PLANNING BOARD
FOR THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE
GENERAL HEARING
Tuesday, March 28, 2017
7:05 p.m.
in
Second Floor Meeting Room
344 Broadway
Cambridge, Massachusetts

H. Theodore Cohen, Chair
Catherine Preston Connolly, Acting Chair
Hugh Russell, Member
Steven Cohen, Member
Louis J. Bacci, Jr., Member

Iram Farooq, Assistant City Manager

Community Development Staff:
Liza Paden
Jeff Roberts
Suzannah Bigolin
Swaathi Joseph

_____

REPORTERS, INC.
CAPTURING THE OFFICIAL RECORD
617.786.7783/617.639.0396
www.reportersinc.com

I N D E X

P R O C E E D I N G S

* * * * *

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay, welcome to the March 28th meeting of the Planning Board. We'll start out with the update from Community Development Department.

IRAM FAROOQ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Tonight's meeting includes public hearing on the Harding Petition which is amendments to the Mass. and Main area subdistrict of the Central Square Overlay District.

We also have an extension request for 57 JFK Street project and design review for building 3 of MIT's South of Main development.

And we have three meetings in April. Starting with April 4th there will be a public hearing, continued public hearing on Lanes and Games. And also we will have some discussion

that we've had with the Chair and Vice Chair about thinking about start times of Planning Board meetings and procedures to streamline the meetings. So we'd like to have some discussion of that on the 4th.

Moving on to April 18th we have a public hearing for the City Council petition for use of rooftop space in Harvard Square which is similar to what was adopted in the Central Square Overlay District. There will also be design review of MIT's building 5 in the South of Main development.

And then as of now the final meeting in April is April 25th which is a public hearing -- what Section 11.9 Jeff.

LIZA PADEN: Abandoned buildings.

IRAM FAROOQ: Oh, abandoned buildings. That is a City Council petition also.

And then a general business pre-application for the building of E.F. Education where they have made a -- they have an agreement with the state to utilize an under utilized had DCR parcel that has a maintenance facility currently, to build their new building and rebuild the DCR maintenance facility which will be hopefully filling in the gap on that, on the street and the connection from the larger North Point Divco project to the riverfront.

In related City Council matters, there is an Ordinance Committee meeting on March 29th which is a public hearing on the fire-related reconstruction of nonconforming buildings that the Board heard last week. That's tomorrow.

And then April 6th they'll have a hearing on the Harvard Square rooftop FAR exemption in the Harvard Square Overlay District.

April 19th is the Ordinance Committee hearing on the registration of abandoned buildings.

Those are the significant things coming up. Just one quick update on the public meeting last week on the Veil Court area. So we had a pretty good meeting, very well attended meeting with abutters as well as broader housing advocates to talk about future use of the parcel, and then also demolition. So there's going to be a very significant process of demolition and site work prior to any future use. And so that meeting went really well, and there was a lot of support and consensus for affordable housing on the site which obviously was one of the -- which was the Council's goal in acquiring the site.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Iram, Liza, my understanding was that the general business matter relating to 57 JFK Street was not going to be before us this evening. Is that correct?

LIZA PADEN: The extension of time for 57 JFK Street is on the agenda. The one that was pulled was the one for Eliot Street. They're two different extensions. Two different cases, excuse me.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I'm sorry, I was confused.

Okay, we will now have a public hearing with regard to the petition from Richard Harding and others to amending Zoning Ordinance Sections 20.307 in the Central Square Overlay District the Mass. and Main residential mixed income subdistrict that would amend the maximum height provision by deleting the number 195 and

substituting the number 150. And in Section 20.307.08.1 with regard to affordable housing and deleting the number 17 percent and replacing it with 20 percent and in Section b. Deleting 3 percent and replacing it with 5 percent in the section referring to middle income units.

Is there someone here who is representing the petitioner?

(No Response.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: None appearing. Jeff, do you have anything further to add to this provision or this petition?

JEFF ROBERTS: I could explain -- we could wait until after public comment, but I could try to -- I provided a memo which the Board received, as well as the Ordinance Committee, just explaining the background of the zoning that is proposed to be amended. It relates to the

Mass. and Main development which the Planning Board back in -- last in January but over a few months reviewed and granted approval for.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay. Then we will turn to the public. Is there a sign-up sheet? Has anyone signed it?

JEFF ROBERTS: I'll grab it.

H. THEODORE COHEN: So when I call your name, please come forward. Make sure the microphone is on, state your name and address for the stenographer. There is a timing system. You will get a green light when your time begins and it will turn yellow as you are nearing the end of your three minutes, and then when it turns red, we ask that you wrap up.

Bob Flack.

BOB FLACK: I'm Bob Flack, Senior Vice President for Twining Properties, One Broadway

Cambridge, the developer for the Mass. and Main project.

First of all, I would like to thank you for what is now the sixth hearing before this Board. I feel like a frequent flyer, and it's a delight to be here again. But I say that because this has been a very deliberate process, highly considered over a four-year period involving many hearings and many meetings. It's during that time I personally directed the outreach community effort. And as you know, it's during that same period of time that you as a Planning Board focussed on the need to -- for developers to take the responsibility to engage in the meaningful way with the community and to document responses. And you set up I think a very thoughtful and cogent sort of process. I personally took this very seriously, and as a company we've taken that

sort of charge very seriously. We held over five open houses. We had 25 community meetings. And arguably we had over a thousand sort of community discussions with city officials, our neighbors, and abutters. And in large part it's because of this effort that you may recall there were many supporters at these hearings. And I've been in and out of hearings for the last 25 years or so, and I have to say that we were very proud of the overt show of support from the community. And the Planning Board on two different occasions has voted unanimously to either send a positive recommendation to the City Council for zoning or unanimously approved the Special Permit, and that was just recently. And consistent with our history as developers in Cambridge and East Cambridge in particular, when we developed in Central Square -- in Kendall Square, we take

great pride in building positive relationships with our neighbors, and I want to assure the Board and anyone in the audience that we are committed to building strong relationships in Central Square as well.

That said, we have to state for the record that if this last minute zoning, down zoning effort petition were to pass, and we do not believe that Mass. and Main at this point is subject to those -- would be subject to those provisions, but if we were, for whatever reason to become subject to those provisions, that the project would become infeasible and it would remain -- the site would remain vacant for the foreseeable future.

Furthermore, I'd like to just point out I think what you know, passing such a down zoning petition or relatively arbitrary petition would

set an unfortunate precedent that the city is actually capable of rescinding approvals after a considerate process that you've gone through despite the many hearings. And you made approvals grounded, solidly grounded in prior studies over the last decade of work.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Mr. Flack, if you could wrap up?

BOB FLACK: Excuse me?

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: If you could wrap up.

H. THEODORE COHEN: If you could wrap up.

BOB FLACK: I respectfully ask the Board to send a negative report to the City Council.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you. Is there anyone else who wishes to speak?

(No Response.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: None appearing. Board members, I'm happy to start. I think this has come before us many times over two or three years. We have supported the height to 195 feet on several occasions. We granted a Special Permit that approved the building at that height. I would also note that my understanding is that City Council is considering with regard to inclusionary zoning would end up with the same 20 percent that is -- no?

Iram.

IRAM FAROOQ: Mr. Chair, I'm sorry, wait, maybe I'm here for the -- maybe I'm saying this for the wrong project, but the way the -- I may be saying this for the wrong project. The Council's inclusionary zoning would have a 15 percent requirement at the start and then racheting up to 20 percent in June.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes.

IRAM FAROOQ: But it would eventually, it would eventually get there. I think I'm actually saying this for the wrong project.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And total 20 percent ultimately.

IRAM FAROOQ: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And my understanding is they don't seem to be adding a middle income element to the inclusionary zoning.

And, you know, as I was saying, is that the Special Permit requires 20 percent, 17 percent though in moderate and three percent middle. So I personally would not support this petition.

Other comments?

STEVEN COHEN: I'll just make a quick comment. Whatever the merits might be as to the

number of affordable units, you've got to look at the this procedurally. And as a matter of procedure, this has been before us. We have made a decision based on the certain set of assumptions, the Applicant has gone forward on the project, presumably made substantial commitments and investment based on certain sets of rules and regulations and assumptions. And sometimes fairness does enter into our work. And I think in situations like this, the merits and personal opinions and political issues associated with particular regulations aside, simply is a matter of procedural fairness. I think it's inappropriate to change the rules of the game at this stage of a process.

So for these reasons, as well as many other reasons that my colleagues I'm sure could enumerate, I would not support this petition.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Any other comments? Hugh.

HUGH RUSSELL: I think the procedural point is that when one makes substantial changes to zoning there's a process that one goes through of studying, particularly in this case, the affordable thing requires a rather extensive study. And, you know, there was a lot of study around the height and a lot of agreement that this height was an acceptable height because it was in such a restricted place. So I think we could also reject it on the fact that the procedure is arbitrary and not grounded in the planning studies.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Lou? Catherine?

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: I think I largely agree with everything that's been said. The thing I would add to what Hugh has said is

not only is it not grounded in those studies, there have in fact been significant study through the K2-C2 process, through the existence of zoning process, through the various permutations and designs that support the conclusion already reached and that this would seek to overturn. So I think we leave this undisturbed and/or rather we leave the prior decisions undisturbed and forward a negative recommendation on this particular zoning petition.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Lou? No?

Could we have a motion to not recommend this zoning petition for the reasons stated?

STEVEN COHEN: So moved.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Second.

H. THEODORE COHEN: All those in favor?

(Show of hands.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: It's unanimous.

Okay. The next matter is I think the request for extension for 57 JFK Street for a Special Permit in Planning Board case No. 296.

LIZA PADEN: This is 57 JFK Street which is for a Special Permit for an addition of three floors of office at the Galleria building on the corner of Winthrop Street and JFK Street. And you have the letter requesting it in front of you. He is in the midst of resolving issues with Eversource.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: God bless.

LIZA PADEN: Yeah. So that's all I have to say about that.

STEVEN COHEN: Good luck.

LIZA PADEN: And he's asking for an extension of one year.

STEVEN COHEN: It takes a year to resolve it with Eversource?

LIZA PADEN: I'm not saying anything.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And the permit would expire when?

LIZA PADEN: And so this permit was granted by the Planning Board on the 21st of July and was filed with the Clerk's office on July 30th. So one year extension would make it to July 30, 2018.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I guess my question is there any indication that the proponent has not been moving expeditiously over the past couple of years to proceed with the project?

LIZA PADEN: Not that I'm aware of, no.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Other questions? Comments?

STEVEN COHEN: You know, so much time has elapsed fashions might change and we might want to see different colors.

H. THEODORE COHEN: So would you not want to grant the extension?

STEVEN COHEN: It's a tough one. I could be persuaded.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Could we have a motion to grant the request for extension?

STEVEN COHEN: So moved.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Second?

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Second.

H. THEODORE COHEN: All those in favor?

(Show of hands.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay. Thank you.

LIZA PADEN: Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And now, is MIT here?

LIZA PADEN: Yes, they are.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Do they need a couple of minutes to set up?

LIZA PADEN: Yes, they do, please.

H. THEODORE COHEN: We'll take a five minute break.

(A short recess was taken.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay, we are back in session. This is a continuation of a general business section relating to the design review of the South of Main Street project for MIT. This is building No. 3, Planning Board No. 303. We commenced this review on March 7th and board members had a number of questions and a number of issues that they wanted MIT to think about and come back and then either explain things to us or propose some perhaps changes to the design, and so we are picking up with that meeting.

So is there further presentation to be made this evening.

MAUREEN McCAFFREY: There is.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay. As before, I

guess other buildings we've indicated the presentation should be limited to 30 minutes. And we're going to subject to our light system again. So please begin.

MAUREEN McCAFFREY: Thank you.

Thank you to the Board for having us back tonight. My name is Maureen McCaffrey. I'm a Director of Real Estate at MIT and it's nice to see all of you again. At our last meeting three weeks ago we challenged MIT and the design team to make you believe in our design for SoMa building 3 as much as we do. MIT has worked for three years on a design of this building and is deeply committed to executing a building with striking form and elegant design. Our belief in this building goes back to our rigorous designer selection process. We assembled a selection committee of respected experts in design from

within MIT, including the School of Architecture and Planning and invited architects who were leaders of cutting edge design worldwide to participate.

On SoMa building 3 Perkins + Will design architects Ralph Johnson and Robert Brown were selected due to their ability to design and execute truly beautiful and memorable buildings in similar urban context.

We have given a great deal of thought to your feedback at our last meeting earlier this month. You observed that the technical materials required for design review that we shared did not convey the richness of the design. The Perkins + Will team has worked tirelessly over the intervening weeks using your recommendations of a movie, varied renderings, and more detailed models to better illustrate the overall design

approach as well as the specific features of this building. Tonight we will use those materials to share the experiential in response to your questions.

I'll now introduce MIT's Dean of School of Architecture and planning Hashim Sarkis who will discuss the role that this building plays in the context of MIT's Kendall Square initiative project. He will be followed by design architect Robert Brown who will address your questions about the facade, the ground floor, and the intentional relationship to 238 Main Street. I look forward to your thoughts on this building and to answer any questions that you have.

HASHIM SARKIS: Thank you very much. Good evening. It's good to be back in front of this Board. The last time I presented was in January 2016, and I was here to present the urban

design guidelines, the principles around which this project has been shaped. In the last meeting several questions were raised precisely about this issue.

How does building 3 fit within the larger urban design context of the Kendall Square initiative that MIT is building? And I'm here to answer these questions in relationship to building 3. And in answering them, I would be referring back to some of those principles, but I will also show you how these have evolved. And it is very important to explain a little bit the process because it has been not just the top down process, but a bottom up process as well. And MIT has assembled excellent architects who have worked together and separately to come up with this collective scheme. Occasionally ideas will come up that cohere, that bring the project

together, and that each person will go back and test them. Comes back with revisions. Comes back with feedback. And it is by working in a group, working in pairs, working in threes, that we were able to develop this process in a very democratic way. And I've come to appreciate very much this process which is rather unique, and I think unique to MIT and to the Kendall Square area.

Last time when building 3 was presented many questions were raised:

How does it fit within the Main Street context?

What are the cantilevers doing?

What about the materiality of the surface?

How does it relate to the campus?

Is it a MITIMCo building or is it an MIT

building?

Let me start with the last question. This is the frontier of MIT, not just physical frontier of MIT where it meets the city, but it's really the future of MIT in terms of how it thinks of itself in terms of education. Education at MIT no longer takes place in the confines of the academic buildings. It happens there but it also happens on the ground. We are problem solvers. Our motto is mind in hand. We come up with the solutions and we want to deploy them. We are developing after all an ecosystem in the Kendall Square area for innovation and this is it. So these buildings are very much MIT. They are very much the industry. They're very much the future of education as we hopefully articulated through this progress.

Building 3, like the other buildings --

allow me to speak from here, can you hear me? Is this working?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Make sure the green light is on.

JEFF ROBERTS: The green light at the bottom.

HASHIM SARKIS: Part about enhancing the privacy of Main Street in Kendall Square. We're trying not just to protect the individual buildings but to enhance the character of Main Street as the historical spire of the area. And building 3 also contributes to a cluster of similar sized volumetric composition of three buildings: One Broadway, building 2, and building 3, that define through their massing the convergence of Main and Broadway at this very critical junction here.

Like all the buildings in this

composition, the building 3's body, in this case, in relation to the clock tower sets back and rotates in order to allow sun and light and air to come to Main Street so that we do not block it. In doing so, the buildings create these cantilevered spaces to their size or to their backs. In this case the defining an entrance, but also importantly defining the point at which the main access of MIT, the Infinite Corridor comes to a point before it releases up to this arrival in space at the entrance of the core of Kendall Square. Somewhere along the way of developing these projects the architects have created a common language of these semi-covered spaces that also act as urban indices. They point. In this case they help you rotate to the entrance. And here it defines the entrance. And here it creates a destination. At this point it

creates the sign of the arrival. It's almost like they're all creating an intermediary skyline at the level where one is experiencing the plaza in the back.

How does this cantilever relate to the landscape? For one thing it covers the entrance. But for another it allows the dimerism of the landscape to continue underneath it. So other than defining it in a very static ways, and because it's very high up, it actually just indicates it as you're passing that there's an entrance there without confining the entrance too strong.

Questions were raised about the skin of the building and how does that skin differ from other skins. When it's clear in the composition that the two residential buildings are clad with windows. Whereas the other lab and office

buildings are curtain walls. And that's a very important distinction so that the buildings indicate what they are in a very functional and direct way to the process. But what is very beautiful about this building in particular is that it is very clear about pulling back in order to help enhance the presence of character of the historic building here, but it also it takes the functional matter of fact language of the modernist lab buildings around the campus buildings and elevates them into a much more sophisticated defined skin that projects it also into the contemporary setting of the Kendall Square area.

The questions that were raised specifically in relation to the character of the building itself will be answered by Robert Brown. But if you have any other questions relating to

the urban impact of this building, I would be happen to answer them after his presentation.

Thank you.

ROBERT BROWN: Thank you, Dean. I'm Robert Brown. I'm the managing director for the Boston office and I've been working closely with Ralph Johnson who hopefully you know who did the Spaulding Hospital there and the Chelsea High School. So we're very pleased to be back and working on MIT. And as the Dean was saying, this is a remarkable experience from an architectural side where the five teams of architects were really helping both craft the urban design based on some direction from the Dean, and then as he was responding, seeing how each building was working with the other.

So what's critical for us is that overall massing piece. And as Dean Sarkis was talking,

these are interrelated components with many, many iterations before we came to this Board with what that -- how it was going to be resolved. And each of them having very specific relationships. And in this case we'll talk about 238.

The basic assumption was that there is a building that is really sit behind 238. 238 is that prominent piece, the obviously the clock tower is the most important and the preeminent piece both on Main Street and on Broadway. So we are sitting back. There was an object. This is the amount of square footage that we had. We looked at separating it from the building. And then there was this clever understanding of well, what happens if we set it and turn it? Because we really don't want to have this as purely a backdrop building behind this, but we want to have it so the building stands. And you'll see

when we show you the Broadway Street or the Third Street perspective, it really is enhanced by this turn. It's enhanced because the building is sitting behind on 238, and then it becomes a much more bold move as we are on the open space.

And then the last slide is really showing the sense of the Infinite Corridor as it's going forward and being the slight portal as we see as walk through the Infinite Corridor in that direction.

So these sort of renderings that we showed before, we just want to help you understand that as we're looking down Third Street the sense is with the axial relationship to the tower that we've really set the building back and to the left or towards the east, and then it is forming the apex of where this opening is between 4 and 3.

As we get a little bit closer, this is a new rendering, the building really takes this most urbane form. So it has -- it's tightest to the edge. Wadsworth is that major arterial connector from East Cambridge down to the river. It's really the most straightforward. And so we wanted to make that a prominent piece. And yet at the same time the relationship of the base that you can see on the large model is really relating to the base that exists on 238 Main. And as we are hopefully going up and down in all cases, it's really the tower that's the most important within the composition.

Another new rendering from the opposite direction, seen where the arcade -- excuse me, the atrium is really a recessed piece in here, and so that we have really two forms that are sort of forming the edge of Hayward. Again, the

tower and the -- really the red brick structure. In a way this was the technology that we had at the time; masonry buildings, small punched windows. We really couldn't get buildings higher. And so not only was it the urban design gestures that we were talking about, but as the Dean was talking about this motto of mind in hands, innovation, science, engineering, coming up with what is the most efficient and most practical sense of what we're doing, we really have tried to do this within this building. And we'll show you the building blocks that make it a lab and office building very unique.

If we look at the rendering that we had from before, is that more bolder move. It's the bold move that's sitting on the open space. Someplace that is, you know, challenging, dynamic, and interesting. And we'll be showing

you a movie in a second that shows how the glass transforms particularly on this facade as it is facing mostly south.

We've talked about the ability -- that this glass will really respond and change. And in a minute I'll show you how from this one model you're getting a couple of different variations. One is certainly tonality. This being in the afternoon where you're going to get a much more warmer tone than if it's in the morning. And then there's even an evening where all of a sudden we're switching and the interior of the building starts to get lit up, but it doesn't go all turn on at one time, or turn off. And you'll see from the video that we were able to produce, ways of making that happen.

Now Thacher is not here this morning -- or this evening, but one of the key things that

he had asked us about, but was one of the basic tenants of this project, is active retail, active space, a place where the entire community can connect together. And so we've spent time advancing this in the design. At the same time it also shows you a little bit more about the curtain wall, the relationship of the cantilever. And really at its 90 feet up in the air, 30 feet sitting out, and how that sort of just gives shape to that space, and in a way is inventive and new within the campus.

This is that entry that Dean Sarkis was talking about. It connects all the way through to 238 Main, and across to the connection that goes to on the atrium to Wadsworth.

We have vibrant retail. We don't have architecture that's trying to impose a style on the retail, but we're allowing the retail to

really expand and do what is unique to it. Is it something that is a specialty store that wants to have very light wood? Is it something that wants to be more retro? The dynamic quality of retail is it changes every two to five years. Something else is changing within that, and so it really lends to that vibrant ground plain.

An interesting detail is the louver system that's here. For each of these retail operations we have to provide air in and air out. We're not -- this is not exhausting kitchens if there are kitchens that have to go through the roof, but each of these has a louver and they're in a variety of different patterns. So the ability to have a continuos louver is really unique.

Lou, you had asked about sound and smell. So the smell is really any exhausted fumes are

going up through the roof. Nothing is coming out the side. And anything that's coming out is through an attenuator. So typically there are attenuators that acoustic attenuators or we just take ducks, turn them 90 degrees, insulate the inside, and you really don't have transmission of sound on the outside. Because obviously if we did, we would not have happy customers out here. So there's that real interest on creating a vibrant place at the entries where people are overflowing from seating, and then the natural seating that exists within the space.

If we continue around, now we're on Wadsworth. We're at the division between 238 and the new building. The atrium is there. The glass is totally different. There's the aluminum fins that are coming down, and then it is totally glazed. It is so glazed that the typical detail

that you've seen where the spiders bolt right through the glass, these spiders are embedded in the back of the glass. So nothing comes through. It is absolutely a flush surface. So this is a new innovative technique that we've been able to use.

This also points out every other space within this building has retail or active space. We do have two areas where there's egress and emergency exit from the building and entrance and access for parking at one spot, and then we return back to retail or active use around here. So we've really been cognitive of that. And if you recall the larger project, all the loading for this building is taken through building No. 4. So we don't have loading docks that are sitting here.

If we look back, now we're looking from

Main Street looking back towards the open space on Hayward. It is the one location where we have a contiguous piece of retail. And it is the one location where we have a contiguous piece of retail, and is that one area where I know there's been lots of conversation of having either a pharmacy or some larger piece as most of the retail is rather small, so that is in that location.

This shows where the atrium sets back. And again, like the atrium on the other side, this side of the building, this little niche in that inside right in there is a clear glass with glazed mullion. So it's very different then what is the metal expression that we're seeing on the other side.

So if we can, we've just got to switch programs a second. We've done about a 45 second

film. It's in five vignettes. So, Matt, you can help me do this: It will take about three minutes to sort of talk it through because I think it in a way it's moving quickly. But I want to really share with you. Because this building is, as Maureen was saying, it's experiential. Fixed renderings say what it looks like at one point in time. We are totally relying on the changing nature of the sun, the changing nature of the seasons, and the dimensionality which is these nine-inch fins that are extending out are taking a curtain wall and really much like a punched window building where we set the windows back some six inches back or something. In this case we're putting the structure on the outside so we create a real depth of moving. So let's see what we can do for you.

UNIDENTIFIED MEMBER FROM THE AUDIENCE: Hit the space bar starts it, too.

ROBERT BROWN: Okay, I want to pause it here. So we are looking at the south side of the building. This is morning light. You're able to see reflection that's going to be coming from the tower No. 4. Pay attention to this one area. You're going to see that all of a sudden the light's going to come through here. And first we were baffled of what that is. That's really the light that's penetrating the building and being cut off from the ceiling of each blade. So it's really kind of an interesting dynamic. So there you see that. The light is going up. And there's really sort of a ripple-like quality across the very top of the curtain wall.

So the next scene is actually looking in the opposite direction. We want to have you

really understand. So this is the proposed underside of the cantilever. It is an area that we've talked about that MIT will be very active and engaging in an art program into it. But we wanted to show you on -- in the rendering that depending how one's looking at this, it almost looks like we're looking 45 degrees to the corner. We're able to see and transmit right through the glass. This glass is floor to floor. There are no mullions that are sitting at this structure. This is what's called a shadow box. And if you have a chance, we have a full mockup just outside the wall. The shadow box is sitting back nine inches from the glass so that you really get a quality of not having a mirror that's sitting on that front or piece, but really letting that glass run all the way through. Yet at the same time if you're looking at this

facade, it's really -- you're getting a much more metal-like feeling to it. It's much more solid and it transitions and what we'll hopefully see within this is sort of as it moves, whoops -- all righty. We'll get there. All of a sudden the glass starts becoming much more of a visible piece and you'll see some details. I mean Hugh was very interested in having some other examples of actually built buildings. We'll show you that in the end. And it shows the strength of these shadows.

Now this next scene is taking a look at the south facade and looking at the sun. What happens when it goes from east to west? So right now it's on the east side. It is lighting up these very brightly, and on this side you're seeing the shadow side and you can actually see the shadow that's sitting on the spandrel panels,

excuse me, the shadow box panels. And these are the blinds as they're coming down. So you can sort of see the shadow as it traverses across. And so we're sort of now midday. And then at the end of the day it's really the sun is now on this side. Those sides of the metal are being lit, and this side is not being lit. And you're seeing not only the depth of the nine inch mullion, but you will see, and if you look at the mockup, that you're actually seeing a slight reflection as well as the cap behind it, that's another six inch or nine inch so that we have almost have 19 inches of depth that we're able to run forward with.

So this view is looking back at the corner or almost diagonally across from 238's on the front side. The Main Street's here. This is the roof deck or roof terrace, excuse me. It

shows that the fins are going up. They're becoming a part of that terrace. There's glazing that's up here. That is that terrace piece. This is the sixth floor, which is abut glaze system similar to the atrium itself. And again we'll sort of see as the sun passes over and the building turns the ability to both look into and then seeing a very different kind of image as you're going through. In some cases as the sky is lightening up, it's much more of kind of a reflective quality because of the sky, but where you're getting shadow and shade, you're really getting the view into the building itself.

And then lastly, a view at the corner, and this one's really trying to look at what happens during the day. And then as we really go into the night setting. And so the lights from the inside are going on in the building and it

gets dark. And then lastly what happens at night.

So as the building is there, it starts being lit from the base, lights are coming on, and then there's a total lighting of the building.

So I hope that was helpful. If I -- I'm going to just run it one more time just continuously so you can kind of get the feeling as the building transforms itself going around from sort of day to night.

This is sort of midday looking more towards the east. Looking at that facade as it goes towards the top, the mechanical penthouse in its louver system. It is a metal so it's not going to develop as much shade and shadow which we want because of the definition of that top.

And then around the building what happens

as it goes and transforms itself from day to evening. And then the very end sort of mid evening as the lights start turning on and becoming more of a prominent piece and then the night sky that's there.

So what I'd like to do is sort of move over and talk a little bit more about this model and the other model that we have and how they're relating to the details.

So, there was a question as to how this building was assembled. And so the diagram that's on the wall is showing that in lab buildings the magic dimension is 11 feet. And every single building is at 11 feet or 10-foot, six is sort of the new norm that we're seeing, but it's essentially at 11 foot office buildings at 10 feet, five foot module. 22 feet, 33 feet. So you can see the column structure here, the lab

benches in many cases are perpendicular to the wall, but because it's a commercial building, we really don't determine that. In many cases on labs they want them on the inside face and have the offices on the outside. So it's a very interesting module as we go forward.

You can see the mullion system and the fins here. And this is a half-inch scale model. It shows the nine-inch mullions. It shows the open corner. The spandrels are set back. There's a singular piece of glass as I mentioned from floor to floor, going up the entire piece.

So the detail, I think we've shown you this before, it's really looking down, but really I think a model is a much more interesting piece. And I just want to sort of turn it to -- so from your side you should be seeing metal ribs. Whereas where Lou is sitting, it's completely

open. And so we're just seeing over time that this is going to really make a transition depending on where you're standing, depending on how the sun is doing. So we really have three elements that happen. Your position within the context and then how the sun is going passed that. But we're really -- I mean, sort of a signature piece that comes out of a Perkins + Will building is a very clean -- we try to be as simple as we possibly can. Have those move be really major and important bold moves. And I now that Ralph and I both are feeling that we've really accomplished this and are excited about it. This happens to show the detail at the very top. The blue line is showing the glass that is extending passed. This is that spandrel condition which sits nine inches back. The structure itself. And then the louver system

that sits, sits above that high quality anodized aluminum system at the very top.

And then we've shown this before. The -- I think a key thing is that underside of the cantilever, a white aluminum panel right now, a really a blank canvas for the art that can occur. The details that we're showing at the base with that horizontal aluminum piece.

Again, a lower section. And then sort of a midsection. But again with a fixed rendering sort of shows the different affects that we're getting from the sun, and hopefully that the movie that was there that really helps you see those pieces.

Now, we were asked, and I think this is a very good question, we're looking for -- this is a fairly new glass. But we've found a couple of projects. This is 51 Astor Place in New York.

And interestingly enough the mullion system is about at that two-foot, nine so you can sort of see the similar proportion. Equally there is that louver system that exists. And in their case they're letting the mullions go through it. In our case we want to have it set back.

The glass at the base is clear glass. The glass that's up here -- this is 70 percent transmitted. So 70 percent of the light that is hitting that glass is going through, 30 percent is being reflected back.

Another tower in New York. Just note sort of the transparency that's happening at the top, and obviously when there are lights on. And also the slight reflectivity, but it's not a mirror by any means. And that's where the model is. This is the third skin we put on it. It does show not dark but a deeper color, and that

really is sort of the quality that one's going to get from the glass.

This is another project. These happen to be class fins, but they are at about that two-foot, nine spacing. Maybe a little bit tighter. And if we get closer, you can sort of see the fins at the top, the fins at the base. This is more of a clear glass. This is a -- not the same glass as we have. This is much more of a mirrored glass.

And then just a detail. And what we don't have in this model quite yet, and we are working on, is the quality of the connections. So that's a continuous piece of aluminum coming down, and there are going to be joints. We can't do, you know, seven stories of this. So it's sometimes that very refined detail that really makes a difference as we go forward. And in this

case there's that six to seven inches that's sitting out, and then six to seven inches on the back side.

Equally cantilevers were a question. Our city has some really interesting ones. Most notable is probably the ICA and how vibrant that is as a piece. If you know Atlantic Wharf, Atlantic Wharf had a portion of the building that's equally -- it sits about 30 feet that's sitting over the atrium space that's there.

And then some projects that we know from New York of Alice Tully Hall and the vibrancy that can happen with these spaces that are shaping outside areas with lighting.

So this just shows the fixed models we have. And you have that within your book.

And I hope that that has given you a little bit better understanding of our

impression. We're really very excited about the project. We took everything you said to heart and went back, we checked our proportion, we checked the dimensions, we talked to the manufacturers, and in the end of the day we're returning with information of which we think is a little bit more deeper than we had in the past.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you. Is that the conclusion of the presentation right now?

MAUREEN McCAFFREY: Yes.

ROBERT BROWN: And that's the end.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And that's the end.

ROBERT BROWN: And that's all folks.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay.

Anyone have any questions right at the moment? Start with questions?

(No Response.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: Would anyone like to start with comments?

STEVEN COHEN: Are we going to public comment on this one?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes, thank you for reminding me. Yes, you are correct. Thank you.

So we'll take public comment now. When we call your name, please come forward, state your name and your address. Make sure the microphone is on and we ask that you speak for three minutes. And you'll see the lighting system. You may or may not see the lighting system because it's beyond the laptop. We ask that you speak only for three minutes.

Heather.

HEATHER HOFFMAN: Hello. Heather Hoffman, 213 Hurley Street. And, you know, I don't know whether any of you have noticed but I

actually choose my T-shirts for these meetings. And the one today says less is more. I was not going to say anything more about this building. I thought that I had said my piece last time we discussed this, and then I saw the gigantic light box picture and I was utterly horrified. If this is what Alexandria did to its penthouse and was rapidly convinced to turn off, then I really hope we don't make that mistake in an entire building. If the penthouse is the only place that isn't glowing in the dark, well, it will be different, but I'm just utterly horrified. I was glad to hear that the glass is not reflective, particularly so that I will be able to walk down the street and not be blinded at certain times of the day because that is an issue with various buildings. And given the amount of traffic on various numbers of wheels and on feet, that

matters a whole lot for people to be able to see and not to be blinded as they're trying to get around. So I'm pleased with that. But please, please, please inquire more deeply of the proponent about this, what looks to me to be the biggest light box I've ever seen.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Is there anyone else who would like to speak?

JAMES WILLIAMSON: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Jim.

JAMES WILLIAMSON: Thank you. My name is James Williamson, 1000 Jackson Place. I had actually come with an interest in the earlier hearing, but apparently that lasted only ten minutes. So I thought I would stick around.

A couple of observations and

reiterating -- in terms of what was said about the noise. There is a huge problem with noise from the building that is -- and I'll point to it. Right there. That's the building, that's a Sloan building, and the mechanicals on top of that, all you have to do is walk out of Dewey Library and the noise from the rooftop mechanicals of that building are unbelievable. And I don't know what confidence we all should have that that's not gonna be the case with this building, but it's gonna be, you know, it continues to be a problem and it would be nice if in the context of all this development that were something that MIT were interested in. Or maybe they already have taken a look at it. But could make an effort to address. I think people in this -- throughout this area would be a lot happier.

Astor Place, I used to go to conferences in the Cooper Union building for many years and was quite horrified at the glass building, the first one that went up. I'm not sure which one this one is that's shown here, but until I see the rest of it above what's cut off in the slide, but I think if you go to Astor Place and have a look at those glass buildings they're really, it's somewhat subjective. I don't find them very welcome.

My biggest concern just looking at the images is the relationship between the -- this building on the other side. I mean, these images are being shown and they're, you know, maybe less worrying in a way to me, than from the other side where the juxtaposition looking over the clock tower building and seeing the juxtaposition between the front, if you will, the mainstream

front of this building and this building that just you catch just the edge of the dorm, the new dorm building. And to me that juxtaposition, and there's an image in the packet, is jarring to me. And I don't know whether you've already had discussions about it, but it's something that I think would be interesting to hear people reflect on.

And then the last observation I have is the metal materiality, if you will, of where the cafe is at the ground level here. Also the proximity. I think to understand how close that building is to the existing Muckley building which is the, you know, the one that's in the winter picture. It's not clear to me, and I hope there will be some reflection on how this supposed and continuation of this so-called Infinite Corridor actually works where this

building, which backs up quite a bit from where, over where the current parking lot is, and how it works in conjunction with the Muckley building is interesting to me. And, again, maybe you've done some reflection on that. But the metal materiality at ground level for the cafe spaces and retail spaces, it's more pervasive all over the city now it seems. And it's -- I think there is, you know, it's not as welcoming as perhaps some other materials that could be included in that development, developing those ideas.

So thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Is there anyone else who wishes to speak?

(No Response.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: None appearing, then board members, questions? Comments? Do you have any information from staff you'd like to receive?

STEVEN COHEN: Does staff have any information that they'd like to make?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Suzannah, do you have any additional questions or comments? We received your memo several weeks ago and do you want to, you know, add anything or state your concerns?

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: I guess from our original memo that we provided last time, the comments that we raised were very similar to what the Board raised at the first meeting. We did appreciate the project's kind of sleek minimal appeal. And it's very functional from the way it's been described tonight and how it fits into the sort of idea of the context.

We also felt the curtain wall was very elegantly and carefully detailed. And it's obviously important because it's such a sort of

significant component of the building design.

We did raise concerns about the undifferentiated facades of the podium and the upper volume as well as the ground floor, and we offered possible ways to explore some variations that we thought would not undermine the sort of purity of the geometry. And with the ground floor as well, we -- just looking at the renderings tonight, we worry about the back of house functions and how that would all sort of fit into so much glass.

But we think, I think the renderings show a lot more detail and there's some sort of special moments in the building. The sort of beauty of that transparent atrium I think is really successful. And I think some of the play of light and the texture that came across in the movie is also a positive component of the design.

We also are hopeful that the potential tenant can create some different types of spaces that might be visible on the facades or maybe there will be some sort of double height shed stairs or different spaces that could actually help enliven the facades.

We do still care about the sort of undifferentiated nature of the facades and would like to see that further explored by the Board.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Anyone have questions for Suzannah right now?

(No Response.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: No? Thank you.

Steve?

STEVEN COHEN: Yeah. You know last time around I think I was the one who was most positive and open to this design, and I thought

that the elevations were deceptive or didn't tell the story. And then that if we saw more, you know, perspective renderings, that we would get a more accurate and a more appealing picture of the building. And I think we have those renderings now. And to my eye it is what I hoped for and expected. I do think it's more interesting and appealing. Yes, it certainly -- it celebrates its simplicity, and I guess some would characterize it as austerity. But one might characterize it as purity. But, you know, it's a vision of geometry and texture and both transparency and reflectivity and continuity of glass. You know, I can understand that it might not be to everybody's taste, and it certainly sort of pure and modernist vision, but well, gosh, it is part of an engineering school.

So I'm -- well, even at the ground level

as well, I think the louvers, you know, extend that sort of vocabulary of just texture and material. That, again, that continuity of the glass. You know, it's consistent with the vocabulary of the whole building, you know. And especially as you observe it as part of a set of buildings, you know, it's a very interesting to my eye sort of study in geometry and form. And, you know, kind of appropriate for MIT. So, you know, while I acknowledge that it might not be to everybody's taste and for those who are looking for more of a, you know, period architecture or, you know, warm materials. I mean, you know, I'll grant you that warmth is not one of the adjectives that you might associate with the building. I don't think it's, you know, our job to sort of make sure that it's to our particular subjective taste. I think it's our job to make

sure that it in whenever style and with whatever materials does constitute a good design? And I think given what the architects attempted to achieve and attempted to say with their design, I think it's quite successful. I think the detailing, by the way, in the curtain walls is really interesting with that purity and continuity of both the glass and the fins. So, you know, as simple as it is, I mean, this detailing I don't think comes easy, probably not cheap either.

So, you know, I'm balanced and I'm always, you know, a little bit shy and reluctant in the presence of experienced architects. I'm just a layman at this stuff. But I think it's a successful design and I have a few criticism.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay. Lou.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: I'm going to

disagree.

STEVEN COHEN: Imagine that.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: I guess I'll start off with the mechanical enclosure. Is this mechanical enclosure specifically for this building itself? No other buildings are connected to this? The garage? It's not ventilating the garage and so forth? What I'm really after is how we got a 44-foot mechanical enclosure? It seems to be quite a big percentage of this building. I know it's a lab.

ROBERT BROWN: Yes, so typically within the lab buildings they end up having two, 20-story --

IRAM FAROOQ: Robert, can you speak into the microphone?

ROBERT BROWN: I'm sorry.

So typically within a lab building and

certainly within the flexibility that's happening in the high quality of science that we can anticipate that could happen here, we're seeing that those lab buildings, there are two distinct levels. And then on top of that as we're showing strobic fans which have to be above the lab itself. There is exhaust that's coming from the garage. So we are taking exhaust through this, but there's no other specific building that this is tied to, three, five, or the other.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Okay, so this building is handling all of the garage exhaust? Or a --

ROBERT BROWN: No, it is not. The garage exhaust is happening in a variety of locations. As we had to have intake separate from exterior, and so....

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: I also like to see

what the louvers actually look like because there are -- percentage the louvers on this building is enormous.

ROBERT BROWN: Right, so we do have a photograph of that with the fin.

Okay, so this is showing the louver now. We're looking up. There is the nine-inch fin that's on that side, and there would be a nine-inch side that's sitting on this side. And so it is going to be getting shade and shadow depending on the light. It is running, as you can see, and we're not done with all the detailing. It really is a very clean connection. It would be very similar to what the glass is. So that we're not seeing some other component. And then the glass is coming right up to the underside of this louver. So it's a very refined piece not like what you would see in maybe an

industrial building where you're seeing the drip and everything else. That's all happening within the site.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: So it's almost a 50/50 mix of metal and shade?

ROBERT BROWN: I would say that in certain periods of the day you would sense that.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: So this is going to be a very dark top it seems?

ROBERT BROWN: I would -- at least as we've taken a look at it, it's -- we don't believe that it's going to be dark. We think that it's gonna change. So when -- and what's been good on the movie sequences is that you're able to see what the lighting -- so they're trying to replicate the light from the sun. And so in some cases they're getting bounced up. The underside of this is going to be bouncing light

to the other side.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: But your movie didn't show us louvers, it showed us flat skin.

MAUREEN McCAFFREY: It does show louvers.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: No, no, not on the movie you showed. Not all of them anyway.

Another thing, when you get a pretty acute angle on this building, it turns into a big metal box. And I know you tried to do some of this. And also this has created some very dark windows and glass is fairly reflective.

ROBERT BROWN: It's 70 percent transmission, 30 percent reflective, that is correct.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: But when it's in a dark condition, it's very reflective.

ROBERT BROWN: It's usually most reflective when the light is sitting right on it.

And when it's dark, it's getting more -- there's more transmittance because the light --

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: When the sun is not on this wall that is a very dark opening. And the fins, and I see your point about trying to make the windows inset, but by making them inset they actually appear darker. So I'm having a hard time with that darkness. And then if you look down the side of the building at an angle, you have no windows. It's all metal.

ROBERT BROWN: Absolutely, that is our effect.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: And a lot of the views of this building are at angles. So that's -- and it turns it into a big grey box sometimes. And that's part of my problem.

ROBERT BROWN: I think the way we were looking at it, again, we were hoping that the

film was doing it or even -- so this is the glass sample in the sun, but up at the very top is the shadow box. So this is, this is reflective. This is reflective behind because we're -- there's no transmittance here. This is the window in the sun. This is the window in the shade. And this is what we're seeing on the metal fins is that essentially you're usually getting a little bit of a sparkle at the very edge. And then that nine inches, depending where the sun is on it in this case, or the sun is not on it in this case, it changes. So it's that continuing changing that we're hoping, but I can see -- there certainly would be circumstances where there's going to be with the shadow of the building, if the lights aren't on in the inside or it's still bright outside, that it could be dark.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: The five times that I went to this model, mockup, five different times during the day, sun up, sundown, during the day, could not get this to stop being very reflective.

ROBERT BROWN: Oh, really?

Well, some of it may be -- we're looking straight into this. The glass is actually going to be up. We were going to have Turner push it up higher so maybe that's something we need to take a look at.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: I guess that's all I have for now. But these are some serious concerns I have. I don't know if it comes from the fins being so narrow, and I know the idea what you're trying to pick up, but it seems to close off the building. They seem to fold over when you see them at a distance.

ROBERT BROWN: Well, we've been working, you can imagine, from the inside out as well to make sure that those fins aren't too deep because they don't want to have just a view like this, but a broad as view as we can. We appreciate your comments. Certainly those are issues that we've thought about and we feel like we've got an answer to that but in this brief time --

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: My real concern is that this building turns into a big grey box quite often as you walk around it.

ROBERT BROWN: I don't think it will, but as you say, it's a sort of personal opinion right at this moment.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Hugh.

HUGH RUSSELL: So if you could, I'm going to ask you to put up a series of the views that are in the book you gave us tonight.

ROBERT BROWN: Okay. Of the other buildings?

HUGH RUSSELL: So I'd like to start with page 21 which is 51 Astor Place.

ROBERT BROWN: Yes.

HUGH RUSSELL: And what I'm trying to do is understand the pictures and see what the pictures tell us. And I cannot see anything going on inside this building in this view. I see the reflections of the adjacent buildings being pretty important.

So now let's look at 23, two more pages down. So again --

ROBERT BROWN: This is not the same glass.

HUGH RUSSELL: Pardon?

ROBERT BROWN: This is not the same glass.

IRAM FAROOQ: Robert, this is being recorded so we need you to speak into the microphone.

ROBERT BROWN: Okay.

Just matter of fact, this is not exactly the same glass. So this one was to be brought in so we could see what fins were there. As I say it's a pretty new glass. There are buildings in the city that have that.

HUGH RUSSELL: So is this glass more or less reflective than the glass you proposed?

ROBERT BROWN: We're assuming -- we're 70 percent transmittant. This happens to be in Abu Dhabi, which in most cases are 50 or 40 percent transient. It's a very different client.

So I would say --

HUGH RUSSELL: So --

ROBERT BROWN: Hugh, the only comment I

would make back on this is sunlight is 1,000 foot candles. There is no building, punched window, or anything that you would be seeing into the building because the lighting on the inside of this building is about 50 foot candles.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, and I agree. And when I get to looking at your renderings, I'm going to -- which show you looking into the building.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Into the building.

HUGH RUSSELL: It's a problem for me. Again, on 25. Two more pages down, skipping 24.

ROBERT BROWN: This one?

HUGH RUSSELL: Yeah.

ROBERT BROWN: Okay.

HUGH RUSSELL: Because it's a fin building. And, again, the reflectivity means we're only seeing the outside is reflected. And

so now we want to go back and look at your renderings to see what -- and I have to -- I say this, but you haven't heard it before. I'm an architect. I sometimes do renderings and nothing anywhere as sophisticated as you do, but I understand that if your goal is to try and understand what it's really going to look like, and I believe that is your goal in presenting these renderings to us, it's the difficult goal to achieve. But it's what you're trying to understand as a designer to make your own design decisions. And then when you, so when you do a rendering and you look at it on the screen and then you print it in a book, it's different because it's, you know --

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: It is.

HUGH RUSSELL: -- admitting something. So these are all inherent problems in renderings.

So if you go to the cover, the same rendering occurs about seven times in the book. And I just want to look at that one that happens to be on the cover.

Yeah, that's the one. So you're seeing things inside the building in this rendering.

ROBERT BROWN: Yeah.

HUGH RUSSELL: Which I do not think you're going to see based on the 51 Astor Street photograph. And again, so what you said is because of the bright sun, there's so much light outside, that the -- you can't see what's going on inside. What you do see is a line and I -- it's the -- I guess I want to try to point that line out.

Here's the line. That line there and that, I believe line is generated by the reflection of building 4.

ROBERT BROWN: Of 4, correct.

HUGH RUSSELL: Now, if you look at a couple of other renderings at different times of day, and that same line is there, and like at dusk, it's still there. And so I get a little suspicious about that line. And of course it's a line that occurs --

ROBERT BROWN: Well, but this is from the same exact vantage point. So the sun's not going to change the reflectivity of the other buildings.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right.

ROBERT BROWN: That line -- excuse me, that line will always be there as we're standing here and that's reflecting in the building. The sun is --

HUGH RUSSELL: Right.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I'm sorry, could you

speak into the microphone, please?

ROBERT BROWN: So we are at a fixed location. So the difference between this rendering and this one, you're gonna -- I think we're telling what we understand, that reflection is a reflection off of this building. The building's don't move. Whether the sun's moving doesn't change where the reflection is.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right.

ROBERT BROWN: It will change where the shadow is and where the tone of the building is.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. What I'm questioning is whether in the different light conditions you will actually see that reflection or not. It will be -- so that's kind of the only -- that's the one thing that changes. The top of the building is different because it doesn't have the reflective skin. But it's -- there's a lot more

change and variation in that particular rendering, and I'm wondering what -- where is it coming from? Is it real or is it the art of the renderer that's creating a more mirrored look?

I'd like to comment on the animation which was very sensuous, very exciting, and -- but represents you're staying at one point and opening your eyes once every minute and then somehow your brain putting that together. It shows you that as the sun moves around the building, things change. But as a person who's walking around the building, that's not your experience. So I kind of discount the animation. I can't make, I can't figure it out.

So then I'd like to look at 4 and 5 and -- 4, 5, and 6. So --

ROBERT BROWN: This is 5.

HUGH RUSSELL: Go to 4.

So 4, the bottom of the building's dark and the top is very bright.

ROBERT BROWN: Right.

HUGH RUSSELL: Which is -- and then if you go to 5, it's all kind of dark. And then you go to 6, and the bottom is light and the top is dark.

ROBERT BROWN: Right. All things that we're imagining are going to be happening. I mean, so --

HUGH RUSSELL: The angles are different I understand that.

ROBERT BROWN: Right.

So our anticipation is that we're going to be running through that level of reflectivity and shadow. So I think that, you know, to Lou's point, this is really seeing the louvers as dark, because the sun is glancing across, we're picking

up the lightness of the fins, which we think would be happening, but the louver is in full shadow. And in this case, because the sun's coming from the east, the louvers and the glass are totally illuminated except we are in that oblique way which is what we're interested in, which is essentially this is not just a square box with each of the facades the same.

So, Hugh, I would totally agree with you. On one side that the renderings are, any rendering is really a render. We're trying to get as much realistic light because they can now, within the renderings themselves, we can say that's where the sun's gonna be let's see what the reflections are. And then there is the artistry that's in there to help everybody sort of understand where it's at.

HUGH RUSSELL: So what time of day is

this intending to be?

ROBERT BROWN: This one I would assume we're in morning, because we're coming up in the east and we're going to start swinging around to the south.

HUGH RUSSELL: So it seems to me that if it's like nine or ten in the morning, say, you're not going to see the life of the inside. If it were, you know, maybe at seven in the morning or six-thirty and the building's occupied, but you wouldn't have the sky be so bright. So it's something -- I can't rely upon this rendering I think is what I'm saying, because it's contradictory to me. And whereas I suspect the one on the next, page 6, is more reliable except you're not going to see the light fixtures.

So what I'm concluding from this is that Lou's analysis is largely correct. That it's

going to be a pretty much featureless surface only affected by the large scale reflections of the adjacent buildings. It changes in its silveriness and darkness depending on the time of day and what the sun's doing, but if you're looking at it for a few minutes, it's all going to be pretty much the same and I find that somewhat disturbing. And I think -- so I don't think it's going to look as good as it does in the renderings. Although it's, as been pointed out, it's exquisitely detailed. And as you get close to it, it's, you know -- and look at this kind of scale, it's going to be a very handsome piece. But as you get farther away, it's going to be very bland.

Now, my colleague Mr. Sieniewicz asked the question which I did not hear an answer tonight, which is is this the appropriate

expression for a world that's heading into climate disaster with -- is it appropriate to have a building that's undifferentiated on all four sides that as -- doesn't shade from the south sun that has this much glass? And much earlier here I asked what your overall U-value was? And the answer was I believe the resistance was about two.

ROBERT BROWN: 0.32. The U-value is 0.32.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, so that's about a three as an R-value. And the prescriptive code requirement is an R-value of seven in the energy code that prevails now. You're obviously doing an energy model, you're not using prescriptive values, but it tells you something that your skin is half as good as what the energy code thinks is a standard.

We also had a concern about the fins, because when I looked at your mockup, it appeared to me -- there didn't seem like there was any thermo break and that the fins looked like they were going to be either attracting heat or radiating out heat, and I didn't see how you could hold the fins on the building with something squishy in between them and the structure they were fastened to. Now, I understand that there is a thermal break beyond the glass line so that as somebody said, they couldn't see it in the mockup. So, I think Tom's question about is this building responding to the challenge of the age of doing buildings that are efficient and are relating with its environment properly is really unanswered. I mean, I think I know the answer and the answer is -- it's not.

ROBERT BROWN: Well, I mean our answer is

it's meeting the energy code as prescribed by Cambridge. We are through the whole process looking at each of the buildings to make them as energy efficient as possible. So I would say that almost on every single project there could be more stringent energy codes that could be applied. It is a commercial building. So on one side of the commercial building is that there's evenness that we're -- I mean, we can't put one side where it's say 50 percent or 60 percent solid because that side would never be rented. So that there is a quality to a commercial building that's very different than a classroom building or program specific. So we can't be prescriptive as to where things can happen. What we did look at is that the fins are much more of a decorative treatment than they are to really enhance them. And I've done south facing glass

where the fins are almost six feet deep to protect that entire glazing. So what we're doing using a very highly energy efficient glass. And as we've looked at whether these are horizontal, vertical, they're not acting as an energy component, they are acting much more in giving up a visual effect to the building so that we have what you've commented on as either a much more italic -- metallic solid feature as you're looking towards on the bias or where one is able to look much more straight into the building whether you're seeing in a reflective way transmitting to the building or not. So --

HUGH RUSSELL: So this building that's only a few blocks away from this that was built as part of the David Clemms' development whose name keeps changing, and I'm not sure what the current name is. It's across a side street from

the Genzyme building and it faces out onto the skating rink plaza and the Athenaeum building is behind it. And the new Manfredi building is on the other side. And this building was not the most handsome building we ever seen on this Board, but the interesting thing about it was each elevation was different and responded to the environment, and basically the solar environment. And it was a commercial lab office building. And they found a way to do it. So I don't think it's impossible to do. I think the building's occupied. I just think you don't want to do it.

ROBERT BROWN: Well, all I would say is my practice for 40 years has been commercial development work, and so on every single project what we're looking to do is create a flexibility within the plans and that has not changed within the development market. Is that essentially

there is a reality that every single square foot of the building has -- will become a tenant space at one time, and that we can't be prescriptive as to which way they're going to be looking at the views, where they want to put the labs, how they want to establish that. So what we're trying to do is make this thing leasable and then releasable and releasable, you know, for 50 to 100 years. So it is a factor of a commercial project because it doesn't have a specific program.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Do you have anything else?

HUGH RUSSELL: I do not.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Catherine.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Sure.

So not being an architect, some of the pictures you gave us tonight were helpful for

giving me some vocabulary to talk about what I don't like about this building. I'll start with the view that you have up there first. And it's interesting to see that your animation never shows this view at all. And I really feel like the glass and metal building behind it doesn't relate to this at all. And it has a very prominent place in our city as you come down Third Street. And to me the metal and glass building kind of looms over the clock tower building and it is, you know, even the way everyone has been talking about the building, the remaining clock tower building is like this afterthought and there's no, you know, you have this nice glass atrium that I have agreed with everyone who said looks lovely, but the rest of the building doesn't relate to it at all. And I find that a loss and I find it detracts from the

clock tower building, which we as a city have made it clear that we want preserved and enhanced.

ROBERT BROWN: Right. So we followed --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: I'm going to go through all my comments first. Thanks.

ROBERT BROWN: Okay.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: So that's my issue with that side of the building.

The front of the building, which is clearly how you view the side facing MIT, I've never really found the cantilever works for me. And the nice thing about the pictures you gave is I finally can see I think it's the proportions. The proportions feel really off to me. And whether it's the ICA or the Alice Tulley Hall, you know, how high the cantilever starts or that it doesn't go out far enough or that there is not

enough differentiation within it. Like the Alice Tulley -- both of them actually have interesting things that jut out into the cantilevered space that just really makes all of the proportions of those spaces more interesting and work better. The way this space is cantilevered on that MIT side, to me, feels like it just kind of hangs over and not like it's intentional or a majestic space. It feels like an afterthought. And again, I'm not an architect. If an architect tells me I'm totally wrong about that, you know, I can and, you know, say all right, it's a matter of taste. But what you've showed me here are much more successful versions in my view of what you are trying to do in this space. And if you're going to do a cantilever, I'd like to see it be successful.

Right now it feels to me like a building

that doesn't fit in this space. It doesn't relate to Kendall Square. It feels like it wants to be in Manhattan or in the Seaport District or in someplace else that doesn't have the kind of existing fabric that we have here. And as much as I appreciate that this is a chance to make a statement building and it has to have all the flexibility that commercial buildings do, I think it would also be a lost opportunity to not have a beautiful building that clearly belongs in Kendall Square. And I don't feel that this has done that.

I would also like to say as kind of a last point again with your pictures, the two pictures you have at Atlantic Wharf I think do two things really well:

They show how successful that atrium is. And, again, I think everyone agrees that the

atrium you proposed here is one of the better parts of the whole thing. But it also shows that cantilever over the atrium which is the least successful part of that atrium. And, again, looks similar to what you have proposed as an afterthought that doesn't seem to me to fit there.

So I guess I was not expecting to see you so soon after the feedback you got last time, and frankly hoping that you might make some changes before you came back. But given that you haven't, you haven't convinced me that this is a building that works.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay. It is unfortunate that Tom is not here, because he had raised some significant questions, and the comments that I have from him was that he doesn't get the building and he's deeply puzzled by it.

And I echo those, that comment. Yes, it's detailed handsomely. I mean, the materials look beautiful, but it is a big grey box and it's a very timid big grey box. I don't think it would belong or be built in Manhattan. It would be three times the size. It would go up much higher. I think the proportions are way off everywhere. It's short and squat and it, you know, if you look at this rendering or this model over here or any of the renderings, you see 238, you see some glass block, and then suddenly you see the 40 feet of dark grey penthouse. And what you're seeing, you know -- actually, I like best actually going down third Avenue and looking at this because you see 238. You know? It shows off 238 to a great extent. And behind it you've got a glass wall and then a band of grey at the top.

I have the same comment as Catherine does about the cantilever. If you're going to do it, be big, be bold. I mean, MIT which is designed -- has some great buildings is suddenly so timid with this building that it's short and the cantilever is there. It's not very big. I don't understand it. I don't understand what's under it. And there's -- at the moment there's nothing on the underside of it. We've heard repeatedly there's going to be some art. I don't know what that means. I don't know what it's ever going to be. Are they going to paint a mural on it? You know, are they going to mirror it? I don't know what's going to be. But I don't understand, you know -- and you're absolutely right that the ICA and Alice Tulley Hall, they're big, they're bold, they make a statement. And this is like, what? Why is it is

there?

I also find the facade, I guess it's the west facade, I mean it's just a straight wall going down, it doesn't have the advantage of having 238 in front of it to give it some visual appeal. I know, yes, it's going to be next to building 2. And there's just a, you know, a small street between the two of them. But still when you come off the bridge and you come down, you know, Broadway, you're just going to see a blank grey wall. You know, I'm fine with minimalism. I love the Hancock building. I love mirrors on the old buildings, but, you know, in my mind this wants to be narrower and it wants to be a lot higher. And then, you know, I think the big grey box would, you know, call out to you. It would say something, you know. I think most of the pictures you've shown us in here with

glass buildings, I can't tell of all of them, but I think they're a lot taller. I think they're doing a lot more, you know, and that's really my comments about it. I echo Tom's. I'm puzzled by it. I'm confused by it. You'd think MIT wants to make some grandiose statement even it's a leased commercial building. It's theirs. It's part of their campus. It's part of this overall complex. You know, it just doesn't do anything.

And then I guess the last comment I have is not quite sure what happens with the landscaping in front of it. We did approve the overall landscaping plan, but we're -- there was indication that as each building came before us for review, there was going to be details about the landscaping and how it was going to relate to that building and to the entire program. And, you know, and maybe the landscaping does

something with the cantilever, but I, I don't get it. And, you know, I'm not an architect. I'm not an engineer. But, you know, I hear what Hugh said and I think Tom said the same thing about the sustainability of the building of whether it's the same from all directions. And maybe you can do that with glass, I don't know. But I hear other people questioning it and so I question it, too.

I too was surprised that this came back so quickly and that, you know, we had raised significant issues. And, you know, I think we invited you to either, you know, take our comments to heart and make some changes or to try to come back and convince us why it was exactly what it should be. And I can't say that I'm convinced that this building is what it should be.

Steve.

STEVEN COHEN: Yeah, I'd love to just pose a couple of questions to my colleagues. One of the significant criticisms, especially from Hugh I think was the reflectivity. He doesn't believe the renderings, and he thinks it's going to be much more reflective than it is transparent. And I guess I address this to both the applicant and my colleagues. You know, if the glass in fact were more transparent and the reflectivity of the glass were altered, to what extent -- well, to the applicant, to what extent is that possible here? And to Hugh and colleagues, to what extent would that address your concern and improve your reaction?

And second question I'd ask, I guess several of you raised, and especially you -- the notion that it's a big grey box from certain --

well, from many angles you're saying, and I guess that's a reflection of the fins which, you know, both their frequency in the facade and their depth, and I wonder to what extent your concerns might be allayed if they were further apart?

I don't think you'd want them to address, reduce the depth. I mean, that's really inherent in the design and concept. But in any event, you know, maybe both. But in any event, make some changes so it would reduce the number of perspectives in which you're just seeing metal. So those are two questions and thoughts I had.

You know, as to the cantilever, and I mean I kind of agree frankly with Ted, you know. Ideally, you know, purely from a geometric and visual perspective I wish it were narrower and taller. I totally agree with that. I don't know what the considerations and parameters are there.

And, you know, I think it's great that a Planning Board in America would saying to an applicant, make it taller. It usually goes in the other direction. But I agree with your comment on that.

But going back to those first two about reflectivity and the greyness, how do you guys react to those two possibilities?

HUGH RUSSELL: If the skin's a lot more transparent, it would transmit energy better which is not the right direction to go. So it's a balancing act that has to be done. So that, that's just the kind of the physics of it.

The spacing of the mullions, remember they're dealing with a grid of eleven-foot, nine. They're full mullions on each grid point. I don't have the knowledge or experience to know whether if you made that two instead of, you

know, two spaces instead of four spaces, whether that ends up being something that creates problems with certain kinds of floor layouts. You know, with offices, office buildings -- it's funny, we used to, in the early 90s our firm measured a bunch of empty office buildings that were built in the 80s. You may remember there was a real estate collapse through the end of the 80s. We could measure a 60,000 square foot building done by a particular person who specialized in these buildings in like three hours because everything was on a five-foot module. And so you had to pick up the core and, you know, they knew how big the building was. So -- and he didn't do it because he was lazy. He did it because that's what the market wanted to be able to deliver spaces that were ten foot offices for little people and 15 foot offices for

bigger people. And you had, sure, the president had something different, but the module didn't make much difference. So there's a lot in this design that is reflecting the specific technical realities of delivering a building responsibly. And so if you make the tower thinner, you screw up the space. You have to look -- if you look at the floor plans, you'll see they're -- there's a core which is in the center of the upper one and is off center in the lower one, but it still leaves a considerable space between that and the outside wall which gives you the ability to have several layers of activities and those are relating to the -- how these buildings tend to get rented out by people.

So I'm thinking about our discussion and I'm more interested in dealing with the skin than I am of the massing, because I think the massing

is really terribly fundamental to the building. Yes, you could rotate the top back, and a lot of the good things about the project would disappear. The -- keeping the lower volume of the new building having a relationship to the volume of the clock tower building is very good. I think the way in which those things react is very good.

STEVEN COHEN: The rotation is the whole thing.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right, rotation -- well, if you look at the -- remember the site plan, John somebody, I guess -- no, it was James mentioned the building that's immediately to the south, and the cantilever actually comes very close to the line of that building. And so the cantilever then gives you -- allows the open space to go through, which I think is very

important, and it's generous. It's a big opening. Yes, it's only 90 feet tall, but 90 feet is a tremen -- so I'm, you know. This big cantilever 90 feet in the air, what's it going to feel like? My sense is that it's not going to feel like very much when you're near it. If you look at the nighttime winter view, when you're sort of just coming out of the door to the health science building, yes, that -- there you can see the cantilever. But closer you get to it, it's just out of view. It's sort of now boring, but the intention is to make it not boring through the application of art.

And I agree with Ted, we -- well, I would say my thing is you have to have a leap of faith that in an institution that has done a pretty good job with outdoor art, will figure this one out, too, somehow. But I don't know how.

So my question I guess to my colleagues is how much of it is skin and how much of it is volume?

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: So I tend to be on the volume side and I actually think if we're not -- it was interesting as you were talking, I realized that the two successful versions of cantilevers that they showed in their pictures, neither of which are office or lab buildings, right? It's the ICA, it's Alice Tulley Hall. And maybe that's what you need to do a successful cantilever that really is worth doing. To me this cantilever is not worth doing the way it is now. And I would actually rather see the building rotated back flat, have a blank wall against which you could see the view down Third Street as Ted mentioned, where you could still see the clock tower, than to have, you

know, a half-hearted attempt at a statement with a cantilever that doesn't work. That to me is not, is not worth it. And I agree with you, you're not going to see it, then why do it? I just don't, I don't -- that's the part of this that I don't get even more than the skin. I agree that the skin needs to be tweaked. I don't know if it's right to, you know, to have the two, to take out half the fins and see if it's a better building?

I do think Heather had a really good point that we need to understand what light is coming off of this in the night, and I don't feel like that's been addressed well in a way that is going to make this a good neighbor to the residents who are going to be living right around here. But -- and I think that's a skin question. But to me kind of the fundamental, you know, is

there a cantilever, is this rotated or not, to me that's a pretty big question and I'm not convinced it's worth having the cantilever right now.

HUGH RUSSELL: You're sounding a bit like Tom.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, I don't, I don't know whether it's a skin or a massing issue. I kind of like the concept of the cantilever, but this one does nothing to me. But then if you go back to the earlier, you know, the program and you just rotate it back, then you really have just the -- a flat building and maybe, you know, you have like a --

STEVEN COHEN: Slab.

H. THEODORE COHEN: -- a slab tower that can work with the right differentiation. But I guess I wouldn't like to see this building

just --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Oh, I agree. If you rotate it back, it shouldn't be the same building it is now. But I thought Hugh made a really good point that, you know, floor plates being what they are for commercial, lab, and office buildings, it's hard to imagine getting the proportions that they're showing with what I consider to be visually pleasing cantilevered buildings into a standardized floor plate building.

H. THEODORE COHEN: No, I accept that. And I know people want large floor plates.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Yep.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And they'd rather buildings are shorter and squatter and they got more space to wander around in.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: They rather

they were built in the suburbs.

H. THEODORE COHEN: But this is not the suburbs.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Right.

H. THEODORE COHEN: This is coming right off Longfellow Bridge when it's done.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Two years.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Did you say two weeks?

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Two years.

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: Can I just add a comment about the massing. I think what is actually successful about this form being rotated is that it allows sky views through. And if we brought it back -- and I think that was part of the process of how MIT moved the upper volume massing. If we turned it back around, it would kind of just be all building there because it

would blend into building 4. So I kind of thought that was a successful aspect of the massing.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Yeah.

STEVEN COHEN: If I could just say something also. I mean, you know, while I really like a lot of the detailing and the attention there, but ultimately to me, you know, I think objectively speaking the concept of this building is precisely that rotation and that cantilever. I mean, that's the central character of this design. I agree, all things being equal, I wish it would cantilever further. And maybe that's still a possibility. Not withstanding the possibility that it creates a little bit more shadow in the rear, but I think to talk about rotating it back is to totally reject the entire design and to tell the applicant to go back to

the drawing board from scratch, which may be what my colleagues are saying anyway. But I don't think that kind of critique is warranted here.

You know, we're talking a lot about the skins I guess, and I'm trying to put myself in the shoes of an applicant. I'm trying to figure out exactly what's being said. You know, for instance when I talk about well, what about changing the glass? And you say well, you can't really do that. And then you say well, what about, you know, changing the spacing of the, what I keep calling the fins? Well, no, there's a logic to that also. And you can't really mess with that. And so where are we suggesting that changes be made? I mean, basically you're saying that you can't simply fine tune the design. I mean it sounds like you're saying you really have to totally reconceptualize the skin and the

design from scratch is kind of what I'm hearing. And, again, I don't know, I just don't know and believe that is what's warranted. You know, as I say, I -- you know, reacted fairly favorably to it, but I'm trying even, you know, hearing your critiques and trying to figure out what you could do to address the critiques, I'm not sure what you're having in mind other than, guys, come back with a totally different design.

HASHIM SARKIS: If I can interject just for a second --

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes.

HASHIM SARKIS: -- to say it is not unusual for us to hear different opinions about a certain idea and absorb them. And indeed I think we may have come back too soon now that I hear the comments again more in detail. Especially in regards to the facade. I know for a fact that

Perkins + Will have done other tests of the facades, but many of them may need more testing and we can bring them back once we're more convinced about them.

On the volume and the cantilever as you said, Mr. Cohen, this is the concept of the building and it has been locked into the master plan and carefully calibrated with the buildings around it as an orchestration. But we do need to come back and show you with more articulation how this space with the cantilever works with the landscape, with the entrance, with the program, because we agree, we need to work on that and come back and convince you.

So we hear you. We appreciate the feedback. And we will go back and put our thinking caps on and our drawing boards in front of us and come back to you.

STEVEN COHEN: Let me just react to what you've said and, again, I'm speaking as the one who is most appreciative of the design, but -- and maybe I take your words too literally, but --

JEFF ROBERTS: Steve, I'm not sure you're on.

STEVEN COHEN: Oh, I'm sorry. If you're going to come back and simply try to convince them that this design is the way to go, I'm not sure that my colleagues would be terribly pleased.

HASHIM SARKIS: I did say that we will bring the drawing boards out again and start working on them.

STEVEN COHEN: Okay. Just wanted to make sure we're on the same page.

HASHIM SARKIS: We are. We understood.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay. Do we have

anyone have any further comments right now?

(No Response.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: Then I, you know, appreciate your understanding of where we are and the need for you to, you know, rethink what you think -- what you feel should be thought about and come back at some future time and explain what, if any changes, you think are appropriate.

ROBERT BROWN: Thank you very much.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And thank you very much.

Just remind you that generally nothing will get scheduled until two weeks after staff has received whatever materials there are so that they have time to absorb them and forward them to us. And I know, that this is a general meeting matter and so it can be put on as soon as we provide whatever materials you want and staff can

then reschedule it.

So thank you all very much.

ROBERT BROWN: Thank you.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: We have nothing else?

LIZA PADEN: No.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Liza, did I pass over transcripts?

LIZA PADEN: We'll get them next week.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay. Thank you, all. We are adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 9:30 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.

PAGE **LINE**

_____ _____ **CHANGE:** _____
REASON: _____
_____ _____ **CHANGE:** _____
REASON: _____
_____ _____ **CHANGE:** _____
REASON: _____
_____ _____ **CHANGE:** _____
REASON: _____
_____ _____ **CHANGE:** _____
REASON: _____
_____ _____ **CHANGE:** _____
REASON: _____

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 19th day of May, 2017.

_____
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.

B

D

Q

R

S