <b>actual</b> [4] - 131:9, 131:12, 139:1, 174:9  <b>acute</b> [1] - 93:15  <b>ad</b> [2] - 154:15, 159:11  <b>add</b> [3] - 92:18, 94:18, 151:19  <b>added</b> [5] - 18:8, 18:9, 29:18, 50:6, 58:3  <b>addition</b> [3] - 9:5, 86:10, 141:16  <b>additional</b> [4] - 9:1, 25:17, 111:11, 113:3  <b>address</b> [3] - 59:2, 76:13, 114:16  <b>adjourned</b> [1] - 176:14  <b>Adjourned</b> [1] - 176:16  <b>adjusted</b> [3] - 23:13, 25:4, 138:9  <b>administration</b> [1] - 94:4  <b>administrator</b> [1] - 86:3  <b>adopted</b> [1] - 75:7  <b>Adoption</b> [1] - 2:5  <b>advance</b> [3] - 7:2, 82:13, 143:18  <b>advanced</b> [1] - 6:9  <b>advantage</b> [1] - 52:4  <b>advertising</b> [1] - 12:3  <b>advice</b> [1] - 125:6  <b>Advisory</b> [1] - 89:16  <b>advocacy</b> [1] - 118:18  <b>advocate</b> [3] - 74:5,</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>0</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>2</b></p> <p><b>2</b> [3] - 55:2, 169:1, 169:9  <b>2.6</b> [1] - 37:19  <b>20</b> [24] - 40:19, 51:14, 80:9, 80:13, 81:5, 81:8, 82:2, 82:17, 87:5, 87:16, 91:4, 91:13, 96:17, 96:19, 103:14, 104:7, 104:8, 106:4, 109:9, 115:5, 123:8, 164:13, 165:7, 168:13  <b>20,000</b> [1] - 164:12  <b>20-site</b> [1] - 49:10  <b>200,000</b> [2] - 22:4, 22:9  <b>2001</b> [2] - 32:12, 32:16  <b>2005</b> [1] - 157:5  <b>2012</b> [1] - 14:17  <b>2013</b> [1] - 14:18  <b>2015</b> [2] - 1:4, 178:8  <b>2017</b> [1] - 96:17  <b>2022</b> [1] - 178:14  <b>21,500</b> [1] - 33:18  <b>24th</b> [1] - 10:6  <b>25</b> [9] - 38:3, 89:18, 90:4, 90:6, 90:17, 90:19, 103:14, 122:6, 150:5  <b>250</b> [13] - 34:8, 34:17, 35:1, 35:15, 38:19, 39:8, 41:1, 43:6, 69:3, 90:2, 90:4, 90:19, 91:1  <b>250-foot</b> [1] - 28:4  <b>26th</b> [1] - 3:18  <b>270</b> [1] - 33:9  <b>275</b> [1] - 35:3  <b>28th</b> [1] - 163:4  <b>29</b> [1] - 178:14  <b>295</b> [1] - 33:12  <b>2nd</b> [2] - 4:2, 5:8</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>4</b></p> <p><b>4.0</b> [1] - 18:4  <b>4.4-something</b> [1] - 137:19  <b>4.48</b> [2] - 18:10, 21:7  <b>4.5</b> [3] - 18:12, 21:7, 137:19  <b>40</b> [3] - 18:16, 79:14, 104:1  <b>400</b> [7] - 39:16, 54:2, 54:4, 57:18, 64:13, 69:14  <b>400,000</b> [1] - 37:11  <b>450</b> [1] - 57:18</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>7</b></p> <p><b>7,000</b> [1] - 33:14  <b>70</b> [1] - 56:3  <b>700</b> [2] - 57:9, 64:14  <b>700-foot</b> [1] - 62:14  <b>7:00</b> [1] - 1:5</p>	<p><b>accommodate</b> [4] - 37:13, 38:7, 40:10, 43:9  <b>accommodated</b> [4] - 37:2, 37:8, 37:11, 39:14  <b>according</b> [2] - 51:12, 80:18  <b>accurate</b> [2] - 177:17, 178:6  <b>achieve</b> [4] - 42:3, 47:13, 47:15, 59:11  <b>acquisition</b> [1] - 104:6  <b>acre</b> [2] - 21:3, 126:2  <b>acres</b> [2] - 37:19, 38:4  <b>act</b> [2] - 30:11, 96:14  <b>Acting</b> [3] - 1:12, 2:3, 3:9  <b>activate</b> [1] - 15:16  <b>active</b> [1] - 15:13  <b>activity</b> [1] - 166:14  <b>acts</b> [1] - 142:19  <b>actual</b> [4] - 131:9, 131:12, 139:1, 174:9  <b>acute</b> [1] - 93:15  <b>ad</b> [2] - 154:15, 159:11  <b>add</b> [3] - 92:18, 94:18, 151:19  <b>added</b> [5] - 18:8, 18:9, 29:18, 50:6, 58:3  <b>addition</b> [3] - 9:5, 86:10, 141:16  <b>additional</b> [4] - 9:1, 25:17, 111:11, 113:3  <b>address</b> [3] - 59:2, 76:13, 114:16  <b>adjourned</b> [1] - 176:14  <b>Adjourned</b> [1] - 176:16  <b>adjusted</b> [3] - 23:13, 25:4, 138:9  <b>administration</b> [1] - 94:4  <b>administrator</b> [1] - 86:3  <b>adopted</b> [1] - 75:7  <b>Adoption</b> [1] - 2:5  <b>advance</b> [3] - 7:2, 82:13, 143:18  <b>advanced</b> [1] - 6:9  <b>advantage</b> [1] - 52:4  <b>advertising</b> [1] - 12:3  <b>advice</b> [1] - 125:6  <b>Advisory</b> [1] - 89:16  <b>advocacy</b> [1] - 118:18  <b>advocate</b> [3] - 74:5,</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>0.48</b> [1] - 18:6  <b>0.5</b> [1] - 133:10</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>3</b></p> <p><b>3</b> [3] - 2:4, 25:8, 79:13  <b>3,000</b> [1] - 156:17</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>5</b></p> <p><b>5</b> [1] - 1:4  <b>5.5</b> [2] - 121:18, 122:3  <b>50</b> [7] - 35:19, 81:18, 81:19, 100:14, 139:17, 150:4, 156:15  <b>50-foot</b> [1] - 37:12  <b>50-story</b> [1] - 61:14  <b>50/50</b> [3] - 102:15, 168:15, 169:11  <b>500</b> [7] - 56:15, 64:14, 65:13, 66:1, 69:14, 136:12, 168:5  <b>50s</b> [1] - 67:8  <b>50th</b> [1] - 67:18  <b>57</b> [3] - 2:8, 10:18, 11:6  <b>5th</b> [1] - 3:4</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>8</b></p> <p><b>8,000</b> [1] - 36:2  <b>80</b> [1] - 90:5  <b>8th</b> [1] - 5:19</p>	<p><b>accommodate</b> [4] - 37:13, 38:7, 40:10, 43:9  <b>accommodated</b> [4] - 37:2, 37:8, 37:11, 39:14  <b>according</b> [2] - 51:12, 80:18  <b>accurate</b> [2] - 177:17, 178:6  <b>achieve</b> [4] - 42:3, 47:13, 47:15, 59:11  <b>acquisition</b> [1] - 104:6  <b>acre</b> [2] - 21:3, 126:2  <b>acres</b> [2] - 37:19, 38:4  <b>act</b> [2] - 30:11, 96:14  <b>Acting</b> [3] - 1:12, 2:3, 3:9  <b>activate</b> [1] - 15:16  <b>active</b> [1] - 15:13  <b>activity</b> [1] - 166:14  <b>acts</b> [1] - 142:19  <b>actual</b> [4] - 131:9, 131:12, 139:1, 174:9  <b>acute</b> [1] - 93:15  <b>ad</b> [2] - 154:15, 159:11  <b>add</b> [3] - 92:18, 94:18, 151:19  <b>added</b> [5] - 18:8, 18:9, 29:18, 50:6, 58:3  <b>addition</b> [3] - 9:5, 86:10, 141:16  <b>additional</b> [4] - 9:1, 25:17, 111:11, 113:3  <b>address</b> [3] - 59:2, 76:13, 114:16  <b>adjourned</b> [1] - 176:14  <b>Adjourned</b> [1] - 176:16  <b>adjusted</b> [3] - 23:13, 25:4, 138:9  <b>administration</b> [1] - 94:4  <b>administrator</b> [1] - 86:3  <b>adopted</b> [1] - 75:7  <b>Adoption</b> [1] - 2:5  <b>advance</b> [3] - 7:2, 82:13, 143:18  <b>advanced</b> [1] - 6:9  <b>advantage</b> [1] - 52:4  <b>advertising</b> [1] - 12:3  <b>advice</b> [1] - 125:6  <b>Advisory</b> [1] - 89:16  <b>advocacy</b> [1] - 118:18  <b>advocate</b> [3] - 74:5,</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>1</b></p> <p><b>10</b> [8] - 2:5, 2:9, 51:13, 82:18, 104:7, 104:8, 115:5  <b>10/5</b> [3] - 174:17, 174:19, 176:1  <b>100</b> [1] - 48:3  <b>10:00</b> [1] - 176:15  <b>10th</b> [1] - 10:5  <b>11.5</b> [2] - 84:9, 84:14  <b>110</b> [1] - 59:5  <b>120</b> [2] - 27:14, 90:5  <b>125</b> [2] - 59:5, 59:9  <b>12th</b> [2] - 5:15, 178:8  <b>13</b> [9] - 2:7, 19:12, 19:13, 71:14, 78:1, 84:14, 95:19, 169:1, 169:8  <b>13.12.4</b> [1] - 142:5  <b>13/2</b> [1] - 174:11  <b>130</b> [1] - 3:15  <b>14.2</b> [1] - 21:3  <b>140</b> [1] - 27:15  <b>147703</b> [1] - 178:12  <b>15</b> [26] - 19:18, 51:14, 71:13, 72:1, 72:2, 78:2, 84:4, 84:6, 84:10, 87:4, 87:16, 87:17, 90:14, 91:7, 94:10, 94:12, 97:3, 98:11, 103:11, 103:13, 106:13, 109:8, 138:17, 168:6, 168:12  <b>15,000</b> [1] - 34:16  <b>150</b> [1] - 59:6  <b>16</b> [1] - 96:2  <b>16,000</b> [2] - 33:4, 45:8</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>3</b></p> <p><b>3</b> [3] - 2:4, 25:8, 79:13  <b>3,000</b> [1] - 156:17</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>5</b></p> <p><b>5</b> [1] - 1:4  <b>5.5</b> [2] - 121:18, 122:3  <b>50</b> [7] - 35:19, 81:18, 81:19, 100:14, 139:17, 150:4, 156:15  <b>50-foot</b> [1] - 37:12  <b>50-story</b> [1] - 61:14  <b>50/50</b> [3] - 102:15, 168:15, 169:11  <b>500</b> [7] - 56:15, 64:14, 65:13, 66:1, 69:14, 136:12, 168:5  <b>50s</b> [1] - 67:8  <b>50th</b> [1] - 67:18  <b>57</b> [3] - 2:8, 10:18, 11:6  <b>5th</b> [1] - 3:4</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>9</b></p> <p><b>90</b> [2] - 5:12, 164:18  <b>99</b> [1] - 104:3</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>A</b></p> <p><b>abatement</b> [1] - 5:16  <b>ability</b> [5] - 26:8, 49:2, 95:6, 133:4, 176:1  <b>able</b> [7] - 6:12, 16:9, 16:13, 73:10, 96:2, 123:17, 134:16  <b>absence</b> [2] - 64:11, 103:15  <b>absolutely</b> [10] - 70:13, 91:16, 109:5, 124:16, 127:12, 169:15, 170:14, 171:8, 173:3, 173:19  <b>abstract</b> [1] - 165:15  <b>academic</b> [1] - 61:8  <b>accept</b> [5] - 10:9, 12:11, 60:5, 120:4, 120:6  <b>acceptable</b> [1] - 95:14  <b>access</b> [3] - 37:17, 41:12, 149:19  <b>accessible</b> [1] - 129:6</p>

<p>121:15, 153:18  <b>advocates</b> [4] - 99:5, 99:7, 99:18, 105:3  <b>advocating</b> [4] - 55:18, 123:9, 142:2, 146:17  <b>aesthetic</b> [1] - 63:14  <b>affect</b> [1] - 132:7  <b>afford</b> [2] - 103:10, 139:13  <b>affordability</b> [5] - 23:10, 25:17, 26:2, 108:1, 153:5  <b>affordable</b> [57] - 17:9, 19:6, 19:14, 20:11, 22:11, 24:12, 25:10, 26:8, 27:3, 31:12, 50:9, 76:17, 79:17, 80:9, 81:2, 81:18, 82:9, 82:13, 82:18, 83:4, 86:15, 93:7, 93:15, 96:1, 102:9, 106:1, 111:9, 111:15, 112:5, 113:4, 116:2, 123:8, 130:10, 138:18, 141:14, 143:19, 144:9, 144:18, 146:18, 147:15, 148:12, 150:5, 150:10, 151:1, 151:16, 153:16, 155:5, 155:8, 155:15, 155:19, 156:4, 156:7, 157:9, 157:10, 168:7, 172:17, 173:15  <b>afraid</b> [3] - 57:7, 58:13, 66:7  <b>agenda</b> [3] - 3:6, 3:13, 10:17  <b>aggressive</b> [1] - 159:13  <b>ago</b> [6] - 4:7, 4:19, 49:14, 58:19, 87:9, 156:15  <b>agonized</b> [1] - 114:12  <b>agree</b> [10] - 12:12, 67:5, 73:9, 82:5, 84:17, 97:9, 98:13, 121:6, 169:13, 175:3  <b>Agreement</b> [1] - 143:6  <b>agreement</b> [5] - 6:11, 107:19, 109:13, 172:5, 172:11  <b>ahead</b> [3] - 88:19, 121:5, 148:19  <b>AHMED</b> [20] - 10:12, 12:13, 54:11, 62:3, 70:3, 70:18, 89:8, 91:8, 91:11, 92:8,</p>	<p>92:11, 125:15, 126:18, 127:15, 160:13, 160:16, 171:18, 174:6, 175:1, 175:9  <b>Ahmed</b> [4] - 1:10, 54:10, 60:4, 67:6  <b>aim</b> [1] - 44:13  <b>Alexandria</b> [1] - 161:16  <b>alignment</b> [1] - 8:8  <b>allocate</b> [1] - 165:18  <b>allocated</b> [1] - 111:8  <b>allocations</b> [1] - 31:12  <b>allow</b> [5] - 55:17, 116:19, 133:17, 166:3, 166:14  <b>allowed</b> [5] - 17:10, 27:16, 28:8, 59:7, 156:15  <b>allows</b> [3] - 28:2, 28:3, 88:9  <b>almost</b> [1] - 121:14  <b>alone</b> [1] - 122:11  <b>alternate</b> [1] - 24:6  <b>alternative</b> [1] - 30:14  <b>ambiguous</b> [1] - 143:8  <b>amendments</b> [1] - 175:16  <b>amenity</b> [1] - 41:12  <b>Ames</b> [2] - 34:19, 45:6  <b>AMI</b> [1] - 90:5  <b>amortization</b> [1] - 122:6  <b>amount</b> [17] - 21:8, 21:17, 22:9, 22:10, 22:13, 23:13, 23:18, 24:14, 26:6, 58:9, 73:4, 81:15, 93:16, 95:2, 108:1, 127:14, 142:7  <b>amounted</b> [2] - 110:19, 111:4  <b>amounts</b> [1] - 95:17  <b>analyses</b> [2] - 122:18, 123:4  <b>analysis</b> [34] - 32:5, 38:14, 39:6, 40:5, 78:17, 79:1, 79:16, 80:10, 80:11, 80:12, 82:14, 103:2, 103:5, 103:8, 103:15, 103:17, 103:18, 104:17, 104:18, 108:11, 112:13, 114:5, 114:14, 115:11, 117:11, 117:17, 121:9, 121:14, 121:16, 122:12, 122:15,</p>	<p>122:19, 123:5  <b>analytical</b> [2] - 77:17, 82:10  <b>analyze</b> [1] - 37:1  <b>AND</b> [1] - 177:1  <b>AND/OR</b> [1] - 178:17  <b>answer</b> [3] - 43:14, 94:2, 143:17  <b>answering</b> [1] - 77:9  <b>anticipate</b> [1] - 51:10  <b>anticipated</b> [1] - 48:10  <b>anticipation</b> [1] - 73:14  <b>ANY</b> [2] - 178:16, 178:16  <b>anyway</b> [1] - 92:14  <b>apologies</b> [1] - 143:16  <b>apologize</b> [1] - 143:18  <b>appeal</b> [1] - 77:5  <b>appear</b> [2] - 34:1, 165:16  <b>applicable</b> [3] - 18:7, 144:2, 146:9  <b>applicant</b> [2] - 70:16, 150:3  <b>applied</b> [3] - 18:4, 58:17, 103:3  <b>APPLY</b> [1] - 178:16  <b>apply</b> [8] - 15:2, 15:3, 15:5, 49:2, 58:16, 90:1, 92:1, 146:3  <b>appreciate</b> [1] - 62:4  <b>appreciated</b> [1] - 142:2  <b>appreciation</b> [1] - 141:12  <b>approach</b> [4] - 29:11, 40:15, 63:5, 120:14  <b>approaches</b> [1] - 37:1  <b>appropriate</b> [9] - 54:1, 83:5, 127:11, 131:5, 139:5, 141:1, 168:9, 168:12, 172:4  <b>approval</b> [9] - 35:1, 46:17, 48:13, 48:19, 49:12, 50:5, 50:12, 50:15, 146:1  <b>approve</b> [3] - 51:4, 70:13, 133:15  <b>approved</b> [2] - 6:9, 50:18  <b>approves</b> [1] - 49:5  <b>approving</b> [1] - 49:12  <b>april</b> [1] - 178:14  <b>aptitude</b> [1] - 52:18  <b>architect</b> [2] - 53:3, 155:4  <b>architects</b> [1] - 165:1  <b>architectural</b> [5] - 48:6, 63:15, 64:9,</p>	<p>66:3, 86:10  <b>architecturally</b> [1] - 164:2  <b>architecture</b> [4] - 42:19, 44:8, 45:14, 105:16  <b>area</b> [17] - 15:4, 15:5, 20:4, 20:14, 21:6, 23:8, 30:13, 39:8, 39:12, 39:18, 52:12, 60:13, 66:13, 67:12, 131:1, 142:4, 142:15  <b>areas</b> [7] - 41:11, 51:18, 126:10, 140:3, 150:1, 173:7, 173:13  <b>arena</b> [1] - 99:8  <b>arguably</b> [1] - 102:8  <b>argument</b> [3] - 97:15, 149:3, 150:6  <b>arise</b> [1] - 36:10  <b>arises</b> [1] - 46:10  <b>arrangement</b> [1] - 145:18  <b>arrangements</b> [3] - 133:15, 134:1, 159:11  <b>art</b> [2] - 8:14, 61:6  <b>Article</b> [1] - 51:5  <b>aside</b> [4] - 76:12, 78:11, 83:13, 119:3  <b>aspect</b> [1] - 43:16  <b>aspirations</b> [1] - 169:3  <b>assigned</b> [1] - 127:3  <b>assistance</b> [1] - 120:17  <b>Assistant</b> [3] - 1:12, 2:3, 3:10  <b>Associate</b> [1] - 1:10  <b>associated</b> [1] - 116:6  <b>assumed</b> [4] - 37:10, 84:7, 121:18, 122:14  <b>assuming</b> [5] - 104:4, 104:7, 106:8, 161:6, 167:14  <b>assumption</b> [4] - 80:10, 80:13, 104:1, 160:9  <b>assumptions</b> [12] - 72:14, 72:16, 78:19, 80:3, 80:6, 115:13, 115:17, 121:8, 121:11, 159:8, 159:13, 159:15  <b>assuring</b> [1] - 159:17  <b>attendance</b> [1] - 125:1  <b>attractive</b> [1] - 76:4</p>	<p><b>AUDIENCE</b> [1] - 66:11  <b>Authority</b> [2] - 108:13, 112:16  <b>available</b> [3] - 81:15, 117:18, 135:11  <b>Ave</b> [1] - 3:15  <b>Avenue</b> [2] - 3:18, 96:10  <b>aware</b> [2] - 82:1, 150:14  <b>awful</b> [1] - 92:19</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>B</b></p> <hr/> <p><b>Bacci</b> [1] - 1:10  <b>BACCI</b> [22] - 61:18, 66:6, 66:10, 66:12, 68:14, 92:13, 109:4, 124:13, 129:9, 129:17, 130:6, 136:5, 136:14, 139:16, 149:13, 153:19, 154:6, 154:12, 168:16, 172:13, 173:19, 174:5  <b>bad</b> [2] - 69:15, 151:2  <b>Baker</b> [1] - 157:19  <b>balance</b> [5] - 20:15, 39:9, 41:8, 93:5, 113:11  <b>balances</b> [1] - 22:8  <b>balancing</b> [2] - 110:8, 110:13  <b>ballpark</b> [1] - 27:2  <b>bankers</b> [1] - 95:2  <b>bar</b> [3] - 24:4, 24:5, 34:1  <b>barely</b> [1] - 137:15  <b>barring</b> [1] - 66:2  <b>base</b> [2] - 18:2, 105:19  <b>based</b> [16] - 8:19, 20:14, 25:4, 28:5, 30:5, 56:16, 72:14, 80:5, 81:7, 95:11, 106:3, 114:14, 115:8, 142:11, 149:10, 175:15  <b>baseline</b> [2] - 84:7, 153:2  <b>basement</b> [3] - 147:6, 151:13, 156:13  <b>basic</b> [2] - 51:12, 115:17  <b>basis</b> [5] - 77:17, 77:19, 113:7, 113:15, 151:9  <b>Bay</b> [1] - 3:15  <b>beat</b> [1] - 153:10  <b>beautiful</b> [2] - 105:17,</p>
--	---	--	--	---

<p>130:3  <b>became</b> [1] - 59:10  <b>become</b> [2] - 96:12, 100:3  <b>becomes</b> [1] - 144:19  <b>becoming</b> [1] - 68:1  <b>bedrock</b> [1] - 144:15  <b>bedroom</b> [5] - 20:12, 90:7, 155:10, 163:12  <b>bedrooms</b> [1] - 21:1  <b>begin</b> [2] - 78:17, 79:2  <b>beginning</b> [4] - 24:18, 84:19, 104:19, 114:19  <b>behalf</b> [1] - 167:9  <b>behind</b> [6] - 17:15, 17:17, 48:7, 73:19, 116:18, 127:6  <b>belabor</b> [1] - 76:2  <b>below</b> [4] - 22:1, 64:3, 133:9, 133:12  <b>benefit</b> [2] - 9:15, 54:3  <b>benefits</b> [1] - 153:5  <b>best</b> [3] - 105:6, 112:6, 160:9  <b>better</b> [14] - 46:5, 48:9, 54:14, 65:1, 91:12, 92:2, 93:5, 102:6, 117:14, 123:3, 152:13, 153:1, 158:19, 160:2  <b>between</b> [11] - 41:7, 71:14, 71:15, 93:5, 94:19, 99:1, 101:13, 109:8, 151:11, 156:3, 165:15  <b>beyond</b> [3] - 95:15, 110:12, 151:8  <b>bid</b> [1] - 159:18  <b>bidder</b> [2] - 74:4, 78:13  <b>big</b> [5] - 50:3, 68:1, 77:11, 96:9, 172:8  <b>bigger</b> [2] - 160:11  <b>Bigolin</b> [2] - 1:15, 31:16  <b>BIGOLIN</b> [6] - 31:15, 44:7, 44:10, 45:6, 45:18, 47:10  <b>binding</b> [1] - 47:4  <b>Binney</b> [5] - 27:17, 27:18, 40:11, 135:13, 136:3  <b>Binney's</b> [1] - 40:13  <b>bit</b> [29] - 5:3, 17:14, 21:12, 21:13, 23:14, 24:10, 27:10, 28:17, 31:8, 40:2, 40:4, 45:3, 57:3, 72:17,</p>	<p>91:5, 98:7, 108:10, 114:12, 119:15, 121:10, 124:8, 137:19, 145:10, 146:8, 152:3, 164:6, 166:6  <b>block</b> [1] - 2:7  <b>blowing</b> [1] - 163:19  <b>board</b> [2] - 112:5, 167:7  <b>BOARD</b> [1] - 1:1  <b>Board</b> [51] - 3:5, 5:8, 5:17, 6:19, 7:17, 9:13, 13:7, 14:8, 29:5, 29:12, 29:13, 31:17, 43:15, 47:11, 47:15, 48:14, 49:5, 49:8, 49:12, 50:7, 51:3, 51:5, 56:16, 56:17, 64:18, 69:12, 71:6, 77:1, 78:4, 96:7, 100:7, 105:5, 106:15, 107:8, 107:14, 133:8, 142:19, 146:1, 149:2, 167:10, 168:2, 168:11, 169:16, 170:2, 170:7, 171:11, 173:2, 176:16, 177:7, 177:16  <b>Board's</b> [8] - 3:12, 8:19, 34:6, 66:4, 108:7, 141:18, 171:15, 171:16  <b>bonus</b> [6] - 18:5, 18:6, 18:13, 18:14, 35:17, 172:16  <b>bonuses</b> [1] - 84:9  <b>books</b> [1] - 89:18  <b>bored</b> [1] - 94:13  <b>Born</b> [1] - 59:12  <b>Bost</b> [1] - 56:6  <b>Boston</b> [8] - 55:1, 55:4, 55:8, 56:7, 56:11, 57:9, 62:15, 136:11  <b>bottom</b> [1] - 121:12  <b>brainer</b> [1] - 76:18  <b>break</b> [2] - 56:1, 84:1  <b>breaking</b> [2] - 117:2, 117:4  <b>breaks</b> [1] - 71:14  <b>Brian</b> [1] - 85:16  <b>bridge</b> [1] - 68:4  <b>brief</b> [2] - 112:11, 161:3  <b>briefly</b> [1] - 48:12  <b>brings</b> [1] - 62:5  <b>BRISTOL</b> [1] - 178:3  <b>Broad</b> [2] - 34:7,</p>	<p>128:6  <b>broad</b> [1] - 116:15  <b>Broad's</b> [1] - 69:4  <b>Broadway</b> [9] - 1:6, 35:6, 38:13, 38:17, 39:16, 40:1, 41:4, 54:7, 69:3  <b>broken</b> [1] - 67:13  <b>bucks</b> [2] - 156:12, 156:17  <b>buffer</b> [1] - 37:12  <b>build</b> [10] - 55:17, 71:1, 79:5, 79:17, 80:1, 91:15, 104:4, 113:8, 134:17, 157:4  <b>Building</b> [7] - 6:10, 6:13, 33:11, 51:1, 51:7, 75:9, 75:16  <b>building</b> [85] - 6:17, 8:13, 31:19, 32:2, 32:6, 33:2, 33:7, 33:14, 34:2, 34:7, 34:14, 35:9, 35:13, 36:4, 36:13, 36:14, 37:6, 37:10, 38:19, 39:1, 40:2, 40:17, 41:1, 41:18, 42:9, 42:14, 44:4, 44:12, 45:2, 46:18, 47:6, 47:18, 48:8, 54:16, 59:17, 61:14, 63:13, 66:8, 67:1, 67:17, 69:2, 69:17, 70:7, 70:8, 70:9, 71:1, 78:16, 79:5, 79:12, 79:13, 80:1, 83:14, 83:17, 83:18, 90:2, 90:4, 90:18, 95:8, 111:13, 114:1, 114:2, 114:3, 126:14, 127:7, 136:3, 144:4, 144:5, 144:6, 144:13, 147:12, 148:14, 148:17, 148:18, 149:17, 150:14, 152:19, 154:3, 157:9, 163:5, 163:15, 164:4, 167:19, 176:2  <b>building's</b> [1] - 163:18  <b>buildings</b> [44] - 27:5, 28:3, 28:7, 32:11, 32:17, 33:2, 34:5, 34:10, 35:14, 38:13, 40:1, 41:5, 41:7, 41:9, 42:17, 43:6, 43:19, 44:11, 45:11, 48:1, 49:18, 57:10, 58:14, 59:4, 59:16,</p>	<p>59:17, 67:11, 69:3, 69:5, 95:8, 115:5, 144:14, 146:10, 147:13, 148:10, 155:5, 155:14, 155:17, 160:2, 163:9, 164:5, 164:9, 164:11, 165:6  <b>built</b> [14] - 27:6, 27:19, 32:17, 37:5, 46:9, 50:16, 51:8, 51:11, 60:19, 67:14, 67:16, 83:15, 145:16  <b>bulk</b> [1] - 64:3  <b>burden</b> [2] - 70:16, 85:8  <b>BUSINESS</b> [1] - 2:2  <b>business</b> [2] - 95:8, 142:5  <b>businesses</b> [1] - 139:12  <b>buy</b> [1] - 122:2  <b>buyer</b> [2] - 72:12, 74:7  <b>buying</b> [2] - 25:17, 120:7  <p style="text-align: center;"><b>C</b></p> <b>calculated</b> [1] - 17:8  <b>calculating</b> [2] - 19:4, 103:9  <b>calculation</b> [2] - 53:2, 78:1  <b>calculations</b> [3] - 52:12, 52:14, 80:4  <b>calculus</b> [1] - 79:3  <b>CAMBRIDGE</b> [1] - 1:2  <b>Cambridge</b> [26] - 1:7, 3:16, 5:1, 32:3, 32:10, 44:2, 44:12, 47:18, 47:19, 49:11, 55:1, 55:8, 55:15, 55:16, 56:7, 63:17, 71:2, 89:14, 97:12, 98:3, 108:13, 112:15, 117:18, 120:2, 156:1, 156:2  <b>camp</b> [1] - 65:12  <b>Canal</b> [1] - 128:6  <b>cannot</b> [1] - 135:7  <b>cap</b> [2] - 115:14, 122:3  <b>capacity</b> [4] - 15:12, 22:3, 23:15, 74:18  <b>capital</b> [3] - 162:8, 162:12, 166:15  <b>caps</b> [1] - 121:17  <b>CAPTURING</b> [1] - 1:18  <b>car</b> [4] - 4:6, 4:8, 5:2</p>	<p><b>careful</b> [2] - 118:14, 151:5  <b>carefully</b> [3] - 94:5, 114:6, 120:13  <b>carried</b> [1] - 122:5  <b>carrying</b> [2] - 83:16, 94:17  <b>cars</b> [1] - 135:13  <b>case</b> [15] - 50:6, 50:17, 63:13, 65:5, 76:16, 88:8, 108:6, 119:6, 119:8, 145:8, 145:9, 153:7, 159:15, 162:10  <b>case-by-case</b> [1] - 153:7  <b>cases</b> [4] - 20:16, 119:18, 162:15, 163:7  <b>cash</b> [3] - 25:9, 103:8, 121:9  <b>CATHERINE</b> [53] - 53:14, 65:11, 68:8, 68:13, 68:19, 83:2, 87:6, 87:14, 89:6, 92:4, 94:11, 101:4, 118:1, 118:8, 123:18, 124:3, 124:9, 124:15, 125:11, 125:16, 126:7, 127:9, 127:18, 128:3, 128:16, 129:3, 129:12, 131:11, 131:14, 131:19, 132:4, 132:11, 132:14, 133:1, 133:6, 133:16, 135:8, 136:17, 137:5, 138:6, 141:9, 143:5, 169:4, 169:12, 170:10, 170:17, 171:5, 172:6, 173:5, 174:3, 174:18, 175:5, 176:4  <b>Catherine</b> [14] - 1:8, 52:15, 65:9, 83:1, 87:3, 89:9, 102:18, 126:4, 131:1, 161:19, 162:4, 162:17, 178:4, 178:11  <b>Catherine's</b> [2] - 100:17, 126:13  <b>caused</b> [1] - 54:13  <b>CD</b> [1] - 52:7  <b>CDD</b> [1] - 31:16  <b>center</b> [3] - 61:3, 61:9, 61:10  <b>Center</b> [4] - 2:7, 3:8, 8:15, 56:12</p>
---	---	--	---	---

<p><b>Central</b> [7] - 60:11, 60:12, 60:16, 60:18, 89:16, 90:8, 90:10</p> <p><b>century</b> [1] - 59:14</p> <p><b>certain</b> [14] - 46:4, 52:9, 69:13, 72:14, 74:15, 107:8, 115:8, 115:12, 115:15, 119:13, 145:13, 149:4, 159:8, 176:2</p> <p><b>certainly</b> [16] - 5:4, 14:10, 30:3, 77:14, 85:7, 98:13, 105:15, 105:17, 107:10, 108:5, 108:15, 118:5, 118:17, 122:7, 153:18, 174:15</p> <p><b>CERTIFICATION</b> [1] - 178:15</p> <p><b>certified</b> [1] - 10:7</p> <p><b>Certified</b> [2] - 178:4, 178:12</p> <p><b>certify</b> [1] - 178:5</p> <p><b>CERTIFYING</b> [1] - 178:17</p> <p><b>Chair</b> [4] - 1:8, 1:8, 140:16, 175:9</p> <p><b>chair</b> [8] - 3:12, 14:3, 46:14, 72:7, 90:16, 110:15, 121:3, 171:9</p> <p><b>Chairman</b> [2] - 62:3, 160:13</p> <p><b>challenge</b> [2] - 96:11, 174:12</p> <p><b>chance</b> [2] - 54:19, 124:5</p> <p><b>CHANGE</b> [6] - 177:9, 177:10, 177:11, 177:12, 177:13, 177:14</p> <p><b>change</b> [27] - 21:6, 21:7, 52:3, 61:4, 72:1, 72:11, 72:17, 73:4, 73:12, 73:15, 74:1, 74:15, 75:1, 76:10, 104:10, 115:17, 132:16, 132:18, 133:4, 134:2, 135:15, 138:3, 138:11, 152:7, 166:4, 175:19, 177:7</p> <p><b>changed</b> [9] - 27:14, 28:18, 73:7, 76:9, 98:5, 115:19, 132:1, 137:15, 140:13</p> <p><b>changes</b> [26] - 2:6, 7:10, 9:8, 13:3, 14:1, 14:15, 17:3,</p>	<p>17:6, 17:8, 17:10, 17:11, 17:13, 18:1, 19:2, 42:7, 43:4, 43:16, 80:16, 117:15, 132:8, 140:12, 140:18, 170:3, 170:4, 177:17</p> <p><b>changing</b> [3] - 18:11, 18:15, 74:9</p> <p><b>character</b> [1] - 62:1</p> <p><b>characterizes</b> [1] - 102:18</p> <p><b>Charles</b> [1] - 56:1</p> <p><b>Charlie</b> [1] - 157:19</p> <p><b>cheap</b> [1] - 157:18</p> <p><b>check</b> [1] - 10:2</p> <p><b>Chestnut</b> [1] - 5:16</p> <p><b>Cheung</b> [4] - 4:14, 5:5, 53:16, 69:6</p> <p><b>children</b> [1] - 163:6</p> <p><b>choice</b> [3] - 119:19, 156:16, 165:18</p> <p><b>choose</b> [2] - 120:4, 161:6</p> <p><b>circumstances</b> [4] - 69:13, 80:12, 103:4, 123:2</p> <p><b>cite</b> [1] - 99:3</p> <p><b>cities</b> [1] - 99:9</p> <p><b>CITY</b> [1] - 1:2</p> <p><b>city</b> [34] - 6:11, 8:4, 26:1, 26:3, 59:14, 59:19, 60:6, 62:16, 66:15, 67:9, 67:19, 69:8, 73:8, 74:19, 75:4, 76:17, 81:16, 82:12, 84:19, 86:12, 88:4, 88:18, 93:11, 93:13, 100:1, 100:2, 105:7, 105:12, 105:14, 105:17, 111:15, 117:12, 158:13</p> <p><b>City</b> [36] - 1:12, 2:3, 3:10, 5:19, 6:8, 7:12, 9:13, 13:11, 13:15, 20:8, 30:1, 52:9, 55:13, 55:16, 69:14, 71:2, 71:6, 72:11, 75:1, 85:13, 87:13, 88:6, 88:15, 88:17, 89:14, 102:19, 106:11, 107:6, 120:17, 123:13, 134:7, 167:9, 167:17, 170:15, 173:14, 175:15</p> <p><b>City's</b> [2] - 95:5, 171:17</p>	<p><b>city's</b> [2] - 117:10, 158:7</p> <p><b>citywide</b> [3] - 6:1, 6:2, 74:16</p> <p><b>clamoring</b> [1] - 87:18</p> <p><b>clarification</b> [1] - 140:7</p> <p><b>clarified</b> [1] - 140:5</p> <p><b>clarify</b> [4] - 40:7, 91:9, 140:19, 143:10</p> <p><b>class</b> [4] - 97:13, 97:14, 98:3, 99:18</p> <p><b>clear</b> [7] - 48:15, 59:10, 79:9, 80:7, 107:2, 123:13, 168:10</p> <p><b>climate</b> [1] - 5:3</p> <p><b>clock</b> [1] - 59:16</p> <p><b>close</b> [3] - 22:15, 48:4, 56:11</p> <p><b>closely</b> [3] - 4:17, 16:12, 37:3</p> <p><b>closer</b> [3] - 66:11, 122:4, 162:2</p> <p><b>codified</b> [1] - 88:12</p> <p><b>Cohen</b> [2] - 1:8, 1:9</p> <p><b>COHEN</b> [180] - 3:3, 4:4, 10:1, 10:8, 10:10, 10:11, 10:13, 10:16, 11:2, 11:16, 11:19, 12:5, 12:9, 12:11, 12:14, 12:15, 12:18, 13:1, 43:18, 44:9, 45:15, 46:13, 46:14, 48:4, 48:11, 53:6, 53:15, 57:13, 57:17, 63:7, 63:8, 65:9, 67:5, 68:10, 68:16, 69:1, 70:6, 70:9, 70:11, 70:14, 70:15, 71:9, 71:10, 71:11, 72:6, 72:8, 72:9, 72:19, 74:2, 76:1, 83:1, 87:3, 87:8, 89:4, 92:7, 92:9, 92:12, 93:2, 94:10, 96:18, 98:19, 101:11, 106:6, 106:18, 107:1, 108:18, 109:6, 109:14, 109:16, 109:17, 109:19, 110:14, 110:16, 110:17, 111:3, 111:17, 112:9, 121:3, 121:5, 121:6, 123:10, 124:1, 124:7, 124:11, 125:3, 125:7, 125:14, 125:19, 126:8, 127:16, 127:19, 128:4,</p>	<p>128:9, 128:11, 128:17, 128:19, 129:4, 129:11, 129:19, 130:7, 130:9, 130:12, 130:14, 130:16, 130:18, 130:19, 131:13, 131:15, 133:14, 135:3, 136:1, 137:13, 138:5, 138:10, 138:15, 139:13, 139:18, 141:3, 141:19, 142:3, 142:17, 143:2, 143:7, 143:14, 146:5, 147:17, 148:19, 149:1, 149:6, 149:15, 150:2, 151:3, 151:10, 153:9, 154:4, 154:7, 154:9, 154:14, 155:1, 155:2, 158:9, 159:4, 160:10, 160:15, 160:17, 161:2, 161:12, 162:1, 164:15, 165:8, 165:12, 165:13, 167:1, 167:2, 167:6, 167:11, 167:14, 168:18, 169:5, 169:8, 170:15, 170:18, 171:2, 171:6, 172:7, 172:10, 172:14, 173:4, 173:6, 174:1, 174:8, 174:14, 174:16, 175:3, 175:7, 175:11, 176:5, 176:8, 176:11, 176:13</p> <p><b>colleague's</b> [1] - 58:1</p> <p><b>colleagues</b> [1] - 82:4</p> <p><b>color</b> [2] - 16:5, 16:6</p> <p><b>column</b> [1] - 29:1</p> <p><b>Comcast</b> [1] - 67:16</p> <p><b>comfortable</b> [14] - 21:17, 29:11, 30:5, 30:10, 40:3, 59:6, 65:17, 69:10, 70:2, 70:3, 70:5, 98:18, 133:19, 143:4</p> <p><b>coming</b> [4] - 22:18, 55:2, 98:16, 139:6</p> <p><b>comment</b> [19] - 6:5, 13:9, 13:17, 14:7, 53:1, 58:19, 72:10, 112:12, 118:11, 121:4, 124:18, 125:4, 130:15, 146:6, 161:4,</p>	<p>164:16, 167:4, 170:6, 170:7</p> <p><b>commentary</b> [4] - 106:11, 169:2, 171:12, 171:14</p> <p><b>commented</b> [2] - 5:17, 131:16</p> <p><b>comments</b> [10] - 6:6, 58:2, 112:11, 125:8, 126:11, 126:13, 131:17, 131:18, 160:18, 172:2</p> <p><b>commerce</b> [1] - 60:18</p> <p><b>commercial</b> [18] - 15:15, 18:16, 18:18, 22:3, 23:15, 24:13, 25:6, 35:14, 37:14, 43:7, 61:9, 68:15, 79:15, 134:11, 134:18, 137:1, 138:16, 164:10</p> <p><b>Commission</b> [1] - 178:13</p> <p><b>commissioned</b> [3] - 87:13, 108:12, 112:15</p> <p><b>Committee</b> [5] - 5:15, 13:14, 55:17, 170:1, 170:12</p> <p><b>committee</b> [2] - 7:1, 24:16</p> <p><b>common</b> [2] - 150:1, 150:19</p> <p><b>commonality</b> [1] - 107:16</p> <p><b>commonly</b> [1] - 157:3</p> <p><b>COMMONWEALTH</b> [1] - 178:2</p> <p><b>Commonwealth</b> [2] - 32:14, 60:14</p> <p><b>communicate</b> [1] - 171:7</p> <p><b>communities</b> [1] - 120:3</p> <p><b>community</b> [2] - 14:11, 84:5</p> <p><b>Community</b> [4] - 1:13, 2:4, 14:4, 177:4</p> <p><b>compared</b> [1] - 26:15</p> <p><b>comparing</b> [1] - 23:9</p> <p><b>comparison</b> [3] - 18:8, 19:4, 23:7</p> <p><b>complete</b> [1] - 88:13</p> <p><b>completed</b> [1] - 166:18</p> <p><b>completely</b> [1] - 83:18</p> <p><b>comply</b> [1] - 72:4</p> <p><b>component</b> [9] - 81:2, 100:13, 100:16, 102:10, 102:15, 108:3, 111:16,</p>
--	--	--	---	---

<p>122:14, 122:16  <b>comprehensive</b> [1] - 103:7  <b>Comprehensive</b> [1] - 32:14  <b>compromise</b> [2] - 105:8, 147:3  <b>compromising</b> [3] - 77:5, 77:10, 147:14  <b>conceivable</b> [1] - 13:8  <b>conceived</b> [1] - 28:17  <b>concentrated</b> [1] - 144:7  <b>concept</b> [3] - 69:10, 70:2, 72:18  <b>conceptual</b> [3] - 49:7, 50:18, 51:12  <b>concern</b> [1] - 30:17  <b>concerned</b> [1] - 91:19  <b>concerns</b> [1] - 4:10  <b>conclusion</b> [2] - 59:3, 78:10  <b>conclusions</b> [3] - 80:3, 80:6, 116:16  <b>conditions</b> [4] - 50:13, 50:19, 54:15, 115:9  <b>confidence</b> [1] - 136:18  <b>confident</b> [1] - 52:17  <b>configured</b> [1] - 42:10  <b>confusing</b> [1] - 79:3  <b>connect</b> [1] - 126:9  <b>connected</b> [1] - 60:4  <b>connection</b> [1] - 157:15  <b>connections</b> [5] - 37:16, 37:18, 38:1, 43:5, 126:6  <b>CONNOLLY</b> [53] - 53:14, 65:11, 68:8, 68:13, 68:19, 83:2, 87:6, 87:14, 89:6, 92:4, 94:11, 101:4, 118:1, 118:8, 123:18, 124:3, 124:9, 124:15, 125:11, 125:16, 126:7, 127:9, 127:18, 128:3, 128:16, 129:3, 129:12, 131:11, 131:14, 131:19, 132:4, 132:11, 132:14, 133:1, 133:6, 133:16, 135:8, 136:17, 137:5, 138:6, 141:9, 143:5, 169:4, 169:12, 170:10, 170:17, 171:5,</p>	<p>172:6, 173:5, 174:3, 174:18, 175:5, 176:4  <b>Connolly</b> [2] - 1:8, 52:16  <b>consequences</b> [1] - 121:11  <b>conserve</b> [1] - 156:19  <b>consider</b> [4] - 41:14, 42:16, 47:16, 58:13  <b>consideration</b> [5] - 39:4, 43:1, 66:14, 91:7, 175:14  <b>considerations</b> [2] - 21:15, 44:19  <b>considered</b> [5] - 36:13, 37:19, 38:10, 43:6, 127:1  <b>considering</b> [2] - 42:12, 89:13  <b>consistent</b> [3] - 47:8, 100:11, 132:9  <b>constitutes</b> [1] - 105:6  <b>constrained</b> [1] - 119:4  <b>constraints</b> [5] - 16:16, 16:17, 21:14, 38:9, 108:16  <b>construction</b> [3] - 116:8, 133:18, 137:11  <b>consultant</b> [1] - 103:1  <b>consumer</b> [2] - 142:6, 142:13  <b>context</b> [1] - 173:16  <b>continuation</b> [1] - 13:6  <b>continue</b> [4] - 29:10, 43:10, 90:1, 97:13  <b>Continued</b> [1] - 2:6  <b>continued</b> [2] - 3:19, 13:2  <b>continuing</b> [2] - 3:7, 14:18  <b>continuously</b> [1] - 81:10  <b>contracts</b> [1] - 96:16  <b>contrary</b> [1] - 145:2  <b>contrast</b> [1] - 39:19  <b>contribute</b> [3] - 26:7, 60:8, 60:9  <b>contribution</b> [2] - 26:12, 27:7  <b>contributions</b> [1] - 26:15  <b>CONTROL</b> [1] - 178:17  <b>control</b> [2] - 11:13, 62:12  <b>controlled</b> [1] - 30:1</p>	<p><b>conversation</b> [6] - 85:2, 85:18, 85:19, 111:14, 140:1, 142:12  <b>convinced</b> [1] - 137:6  <b>cool</b> [1] - 61:17  <b>corners</b> [1] - 155:17  <b>correct</b> [3] - 129:11, 138:7, 148:4  <b>correction</b> [1] - 177:8  <b>corrections</b> [1] - 177:17  <b>corresponding</b> [2] - 138:13, 138:15  <b>cost</b> [7] - 78:15, 79:5, 83:14, 94:14, 94:18, 110:6, 119:5  <b>costly</b> [1] - 83:13  <b>costs</b> [4] - 83:16, 94:17, 116:5, 116:7  <b>Council</b> [27] - 6:1, 6:8, 7:3, 7:12, 7:13, 7:16, 9:13, 13:11, 13:15, 20:8, 69:14, 75:1, 75:16, 88:7, 88:15, 88:18, 96:14, 106:11, 107:6, 123:14, 167:9, 167:17, 169:19, 170:16, 175:15  <b>Councillor</b> [4] - 4:14, 5:4, 53:16, 69:6  <b>count</b> [1] - 129:15  <b>counted</b> [3] - 129:7, 129:15, 130:8  <b>counter</b> [1] - 76:11  <b>counters</b> [4] - 157:6, 157:7, 157:11, 157:14  <b>couple</b> [7] - 4:7, 112:11, 121:16, 161:17, 161:18, 173:7, 173:13  <b>course</b> [1] - 131:8  <b>courthouse</b> [3] - 33:16, 33:19, 86:17  <b>cover</b> [3] - 107:13, 108:7, 154:19  <b>covered</b> [2] - 15:18, 41:4  <b>CPA</b> [3] - 26:12, 26:16, 27:4  <b>CPI</b> [1] - 25:4  <b>CRA</b> [6] - 6:12, 6:13, 112:19, 113:6, 115:16  <b>CRA's</b> [2] - 113:8, 114:9  <b>crazy</b> [1] - 127:4  <b>create</b> [1] - 20:15  <b>created</b> [4] - 23:14,</p>	<p>25:18, 126:16, 144:19  <b>creating</b> [3] - 23:17, 31:1, 41:10  <b>credit</b> [1] - 160:12  <b>criteria</b> [4] - 42:15, 58:15, 58:16, 75:11  <b>critical</b> [1] - 77:11  <b>crossover</b> [1] - 166:9  <b>crying</b> [1] - 84:6  <b>current</b> [6] - 7:5, 19:14, 29:17, 75:14, 114:4, 117:9  <b>cut</b> [1] - 46:6  <b>CVS's</b> [1] - 62:10  <b>cycle</b> [1] - 86:8  <b>cycles</b> [5] - 162:12, 166:12, 166:14, 166:19</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>D</b></p> <p><b>Dalton</b> [1] - 56:2  <b>dark</b> [2] - 87:12, 104:15  <b>Dash</b> [1] - 1:14  <b>DASH</b> [2] - 150:10, 151:4  <b>data</b> [3] - 44:16, 123:3, 124:8  <b>date</b> [5] - 5:10, 5:13, 84:12, 96:17, 177:8  <b>dated</b> [1] - 87:9  <b>daughter</b> [1] - 62:8  <b>days</b> [1] - 5:13  <b>dead</b> [1] - 153:10  <b>deal</b> [7] - 94:8, 94:13, 97:6, 112:17, 113:5, 146:15, 158:19  <b>debatable</b> [1] - 100:19  <b>debate</b> [1] - 141:17  <b>decade</b> [1] - 87:18  <b>decades</b> [1] - 8:6  <b>decent</b> [1] - 81:14  <b>decide</b> [3] - 57:2, 123:16, 130:3  <b>decided</b> [3] - 86:9, 114:15, 156:10  <b>decides</b> [2] - 88:7, 88:18  <b>decision</b> [3] - 2:9, 11:9, 12:7  <b>decisionmaking</b> [1] - 82:15  <b>decker</b> [1] - 68:12  <b>decrease</b> [1] - 22:8  <b>decreasing</b> [1] - 64:5  <b>dedicated</b> [2] - 20:1, 23:3  <b>deed</b> [2] - 119:8,</p>	<p>120:7  <b>definite</b> [1] - 172:17  <b>definitely</b> [2] - 90:14, 91:12  <b>definition</b> [3] - 19:14, 29:17, 52:14  <b>deliberating</b> [1] - 9:14  <b>deliverable</b> [1] - 6:3  <b>delivered</b> [1] - 177:4  <b>delta</b> [1] - 90:19  <b>demand</b> [7] - 4:17, 99:9, 99:11, 99:13, 99:15, 99:17, 145:7  <b>demands</b> [1] - 74:6  <b>demonstrate</b> [1] - 135:10  <b>dense</b> [1] - 38:10  <b>density</b> [7] - 17:7, 21:19, 35:17, 59:17, 63:11, 64:1, 64:5  <b>Department</b> [4] - 51:17, 52:7, 134:6, 177:5  <b>described</b> [2] - 16:10, 79:8  <b>design</b> [30] - 17:16, 32:8, 35:19, 36:6, 36:10, 36:17, 37:4, 39:2, 41:15, 42:19, 43:3, 44:14, 44:16, 45:10, 45:12, 45:15, 45:19, 46:18, 47:3, 47:9, 47:19, 51:2, 51:4, 63:14, 64:8, 65:13, 66:1, 66:16, 127:11, 164:2  <b>designed</b> [1] - 128:13  <b>desire</b> [4] - 8:4, 20:9, 100:11, 147:14  <b>desired</b> [1] - 36:16  <b>detail</b> [5] - 45:10, 78:3, 78:8, 140:3, 140:10  <b>detailed</b> [1] - 103:5  <b>details</b> [4] - 16:14, 17:6, 119:2, 143:16  <b>determination</b> [1] - 77:14  <b>determined</b> [1] - 112:1  <b>develop</b> [3] - 6:16, 8:12, 76:6  <b>development</b> [1] - 32:12  <b>developer</b> [22] - 8:11, 49:1, 70:19, 72:3, 73:11, 76:5, 76:7, 77:6, 83:12, 102:7, 103:10, 110:6, 110:9, 112:18, 149:3, 151:18, 152:4, 152:10,</p>
---	--	---	--	---

<p>155:8, 159:7, 166:2, 168:4</p> <p><b>developer's</b> [1] - 79:12</p> <p><b>developers</b> [6] - 55:12, 145:6, 146:7, 151:9, 156:5, 157:3</p> <p><b>developing</b> [1] - 113:5</p> <p><b>Development</b> [4] - 1:13, 2:4, 14:4, 177:5</p> <p><b>development</b> [40] - 6:15, 8:12, 8:15, 9:5, 14:13, 15:15, 21:9, 21:10, 21:18, 22:3, 24:14, 25:7, 27:18, 38:11, 43:7, 49:6, 50:14, 60:3, 74:18, 78:11, 78:12, 105:12, 112:17, 113:2, 113:3, 113:7, 113:15, 113:16, 115:4, 116:13, 117:12, 131:5, 134:11, 134:19, 135:17, 137:1, 158:1, 173:17</p> <p><b>develops</b> [1] - 136:18</p> <p><b>deviation</b> [1] - 153:4</p> <p><b>devoted</b> [1] - 104:6</p> <p><b>Dhanda</b> [1] - 11:5</p> <p><b>Dick</b> [2] - 55:19, 62:13</p> <p><b>dictated</b> [1] - 62:7</p> <p><b>difference</b> [8] - 22:18, 23:8, 107:7, 109:7, 109:11, 110:1, 123:14, 173:12</p> <p><b>differences</b> [5] - 24:7, 27:12, 107:9, 107:17, 122:12</p> <p><b>different</b> [22] - 30:15, 30:16, 34:3, 42:8, 47:16, 55:12, 58:16, 61:8, 80:11, 80:12, 103:3, 103:6, 106:16, 113:16, 115:19, 120:1, 120:12, 120:19, 145:17, 145:18, 149:18, 174:12</p> <p><b>differentiated</b> [1] - 144:19</p> <p><b>difficult</b> [1] - 78:17</p> <p><b>difficulty</b> [1] - 64:10</p> <p><b>dimension</b> [3] - 34:1, 36:4, 58:3</p> <p><b>dimensions</b> [2] - 36:5, 42:2</p> <p><b>diminish</b> [1] - 105:9</p> <p><b>diminishment</b> [1] -</p>	<p>138:11</p> <p><b>DIRECT</b> [1] - 178:17</p> <p><b>direct</b> [2] - 24:11, 25:9</p> <p><b>direction</b> [5] - 57:5, 90:15, 91:13, 105:3, 142:1</p> <p><b>DIRECTION</b> [1] - 178:17</p> <p><b>disagree</b> [1] - 83:3</p> <p><b>disagreement</b> [1] - 170:11</p> <p><b>disagreements</b> [1] - 172:8</p> <p><b>disappointment</b> [1] - 57:3</p> <p><b>discount</b> [1] - 101:19</p> <p><b>discounted</b> [2] - 103:8, 121:9</p> <p><b>discouraging</b> [1] - 30:19</p> <p><b>discretion</b> [7] - 47:11, 56:17, 66:4, 69:12, 70:12, 71:5, 168:2</p> <p><b>discretionary</b> [1] - 65:7</p> <p><b>discuss</b> [3] - 11:11, 71:12, 123:12</p> <p><b>discussed</b> [8] - 4:8, 20:7, 26:11, 73:5, 76:3, 132:17, 161:4, 175:17</p> <p><b>discussing</b> [1] - 64:16</p> <p><b>discussion</b> [27] - 2:6, 3:7, 7:18, 8:19, 12:9, 13:2, 13:6, 14:7, 29:10, 31:18, 43:14, 58:3, 59:9, 71:17, 83:3, 88:15, 100:15, 102:16, 114:14, 118:12, 124:6, 152:4, 169:2, 170:19, 174:13, 175:17, 176:6</p> <p><b>discussions</b> [9] - 14:2, 30:5, 41:16, 81:11, 85:1, 96:8, 155:7, 161:8, 170:5</p> <p><b>distance</b> [1] - 134:15</p> <p><b>distributed</b> [6] - 144:13, 148:17, 149:16, 150:13, 151:12, 153:3</p> <p><b>distribution</b> [5] - 146:3, 147:4, 147:8, 147:12, 158:18</p> <p><b>District</b> [5] - 2:6, 3:8, 13:4, 115:1, 148:6</p> <p><b>district</b> [4] - 27:13, 126:17, 142:8, 142:14</p> <p><b>Division</b> [1] - 4:16</p>	<p><b>DOES</b> [1] - 178:16</p> <p><b>dollar</b> [2] - 7:7, 9:3</p> <p><b>dollars</b> [7] - 7:5, 7:6, 24:19, 25:6, 31:14, 111:11, 165:7</p> <p><b>dominated</b> [1] - 61:1</p> <p><b>done</b> [24] - 7:8, 17:13, 17:16, 19:3, 26:6, 52:1, 58:5, 80:11, 80:13, 85:18, 86:6, 86:8, 86:13, 89:3, 90:8, 103:2, 103:3, 122:15, 123:1, 130:1, 160:1, 160:3, 166:16</p> <p><b>donut</b> [1] - 100:2</p> <p><b>door</b> [2] - 158:3, 158:4</p> <p><b>DOT</b> [10] - 16:12, 30:6, 58:8, 78:16, 79:5, 80:1, 134:12, 134:17, 135:1, 135:6</p> <p><b>doubt</b> [1] - 79:4</p> <p><b>down</b> [12] - 22:13, 27:16, 45:5, 47:1, 64:3, 71:14, 84:18, 120:17, 124:5, 130:1, 159:11, 163:6</p> <p><b>downtown</b> [1] - 67:12</p> <p><b>draft</b> [1] - 175:15</p> <p><b>drafted</b> [2] - 57:15, 172:15</p> <p><b>dramatic</b> [1] - 122:12</p> <p><b>dramatically</b> [2] - 76:10, 104:10</p> <p><b>drastic</b> [1] - 39:19</p> <p><b>drill</b> [1] - 82:7</p> <p><b>drive</b> [3] - 55:2, 92:14, 166:15</p> <p><b>Drive</b> [1] - 3:16</p> <p><b>driver</b> [2] - 60:7, 61:10</p> <p><b>driveways</b> [1] - 4:12</p> <p><b>driving</b> [1] - 166:5</p> <p><b>due</b> [1] - 6:7</p> <p><b>during</b> [3] - 32:17, 127:7, 133:18</p> <p><b>dwelling</b> [1] - 133:10</p>	<p>61:10, 68:1, 74:11, 76:5, 79:15, 86:11, 92:10, 113:11, 115:8</p> <p><b>economically</b> [5] - 106:2, 106:5, 147:1, 151:17, 153:15</p> <p><b>economics</b> [12] - 67:1, 76:10, 77:4, 77:11, 78:8, 82:8, 85:5, 87:11, 92:14, 146:16, 146:19, 149:5</p> <p><b>edited</b> [2] - 142:10, 142:11</p> <p><b>eight</b> [4] - 26:19, 31:14, 87:1</p> <p><b>either</b> [11] - 6:14, 28:7, 32:13, 37:14, 43:15, 64:15, 67:10, 133:12, 152:16, 157:13, 164:12</p> <p><b>elastic</b> [1] - 99:11</p> <p><b>electronically</b> [1] - 177:5</p> <p><b>element</b> [5] - 15:14, 44:17, 45:7, 135:2, 150:12</p> <p><b>elements</b> [2] - 6:3, 50:4</p> <p><b>eleven</b> [5] - 19:8, 95:18, 96:1, 98:8</p> <p><b>eleven-and-a-half</b> [3] - 95:18, 96:1, 98:8</p> <p><b>elite</b> [1] - 75:11</p> <p><b>elsewhere</b> [3] - 26:1, 44:3, 144:7</p> <p><b>embraced</b> [1] - 48:8</p> <p><b>emerge</b> [1] - 9:16</p> <p><b>emphasis</b> [1] - 29:19</p> <p><b>enable</b> [2] - 15:6, 16:9</p> <p><b>encoded</b> [1] - 88:2</p> <p><b>encourage</b> [5] - 15:13, 20:10, 45:13, 117:16</p> <p><b>encouraged</b> [1] - 65:16</p> <p><b>encourages</b> [1] - 31:2</p> <p><b>encouraging</b> [1] - 105:11</p> <p><b>end</b> [10] - 13:10, 18:5, 30:18, 36:13, 74:3, 88:6, 88:17, 97:16, 130:13, 153:5</p> <p><b>endeavor</b> [1] - 94:3</p> <p><b>ended</b> [2] - 4:9, 142:10</p> <p><b>ending</b> [1] - 91:5</p> <p><b>endorse</b> [3] - 7:13, 173:7, 173:11</p> <p><b>endorses</b> [1] - 173:3</p>	<p><b>ends</b> [1] - 147:14</p> <p><b>enemy</b> [1] - 151:15</p> <p><b>enforce</b> [1] - 158:8</p> <p><b>engaged</b> [1] - 102:19</p> <p><b>engendered</b> [1] - 141:17</p> <p><b>engine</b> [2] - 59:14, 86:12</p> <p><b>enormous</b> [1] - 121:11</p> <p><b>ensure</b> [1] - 150:18</p> <p><b>entails</b> [1] - 49:15</p> <p><b>enterprise</b> [1] - 60:17</p> <p><b>enticing</b> [1] - 14:9</p> <p><b>entirely</b> [1] - 18:14</p> <p><b>entities</b> [1] - 112:2</p> <p><b>entity</b> [2] - 6:15, 30:2</p> <p><b>entrances</b> [3] - 50:2, 50:3</p> <p><b>enumerate</b> [1] - 175:18</p> <p><b>envelope</b> [2] - 95:11, 95:13</p> <p><b>envision</b> [2] - 12:5, 12:7</p> <p><b>envisioned</b> [1] - 51:10</p> <p><b>equal</b> [2] - 147:4, 147:11</p> <p><b>equally</b> [4] - 99:14, 144:6, 151:12, 153:3</p> <p><b>equates</b> [1] - 37:18</p> <p><b>equation</b> [2] - 162:6, 162:7</p> <p><b>Equipped</b> [1] - 94:16</p> <p><b>Equities</b> [1] - 161:16</p> <p><b>ERRATA</b> [1] - 177:1</p> <p><b>Errata</b> [2] - 177:3, 177:8</p> <p><b>error</b> [1] - 123:6</p> <p><b>especially</b> [3] - 127:3, 146:8, 147:13</p> <p><b>essentially</b> [2] - 48:10, 49:6</p> <p><b>establish</b> [1] - 36:3</p> <p><b>established</b> [1] - 35:14</p> <p><b>establishments</b> [1] - 142:6</p> <p><b>estate</b> [1] - 154:1</p> <p><b>Estate</b> [1] - 161:16</p> <p><b>estimate</b> [1] - 160:5</p> <p><b>estimates</b> [1] - 33:5</p> <p><b>etcetera</b> [2] - 150:1</p> <p><b>evaluate</b> [3] - 7:9, 41:17, 96:16</p> <p><b>evaluating</b> [1] - 87:11</p> <p><b>evaluation</b> [1] - 153:7</p> <p><b>evening</b> [2] - 3:3, 3:6</p> <p><b>evolve</b> [1] - 75:18</p> <p><b>exact</b> [1] - 33:6</p>
<b>E</b>				
		<p><b>easier</b> [1] - 40:4</p> <p><b>East</b> [2] - 32:2, 32:10</p> <p><b>eastgate's</b> [1] - 33:7</p> <p><b>easy</b> [2] - 125:15, 144:17</p> <p><b>economic</b> [12] - 16:17, 59:14, 60:7,</p>		



<p><b>exactly</b> [5] - 79:4, 85:2, 90:12, 111:4, 125:12</p> <p><b>example</b> [4] - 64:17, 89:15, 89:19, 90:13</p> <p><b>examples</b> [1] - 36:7</p> <p><b>exceed</b> [2] - 28:3, 142:8</p> <p><b>exceeding</b> [1] - 90:2</p> <p><b>excellent</b> [1] - 125:14</p> <p><b>except</b> [2] - 133:9, 177:16</p> <p><b>exception</b> [2] - 86:17, 167:18</p> <p><b>exchange</b> [4] - 8:10, 8:13, 152:17, 153:1</p> <p><b>exclude</b> [1] - 149:14</p> <p><b>excluded</b> [1] - 13:9</p> <p><b>exemptions</b> [1] - 32:15</p> <p><b>existing</b> [5] - 32:1, 32:19, 33:1, 33:2, 54:14</p> <p><b>exit</b> [2] - 98:3, 121:17</p> <p><b>expand</b> [1] - 111:8</p> <p><b>expanding</b> [2] - 118:15, 120:11</p> <p><b>expect</b> [2] - 137:9, 164:4</p> <p><b>expensive</b> [1] - 97:15</p> <p><b>experience</b> [1] - 119:12</p> <p><b>experienced</b> [1] - 112:6</p> <p><b>experiment</b> [3] - 85:6, 101:9, 104:16</p> <p><b>experimenting</b> [1] - 102:19</p> <p><b>expert</b> [1] - 124:19</p> <p><b>experts</b> [2] - 99:3, 121:19</p> <p><b>expire</b> [1] - 5:9</p> <p><b>Expires</b> [1] - 178:13</p> <p><b>expiring</b> [1] - 26:3</p> <p><b>explain</b> [2] - 17:12, 52:8</p> <p><b>explanation</b> [1] - 148:2</p> <p><b>exposure</b> [1] - 42:13</p> <p><b>exposures</b> [1] - 155:18</p> <p><b>express</b> [1] - 54:19</p> <p><b>expressed</b> [2] - 59:15, 81:10</p> <p><b>expressive</b> [2] - 61:11, 61:12</p> <p><b>extended</b> [1] - 128:6</p> <p><b>extending</b> [1] - 37:17</p> <p><b>extension</b> [5] - 2:8, 10:18, 11:7, 11:8, 12:12</p>	<p><b>extent</b> [9] - 63:16, 77:1, 78:14, 102:3, 102:5, 105:13, 146:14, 147:2, 147:3</p> <p><b>exterior</b> [1] - 149:18</p> <p><b>extra</b> [2] - 35:19, 160:4</p> <p><b>extraordinary</b> [6] - 42:18, 44:4, 66:2, 83:10, 85:8, 85:9</p>	<p>4:5, 26:18, 31:11, 45:2, 74:14, 90:16, 91:9, 107:12, 111:2, 118:6, 128:8, 150:8, 151:19, 154:18, 161:13, 169:15, 170:14, 171:1, 171:8</p> <p><b>Farooq</b> [1] - 1:12</p> <p><b>fast</b> [1] - 137:1</p> <p><b>faster</b> [1] - 135:18</p> <p><b>favor</b> [3] - 10:14, 12:16, 176:9</p> <p><b>favorable</b> [1] - 52:19</p> <p><b>fear</b> [1] - 62:6</p> <p><b>feasibility</b> [2] - 92:10, 93:19</p> <p><b>feasible</b> [5] - 76:4, 147:1, 151:17, 153:16, 159:7</p> <p><b>feasibly</b> [1] - 109:2</p> <p><b>feature</b> [1] - 128:5</p> <p><b>federal</b> [8] - 16:12, 21:11, 29:15, 30:11, 31:2, 52:19, 83:14, 136:2</p> <p><b>Federal</b> [2] - 8:8, 32:15</p> <p><b>feds</b> [1] - 134:8</p> <p><b>feedback</b> [1] - 146:6</p> <p><b>fees</b> [1] - 113:2</p> <p><b>feet</b> [53] - 21:10, 22:4, 22:5, 22:9, 23:2, 23:19, 27:14, 27:15, 28:4, 33:3, 33:4, 33:9, 33:12, 33:14, 33:16, 34:8, 34:12, 34:17, 34:18, 35:1, 35:3, 35:15, 35:16, 35:18, 35:19, 36:2, 37:11, 38:19, 39:8, 39:16, 40:6, 41:19, 43:6, 45:9, 53:17, 53:19, 54:4, 55:18, 56:3, 57:9, 59:6, 59:10, 61:11, 65:5, 69:4, 79:13, 90:19, 94:15, 104:5, 164:13, 168:1, 168:5</p> <p><b>felt</b> [4] - 21:16, 30:4, 156:16, 168:11</p> <p><b>fence</b> [1] - 130:4</p> <p><b>few</b> [5] - 4:18, 31:13, 50:6, 93:9, 160:1</p> <p><b>fifteen</b> [1] - 91:11</p> <p><b>figure</b> [4] - 25:4, 93:1, 136:19, 137:9</p> <p><b>file</b> [4] - 6:5, 13:10, 106:10, 167:8</p> <p><b>filed</b> [3] - 4:14, 5:6,</p>	<p>12:8</p> <p><b>filing</b> [3] - 2:8, 11:8, 170:13</p> <p><b>fill</b> [1] - 13:19</p> <p><b>filling</b> [1] - 121:2</p> <p><b>final</b> [1] - 49:5</p> <p><b>finally</b> [2] - 6:19, 97:4</p> <p><b>finance</b> [1] - 122:7</p> <p><b>financial</b> [7] - 74:18, 93:19, 103:15, 104:17, 115:13, 134:10, 152:14</p> <p><b>fine</b> [3] - 131:2, 132:15, 167:6</p> <p><b>finished</b> [1] - 88:14</p> <p><b>finishes</b> [1] - 157:4</p> <p><b>first</b> [15] - 5:7, 5:12, 18:1, 22:6, 46:16, 55:14, 72:9, 83:15, 85:16, 98:19, 101:13, 112:13, 114:18, 125:8, 162:6</p> <p><b>fit</b> [2] - 44:1, 157:12</p> <p><b>fits</b> [3] - 34:12, 40:3, 54:14</p> <p><b>five</b> [8] - 61:14, 96:4, 98:9, 142:8, 142:14, 159:1, 165:6, 175:2</p> <p><b>five-story</b> [1] - 61:14</p> <p><b>fixed</b> [3] - 72:14, 78:15, 119:6</p> <p><b>flexibility</b> [20] - 40:7, 47:4, 54:5, 64:19, 65:15, 66:18, 135:18, 141:14, 145:11, 145:15, 145:19, 149:7, 149:9, 149:12, 154:16, 158:10, 158:13, 162:19, 163:9, 166:16</p> <p><b>flexible</b> [1] - 79:2</p> <p><b>Floor</b> [1] - 1:6</p> <p><b>floor</b> [35] - 20:4, 20:14, 21:6, 32:3, 33:3, 33:9, 33:13, 33:17, 34:9, 34:11, 34:14, 35:5, 36:1, 37:9, 39:1, 39:6, 39:7, 39:12, 39:18, 41:2, 42:1, 45:9, 46:10, 46:16, 52:11, 66:17, 67:18, 91:3, 142:15, 155:15, 163:4, 163:17, 164:11, 164:19</p> <p><b>floors</b> [8] - 15:13, 15:16, 146:12, 146:14, 147:5, 149:5, 150:15,</p>	<p>159:1</p> <p><b>flow</b> [2] - 103:8, 121:9</p> <p><b>focus</b> [3] - 14:15, 107:16, 108:4</p> <p><b>folks</b> [4] - 4:10, 16:11, 86:4, 150:11</p> <p><b>followed</b> [1] - 51:13</p> <p><b>following</b> [3] - 36:18, 40:5, 164:16</p> <p><b>follows</b> [1] - 2:6</p> <p><b>foot</b> [7] - 7:6, 9:4, 25:1, 103:19, 113:7, 113:15, 130:4</p> <p><b>footage</b> [6] - 24:15, 38:7, 39:14, 49:16, 63:12, 148:9</p> <p><b>footnotes</b> [1] - 172:8</p> <p><b>FOR</b> [1] - 1:2</p> <p><b>for-profit</b> [1] - 6:15</p> <p><b>foregoing</b> [1] - 177:16</p> <p><b>FOREGOING</b> [1] - 178:15</p> <p><b>foresee</b> [1] - 46:2</p> <p><b>foreseeable</b> [1] - 73:17</p> <p><b>form</b> [13] - 16:6, 16:7, 34:16, 36:5, 36:9, 37:2, 37:5, 38:19, 42:9, 46:9, 50:13, 50:18, 167:17</p> <p><b>forma</b> [2] - 80:5, 95:4</p> <p><b>former</b> [1] - 157:15</p> <p><b>formica</b> [2] - 157:6, 157:14</p> <p><b>forming</b> [1] - 6:11</p> <p><b>forms</b> [1] - 42:1</p> <p><b>forth</b> [5] - 57:1, 62:17, 63:1, 105:19, 178:6</p> <p><b>forthrightly</b> [1] - 146:15</p> <p><b>forum</b> [1] - 124:6</p> <p><b>forward</b> [12] - 4:9, 7:16, 16:10, 41:15, 43:11, 117:8, 141:8, 161:7, 167:7, 173:18, 174:11, 174:12</p> <p><b>forwarded</b> [1] - 13:18</p> <p><b>Foundry</b> [2] - 6:10, 6:13</p> <p><b>Four</b> [2] - 62:16, 67:17</p> <p><b>four</b> [9] - 7:5, 53:7, 55:6, 122:4, 122:10, 122:11, 125:2, 154:13, 155:14</p> <p><b>four-story</b> [1] - 155:14</p> <p><b>framed</b> [1] - 20:3</p> <p><b>framework</b> [1] - 39:5</p> <p><b>frankly</b> [2] - 64:8, 78:4</p> <p><b>free</b> [2] - 125:18,</p>
---	---	--	---	---

<p>135:9  <b>freedom</b> [1] - 164:1  <b>frequently</b> [1] - 146:12  <b>Friday</b> [1] - 6:7  <b>Friedman</b> [1] - 56:1  <b>Friedman's</b> [1] - 62:13  <b>friendly</b> [2] - 162:13, 163:1  <b>friends</b> [2] - 90:11, 165:1  <b>FROM</b> [1] - 66:11  <b>front</b> [1] - 116:9  <b>frothy</b> [1] - 162:10  <b>fruition</b> [1] - 15:7  <b>full</b> [8] - 7:3, 7:13, 19:18, 80:13, 134:15, 136:12, 138:17, 158:17  <b>fully</b> [2] - 83:19, 94:15  <b>function</b> [1] - 119:16  <b>funding</b> [2] - 25:12, 27:8  <b>funds</b> [2] - 111:19, 112:7  <b>funny</b> [1] - 78:12  <b>future</b> [6] - 61:7, 73:8, 73:18, 77:7, 112:18, 155:16  <b>fuzzy</b> [1] - 79:1</p>	<p>37:8  <b>Genzyme</b> [3] - 47:18, 48:2, 64:17  <b>GFA</b> [3] - 141:5, 141:15, 142:7  <b>GFI</b> [1] - 90:5  <b>ghettoized</b> [1] - 147:6  <b>giant</b> [1] - 127:5  <b>given</b> [6] - 21:14, 47:6, 53:12, 91:2, 134:13, 170:11  <b>glad</b> [2] - 69:9, 84:19  <b>glass</b> [1] - 48:3  <b>goal</b> [5] - 22:14, 30:10, 109:13, 147:3, 169:13  <b>goals</b> [10] - 6:17, 15:10, 15:18, 58:6, 58:7, 59:11, 76:12, 145:2, 159:16, 171:15  <b>Gold</b> [2] - 75:13  <b>government</b> [1] - 156:19  <b>Government</b> [2] - 8:9, 32:15  <b>governor</b> [2] - 157:9, 157:15  <b>granite</b> [3] - 157:7, 157:11, 157:18  <b>granted</b> [1] - 95:13  <b>great</b> [18] - 55:4, 62:1, 83:11, 92:2, 97:10, 97:11, 105:15, 124:10, 124:12, 136:18, 139:6, 140:3, 140:10, 141:16, 150:14, 174:19, 175:1, 175:7  <b>greater</b> [3] - 72:2, 72:4, 74:6  <b>greatest</b> [2] - 105:13, 147:15  <b>green</b> [3] - 3:14, 127:1, 127:6  <b>Green</b> [3] - 33:11, 75:9, 75:16  <b>grew</b> [1] - 67:7  <b>Groll</b> [1] - 4:16  <b>grooming</b> [1] - 61:5  <b>gross</b> [2] - 63:12, 142:15  <b>ground</b> [8] - 15:13, 15:16, 39:10, 39:12, 56:2, 84:1, 151:11, 153:17  <b>grounded</b> [1] - 14:17  <b>group</b> [1] - 86:3  <b>groups</b> [1] - 5:1  <b>growth</b> [3] - 15:12,</p>	<p>58:11, 61:5  <b>GSA</b> [7] - 16:12, 30:6, 85:18, 86:2, 95:6, 96:15, 137:10  <b>guarantee</b> [1] - 86:2  <b>guess</b> [15] - 11:14, 14:17, 36:12, 58:18, 61:13, 63:19, 65:11, 66:6, 95:9, 105:1, 107:15, 134:4, 146:7, 149:13, 174:10  <b>guide</b> [1] - 15:7  <b>guideline</b> [1] - 36:1  <b>guidelines</b> [29] - 30:7, 36:3, 36:7, 36:11, 36:17, 37:4, 39:3, 42:4, 43:3, 43:5, 43:11, 44:1, 45:13, 45:16, 45:19, 46:2, 46:8, 46:10, 46:12, 47:3, 47:9, 47:12, 47:19, 48:10, 65:1, 66:1, 129:2  <b>gut</b> [2] - 93:10, 93:12  <b>guys</b> [1] - 146:17</p>	<p>13:17, 36:18, 49:4, 124:4, 170:8, 174:7, 178:6  <b>HEARING</b> [1] - 1:3  <b>Hearing</b> [1] - 5:14  <b>hearings</b> [3] - 29:9, 78:6, 170:5  <b>heart</b> [2] - 33:8, 96:19  <b>height</b> [34] - 17:17, 21:16, 27:9, 27:10, 31:9, 33:3, 34:17, 35:14, 39:16, 42:14, 43:10, 51:18, 53:13, 54:1, 54:8, 54:12, 54:15, 57:12, 57:14, 58:6, 59:3, 59:7, 59:9, 62:11, 63:2, 63:3, 63:9, 63:10, 64:8, 65:2, 66:7, 67:13, 90:3, 91:14  <b>heights</b> [15] - 17:10, 28:9, 31:19, 32:2, 32:6, 35:13, 37:7, 37:9, 39:7, 40:2, 40:18, 41:1, 41:18, 49:17, 67:11  <b>help</b> [9] - 15:6, 40:6, 77:15, 111:15, 120:16, 120:18, 135:1, 140:19, 159:12  <b>helpful</b> [2] - 48:12, 171:13  <b>hereby</b> [1] - 177:17  <b>herein</b> [1] - 178:6  <b>hereunto</b> [1] - 178:8  <b>high</b> [8] - 15:17, 44:13, 45:11, 45:13, 66:18, 146:12, 168:5, 175:1  <b>higher</b> [13] - 21:19, 57:8, 64:2, 80:19, 86:19, 89:2, 98:12, 101:18, 104:11, 109:10, 122:13, 122:17, 152:18  <b>highest</b> [2] - 71:1, 145:4  <b>highly</b> [4] - 103:4, 115:11, 157:9, 157:10  <b>Hill</b> [2] - 5:16, 55:3  <b>hit</b> [1] - 91:14  <b>hoc</b> [2] - 154:15, 159:11  <b>hold</b> [1] - 110:11  <b>honor</b> [1] - 158:9  <b>hope</b> [2] - 15:5, 173:7  <b>hopefully</b> [1] - 74:3  <b>hoping</b> [2] - 6:5, 98:15</p>	<p><b>hopping</b> [1] - 67:19  <b>horse</b> [1] - 153:10  <b>Hotel</b> [3] - 35:3, 56:1, 67:18  <b>house</b> [1] - 96:9  <b>household</b> [1] - 119:7  <b>households</b> [8] - 19:16, 19:18, 20:2, 118:16, 119:13, 119:18, 120:16, 120:19  <b>houses</b> [1] - 68:12  <b>housing</b> [98] - 3:18, 7:1, 17:9, 18:5, 18:13, 18:14, 19:2, 19:6, 19:9, 19:10, 20:11, 20:17, 20:18, 22:11, 22:13, 23:3, 23:4, 23:11, 23:13, 23:18, 23:19, 24:12, 24:16, 25:10, 26:8, 26:15, 27:3, 31:12, 34:13, 50:8, 50:9, 57:2, 58:8, 76:17, 79:17, 80:9, 80:14, 80:16, 80:18, 81:1, 81:2, 81:12, 81:15, 82:9, 82:13, 83:4, 84:14, 84:15, 86:15, 93:13, 93:19, 97:9, 97:11, 97:14, 99:3, 99:5, 99:10, 102:4, 102:9, 106:2, 110:4, 110:7, 111:9, 111:16, 112:5, 112:19, 113:4, 118:13, 119:1, 119:3, 119:6, 119:19, 120:1, 120:2, 120:6, 120:7, 123:8, 138:18, 144:18, 145:1, 145:3, 145:9, 145:14, 146:18, 148:17, 150:10, 150:19, 151:1, 156:14, 162:5, 162:6, 162:14, 162:15, 168:7, 172:18, 173:15  <b>HRA</b> [7] - 77:18, 79:16, 80:11, 81:4, 87:8, 87:12, 121:4  <b>HRNA</b> [2] - 108:11, 112:13  <b>huge</b> [3] - 52:4, 67:16, 160:7  <b>HUGH</b> [38] - 45:4, 47:17, 48:5, 51:15, 57:15, 57:19, 61:19, 70:4, 70:8, 93:3, 94:12, 124:17,</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>G</b></p> <p><b>gain</b> [1] - 152:14  <b>Galleria</b> [1] - 136:6  <b>game</b> [3] - 74:8, 74:9, 76:8  <b>garage</b> [2] - 136:6, 136:9  <b>garages</b> [2] - 134:14, 136:11  <b>gardens</b> [1] - 129:14  <b>gateway</b> [1] - 66:14  <b>gee</b> [1] - 152:11  <b>general</b> [6] - 21:6, 49:18, 94:4, 122:17, 171:14, 171:15  <b>GENERAL</b> [2] - 1:3, 2:2  <b>generally</b> [1] - 170:4  <b>generate</b> [6] - 79:18, 111:12, 113:3, 119:16, 122:13, 122:16  <b>generated</b> [2] - 111:7, 115:8  <b>generates</b> [1] - 80:18  <b>generating</b> [1] - 47:2  <b>generous</b> [2] - 37:6,</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>H</b></p> <p><b>half</b> [5] - 19:8, 95:18, 96:1, 98:8, 102:1  <b>Hancock</b> [1] - 57:11  <b>hand</b> [6] - 55:19, 74:6, 74:7, 150:17, 161:14, 178:8  <b>handled</b> [2] - 141:13, 173:9  <b>hands</b> [1] - 123:16  <b>hands</b> [3] - 10:15, 12:17, 176:10  <b>happy</b> [8] - 43:13, 96:5, 96:7, 125:18, 127:15, 128:7, 128:10, 136:13  <b>hard</b> [6] - 24:4, 65:19, 94:18, 116:15, 116:17  <b>Harvard</b> [4] - 60:19, 62:6, 62:9, 62:10  <b>hate</b> [1] - 86:7  <b>HAWKINSON</b> [1] - 66:9  <b>head</b> [2] - 81:7, 97:2  <b>hear</b> [6] - 5:16, 43:14, 65:16, 89:8, 153:9, 160:10  <b>heard</b> [3] - 79:6, 110:17, 141:11  <b>hearing</b> [16] - 3:14, 4:1, 4:3, 5:7, 5:12, 12:4, 13:5, 13:13,</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>H</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>H</b></p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>H</b></p>

<p>125:5, 126:12, 129:2, 132:19, 133:2, 133:13, 134:3, 135:5, 135:9, 136:4, 136:8, 136:15, 137:4, 138:2, 138:8, 138:13, 139:8, 139:15, 155:4, 158:12, 159:19, 165:4, 168:19, 169:6, 174:10, 175:13 <b>Hugh</b> [5] - 1:9, 67:6, 93:2, 98:19, 116:5 <b>Hugh's</b> [1] - 64:17 <b>human</b> [1] - 44:15</p>	<p><b>included</b> [5] - 27:11, 28:2, 48:17, 115:10, 129:10 <b>includes</b> [1] - 19:15 <b>including</b> [3] - 21:11, 102:14, 171:12 <b>inclusionary</b> [3] - 9:9, 9:16, 18:4, 18:12, 18:13, 19:2, 56:19, 71:12, 75:7, 76:14, 77:2, 82:9, 83:6, 89:10, 89:11, 89:18, 89:19, 98:16, 110:19, 118:15, 119:1, 119:3, 119:17, 120:12, 121:1, 144:16, 146:4, 150:12, 150:19, 151:1, 152:6 <b>income</b> [8] - 19:15, 19:17, 20:2, 22:12, 23:1, 23:3, 23:4, 35:16, 80:14, 80:16, 80:17, 81:1, 81:3, 81:12, 81:13, 81:15, 81:16, 81:19, 82:19, 84:13, 84:15, 90:1, 90:7, 90:13, 91:18, 93:6, 97:9, 97:11, 99:1, 99:2, 99:4, 99:5, 99:6, 99:10, 99:14, 100:4, 100:5, 100:8, 100:19, 101:2, 101:7, 101:14, 101:18, 101:19, 102:1, 102:2, 102:4, 102:10, 102:14, 104:7, 104:9, 104:10, 108:3, 109:2, 109:15, 110:4, 110:7, 118:12, 118:16, 119:4, 119:14, 119:18, 120:5, 120:12, 120:16, 120:19, 122:14, 122:16, 135:18, 136:16, 139:9, 139:17, 145:9, 145:13, 148:12, 148:16, 158:3 <b>incomes</b> [1] - 119:14 <b>incorporate</b> [1] - 139:7 <b>increase</b> [16] - 7:7, 15:11, 21:8, 22:19, 23:2, 25:3, 25:6, 25:7, 40:11, 84:11, 84:13, 102:10, 105:9, 108:3,</p>	<p>109:18 <b>increased</b> [1] - 102:14 <b>increasing</b> [10] - 7:4, 24:11, 24:13, 24:14, 39:6, 63:12, 64:4, 138:14, 138:16, 153:12 <b>indeed</b> [3] - 60:1, 129:5, 157:8 <b>Index</b> [1] - 2:11 <b>indicate</b> [1] - 133:5 <b>indicated</b> [1] - 38:8 <b>indicates</b> [2] - 58:5, 148:9 <b>indication</b> [1] - 148:11 <b>individually</b> [1] - 53:10 <b>industries</b> [1] - 105:18 <b>industry</b> [1] - 59:18 <b>infinitum</b> [1] - 153:11 <b>inflexible</b> [1] - 149:8 <b>information</b> [4] - 77:13, 98:14, 121:2, 124:14 <b>initial</b> [3] - 18:10, 19:7, 24:5 <b>innovation</b> [1] - 15:14 <b>insisting</b> [1] - 150:16 <b>instance</b> [2] - 74:19, 153:8 <b>instances</b> [1] - 46:2 <b>instead</b> [2] - 57:1, 157:5 <b>instincts</b> [1] - 93:3 <b>Institute</b> [1] - 34:7 <b>INSTRUCTIONS</b> [2] - 177:1, 177:6 <b>integrate</b> [1] - 29:15 <b>integrated</b> [1] - 30:12 <b>intelligent</b> [1] - 82:11 <b>intended</b> [3] - 29:19, 47:3, 90:18 <b>intent</b> [1] - 36:16 <b>intention</b> [1] - 9:11 <b>inter</b> [1] - 133:17 <b>interest</b> [2] - 115:14, 122:5 <b>interested</b> [3] - 8:9, 71:8, 117:17 <b>interesting</b> [4] - 24:10, 25:12, 28:11, 36:12 <b>interestingly</b> [2] - 35:4, 61:2 <b>interfaces</b> [2] - 38:2, 40:16 <b>interior</b> [2] - 149:18, 157:4 <b>internal</b> [1] - 103:11</p>	<p><b>internally</b> [1] - 20:7 <b>international</b> [1] - 70:19 <b>intricacies</b> [1] - 52:8 <b>introducing</b> [1] - 148:6 <b>investigating</b> [1] - 20:6 <b>invite</b> [1] - 77:14 <b>involved</b> [3] - 89:16, 140:8, 157:1 <b>Iram</b> [6] - 1:12, 24:17, 26:13, 74:12, 128:7, 158:16 <b>IRAM</b> [20] - 3:11, 4:5, 26:18, 31:11, 45:2, 74:14, 90:16, 91:9, 107:12, 111:2, 118:6, 128:8, 150:8, 151:19, 154:18, 161:13, 169:15, 170:14, 171:1, 171:8 <b>Iram's</b> [1] - 85:11 <b>IRR</b> [1] - 78:17 <b>irrational</b> [1] - 103:16 <b>issue</b> [10] - 59:3, 63:15, 63:16, 64:1, 64:9, 71:12, 99:1, 106:13, 125:9, 162:16 <b>issued</b> [1] - 51:1 <b>issues</b> [18] - 41:14, 41:17, 41:18, 53:7, 107:2, 107:4, 107:8, 114:16, 123:11, 125:2, 134:10, 137:17, 139:19, 141:7, 143:11, 143:12, 165:10, 174:6 <b>Istanbul</b> [1] - 55:6 <b>item</b> [1] - 3:6 <b>iteration</b> [1] - 49:13 <b>itself</b> [1] - 170:9</p>	<p>9:19, 13:19, 14:4, 32:7, 38:3, 48:11, 53:2, 77:14, 106:8, 108:10, 108:16, 121:7, 129:13, 140:2, 143:15 <b>Jeff's</b> [1] - 40:18 <b>jeopardize</b> [1] - 77:7 <b>JFK</b> [1] - 2:8 <b>job</b> [2] - 89:5, 139:6 <b>Joe</b> [3] - 161:13, 161:15, 165:13 <b>JOHN</b> [1] - 66:9 <b>JOSEPH</b> [4] - 161:15, 162:3, 165:9, 166:1 <b>journey</b> [1] - 28:11 <b>JR</b> [22] - 61:18, 66:6, 66:10, 66:12, 68:14, 92:13, 109:4, 124:13, 129:9, 129:17, 130:6, 136:5, 136:14, 139:16, 149:13, 153:19, 154:6, 154:12, 168:16, 172:13, 173:19, 174:5 <b>Jr</b> [1] - 1:10 <b>JSA</b> [1] - 130:1 <b>judgment</b> [2] - 64:10, 82:11 <b>July</b> [4] - 11:9, 11:18, 12:6, 12:12 <b>jump</b> [3] - 73:1, 77:15, 122:1 <b>June</b> [6] - 4:5, 5:8, 5:19, 9:12, 178:8 <b>justified</b> [2] - 106:2, 106:5 <b>justify</b> [1] - 123:6 <b>justifying</b> [1] - 121:14</p>
<b>I</b>		<b>K</b>		
<p><b>idea</b> [9] - 14:12, 14:13, 40:19, 65:14, 65:15, 66:8, 69:16, 88:16, 173:8 <b>ideal</b> [1] - 100:18 <b>ideas</b> [1] - 63:6 <b>identified</b> [1] - 6:18 <b>identifies</b> [1] - 49:15 <b>image</b> [1] - 63:18 <b>images</b> [2] - 43:19, 45:1 <b>imagining</b> [1] - 14:12 <b>impact</b> [2] - 74:17, 75:3 <b>impacts</b> [2] - 37:4, 42:12 <b>implement</b> [2] - 15:1, 26:9 <b>implementing</b> [1] - 119:12 <b>implications</b> [2] - 32:8, 51:18 <b>implied</b> [1] - 53:3 <b>important</b> [9] - 14:5, 42:3, 42:6, 42:11, 44:14, 44:19, 101:15, 101:17, 135:16 <b>IN</b> [2] - 178:8, 178:16 <b>inaccessible</b> [1] - 130:5 <b>inaudible</b> [2] - 71:6, 91:19 <b>INC</b> [1] - 1:17 <b>incentive</b> [9] - 7:2, 7:4, 9:6, 24:15, 75:2, 89:19, 111:2, 111:3, 111:6 <b>include</b> [4] - 90:6, 102:3, 114:13, 171:11</p>	<p><b>income</b> [8] - 19:15, 19:17, 20:2, 22:12, 23:1, 23:3, 23:4, 35:16, 80:14, 80:16, 80:17, 81:1, 81:3, 81:12, 81:13, 81:15, 81:16, 81:19, 82:19, 84:13, 84:15, 90:1, 90:7, 90:13, 91:18, 93:6, 97:9, 97:11, 99:1, 99:2, 99:4, 99:5, 99:6, 99:10, 99:14, 100:4, 100:5, 100:8, 100:19, 101:2, 101:7, 101:14, 101:18, 101:19, 102:1, 102:2, 102:4, 102:10, 102:14, 104:7, 104:9, 104:10, 108:3, 109:2, 109:15, 110:4, 110:7, 118:12, 118:16, 119:4, 119:14, 119:18, 120:5, 120:12, 120:16, 120:19, 122:14, 122:16, 135:18, 136:16, 139:9, 139:17, 145:9, 145:13, 148:12, 148:16, 158:3 <b>incomes</b> [1] - 119:14 <b>incorporate</b> [1] - 139:7 <b>increase</b> [16] - 7:7, 15:11, 21:8, 22:19, 23:2, 25:3, 25:6, 25:7, 40:11, 84:11, 84:13, 102:10, 105:9, 108:3,</p>	<p>109:18 <b>increased</b> [1] - 102:14 <b>increasing</b> [10] - 7:4, 24:11, 24:13, 24:14, 39:6, 63:12, 64:4, 138:14, 138:16, 153:12 <b>indeed</b> [3] - 60:1, 129:5, 157:8 <b>Index</b> [1] - 2:11 <b>indicate</b> [1] - 133:5 <b>indicated</b> [1] - 38:8 <b>indicates</b> [2] - 58:5, 148:9 <b>indication</b> [1] - 148:11 <b>individually</b> [1] - 53:10 <b>industries</b> [1] - 105:18 <b>industry</b> [1] - 59:18 <b>infinitum</b> [1] - 153:11 <b>inflexible</b> [1] - 149:8 <b>information</b> [4] - 77:13, 98:14, 121:2, 124:14 <b>initial</b> [3] - 18:10, 19:7, 24:5 <b>innovation</b> [1] - 15:14 <b>insisting</b> [1] - 150:16 <b>instance</b> [2] - 74:19, 153:8 <b>instances</b> [1] - 46:2 <b>instead</b> [2] - 57:1, 157:5 <b>instincts</b> [1] - 93:3 <b>Institute</b> [1] - 34:7 <b>INSTRUCTIONS</b> [2] - 177:1, 177:6 <b>integrate</b> [1] - 29:15 <b>integrated</b> [1] - 30:12 <b>intelligent</b> [1] - 82:11 <b>intended</b> [3] - 29:19, 47:3, 90:18 <b>intent</b> [1] - 36:16 <b>intention</b> [1] - 9:11 <b>inter</b> [1] - 133:17 <b>interest</b> [2] - 115:14, 122:5 <b>interested</b> [3] - 8:9, 71:8, 117:17 <b>interesting</b> [4] - 24:10, 25:12, 28:11, 36:12 <b>interestingly</b> [2] - 35:4, 61:2 <b>interfaces</b> [2] - 38:2, 40:16 <b>interior</b> [2] - 149:18, 157:4 <b>internal</b> [1] - 103:11</p>	<p><b>internally</b> [1] - 20:7 <b>international</b> [1] - 70:19 <b>intricacies</b> [1] - 52:8 <b>introducing</b> [1] - 148:6 <b>investigating</b> [1] - 20:6 <b>invite</b> [1] - 77:14 <b>involved</b> [3] - 89:16, 140:8, 157:1 <b>Iram</b> [6] - 1:12, 24:17, 26:13, 74:12, 128:7, 158:16 <b>IRAM</b> [20] - 3:11, 4:5, 26:18, 31:11, 45:2, 74:14, 90:16, 91:9, 107:12, 111:2, 118:6, 128:8, 150:8, 151:19, 154:18, 161:13, 169:15, 170:14, 171:1, 171:8 <b>Iram's</b> [1] - 85:11 <b>IRR</b> [1] - 78:17 <b>irrational</b> [1] - 103:16 <b>issue</b> [10] - 59:3, 63:15, 63:16, 64:1, 64:9, 71:12, 99:1, 106:13, 125:9, 162:16 <b>issued</b> [1] - 51:1 <b>issues</b> [18] - 41:14, 41:17, 41:18, 53:7, 107:2, 107:4, 107:8, 114:16, 123:11, 125:2, 134:10, 137:17, 139:19, 141:7, 143:11, 143:12, 165:10, 174:6 <b>Istanbul</b> [1] - 55:6 <b>item</b> [1] - 3:6 <b>iteration</b> [1] - 49:13 <b>itself</b> [1] - 170:9</p>	
<b>J</b>		<b>K</b>		
<p>125:5, 126:12, 129:2, 132:19, 133:2, 133:13, 134:3, 135:5, 135:9, 136:4, 136:8, 136:15, 137:4, 138:2, 138:8, 138:13, 139:8, 139:15, 155:4, 158:12, 159:19, 165:4, 168:19, 169:6, 174:10, 175:13 <b>Hugh</b> [5] - 1:9, 67:6, 93:2, 98:19, 116:5 <b>Hugh's</b> [1] - 64:17 <b>human</b> [1] - 44:15</p>	<p><b>included</b> [5] - 27:11, 28:2, 48:17, 115:10, 129:10 <b>includes</b> [1] - 19:15 <b>including</b> [3] - 21:11, 102:14, 171:12 <b>inclusionary</b> [3] - 9:9, 9:16, 18:4, 18:12, 18:13, 19:2, 56:19, 71:12, 75:7, 76:14, 77:2, 82:9, 83:6, 89:10, 89:11, 89:18, 89:19, 98:16, 110:19, 118:15, 119:1, 119:3, 119:17, 120:12, 121:1, 144:16, 146:4, 150:12, 150:19, 151:1, 152:6 <b>income</b> [8] - 19:15, 19:17, 20:2, 22:12, 23:1, 23:3, 23:4, 35:16, 80:14, 80:16, 80:17, 81:1, 81:3, 81:12, 81:13, 81:15, 81:16, 81:19, 82:19, 84:13, 84:15, 90:1, 90:7, 90:13, 91:18, 93:6, 97:9, 97:11, 99:1, 99:2, 99:4, 99:5, 99:6, 99:10, 99:14, 100:4, 100:5, 100:8, 100:19, 101:2, 101:7, 101:14, 101:18, 101:19, 102:1, 102:2, 102:4, 102:10, 102:14, 104:7, 104:9, 104:10, 108:3, 109:2, 109:15, 110:4, 110:7, 118:12, 118:16, 119:4, 119:14, 119:18, 120:5, 120:12, 120:16, 120:19, 122:14, 122:16, 135:18, 136:16, 139:9, 139:17, 145:9, 145:13, 148:12, 148:16, 158:3 <b>incomes</b> [1] - 119:14 <b>incorporate</b> [1] - 139:7 <b>increase</b> [16] - 7:7, 15:11, 21:8, 22:19, 23:2, 25:3, 25:6, 25:7, 40:11, 84:11, 84:13, 102:10, 105:9, 108:3,</p>	<p>109:18 <b>increased</b> [1] - 102:14 <b>increasing</b> [10] - 7:4, 24:11, 24:13, 24:14, 39:6, 63:12, 64:4, 138:14, 138:16, 153:12 <b>indeed</b> [3] - 60:1, 129:5, 157:8 <b>Index</b> [1] - 2:11 <b>indicate</b> [1] - 133:5 <b>indicated</b> [1] - 38:8 <b>indicates</b> [2] - 58:5, 148:9 <b>indication</b> [1] - 148:11 <b>individually</b> [1] - 53:10 <b>industries</b> [1] - 105:18 <b>industry</b> [1] - 59:18 <b>infinitum</b> [1] - 153:11 <b>inflexible</b> [1] - 149:8 <b>information</b> [4] - 77:13, 98:14, 121:2, 124:14 <b>initial</b> [3] - 18:10, 19:7, 24:5 <b>innovation</b> [1] - 15:14 <b>insisting</b> [1] - 150:16 <b>instance</b> [2] - 74:19, 153:8 <b>instances</b> [1] - 46:2 <b>instead</b> [2] - 57:1, 157:5 <b>instincts</b> [1] - 93:3 <b>Institute</b> [1] - 34:7 <b>INSTRUCTIONS</b> [2] - 177:1, 177:6 <b>integrate</b> [1] - 29:15 <b>integrated</b> [1] - 30:12 <b>intelligent</b> [1] - 82:11 <b>intended</b> [3] - 29:19, 47:3, 90:18 <b>intent</b> [1] - 36:16 <b>intention</b> [1] - 9:11 <b>inter</b> [1] - 133:17 <b>interest</b> [2] - 115:14, 122:5 <b>interested</b> [3] - 8:9, 71:8, 117:17 <b>interesting</b> [4] - 24:10, 25:12, 28:11, 36:12 <b>interestingly</b> [2] - 35:4, 61:2 <b>interfaces</b> [2] - 38:2, 40:16 <b>interior</b> [2] - 149:18, 157:4 <b>internal</b> [1] - 103:11</p>	<p>9:19, 13:19, 14:4, 32:7, 38:3, 48:11, 53:2, 77:14, 106:8, 108:10, 108:16, 121:7, 129:13, 140:2, 143:15 <b>Jeff's</b> [1] - 40:18 <b>jeopardize</b> [1] - 77:7 <b>JFK</b> [1] - 2:8 <b>job</b> [2] - 89:5, 139:6 <b>Joe</b> [3] - 161:13, 161:15, 165:13 <b>JOHN</b> [1] - 66:9 <b>JOSEPH</b> [4] - 161:15, 162:3, 165:9, 166:1 <b>journey</b> [1] - 28:11 <b>JR</b> [22] - 61:18, 66:6, 66:10, 66:12, 68:14, 92:13, 109:4, 124:13, 129:9, 129:17, 130:6, 136:5, 136:14, 139:16, 149:13, 153:19, 154:6, 154:12, 168:16, 172:13, 173:19, 174:5 <b>Jr</b> [1] - 1:10 <b>JSA</b> [1] - 130:1 <b>judgment</b> [2] - 64:10, 82:11 <b>July</b> [4] - 11:9, 11:18, 12:6, 12:12 <b>jump</b> [3] - 73:1, 77:15, 122:1 <b>June</b> [6] - 4:5, 5:8, 5:19, 9:12, 178:8 <b>justified</b> [2] - 106:2, 106:5 <b>justify</b> [1] - 123:6 <b>justifying</b> [1] - 121:14</p>	
<b>J</b>		<b>K</b>		
<p>125:5, 126:12, 129:2, 132:19, 133:2, 133:13, 134:3, 135:5, 135:9, 136:4, 136:8, 136:15, 137:4, 138:2, 138:8, 138:13, 139:8, 139:15, 155:4, 158:12, 159:19, 165:4, 168:19, 169:6, 174:10, 175:13 <b>Hugh</b> [5] - 1:9, 67:6, 93:2, 98:19, 116:5 <b>Hugh's</b> [1] - 64:17 <b>human</b> [1] - 44:15</p>	<p><b>included</b> [5] - 27:11, 28:2, 48:17, 115:10, 129:10 <b>includes</b> [1] - 19:15 <b>including</b> [3] - 21:11, 102:14, 171:12 <b>inclusionary</b> [3] - 9:9, 9:16, 18:4, 18:12, 18:13, 19:2, 56:19, 71:12, 75:7, 76:14, 77:2, 82:9, 83:6, 89:10, 89:11, 89:18, 89:19, 98:16, 110:19, 118:15, 119:1, 119:3, 119:17, 120:12, 121:1, 144:16, 146:4, 150:12, 150:19, 151:1, 152:6 <b>income</b> [8] - 19:15, 19:17, 20:2, 22:12, 23:1, 23:3, 23:4, 35:16, 80:14, 80:16, 80:17, 81:1, 81:3, 81:12, 81:13, 81:15, 81:16, 81:19, 82:19, 84:13, 84:15, 90:1, 90:7, 90:13, 91:18, 93:6, 97:9, 97:11, 99:1, 99:2, 99:4, 99:5, 99:6, 99:10, 99:14, 100:4, 100:5, 100:8, 100:19, 101:2, 101:7, 101:14, 101:18, 101:19, 102:1, 102:2, 102:4, 102:10, 102:14, 104:7, 104:9, 104:10, 108:3, 109:2, 109:15, 110:4, 110:7, 118:12, 118:16, 119:4, 119:14, 119:18, 120:5, 120:12, 120:16, 120:19, 122:14, 122:16, 135:18, 136:16, 139:9, 139:17, 145:9, 145:13, 148:12, 148:16, 158:3 <b>incomes</b> [1] - 119:14 <b>incorporate</b> [1] - 139:7 <b>increase</b> [16] - 7:7, 15:11, 21:8, 22:19, 23:2, 25:3, 25:6, 25:7, 40:11, 84:11, 84:13, 102:10, 105:9, 108:3,</p>	<p>109:18 <b>increased</b> [1] - 102:14 <b>increasing</b> [10] - 7:4, 24:11, 24:13, 24:14, 39:6, 63:12, 64:4, 138:14, 138:16, 153:12 <b>indeed</b> [3] - 60:1, 129:5, 157:8 <b>Index</b> [1] - 2:11 <b>indicate</b> [1] - 133:5 <b>indicated</b> [1] - 38:8 <b>indicates</b> [2] - 58:5, 148:9 <b>indication</b> [1] - 148:11 <b>individually</b> [1] - 53:10 <b>industries</b> [1] - 105:18 <b>industry</b> [1] - 59:18 <b>inf</b></p>		

<p><b>kept</b> [1] - 28:18  <b>key</b> [9] - 23:8, 27:12, 41:14, 41:18, 42:19, 43:1, 94:1, 121:10, 150:11  <b>Keyword</b> [1] - 2:11  <b>killer</b> [2] - 94:8, 94:13  <b>killing</b> [2] - 109:3, 169:14  <b>kind</b> [17] - 8:7, 23:6, 28:10, 35:7, 36:19, 39:9, 59:18, 61:8, 66:14, 93:18, 95:3, 111:5, 116:13, 116:19, 122:2, 127:10, 149:11  <b>kinds</b> [3] - 59:11, 79:1, 129:16  <b>knock</b> [1] - 158:4  <b>knowledgeable</b> [1] - 96:12  <b>known</b> [1] - 16:15  <b>KS</b> [3] - 2:6, 3:7, 13:3  <b>KS-1</b> [1] - 89:17</p>	<p><b>last</b> [19] - 5:18, 6:8, 7:1, 8:6, 14:8, 15:18, 25:11, 26:11, 29:5, 29:14, 31:13, 31:17, 36:18, 37:17, 43:3, 57:18, 73:5, 132:1, 137:15  <b>late</b> [1] - 160:16  <b>law</b> [1] - 88:2  <b>Lawson</b> [1] - 178:4  <b>lawyers</b> [1] - 65:3  <b>layout</b> [1] - 49:15  <b>learn</b> [1] - 145:15  <b>learned</b> [1] - 84:8  <b>lease</b> [1] - 6:12  <b>least</b> [5] - 63:2, 65:17, 90:3, 106:14, 168:13  <b>leave</b> [3] - 95:19, 123:15  <b>leaves</b> [1] - 117:10  <b>leaving</b> [1] - 128:12  <b>LEED</b> [1] - 75:15  <b>left</b> [2] - 139:1, 143:7  <b>legitimate</b> [1] - 173:12  <b>length</b> [1] - 93:17  <b>lengthy</b> [1] - 140:1  <b>Lesley</b> [1] - 61:5  <b>less</b> [5] - 23:15, 64:2, 96:3, 102:5, 110:5  <b>lesser</b> [1] - 73:7  <b>letter</b> [5] - 106:12, 107:6, 107:13, 108:7, 154:19  <b>level</b> [10] - 44:16, 45:9, 73:17, 75:12, 81:13, 101:18, 119:14, 133:3, 139:12, 170:11  <b>levels</b> [3] - 15:17, 44:18, 120:13  <b>leverage</b> [2] - 152:15, 156:7  <b>Lexington</b> [1] - 55:3  <b>Liberty</b> [2] - 67:14, 67:15  <b>License</b> [1] - 178:12  <b>lifetime</b> [1] - 61:4  <b>light</b> [5] - 14:2, 15:9, 41:10, 59:7, 131:6  <b>likely</b> [2] - 37:13, 75:1  <b>limit</b> [6] - 18:11, 28:4, 65:19, 67:11, 67:13, 69:11  <b>limitation</b> [2] - 41:5, 57:6  <b>limitations</b> [2] - 28:3, 55:11  <b>limited</b> [2] - 122:18, 142:14  <b>limiting</b> [1] - 129:9</p>	<p><b>limits</b> [4] - 58:6, 119:4, 120:8, 158:15  <b>line</b> [2] - 21:5, 121:12  <b>LINE</b> [1] - 177:9  <b>lines</b> [4] - 22:1, 23:7, 137:11, 167:16  <b>link</b> [1] - 118:2  <b>list</b> [1] - 46:17  <b>lists</b> [1] - 93:17  <b>live</b> [2] - 156:13, 156:18  <b>lives</b> [1] - 61:3  <b>LIZA</b> [7] - 10:4, 11:1, 11:4, 11:18, 12:1, 12:7, 12:19  <b>Liza</b> [4] - 1:13, 10:2, 10:17, 118:7  <b>loan</b> [1] - 136:14  <b>located</b> [3] - 50:10, 144:12, 153:2  <b>location</b> [8] - 38:12, 100:18, 101:1, 101:7, 144:1, 145:17, 148:3, 148:9  <b>locations</b> [2] - 38:2, 153:15  <b>lock</b> [1] - 56:5  <b>logical</b> [1] - 37:18  <b>look</b> [28] - 17:16, 25:17, 31:18, 43:8, 50:7, 51:17, 55:3, 55:5, 55:8, 55:10, 55:13, 55:14, 67:4, 76:15, 84:8, 85:3, 89:11, 95:4, 100:1, 104:19, 112:19, 113:9, 116:10, 117:11, 117:17, 119:19, 127:12, 128:7  <b>looked</b> [19] - 24:18, 24:19, 30:13, 32:1, 32:7, 36:19, 37:3, 37:12, 37:15, 38:1, 38:6, 46:8, 77:18, 113:13, 114:5, 114:7, 114:10, 115:12, 120:10  <b>looking</b> [32] - 15:1, 16:19, 25:5, 30:6, 30:7, 32:19, 33:11, 34:19, 37:7, 39:15, 42:1, 43:2, 56:3, 56:18, 83:6, 83:7, 89:10, 94:5, 97:3, 112:17, 113:11, 113:18, 113:19, 114:1, 115:1, 115:4, 120:13, 139:7,</p>	<p>141:6, 159:17, 162:5  <b>looks</b> [3] - 65:14, 74:12, 164:2  <b>lopsided</b> [2] - 92:16, 92:19  <b>lose</b> [2] - 15:9, 97:13  <b>lost</b> [6] - 24:10, 60:1, 60:2, 97:12, 100:5, 118:11  <b>lou</b> [1] - 92:12  <b>Lou</b> [1] - 93:4  <b>LOUIS</b> [22] - 61:18, 66:6, 66:10, 66:12, 68:14, 92:13, 109:4, 124:13, 129:9, 129:17, 130:6, 136:5, 136:14, 139:16, 149:13, 153:19, 154:6, 154:12, 168:16, 172:13, 173:19, 174:5  <b>Louis</b> [1] - 1:10  <b>low</b> [36] - 19:15, 20:1, 22:12, 23:3, 71:15, 80:14, 80:19, 81:15, 81:18, 82:19, 84:13, 92:18, 93:5, 97:9, 97:16, 99:1, 99:4, 99:5, 99:10, 99:13, 100:4, 100:19, 101:7, 101:14, 101:19, 102:2, 104:7, 104:8, 104:9, 106:19, 109:1, 110:6, 122:15, 146:1, 148:16, 168:9  <b>lower</b> [5] - 88:17, 146:14, 150:5, 154:2, 163:7  <b>lunchtime</b> [1] - 59:1</p>	<p><b>map</b> [3] - 27:11, 40:18  <b>MAQUIRE</b> [4] - 161:15, 162:3, 165:9, 166:1  <b>marble</b> [1] - 157:7  <b>March</b> [5] - 10:5, 10:6, 87:9, 114:10  <b>marker</b> [1] - 124:6  <b>market</b> [16] - 20:18, 22:7, 22:10, 102:1, 114:5, 120:1, 145:1, 156:8, 156:9, 156:15, 157:13, 159:2, 162:11, 166:3, 166:6, 166:7  <b>marketable</b> [2] - 146:13, 155:12  <b>markets</b> [7] - 115:13, 162:8, 162:11, 162:13, 166:4, 166:15  <b>marriage</b> [1] - 175:8  <b>Marriott</b> [3] - 35:3, 40:1, 54:15  <b>masonry</b> [1] - 48:2  <b>Mass</b> [2] - 3:15, 96:10  <b>Massachusetts</b> [1] - 1:7  <b>MASSACHUSETTS</b> [1] - 178:2  <b>massing</b> [1] - 148:1  <b>master</b> [12] - 46:16, 46:19, 48:18, 49:14, 50:5, 50:12, 50:18, 51:13, 112:18, 128:15, 133:3, 148:7  <b>match</b> [1] - 27:16  <b>matches</b> [1] - 27:17  <b>matter</b> [3] - 70:18, 82:3, 135:4  <b>maximize</b> [1] - 108:1  <b>maximum</b> [5] - 18:18, 28:4, 40:19, 56:4, 56:14</p>
<b>L</b>		<b>M</b>		
<p><b>L-shaped</b> [1] - 34:16  <b>lab</b> [8] - 34:10, 37:14, 114:3, 165:15, 166:6, 166:7, 166:10  <b>laboratories</b> [1] - 95:1  <b>land</b> [14] - 8:10, 54:18, 56:13, 79:18, 103:19, 104:6, 104:12, 113:4, 113:14, 114:4, 116:2, 122:13, 122:17, 123:7  <b>landed</b> [2] - 7:4, 29:7  <b>landlocked</b> [1] - 44:11  <b>landmark</b> [1] - 66:14  <b>landmarks</b> [1] - 45:14  <b>landscaping</b> [1] - 127:17  <b>language</b> [12] - 7:15, 48:17, 56:18, 63:2, 88:8, 127:2, 140:12, 141:1, 142:1, 142:9, 148:15, 149:17  <b>large</b> [8] - 27:6, 33:17, 34:9, 40:13, 49:10, 50:4, 53:7, 126:2  <b>largely</b> [1] - 8:17  <b>larger</b> [7] - 20:11, 20:16, 34:11, 36:15, 44:2, 152:16, 164:11  <b>largest</b> [2] - 49:10, 60:13</p>		<p><b>magic</b> [1] - 96:17  <b>Maguire</b> [1] - 161:15  <b>main</b> [2] - 76:13, 139:19  <b>maintain</b> [1] - 41:6  <b>maintaining</b> [3] - 40:12, 41:9, 146:2  <b>Malden</b> [1] - 98:2  <b>Mall</b> [1] - 136:7  <b>management</b> [1] - 4:18  <b>manager</b> [2] - 59:1, 86:5  <b>Manager</b> [3] - 1:12, 2:4, 3:10</p>	<p><b>maximiums</b> [1] - 131:4  <b>MBAs</b> [1] - 121:12  <b>mean</b> [35] - 4:13, 5:7, 44:3, 53:15, 64:6, 68:6, 72:5, 75:4, 76:3, 76:18, 77:9, 78:18, 80:5, 81:6, 82:16, 82:19, 83:16, 86:6, 98:5, 99:8, 100:19, 103:14, 104:19, 105:11, 106:12, 107:3, 108:4, 121:7, 136:5, 139:8, 144:10, 146:8, 154:11, 159:19, 164:17</p>	

<p><b>meaningful</b> [4] - 84:11, 84:12, 114:13, 170:6</p> <p><b>means</b> [2] - 48:19, 157:6</p> <p><b>meant</b> [1] - 90:17</p> <p><b>measured</b> [1] - 93:18</p> <p><b>measures</b> [1] - 47:13</p> <p><b>mechanicals</b> [3] - 11:12, 34:8, 35:4</p> <p><b>Medford</b> [1] - 98:1</p> <p><b>meet</b> [3] - 75:11, 88:9, 105:12</p> <p><b>meeting</b> [8] - 3:4, 11:11, 12:2, 14:8, 24:18, 29:5, 43:3, 73:5</p> <p><b>Meeting</b> [2] - 1:6, 2:5</p> <p><b>meetings</b> [2] - 78:6, 82:7</p> <p><b>melded</b> [1] - 103:18</p> <p><b>melodramatic</b> [1] - 85:15</p> <p><b>Member</b> [4] - 1:9, 1:9, 1:10, 1:10</p> <p><b>member</b> [2] - 100:7, 106:14</p> <p><b>Members</b> [1] - 143:6</p> <p><b>members</b> [4] - 13:7, 106:15, 124:19, 168:11</p> <p><b>mention</b> [2] - 126:18, 159:5</p> <p><b>mentioned</b> [6] - 9:9, 24:17, 32:7, 38:3, 40:18, 54:13</p> <p><b>mentioning</b> [1] - 116:5</p> <p><b>mere</b> [1] - 60:2</p> <p><b>messing</b> [1] - 78:19</p> <p><b>met</b> [4] - 26:11, 85:16, 144:4, 145:8</p> <p><b>microphone</b> [1] - 162:2</p> <p><b>microunit</b> [1] - 156:13</p> <p><b>microunits</b> [1] - 139:10</p> <p><b>mid</b> [1] - 40:12</p> <p><b>middle</b> [60] - 19:17, 20:1, 23:1, 23:4, 35:16, 61:16, 71:16, 80:16, 80:17, 81:3, 81:12, 81:16, 81:19, 82:19, 84:15, 90:1, 90:7, 90:13, 92:15, 96:4, 97:10, 97:12, 97:14, 97:17, 98:3, 98:11, 99:2, 99:6, 99:15, 100:5, 100:8, 101:2, 101:7, 101:14, 101:18,</p>	<p>102:1, 102:4, 102:10, 102:14, 104:8, 104:10, 108:3, 109:2, 109:15, 110:4, 118:12, 118:16, 119:11, 119:14, 119:17, 120:16, 120:18, 122:14, 139:9, 145:9, 145:13, 148:12, 151:11, 153:17, 168:10</p> <p><b>midstream</b> [1] - 74:9</p> <p><b>might</b> [31] - 4:7, 13:8, 15:6, 16:5, 16:7, 20:19, 22:6, 23:10, 26:2, 29:15, 30:18, 31:1, 36:10, 43:18, 46:5, 69:15, 73:7, 74:1, 90:3, 94:18, 96:2, 105:2, 134:13, 134:16, 135:1, 136:12, 139:10, 152:18, 171:13</p> <p><b>militate</b> [1] - 159:16</p> <p><b>million</b> [17] - 21:10, 23:19, 25:8, 25:9, 26:19, 27:3, 31:14, 79:7, 79:13, 79:19, 94:14, 94:19, 104:5, 111:1, 111:5, 165:7</p> <p><b>millions</b> [1] - 111:10</p> <p><b>mind</b> [8] - 7:19, 9:2, 28:13, 64:16, 65:14, 76:19, 108:11, 108:17</p> <p><b>minimized</b> [1] - 31:4</p> <p><b>minimum</b> [5] - 36:3, 36:4, 80:8, 82:3, 133:8</p> <p><b>minimums</b> [1] - 131:4</p> <p><b>minority</b> [5] - 106:15, 108:5, 155:1, 155:2, 167:12</p> <p><b>miss</b> [1] - 86:7</p> <p><b>mistake</b> [1] - 151:7</p> <p><b>mistaken</b> [1] - 147:18</p> <p><b>misunderstood</b> [1] - 101:5</p> <p><b>MIT</b> [4] - 33:12, 45:5, 69:5, 75:13</p> <p><b>mix</b> [13] - 15:15, 98:5, 101:13, 102:11, 106:18, 110:2, 148:11, 168:9, 168:14, 169:10, 169:11, 173:16, 174:12</p> <p><b>mixed</b> [2] - 23:7, 99:1</p> <p><b>mixture</b> [1] - 44:17</p>	<p><b>model</b> [1] - 64:11</p> <p><b>modelling</b> [1] - 116:13</p> <p><b>models</b> [1] - 126:15</p> <p><b>moderate</b> [14] - 19:15, 20:1, 22:12, 23:3, 71:16, 84:13, 91:18, 93:6, 93:7, 99:10, 109:2, 146:2, 148:16, 168:9</p> <p><b>modest</b> [1] - 40:11</p> <p><b>modified</b> [4] - 8:19, 74:17, 75:7, 75:15</p> <p><b>modify</b> [2] - 74:17, 149:9</p> <p><b>moment</b> [7] - 8:7, 54:8, 73:2, 78:12, 85:12, 89:12, 161:10</p> <p><b>money</b> [3] - 26:4, 84:2, 137:12</p> <p><b>month</b> [2] - 139:14, 156:12</p> <p><b>months</b> [4] - 4:19, 73:15, 87:9, 127:8</p> <p><b>monumental</b> [1] - 105:16</p> <p><b>moribund</b> [1] - 67:9</p> <p><b>most</b> [15] - 4:16, 21:16, 25:15, 25:16, 37:17, 39:13, 49:13, 59:19, 60:2, 75:14, 97:12, 97:13, 153:14, 155:11, 162:15</p> <p><b>mostly</b> [2] - 14:15, 80:2</p> <p><b>motion</b> [4] - 10:9, 12:11, 167:15, 175:12</p> <p><b>motivated</b> [1] - 76:4</p> <p><b>move</b> [14] - 16:9, 41:15, 43:11, 66:11, 96:13, 97:18, 98:1, 106:7, 123:11, 135:18, 160:14, 167:7, 175:13</p> <p><b>moved</b> [6] - 10:10, 12:13, 29:1, 29:2, 29:5, 166:7</p> <p><b>movement</b> [3] - 164:6, 164:7, 165:10</p> <p><b>moves</b> [1] - 134:12</p> <p><b>moving</b> [3] - 4:9, 165:11, 166:8</p> <p><b>multi</b> [1] - 126:2</p> <p><b>multi-acre</b> [1] - 126:2</p> <p><b>multiple</b> [2] - 115:4, 152:19</p> <p><b>musings</b> [1] - 62:2</p>	<p><b>must</b> [3] - 95:6, 142:10, 165:9</p> <p><b>muster</b> [1] - 157:19</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>N</b></p> <p><b>namely</b> [1] - 116:8</p> <p><b>narrow</b> [2] - 66:16, 163:17</p> <p><b>narrower</b> [2] - 35:10, 36:15</p> <p><b>narrows</b> [1] - 35:11</p> <p><b>natural</b> [1] - 163:18</p> <p><b>nature</b> [1] - 49:7</p> <p><b>nauseam</b> [1] - 153:11</p> <p><b>near</b> [2] - 73:8, 77:6</p> <p><b>necessarily</b> [3] - 52:7, 114:16, 163:3</p> <p><b>necessary</b> [1] - 79:19</p> <p><b>need</b> [22] - 25:19, 28:6, 37:15, 40:9, 43:8, 50:15, 76:17, 82:13, 91:17, 91:18, 93:11, 93:14, 96:13, 97:9, 97:10, 98:13, 118:17, 135:15, 139:10, 161:5, 174:8</p> <p><b>needed</b> [6] - 7:10, 25:15, 38:7, 90:12, 156:18</p> <p><b>needs</b> [10] - 38:11, 39:2, 40:9, 45:10, 66:13, 74:8, 81:13, 83:4, 83:14, 105:13</p> <p><b>negotiate</b> [2] - 151:8, 158:18</p> <p><b>negotiated</b> [1] - 156:5</p> <p><b>negotiations</b> [1] - 160:6</p> <p><b>negotiator</b> [1] - 113:2</p> <p><b>neighborhood</b> [3] - 5:1, 79:7, 122:10</p> <p><b>neighborhoods</b> [1] - 4:11</p> <p><b>neighboring</b> [1] - 4:12</p> <p><b>net</b> [2] - 19:5, 19:7</p> <p><b>network</b> [1] - 126:15</p> <p><b>never</b> [5] - 123:2, 136:10, 155:6, 155:14, 160:3</p> <p><b>new</b> [18] - 9:6, 12:4, 15:14, 21:11, 23:18, 27:18, 37:10, 43:9, 54:17, 58:8, 61:6, 75:8, 78:16, 113:3, 129:4, 132:16, 148:5, 164:17</p> <p><b>New</b> [2] - 164:18, 165:1</p>	<p><b>newer</b> [2] - 34:5, 34:14</p> <p><b>next</b> [10] - 7:7, 12:2, 19:1, 22:1, 71:11, 73:15, 86:2, 86:3, 93:9, 125:9</p> <p><b>nice</b> [4] - 25:13, 65:2, 65:6, 124:7</p> <p><b>nicer</b> [2] - 41:11, 155:17</p> <p><b>night</b> [1] - 6:8</p> <p><b>nobody</b> [1] - 76:15</p> <p><b>non</b> [1] - 6:15</p> <p><b>non-profit</b> [1] - 6:15</p> <p><b>normal</b> [1] - 113:4</p> <p><b>North</b> [4] - 49:9, 49:11, 140:9</p> <p><b>north</b> [1] - 38:17</p> <p><b>NOT</b> [1] - 178:16</p> <p><b>notable</b> [1] - 33:18</p> <p><b>Notary</b> [2] - 178:5, 178:11</p> <p><b>note</b> [3] - 24:9, 121:16, 177:7</p> <p><b>noted</b> [3] - 18:2, 39:4, 177:17</p> <p><b>nothing</b> [1] - 92:5</p> <p><b>notion</b> [6] - 15:1, 16:5, 16:6, 29:16, 72:10, 95:9</p> <p><b>nowadays</b> [1] - 122:4</p> <p><b>number</b> [34] - 22:17, 24:19, 26:17, 28:19, 29:3, 29:6, 32:16, 52:13, 64:7, 80:17, 85:4, 86:18, 87:5, 87:16, 87:17, 88:6, 88:10, 89:1, 91:6, 92:15, 97:1, 97:5, 98:6, 98:12, 104:11, 106:17, 109:9, 109:12, 109:18, 138:18, 147:15, 153:12, 168:13, 169:9</p> <p><b>numbers</b> [16] - 71:18, 79:6, 88:12, 98:14, 101:10, 102:17, 103:9, 103:17, 104:4, 108:14, 114:11, 115:6, 115:10, 115:15, 116:10, 117:5</p> <p><b>Nur</b> [1] - 1:10</p> <p><b>NUR</b> [20] - 10:12, 12:13, 54:11, 62:3, 70:3, 70:18, 89:8, 91:8, 91:11, 92:8, 92:11, 125:15, 126:18, 127:15, 160:13, 160:16,</p>
---	--	---	---	---

171:18, 174:6, 175:1, 175:9	157:2, 161:18, 162:7, 163:14, 164:10, 164:19, 165:5, 167:19, 169:10	<b>orientations</b> [1] - 49:18 <b>oriented</b> [2] - 20:19, 50:9 <b>original</b> [2] - 140:8, 177:3 <b>otherwise</b> [1] - 36:2 <b>ought</b> [6] - 53:9, 71:12, 73:9, 98:10, 152:9, 173:14 <b>outcome</b> [3] - 46:3, 46:5, 52:19 <b>outcomes</b> [2] - 42:3, 47:16 <b>outfitted</b> [1] - 94:16 <b>outweighed</b> [1] - 93:12 <b>overall</b> [6] - 17:7, 20:17, 21:5, 22:10, 23:2, 81:5 <b>overbid</b> [1] - 110:13 <b>overburdens</b> [1] - 87:5 <b>overview</b> [2] - 17:19, 161:17 <b>own</b> [3] - 32:5, 36:19, 46:11 <b>owner</b> [3] - 49:1, 73:11, 119:10 <b>ownership</b> [2] - 119:6, 119:8	<b>Parking</b> [3] - 131:8, 131:16, 173:10 <b>part</b> [28] - 15:10, 15:14, 31:19, 32:8, 32:13, 35:12, 35:16, 38:5, 38:14, 39:2, 41:13, 42:14, 49:8, 57:5, 60:6, 60:10, 62:17, 67:9, 79:10, 105:15, 105:17, 118:13, 120:8, 120:10, 128:14, 132:9, 137:1 <b>particular</b> [22] - 8:3, 15:4, 47:6, 61:13, 68:6, 73:14, 83:8, 89:13, 99:18, 113:1, 114:17, 115:2, 115:9, 122:19, 123:1, 137:17, 141:13, 147:8, 149:10, 155:10, 161:19 <b>particularly</b> [1] - 17:17 <b>particulars</b> [1] - 29:14 <b>partner</b> [1] - 94:3 <b>party</b> [1] - 155:6 <b>pass</b> [2] - 157:19, 166:18 <b>passes</b> [1] - 72:11 <b>pathways</b> [1] - 50:1 <b>pay</b> [7] - 75:5, 75:6, 79:18, 110:5, 113:6, 120:5, 156:12 <b>paying</b> [1] - 139:16 <b>payment</b> [8] - 7:5, 9:2, 9:4, 25:3, 25:8, 113:9, 113:12, 120:17 <b>payments</b> [8] - 24:16, 25:1, 25:9, 25:14, 27:4, 111:4, 111:6, 119:5 <b>PB#296</b> [1] - 2:8 <b>pedestrian</b> [1] - 50:2 <b>penthouse</b> [2] - 150:16, 152:13 <b>people</b> [25] - 4:11, 4:12, 14:11, 52:6, 54:9, 71:17, 86:1, 88:4, 93:14, 96:6, 96:7, 97:16, 97:17, 98:16, 100:9, 101:3, 101:8, 114:10, 125:6, 125:17, 126:11, 128:9, 139:12, 143:4, 169:10 <b>per</b> [10] - 6:17, 9:4, 24:19, 78:14, 88:10,	111:11, 113:6, 113:14, 133:10, 164:19 <b>perceive</b> [1] - 105:14 <b>percent</b> [82] - 18:16, 19:8, 19:13, 19:16, 19:18, 19:19, 38:4, 40:19, 48:3, 71:14, 71:15, 72:1, 72:3, 78:1, 78:2, 79:14, 80:9, 80:14, 80:19, 81:5, 81:9, 81:18, 81:19, 82:2, 82:17, 84:4, 84:6, 84:10, 89:18, 90:5, 90:6, 90:17, 91:1, 91:7, 91:11, 92:16, 92:19, 94:10, 94:12, 95:19, 96:1, 96:2, 96:4, 97:1, 97:3, 98:11, 98:13, 100:14, 101:18, 103:11, 104:1, 104:2, 104:3, 104:7, 104:8, 104:9, 106:4, 106:14, 109:8, 109:9, 119:7, 120:5, 121:19, 122:3, 122:4, 122:5, 122:10, 122:11, 123:8, 138:17, 139:17, 142:8, 142:15, 168:7, 168:12, 168:14, 168:15 <b>percentage</b> [4] - 9:7, 40:8, 87:1, 160:5 <b>percentages</b> [4] - 22:17, 24:3, 133:5, 144:3 <b>perfect</b> [1] - 151:14 <b>perfectly</b> [2] - 47:8, 110:3 <b>perform</b> [1] - 164:3 <b>performance</b> [1] - 135:2 <b>perhaps</b> [10] - 48:11, 60:16, 73:16, 78:8, 101:3, 128:5, 128:6, 128:8, 154:18, 168:5 <b>period</b> [2] - 51:11, 117:13 <b>periodically</b> [1] - 171:4 <b>permit</b> [3] - 65:8, 112:7, 147:11 <b>Permit</b> [7] - 32:14, 32:18, 49:3, 50:14, 51:1, 51:6, 51:7 <b>permitted</b> [1] - 32:17 <b>persevere</b> [1] - 153:11 <b>person</b> [1] - 85:16
<b>O</b>		<b>P</b>		
<p><b>objective</b> [3] - 47:13, 47:14, 47:15 <b>obligation</b> [1] - 70:13 <b>observation</b> [1] - 163:14 <b>observations</b> [1] - 163:13 <b>obvious</b> [2] - 22:6, 143:17 <b>obviously</b> [15] - 8:18, 33:5, 34:15, 35:2, 35:13, 41:10, 41:14, 42:17, 43:8, 44:10, 57:3, 110:7, 110:10, 126:1, 127:16 <b>occasionally</b> [1] - 155:8 <b>occasions</b> [1] - 20:8 <b>occupant</b> [1] - 149:19 <b>occupied</b> [1] - 83:19 <b>OF</b> [5] - 1:2, 178:2, 178:15, 178:16, 178:17 <b>office</b> [9] - 28:8, 34:10, 37:14, 104:2, 114:2, 164:5, 165:15, 166:6, 166:9 <b>OFFICIAL</b> [1] - 1:18 <b>official</b> [1] - 67:10 <b>often</b> [1] - 8:2 <b>old</b> [1] - 140:9 <b>on-site</b> [1] - 38:8 <b>once</b> [2] - 38:9, 156:19 <b>One</b> [1] - 56:2 <b>one</b> [63] - 3:5, 7:6, 13:9, 21:1, 24:9, 25:13, 29:3, 29:6, 30:3, 45:4, 47:7, 50:19, 53:1, 59:5, 61:13, 62:5, 62:14, 64:15, 70:6, 70:8, 70:9, 71:4, 72:10, 74:6, 78:5, 82:6, 90:11, 90:16, 93:7, 93:8, 94:1, 94:7, 98:5, 99:18, 100:15, 100:19, 105:3, 106:14, 110:11, 110:14, 113:17, 130:9, 130:10, 134:3, 134:9, 137:9, 141:5, 143:14, 144:14, 144:15, 146:17, 152:1,</p>	<p>157:2, 161:18, 162:7, 163:14, 164:10, 164:19, 165:5, 167:19, 169:10 <b>one-bedrooms</b> [1] - 21:1 <b>one-to-one</b> [1] - 93:7 <b>ones</b> [1] - 155:10 <b>ongoing</b> [1] - 88:16 <b>open</b> [43] - 17:11, 21:16, 28:10, 28:11, 28:14, 28:15, 29:4, 29:7, 29:15, 29:16, 29:17, 30:4, 30:8, 30:11, 30:12, 31:2, 31:5, 38:1, 40:8, 41:11, 43:4, 49:19, 51:19, 52:15, 58:9, 59:7, 125:9, 126:14, 126:16, 126:17, 126:19, 127:1, 128:10, 128:11, 128:13, 129:1, 129:6, 129:8, 129:10, 129:13, 129:16, 139:1, 173:8 <b>opened</b> [1] - 85:19 <b>opening</b> [1] - 85:11 <b>openness</b> [3] - 41:6, 41:10, 64:4 <b>opinion</b> [8] - 85:7, 107:7, 108:6, 109:7, 109:11, 110:1, 123:14, 173:12 <b>opportune</b> [1] - 8:7 <b>opportunities</b> [3] - 47:1, 55:12, 145:12 <b>opportunity</b> [9] - 13:16, 16:8, 20:14, 54:17, 55:9, 83:11, 83:13, 100:10, 122:2 <b>opposed</b> [2] - 89:11, 176:11 <b>opposite</b> [1] - 35:2 <b>opt</b> [1] - 13:8 <b>options</b> [5] - 25:16, 97:17, 119:19, 120:2 <b>order</b> [3] - 50:16, 81:18, 103:10 <b>Ordinance</b> [10] - 5:14, 5:15, 9:10, 13:14, 55:17, 72:1, 75:9, 75:17, 170:1, 170:12 <b>organized</b> [1] - 128:14 <b>orientation</b> [1] - 20:10</p>	<p><b>orientations</b> [1] - 49:18 <b>oriented</b> [2] - 20:19, 50:9 <b>original</b> [2] - 140:8, 177:3 <b>otherwise</b> [1] - 36:2 <b>ought</b> [6] - 53:9, 71:12, 73:9, 98:10, 152:9, 173:14 <b>outcome</b> [3] - 46:3, 46:5, 52:19 <b>outcomes</b> [2] - 42:3, 47:16 <b>outfitted</b> [1] - 94:16 <b>outweighed</b> [1] - 93:12 <b>overall</b> [6] - 17:7, 20:17, 21:5, 22:10, 23:2, 81:5 <b>overbid</b> [1] - 110:13 <b>overburdens</b> [1] - 87:5 <b>overview</b> [2] - 17:19, 161:17 <b>own</b> [3] - 32:5, 36:19, 46:11 <b>owner</b> [3] - 49:1, 73:11, 119:10 <b>ownership</b> [2] - 119:6, 119:8</p> <p><b>p.m</b> [2] - 1:5, 176:15 <b>package</b> [1] - 27:12 <b>PADEN</b> [7] - 10:4, 11:1, 11:4, 11:18, 12:1, 12:7, 12:19 <b>Paden</b> [1] - 1:13 <b>page</b> [1] - 88:14 <b>PAGE</b> [2] - 2:1, 177:9 <b>parameters</b> [2] - 46:1, 46:8 <b>parcel</b> [8] - 8:3, 8:5, 8:12, 21:4, 68:6, 71:4, 76:3, 126:9 <b>park</b> [1] - 126:2 <b>Park</b> [3] - 3:16, 47:19, 48:1 <b>parked</b> [1] - 135:13 <b>parking</b> [19] - 4:12, 4:17, 131:2, 132:1, 132:6, 132:19, 133:8, 133:15, 133:17, 134:1, 134:5, 134:14, 134:16, 134:18, 135:6, 135:11, 136:3, 136:6, 136:11</p>		

<p><b>personal</b> [1] - 58:19  <b>personally</b> [2] - 56:9, 97:8  <b>perspective</b> [2] - 35:10, 36:9  <b>persuade</b> [1] - 70:17  <b>persuaded</b> [3] - 65:7, 149:12, 150:6  <b>petition</b> [21] - 4:15, 5:6, 5:9, 7:3, 9:14, 13:11, 13:18, 29:8, 106:10, 107:15, 108:8, 160:19, 167:8, 167:16, 169:18, 170:1, 170:8, 171:11, 171:16, 172:3, 172:12  <b>phase</b> [1] - 127:12  <b>Philadelphia</b> [1] - 67:8  <b>phonetic</b> [1] - 56:2  <b>physical</b> [1] - 16:15  <b>pick</b> [3] - 29:3, 29:6, 101:12  <b>picking</b> [1] - 64:16  <b>picture</b> [1] - 172:9  <b>pictures</b> [1] - 130:1  <b>piece</b> [2] - 19:1, 165:7  <b>pinning</b> [1] - 115:6  <b>place</b> [14] - 22:6, 50:15, 54:18, 62:1, 62:19, 65:18, 83:5, 84:4, 85:6, 86:9, 98:2, 101:9, 117:14, 156:6  <b>placed</b> [4] - 153:14, 154:17, 163:2, 163:10  <b>placements</b> [1] - 151:8  <b>places</b> [1] - 151:2  <b>plan</b> [17] - 36:3, 36:5, 46:16, 46:19, 48:18, 49:6, 49:15, 50:5, 50:13, 50:18, 51:13, 74:10, 133:3, 148:1, 148:7, 155:13  <b>Planning</b> [32] - 3:5, 5:8, 7:17, 13:7, 14:8, 29:5, 29:12, 29:13, 31:17, 34:6, 47:10, 47:15, 49:5, 51:3, 56:16, 56:17, 66:4, 69:12, 71:6, 105:5, 107:14, 133:8, 142:18, 146:1, 167:10, 168:2, 170:2, 170:7, 176:16, 177:7, 177:16</p>	<p><b>PLANNING</b> [1] - 1:1  <b>planning</b> [7] - 6:1, 6:3, 8:18, 17:1, 105:6, 128:15, 171:17  <b>plans</b> [1] - 127:17  <b>planting</b> [1] - 127:5  <b>plate</b> [14] - 33:3, 33:10, 33:13, 33:17, 34:9, 34:11, 34:15, 35:5, 36:1, 39:1, 45:9, 66:17, 163:17, 164:11  <b>plates</b> [4] - 32:3, 41:2, 42:2, 91:3  <b>play</b> [5] - 14:13, 16:16, 16:18, 114:11, 116:12  <b>played</b> [1] - 21:3  <b>playing</b> [2] - 96:4, 103:5  <b>pleased</b> [1] - 51:15  <b>plenty</b> [1] - 61:11  <b>plus</b> [3] - 7:5, 78:1, 138:19  <b>podium</b> [8] - 34:4, 36:16, 42:10, 44:2, 44:18, 45:7, 45:17, 46:6  <b>podiums</b> [4] - 37:13, 39:13, 44:15  <b>Point</b> [4] - 49:9, 49:11, 140:9  <b>point</b> [29] - 15:6, 16:15, 29:8, 36:14, 45:5, 54:6, 77:15, 81:9, 85:11, 87:10, 88:10, 100:17, 101:5, 101:15, 102:16, 110:8, 110:9, 110:12, 110:13, 115:9, 117:2, 117:4, 124:5, 152:15, 160:5, 164:10, 166:9, 166:11  <b>pointed</b> [1] - 161:18  <b>pointing</b> [1] - 140:3  <b>points</b> [4] - 67:7, 143:10, 172:5, 175:19  <b>policies</b> [1] - 157:16  <b>policy</b> [1] - 100:10  <b>political</b> [2] - 158:6, 158:15  <b>politics</b> [1] - 105:2  <b>Porter</b> [2] - 61:2, 61:6  <b>portion</b> [7] - 23:11, 27:13, 28:1, 30:12, 31:3, 80:15, 122:8  <b>portions</b> [1] - 172:3</p>	<p><b>positive</b> [1] - 172:5  <b>positively</b> [1] - 5:18  <b>possibility</b> [1] - 159:10  <b>possible</b> [3] - 105:19, 137:2, 137:12  <b>possibly</b> [1] - 73:4  <b>potential</b> [7] - 2:6, 13:3, 58:10, 72:12, 111:8, 124:18, 163:8  <b>power</b> [4] - 65:7, 113:1, 143:3, 150:7  <b>powerhouse</b> [1] - 68:1  <b>precedent</b> [1] - 75:17  <b>precisely</b> [3] - 76:2, 78:7, 103:1  <b>preclude</b> [1] - 137:7  <b>predetermine</b> [1] - 89:1  <b>predetermining</b> [1] - 89:5  <b>predictability</b> [1] - 88:11  <b>prefer</b> [1] - 81:17  <b>preference</b> [1] - 163:6  <b>preferred</b> [2] - 38:12, 38:18  <b>prejudging</b> [1] - 128:18  <b>premium</b> [1] - 110:19  <b>prepared</b> [1] - 167:7  <b>present</b> [1] - 25:5  <b>presentation</b> [3] - 45:1, 53:12, 168:3  <b>presenting</b> [1] - 167:16  <b>presents</b> [2] - 63:18, 152:5  <b>preservation</b> [1] - 26:1  <b>press</b> [1] - 21:18  <b>PRESTON</b> [53] - 53:14, 65:11, 68:8, 68:13, 68:19, 83:2, 87:6, 87:14, 89:6, 92:4, 94:11, 101:4, 118:1, 118:8, 123:18, 124:3, 124:9, 124:15, 125:11, 125:16, 126:7, 127:9, 127:18, 128:3, 128:16, 129:3, 129:12, 131:11, 131:14, 131:19, 132:4, 132:11, 132:14, 133:1, 133:6, 133:16, 135:8, 136:17,</p>	<p>137:5, 138:6, 141:9, 143:5, 169:4, 169:12, 170:10, 170:17, 171:5, 172:6, 173:5, 174:3, 174:18, 175:5, 176:4  <b>Preston</b> [2] - 1:8, 52:16  <b>presume</b> [1] - 66:2  <b>presumed</b> [2] - 69:11, 71:19  <b>presumption</b> [2] - 65:4, 65:5  <b>pretty</b> [7] - 60:19, 61:1, 61:17, 95:7, 104:18, 115:18, 123:6  <b>previous</b> [1] - 22:2  <b>previously</b> [2] - 27:14, 81:10  <b>price</b> [5] - 72:13, 78:14, 78:15, 98:1, 162:14  <b>principle</b> [6] - 15:3, 52:16, 158:2, 158:10, 158:17, 160:8  <b>principles</b> [1] - 144:15  <b>priorities</b> [2] - 15:10, 105:14  <b>priority</b> [1] - 156:14  <b>private</b> [3] - 156:8, 156:14, 158:6  <b>pro</b> [2] - 80:5, 95:4  <b>problem</b> [4] - 66:5, 66:19, 92:5, 125:17  <b>problematic</b> [1] - 76:11  <b>proceed</b> [2] - 13:2, 51:7  <b>proceedings</b> [1] - 178:7  <b>proceeds</b> [1] - 50:14  <b>process</b> [21] - 6:18, 9:11, 9:17, 9:19, 32:1, 32:9, 32:18, 38:5, 41:13, 48:13, 49:4, 50:6, 51:2, 51:9, 52:19, 58:1, 105:1, 126:3, 128:15, 158:11, 169:17  <b>produce</b> [1] - 139:9  <b>production</b> [1] - 112:18  <b>productive</b> [1] - 95:1  <b>professionals</b> [1] - 93:13  <b>profile</b> [2] - 42:6,</p>	<p>164:9  <b>profit</b> [2] - 6:15  <b>profitable</b> [2] - 165:16, 166:10  <b>program</b> [5] - 4:18, 6:16, 118:13, 119:13, 145:4  <b>programs</b> [10] - 26:9, 118:15, 118:19, 120:9, 120:12, 120:15, 120:18, 121:1, 145:14, 150:19  <b>progress</b> [1] - 11:13  <b>progression</b> [1] - 28:13  <b>prohibit</b> [2] - 45:16, 136:2  <b>project</b> [42] - 3:16, 3:19, 14:12, 15:6, 15:7, 16:9, 19:10, 19:19, 25:18, 49:10, 49:11, 50:4, 50:11, 50:12, 51:5, 51:6, 51:11, 52:5, 62:13, 77:3, 77:4, 77:6, 80:8, 86:5, 91:2, 96:13, 108:2, 109:3, 111:7, 111:9, 111:12, 113:8, 115:2, 122:8, 135:19, 157:10, 157:12, 159:6, 159:7, 159:18, 165:17, 169:14  <b>projects</b> [4] - 23:9, 50:16, 84:12, 116:1  <b>prolong</b> [1] - 171:10  <b>prominent</b> [4] - 33:7, 35:7, 45:11, 59:16  <b>promote</b> [2] - 15:17, 139:2  <b>proof</b> [1] - 141:18  <b>proper</b> [1] - 173:15  <b>Properties</b> [1] - 136:11  <b>property</b> [1] - 49:1  <b>proponent</b> [2] - 11:6, 49:2  <b>proportion</b> [1] - 86:14  <b>proposal</b> [34] - 3:14, 5:17, 6:9, 7:14, 8:1, 8:17, 18:10, 19:7, 19:11, 24:5, 28:18, 29:2, 43:17, 47:6, 48:18, 51:16, 53:9, 72:13, 75:12, 94:6, 111:18, 131:9, 132:8, 135:15, 135:17, 139:1, 139:6, 147:19,</p>
--	---	--	---	---

<p>148:7, 149:2, 149:10, 152:5, 159:9, 175:14 <b>propose</b> [2] - 82:18, 135:10 <b>proposed</b> [7] - 9:3, 14:1, 17:4, 18:3, 32:6, 88:9, 148:3 <b>proposing</b> [4] - 56:19, 58:7, 65:1, 168:19 <b>proven</b> [1] - 51:5 <b>provide</b> [10] - 40:6, 40:7, 100:8, 102:8, 118:4, 145:10, 145:17, 147:1, 147:15, 153:16 <b>provided</b> [2] - 148:13, 167:18 <b>provides</b> [2] - 20:14, 144:8 <b>providing</b> [4] - 41:8, 100:13, 110:6, 146:16 <b>provision</b> [3] - 28:2, 73:14, 167:19 <b>provisions</b> [5] - 74:16, 75:2, 75:9, 144:17, 172:16 <b>Prudential</b> [1] - 57:11 <b>public</b> [31] - 3:14, 4:3, 6:5, 6:18, 12:4, 13:5, 13:9, 13:13, 13:16, 13:17, 28:15, 29:7, 29:16, 29:17, 30:1, 30:2, 30:4, 99:7, 114:8, 124:4, 124:6, 124:18, 124:19, 129:6, 129:7, 129:13, 130:15, 161:3, 170:5, 170:8, 174:7 <b>Public</b> [2] - 178:5, 178:11 <b>PUD</b> [16] - 2:6, 3:7, 13:3, 49:3, 50:13, 51:9, 70:10, 89:12, 89:13, 89:14, 140:10, 142:13, 142:16, 142:17, 148:7, 168:1 <b>PUD-KS</b> [2] - 2:6, 13:3 <b>purchase</b> [2] - 78:14, 78:15 <b>purely</b> [2] - 63:15, 147:11 <b>purpose</b> [2] - 112:16, 164:5 <b>pursuit</b> [1] - 103:16 <b>push</b> [6] - 47:7, 67:2, 95:10, 95:11, 110:12, 117:2</p>	<p><b>pushed</b> [1] - 98:7 <b>pushing</b> [5] - 60:17, 99:3, 105:3, 105:4, 173:14 <b>put</b> [12] - 57:7, 66:1, 75:18, 76:12, 78:11, 85:8, 93:3, 117:14, 129:13, 130:4, 154:18, 164:14 <b>putting</b> [6] - 56:4, 94:17, 124:5, 127:6, 151:13, 163:3</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Q</b></p> <hr/> <p><b>qualifications</b> [1] - 6:4 <b>qualified</b> [1] - 112:12 <b>qualify</b> [1] - 30:4 <b>qualifying</b> [1] - 77:5 <b>quality</b> [4] - 44:13, 45:13, 48:6, 145:4 <b>quash</b> [1] - 97:6 <b>questions</b> [5] - 17:17, 43:14, 137:17, 140:6, 160:18 <b>quickly</b> [2] - 141:10, 141:11 <b>quite</b> [18] - 33:17, 34:9, 35:5, 36:1, 36:5, 37:3, 37:6, 38:9, 38:10, 39:18, 40:4, 40:13, 53:4, 58:14, 67:13, 102:13, 164:6, 166:6</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>R</b></p> <hr/> <p><b>raise</b> [2] - 141:7, 143:13 <b>raised</b> [1] - 142:4 <b>raising</b> [1] - 161:13 <b>Raj</b> [1] - 11:5 <b>random</b> [1] - 104:14 <b>range</b> [3] - 23:17, 27:2, 119:13 <b>ranged</b> [1] - 31:13 <b>rate</b> [4] - 20:18, 103:11, 122:5, 145:1 <b>rates</b> [3] - 115:14, 159:2 <b>rather</b> [8] - 20:4, 95:18, 98:2, 99:19, 107:16, 142:13, 157:7, 174:11 <b>re</b> [1] - 142:11 <b>re-edited</b> [1] - 142:11 <b>reach</b> [3] - 28:8, 58:6,</p>	<p>162:14 <b>read</b> [3] - 24:4, 143:16, 177:16 <b>readily</b> [2] - 109:17, 122:7 <b>reading</b> [2] - 129:18, 177:7 <b>ready</b> [2] - 83:19, 115:3 <b>Real</b> [1] - 161:16 <b>real</b> [10] - 68:9, 70:10, 71:13, 84:4, 84:6, 84:10, 84:15, 97:3, 129:16, 154:1 <b>really</b> [51] - 16:19, 22:7, 22:17, 23:12, 26:4, 26:7, 30:15, 30:16, 34:12, 38:10, 39:7, 39:17, 42:3, 42:6, 42:11, 44:13, 44:19, 52:2, 55:10, 62:4, 62:12, 63:14, 64:1, 67:9, 67:12, 67:19, 76:7, 77:12, 82:7, 83:8, 84:9, 86:6, 93:15, 97:10, 105:1, 105:10, 107:17, 118:18, 121:13, 123:2, 138:4, 141:16, 143:8, 145:6, 151:2, 152:11, 152:14, 157:17, 161:9, 170:2, 173:1 <b>Realty</b> [1] - 5:16 <b>rear</b> [1] - 134:7 <b>REASON</b> [6] - 177:10, 177:11, 177:12, 177:13, 177:14, 177:15 <b>reason</b> [3] - 82:10, 118:13, 177:8 <b>reasonable</b> [3] - 110:3, 117:7, 134:14 <b>reasonably</b> [2] - 99:12, 149:16 <b>reasons</b> [2] - 48:7, 102:12 <b>rebuttable</b> [1] - 65:4 <b>recent</b> [2] - 35:1, 49:13 <b>receptive</b> [2] - 5:4, 86:1 <b>recommend</b> [2] - 95:16, 117:15 <b>recommendation</b> [5] - 13:13, 24:17, 106:9, 117:7, 123:13 <b>recommendations</b></p>	<p>[12] - 2:7, 9:12, 9:16, 15:2, 25:2, 31:10, 32:4, 35:12, 38:14, 53:8, 105:8, 132:13 <b>recommended</b> [3] - 18:11, 35:19, 89:17 <b>recommending</b> [2] - 71:13, 102:13 <b>RECORD</b> [1] - 1:18 <b>record</b> [3] - 140:16, 177:18, 178:6 <b>redevelopment</b> [1] - 8:5 <b>Redevelopment</b> [3] - 108:13, 112:15, 117:19 <b>reduced</b> [1] - 20:18 <b>reducing</b> [2] - 57:1, 93:16 <b>refer</b> [1] - 169:19 <b>referral</b> [1] - 170:3 <b>referred</b> [1] - 112:14 <b>refers</b> [2] - 48:18, 148:15 <b>refine</b> [1] - 16:13 <b>reflect</b> [2] - 164:8, 166:13 <b>reflecting</b> [1] - 14:6 <b>reflects</b> [1] - 169:2 <b>regard</b> [2] - 43:4, 56:7 <b>regarding</b> [1] - 21:16 <b>regards</b> [1] - 54:12 <b>regular</b> [1] - 151:9 <b>regulate</b> [1] - 52:9 <b>regulation</b> [1] - 31:1 <b>regulations</b> [1] - 52:3 <b>relates</b> [1] - 75:14 <b>relating</b> [1] - 142:5 <b>relative</b> [1] - 28:16 <b>relatively</b> [1] - 99:10 <b>released</b> [1] - 114:9 <b>relevant</b> [1] - 39:3 <b>reliable</b> [2] - 79:9 <b>rely</b> [2] - 76:8, 166:2 <b>relying</b> [3] - 87:12, 104:16, 123:4 <b>remain</b> [1] - 14:16 <b>remember</b> [4] - 16:1, 26:10, 109:14, 129:17 <b>remind</b> [1] - 169:16 <b>reminds</b> [1] - 47:17 <b>remove</b> [1] - 92:17 <b>removing</b> [1] - 18:12 <b>rent</b> [1] - 104:3 <b>renting</b> [2] - 119:5, 119:7 <b>rents</b> [2] - 80:18, 101:17 <b>reorientation</b> [1] - 18:17</p>	<p><b>repeat</b> [1] - 101:16 <b>report</b> [3] - 121:4, 155:1, 167:13 <b>Reporter</b> [2] - 178:4, 178:12 <b>REPORTER</b> [1] - 178:17 <b>REPORTERS</b> [1] - 1:17 <b>reports</b> [1] - 155:3 <b>represent</b> [1] - 63:17 <b>representations</b> [1] - 176:3 <b>representative</b> [1] - 152:9 <b>representatives</b> [1] - 114:7 <b>represented</b> [1] - 22:2 <b>represents</b> [1] - 52:17 <b>REPRODUCTION</b> [1] - 178:16 <b>request</b> [2] - 10:18, 11:5 <b>requests</b> [1] - 6:4 <b>require</b> [10] - 72:2, 77:2, 82:12, 102:8, 133:11, 135:6, 147:9, 148:2, 154:7, 154:15 <b>required</b> [12] - 19:13, 22:11, 23:16, 24:1, 25:1, 72:3, 75:10, 84:16, 90:2, 103:10, 103:11, 144:12 <b>regulation</b> [16] - 19:12, 20:3, 20:5, 20:13, 23:1, 24:12, 28:15, 28:16, 28:19, 72:4, 72:11, 129:7, 147:8, 148:15, 149:8, 172:17 <b>requirements</b> [16] - 17:9, 17:11, 19:6, 19:17, 23:11, 31:7, 72:16, 90:1, 102:4, 117:9, 131:3, 132:7, 133:9, 134:6, 144:2, 144:10 <b>requires</b> [1] - 147:4 <b>requiring</b> [2] - 128:17, 153:13 <b>resale</b> [2] - 119:10, 120:8 <b>Research</b> [2] - 47:18, 48:1 <b>reserve</b> [1] - 63:3 <b>residences</b> [2] - 68:5, 68:9 <b>resident</b> [1] - 90:5 <b>residential</b> [41] - 4:10, 18:7, 18:14, 18:16,</p>
---	---	---	---	--



<p>18:19, 19:19, 22:7, 22:10, 23:16, 28:7, 34:15, 35:15, 35:18, 36:14, 43:8, 58:14, 60:9, 61:14, 68:18, 79:14, 90:4, 91:15, 91:17, 91:18, 104:2, 114:2, 117:12, 121:18, 122:2, 122:7, 134:19, 138:12, 144:3, 144:12, 146:10, 148:10, 163:16, 164:5, 164:7, 164:17</p> <p><b>residents</b> [1] - 89:15</p> <p><b>resolved</b> [1] - 165:10</p> <p><b>resources</b> [1] - 156:19</p> <p><b>RESPECT</b> [1] - 178:16</p> <p><b>respected</b> [1] - 158:7</p> <p><b>Response</b> [6] - 12:10, 161:1, 161:11, 167:5, 176:7, 176:12</p> <p><b>responsible</b> [1] - 17:1</p> <p><b>rest</b> [2] - 31:5, 73:8</p> <p><b>restricted</b> [2] - 119:9, 120:7</p> <p><b>restrictions</b> [1] - 26:2</p> <p><b>restrictive</b> [2] - 46:1, 46:7</p> <p><b>restricts</b> [1] - 119:9</p> <p><b>result</b> [7] - 19:5, 36:8, 39:5, 39:11, 39:17, 52:18, 116:11</p> <p><b>resulting</b> [1] - 18:18</p> <p><b>results</b> [6] - 18:6, 18:17, 21:4, 25:7, 38:8, 46:9</p> <p><b>retail</b> [4] - 60:13, 142:5, 142:7, 142:13</p> <p><b>retire</b> [1] - 86:5</p> <p><b>return</b> [1] - 103:11</p> <p><b>revenue</b> [1] - 111:12</p> <p><b>review</b> [12] - 17:4, 28:6, 32:8, 41:15, 46:18, 49:4, 49:9, 51:2, 51:6, 127:11, 127:17, 143:1</p> <p><b>reviews</b> [1] - 152:7</p> <p><b>revise</b> [1] - 43:10</p> <p><b>revised</b> [5] - 32:6, 39:15, 40:17, 41:18, 51:16</p> <p><b>revising</b> [1] - 43:9</p> <p><b>revision</b> [1] - 3:17</p> <p><b>revisions</b> [2] - 11:11, 12:3</p>	<p><b>rewarded</b> [1] - 62:14</p> <p><b>RFIs</b> [1] - 96:15</p> <p><b>RFP</b> [1] - 52:6</p> <p><b>rhetorical</b> [1] - 100:6</p> <p><b>rich</b> [1] - 100:3</p> <p><b>rights</b> [2] - 8:12, 113:7</p> <p><b>rise</b> [1] - 40:12</p> <p><b>risk</b> [2] - 73:12, 102:6</p> <p><b>risky</b> [1] - 102:5</p> <p><b>river</b> [5] - 56:10, 56:11, 57:9, 68:3, 71:7</p> <p><b>road</b> [3] - 47:1, 84:18, 159:11</p> <p><b>Roberts</b> [2] - 1:14, 14:4</p> <p><b>ROBERTS</b> [19] - 14:3, 27:1, 43:13, 48:16, 107:10, 112:4, 112:10, 118:4, 118:10, 132:3, 132:6, 132:13, 140:15, 142:9, 142:18, 144:11, 148:4, 171:9, 172:1</p> <p><b>roof</b> [2] - 3:14, 129:14</p> <p><b>rooftop</b> [1] - 11:12</p> <p><b>room</b> [4] - 92:17, 117:10, 122:1, 123:6</p> <p><b>Room</b> [1] - 1:6</p> <p><b>roughly</b> [1] - 5:12</p> <p><b>round</b> [1] - 104:4</p> <p><b>rounded</b> [1] - 137:18</p> <p><b>roundtable</b> [1] - 6:1</p> <p><b>Route</b> [1] - 55:2</p> <p><b>routes</b> [1] - 126:8</p> <p><b>row</b> [1] - 18:1</p> <p><b>rules</b> [3] - 74:8, 74:9, 76:8</p> <p><b>run</b> [1] - 33:1</p> <p><b>running</b> [3] - 79:15, 117:5, 165:5</p> <p><b>runs</b> [1] - 166:12</p> <p><b>RUSSELL</b> [38] - 45:4, 47:17, 48:5, 51:15, 57:15, 57:19, 61:19, 70:4, 70:8, 93:3, 94:12, 124:17, 125:5, 126:12, 129:2, 132:19, 133:2, 133:13, 134:3, 135:5, 135:9, 136:4, 136:8, 136:15, 137:4, 138:2, 138:8, 138:13, 139:8, 139:15, 155:4, 158:12, 159:19, 165:4, 168:19,</p>	<p>169:6, 174:10, 175:13</p> <p><b>Russell</b> [1] - 1:9</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>S</b></p> <hr/> <p><b>sake</b> [1] - 18:8</p> <p><b>SAME</b> [1] - 178:16</p> <p><b>save</b> [1] - 130:12</p> <p><b>saw</b> [2] - 49:12, 139:19</p> <p><b>scale</b> [4] - 40:13, 40:14, 44:15, 50:4</p> <p><b>scenario</b> [1] - 114:18</p> <p><b>schedule</b> [1] - 122:6</p> <p><b>scheduled</b> [2] - 11:11, 11:17</p> <p><b>school</b> [1] - 61:6</p> <p><b>scope</b> [1] - 6:3</p> <p><b>se</b> [1] - 78:14</p> <p><b>Seaport</b> [1] - 130:2</p> <p><b>seasons</b> [1] - 55:7</p> <p><b>Seasons</b> [2] - 62:16, 67:17</p> <p><b>Second</b> [1] - 1:6</p> <p><b>second</b> [11] - 10:11, 10:12, 12:14, 12:15, 34:7, 60:12, 63:9, 67:15, 67:17, 102:16, 176:4</p> <p><b>Section</b> [1] - 142:5</p> <p><b>section</b> [1] - 154:3</p> <p><b>see</b> [29] - 8:4, 17:1, 18:1, 21:5, 22:1, 34:2, 46:9, 51:16, 53:10, 54:8, 55:3, 80:6, 81:17, 84:3, 85:9, 91:8, 93:5, 96:5, 96:7, 97:7, 98:3, 98:4, 98:11, 107:18, 109:1, 117:1, 127:7, 157:17, 158:12</p> <p><b>seeing</b> [3] - 15:8, 64:11, 80:3</p> <p><b>seem</b> [3] - 27:15, 69:9, 97:5</p> <p><b>selection</b> [1] - 152:2</p> <p><b>semi</b> [1] - 79:9</p> <p><b>semi-reliable</b> [1] - 79:9</p> <p><b>send</b> [2] - 96:15, 96:16</p> <p><b>sending</b> [1] - 118:6</p> <p><b>sends</b> [1] - 170:7</p> <p><b>sense</b> [8] - 41:9, 64:5, 93:4, 111:6, 118:17, 118:19, 147:10, 160:2</p> <p><b>sensitive</b> [2] - 40:15,</p>	<p>162:16</p> <p><b>separate</b> [2] - 51:2, 144:8</p> <p><b>separated</b> [1] - 31:4</p> <p><b>separations</b> [1] - 36:4</p> <p><b>serious</b> [2] - 104:18, 105:10</p> <p><b>serve</b> [2] - 100:3, 100:4</p> <p><b>service</b> [2] - 50:3, 142:13</p> <p><b>services</b> [1] - 94:4</p> <p><b>servicing</b> [1] - 120:15</p> <p><b>set</b> [7] - 15:1, 115:8, 115:12, 115:15, 123:1, 178:6, 178:8</p> <p><b>sets</b> [3] - 31:11, 103:3, 119:3</p> <p><b>seventh</b> [1] - 62:15</p> <p><b>several</b> [2] - 8:6, 20:8</p> <p><b>shade</b> [2] - 128:2</p> <p><b>shadow</b> [2] - 42:13, 55:1</p> <p><b>shall</b> [2] - 149:15, 149:19</p> <p><b>Shanghai</b> [2] - 55:6, 62:17</p> <p><b>shaped</b> [2] - 34:16, 42:9</p> <p><b>share</b> [4] - 4:6, 4:8, 146:7</p> <p><b>shared</b> [1] - 133:15</p> <p><b>sharing</b> [2] - 5:2, 36:8</p> <p><b>sheer</b> [1] - 83:14</p> <p><b>SHEET</b> [1] - 177:1</p> <p><b>Sheet</b> [2] - 177:4, 177:8</p> <p><b>sheet</b> [1] - 177:8</p> <p><b>shopping</b> [2] - 60:13, 61:3</p> <p><b>short</b> [1] - 66:7</p> <p><b>Shorthand</b> [2] - 178:4, 178:12</p> <p><b>shot</b> [2] - 87:12, 104:15</p> <p><b>show</b> [5] - 10:15, 21:2, 24:7, 27:11, 176:10</p> <p><b>Show</b> [1] - 12:17</p> <p><b>showed</b> [2] - 23:6, 126:15</p> <p><b>showing</b> [2] - 23:5, 126:14</p> <p><b>shown</b> [1] - 24:2</p> <p><b>side</b> [8] - 38:16, 38:17, 39:19, 71:7, 106:12, 107:6, 162:6</p> <p><b>sides</b> [1] - 46:5</p> <p><b>sidewalks</b> [1] - 129:15</p>	<p><b>sight</b> [1] - 15:9</p> <p><b>Sign</b> [1] - 177:8</p> <p><b>SIGNATURE</b> [1] - 177:1</p> <p><b>significant</b> [9] - 58:9, 80:15, 81:2, 100:13, 100:16, 117:8, 126:17, 138:3, 168:3</p> <p><b>significantly</b> [3] - 67:14, 80:17, 115:18</p> <p><b>Silver</b> [1] - 75:11</p> <p><b>similar</b> [1] - 22:9</p> <p><b>similarly</b> [2] - 13:14, 116:4</p> <p><b>simple</b> [3] - 17:4, 31:6, 52:14</p> <p><b>simpler</b> [1] - 29:11</p> <p><b>simplifying</b> [1] - 141:19</p> <p><b>simply</b> [2] - 82:12, 122:14</p> <p><b>simultaneously</b> [1] - 134:18</p> <p><b>single</b> [4] - 68:11, 70:5, 139:11, 176:2</p> <p><b>site</b> [32] - 16:4, 16:5, 17:7, 18:19, 21:15, 30:11, 31:3, 34:12, 35:2, 37:3, 37:8, 38:4, 38:8, 38:12, 41:3, 41:4, 46:5, 49:17, 49:19, 58:8, 68:3, 76:6, 83:8, 83:9, 85:6, 85:7, 85:14, 144:9, 148:1, 163:7, 166:17, 174:1</p> <p><b>sites</b> [1] - 49:16</p> <p><b>situation</b> [3] - 30:18, 72:15, 135:12</p> <p><b>situations</b> [1] - 144:18</p> <p><b>six</b> [4] - 73:15, 98:8, 122:5, 130:4</p> <p><b>six-foot</b> [1] - 130:4</p> <p><b>size</b> [5] - 138:19, 152:17, 163:8, 163:15, 164:13</p> <p><b>sized</b> [1] - 163:10</p> <p><b>sizes</b> [5] - 20:12, 28:16, 50:10, 145:18, 164:11</p> <p><b>sky</b> [3] - 41:6, 42:13, 55:11</p> <p><b>skyscrapers</b> [1] - 55:4</p> <p><b>slab</b> [2] - 34:2, 42:8</p> <p><b>slab-type</b> [1] - 34:2</p> <p><b>slender</b> [2] - 38:18, 39:9</p>
--	--	--	--	---

<p><b>slenderness</b> [1] - 41:19</p> <p><b>slide</b> [2] - 22:2, 129:14</p> <p><b>slight</b> [2] - 138:11</p> <p><b>slip</b> [1] - 144:17</p> <p><b>small</b> [8] - 22:13, 33:9, 35:5, 36:1, 62:19, 86:18, 91:3, 140:12</p> <p><b>smaller</b> [5] - 21:1, 34:14, 39:1, 41:3, 152:18</p> <p><b>smart</b> [2] - 16:19, 156:17</p> <p><b>soft</b> [1] - 38:16</p> <p><b>Somerville</b> [1] - 97:19</p> <p><b>sometime</b> [2] - 20:6, 78:3</p> <p><b>sometimes</b> [3] - 151:14, 152:7, 152:19</p> <p><b>somewhat</b> [3] - 16:4, 108:15, 148:5</p> <p><b>somewhere</b> [3] - 98:9, 126:2, 156:3</p> <p><b>soon</b> [2] - 12:1, 137:12</p> <p><b>sophisticated</b> [1] - 103:7</p> <p><b>sorry</b> [4] - 4:5, 5:10, 62:4, 150:9</p> <p><b>sort</b> [50] - 18:9, 24:9, 25:5, 28:19, 31:6, 35:6, 35:7, 35:9, 36:3, 36:6, 37:1, 38:6, 38:16, 38:18, 39:5, 39:11, 39:17, 39:18, 40:6, 40:8, 40:11, 41:2, 41:3, 42:16, 42:19, 44:17, 46:7, 46:11, 47:12, 47:17, 54:14, 61:16, 64:9, 69:7, 79:8, 99:7, 100:2, 101:3, 102:9, 103:9, 113:1, 119:2, 121:8, 121:13, 122:8, 123:7, 127:2, 151:7</p> <p><b>sorts</b> [1] - 71:18</p> <p><b>sought</b> [1] - 163:2</p> <p><b>sounds</b> [8] - 92:2, 103:13, 103:14, 103:17, 110:3, 168:16, 174:5</p> <p><b>South</b> [1] - 130:2</p> <p><b>south</b> [2] - 38:16, 39:19</p> <p><b>space</b> [46] - 15:14, 17:11, 17:18, 21:16, 28:10, 28:11, 28:14,</p>	<p>28:15, 29:4, 29:7, 29:15, 29:16, 29:17, 29:19, 30:4, 30:8, 30:11, 30:12, 31:2, 31:5, 37:14, 38:1, 40:8, 41:11, 43:4, 46:10, 49:19, 51:19, 52:15, 58:9, 91:1, 125:10, 126:14, 126:16, 126:19, 127:1, 127:6, 128:10, 128:11, 128:13, 129:1, 129:8, 129:10, 129:13, 129:16, 173:8</p> <p><b>spaces</b> [5] - 59:7, 126:17, 127:3, 136:9, 136:12</p> <p><b>Special</b> [4] - 32:18, 49:3, 50:13, 51:6</p> <p><b>special</b> [2] - 60:10, 66:13</p> <p><b>specific</b> [4] - 65:13, 114:13, 116:18, 171:18</p> <p><b>specifically</b> [2] - 56:13, 75:10</p> <p><b>specified</b> [1] - 138:19</p> <p><b>specify</b> [1] - 112:2</p> <p><b>spectacular</b> [1] - 69:17</p> <p><b>spectrum</b> [1] - 156:6</p> <p><b>spell</b> [1] - 50:14</p> <p><b>spend</b> [1] - 162:11</p> <p><b>spent</b> [4] - 14:10, 14:11, 59:1, 78:3</p> <p><b>spire</b> [1] - 61:16</p> <p><b>spirit</b> [1] - 107:18</p> <p><b>split</b> [2] - 30:14, 172:19</p> <p><b>spread</b> [2] - 27:5, 144:5</p> <p><b>square</b> [26] - 7:6, 9:4, 21:10, 22:4, 22:5, 22:9, 23:2, 23:19, 24:15, 25:1, 33:4, 33:14, 34:17, 36:2, 37:11, 38:6, 39:14, 45:8, 49:16, 63:12, 79:13, 113:6, 113:15, 148:9, 164:13</p> <p><b>Square</b> [36] - 2:7, 3:15, 6:10, 9:3, 14:19, 15:4, 15:12, 32:2, 32:10, 33:8, 42:4, 42:5, 43:2, 54:16, 56:12, 58:11, 59:2, 59:4, 59:13, 60:6, 60:11, 60:12,</p>	<p>60:16, 60:18, 60:19, 61:2, 61:6, 62:6, 62:9, 62:11, 89:16, 90:9, 90:10, 113:17, 132:10</p> <p><b>squares</b> [1] - 60:8</p> <p><b>squeezed</b> [1] - 38:11</p> <p><b>SS</b> [1] - 178:3</p> <p><b>stable</b> [1] - 163:18</p> <p><b>staff</b> [13] - 4:15, 13:7, 53:8, 54:2, 58:5, 58:17, 71:13, 126:13, 139:5, 139:12, 141:11, 152:6, 167:8</p> <p><b>Staff</b> [1] - 1:13</p> <p><b>stage</b> [4] - 16:18, 141:2, 169:18, 170:4</p> <p><b>stages</b> [1] - 48:14</p> <p><b>stand</b> [2] - 14:1, 116:18</p> <p><b>standard</b> [2] - 157:5</p> <p><b>standards</b> [1] - 146:3</p> <p><b>standing</b> [1] - 165:3</p> <p><b>Starbucks</b> [1] - 62:9</p> <p><b>stars</b> [1] - 8:8</p> <p><b>start</b> [13] - 3:9, 12:3, 14:6, 14:14, 31:18, 53:12, 54:11, 65:19, 94:17, 134:11, 136:19, 137:11, 151:7</p> <p><b>started</b> [7] - 16:1, 28:13, 37:1, 41:13, 59:8, 91:13, 116:12</p> <p><b>starting</b> [1] - 81:9</p> <p><b>starts</b> [1] - 163:19</p> <p><b>state</b> [5] - 8:14, 140:16, 160:8, 161:17, 172:4</p> <p><b>state-of-the-art</b> [1] - 8:14</p> <p><b>statement</b> [6] - 66:3, 69:7, 70:10, 86:10, 86:11, 168:11</p> <p><b>statement(s)</b> [1] - 177:18</p> <p><b>States</b> [1] - 30:3</p> <p><b>stay</b> [2] - 73:17, 98:4</p> <p><b>staying</b> [2] - 21:17, 98:10</p> <p><b>stems</b> [1] - 8:17</p> <p><b>step</b> [3] - 57:4, 90:14, 117:8</p> <p><b>Stephanie</b> [1] - 4:16</p> <p><b>steps</b> [1] - 50:15</p> <p><b>Steve</b> [8] - 63:7, 83:3, 85:3, 87:15, 93:4, 96:10, 96:19, 162:18</p>	<p><b>STEVEN</b> [59] - 10:10, 12:14, 46:14, 48:4, 63:8, 70:11, 70:15, 71:10, 72:6, 72:9, 74:2, 76:1, 87:3, 87:8, 89:4, 92:7, 92:9, 98:19, 101:11, 106:18, 109:14, 109:17, 110:14, 110:17, 111:3, 121:3, 121:6, 124:7, 128:11, 128:17, 130:9, 130:14, 130:18, 135:3, 139:13, 141:19, 143:14, 146:5, 148:19, 149:6, 150:2, 151:3, 151:10, 153:9, 154:4, 154:7, 154:14, 155:1, 158:9, 159:4, 160:10, 165:13, 167:1, 167:11, 168:18, 172:7, 173:4, 174:14, 175:7</p> <p><b>Steven</b> [1] - 1:9</p> <p><b>stick</b> [1] - 168:6</p> <p><b>sticking</b> [1] - 63:8</p> <p><b>stiffness</b> [1] - 164:3</p> <p><b>still</b> [20] - 9:10, 15:19, 16:6, 21:9, 23:16, 39:3, 40:12, 41:9, 58:1, 79:17, 88:15, 102:15, 119:15, 132:9, 145:14, 148:14, 148:15, 158:10, 164:7, 170:10</p> <p><b>stories</b> [3] - 150:4, 150:5, 164:18</p> <p><b>story</b> [3] - 61:14, 155:14, 157:8</p> <p><b>straightforward</b> [4] - 19:4, 19:12, 52:11, 145:5</p> <p><b>strangely</b> [1] - 28:17</p> <p><b>stream</b> [1] - 27:8</p> <p><b>street</b> [3] - 35:8, 37:15, 40:13</p> <p><b>Street</b> [13] - 2:8, 10:19, 11:6, 11:15, 27:17, 27:18, 34:19, 40:12, 45:6, 56:2, 130:2, 135:14, 136:3</p> <p><b>streets</b> [1] - 50:1</p> <p><b>streetscape</b> [1] - 40:4</p> <p><b>strength</b> [1] - 59:18</p> <p><b>stretches</b> [1] - 45:8</p>	<p><b>strict</b> [1] - 172:16</p> <p><b>strictly</b> [1] - 122:15</p> <p><b>strong</b> [1] - 149:3</p> <p><b>strongest</b> [1] - 108:6</p> <p><b>strongly</b> [4] - 82:6, 102:13, 105:2, 106:15</p> <p><b>struck</b> [1] - 121:17</p> <p><b>structural</b> [1] - 165:10</p> <p><b>structure</b> [3] - 144:8, 164:17, 165:2</p> <p><b>structured</b> [1] - 36:6</p> <p><b>STUART</b> [2] - 150:10, 151:4</p> <p><b>Stuart</b> [1] - 1:14</p> <p><b>stuck</b> [1] - 151:2</p> <p><b>student</b> [1] - 156:11</p> <p><b>studies</b> [5] - 73:3, 90:8, 98:15, 126:14, 131:7</p> <p><b>studios</b> [1] - 20:19</p> <p><b>study</b> [22] - 7:8, 9:12, 14:19, 15:11, 42:5, 58:4, 77:18, 79:16, 80:7, 80:19, 81:4, 85:1, 86:13, 87:8, 87:13, 90:10, 120:11, 131:12, 131:13, 133:4, 133:5, 147:9</p> <p><b>stuff</b> [1] - 121:13</p> <p><b>style</b> [1] - 3:17</p> <p><b>subject</b> [7] - 9:6, 14:5, 24:15, 52:5, 63:9, 75:8, 162:7</p> <p><b>sublease</b> [1] - 6:14</p> <p><b>submit</b> [2] - 12:2, 175:13</p> <p><b>submitted</b> [1] - 169:1</p> <p><b>subscribe</b> [1] - 177:17</p> <p><b>subsequent</b> [1] - 132:8</p> <p><b>subsidized</b> [1] - 157:13</p> <p><b>subsidy</b> [1] - 95:17</p> <p><b>substantial</b> [4] - 23:12, 23:18, 26:17, 76:9</p> <p><b>substantially</b> [6] - 21:8, 22:19, 26:7, 48:2, 89:2, 167:17</p> <p><b>substantive</b> [1] - 140:18</p> <p><b>substantively</b> [1] - 140:14</p> <p><b>success</b> [1] - 119:11</p> <p><b>successful</b> [3] - 120:9, 159:17, 174:2</p> <p><b>sufficient</b> [1] - 123:7</p>
--	---	--	---	---

<p><b>sufficiently</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 152:8</p> <p><b>suggest</b> <sup>[5]</sup> - 43:4, 53:16, 56:9, 142:12, 158:15</p> <p><b>suggested</b> <sup>[8]</sup> - 11:8, 29:12, 106:13, 117:1, 126:4, 126:5, 143:9, 158:16</p> <p><b>suggesting</b> <sup>[4]</sup> - 24:6, 147:5, 147:7, 154:5</p> <p><b>suggestion</b> <sup>[4]</sup> - 102:18, 104:14, 108:9, 137:8</p> <p><b>suggestions</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 82:5, 140:19</p> <p><b>suggests</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 81:4, 103:18</p> <p><b>summer</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 127:4, 127:8</p> <p><b>sun</b> <sup>[3]</sup> - 41:12, 42:13, 127:7</p> <p><b>superior</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 176:3</p> <p><b>supplement</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 27:7</p> <p><b>supply</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 99:12</p> <p><b>support</b> <sup>[12]</sup> - 80:8, 81:4, 82:14, 95:9, 104:11, 105:18, 111:15, 123:7, 126:12, 141:18, 174:15</p> <p><b>supportable</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 113:14, 114:4</p> <p><b>supported</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 6:11, 103:19</p> <p><b>surface</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 133:17</p> <p><b>surrounding</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 120:3</p> <p><b>suspect</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 61:3, 96:8</p> <p><b>sustainability</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 15:17</p> <p><b>SUZANNAH</b> <sup>[6]</sup> - 31:15, 44:7, 44:10, 45:6, 45:18, 47:10</p> <p><b>Suzannah</b> <sup>[10]</sup> - 1:15, 17:14, 21:13, 27:9, 31:7, 31:11, 31:16, 43:18, 54:13, 58:5</p> <p><b>Suzannah's</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 53:11</p> <p><b>system</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 29:2, 30:12</p>	<p>59:6, 66:8, 67:1, 69:1, 127:6, 146:9, 163:16, 164:4</p> <p><b>taller</b> <sup>[9]</sup> - 38:12, 38:19, 41:5, 41:8, 58:13, 65:6, 65:8, 147:13, 168:1</p> <p><b>tallest</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 44:12, 45:7</p> <p><b>tax</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 105:19, 111:11</p> <p><b>tear</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 45:5</p> <p><b>Tech</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 59:4</p> <p><b>technical</b> <sup>[3]</sup> - 139:11, 175:16</p> <p><b>technology</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 58:11</p> <p><b>Ted</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 175:17</p> <p><b>teenage</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 62:8</p> <p><b>temporarily</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 134:17</p> <p><b>temporary</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 136:6</p> <p><b>ten</b> <sup>[4]</sup> - 9:3, 27:2, 31:14, 165:6</p> <p><b>tend</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 60:11</p> <p><b>tended</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 155:18</p> <p><b>term</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 110:18, 117:13</p> <p><b>terms</b> <sup>[16]</sup> - 3:12, 16:3, 22:12, 37:17, 41:11, 44:7, 93:10, 107:17, 114:1, 115:14, 127:13, 141:15, 159:17, 162:3, 164:9, 171:14</p> <p><b>test</b> <sup>[3]</sup> - 46:11, 46:12, 157:16</p> <p><b>text</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 88:8, 145:10</p> <p><b>THE</b> <sup>[7]</sup> - 1:2, 1:18, 66:11, 178:15, 178:16, 178:17</p> <p><b>them's</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 59:6</p> <p><b>THEODORE</b> <sup>[121]</sup> - 3:3, 4:4, 10:1, 10:8, 10:11, 10:13, 10:16, 11:2, 11:16, 11:19, 12:5, 12:9, 12:11, 12:15, 12:18, 13:1, 43:18, 44:9, 45:15, 46:13, 48:11, 53:6, 53:15, 57:13, 57:17, 63:7, 65:9, 67:5, 68:10, 68:16, 69:1, 70:6, 70:9, 70:14, 71:9, 71:11, 72:8, 72:19, 83:1, 92:12, 93:2, 94:10, 96:18, 106:6, 107:1, 108:18, 109:6, 109:16, 109:19,</p>	<p>110:16, 111:17, 112:9, 121:5, 123:10, 124:1, 124:11, 125:3, 125:7, 125:14, 125:19, 126:8, 127:16, 127:19, 128:4, 128:9, 128:19, 129:4, 129:11, 129:19, 130:7, 130:12, 130:16, 130:19, 131:13, 131:15, 133:14, 136:1, 137:13, 138:5, 138:10, 138:15, 139:18, 141:3, 142:3, 142:17, 143:2, 143:7, 147:17, 149:1, 149:15, 154:9, 155:2, 160:15, 160:17, 161:2, 161:12, 162:1, 164:15, 165:8, 165:12, 167:2, 167:6, 167:14, 169:5, 169:8, 170:15, 170:18, 171:2, 171:6, 172:10, 172:14, 173:6, 174:1, 174:8, 174:16, 175:3, 175:11, 176:5, 176:8, 176:11, 176:13</p> <p><b>Theodore</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 1:8</p> <p><b>thereabout</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 79:19</p> <p><b>therefor</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 177:8</p> <p><b>therefore</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 39:15, 84:3</p> <p><b>they've</b> <sup>[5]</sup> - 10:6, 52:1, 114:7, 145:8</p> <p><b>thinking</b> <sup>[8]</sup> - 17:15, 31:8, 44:6, 45:10, 46:11, 54:17, 57:6, 135:5</p> <p><b>thinks</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 62:18</p> <p><b>third</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 29:1, 100:15</p> <p><b>THIS</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 178:15</p> <p><b>thoughtful</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 151:6</p> <p><b>thoughtfulness</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 48:6</p> <p><b>thoughts</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 54:19</p> <p><b>thousand</b> <sup>[3]</sup> - 53:17, 55:18, 58:8</p> <p><b>three</b> <sup>[14]</sup> - 7:7, 10:4, 20:12, 21:10, 49:14, 53:7, 58:10, 58:19, 62:10, 90:7, 104:5, 139:3, 163:12,</p>	<p>166:19</p> <p><b>three-bedroom</b> <sup>[3]</sup> - 20:12, 90:7, 163:12</p> <p><b>threw</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 57:17, 157:11</p> <p><b>throughout</b> <sup>[9]</sup> - 15:3, 50:11, 144:6, 144:13, 147:12, 148:18, 149:16, 150:13, 151:12</p> <p><b>throwing</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 71:18</p> <p><b>thrown</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 79:3, 96:11</p> <p><b>ticket</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 110:13</p> <p><b>tight</b> <sup>[3]</sup> - 33:9, 33:13, 166:5</p> <p><b>tightening</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 39:12</p> <p><b>tightly</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 34:12</p> <p><b>tiny</b> <sup>[3]</sup> - 53:1, 108:10, 137:18</p> <p><b>tipping</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 110:8</p> <p><b>TO</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 178:16</p> <p><b>to..</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 62:3</p> <p><b>today</b> <sup>[4]</sup> - 8:16, 89:3, 140:2, 166:5</p> <p><b>together</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 18:9, 60:18</p> <p><b>tonight</b> <sup>[5]</sup> - 125:1, 141:17, 161:4, 162:4, 175:18</p> <p><b>top</b> <sup>[5]</sup> - 21:5, 81:7, 154:2, 155:15, 159:1</p> <p><b>topic</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 6:2</p> <p><b>topnotch</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 103:1</p> <p><b>toss</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 161:9</p> <p><b>total</b> <sup>[13]</sup> - 19:8, 19:9, 19:10, 21:9, 21:17, 25:8, 28:14, 29:4, 70:12, 91:2, 142:6, 142:7, 142:15</p> <p><b>totalling</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 19:18</p> <p><b>totally</b> <sup>[4]</sup> - 66:4, 84:17, 121:6, 127:11</p> <p><b>tougher</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 156:2</p> <p><b>towards</b> <sup>[5]</sup> - 15:7, 20:11, 20:16, 20:19, 120:6</p> <p><b>Tower</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 67:15</p> <p><b>tower</b> <sup>[18]</sup> - 36:15, 39:9, 42:1, 42:6, 42:9, 44:17, 45:5, 45:8, 46:3, 46:4, 56:3, 59:16, 61:15, 62:14, 66:16, 67:16, 67:17, 164:18</p> <p><b>towers</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 36:15, 38:18</p> <p><b>trade</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 152:12, 154:1</p>	<p><b>traded</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 44:18</p> <p><b>tradeoff</b> <sup>[3]</sup> - 109:15, 139:5, 153:17</p> <p><b>Traffic</b> <sup>[3]</sup> - 131:8, 131:16, 173:10</p> <p><b>traffic</b> <sup>[3]</sup> - 131:12, 131:13, 133:3</p> <p><b>transaction</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 8:10</p> <p><b>TRANSCRIPT</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 178:16</p> <p><b>transcript</b> <sup>[4]</sup> - 177:3, 177:7, 177:16, 177:17</p> <p><b>Transcript(s)</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 2:5</p> <p><b>transcripts</b> <sup>[3]</sup> - 10:3, 10:5, 10:9</p> <p><b>transition</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 38:16, 93:8</p> <p><b>Transportation</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 4:15, 134:7</p> <p><b>transportation</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 4:17, 129:5</p> <p><b>trapped</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 73:6</p> <p><b>treat</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 30:16, 58:18</p> <p><b>treating</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 141:14</p> <p><b>tree</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 40:14</p> <p><b>trees</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 127:5, 128:1</p> <p><b>tried</b> <sup>[3]</sup> - 37:6, 114:11, 116:11</p> <p><b>triple</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 68:12, 135:13</p> <p><b>troubled</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 72:18</p> <p><b>true</b> <sup>[3]</sup> - 15:15, 64:2, 178:6</p> <p><b>trust</b> <sup>[6]</sup> - 25:10, 25:16, 26:8, 26:16, 27:4, 112:5</p> <p><b>try</b> <sup>[9]</sup> - 22:14, 60:16, 95:10, 100:10, 117:1, 139:2, 152:15, 152:16, 155:12</p> <p><b>trying</b> <sup>[15]</sup> - 21:18, 26:10, 46:6, 58:1, 59:2, 108:2, 117:6, 118:2, 143:9, 145:14, 146:15, 146:18, 150:17, 151:7, 158:8</p> <p><b>tucked</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 31:3</p> <p><b>Tuesday</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 1:4</p> <p><b>turn</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 9:18</p> <p><b>turnkey</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 8:13</p> <p><b>turns</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 154:12</p> <p><b>twelve</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 7:6, 24:19</p> <p><b>twenty</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 88:6</p> <p><b>Twining</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 160:1</p> <p><b>two</b> <sup>[38]</sup> - 19:16, 20:12, 22:1, 28:19, 30:15, 49:4, 49:13,</p>
<b>T</b>				
<p><b>table</b> <sup>[3]</sup> - 94:7, 125:8, 174:13</p> <p><b>talks</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 21:13</p> <p><b>tall</b> <sup>[13]</sup> - 32:11, 32:16, 42:17, 46:3, 46:4,</p>				

<p>54:8, 55:7, 57:10, 58:10, 62:9, 62:10, 62:16, 68:12, 71:15, 78:1, 87:9, 90:7, 90:10, 92:15, 92:19, 93:8, 98:5, 98:12, 101:12, 122:11, 139:2, 154:2, 154:12, 155:10, 163:11, 163:12, 166:19, 169:10, 175:7, 175:19</p> <p><b>two-bedroom</b> [2] - 90:7, 155:10</p> <p><b>two-family</b> [1] - 68:12</p> <p><b>two-to-one</b> [3] - 93:8, 98:5, 169:10</p> <p><b>type</b> [6] - 34:2, 44:5, 46:9, 118:15, 121:1, 126:19</p> <p><b>types</b> [5] - 50:10, 113:16, 128:1, 131:4, 145:18</p> <p><b>typically</b> [2] - 50:17, 155:13</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>U</b></p> <p><b>U.S</b> [1] - 75:16</p> <p><b>ultimately</b> [7] - 13:15, 46:15, 69:15, 106:9, 112:1, 114:15, 116:14</p> <p><b>unanimity</b> [1] - 141:12</p> <p><b>unanimous</b> [2] - 107:4, 107:5</p> <p><b>uncertainty</b> [3] - 115:6, 119:15, 172:2</p> <p><b>UNDER</b> [1] - 178:16</p> <p><b>under</b> [12] - 18:10, 19:7, 19:11, 19:14, 24:16, 25:2, 113:5, 114:4, 122:10, 157:19, 158:1, 169:1</p> <p><b>underlining</b> [1] - 29:18</p> <p><b>undermining</b> [1] - 77:3</p> <p><b>undersigned</b> [1] - 178:4</p> <p><b>understandable</b> [1] - 151:3</p> <p><b>understood</b> [1] - 145:7</p> <p><b>underway</b> [1] - 115:3</p> <p><b>unique</b> [1] - 85:12</p> <p><b>unit</b> [14] - 20:4, 20:12, 50:10, 120:4, 120:7,</p>	<p>133:10, 138:19, 152:13, 152:16, 152:17, 152:18, 153:1, 154:2, 164:19</p> <p><b>United</b> [1] - 30:2</p> <p><b>units</b> [57] - 19:14, 20:12, 20:16, 21:1, 25:18, 26:1, 52:13, 58:8, 86:19, 87:2, 91:4, 93:6, 119:3, 119:8, 119:16, 139:3, 141:15, 143:19, 144:1, 144:9, 145:17, 146:11, 146:14, 146:16, 147:2, 147:6, 147:16, 148:3, 148:11, 148:12, 149:19, 150:5, 150:13, 151:16, 152:2, 152:5, 152:6, 152:19, 153:13, 153:14, 153:16, 154:7, 154:15, 155:5, 155:7, 155:8, 155:10, 155:12, 155:15, 155:16, 156:4, 156:7, 157:13, 163:1, 163:11, 163:12, 165:6</p> <p><b>universally</b> [3] - 84:17, 85:4, 85:5</p> <p><b>university</b> [2] - 61:1, 62:7</p> <p><b>University</b> [1] - 61:5</p> <p><b>UNLESS</b> [1] - 178:16</p> <p><b>unless</b> [3] - 82:1, 142:18, 147:17</p> <p><b>unlike</b> [1] - 113:4</p> <p><b>unlock</b> [1] - 55:10</p> <p><b>unmet</b> [2] - 93:10, 99:13</p> <p><b>unofficial</b> [1] - 67:11</p> <p><b>up</b> [52] - 2:7, 4:9, 7:4, 11:3, 13:10, 15:8, 18:5, 22:3, 22:12, 23:7, 30:18, 31:12, 39:12, 39:16, 41:19, 43:6, 55:3, 64:16, 66:9, 67:7, 71:4, 72:13, 75:4, 75:12, 75:13, 78:13, 85:19, 88:6, 88:17, 91:5, 92:15, 98:12, 98:17, 101:12, 104:3, 115:15, 116:9, 116:16, 116:17, 117:6, 129:13, 130:4, 137:18,</p>	<p>139:6, 142:10, 143:11, 147:14, 152:18, 163:4, 164:16, 166:6</p> <p><b>upcoming</b> [1] - 3:13</p> <p><b>Update</b> [1] - 2:3</p> <p><b>update</b> [1] - 3:9</p> <p><b>upfront</b> [1] - 159:13</p> <p><b>upper</b> [3] - 146:11, 147:5, 150:15</p> <p><b>urban</b> [2] - 17:16, 17:18</p> <p><b>urge</b> [1] - 107:15</p> <p><b>useful</b> [1] - 82:14</p> <p><b>uses</b> [7] - 11:14, 15:16, 28:5, 51:19, 60:9, 165:18, 166:15</p> <p><b>utility</b> [1] - 122:19</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>V</b></p> <p><b>vacation</b> [1] - 4:6</p> <p><b>valuable</b> [3] - 146:13, 153:14, 154:1</p> <p><b>value</b> [10] - 26:4, 79:18, 103:19, 104:12, 113:14, 114:4, 115:19, 122:17, 123:7, 150:15</p> <p><b>values</b> [2] - 116:3, 122:13</p> <p><b>variability</b> [2] - 116:2, 116:4</p> <p><b>variable</b> [1] - 115:11</p> <p><b>variables</b> [1] - 103:6</p> <p><b>Variance</b> [1] - 32:13</p> <p><b>variation</b> [2] - 116:14, 152:1</p> <p><b>various</b> [6] - 38:2, 48:14, 51:18, 114:10, 131:4, 163:8</p> <p><b>vary</b> [2] - 133:18, 149:9</p> <p><b>vehicular</b> [1] - 50:2</p> <p><b>verify</b> [1] - 149:9</p> <p><b>version</b> [1] - 75:15</p> <p><b>versus</b> [1] - 163:3</p> <p><b>vertically</b> [1] - 61:10</p> <p><b>Vice</b> [2] - 1:8, 175:9</p> <p><b>vicinity</b> [1] - 91:4</p> <p><b>view</b> [7] - 30:8, 54:6, 104:13, 104:15, 150:16, 171:15, 171:17</p> <p><b>viewed</b> [1] - 157:10</p> <p><b>viewpoints</b> [1] - 34:3</p> <p><b>views</b> [4] - 35:8, 41:6,</p>	<p>42:8, 42:13</p> <p><b>vision</b> [3] - 16:3, 16:13, 61:7</p> <p><b>visual</b> [1] - 64:5</p> <p><b>visualizing</b> [1] - 64:12</p> <p><b>Volpe</b> [15] - 2:7, 3:8, 8:1, 8:14, 9:19, 21:3, 33:2, 35:2, 37:3, 37:10, 56:12, 114:7, 159:7, 159:18, 166:17</p> <p><b>volume</b> [1] - 177:7</p> <p><b>vote</b> [1] - 174:9</p> <p><b>voted</b> [1] - 7:2</p> <p><b>voting</b> [1] - 13:10</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>W</b></p> <p><b>waiting</b> [1] - 93:17</p> <p><b>waive</b> [3] - 133:8, 133:12, 142:19</p> <p><b>waiver</b> [1] - 133:11</p> <p><b>walk</b> [2] - 31:6, 35:9</p> <p><b>walking</b> [1] - 59:1</p> <p><b>walkway</b> [1] - 130:3</p> <p><b>water</b> [3] - 16:4, 16:6, 128:5</p> <p><b>Watermark</b> [3] - 34:13, 45:2, 68:7</p> <p><b>ways</b> [6] - 25:12, 30:16, 78:19, 111:14, 112:6, 112:19</p> <p><b>website</b> [2] - 114:10, 117:19</p> <p><b>Webster</b> [1] - 3:18</p> <p><b>weeds</b> [1] - 82:16</p> <p><b>week</b> [1] - 7:1</p> <p><b>weighted</b> [1] - 20:16</p> <p><b>welcome</b> [1] - 3:4</p> <p><b>whereas</b> [3] - 62:13, 76:3, 97:17</p> <p><b>WHEREOF</b> [1] - 178:8</p> <p><b>whims</b> [1] - 162:8</p> <p><b>whole</b> [8] - 22:16, 41:3, 48:13, 77:12, 79:2, 82:8, 90:18, 173:11</p> <p><b>wholeheartedly</b> [1] - 173:2</p> <p><b>wholistically</b> [1] - 117:11</p> <p><b>width</b> [1] - 163:15</p> <p><b>willing</b> [2] - 152:12, 156:12</p> <p><b>wind</b> [2] - 42:13, 163:19</p> <p><b>winters</b> [1] - 127:4</p> <p><b>Winthrop</b> [1] - 11:14</p> <p><b>wish</b> [2] - 100:11,</p>	<p>143:13</p> <p><b>wishes</b> [1] - 167:3</p> <p><b>WITNESS</b> [1] - 178:8</p> <p><b>wondered</b> [2] - 53:6, 56:5</p> <p><b>wonderfully</b> [1] - 95:1</p> <p><b>wondering</b> [4] - 44:5, 134:9, 165:2, 174:10</p> <p><b>wording</b> [1] - 53:5</p> <p><b>workable</b> [2] - 135:12, 137:10</p> <p><b>works</b> [7] - 4:16, 66:17, 110:9, 110:10, 140:8, 156:9, 169:17</p> <p><b>world</b> [4] - 55:5, 62:16, 62:19, 63:18</p> <p><b>worried</b> [1] - 4:11</p> <p><b>worst</b> [2] - 156:3, 159:15</p> <p><b>written</b> [7] - 51:10, 52:4, 53:8, 70:1, 71:19, 73:1, 73:7</p> <p><b>wrote</b> [2] - 53:2, 155:10</p> <p><b>www.reportersinc.com</b> [1] - 1:19</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Y</b></p> <p><b>year</b> [4] - 27:3, 111:11, 122:6, 156:18</p> <p><b>years</b> [15] - 4:7, 7:7, 31:13, 47:5, 49:14, 51:14, 58:10, 58:19, 83:16, 85:13, 90:10, 93:9, 93:18, 115:5, 156:15</p> <p><b>York</b> [2] - 164:18, 165:1</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Z</b></p> <p><b>Zelinski</b> [2] - 178:4, 178:11</p> <p><b>zoning</b> [16] - 2:6, 4:7, 4:8, 7:2, 17:1, 24:16, 71:13, 75:2, 76:14, 77:2, 82:9, 83:7, 89:19, 98:16, 144:16, 150:12</p> <p><b>Zoning</b> [35] - 2:7, 7:15, 9:10, 13:3, 14:9, 15:2, 16:9, 28:14, 29:18, 30:17, 42:15, 43:16, 45:16, 47:2, 52:18, 55:15, 55:16, 56:14, 56:18, 57:8, 70:1, 73:12,</p>
---	---	---	---	---

74:15, 83:8, 88:12,  
111:19, 115:1,  
127:13, 135:3,  
135:15, 137:6,  
145:10, 148:6,  
148:14, 175:14