

PLANNING BOARD
FOR THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

GENERAL HEARING

Tuesday, April 28, 2015

7:00 p.m.

in

Second Floor Meeting Room
344 Broadway
Cambridge, Massachusetts

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

Iram Farooq, Acting Assistant City Manager

Community Development Staff:

Jeff Roberts
Stuart Dash
Suzannah Bigolin

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

I N D E X

PAGE

GENERAL BUSINESS

| | |
|--|---|
| Update from the Acting Assistant city Manager for the Community Development | 3 |
| Adoption of the Meeting Transcript(s) | 6 |

PUBLIC HEARING

| | |
|---|---|
| Continued - Normandy Realty Estate Partners and Twining Properties Petition to amend the Zoning Ordinance of the City of Cambridge by creating the Mass and Main Residential Mixed Income Subdistrict in the Central Square area of Massachusetts Avenue, Columbia, and Douglass Streets and Bishop Allen Drive (not including the City parking lots). Some of the proposed changes would include a proposed new Mass Ave Height Zone, which would allow building height to be up to 195 feet for a Residential Mixed Income Incentive Project where the current height limit (by Special Permit) is 80 feet, while reducing the height limit to 70 feet along Columbia and Douglass Streets. The allowable Floor Area Ratio (FAR) for such a project could be increased to 6.5 subject to increased Inclusionary Housing Requirements including units for middle income households as well as a minimum requirement for three-bedroom units. New requirements applying to ground floor retail uses are also included. The entire text of his zoning petition and additional materials are available on the Community Development Department web site at the link below. | 7 |
|---|---|

Keyword Index

P R O C E E D I N G S

* * * * *

H. THEODORE COHEN: Good evening, everyone. Good evening. Welcome to the April 28th meeting of the Planning Board.

JOHN HAWKINSON: Ted, we can't hear you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Good evening, everyone. Welcome to the April 28th meeting of the Planning Board. We'll start out with an update from the Acting Assistant City Manager.

IRAM FAROOQ: Thank you, Ted.

So today's meeting focuses is on a one item meeting, focuses on the Normandy Twining Zoning Petition. And you've heard this before. The city -- the status at City Council, the Ordinance Committee has forwarded this to the full City Council and

it has passed to a second reading, right?
And so which means that they could act on it at any point. The period has elapsed where they need to wait for Planning Board recommendation, but the Council has -- is essentially at this point waiting for tonight's hearing and any recommendation from the Planning Board before they, before they act on this.

(Catherine Preston Connolly seated).

Upcoming agenda items here are our May 5th meeting, which is next week, will focus on the Volpe Center Zoning discussion. And then May 19th we have a public hearing on a building which wants to install a green roof. So it's a smaller scale than today, but it will, it promises to be an interesting item where some of the things that we did many years ago in the Green Building Zoning

Petition, they want to access that particular green roof provision.

And then there will be discussion on 130 CambridgePark Drive. They have some revisions to the facade.

So other things happening are that tomorrow there will be a -- sorry, Thursday, there will be a meeting of the Housing Committee from four to six where they will be talking about the incentive zoning, incentive zoning report done by Carl Seiderman, and I think you all have a copy of that report. And hopefully from that discussion will emerge some guidance regarding what the Council would like to see in the Zoning revisions to the Incentive Ordinance. And then there are regular City Council meetings.

The next roundtable at Council is going to be on the citywide plan, and that's not

until June, so that's scheduled for June 8th.

The only other interesting thing I would want to point out is that the NetZero task force which has concluded its work, we're now working on putting together the recommendations and the executive summary which hopefully should be done in another week or so. So we will be forwarding that to the Planning Board as well. And Tom, of course, served as the Planning Board's representative on that task force. So thank you very much.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Are there any meeting transcripts to adopt this evening?

JEFF ROBERTS: There are none.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay, thank you.

So then we will begin our only item on the agenda tonight which is the continued

hearing about the Normandy Twining Zoning Petition. We obviously have a very large crowd and I anticipate that this will be a lengthy hearing and so I ask everybody to please keep your comments as succinct as possible, this includes the developer.

Please, we don't -- we've heard a lot, but we want to hear, you know, what the changes are, but we ask that you be succinct. And when we get to the public hearing session and the public is speaking, please remember that your comments are to be limited to three minutes.

If you have already submitted a letter or an e-mail, we have received them, you don't need to read them into the record. You also don't need to repeat what's been said before. If you can just say you agree with such and such, I'd like to get through this as, you know, expeditiously as possible.

Also, I'll note that like most of you, we did not receive the revisions until late last week. We know that there was a short time scheme to read them and review them and go over it, and so we don't really need everybody to tell us that we didn't get it until a couple of days ago.

With that as background, if the proponent could begin its presentation.

ATTORNEY ANTHONY GALLUCCIO: Thank you, Mr. Chair and Honorable Members of the Planning Board. Can everyone hear me? Do you want me to use the mic?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Can you stand at the podium?

ATTORNEY ANTHONY GALLUCCIO: Sure.

Thank you, Honorable Members, and first I did -- I didn't want to forget to say thank you to members of the public. This has been

a long process. I think we had three Ordinance Committee hearings. We've been here twice. We've had a ton of meetings. And regardless of how people feel, I just wanted to say thank you. This is as purely a Democratic process as I can think of in a legal context, and I just wanted to thank everyone who has taken so much time tonight, meetings, and to send e-mails, and to send correspondence. I think it's made this a much better process and I think it's a much better proposal. Regardless of where people stand tonight, you have influenced this in a really positive way. So I wanted to say thank you.

I just need a clicker.

Through you, Mr. Chair, tonight's presentation represents, as you have indicated, a number of revisions. I want to

just mention I'm joined by Alex Twining and Mark Roopenian who represent the partnership and a number of other team members including David Nagahiro, Susan Sloan-Rossiter. Our whole team is here, and you'll hear from some of them.

We have tried to be as pro-active as possible in responding to the things we've heard, whether it was early on calling for more affordable housing. Jeff Roberts sent a memo early on that was incredibly helpful, it laid out a number of issues. And your comments at the last hearing were very helpful, and these revisions have all related back to those comments. We really wanted to be preemptive and not have last minute changes. So we've tried to make this a really strong petition. It's come a long way. And, again, we want it to not have this

go down to the last week before expiration where we're making changes. We wanted this to be a collaborative effort and we really tried to respond to everything that we heard so that at the very least people understand exactly where we are at this point. And I think that's important again, whether you're wholly in agreement or not, we really wanted to be clear about where we were going down to the last, really the last month.

This is just an outline of the presentation for tonight. We heard from just about all the Planning Board Members. And we've heard it throughout the process, you know, how do we interact and relate to C2 and we're going to go through a lot of that and focus on the revisions tonight.

These are just the major goals of the petition, and this has been the core value

from the beginning: Creating a sustainable housing for a mix of incomes. No new developments for commercial allowed. This is a unique petition in that sense. We're not asking for any rights for office or lab beyond what's allowed under existing Zoning.

Enhance what is really a dead lab space now with retail and public connections. Just to be clear, the new development rights requested is 93,000 square feet. I point that out because the location of this and the proposal has given it a lot of attention, but this is a relatively small ask in relation to other petitions. That doesn't mean it's not worthy of all the scrutiny it's gotten. And that's what we're asking for. And those new rights have to be residential. And, again, no new commercial.

This is our timeline. It goes back to

Alex's early days working through the C2 process and meeting with people back at acquisition and really in early 2013 all the way through what has been a really lengthy conversation. And the one thing that we heard regardless of how folks felt about heights and densities and locations is this is about housing. And that's really what we tried to respond to.

Again, I think Iram mentioned we were approved to go to a second reading last night, and we really look forward to working with the Planning Board on an improved petition that has clarity and hopefully represents all the things that we have all heard.

This represents our public space that we've had open really going back to the early winter. Over 250 people came through.

Anyone and everyone that wanted a meeting, we gave them. We've worked really hard with our abutters directly and we're really pleased. I know that Saint Paul's has sent a letter of support. I don't know of any opposition from direct abutters. We've worked -- there's a letter in support from the owner of the Luna property, people who are closest to -- the Fullers who live very close are very supportive and that to me is very critical.

This is a map that just talks about housing, supply, and creation. And it really just highlights the importance of new supply really around the Central Square Overlay District which I see as kind of the core of Central Square. And it's interesting because everyone sort of agrees that there's this massive pressure on Area 4 and Cambridgeport for workers, and in the new -- in the booming

technology and biotech economy, and yet the production of housing in this core has been really amongst the smallest in the city and represents only 2.6 complete and permanent dwelling units.

And the last, you know, significant housing that I can think of goes back to the home stressed way back.

Just wanted to point out these are the properties that are owned by the partnership. This is where our public space was. The petition area is here. Again, we have not acquired any additional properties since acquiring the original Quest properties which I think has been good. We're surrounded by interesting retail and varied heights and densities, and I think it makes this really kind of Central Square-esque and we're happy with that. We focussed the petition area

where we think we can deliver the product that we think the community, you know, the majority of the community really wanted to see happen.

This just represents our petition with respect to the Central Square Overlay District. There are some pieces of these parcels that run outside the Central Square Overlay. That predates us. The Central Square Overlay District didn't take on those residential districts, the C-1 District that wraps down here. So we just, we kind of ran with the Central Square Overlay. The people have pointed out that the petition overlaps with those residential areas because the parcel spill out into those, but the majority, vast majority of the petition is within the Central Square Overlay District.

I just see this as kind of the defining

block where you have, you know, McDonald's, a continuing with retail and then it just stops and then there's a solid wall which was the Quest Labs. And this is, this to me identifies the area where we want to open up connections and get live bodies 24 hours a day with a mix of incomes and retail.

This is just the petition area, two height zones.

Area in the back that represents parking. We'll talk about that tonight. We tried to respond to some of those issues. Allows for one building at 195 and we've capped heights here at 90.

We'd like to explain this. It's an opt-in provision. If you take advantage of the additional FAR for residential, you have to comply with the affordable housing compliant. And you also have to comply with

the sustainability requirements and all of the other requirements of the Zoning. So it's really an opt-in. If you don't opt-in, you would operate under base zoning, BA, BB, and the Central Square Overlay.

I'm going to run through these quickly. I think these were posted last week. We tried to make our memo really clear and I think the Zoning is much clearer to read. To be clear about this, Article 19 is still rules. We would go through our large project review and C2, consistent with C2.

These checks, I won't repeat it, I'm going to go through the revisions that sort of line up generally with C2. We use the C2 May Zoning template and the planning study to try to understand exactly how we relate to C2, and then at the end I'll go through a few areas where we have differences.

This was an issue I think, Hugh, actually, you raised it, why do you need this extra FAR along the south side of Bishop Allen? We don't. We've removed it. It's not a focus for us and we were happy to deal with that.

And so that back area which abuts the residential district stays in accordance with Base Zoning. The height back there is 45 feet, same FAR, same Zoning. We think that's the way it should be.

Floor plate limitations. We've adopted this as the requirement of the additional upper floor height. It's one of the sort of benefits of residential when you do have height, you know, you can really bring the massing in, and I think David will try to give you some reference points for that.

Parking. We've revised our Zoning to

bring in a range. We started at 0.7. We're now at 0.5 to 0.75. We didn't have a car sharing requirement. Steve Kaiser was relentless on this and I think made us rethink this and Susan has embraced it. We're still working on this, and I know the city is working on this conceptually but we have included it.

Our original petition allowed tandem spaces. We don't need a lot of tandem spaces so we, we limited that to 25 percent of our parking just to give folks some comfort around that. And, again, consistent with C2.

This was a big issue. Even supporters of the petition said, you know, why so many middle income units which go from 80 to 120 percent median? Can you get that affordable number up which deals with the 60 to 80 percent which somebody asked me earlier,

which for a single person it's about 32,000 starting. Family of four for a three-bedroom it goes up to like 38, 39, maybe a little higher than that, but this is -- we heard that loud and clear, particularly from housing advocates, said more affordable units, more permanent subsidized units altogether. This was a big financial commitment. We did want to keep a middle income category because we all know people who go above 80 percent and then they're asked to leave the unit. We think this is important. And the City talked about it a lot in C2. So we shifted from eight and a half percent affordable to 17 percent affordable, which was a huge shift. It was, you know, 13 more units, plus seven and we kept that three percent. We've always had ten percent three bedrooms. Again, I thought

this was a strong petition when we started. We wanted to build good faith from the beginning and not wait for people to make demands. We really tried to start out on the right foot, but this think I think is very, very responsive. And 20 percent, I've been around here for a little while, I don't know of any housing development without tax subsidy or public subsidy that comes close to this number. This is privately subsidized forever running with the land and we will obviously, we will conform to our goal 11.2 in terms of placement and we will run with the City's criterion.

The City Manager last night during the budget hearing said the City is used to spending between 500 and 600,000 dollars a unit to create a permanent affordable housing unit. My guess is that that includes land

costs. We didn't use land costs because it gets -- how much you paid for land, how much you should have paid for land, that's kind of a debate that could go on forever. This is a number that we're comfortable with. People have talked about community benefits. This is it. We have tried to make this petition -- we've tried to maintain the integrity of this petition. It's not a grab bag for a bunch of different things, it's about affordable housing. And this is, this is the cost of creating these units. The middle is, is lower because you get more income for rent. It's a subsidy of \$19,237,000. 47 units, I thought of this today, I grew up with a lot of people who lived in Columbia Terrace. I know a ton of families that I went to school with and played sports with. Columbia Terrace has 42

units. Columbia Terrace has made a difference in the neighborhood for decades. We have 47 units. So it gives you a sense of the magnitude and the impact that this can have.

This is just a change. Just a big, big shift.

Retail. We really tried to line up more consistently with C2. Community Development flagged for us, we had no limitation on accessory uses. So lobbies, mechanicals. And we've had issues like this in Kendall Square where somebody says I'm going to do retail but they don't limit their accessory space and you end up with a real small retail space and a big lobby on mechanical. We think we can make this work at 30 percent, so we limited those uses. So 70 percent of the frontage has to be retail.

We exempted small retail. People have said they want more smaller spaces, so we adopted this incentive that C2 has. We've only had about 10,000 square feet of retail. So it's -- we haven't sort of overplayed this as we can solve all issues, but we think the retail space combined with the public market, the prohibition on banks, we can make a big difference. And that, along with the public connections, our new design will really show you that will connect better and more frontage with Jill Rhone Lafayette Park so we think that creates additional space there.

Sustainability. This was asked of us early on. It's a cost. It's real. And we were happy to make this commitment to LEED Gold. And Alex has a long track record on this. It's something that we're proud of and we think will help set a standard as the City

moves forward on these types of requirements.

We really have felt, regardless of how people feel, that we have hopefully broadened the conversation about inclusionary housing, sustainability, how residential development can offer benefits. Regardless of how this turns out, we think we've really helped bring that conversation and helped expand it beyond what C2 was able to accomplish which was really helpful.

Design guidelines. We've adopted the C2 design guidelines by reference. The floor plate restriction is in the Zoning as a condition of height, but we've also adopted the C2 design guidelines. That was an issue that a number of you asked about.

We have not finalized this language. Jeff Roberts early on remember looking and saying, you know, I'm concerned about sort of

memorializing the surface parking lot. We've been clear that the garage was bought and paid for. It really kind of makes this work. It allows us -- having that parking supply allows us to make this affordable contribution. But we've been pressing ourselves to deal with that surface lot. Former Mayor Simmons asked about it early on. She's here. What we've been working towards is can we get the front portion of that lot, can we get cars off of it, prohibit parking on the front portion of that lot, and get that frontage as a residential streetscape? And so we've tried to figure out at what ratio which we think is probably a 0.45 where we can, we can get cars off of that and prohibit parking and get reuse along that front edge. We're happy to talk about specific language tonight. We have some

ideas. We don't think we can do did for five years because we don't want to be a parking burden on the neighborhood. And although we're really confident about this site as it relates to transit-oriented development and we really think it's going to be a low trip in car site, we don't know yet and we just want to make sure that we're not a burden to the community at this sort of consensus in that neighborhood regardless of where you are on different issues that parking is an issue. So this is something that we're certainly willing to consider. And, again, both Jeff and Hugh Russell, we've dug into this and happy to talk about it tonight.

Differences between C2, I think people are pretty clear on this. With transfer development rights you can go from 140 to 160. We did not want to come in over 200

feet. We, we didn't want to play the game of get knocked down. We wanted to come in with a proposal that allowed us to deliver what we thought we could, and this is the height and density that makes this work. We've stretched, and there's some tension and challenges with delivering this, but we think right now we can. But this is the, you know, it's 140 to 160 and 195. Again, the heights stay the same along the neighborhood edge on the south side of Bishop Allen.

C2 Zoning went up to a 4.0, did not take away the inclusionary bump. So my math -- our math is C2 is at a 5.2. We don't own a lot of property, so we don't own a lot of that block because obviously the city lot has to go through a state law required public bid. We can't get into a negotiation or a joint venture or any of those things. That

issue is controlled by state bidding law, and it's really not something that we can really engage in. But if we had more land area, we'd have a lower FAR in the same building if people understand that math. But this is where we are. A 6.5 in a 5.2.

We didn't use transfer development rights. I get them, I think they can be helpful. I think they're also a little bit confusing to people and we just wanted to be straightforward about what we wanted to do and how we would do it.

Just as my voice is about to go, Susan Sloan-Rossiter is just going to come up and do a few minutes on traffic and parking and then David Nagahiro will get into some design.

SUSAN SLOAN-ROSSITER: Good evening.
I'm Susan Sloan-Rossiter with Vanasse, Hangen

and Brustlin, VHB. And I just wanted to go over -- I hope I'm speaking into this all right. I wanted to give you an overview of what we looked at in transportation as, you know, as part of Article 19. We will be doing a TIS and doing a full analysis. But we really were looking at -- as all of our presentations have really focussed on, we really see this as a mixed mode transportation project, and we will have a large emphasis on the utilization of transit, both the Red Line and the busses as well served. We all know the Red Line needs improvements, but as it being a major transportation mode of the City of Cambridge, I think we can expect that that will occur.

Car sharing is really important to us. Car sharing is really about people not needing to own cars. And so reducing auto

ownership, as you might suspect, don't own a car, you really do travel less and you use different modes and you change your travel behavior. So we really are having an emphasis on trying to really promote car sharing as a means to reduce just the dependence on the automobile. And of course we are, as David will probably go through, we're providing all of the required bike parking both inside and outside to meet the current Zoning requirements.

Just wanted to give you a bit of looking at the C2 analysis and using those same assumptions. How much traffic will we be generating from the vehicular standpoint? And these are the mode shares that are in the C2 study. And we use that as the basis. So currently C2 study is saying that 28 percent of people drive as residents and 39 percent

taking transit with biking and walking. These actually are a little bit dated. The new data that the City is looking at is the American survey which reduces these even further where the residential share is 20 percent for this particular area and the transit is up to 42 percent. So now what I'm going to show you is a little bit of an overstatement just based on how we do our analysis.

But as you can see, because it's a residential use, the mode shares for auto use are very low. The number of trips during the peak hours, again, is quite low for this particular type of land use. And you can see that we have a total, you know, the ins and outs are, you know, people leaving in the morning and coming back in the evening. You can see how it balances out as being more

reflective of the travel behavior. Our 35 trips in the morning leaving in the peak hour and 48 returning in the evening.

We just want to give you a little sense of well, how will that compare to office use? If there was going to be an office use on this site. And as you can see, we did the same comparison, we used the mode shares for office that we used in C2 as well, and there really is a difference in terms of the peak hour traffic. There would be more traffic generated with office during both the a.m. and p.m. peak hours.

And also from the C2 study, they did a kind of a broad brush analysis which is called a critical sums analysis versus when we do Article 19, we're going to be much more specific about the intersections and looking at their actual level of service and how they

would function. And the C2 is a broader analysis that says based on the amount of traffic at each one of these intersections, should they be able to function appropriately based on the traffic that will be going through them. And from the C2 study, they found that the -- all of the intersections that are in the Central Square area are below what they would flag as having extreme problems in the future depending on, you know, how you would need to balance the traffic within that intersection.

So we're feeling that when we go ahead and we do our fuller analysis, that we're -- because of the small amount of traffic, less amount of traffic, that we would be putting through the same sections that we would be able to manage the increase in those particular intersections.

That's it.

DAVID NAGAHIRO: Good evening. I'm David Nagahiro CBT. I'll be taking you through the design evolution, and we're excited about showing you the impacts of the evolution of the design. We've had a lot of interaction with the Community Development Department as well as the neighborhood. And a lot of it, which you'll see tonight, is a reflection of the impacts that we've seen and the things that we've discussed over that time.

The first image is an image that you've seen before. What you see in blue is the major sort of office and lab and institution as it comes to a point at the corner of Mass. and Main. And the yellow is the Area 4 and it shows the proposal that we're literally looking at setting retail and residential

edge to the Central Square neighborhood.

The next image is an image that you've seen before and we've been asked to look at heights along Central Square along Mass. Ave. and Main Street. You can see by the center of the project we have heights ranging from 90 to 180 along Mass. Ave. and University Park ranging from 100 up to 220.

These are some of the -- just as a reference to some of the C2 guiding principles, really looking at enriching the square's public realm, celebrating and maintaining the next sort of the funky cool nature of the culture district in Central Square. The diversity through more varied housing choices, as well as enriching the walkability and liveability by creating streets and green streets and creating more access choices.

This is a diagram that I'll be explaining, but to start, we really had the very productive meetings and feedback from the Community Development Department discussing how to integrate C2 and the CDD suggestions for the Zoning petition. We are showing you this, really creating a real building design, how it actually would play out. We really want to stress, though, that this is really a point of reference. We understand that this is a Zoning Petition, but we wanted to show you as sort of a real time building that we really understand the design will go through the scrutiny of the Article 19 and Special Permit design review process.

What you see up on the screen is the C2 Zoning recommendations. The massing suggestions between Mass. Ave. and Bishop

Allen. The residential at 140 with a Special Permit floor plate above 80 feet allows you to go to a 10,000 square foot smaller plate above that. But at 160 feet along Mass. Ave. (inaudible) along with that height with the transfer development heights. What you see in the red plane is a 45 degree bulk plane along Bishop Allen. So looking at the section here you see the 140, the 160, and then the bulk plane from Bishop Allen continuing up and that's where you want to have the buildings fit within.

And the next is sort of the evolution of the planning. We had started out with the sort of longer slab style building that you see in the upper left-hand corner. That's at 195 feet and that's 190 units. There's 70 feet and the 40 units along Columbia Street. Through the evolution we're looking at the

idea of moving the mass away from Lafayette Square, really maintaining that 60-foot or 70-foot podium at the base of the building and then really looking at the scaling elements on the building as well and really trying to break down the scale. Some of the impacts that we had in our conversations with the neighborhood as well as with the Community Development was the idea of the shadow impacts and we'll talk a little bit about that in just a second.

We're really looking at compacting the massing, so really pushing the massing again from Lafayette Square creating a little bit deeper. One of the impacts on this particular image when you're looking at the building from Area 4 with the Cambridgeport, it felt like a wall and we really wanted to break that scale down and that prompted the

idea of pushing building, making it slightly deeper. The other impact that it had is that it reduced the shadows on the city parking lot and I'll talk about that as well.

As we continue to evolve the plan, it was a matter of breaking down the scale, taking the area that you see here and really pushing back the base of the building, really creating more public realm on Mass. Ave. Setting back the setback that you see here, see here with these series of arrows. One was a reflection with the adjacency of the abutter increasing more scaling elements on the building itself. The curve was also a conversation that we had with Community Development of wanting to make sure that the area to the north was relegated to the back of the building, really anticipating that something would be happening on the city

block in the future and wanted to make sure that there was a series of front to the building as well.

And the point massing that you see in the bottom right-hand corner is the resultant of that.

So what you see in this diagram is really C2 massing and the massing main proposal heights. You can see we've inserted our proposal of the compacted point plan within the C2 160 massing envelope that you see in the dashed blue line here. We are showing 195 compacted plan, really avoiding the wall effect from both the Area 4 and the Cambridgeport and really reducing the shadow impact on the city parking lot as well.

You see the bulk plane of the 140 feet height, 160, and our suggestion of going to the 195. The 45 bulk plane and the building

along Columbia Street fitting within that envelope.

To speak quickly about the shadows, and I have shadow examples and shadow studies that I could show you at the end. But originally we were looking at the shadow impact on Lafayette Square. We showed it last time that no time during the year do we have any shadows on Lafayette.

The other impact was looking at the Clement Morgan Park, and we showed that only in the late winter where the shadows are very long, that we have about less than an hour of shadow on that park and as an impact. And then more recently with the reconfiguration of the building which really prompted by not only breaking down that straight wall but really reducing the shadow impacts on the city parking lot.

Looking at the ground plane, looking at the activity orienting you with Mass. Ave. and Main Street, Lafayette Square, you see the parking lot with Bishop Allen to the rear. Looking at the idea of really trying to activate as much of the ground plane along Mass. Ave. and Main Street with retail. Looking at preserving the Coolidge Place Connection here. Looking at a bike storage for about 200 bike spaces here. Really trying to minimize the impact of the residential entry sequence into the building and maximize the retail at the base.

Also looking at that slight setback that we've talked about of pushing the lower portion of the podium back to create a little bit more of a public realm plaza here at the midpoint crossing at the crosswalk and really receiving something special there. Also

looking at creating a retail on this side as well as the existing Apollo and creating a place there. So I'll talk a little bit more about the catenary lighting that we have between the two and trying to create an exterior room there.

The retail is really looking at facing Mass. Ave., Columbia, and also continuing it back to the parking lot. So we're having a front to back really trying to create more eyes and ears in these particular locations really increasing the safety and security along the parking lot.

You can see the current condition here that doesn't have that connection. And also looking at the opportunity for seasonal market and the idea of having a circulation be -- I think the idea behind the connections also is that it's sort of anticipating the

opportunity of having something on the city lot in the future.

This is just a series of comparisons, sort of before and after. This is where we have this sort of lab with the longer piece. At the mid-block crossing continuing across to this extension continuing to Lafayette Square. The new connection is the idea of coming across and now having a public realm place. So really moving that massing back. Also creating the opportunity of creating that exterior room with catenary lighting which I'll show you in another rendering in just a second. And you can see the difference between the two and improvement of the -- increasing the public realm along Mass. Avenue.

The second image is really looking at Bishop Allen looking to the south at the

previous or the slab building. And the new configuration of compacting the mass and making it a little deeper, but the idea of reducing the shadow impacts on the city parking as well as producing more sky brightness. And, again, here is the comparison.

And another view looking from Clement Morgan Park, this is the park that we showed the shadow impacts there earlier with the longer shadows reaching it from the winter. This is the massing that was previously shown, and the new massing of the compacted floor plan.

And finally just having a series of updated renderings from the site along Mass. Ave., the idea of creating a point or compact of massing setting the building back and creating that more public realm, stepping the

buildings down to the existing Apollo and then the transition to the residence along Columbia Street.

And then moving a little bit more closely, the idea of picking up on those desired lines or the (inaudible) the buildings, making those setbacks, setting the building back and changing the materials to sort of break down the scale of the massing as well the mid-block connection and really terminating it the new opportunity for a public plaza. Looking at the space between the existing building and new building and creating that exterior place.

And then finally ground plane eye level view, the idea from McDonald's all the way down to Cafe Luna creating the continuity of the retail experience, creating scaling elements like awnings that make it more

pedestrian friendly. The idea of using the catenary lighting to create that exterior room. Really creating not only a passageway between Mass. Ave. and Bishop Allen but really trying to create a public plaza in that location.

Thank you.

ATTORNEY ANTHONY GALLUCCIO:

Mr. Chair, that concludes our presentation.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay, thank you. Do Board Members have any questions at this time?

HUGH RUSSELL: On the traffic I have a question. How does that compare to what the Quest Pharmaceutical traffic or Quest Traffic would have been if they were occupied?

SUSAN SLOAN-ROSSITER: We were looking to get to see what data we could get

on their existing traffic. Their existing traffic had more trips coming and then they had a lot of activity during the day with people using their cars. And we have some information, but it's incomplete. I have to really get you a comparison in the a.m. and p.m. I don't have that to offer you today.

HUGH RUSSELL: Is it fair to say that the proposed residential use is very likely to have a lower traffic impact than the Quest.

SUSAN SLOAN-ROSSITER: Yes, because if we just took their office square footage and did it not by real data and not methodology absolutely, yes. Yes.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Anyone else have questions now?

(No Response.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: Why don't we then go to the public hearing for public comments. Is there a sign-up sheet somewhere?

So I will call the people in pairs. First person could come up and the second person could be on deck as it were. Please limit your comments to three minutes. When you come up, please give your name and address and we'll proceed from there. And if someone has not signed up, you will not be excluded from speaking. There will be an opportunity after we go through everyone on the list to see if anyone else wants to speak.

And I apologize in advance if I mangle people's names.

First person is Kasper Bejoian. And the next person would be Olivia Fiske.

KASPER BEJOIAN: Kasper,
K-a-s-p-e-r, last name Bejoian,
B-e-j-o-i-a-n. I live at 544 Huron Avenue
and I have lived in Cambridge for about 30
years. I am speaking tonight on behalf of
myself and my mother Rose and my brother
Paul, both of whom are disabled and live on
Essex Street as well. I strongly support
this Mass. and Main project, and have spoken
numerous times about the significant position
impact and it will have on the Central Square
area with its plans for public market space,
local and independent retail, no banks, and
especially its unusual high percentage of
affordable housing. Twenty percent, an
amount of which I have never, never, I must
say again, seen proposed by any private
developer in my 30 years of observing the
Cambridge development scene. But I want to

address an important issue that was brought up last night and it asked the Council where -- it was -- they said where is the beef? In other words, where is a community benefit for this proposal? And well, ladies and gentlemen, the City Council and the honorable Planning Board, I submit to you that the answer to this question is right under our noses. Last night under questioning from Mr. Carlone during the budget review on why the City doesn't spend more of its money on affordable housing, the City Manager Rossi stated an affordable unit cost the city between 500,000 and 600,000 dollars a unit. The proposal before you offers 47 affordable units and my math and Mr. Rossi's lower number, that means that the affordable component is costing Normandy and Twining, \$23.5 million. That's 500,000 times

47 units. The developer has always said we're putting everything into this affordable component that I think, you know, is 23.5 million and the City's number for a developer of this type to do this is unheard of. So, the opponents for the project, I would say there's the beef. And there seems to be a lot of it. Please vote in support of this project and let's make Central Square what is -- what it ought to be.

Thank you very much.

OLIVIA FISKE: My name is Olivia Fiske, F-i-s-k-e. I live at 131 Magazine Street and I am here to speak in favor of this project. And I can just say ditto to the man ahead of me. Okay? I have my written stuff, but he said it all. I applaud it.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Next people would be Kelly Thompson Clark and then George Metzker.

KELLY THOMPSON CLARK: Good evening, Chairman Cohen and Members of the Planning Board. My name is Kelly Thompson Clark. I'm COE of the Cambridge Chamber of Commerce. And I'm here tonight to support the petition. In order for Cambridge's business districts to stay healthy, they need to maintain and grow in a mix of residential and commercial use. This may mean increasing height and density in some places, and it's important to remain flexible as we move towards these options and provide opportunity to add units of housing. We value the C2 process planning process that involves residence and businesses to envision what's next for Central Square. It's notable that the Mass.

and Main petition follows the recommendations of the C2 study quite closely by adding units of housing, preserving some open space for public amenities, and invigorating space that are both unused and underutilized. The chamber is aware that this petition is just the start. If it is approved by the City Council, the project's proposal then comes forward and will then likely go through many iterations and changes. We urge the Planning Board to consider the net possible benefits and we urge you to give it favorable recommendation to City Council.

Thank you for your time.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Mr. Metzker?

ROBIN LAPIDUS: Not entirely.

FROM THE AUDIENCE: George, you've gotten so much better looking.

ROBIN LAPIDUS: Thank you.

FROM THE AUDIENCE: No offense, George, if you're in the back.

ROBIN LAPIDUS: I'm Robin Lapidus, L-a-p-i-d-u-s from the Central Square Business Square Association. George had to leave so if it's okay, I'd like to speak in his spot. Thank you.

We've sent a letter saying that over the past several years we have worked together in public processes, including the Red Ribbon Commission and the Kendall Square -- the Kendall Square Central Square Planning Study to determine various ways to unblock Central Square's potential through Zoning and Non-Zoning changes. Both efforts concluded that this goal could be achieved by adding a residential component above retail uses on Mass. Ave. and the first block of streets off Mass. Avenue. The Twining-Normandy petition

embodies the spirit and recommendations of the K2-C2 process of which I was a -- I'm a proud participant. And we feel that within this petition lies the potential for a real landmark building in Central Square and an opportunity to provide Central Square with improvements that are long overdue. We feel that this petition alliance with the various studies in that it offers a mix of housing with 230 residential units approximately and 47 permanent and privately subsidized affordable housing units which the city manager mentioned yesterday at the budget hearing that the city estimates 500,000 to 600,000 dollars in cost for one unit of affordable housing. So times 47 that's a hell of a lot of affordable housing that I don't know how we could otherwise afford in Central Square. And more importantly, it

puts neighbors on Mass. Ave. And I think the one thing that we all feel is that Mass. Ave. is -- Mass. Ave. and Central Square is incredibly busy, and it's a transit hub. And what people do is they transit. They don't live there. They don't sweep their front doors. They don't shovel. There are very few people that actually live and behave like neighbors in Central Square although everyone has a feeling that they know what's best for it. So it would be so nice to actually have a Central Square with people who live there and can tell you that they've done their best to improve it and to participate in what people do in a community.

We as the business association try to create community, but we're there at odd times and, you know, we don't live there. So although I think Clover maybe can say they do

because they're open 24/7.

Anyway, in addition to this, we feel like the creation of ground floor retail with a focus on affordable small footprint spaces suitable for local business in an area that has nothing; no socks, no underwear, and no opportunity to buy small things that people want affordably, is really an improvement. We also feel like having an invested property owner who we believe Normandy and Twining --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Could you wrap up your comments, please?

ROBIN LAPIDUS: I'm flying by the seat of George Metzker's pants. Yes. So anyway, to wrap that up, we do believe that they will be an invested property owner and that's really important for Central Square. So I think I'll wrap it up there.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Bill McAvinney and then Carolyn Fuller.

WILLIAM MCAVINNEY: William McAvinney, M-c-A-v-i-n-n-e-y. I live at 12 Douglass Street which is within the proposed subdistrict and we have a housing crisis. Housing crisis -- housing costs are sky rocketing and we have a climate crisis with too many people widely scattered and pouring carbon into our atmosphere. Some people believe Cambridge is such a special place that it is exempt from the laws of supply and demand. That's a very risky leap of faith to bet our future on. Change is happening in our city right now and if we don't get out in front of it, it will make Cambridge a city where only the rich and current homeowners can afford to live. I'm a firm believe in do no harm. Creating this project will not

solve Cambridge's housing crisis, even less, all of our climate crisis. What about not building it or delaying it for several years? I can't believe that won't harm Cambridge. 185 fewer market rate homes for people to live. 47 fewer affordable units. That has real impact and people's lives. Many more of my neighbors would be displaced, more cars, more carbon, as all the new lab spaces open and their employees either outbid my neighbors for their homes or commute long distances. What better place to build dense housing than in Central Square. A bustling urban center and transit hub where far fewer than us own cars than a block or two away. And what are we losing? Some of our precious green space? Neighborhood housing? No. Lab space. Lab space. How often do we get the chance to displace labs with housing? I urge

you to move forward with this Zoning change as a way of preserving more of our diversity, reducing our carbon footprint, and keeping our city a growing, a live, and welcoming place. And to be vigilant to details for making this project the best of our city.

Thank you.

CAROLYN FULLER: Carolyn Fuller, F-u-l-l-e-r C-a-r-o-l-y-n. And I do live in Central Square. I live at 12 Douglass Street in the heart of Central Square and very literally in the shadow of these proposed buildings for over 35 years. And I am here to support the Mass. and Main petition. I'm a passionate supporter of this project because I truly believe that this is an historic moment when we can either embrace, significant new housing developments in our core cities near public transportation or

continue to push development to exurbia, building ever more McMansions in our bedroom communities and putting ever more cars onto our super highways. Surely those days when the almighty car ruled the world are ending. Surely it is time to return to an earlier part in our history when industries rose in our cities, development nearby to support the housing needs for the industry workers also rose. Just as my current home served as housing for the candy factory workers of the 1800s, Mass. and Main will serve as housing for the tech workers of tomorrow. Do we want our public transit overcrowded with ever and ever higher numbers of voters, clamoring for improvements or do we want these same voters clamoring for bigger and bigger super highways? I welcome the 21st factory workers into my backyard, literally my backyard

because I want a cleaner environment for my grandchildren. I want better public transportation now, and I want fewer McMansions in suburbia.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Catherine --

FROM THE AUDIENCE: Zusy.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Zusy. And then Paul Dennis.

CATHERINE ZUSY: Okay. In short, Z-u-s-y. I support this proposal because we need more housing and especially low income units. I believe Twining Normandy have gone above and beyond to community sentiment and I'm confident that they'll do a great job.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Could we just have your address, please.

CATHERINE ZUSY: 202 Hamilton

Street.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Paul Dennis.

Deny? No?

Amanda.

FROM THE AUDIENCE: I think he's
right out here.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, while we
get him, Amanda Tramont.

AMANDA TRAMONT: T-r-a-m-o-n-t.

Good evening. My name is Amanda
Tramont and I live at Three Dana Street. I
come here tonight in support of the Mass. and
Main project. I have attended many open
houses and most of the meetings and firmly
believe this project should be approved
without further delay. We desperately need
more affordable housing in Cambridge, and
this residential, not office or lab space,
gives us a very large affordable component.

Further, it has independent and local retail and it connects Mass. Ave. back into the neighborhood instead of that awful Quest building which has become a dead zone. I have heard a lot of people talking about a master plan and the height, but I think that's just a delay tactic on their part. It's pretty easy for someone who has a home and a warm bed to sleep in at night, talk about height, master planning, and we need to study this more. But there are 47 permanently affordable housing units ready to go now. Please approve this project. It's good for the city and good for Central Square.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Is Paul around?

PAUL DENNIS: Yes.

Good evening. My name is Paul Dennis

from 156 Cherry Street, just blocks away from the proposed Mass. and Main project. It's always been clear to me that the best use for the lots purchased by the developers would be residential units. The fact is that we have seen a trend in new labs and office space while the city still shows a strong need for new units on the market. I think it's compensable by Normandy and Twining to present a petition for residential units knowing that commercial square footage can be more lucrative. Nevertheless, they are choosing to build residential. My only reservation early in the petition was the number of affordable housing units that were available and what percentage of the building was allocated to affordable housing. I must say I was not in total agreement initially, but now that the developers have listened to

the public opinion and it's clear that most of us wanted to see more affordable housing, they have done so, and as a result, we have a chance to have 47 affordable housing units available that we currently do not have, nor do we have a line of people looking to offer that amount of units at the moment nor have they in the past. The city can also look into addressing the issue proactively by possibly building its own 100 percent affordable unit projects, that way we can avoid discouraging builders who would otherwise just build labs or office space which would not help the community. You see I speak as someone who is now a single parent of a boy and a girl ages nine and six that will not be able to share a room for much longer. And this developer has incorporated three bedrooms into this project and has

shown consideration for the future of Cambridge families. I would just like to maintain my lifelong Cambridge residency for my children's sake at this point. Since we're returning back to Mass., I've been working quite hard to stay and keep my family in Cambridge. So we just want to make sure that this doesn't become a problem or a bigger problem for the crisis that we currently see. Unfortunately I'm on the Cambridge Housing Authority's waiting list for close to six years now and I was just recently notified that has been extended for an additional two years. This, while I've been working as a full-time temporary city employee that didn't really make the city's cut for inclusionary program. So it's easy to say that 40 plus units on the market aren't enough unless you're one of the people

on that list.

Have a good night.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Jeff Bagonis (phonetic) and then Jean Tanous, do you wish to speak?

And then the next one after Jeff will be Lydia Vickers.

FROM THE AUDIENCE: Sorry, Jeff Byrns, B-y-r-n-s. Seven Lawrence Street.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Seven Lawrence Street? I'm sorry.

JEFF BYRNS: I'm Jeff Byrns. I live at Seven Lawrence Street. I'm actually relatively a recent Cambridge resident. I moved here -- only been here a little shy of three years. My wife and I live on Lawrence Street. We love it here. She lived here for quite a few more years before that.

I'm very much in favor of this project.

We need housing. We need affordable housing. We need market rate housing. There are all kinds of people here. The developer has worked really, really hard to add that. In addition, this puts more housing in a place where it will be well served, right in the middle of Central Square. What better place? It's right next to the train station. All those people if they lived somewhere else in Cambridge, might have cars and drive all over the place probably won't or will be discouraged and won't drive as much even if they do have a car. So this seems like a really, really great place to build a whole lot of housing and the developers seemed to work really, really hard to do that.

Thanks very much. I hope you vote in favor of this project. Have a good night.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Lydia Vickers.

LYDIA VICKERS: I won't take very long. My name is Lydia Vickers. I'm at 45 Cherry Street, and for the most part I think I need to relinquish my turn, but what I had wanted to say was pretty much appropriate for last night's City Council meeting which I couldn't stay for very long. So the main point that I wanted to bring up at that meeting was my concern about the precedent that this project sets. Okay, it's -- the diagrams and the pictures on the screen are reasonably attractive. On the other hand, what's to stop any other developer who wants to build two and a half times the limits on the existing Zoning if this petition goes through, then it's kind of open season on Central Square which I'm very fond of. So I don't have much more to say, because what I had wanted to say was more appropriate for

last night's City Council and I will
relinquish my turn to the next person.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

David Day and then Patrick Verbeke.

PATRICK VERBEKE: If I may, I think
David had a meeting so he couldn't stay.

JOHN HAWKINSON: Is the mic on?

PATRICK VERBEKE: Here we go again.
I was saying David was sitting next to me.
My name is Patrick Verbeke. I live at 91
Sidney Street, 02139.

As a -- I'm a Central Square resident.
I spoke several times in favor of the Mass.
and Main project that offers, in my opinion,
many benefits to the Central Square community
including --

FROM THE AUDIENCE: Please speak
closer to the mic.

PATRICK VERBEKE: I'm too tall. I

went through that before. I feel like a rock star. Don't write that down.

So, you know, I mean the project -- let's be serious. So the project offers many benefits in my view to the Central Square community in general, including residential housing for a mix of incomes, including now 47 permanently affordable units, and also additional retail for local residents.

I'd like to bring another point. I think this was said very well by a number of people, but I would like to put a different perspective. Also, I think there are a lot of communities that are seeking new investment, new housing investment, and we have here, we're fortunate here in Central Square to have a great project coming from the developers, who based what I've seen so far, have listened to the community, have

made many changes, and who I believe will be great members of the Central Square community.

As you review this petition and prepare to make decision, please keep the big picture in mind. And please allow for this project to be implemented without delay.

Thank you very much.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Esther Hanig and then David Chilinski.

ESTHER HANIG: Esther, E-s-t-h-e-r H-a-n-i-g, 136 Pine Street, No. 2. I'm here to express my strong support for the Normandy Twining petition. I am particularly pleased about the increase of affordable units at 20 percent and the doubling of low income units.

JOHN HAWKINSON: Could you speak up, please?

ESTHER HANIG: Sure.

As a former member of the C2 committee, I've been waiting now for over two years to see the kind of housing development that we were seeking to realize our vision of a vibrant, sustainable, and diverse urban center. I realize that the height of this building is greater than that proposed in our recommendations. Even as we were finishing our recommendations, we had doubts that our proposed density was sufficient given housing construction costs to adequately innocent developers to build the kind of affordable housing we felt was so important. That was also, as I recall, the issue that kind of derailed C2 at the Planning Board and we are still awaiting the results of a study to for more information on that.

As a resident of Central Square for over 30 years who has cherished the diversity

and community of my neighborhood, I am watching with horror as housing prices in Cambridge continue to skyrocket at an extraordinarily rapid rate. And I see, as I see the diversity of my neighborhood decline at a similarly rapid rate. I believe that given the strong demand for housing, there is an urgent need to increase the supply. The housing units that would be provided by this proposal are sorely and desperately needed to even begin to curb the skyrocketing prices. I'm particularly pleased about the 47 affordable units that will be mixed throughout the building and the inclusion of additional family units. To retain as much diversity as possible and meet the urgent need of affordable housing, these units are a welcome addition. While I look forward to the additional housing that the city, state,

and federal funds will be able to provide for our community, I know that the financing constraints limit the number we can build. With rising costs and falling state and federal subsidies, affordable units provided by inclusionary zoning is that much more critical to help address this pressing need. This project will help to preserve some modicum of diversity in our city. It will, it will create a transit-oriented development that encourages residents to use public transportation or walk or bike because they work, play, shop, and live in the same area. It will help to create a strong enough market to sustain the kind of retail our neighborhood is looking for. For all of these reasons, I urge you to support this project.

DAVID CHILINSKI: My name is David

Chilinski. I live at One Grey Street.

Cambridge. C-h-i-l-i-n-s-k-i.

Good evening. Having lived in Cambridge and run my architectural office here in Cambridge for over 30 years, I want to speak in support of this petition that's before you this evening. I reviewed the underlying Zoning which would have allowed a very bulky, almost 100,000 square foot commercial office lab building on this site, and I think that a residential approach is actually much better for the city. As opposed to 300 workers finding their way here by train or by car from some area suburb, I think that the perhaps 300 people that will live in this building will do much more for the area merchants and restaurants who will benefit from the infusion of these new residents in Central Square. The height of

this building and the scale of it are currently not found in our square, but for this very important focal location along Mass. Ave. and Main Street I think it is an appropriate urban design move. And in the spirit of smart growth and transit-oriented development, it is in the right location. I also think that because it is near Kendall Square and MIT, where there are many jobs for folks who have the kind of incomes that will live in this particular building, I think many of these people potentially will work in Cambridge and not use the transportation. I think the unprecedented affordable approach that they have taken on this site demonstrates a clear understanding of probably the biggest challenge that the City of Cambridge is facing right now. I think it sets a tone for future developments to

consider. For these reasons, I would ask you to vote in favor of this petition.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

John Sanzone and then Emilia Ameron (phonetic).

JOHN SANZONE: John Sanzone.

J-o-h-n S-a-n-z-o-n-e and I live at 140 Memorial Drive in Cambridge.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Can you speak as close to the mic as possible?

JOHN SANZONE: Yes. How's this?

So I'm speaking in general favor of the Zoning Petition, particularly the proposed design of the structures. So first, there's the overarching responsibility of our city to build density. I think these two individuals up front said it much better than I'll be able to say it, but I'll second everything

they said.

And as far as the design and the site plan of the Main block, the Mass. and Main block, I support it on the design merits both on density and massing and its general design and use concept. Cambridge can take height in some places, a few places, and this is one of them. It can't take density. Our city can take density. But the structures that support that density, the architecture has to be well designed and has to meet its surroundings cohesively and I believe this proposal does that. The massing is cohesive and interesting and appropriate. I believe it captures the Central Square historic district and it invigorates the Central Square historic district by contributing to residents and by contributing a contemporary piece to the urban fabric.

My one criticism is around parking. I don't think that it needs any more than the 0.25. I think a regimen of car sharing, ZipCars, 15 to 20 ZipCars could serve a huge amount of the automobile needs of the population of the proposed development. I think enhancing things like Hubway and bike sharing in some way can also serve most of the rest of the ability needs of this building. And I'll take my usual opportunity to call for bike lanes on Mass. Ave. and Main Street which is a low hanging fruit which I think will obviously directly serve and enhance the residents here. And obviously the Red Line, the bus lines, and the walkability around this area need all the rest of the mobility needs. So maybe a more firm recognition of the future better uses of the surface parking lots that were purchase

as part of the Quest suite should be further explored. And, again, I don't think it needs any more than a very original maybe pre-petition 0.25 parking spaces that the petitioners had referenced earlier on. And, again, car sharing, bike sharing can serve most of that gap.

Thanks.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Emilia? While they're getting her, Marilee Meyer and then Carol Bellow. Thank you.

MARILEE MEYER: Hi, Marilee Meyer. M-a-r-i-l-e-e M-e-y-e-r, 10 Dana Street. Now for a refreshing change of pace, I'm an architectural historian and I can be for the proposal except for the height or I can be against the proposal because we do not have a Comprehensive Zoning or affordable housing

plan and the developer actually has used housing as an emotional hot button because it is. More affordable housing could be included in the developer's smaller parking lots but what we have is a luxury tower two and a half times the size of what is allowed and they're asking for a permanent legislation, not a Special Permit. It is too tall. Yes, the -- yes to residential, vital businesses, density, transportation, location, but no to the height. I find it interesting with the shots, the full context of the streetscape is not taken into account when you're presenting buildings, and the buildings look rather generic. And then when you put them into context, it's very jarring.

Cut the top off and put it in the parking lot behind. We haven't tried other ways of looking for affordable housing or

dealing with mass. The tall building of mass and prospect is an eyesore, but don't use this as a guidepost. And we will be repeated -- we will be repeating -- well, forget that. 6.5 is -- will be asked for by other developers as well. We have to watch out for that precedent. The precedent is what I'm concerned with.

Regulations and procedures in this petition are, quote, intended to provide incentives for a residential development and provide a transition between the character uses and scale of Kendall Square as well as the adjacent Cambridgeport revitalization development district and provide a transition to the abutting residential districts behind Bishop Allen Drive. It is 19 stories. There is no transition there.

It steps inside the human scale Central

Square. The neighborhood in Central Square businesses actually start in the public housing and restaurants on Main Street. Any back street will have this intrusive building blocking sky and taking parking spaces and impacting historic streetscapes. The scale is very important. I hope that the Planning Board will step back and look at the harmonious urban planning and fabric of our funky square and know that we can do better to build affordable housing without importing actually a New York kind of sensibility in being, in going taller in this way. The -- there are several different issues here and everybody is pouring everything into the same pot. There are several, you know, Zoning -- we need a comprehensive plan.

Thank you.

CAROL BELLEW: Carol Bellew.

Bellew, 257 Charles Street. Sorry if this is a repeat for everybody. I'm here to support the project that Twining has brought to the Central Square. I heard rumors that it is similar to the courthouse. I wanted to dispel those rumors. The fact is the building that Twining has in Central Square is two thirds the size of the courthouse. Twining -- well, Central Square is all housing with affordable housing being acquisitional for the affordable being added by them that they were asked in meetings before this one. Whereas the courthouse is all office except for what we need in East Cambridge got them to compromise with with four floors at the bottom of the building for housing with 24 units. Small pittance for what we were interested in having them do. But let's be clear, I'm not comparing the two

buildings in Central Square being compared to the courthouse and the debacle and the existing of that building today which is now in suit as everyone knows. I think that the Twining building is something that is desperately needed in Central Square. There is so very little housing there now to support any of the commercial and restaurants there. This would be a welcome addition to the square and give the area of businesses and retail and market to build towards in the coming years. They are offering retail on the first floor, which is what we asked all of our developers in East Cambridge to do and have it be local so that we can support others in our neighborhoods to grow here for us first. This development starts the ball rolling and moves things forward in a way that Central Square has never seen before. I

think the square deserves a good building for residential, and it can be a key building in the square for future development. If the other buildings are doing commercial and retail, than this is a welcome addition to the square.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Joseph Elder and then Barbara Rodriguez.

JOSEPH ELDER: Good evening, everybody. My name is Joseph Elder. I live at 243 Broadway. E-l-d-e-r.

I support the Mass. and Main. Yeah, Mass and Main. I support it and everything I heard actually from the first gentleman that shared about his parents living on Essex Street. I have a few relatives lived there, passed away and the location is very, you

know, that building over there is a nice looking building, but the building that the developers just showed there was amazing. You know, I lived in Cambridge my whole life and all I see is Tech Square growing into this massive technology square. I see Harvard and MIT building buildings all down Albany Street. You know, I work construction so I see, you know, this construction going on all the time. 47 units for affordable housing is the biggest thing I've ever heard in this city. I'm for it because I think the gentleman, you know, the developers, the architects, and the owners are doing the right thing for our community. The lady that just spoke before me about, you know, bringing innovation, you know, to the city, Jeff Young, superintendent brought innovation to the schools, my grandfather actually owned

a home on Magee Street and it was taken for eminent domain and now they're milling a middle school which my 12-year-old will be going to the Putnam Ave. open school soon. You know, I'm excited with the changes in the city. I can't afford to live here, you know what I mean, as far as own here, but I still, you know, have a lot of ties to the city. And I think it's a good project.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

BARBARA RODRIGUEZ: My name is Barbara Rodriguez, R-o-d-r-i-g-u-e-z. I live at 140 Columbia Street right on the other side of Harvard Street within five minute walk to Central Square. I support Mass./Main project. I think it's very exciting. There's a housing crunch on in Cambridge obviously. I've only lived here for two

years. I came from the South End of Boston. When I moved to the South End some 30-some odd years ago, it was a diverse community of many different ethnic groups and incomes and that's gone now. There's no place in the South End for people who don't have money unless they're in the long time subsidized housing. It is now a community of very wealthy people and buildings that were apartments and -- originally, at one point rooming houses are now going back to single-family houses. So I think with all of this -- all the residential units being built, proposed here and the 20 percent affordable housing, I say don't, don't waste time. Do this. I think it's so exciting and I think it will bring so much vitality to the square. It won't be just Clover that's open 24 hours a day, you know? There will be lots

of things going on. And Central Square is, am I right, the entertainment and cultural district of the city. Go for it.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Elaine DeRosa and then Councillor Carlone.

ELAINE DEROSA: Elaine DeRosa, 4 Pleasant Place, Cambridge. I'm speaking as the director of the Cambridge Economic Opportunity for Cambridge Antipoverty Community Action Agency. When this proposal was first submitted, I was quite critical of the meager affordable housing that was submitted and I joined everyone else and appreciated the change that is before you now. The other piece of it is not only that it creates an affordable housing, but it's creating affordable housing in an area where

there is soon to be an incoming gap based on the change in the way of housing is being built now using tax credits. That to be eligible to live in a tax credit building, which is basically the way that most subsidized housing is being developed because of the government's walking away from building affordable housing, is that you cannot have income over 60 percent. So this 50 to 80 percent number of units that will be built here is really critical because this is the gap that will be created for people who are struggling to stay in the city when their incomes start to go up a little bit, and clearly affordable housing has been CEOC's major focus of preservation and construction. So I think the ability to create these units is really critical to the city and the need that we have here.

So thank you.

COUNCILLOR DENNIS CARLONE: I just want to hand out something. So, Dennis Carlone, Nine Washington Avenue, apartment 6. There's no question in that this project has improved over time and I think that's great. That's what's supposed to happen and hopefully will continue to happen when it's before the Planning Board.

A couple of things I wanted to mention. One of the reasons why this affordable housing number is such a key and important issue is the City has zero dollars in the city budget every year for affordable housing, and I ask the Planning Board to consider that. And the City of Boston has had a good number in there for ten years. Now we have other programs, CPA and others, but so does the City of Boston. We are --

the City itself is not helping the problem. Yes, we are doing a lot and we -- maybe we're doing more than any other city of 107,000, but the need is great. You probably all know about the Barry Bluestone findings, that we need about half of new construction to be affordable housing to make up the difference. Half.

New York City now has a policy, it's half. And they look at the public ownership of land next to private, and that's the drawing I gave you in front of you. And that drawing I presented to an Ordinance meeting, there was absolutely no discussion of it and -- but basically what that is is it says the city parking lot becomes open space. And I believe it was -- oh, I have the number in front of me. 51 units of affordable housing, two and three bedrooms. And then stretching

that and saying what should Bishop Allen be? And I was pleased to hear Anthony to mention that they're looking at their parking, lot perhaps the front of it is housing. The goal of urban design is always to complete streets, to make streets healthy. Any new construction should be additives so that all the pieces come together. Well, that tells me that the city, we need to do that kind of sketch on any large project. What are the adjacent sites? What are the opportunities? The city has talked about putting affordable housing open space on the parking lots. Yes, the cost would be to put parking below grade to replace it. It's true. But given the price of land, that's a reasonable deal. The price of land is zero if you own it and then the cost becomes the parking structure below.

So, 80/20. I'm going to go off topic,

but it's all related. 80/20 is not enough. Economists tell us. Yes, the developers propose 20 percent and they should be saluted. They're being saluted by 93,000 extra square feet and nine floors of height. And in fact, if you look at the height two and a half times, it's even more than that what was misquoted tonight is Councillor Reeves, former Mayor Reeves said, You're giving a way a lot. Are you getting enough?

Now, if you look at this Zoning and say the base zone is three, which it is existing, they're asking for three and a half bonus on top of that for additional units, but that's a huge difference. Now, if you go back just to the C2 recommendations, and I had problems with the heights of C2, 120, 140, but I won't go into that tonight. I'm happy to explain that another time on economics, but if you

look at the C2 Zoning, the base of three and you added 2.2, I believe it is -- to 5.2, do all the numbers, and you take out the amount of units -- sorry, the square footage per unit which is what the petition does, 29.6 percent of the units should be affordable. That's using the City formulas, the City Zoning. It's just working the numbers like the developers have only from another point of view, and that's affordable housing.

This developer owns numerous parking lots. You've not seen any recommendations on adjoining properties. I think that should be almost a requirement if -- especially in a major upzoning.

What's happening on the other sites? Are you coming in for a 6.5 there? The rationale is it's already been approved on one side and guess what, we own these other

sites as well.

Sorry, this is all over the place.

The thing that bothers me the most is land value. We talk about we can't afford -- we don't have enough money in the city to buy land. Well, we're raising the land value here enormously to substantiate, yes, the 20 odd million in affordable housing, but the very high land cost price. That raises the land value everywhere because then the goal is if they've got 6.5, I can get 6.5. I think that's counterproductive. I also think there's an offshoot of that right off Columbia Street that's going to affect the price of housing. That's one of the few quarters where there's low income rental property prices that exist in houses.

So we have Inclusionary Zoning coming up, Incentive Zoning coming up. I think we

have to get a budget to represent that -- as you probably know, in the city survey this was the number one issue mentioned. I believe it was nine times more -- maybe it's four and a half times more than taxes were mentioned. We now downright the lowest tax rate in the state even further, and that money could go to this.

My point is the City can do more and then they're not subject to this kind of upzoning. And now the city staff has said that it's only three or four other sites that this will happen. In fact, there are many more sites than that. Historic support buildings are not off limits to developers. The precedent honestly -- and this is, forget about the design. It's just the Zoning precedent. It's highest, the largest Zoning increase that I know of in the City, ever,

and you have to really study that.

Now on top of that there's no comprehensive housing plan. There's no adopted plan for Central Square. And we've talked about this the other night with the master plan study. The economic analysis of Central Square somehow was stopped. We cannot figure out what happened. And I don't know if you've gotten any economic analysis. I know a few of you know numbers extremely well, but to me this is all questions up in the air.

Now, this is a plot-by-plot Zoning. The only extra height is on their land. And the abutting properties on Columbia and Douglass, I believe, go to a 6.5 FAR as well. I'm not even sure, I'll be honest with that. But I believe that's the case. And right next to it we have very, very different

Zoning.

So my fear is that this will open the door as has been mentioned to increase Zoning elsewhere, and certain councillors, my colleagues, have said oh, we won't accept it there. Well, that is a way of saying something was spot zoning if you don't accept it elsewhere. If people come in with the same petition, you're going to have this throughout the square. But it's not even the square, it's going everywhere because it isn't just particular to Central Square. It's particular to a business district or a high density residential district.

There was a phase of towers in Cambridge and in America in the 1960s and 70s, and just like modernism that's come back so has this element come back, but -- and the rationale is the land value. So much we have

to support it with extra increased density. I get that, but you can do everything possible to make it fit in. I believe in a principal called relativity, but not the one you normally think of, and that is the bigger the project, the more important the character, the design review, the quality of materials, the profile, all the elements that are urban design in architecture. This is the biggest project. It should be subject to the highest standards, not some of the -- like some of the other buildings that have been built recently in Central Square.

So I believe that's all I -- I must conclude by saying that there's no question this project has gotten better. It's gotten better because of your input. It's gotten better because of public input, and I appreciate that. But 195 feet, the average

building in Central Square is five stories. The Zoning is 55 feet going to 80 feet. 195 feet. It just seems like another world.

And my last comment is, Moshofsky (phonetic) and Cohen Development came in in East Cambridge and wanted to come in and build a 240-foot tower in East Cambridge. That was an 120 foot high zone max. It was a PUD. I can't remember what the base was. And the Planning Board laughed. And I don't expect you to do that. I don't expect you to laugh, but the point is what is Zoning? Yes, you can improve it, but do you dramatically make it night and day? I just don't understand that. So my concerns are not building oriented except for the height, except for looking at what can happen in the parking lot and making sure the new building -- and I know there's going to be a

new building there. It can happen in a way that integrates with the neighborhood behind it, and I mean the parking lot in particular, whether it's open space or all affordable housing.

And lastly, labs. Industry, as you know, one of the reasons Zoning came about was to keep the piggeries away in Cambridge yet from residences, and then it was from industry away from residences. Noisy industry, very light polluted industry, and air polluted industry. Well, labs have some of those characteristics and I firmly believe labs do not belong near residential areas period. It only causes problems and litigation after the fact. And you've heard people say, you know, we got to build this or it will be a lab. I think that's -- I hope you look at that because we're certainly --

I'm certainly going to raise it with the Council. Of course I tried once before. And this is a broader issue. It isn't just this site. It is what is Central Square, what is development in Cambridge? It's very complex.

Thank you for your time.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

I'm sorry, I can't -- Pat at 239 Broad Street.

FROM THE AUDIENCE: Jean Patrick at 249 Broadway?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Maybe.

PATRICK BARRETT: I'm a lawyer I can't write. Hello, my name is Patrick Barrett. I live at 234 Broad Street. It's Broadway. Just kidding. I was on the C2 board that put together the C2 recommendations. I'm also an abutter at 897-907 Broad Street to this project. I've

written you all before. I've been here a thousand times. I may not be saying anything any of you haven't already heard a thousand times already.

I am going to say something a little bit new. I have this in my hand from the person who just spoke, Councillor Dennis Carlone. Using city land, land that he does not own, putting three units above a garage, and 22 affordable units on a piece of land that is zoned BA. 1.75 FAR, which based on its current design could not support 22 units let alone the probably the six or seven you could build on it based on the current standards that you have. I look at this as a piece of science fiction. And a piece of science fiction that's been pushed into the conversation to derail very valid Zoning conversation that's been taking place for the

past two years. That's actually not fair. The passed couple decades for Central Square. And it's not fair because he sells this to population that would like to believe in this, but this is a lie. This is a total fiction.

So we have a plan and it's called C2. I remember Iram Farooq had told me that initially when we started that process was to get ahead of development. And that's what we tried to do, was get ahead of the development. And during the entire process we'll be (inaudible) with tractors. Councillor Carlone before he became Councillor Carlone, and we were completely taken off the course. I mean you talk about how Zoning is used to stop piggeries from being put next to housing and residential, you know, that's originally why Zoning was

created. But now Zoning is used so people who don't like something can stop their neighbor from doing something else.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Mr. Barrett, could you limit your remarks to this particular proposal?

PATRICK BARRETT: I am going to. I'm sorry.

So --

FROM THE AUDIENCE: Thank you.

PATRICK BARRETT: You're welcome.

I'm for this project. I'm for the redevelopment of Central Square because Central Square needs it. Needs it terribly. And I see this as the beginning and not the end. I see this as a project that will lead to other projects, that will lead to good Zoning, that will lead to redevelopment of the entire area. And while it's not what I

wanted, that's the point I was trying to make, it's not the original Zoning that we tried to set out on. The path is that we must take because the alternative is nothing to sit around and to wait for a plan that is based on nothing.

So, one other point, the developer's offering 47 affordable units. I have worked in real estate since I was kid. I worked all over Boston, Jamaica Plain, I know it inside and out, from buildings to development to managing to being a baby-sitter for Harvard and MIT kids. And if you can find a 47-unit brand new building with parking in Cambridge for less than \$30 million, I will buy it today. There is \$30 million on the table. I've heard people, particularly Councillor Reeves, people talk about the community amenities and benefits. Find me a project

that's putting 30 million on the table.
There is none. So while you guys have the horrible position of looking at this Zoning which is not what we wanted, I ask you to look at it as the beginning of something we can all work to make better and not something that we have to look at as spot zoning which you guys know it's not. I don't need a legal degree to tell you that. Something that's going to benefit Central Square and because we need the benefit. So, I'm an abutter. I don't look forward to my building being shaken apart by crazy Alex Twining and his cranes, but I welcome him and I hope you guys do, too.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Lee Farris and then Heather Hoffman.

LEE FARRIS: My name is Lee, L-e-e

Farris, F-a-r-r-i-s, 269 Norfolk Street.

So for those who attended Council last night, last night I followed Ken Reeves and now I follow Patrick Barrett. It's quite interesting.

So as Councillor Carlone mentioned, former Mayor Ken Reeves said we should be getting more from this project. What I'm requesting the Planning Board do is that you vote negatively on the Normandy upzoning petition and I hope that then the City Council will let the petition expire and then some more work could be done and it could then come back. As some people have mentioned, this FAR is among the densest in the city, and I don't think it has an adequate benefit for the residents. It's not appropriate and it's not in scale at this location. And as has been mentioned, C2

draft zoning called for much lower FAR and for a much lower height. So I asked Jeff Roberts for a comparable FAR, and he said that the closest example would be the 100 Lansdowne Street, residential highrise in University Park and that site has an FAR of about 6.5, but the overall FAR across University Park is less than 2.5. So I'm concerned that this extreme FAR would set a precedent and would encourage other developers to ask for their own custom upzoning. I don't think that this project provides enough affordable housing given the really extreme height and FAR, although I'm pleased that the amount has increased. And just as a point of fact, it's my understanding that there are private developers operating in Cambridge, such as Alexandria, which have provided much more

affordable housing than is proposed here. I believe they proposed roughly in the area of 35 percent of low, moderate, and middle income housing. And I don't like that this project still relies -- or this upzoning still relies on a permanent surface parking lot which C2 sought to avoid. And ideally I'd like us to work on planning Central Square first and I'd like us to try to create something that utilizes the city parking lot 6P. I'd also like that if this petition goes forward, I'd like to see that all of the 23 -- roughly 23, three-bedroom apartments would be required to be affordable. Otherwise I think they'll just be likely filled up with young single roommates and they won't accomplish what the neighborhood wants to have accomplished with the larger apartments. And I'd also like the petition to require, if

it goes forward, that the developer cannot come back and ask for more density on any of their other lots that are outside of the petition for some amount of time, at least ten years if not more.

Thank you. I hope you will vote negatively on this petition as it currently is.

Thank you.

HEATHER HOFFMAN: Hello. My name is Heather Hoffman. I live at 213 Hurley Street and Lee is correct, that Alexandria is in fact providing far more affordable housing in the housing that it's developing in East Cambridge. It's not comparable to this because that's part of an entire much larger development. It's not one building. However, as people have pointed out, this isn't the only piece that this developer owns

in the area. So you might think about this in the context of something larger and whether we can get more because this is part of something larger. Alexandria is losing money on the housing that it's building in East Cambridge. That was part of the community benefit. They were going to provide no housing whatsoever. That changed because residents asked and they listened. The affordable housing is there because residents asked and they listened. The moderate income housing -- the middle income housing that Alexandria is providing is there because City Councillors asked and they listened. And I was so thrilled to hear Ken Reeves last night. As I said, last night it's nice to know he's been listening to me all of these years, because he finally figured out that we deserve a lot because we

are giving a whole lot. We deserve excellent architecture. We deserve to have this, whatever they build, and the architecture isn't before us now, it's a Zoning petition. They could sell -- they could sell all of this and the Zoning the day after it passes and we'd get somebody else. So you better be darn sure that there are design guidelines that will get us the beautiful architecture, the affordable retail, and all of the other things that we should be getting for giving them this immense, immense gift because we deserve that. And if they -- if you want to call their bluff and say fine, build a 55-foot lab building, go to town. We won't give you a Special Permit to go higher, fine. Because I think that we deserve great. We don't deserve passable.

Thanks.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Mark Boyes-Watson and then Steve Kaiser.

MARK BOYES-WATSON: Good evening.

Mark Boyes-Watson, 100 Pacific Street which is a few blocks south of the project. I'm speaking today to urge you to recommend passage of Mass. and Main Zoning petition. It proposes sorely needed housing in a location well suited to it. Having had the pleasure of presenting an idea for an urban square in Central Square to the Red Ribbon Commission on the delights and concerns of Central Square, and then having served as the member of the C2 Committee for the K2-C2 Study, I'm familiar with the challenges and the opportunities that development in and around the square bring. And with the ideas and aspirations that came out of the long

committee and community process and CDD's subsequent report, I think there is a sense in the community that the challenge of escalating housing costs is an inseparable problem. As many of you know, I've worked as an architect here in Cambridge for about 30 years, focussed more or less entirely on building housing in Cambridge. From this experience I can reinforce something that I think you already are well aware of, and that is that it is hard, very hard to obtain permits to build housing. In my opinion, it's too hard. And in fact, so hard that despite the will to invest in housing in the city, not enough housing is being permitted and built here especially in the city core. The result of this means that we have a throttle supply that the well-to-do moderate income and low income folk all are competing

that is limited in a way too static resource. This is only, as some would have it, just a problem of building enough affordable housing. This is a problem of permitting not enough housing period. Every new unit of housing takes pressure off the existing housing stock. It's very expensive to build so the new housing is indeed expensive, but every permitted unit relieves pressure on the existing housing stock. So I believe it's a false choice between new luxury housing and new affordable housing. They both improve housing affordability.

This proposal has both a substantial amount of affordable units and it is consistent with the goals established in the C2 -- I agree with Anthony. It would be a small step in increasing housing production to recommend to the Council to advance the

Mass. and Main petition and permit, permit proposed housing to be built. It's my hope that as soon as this passes, that we and you can move on to addressing the issues of quality of life and housing affordability that would come out of the broad new Zoning suggested by the C2 process. It's disingenuous, I believe, to suggest that we are powerless to slow the rise of housing costs in Cambridge. Those who have control can and should slow the rise in housing costs by permitting more housing to be built. I see this petition both as an affirmation and a critique -- I'll wrap up -- of the C2 process. Ten years on and I'm still dreaming of an urban square in Central Square. Hopefully this project will expedite the review of the city parking lots and their incorporation into 21st planning for Central

Square. Meanwhile I hope you vote to recommend this Zoning Petition and thanks for your service and thanks for letting me speak.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

STEVE KAISER: My name is Steve Kaiser. I live at 191 Hamilton Street and I have submitted an alternative Zoning Petition. It is late. I got my copy of the developer's petition last Thursday, and I got my version in as soon as I could which was Monday, yesterday.

There are some differences. I put a definitions in the section up front and that allowed me to simplify the language in the rest of the petition. So I was able to reduce the length of it considerably. But here are the interesting similarities. For this project I kept the 230 units that are proposed. I kept the 47 subsidized units

that are proposed, and made no mention of the 6.5 FAR. Let me explain how I did that.

I wrote into my petition a common procedure, which is when you calculate the FAR for a project, you include the building and its parking on all the parcel, the entirety of the parcel. So that when you include the parking garage and the parking lot at No. 65 Bishop Allen Drive, you end up with an FAR of 3.7 which is entirely within existing Zoning. They don't need the 6.5. They don't need it. Cross it out.

Now what happens, the difference here is this incredible bonus here for that, they're proposing a 3.5 and that's composed of a 11, 200 section bonus of 0.9 plus the number 2.6 that gives you 3.5. A 3.5 FAR bonus for a site with an allowed FAR of 3.0, a base FAR of three, that's the extraordinary

give away. That's the extraordinary give away.

So here's the interesting question: Suppose you were to do this fairly, which I gave away, you got back in terms of units consistent with 11, 200 with the affordable housing provisions. You end up with a need for 110 subsidized units, not 47, 110. That's the penalty of the FAR of 6.5. Now, they don't want to do the 110 units. Then don't do the FAR of 6.5. Go with the project as proposed.

And just very quickly, there's one other thing that I think would be valuable here is the cautionary provision. I'm in agreement with all of it except there's a limit. They have a minimum and a maximum. The minimum is two parking spaces for this project, and the maximum is about seven. And

why is that maximum set so low? I think it will -- should be satisfying 20. So that you could really get a substantial chunk of parking as shared parking which reduces the demand, the provision for parking generally on-site, and you can build housing instead and that reduces your FAR even more.

So those are the two thoughts that I would really leave with you which is take away that low maximum on the car sharing and get rid of the 6.5. It's unnecessary. We don't need it.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Pam Ross and then Leonard Harry.

PAM ROSS: Hi, my name is Pam Ross. I live at 67 Highland Avenue. I'm in favor of Mass. and Main. I think the builders and the people involved are interested in what

Cambridge wants and everything we've asked them for. We don't want any more banks. They're on every street corner, you know, right next to each other. They're trying to get our business. What do we -- what do we need those banks for? And we've got -- if you go to Harvard Square, we could have all the chain stores we want. We want local stores, and they have offered to give them to us. They've offered us more moderately priced units, which is good because I don't know about anybody else here, but if I had to buy where I live today, I would not be living in Cambridge. Everything is more and more expensive. And -- but we all want to live here because this is a great place to live. We're -- if we want to go into Boston, we want to go to Fenway Park, we can walk there, ride there, we can take the bus there. We

can take the subway there. This is a great place to live and lots of people want to live here. And this is our first big attempt to build housing in Central Square. And I'll tell you as a person whose lived here since 1977, and I used to work at Harvard Law School in the library, when I'd come down to Central Square, I noticed that when the economic problems happened, Central Square seemed to suffer the worst. Maybe that's because you know Harvard, I used to spend a lot of time in Harvard Square and, you know, it doesn't really suffer. But if a lot of people are living here all the time, this area won't suffer as much. It won't lose, you know, stores and close down. It will have community going out there everyday to buy something and that's what we need. We need more people here to build our community,

to make it better, and to make us stronger. And if we don't like the fact that we're building such a big building, then start making this process work. Don't let, you know, somebody else decide. Come here, make this -- these people do what we want, and then after it's completed, learn from that experience to make other builders who come here and will come here. You know they're going to come here. Everybody wants to come here. Isn't this the greatest place to live? Anyway, so everybody wants to come here so we should be prepared and this is -- this is our learning curve. I'm in favor of it. I think they're doing a good job of listening to us and that's -- let's hope that this will pass.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Mr. Array (phonetic) or Arrax (phonetic)?

No.

Is there anyone else who wishes to speak?

NANCY RYAN: Good evening. My name is Nancy Ryan and I live at Four Ashburton Place in Central Square. I didn't sign up because I wasn't sure I needed to speak, but there are just a couple of things I like to reference.

The woman who spoke from the South End she was driven out the South End essentially because of all of the high luxury housing and the retail that goes with it that came into the South End. So now she's on Columbia and Harvard and hoping that this project will somehow bring some relief. I think it will bring the same that came into the South End. Regarding C2, I've been waiting, we've all been waiting for a couple of years for a

serious thoughtful conversation about C2. Is 140 high enough or too high? Is 160 high enough or too high for Central Square? And what about the density? We haven't had the discussion. And we haven't had it here and we certainly have had it at City Council.

I'm interested in one thing. I'm interested that the proponents are using 160 as their measure for comparing 160 to 195 when 160 is what you get with transfer of development rights and they state explicitly they're not using transfer of development rights. So 140 is the standard if they want to be loyal to the C2 standards that exists even though it hasn't been passed and that creates a significant difference between that height and the height that is proposed. The neighborhood edge, this destroys the concept of neighborhood edge that is a big deal in

C2. They have three subdistricts, one is the neighborhood edge. I live a block and a half from the surface parking lot that has -- that's about to be looks like zoned into a permanent parking lot. And this five year business, I don't trust it. We all remember when Forest City was building the lab over there, they were saying we don't have to build any housing, gosh, we've got all this housing we built a number of years ago and somehow everybody felt, and including Community Development, forgot that that housing was about to expire. Well, in five years will anybody remember well maybe we were going to sort of do something with that parking lot so that it might actually turn into some housing? I can't imagine that you guys as planners are going to support planning in and zoning a surface parking lot

into the neighborhood edge in Central Square. So I think that's all I have to say. I'm really, really hoping for a serious discussion about the meaning of the design and the massing and the density of this building on this plot at this time in Central Square with no other planning apparently going on. So I'm looking forward to what you have to say.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

PHYLLIS BRETHOLTZ: My name is Phyllis Bretholtz, B-r-e-t-h-o-l-t-z. I did actually sign up on something so I don't know if there's somebody else who has already also signed up. Am I the only one on that sheet? Oh, okay. I'm at 65 Antrim Street.

I actually had submitted a letter and left copies. I sent copies to Mr. Roberts.

H. THEODORE COHEN: We have received your letter.

PHYLLIS BRETHOLTZ: Good.

So I don't feel the need really to read it, but I want to at this point actually speak to a few of the comments that have been made this evening that I don't think I stressed in the same way in the letter. So, one concern -- let me begin by saying that I'm very concerned about the issue of affordable housing and I really appreciate the changes that have been made in the Twining and Normandy project. However, as a photographer as well as a community activist who has walked the length of Mass. Ave. from Vassar and Albany Streets all the way up to the center of Central Square photographing every single building in sight. There is not a single building, including the Novartis

building that exceeds nine stories. So my major concern about this project, and therefore, I am opposed to granting a variance that would allow a 19 or as Anthony has corrected me, an 18-story building at this location. I'm very much opposed to that.

I don't hear any talking about holding MIT accountable for building enough housing for their graduate students which would reduce the number of people coming into Central Square looking for housing. Many of the people who -- the question of affordability is highly flexible. I don't know that anybody has determined what affordability means or what moderate income means. But certainly many of the units that might be appealing to people who are part coming in for the innovation hub. I'm

assuming will be relatively, however, that gets defined young people. And what would be completely appropriate for young people who are at the height of their careers is that they would be invested in their careers and not in participating in the active life of Cambridge. And I say that as somebody who taught at the high school for 30 years, and during that time I was not very actively involved as I am now, because I was completely immersed in my work. So I think it's totally appropriate that the young people would be appropriately focussed there.

There's been talk about this as a transportation hub. I think the Red Line has shown itself to be dysfunctional. And the last thing I want to say is that it has taken us two years at least to get to this point where we have a building that many of us

think is much more interesting and acceptable and it does not make me feel very trusting of the initial designs and the process that it has taken two years to get to this point. So I want to know where are the heads of the people who made the original designs? They're not living here in Cambridge.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Can you wrap up, please?

PHYLLIS BRETHOLTZ: Yep. It's a question of trust.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Is there anyone else who wishes to speak?

MICHA SCHATTNER: Yes, please.

Micha Schattner, Lexington Avenue. My point is again the FAR of --

H. THEODORE COHEN: Please state your name and address.

MICHA SCHATTNER: Micha Schattner, Lexington Avenue, 198.

FROM THE AUDIENCE: Speak up.

JOHN HAWKINSON: Is the green light on?

MICHA SCHATTNER: Yes, it is. My point is mainly the high density and the height. And the nearest points I can think about is parking lot No. 6 at the back side of that parking lot. If that thing, if that thing is a proved the way it is, the city would not be able to develop the parking lot for any further use because nobody will be able to purchase it unless they would be already promised guaranteed FAR of close to five. And this is just the beginning of a trend that is simply out of place, out of

scale of the rest of the C2 density designations.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Anyone else wish to speak?

(No Response.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: All right, fine, Charles? Sorry. You have to speak up.

CHARLES TEAGUE: I'm just trying not to repeat anybody.

Thank you. Charles Teague, 23 Edmunds Street. I'm going to -- I have three reasons to ask the Council to do better than this amendment, simply it's too tall and you all know that. And it's also too small. And a bigger development area is gonna get us way more housing of all kinds. So all of Central needs to be done together. You all know that. And it blocks everything that requires

a large area such as garage parking or bus terminal. So people have mentioned precedent. I have a conceptual question based upon the Board comments at the -- when we discussed them at the process at the Planning Board and Hugh Russell says the Planning Board doesn't plan, the city staff does, and Ms. Connolly said discussing Special Permits that Zoning should not be revisited project by project. And so how does the Planning Board deal with the single developer planning and rezoning a single block? And, you know, and so that goes -- what is the precedent? What are we doing here? And that's asked in good faith really.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Anyone else?

(No Response.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: Fine, we will take a five minute break and then the board will come back and discuss what we've heard this evening and in our prior hearings.

(A short recess was taken.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay, we're ready to continue. If everyone could sit down, please.

Before we start our deliberations, we've received a memo from staff and I was wondering does anybody have any questions for staff before we start or if, Jeff, you or Iram wanted to give us a quick overview of some of the issues that you were addressing in the memo.

JEFF ROBERTS: Sure. Jeff Roberts. I'll give a brief overview of what's in the memo and if there are any questions Suzannah Bigolin who did much of the work on the memo,

along with myself, can try to answer those questions.

So the attempt here was to do two basic things: One was to respond to some of the comments and questions raised at the last Planning Board hearing when this was open on February 24th.

And then the second piece was to try to respond to some of the changes that had been made through the continuing process since that time through discussions with the Ordinance Committee and work with staff. So the first piece of it we started by just giving an overview of what the Central Square Zoning recommendations were. We try to do that in a very brief way and we can certainly go into some more detail if needed.

The second piece the Planning Board asked about at the last hearing about how

does this particular area fit into a somewhat larger context of the sort of surrounding blocks and so we took some of the information. We actually done this sort of exercise as part of the Central Square study where we looked at what the existing land uses are. We looked at things like historic protections on buildings, different or different levels of historic interests to buildings in the area. And we looked at the -- just the -- what existing buildings were there. What existing density was existing on the site. And so we, for the area around Mass. and Main we pulled some of that information together and did a little summary of it. And I think the -- one of the major takeaway conclusions is that there are a lot of sites in this area that we wouldn't expect to undergo any significant change based on

just the value of what's existing there or in some cases based on the fact that the site might be difficult to redevelop based on the size or the current use. But we also identified that the -- this Quest portfolio is a relatively unique opportunity given the circumstances of the site, and along with those the -- and the surface parking areas, those are the sites that we would imagine that would be undergoing change in the future, and those are the sites that are really the Central Square recommendations as they apply to redevelopment. That that's where those recommendations would apply the most.

We also looked as part of this, as an intriguing question, I think was raised by the Planning Board the last time about well, how does this proposed increase in density

compare to how a transferred development right kind of regime would play out. And we did look at that question by taking the Quest portfolio and looking at what the allowed density would be under the Central Square recommendations as well as the recommended Zoning as well as the proposed Zoning in this Mass. and Main petition. We found that the allowed density in that area north of Bishop Allen Drive, if it were transferred on to the site closer to Mass. Ave., would result in about a comparable density to what's being proposed here. So that's one aspect of that question. But then the other aspect of the question about transfer development rights is that you're hoping to place density on the receiving lot where it's more appropriate, but also to achieve some benefit on the donating sites as well. And I think the

Planning Board raised and the petitioner's comments had been on what thinking might be done on what the future holds for those, for those sites that are north of Bishop Allen Drive and some ways that they could be thought about. There hasn't been a lot of detail proposed at this point but certainly that's been a topic of conversation.

So the second piece of the memo is comments on the Zoning text revisions. The petitioner explained many of the substantial changes that have been made which aim to bring the proposal into greater alignment with the recommendations of the Central Square Zoning -- study recommendations. There are some aspects where it remains different and the petitioner has explained those as well. The -- in terms of the Zoning text itself, I think in the initial proposal

there were certain technical aspects of the Zoning language that seem somewhat vague and in some cases not entirely consistent with the languages used elsewhere in the Zoning Ordinance and the changes have improved that. I think there were some aspects where the language maybe is still a bit more confusing than it needs to be, but it's -- I think that it reads clearly enough that it can be applied in a straightforward way if it were adopted.

And then the final piece, while we felt it was a positive move to reference the Central Square urban design guidelines, we also felt that since the Central Square design guidelines don't address heights above 140, 160 -- 140 feet, 160 feet. It was important to incorporate some considerations that the Planning Board would look at in

project review for heights at that level. I think a lot of what's reflected in our memo is represented somewhat in the design alternative that's been proposed by the petitioner, but we did feel it was important to have those considerations reflected as guidelines explicitly so that, so that they continue to be considerations that are carried forward in association with the Zoning. So that would -- may be longer than it needed to be, but I'm happy to answer questions and Suzannah as well.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Before we get into questions, Jeff, could you also explain where we are with regard to the timing of this petition?

JEFF ROBERTS: This petition, the 90-day expiration period for final action comes up, I believe, on May 27th. And so the

City Council will have to act on it before that point. And I believe there are only two or three City Council meetings scheduled for the month of May. So it, it's on a fairly close time frame at this point if the City Council were going to act within the statutory 90-day period.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And can that period be extended?

JEFF ROBERTS: It can't be extended. But the process would only continue if the City Council chose to refer it back for more public hearings, which would then require it to come back to the Planning Board and the Ordinance Committee.

H. THEODORE COHEN: It would be a re-filing?

JEFF ROBERTS: It essentially would be a re-filing and another 90-day period

would start.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And the period that they -- City Council has to wait until they get a recommendation or failure of a recommendation from the Planning Board is that already expired?

JEFF ROBERTS: Yes, that's 21 days after the Planning Board initial hearing. And so that took place on February 24th. So the Council is free to act with or without a Planning Board recommendation at this point.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

JOHN HAWKINSON: Can I just briefly -- the Council advertising won't be done until May --

H. THEODORE COHEN: No, please.

JOHN HAWKINSON: Okay.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay, does anyone have any questions for Jeff?

Does anyone on staff?

(No Response.)

STEVEN COHEN: Just one detail.

Jeff, we talked about affordable Zoning.

What is the median income that we're using as a reference point here; 60 to 180, 80 to 120?

JEFF ROBERTS: I will try to pull that up for you because I don't know it offhand. It's -- the income limits are based on our --

ATTORNEY ANTHONY GALLUCCIO: That might be helpful.

STEVEN COHEN: Anthony, is it the median of the City of the Boston area, of the state?

IRAM FAROOQ: It's the -- yes, it's the -- Boston, essentially the region.

STEVEN COHEN: The MS whatever it is, yeah?

JEFF ROBERTS: So according to, according to information that we currently have on our website, which I hope is up to date, median income for a one person household is 69,000. Median for two person household is 78,800. For three persons 88,700. And for a four person household is 98,500.

ATTORNEY ANTHONY GALLUCCIO: Jeff, I think that's the middle that you're reading.

JEFF ROBERTS: That's the median income which is 100 percent of the actual median household so half the households are lower than that. And then the income limits are based on -- so the income limits are based on a -- so for instance, middle income would be 80 percent to 120 percent of that, of that median. So the range, let's say, for a -- for a three-person household would be

between 70,960 and 106,040 for 140.

ATTORNEY ANTHONY GALLUCCIO:

Mr. Chair, just to review. You have to factor bedroom and number of people in the dwelling unit, though. So I mean for a studio one person, 50 percent of median -- this may be a little outdated, is 32,000. And then for a one bedroom with two people, it's 37. And a two bedroom with three people, it's 42. That's at 50 percent of median that as Jeff indicates the target for the Article 11.2, which we're referencing and conforming to is 65 percent of median. So the target is to be in the middle of 55 and 80. You're eligible at 50, and you're not eligible above 80 for the 17 percent. And then we have three percent middle which is higher incomes.

Sorry to -- you want this back?

STEVEN COHEN: Yes. Would you like me to make you a copy?

ATTORNEY ANTHONY GALLUCCIO: No, that's okay.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Would anyone like to kick off the discussion?

TOM SIENIEWICZ: I have a question.

Jeff, actually a question. A comment in your memo that the City didn't feel it had the legal ability to deny parking permits to residents in this particular building, and to what extent in your opinion does the, you know, does the Traffic and Parking load rely on that ability to police those parking permits?

JEFF ROBERTS: So, just to maybe back up and explain it from the beginning. So it's been my understanding, and this is an issue that has been discussed in the past,

that the -- what I have heard from the Traffic, Parking, and Transportation Department as well as the Law Department is that the City would not deny -- if a resident of the City who is eligible for a parking permit came in to get a parking permit, they could be issued a parking permit. What's being proposed here is that as a condition of the lease of the units, that the occupant would not seek a resident parking permit. And I think it's -- I think it's important just to be -- just to make sure that the Planning Board -- it's clear to both the Planning Board and the Council and that it's clear in the Zoning that this is not a provision that would be enforceable by the City.

H. THEODORE COHEN: All right. If I could jump in there.

I'm actually very opposed to the concept being written into the Zoning Ordinance.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Me, too.

H. THEODORE COHEN: That residents of the city, one particular class of residents of the city could not get a parking permit. I know it's come up before, and I know it's never been written into the Ordinance itself. I think there may have been developers who said that they were going to make this as part of the lease and if they want to do that as a private matter, that's fine. But I think all residents of the city have the same right regardless of the type of unit they may live in, and that I think it is wrong to have it in the Ordinance.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: I couldn't agree more.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, if no one else wants to start, I will start. And a lot of my comments are fairly technical and go to the drafting of this amendment.

If I had my druthers, I would throw out the entire amendment as it's currently drafted and redraft it completely differently basically starting with this is what -- this is a particular district, this is what's allowed in the district. Anything that conflicts in the Zoning otherwise in the Zoning Ordinance this controls, rather than the very confusing reference to some sections that do apply that don't apply, that this particular part of section applies. I would hope that future Zoning Ordinances doesn't get this far along in the process without them being clarified a lot better.

I think there's a lot of duplication in

here. But that having been said, let me talk about some of the -- some of my comments about that and then we can go into larger comments about the project itself. You know, I think Section 20.307.3 applicability, the first paragraph is duplicative of what starts out in Section 307.1 establishment and scope.

I assume that the Section 307.4 is what is intended to make clear that Article 19 applies. I do not care for the way it's worded. You know, in addition to the development review procedures set forth in Article 19 shall be subject to development review procedures specified in 3041.1. I think we need a clear statement that Article 19 applies. That all the things that flow from Article 19 applies. And that this is a subsection, a special district, that you have to comply with these regulations and comply

with Article 19 and comply with the provisions of Section 10 relating to the granting of Special Permits.

I think -- I wish the innovation units were called something else. We have an innovation district. Boston has an innovation district. They're referring to office space generally. I wish they had a different name. It seems to me they're live/work units and they could be called that or they could be just residential units and people are allowed to have offices in. Which I think they are in general anyway under our Zoning.

I think the language relating to car sharing is very confusing as to how many you're allowed, what the minimum is, what the maximum is. I've reread it several times and I'm not certain exactly what it says. So I

would like to have that clarified.

The last paragraph of Section 307.7 any specific Special Permit provision set forth in Article 16, etcetera, etcetera, seems to me it's duplicative of other things that came before, and I don't know that we need a reference to a Special Permit granted by the ZBA. It could be granted by the Planning Board. I think that's already in the Ordinance. I'd like to strip out what's not necessary and just so that we can all be clearer of what is being allowed.

The definition of middle income units in Section 307.8.2 talks about mortgage payments including utilities. Utilities are not usually included in mortgage payments. So I don't know if that's from some federal or state definition, but it struck me at odd.

Section 307.10 about local retail and

street activation, I think there are simply typos in it that refer to 307.9. I think when things got renumbered that didn't get renumbered.

I've already -- you know, already stated that in 307.9 relating to innovation housing, I was opposed to the reference to that the people who lived in the innovation units couldn't apply for parking permits.

I think that where there are grandfathering provisions currently, there are several dates that are being used and I think either you should stick with the date of the first notice of the public hearing before the Planning Board or you should stick with the date of the adoption of the Ordinance or the places where you use different dates. And if there is some rationale for it, I'd like to hear it. I

don't know what -- I question with regard to Section 307.13 where the reference is made to the Central Square design guidelines dated February 2013, updated May 2013. What happens to projects that may not start right away and perhaps there will be new design guidelines for Central Square that get adopted in the not too distant future? And I think this project, you know, if it hasn't gotten it's permitting, like everyone else, needs to comply with whatever the design guidelines are in effect at the time the project goes forward.

I don't know what to do at all about Section 307.14, the Bishop Allen Drive street activation since there's nothing there now and I don't know how we can make a recommendation one way or another on language we haven't seen and I don't see how City

Council could possibly be voting on something that they haven't seen and we haven't seen.

Those are my overall comments to, you know, some of the language. Having said that, I think we need housing. I think we need housing in Central Square and elsewhere in the city. We've been talking about affordable housing being 15 percent which really isn't 15 percent and here we're suddenly talking about, you know, a real 20 percent and I think that's great. You know, I know what the Central Square C2 talked about. Personally I'm not opposed to 18, 19-story building at that particular location. You know, I know it is in the concept of Volpe that Councillor Cheung made his comment about a thousand foot building. Obviously we're not going there, but I think Cambridge can support some taller buildings

in some different locations. And at this particular intersection, I don't have a particular problem with that. Especially now I think the massing has been reduced and I think it's an interesting concept.

Exactly what happens with parking lots, I think is still up in the air, but, you know, I'm not sure we can keep saying, you know, let's wait until the C2 study, let's wait for this, let's wait for that, let's wait for the next thing. I've lived in Central Square when I first moved here in 1972, and it looks an awful lot now as it did in 1972. I like Central Square but I think it's time, you know, things started to move on. And I think that having, you know, more units, more housing, and more people there will be a good thing.

So I'll send it out to other people.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Thank you.

So I'm not going to do the line by line edit that Ted did, but I would agree with the general principle. I think it's not well drafted. Not that frankly a lot of our Zoning is. And I'm not sure that this is a lot worse than a lot of confusing provisions that have me going back and forth from section to section, but I too -- if, if this is the goal, I would probably draft it differently.

I think the question then is, is what is the goal? And I have, from the first time we saw this to tonight, felt very uncomfortable with the conflation of a Zoning petition and project and that was really evident in a lot of the comments tonight kept -- people kept referring to this as a

project. It is not a project. And it is a Zoning Petition and, therefore, you know, some of the specific architecture, even some of the things like when and how much should be built on a surface parking lot, those to me are project specific concerns that perhaps don't belong in Zoning. And I think the desire to both give the community all the assurances one has with project-specific design and review in the rezoning has resulted in something that doesn't do either very well. And I think that is part of what happens with these very specific area zonings. Is that they try to take on the character of project review and they don't do it very well and we end up with getting not exactly what we thought we were getting because things change hands, times change, economies change, and, and then we're back to

renegotiating things. I do, you know, in the same breath I want to say that as much as I would like to see a Zoning for the whole area that incorporates the city's lots, that incorporates all of the Quest parcels, not just a selection of them. I also don't think it's fair to say keep waiting. I -- the point that has been made by many people that, you know, C2 was two years ago. This has been debated forever. We have owners who do want to do something now and we do need something here now. And I really appreciate the commitment to affordable and to middle income housing. I think the number of things about this are really good. So given that it is what is before us and someone has finally proposed something, I'm moving forward with the assumption that that -- that something is what we're working with. I'm not, you know,

saying well, we should wait and see what better thing is proposed here. If some better thing is later proposed in a Zoning Petition, we can consider that Zoning Petition, too. But this is what's before me now.

I do think that some things that are appropriate to include in Zoning would be that the portion of the housing units that is allocated to affordable housing, to middle income housing, and to three-bedroom units, I do strongly agree that the three-bedroom units should be affordable and that that helps achieve multiple city goals and is an appropriate commitment to make in the Zoning.

I don't want to see any preclusion of future development on surface lots or any commitment -- or anything that says that the Planning Board couldn't require any phase

development that a surface lot eventually be developed. I get that there's timing and economic reasons why a surface lot needs to be kept open while other things are going on, but I would not -- I don't want the Zoning to say we can't do that.

I'm torn about the height. I do think this is an appropriate place for much higher height than we have in the rest of Central Square. I'm not sure 195 feet is the right height, but I'm not sure it's not. So I guess I'm agnostic as to whether or not that's the right height. I think the overall unit count and density for overall is more important to me than rather it's 195 or 160.

I do think that the -- I agree with Ted and Tom's comments that it is inappropriate to have anything in the Zoning that some residents are eligible for Cambridge resident

stickers. Whether or not it's a developer's commitment to enforce it, it puts the city in a terrible position of having to explain that they're not enforcing it and that's aside from the whole question of whether or not it's even legal to do, but -- and I do think that the parking ratios that the developer's talking about the 0.5 to 0.75 spaces per unit are plenty for Central Square. We're permitted lower. The data supports all of 0.5. I'm perfectly comfortable even without the commitment on the resident stickers that it is a totally supportable parking ratio. And, again, when there's actually a project, we will have a traffic study and we will look more closely at the data and at all of the impacts. And I get that everyone wants to get all of this done now. But it is, you know, some of this is really appropriately

small picture Special Permit criteria that -- I do appreciate that we're clarifying that this project, when it is a project, will go through the Article 19 process. That being said, therefore, it is even more important to set just the broad envelope and guidelines for it so that when we go through that process we can get into the nitty-gritty details and deal with something that's very real.

I'll stop there.

H. THEODORE COHEN: You want to go? Steve.

STEVEN COHEN: I'm of two minds with the application before us and I guess this is my first mind, we've been waiting for development in Central Square for a generation as Ted has pointed out, and our seek to rezoning has been going on for two

years now. We're at the right point in the business cycle and now the interest rates are low and the interest rates are low, the economy is strong and picking up. The residential market in Cambridge is sizzling. You know, this is absolutely the time to encourage and incentivize residential development in Central Square. I mean, we look at places, well, like in Boston, the harbor, the South Boston harbor, and where there was constant talk about redeveloping it. And each time was talk, talk, and planning and zoning and, you know, and cycle after cycle they missed a cycle. And it would be a shame and a tragedy to miss this cycle and wait, who knows, perhaps another ten years until the stars align once again.

And with regard to the project that is presented to us, I think, you know, well

designed, well thought out, I found it attractive.

I like the plaza down on the street. I don't have any big problems with the height or the FAR proposed in that location. So I have a lot of positive feelings about the application. And Lord knows, the time is now and I don't want to miss it. And of course I didn't mention the affordable zoning component. You don't need to hear from yet one more person, me, how important affordable zoning is here. And we have a proposal for 20 percent affordable zoning units as compared to what works out to about 11.3 or so under existing Zoning. So one more reason why this is great.

Okay, but now my other mind, as Catherine points out, we're not reviewing a specific project here, we're reviewing

Zoning. And we're actually reviewing Zoning for a very small portion of Central Square. I said this at the first hearing and I say it again now, and I -- and that raises concerns for me. I mean, what are the ramifications -- first of all, I'm not sure I fully understand what the Zoning, what the potential development possibilities and options are just within this site and just within this site. We've got a corner of this new Zoning district with a small building and a one-story building that isn't owned by the applicant here. It's relatively low density. Now it's clearly going to be incentivized, redeveloped. I'm not sure how that would fit in with this project that's presented. And then on the other side we have the McDonald's. It's great that we have fast food to serve the needs of our hungry

populous, but I'm not sure that little building reflects the highest achievements of urban planning. And so both from a planning perspective and from the financial motivation incentives of the owner, I you know would like to see, and I imagine we will see that site somehow redeveloped with the new incentives built into the Zoning. How would that all affect the sort of application or project that you have designed? But even more importantly than that, if a 6.5 FAR is appropriate here, and I don't have any strong objection to that concept, but if a 6.5 FAR is appropriate here, then why isn't it appropriate, you know, all the way down Mass. Ave. into Central Square? We've all said and agreed that Central Square on top of the Mass. transit is in fact the appropriate place for height and density and further

development. If in fact we rezone this parcel for a 6.5 FAR and significant height increase, 195 feet, I would be hard pressed to come up with any rational objection to extending those Zoning standards down Mass. Ave. to Prospect Street and perhaps beyond. Is that a bad thing? No, I don't think that's necessarily a bad thing, but the fact is I don't know if it's a bad thing because we haven't looked at that. We haven't discussed it. We haven't studied it. And so I'm troubled. You know, I don't want to talk about the technical concept of spot zoning, but I'm just troubled from doing all of this kind of planning and making such significant changes in Zoning for such a small piece of the Central Square district.

So those are some of my general concerns. Going to the specific concerns I

have no problem with the proposed FAR of 6.5 percent, but we are talking about a 67 percent increase in FAR over the current Zoning of that site, and I guess as somebody said, the City Councillor or maybe Councillor Reeves, you know, the question is what do you get in return for that? I think what you've proposed for the affordable zoning is a good quid pro quo. But I guess I'm not 100 percent sure that it's enough. Whether, you know, is it just a down payment? I certainly understand those who felt also that a significant portion of the affordable housing should be skewed towards the lower end, the 60 to 80 percent portion. But, again, as I have a said in here before, you know, the low income folks at least have, you know, some good public housing in the city. Middle income folk have no great support and

opportunities in the city. And frankly, I would like to see some opportunities made for middle income folk as well. I mean, I would at least like to have the discussion amongst my members of the Board whether it might make sense to increase that 20 percent number somewhat and for some of that increase to include a little bit for the middle income that's the 80 to 120 percent of the median.

I guess the last thing I guess I'd say, just picking up on Ted's point about the drafting, I haven't gone through every word and sentence in the drafting itself, but Lord knows our bible, our goal and any time we draft should be, you know, clarity and simplicity. You shouldn't have to be a Zoning nerd to understand the central land planning document in our city. And it may be true that this is no worse than the worst of

our code, but any time we're in the business of drafting or changing the code and drafting new sections of the code, I feel that we should be taking that opportunity to at least improve that section. At least those sections that have our fingerprints, you know, should be sections that reflect our goals and values and priorities in the code and they should be clear and they should be simple.

And along those lines I, you know, I have to say that the changes that we've made in the affordable zoning housing provisions -- and instead of, you know, the relatively convoluted provisions that we have in our regular code saying very simply here, you know, that if you want to take advantage of 6.5 percent FAR, that you must provide 20 percent affordable housing, gosh, even I can

understand that. Yeah, anybody can understand that. And somebody who reads the code understands this city's policy with regard to affordable housing. I mean that was a great improvement and that's the sort of clarity and simplicity that I would love to see in this amendment, and over time for this Board to introduce to the rest of our Zoning Code.

So I'm of two minds, and I don't know how to reconcile those two things because I really do want to see improvements done in this cycle and I'm looking forward to hearing further from the other members.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Hugh.

HUGH RUSSELL: It's interesting this perhaps is the first time that the three lawyers on the Board have led off a discussion.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, the architects were just sitting.

HUGH RUSSELL: I'm really glad that you've dug into these language questions. I think they're solvable and I can understand you would rather have tried to implement these concepts from scratch in a different way and we're kind of stuck with trying to patch it together at this point. I don't think it's going to be terribly difficult for someone to actually understand what's intended. So to the second mind of my colleague, Steven, to me the crucial piece here was the chart on page 7 of 12 that Jeff referred to and spoke to in his remarks. So I'm going to back up and say what should have happened here? And the answer is two years ago we should have acted on Central Square recommendations and that would have created

on these parcels with the transfer and development right provisions built into it a development density that they're asking for under this proposal. It's different math but the bottom line is very close to the same. So that to me is important. I think they would have come to us while we were considering that and they would have said, you know, it's not wise to stop limit the height at 160 feet. We've done some studies and we think, you know, we'd be able to consider three more floors. But we're having this discussion here tonight. So I think because the density is basically what was contemplated in Central Square Zoning because the guidelines are essentially what was contemplated, the affordability is actually beyond what was contemplated, and the reason for that is actually that ugly parking

garage. That awful parking garage on Bishop Allen Drive saves them a bundle of money which they're able then to put into additional affordability. We're not giving them anything much that they weren't going to get if we done our job two years ago. So we're -- I think the -- what we're getting in terms of affordability is big in terms of what they're actually getting out of this.

Now, could you quickly put that photograph up on the screen? I guess not.

ATTORNEY ANTHONY GALLUCCIO: Yes, we can. Mass. Avenue.

HUGH RUSSELL: That's a fine view. It's not quite there, but it's close.

Imagine for the moment that you knock three stories off the tower and you pile them on the little red building next to it, which because the footprint's a little smaller, it

might end up being like four stories piled on that. Now, do we want to have the right to think about that tradeoff when it comes to us for the Special Permit? I think we really do, because I'm -- I look at that and I say well, you know, once you get above 80 or 90 feet, you don't -- most places you don't really see it. And from the places, this is a real point of view here. You know, it doesn't make much difference when you're standing in front of the fire station whether the three -- but I think it makes a big difference that that, the brick building in front is only six stories. And in terms of the light that gets through and in terms of the scale, in terms of that sort of stepping down to the existing three-story building next to it. Now you know the corner building some day probably won't be one story tall.

And but is it going to be 160 feet tall? It can't be. They don't have any parking.

That's the problem. I'm redeveloping all the other sites that get the 6.5 FAR. None of them have any parking. And if you try to redevelop the tiny piece, you can't do it without making some kind of a deal on parking.

So I look at this whole thing and say basically we're getting a partial C2 Zoning in a limited area, and based on the studies that these people have been doing for two years, we're saying well, we ought to be able to probably consider going a little taller on the tower to get other benefits. So that height, it's real. It's something that we're giving, but we're going to get something for it. You know, maybe if we just enacted C2 two years ago, they would -- and maybe they

wouldn't have been successful in the height limit, they would be coming back for approving a project and they couldn't give as much affordability. And, you know, but they're trying so hard to do such a good job that it would be a pretty good project. It might not be as good as that. It might be better. We can't know that. And, again, we're not, we're reviewing the Zoning. We're not reviewing the design. This is, this is a wonderful study that shows us the consequences of the Zoning. So I guess I'm feeling we really ought to support this proposal. But the other point that I think was very interesting in the testimony tonight was a number of people say they were members of the C2 Committee, and in their opinion this was consistent pretty much with what their thinking and was in terms of the goals,

it was very consistent. I think we have to pay attention to that because these people have spent a lot more time than most of the rest of us looking at these issues in a very public process. So I'm, you know, I would like to go forward, submit a favorable recommendation with all of the comments of my colleagues about the way to perfect the language of the proposal, to get rid of the, you know, the prohibition against resident parking, which I agree with you is -- that's a legal problem. That's a real mess if that's in there. So that's just, you know, I've listened very carefully to you and I think you've made a number of wonderful points, but I don't think any of them are against the notion that we shouldn't go ahead and do this tonight.

STEVEN COHEN: Can I just ask a

question?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Go ahead.

STEVEN COHEN: Just for clarity and clarification for myself, just when we say that this pretty much could have been done under the C2, under the C2, the FAR would have worked out to I think 5.2 and here we're looking for 6.5?

HUGH RUSSELL: Right.

STEVEN COHEN: And so we're on the same page there. And I'm not objecting to the 6.5 at all.

HUGH RUSSELL: But what they're doing, they could have, under C2, counted the parking on --

STEVEN COHEN: And transferred the development?

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. And that would have -- Jeff calculates is within a few

thousand feet of the total that they needed.

STEVEN COHEN: So they're not transferring those rights in this case? So the surface parking lot on Bishop Allen is still developable?

HUGH RUSSELL: That's right. Right, so depending on how much goes on there, that's in a way a give. But they're -- most of what they're asking for in terms of the 93,000 feet is actually stuff that could have been transferred under C2. And I can understand having worked for developers that that mechanism is something that just rather not go for. It's -- may cause problems with the lenders. It may make it just messy and this is a cleaner way to get to the same place.

STEVEN COHEN: Forgive me, just one more follow up. I don't mean to -- I want to

follow up.

HUGH RUSSELL: Hey, we're actually discussing this.

STEVEN COHEN: Imagine that. This is planning, hey.

Two quick follow-up questions:

First of all, one of my concerns was as I say, if this height is appropriate and if this FAR is appropriate here, would it not be appropriate in much of the rest of Central Square? I personally anyway would feel hard pressed to say that it wouldn't be appropriate elsewhere. And do we know what that would actually mean and does that raise any concerns for us in sort of setting that precedent or contemplating those ramifications?

HUGH RUSSELL: So I would say the FAR would not be appropriate because if C2 is

a definition of what's appropriate, it's 5.2 for a full housing project. And if somebody else has got some other land on the residential strips, subdistricts that they're willing to leave undeveloped, yes, that's fine. But it's that transfer that makes a huge difference to me in terms of the, that overall development. We're getting a benefit of keeping the scale on Bishop Allen Drive low.

STEVEN COHEN: But we're not transferring the development rights.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: But they're encumbered by the obligation to provide a certain amount of parking. We haven't determined that yet, right? So those, in effect, there is a TOD going on because they've got to provide X -- depending on how the Article 90 review goes and the traffic --

STEVEN COHEN: That would be part of the actual project --

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Right. You've got a development you've got to put cars on them.

STEVEN COHEN: -- application.

And I'm sorry, just the last follow up --

HUGH RUSSELL: And to the height, I don't think a bunch of 18-story towers on Mass. Avenue is desirable. And we have -- we've got one at the corner of Prospect Street. We've got a slightly lower building across the street. We've got one on Franklin Street that is pretty well hidden. Could there be another 160-foot tower? I'm not sure how you'd get the parcel together to do it, but, you know, another one may be okay. But a whole bunch of them, I think changes the character of Central Square more than I

want to see it changed.

STEVEN COHEN: Well, I guess to, you know, to some extent we're setting the precedent, and to some extent I mean back in the C2 discussions we talked about whether in fact, again, we needed to grant a little more density and height in order to adequately incentivize owners to redevelop some of these lots. So I think this is going to come up, some will say will haunt us, others will say it's a good precedent, but I think our decisions on this application will absolutely inhabit our future discussions on that.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Again, it's a petition not an application.

STEVEN COHEN: Right, I'm sorry. I know that. Sorry.

Anyway, the last follow up simply I had expressed some thoughts about as a middle

income housing.

HUGH RUSSELL: I agree with you, you know, I think we have to do more for middle income housing. I would have preferred to have -- right now the balance is 17.3 percent. I would have preferred a richer balance, but I don't know how that 17 and 3 came about. I don't know that the discussions that were made with, you know, a variety of other people and I'm willing to say well, it's a start. You know, should it be 50/50? Maybe not. Should it be two-thirds, one-third? Both are needed.

STEVEN COHEN: Both are needed of the -- I think it's an important precedent. You know, I think we should think about it and if we decide 17, 3 is the right numbers, so be it. But I don't think we should just defer to the numbers that happen to be thrown

at us.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: So --

STEVEN COHEN: I'm sorry, Tom.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: There was a point like three questions ago that I was trying to comment on in your conversation rather than a discussion. But now relative to the precedent of height setting a dangerous precedent of height here, the part of Jeff's memo here that I very much appreciated was the analysis of the parcels up and down Mass. Ave. and the ability to aggregate and compile -- it wasn't encumbered by an historic structure or it was big enough to support this kind of height by extension of FAR was reassuring to me. There are very limited number of areas where this height, this may come back to bite us. I agree. Things can happen. Properties can transfer,

buildings can burn down. But it was reassuring, the memo, in that regard in terms of the precedent that this might set in terms of the height and that was raised by the public on number of occasions and something that weighed on us and something we looked at. And is it time now for me to comment?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Go ahead.

STEVEN COHEN: Just one more point.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Go ahead, I'll wait.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: The problem with Lou, you're going to have to go last. You have to say something smarter than all of other people.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: You guys covered mostly everything I have.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: I wrote down the Zoning Petition and talk about brilliant,

that was a great way to start this conversation, Catherine, saying this is Zoning and it's not a proposal. Right?

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Right.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: And I wrote down Hugh's points. This is not been done in a vacuum, right? C2, this district's been studied and people talk about the base zoning. Well, everybody's agreed for a long, long time that the base zoning is antiquated and it needs to be updated. The right that exists on the property is really not a fair comparison. The government legislative body in this not in wisdom, I don't understand has not enacted the Zoning but, you know, they're in a particularly difficult position and I can understand reasons why they might not do that. So we're stuck with the real politic of a particular moment in time. And so when

I go back and look at this analysis, I just go to the blind side which is Zoning, and I go, okay, if we go through the categories of Zoning, yes Article 19 will govern this has to be stated clearly, This is not a project. If you say the uses here, I have no objection to the mix of uses here. In fact, it's consistent entirely with what the city needs.

The setbacks and the massing, there are imagined the Zoning are consistent with C2 recommendations and consistent with the overall pattern of this district. I don't have any issues with the setbacks.

The open space as described which will be not provided in conventional way, because it's vertical housing situation will be providing two balconies, accessible roofs, etcetera. I think satisfies the intent of Zoning to protect open space and access to

open space for residents of our city.

Brings me to FAR, that's been talked about at length here and looked at in a lot of different ways, actually I appreciated Stephen Kaiser's comments. Actually, it could be moved because the overall parcels in consideration add up to a relatively conventional density, right?

And so I'm okay with the FAR where it is.

That brings me to height. And this is where I conjugate the mixtures, that I find the images are very, very helpful. And actually my fellow member here pulled that apart in a really beautiful way saying that the additional 35 feet allows for stuff that actually would make it a much, much better project potentially. And the other way I look at it, Zoning is a blunt instrument. 35

feet over 160, a 22 percent Variance over a height, it's one fifth. Yes, it's higher than what was imagined in the study, but it's not extraordinary. So I'm okay with the height here. So that's how I analyzed this relative with the other section that the coordinates talked to is parking. One part that I really wish would -- and I'm going to push in the Article 19 review should this come back in that form, is the car sharing and the eight to one ratio that was referenced in some either letter or a memo, my memory's getting foggy here in terms of what it is worth in terms of replacing parking spaces. I'm wondering if we can't amp this up here in this very TOD site. So that's where I am, I'm in favor of sending it to the Council with the boiler you drafted.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Lou.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: And I'll cut it short by saying I'm also in favor.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: The wisest member.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay.

Does somebody want to make a motion as to our recommendation to City Council?

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Does staff understand what we're recommending?

JEFF ROBERTS: So I think going back to the beginning of this conversation there were a number of questions, and I wanted to try to talk back through some of those and make sure I got all of them.

I think the point about the parking permit provision is clear.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Okay.

H. THEODORE COHEN: We're clear on that.

JEFF ROBERTS: The -- I, you know,

I've -- admittedly a zoning nerd, I guess I have to admit that term.

H. THEODORE COHEN: You and me both.

JEFF ROBERTS: And I agree about the complication. I do just in general tend to point out that sometimes, sometimes it's the complication is a necessary complication because it really needs to be crystal clear, even if it's not clear to a casual reader, it needs to be very clear to, you know, a developer and an owner or financier or whoever else exactly what's allowed and what's not. So I think the comments about 307 -- 20.307.4 about the application of different Zoning Districts I'm not sure if there are any specific comments. I think it does make reference to all of the articles that would play into the review of a project by the Planning Board.

H. THEODORE COHEN: With regard to that provision, I mean I think it says what we want it to say, but I think it would just be made clearer with the change of a word or two, you know, rather than the phrases in addition to the development review procedure set forth in Article 19. It's development review provisions of Article 19 apply as to the development review provisions specified in the, you know, in addition to the provisions of 20.304.1. I think just a word or two changed to make it clear that Article 19 unquestionably applies rather than sort of just slant reference to it.

JEFF ROBERTS: Okay. I can look at that.

The point about innovation units is, is there another term that the Board would recommend using in place of innovation units?

ATTORNEY ANTHONY GALLUCCIO:

Mr. Chair. Micro?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Pardon me?

ATTORNEY ANTHONY GALLUCCIO: The principle is smaller units, more efficient. Micro.

STEVEN COHEN: That's the generic term, that's what they're known as.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Aren't you seeking something in addition to something smaller than size? It's anticipated they might be used at park the --

ATTORNEY ANTHONY GALLUCCIO: The parking is kind of a principle that folks who would take a smaller unit are more transit oriented are into are looking for efficiency, but we get the message on that other issue, but micro would still may be helpful.

JEFF ROBERTS: Yes, I think to your

point, Mr. Chair, it can be more generally the case that people could have offices or work spaces in residential units. So really the defining characteristic of I think the innovation unit as defined here is the size.

H. THEODORE COHEN: If it's the size then micro or some other similar term.

HUGH RUSSELL: Although I would caution you not to use micro because it's the 500 square foot floor actually is hardly the micro scale. So maybe you just need to define, you know, a small unit for a sub-500 square foot unit that's somehow --

STEVEN COHEN: I would defer to staff on this.

H. THEODORE COHEN: You can come up with a word.

JEFF ROBERTS: Okay, but that's the point to not use that term. I think that's

the point.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right. It's being used elsewhere to mean other things.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Right.

JEFF ROBERTS: Okay.

The provision about car sharing, I think it seemed relevantly clear to me that it was -- it was meant to set a minimum required number of spaces and then had a provision that allows a reduction in total parking, but it has a limit on how much the parking can be reduced. So presumably you couldn't just, you couldn't put in, you know, 40 car sharing spaces and not have any other parking. So I feel like that's reasonable. We will be talking more about car sharing. I think in the relatively new future.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Just look at the second sentence of subparagraph D when you

have, you know, when you're looking at 377 sub D the -- I don't know, understand the first and second sentence together and I think that could be made clearer.

STEVEN COHEN: If he can't understand them.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right, because I'm a zoning nerd, too. So this one's over my head right at the moment.

JEFF ROBERTS: So I think the rest of it -- well, some of the other terms are clarifications. I think the definition of middle income units that is I think I understand the concern, but I looked at it and were aiming for consistency with the standards of using in our inclusionary housing ordinance.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Fine, if we've used that elsewhere, then continue with it.

JEFF ROBERTS: Right. I think the dates can be, can be made consistent.

And central -- oh, the design guidelines question. So there's sort of two areas I wanted to try to clarify on that.

One, it's always been my understanding, and I think has always been the practice of the Board that in reviewing a project under Article 19, there are the general citywide urban design objectives. And those in turn may refer to any plans or guidelines established by the city for any particular area. Regarding what's referenced in the Zoning I think that any guidelines that are, that have been created by the city and are deemed to be appropriate in that scenario are fair for the Board to look at. It is helpful to refer to those guidelines that we think are particular or in which we think the C2

guidelines are. And related to that point there's the comment that staff made about having additional guidelines for the Board's consideration related to height. I don't know if the Board had any view on whether that should be sent along with the recommendation.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes, I think so. The staff's comments about taking into account shadows and winds and other issues, I think yes, this comes back in an Article 19. It would be good to have some clearer guidelines on what we're considering or what that word is considering.

JEFF ROBERTS: Okay.

I'm going to just make sure that I covered everything.

Oh, and then the final text about Bishop Allen Drive, I think one board member

made the comment that often that that type of provision is often reviewed as part of the Planning Board's review of the project, and in cases where there's a project with a building on one site and parking on the other site, it's not unusual for the Board to have Special Permit provisions that govern what can -- what's allowed to happen and what must happen in the future on that site. So is that the Board's, is that the prevailing view of the Board that that's a more appropriate way to --

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Yes, because I'm curious of what happens, how we grandfather this into this project and so forth. What happens if this gets split off and they lose their parking? And can you fit enough parking on those sites if they were developed?

H. THEODORE COHEN: I would imagine if they were developed, they would have to put in underground parking or --

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: And having a very tall parking structure.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And build on top of it. Which we're seeing on Ames Street. That clearly at some point it becomes, you know, financially feasible to leave your parking structure but build on top of it.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Right.

STEVEN COHEN: But not on the small lots.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: But they're in a residential kind of -- that's what I was concerned if they developed these two.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Special Permit.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Lots.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: So

Special Permit.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Special Permit.

STEVEN COHEN: I'm sorry, how do you relate to a vacant lot?

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: But that's tied into this for their parking, correct?

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: So having been the one who suggested that we not preclude it being developed, and I think this gets to some of the confusion about the FAR, what I would like to see is that the Zoning, not include a prohibition on that lot being developed which does in fact mean that the FAR applies to all of the parcels. And if it were broken off before developed, that parcel would be entitled to the same FAR. The idea being that, you know, surface lots in general, and this is again consistent with C2 that are not desirable.

Now, as a practical matter, if that gets broken off before it's developed, it's as Steve was alluding to, it's not going to get developed very likely at a 6.5 FAR because physically you're going to have trouble doing it.

STEVEN COHEN: On the other hand, if we're using parking on that lot to fulfill a parking requirement --

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR: Right.

STEVEN COHEN: -- then as a practical matter, it will be a surface parking lot forever.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: What we permit.

HUGH RUSSELL: What we determine in the Special Permit.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: In the Special Permit. And I think that's my point,

is I would like to look at that in the context of the Special Permit and say what is the right parking ratio exactly here?

Because this Zoning gives us a range. Would we rather see that lot used in perpetuity for surface parking and, you know, make that decision with the traffic analysis that is project specific before us and, you know, and if that's the decision of the Board based on that, then it would be and it would be incumbered, so that if it were broken off, it would be in perpetuity. Or we might decide that, no, actually we'd rather see six units of housing there and just, you know, maybe six townhouses or whatever and to have instead of 0.75 spaces per unit, it's going to be 0.65 or something. But I think that's the appropriate place for that conversation. And so I don't want the Zoning to preclude us

from having the conversation.

JEFF ROBERTS: So I wonder if there's anything I missed then.

The recommendation is favorable and then that there were these -- I'm just trying to get the detail of the comments of the Planning Board.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: That was one of my questions that I didn't bring out because I thought it was covered pretty well. The parking on the lots. My fear is that if this was developed and then this was broken off later, that they would not be able to provide enough parking.

H. THEODORE COHEN: But they're going to have to --

STEVEN COHEN: Then the project gets smaller.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: It's tied into

this one. The existing that will be there?

STEVEN COHEN: There is no project.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Correct, I understand. Tied to the zoning, you're right.

JEFF ROBERTS: So if I've covered everything, the Board can proceed.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes. I think you covered everything.

All right, somebody want to make a motion?

HUGH RUSSELL: Sure. I'll move that we send a favorable recommendation on the proposed Zoning with the comments, including the comments for the changes in the text, that we've discussed here tonight. And also the explaining our reasoning as we've discussed tonight for why we support this.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Is there a

second?

TOM SIENIEWICZ: I'll second it.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Any discussion?

(No Response.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: All those in
favor?

(Show of hands.)

STEVEN COHEN: With reservation.

H. THEODORE COHEN: With an
asterisk.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Two hands.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Unanimous vote.

Well, thank you all for coming.

And there's no other business. We are
adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 10:50 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 29th day of May, 2015.

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

My Commission Expires:
April 29, 2022

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

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| <p style="text-align: center;">\$</p> <p>\$19,237,000 [1] - 23:15 \$30 [2] - 113:15, 113:16</p> | <p>160 [16] - 28:19, 29:9, 39:4, 39:9, 42:11, 42:18, 133:2, 133:8, 133:9, 149:17, 171:15, 184:10, 187:1, 202:1 160-foot [1] - 194:15 17 [4] - 21:15, 155:16, 196:7, 196:17 17.3 [1] - 196:5 18 [1] - 165:13 18-story [2] - 137:5, 194:9 180 [2] - 37:7, 153:6 1800s [1] - 64:12 185 [1] - 62:5 19 [19] - 18:10, 31:5, 34:17, 38:15, 87:17, 137:4, 160:9, 160:13, 160:16, 160:17, 161:1, 173:4, 200:4, 202:9, 205:7, 205:8, 205:13, 210:9, 211:11 19-story [1] - 165:14 190 [1] - 39:17 191 [1] - 125:6 195 [12] - 2:10, 17:13, 29:9, 39:17, 42:13, 42:19, 106:19, 107:2, 133:9, 171:10, 171:15, 178:3 1960s [1] - 105:16 1972 [2] - 166:13, 166:14 1977 [1] - 130:6 198 [1] - 140:4 19th [1] - 4:14</p> | <p>2022 [1] - 221:15 21 [1] - 152:7 213 [1] - 118:11 21st [2] - 64:18, 124:19 22 [3] - 110:10, 110:12, 202:1 220 [1] - 37:8 23 [3] - 117:12, 117:13, 141:11 23.5 [2] - 53:19, 54:3 230 [2] - 58:10, 125:18 234 [1] - 109:15 239 [1] - 109:8 24 [3] - 17:6, 89:17, 94:19 24/7 [1] - 60:1 240-foot [1] - 107:7 243 [1] - 91:13 249 [1] - 109:11 24th [2] - 144:7, 152:9 25 [1] - 20:11 250 [1] - 13:19 257 [1] - 89:1 269 [1] - 115:1 27th [1] - 150:19 28 [2] - 1:5, 32:18 28th [2] - 3:5, 3:9 29 [1] - 221:15 29.6 [1] - 101:5 29th [1] - 221:8</p> | <p>35 [5] - 34:1, 63:13, 117:3, 201:16, 201:19 37 [1] - 155:9 377 [1] - 209:1 38 [1] - 21:3 39 [2] - 21:3, 32:19</p> | <p>215:4 60 [4] - 20:18, 96:9, 153:6, 179:15 60-foot [1] - 40:2 600,000 [3] - 22:17, 53:14, 58:15 617.786.7783/617.639.0396 [1] - 1:18 65 [3] - 126:9, 135:17, 155:13 67 [2] - 128:17, 179:2 69,000 [1] - 154:5 6P [1] - 117:11</p> |
| <p style="text-align: center;">0</p> | | | <p style="text-align: center;">4</p> | |
| <p>0.25 [2] - 84:3, 85:4 0.45 [1] - 27:15 0.5 [3] - 20:2, 172:8, 172:11 0.65 [1] - 216:17 0.7 [1] - 20:1 0.75 [3] - 20:2, 172:8, 216:16 0.9 [1] - 126:16 02139 [1] - 74:11</p> | | | <p>4 [5] - 14:18, 36:17, 40:17, 42:14, 95:8 4.0 [1] - 29:12 40 [3] - 39:18, 70:18, 208:14 42 [3] - 23:19, 33:7, 155:10 45 [4] - 19:9, 39:7, 42:19, 73:2 47 [15] - 23:15, 24:3, 53:16, 54:1, 58:11, 58:16, 62:6, 67:11, 69:4, 75:8, 78:12, 92:10, 113:8, 125:19, 127:8 47-unit [1] - 113:13 48 [1] - 34:3</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">7</p> <p>7 [2] - 2:18, 183:14 70 [3] - 2:12, 24:19, 39:17 70,960 [1] - 155:1 70-foot [1] - 40:3 70s [1] - 105:17 78,800 [1] - 154:6 7:00 [1] - 1:6</p> |
| <p style="text-align: center;">1</p> <p>1.75 [1] - 110:11 10 [2] - 85:14, 161:2 10,000 [2] - 25:4, 39:3 100 [6] - 37:8, 69:10, 116:4, 121:5, 154:12, 179:9 100,000 [1] - 80:9 106,040 [1] - 155:1 107,000 [1] - 98:3 10:50 [1] - 219:16 11 [2] - 126:16, 127:6 11.2 [2] - 22:12, 155:12 11.3 [1] - 175:14 110 [3] - 127:8, 127:10 12 [3] - 61:4, 63:10, 183:14 12-year-old [1] - 93:3 120 [6] - 20:16, 100:17, 107:8, 153:6, 154:17, 180:9 13 [1] - 21:17 130 [1] - 5:4 131 [1] - 54:13 136 [1] - 76:12 140 [13] - 28:18, 29:9, 39:1, 39:9, 42:17, 82:8, 93:14, 100:17, 133:2, 133:12, 149:17, 155:1 147703 [1] - 221:13 15 [3] - 84:4, 165:8, 165:9 156 [1] - 68:1 16 [1] - 162:4</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <p>2 [1] - 76:12 2.2 [1] - 101:2 2.5 [1] - 116:8 2.6 [2] - 15:4, 126:17 20 [12] - 22:6, 33:5, 76:15, 84:4, 94:14, 100:3, 102:7, 128:2, 165:10, 175:13, 180:6, 181:18 20.304.1 [1] - 205:11 20.307.3 [1] - 160:5 20.307.4 [1] - 204:14 200 [4] - 28:19, 44:10, 126:16, 127:6 2013 [3] - 13:3, 164:4 2015 [2] - 1:5, 221:8 202 [1] - 65:19</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">3</p> <p>3 [3] - 2:3, 196:7, 196:17 3.0 [1] - 126:18 3.5 [3] - 126:15, 126:17 3.7 [1] - 126:10 30 [8] - 24:18, 52:4, 52:18, 77:19, 80:5, 114:1, 122:6, 138:8 30-some [1] - 94:2 300 [2] - 80:13, 80:15 3041.1 [1] - 160:14 307 [1] - 204:14 307.1 [1] - 160:7 307.10 [1] - 162:19 307.13 [1] - 164:2 307.14 [1] - 164:15 307.4 [1] - 160:8 307.7 [1] - 162:2 307.8.2 [1] - 162:14 307.9 [2] - 163:2, 163:6 32,000 [2] - 21:1, 155:7 344 [1] - 1:7</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">5</p> <p>5.2 [5] - 29:14, 30:6, 101:2, 190:7, 193:1 50 [4] - 96:10, 155:6, 155:10, 155:15 50/50 [1] - 196:12 500 [2] - 22:17, 207:10 500,000 [3] - 53:14, 53:19, 58:14 51 [1] - 98:18 544 [1] - 52:3 55 [2] - 107:2, 155:14 55-foot [1] - 120:15 5th [1] - 4:12</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">8</p> <p>80 [14] - 2:12, 20:16, 20:18, 21:11, 39:2, 96:10, 107:2, 153:6, 154:17, 155:15, 155:16, 179:15, 180:9, 186:6 80/20 [2] - 99:19, 100:1 88,700 [1] - 154:7 897-907 [1] - 109:19 8th [1] - 6:1</p> |
| <p style="text-align: center;">1</p> | | | <p style="text-align: center;">6</p> <p>6 [3] - 2:4, 97:4, 140:11 6.5 [22] - 2:14, 30:6, 87:5, 101:17, 102:11, 104:16, 116:7, 126:2, 126:11, 127:9, 127:11, 128:11, 177:11, 177:13, 178:2, 179:1, 181:18, 187:4, 190:8, 190:12,</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">9</p> <p>90 [4] - 17:14, 37:7, 186:6, 193:19 90-day [3] - 150:18, 151:7, 151:19 91 [1] - 74:10 93,000 [3] - 12:10, 100:4, 191:10 98,500 [1] - 154:8</p> |
| <p style="text-align: center;">1</p> | | | | <p style="text-align: center;">A</p> <p>a.m [2] - 34:12, 50:6 ability [5] - 84:9, 96:17, 156:10, 156:14, 197:12 able [13] - 26:9, 35:4, 35:18, 69:17, 79:1,</p> |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| <p>82:19, 125:15, 140:14, 140:16, 184:11, 185:3, 187:13, 217:13</p> <p>absolutely [4] - 50:15, 98:14, 174:6, 195:12</p> <p>abuts [1] - 19:7</p> <p>abutter [3] - 41:13, 109:18, 114:11</p> <p>abutters [2] - 14:3, 14:6</p> <p>abutting [2] - 87:16, 104:15</p> <p>accept [2] - 105:5, 105:7</p> <p>acceptable [1] - 139:1</p> <p>access [3] - 5:1, 37:19, 200:19</p> <p>accessible [1] - 200:17</p> <p>accessory [2] - 24:11, 24:15</p> <p>accomplish [2] - 26:9, 117:17</p> <p>accomplished [1] - 117:18</p> <p>accordance [1] - 19:8</p> <p>according [2] - 154:1, 154:2</p> <p>account [2] - 86:13, 211:10</p> <p>accountable [1] - 137:9</p> <p>accurate [2] - 220:16, 221:6</p> <p>achieve [2] - 147:18, 170:14</p> <p>achieved [1] - 57:16</p> <p>achievements [1] - 177:2</p> <p>acquired [1] - 15:13</p> <p>acquiring [1] - 15:14</p> <p>acquisition [1] - 13:3</p> <p>acquisitional [1] - 89:11</p> <p>act [5] - 4:2, 4:9, 151:1, 151:6, 152:10</p> <p>acted [1] - 183:18</p> <p>Acting [3] - 1:13, 2:2, 3:11</p> <p>action [1] - 150:18</p> <p>Action [1] - 95:12</p> <p>activate [1] - 44:6</p> <p>activation [2] - 163:1, 164:16</p> <p>active [2] - 10:7, 138:6</p> <p>actively [1] - 138:9</p> <p>activist [1] - 136:14</p> | <p>activity [2] - 44:2, 50:3</p> <p>actual [3] - 34:19, 154:12, 194:2</p> <p>add [3] - 55:15, 72:4, 201:7</p> <p>added [2] - 89:11, 101:2</p> <p>adding [2] - 56:2, 57:16</p> <p>addition [9] - 60:2, 72:5, 78:18, 90:9, 91:5, 160:11, 205:6, 205:10, 206:10</p> <p>additional [13] - 2:17, 15:13, 17:17, 19:13, 25:13, 70:14, 75:9, 78:15, 78:19, 100:14, 185:4, 201:16, 211:3</p> <p>additives [1] - 99:7</p> <p>address [6] - 51:10, 53:1, 65:18, 79:7, 140:2, 149:16</p> <p>addressing [3] - 69:9, 124:4, 143:14</p> <p>adequate [1] - 115:17</p> <p>adequately [2] - 77:11, 195:7</p> <p>adjacency [1] - 41:12</p> <p>adjacent [2] - 87:14, 99:11</p> <p>adjoining [1] - 101:13</p> <p>adjourned [1] - 219:15</p> <p>Adjourned [1] - 219:17</p> <p>admit [1] - 204:2</p> <p>admittedly [1] - 204:1</p> <p>adopt [1] - 6:15</p> <p>adopted [7] - 19:12, 25:2, 26:11, 26:14, 104:4, 149:11, 164:8</p> <p>Adoption [1] - 2:4</p> <p>adoption [1] - 163:16</p> <p>advance [2] - 51:16, 123:19</p> <p>advantage [2] - 17:16, 181:17</p> <p>advertising [1] - 152:14</p> <p>advocates [1] - 21:6</p> <p>affect [2] - 102:14, 177:9</p> <p>affirmation [1] - 124:13</p> <p>afford [4] - 58:18, 61:18, 93:6, 102:4</p> <p>affordability [8] - 123:13, 124:5,</p> | <p>137:14, 137:16, 184:17, 185:4, 185:8, 188:4</p> <p>affordable [84] - 10:10, 17:18, 20:17, 21:6, 21:15, 21:16, 22:18, 23:11, 27:5, 52:15, 53:12, 53:13, 53:16, 53:18, 54:2, 58:12, 58:16, 58:17, 60:4, 62:6, 66:17, 66:19, 67:12, 68:15, 68:17, 69:2, 69:4, 69:11, 72:1, 75:8, 76:15, 77:12, 78:13, 78:17, 79:5, 81:14, 85:19, 86:3, 86:19, 88:11, 89:10, 89:11, 92:10, 94:15, 95:14, 95:18, 95:19, 96:8, 96:15, 97:11, 97:14, 98:7, 98:18, 99:12, 101:6, 101:10, 102:8, 108:4, 110:10, 113:8, 116:13, 117:1, 117:14, 118:13, 119:10, 120:10, 123:3, 123:12, 123:15, 127:6, 136:11, 153:4, 165:8, 169:13, 170:10, 170:13, 175:9, 175:11, 175:13, 179:8, 179:13, 181:13, 181:19, 182:4</p> <p>affordably [1] - 60:8</p> <p>afters [1] - 46:4</p> <p>Agency [1] - 95:12</p> <p>agenda [2] - 4:11, 6:19</p> <p>ages [1] - 69:16</p> <p>aggregate [1] - 197:12</p> <p>agnostic [1] - 171:12</p> <p>ago [9] - 4:19, 8:7, 94:3, 134:10, 169:9, 183:18, 185:6, 187:19, 197:5</p> <p>agree [10] - 7:17, 123:17, 158:18, 167:4, 170:12, 171:16, 189:11, 196:2, 197:18, 204:4</p> <p>agreed [2] - 177:17, 199:9</p> <p>agreement [3] - 11:8, 68:18, 127:16</p> <p>agrees [1] - 14:17</p> <p>ahead [8] - 35:13,</p> | <p>54:16, 111:10, 111:11, 189:17, 190:2, 198:8, 198:10</p> <p>aim [1] - 148:12</p> <p>aiming [1] - 209:15</p> <p>air [3] - 104:12, 108:12, 166:7</p> <p>Albany [2] - 92:8, 136:16</p> <p>Alex [3] - 10:1, 25:17, 114:13</p> <p>Alex's [1] - 13:1</p> <p>Alexandria [4] - 116:19, 118:12, 119:4, 119:13</p> <p>align [1] - 174:17</p> <p>alignment [1] - 148:13</p> <p>Allen [19] - 2:8, 19:4, 29:11, 39:1, 39:8, 39:10, 44:4, 46:19, 49:4, 87:17, 99:1, 126:9, 147:10, 148:4, 164:15, 185:2, 191:4, 193:9, 211:19</p> <p>alliance [1] - 58:8</p> <p>allocated [2] - 68:17, 170:10</p> <p>allow [3] - 2:10, 76:6, 137:4</p> <p>allowable [1] - 2:13</p> <p>allowed [16] - 12:3, 12:6, 20:9, 29:3, 80:8, 86:6, 125:14, 126:18, 147:4, 147:9, 159:10, 161:12, 161:17, 162:12, 204:12, 212:8</p> <p>allows [6] - 17:13, 27:4, 27:5, 39:2, 201:16, 208:10</p> <p>alluding [1] - 215:3</p> <p>almighty [1] - 64:5</p> <p>almost [2] - 80:9, 101:14</p> <p>alone [1] - 110:13</p> <p>alternative [3] - 113:4, 125:7, 150:4</p> <p>altogether [1] - 21:8</p> <p>Amanda [3] - 66:4, 66:8, 66:10</p> <p>AMANDA [1] - 66:9</p> <p>amazing [1] - 92:3</p> <p>amend [1] - 2:6</p> <p>amendment [4] - 141:14, 159:4, 159:6, 182:7</p> <p>amenities [2] - 56:4,</p> | <p>113:19</p> <p>America [1] - 105:16</p> <p>American [1] - 33:4</p> <p>Ameron [1] - 82:5</p> <p>Ames [1] - 213:7</p> <p>amount [11] - 35:2, 35:15, 35:16, 52:16, 69:7, 84:5, 101:3, 116:15, 118:4, 123:15, 193:15</p> <p>amp [1] - 202:16</p> <p>analysis [12] - 31:6, 32:13, 33:10, 34:15, 34:16, 35:2, 35:14, 104:6, 104:9, 197:11, 200:1, 216:7</p> <p>analyzed [1] - 202:5</p> <p>AND [1] - 220:1</p> <p>AND/OR [1] - 221:17</p> <p>answer [4] - 53:8, 144:1, 150:11, 183:17</p> <p>ANTHONY [11] - 8:10, 8:16, 49:8, 153:11, 154:9, 155:2, 156:3, 185:12, 206:1, 206:4, 206:13</p> <p>Anthony [4] - 99:2, 123:17, 137:4, 153:13</p> <p>anticipate [1] - 7:3</p> <p>anticipated [1] - 206:11</p> <p>anticipating [2] - 41:18, 45:19</p> <p>Antipoverty [1] - 95:11</p> <p>antiquated [1] - 199:10</p> <p>Antrim [1] - 135:17</p> <p>ANY [2] - 221:16, 221:17</p> <p>anyway [6] - 60:2, 60:15, 131:12, 161:13, 192:11, 195:18</p> <p>apart [2] - 114:13, 201:15</p> <p>apartment [1] - 97:4</p> <p>apartments [3] - 94:10, 117:13, 117:18</p> <p>Apollo [2] - 45:2, 48:1</p> <p>apologize [1] - 51:16</p> <p>appealing [1] - 137:18</p> <p>applaud [1] - 54:17</p> <p>applicability [1] - 160:5</p> <p>applicant [1] - 176:13</p> <p>application [7] -</p> |
|--|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|---|---|
| <p>173:15, 175:7, 177:9, 194:5, 195:12, 195:15, 204:14</p> <p>applied [1] - 149:10</p> <p>applies [6] - 159:15, 160:10, 160:16, 160:17, 205:13, 214:14</p> <p>APPLY [1] - 221:16</p> <p>apply [6] - 146:13, 146:14, 159:14, 163:9, 205:8</p> <p>applying [1] - 2:16</p> <p>appreciate [4] - 106:19, 136:11, 169:12, 173:2</p> <p>appreciated [3] - 95:16, 197:10, 201:4</p> <p>approach [2] - 80:11, 81:14</p> <p>appropriate [24] - 73:5, 73:19, 81:5, 83:14, 115:18, 138:3, 138:12, 147:17, 170:8, 170:15, 171:8, 177:12, 177:14, 177:15, 177:18, 192:8, 192:9, 192:10, 192:13, 192:19, 193:1, 210:16, 212:11, 216:18</p> <p>appropriately [3] - 35:4, 138:13, 172:19</p> <p>approve [1] - 67:13</p> <p>approved [4] - 13:11, 56:7, 66:15, 101:18</p> <p>approving [1] - 188:3</p> <p>april [1] - 221:15</p> <p>April [3] - 1:5, 3:5, 3:9</p> <p>architect [1] - 122:6</p> <p>architects [2] - 92:14, 183:2</p> <p>architectural [2] - 80:4, 85:16</p> <p>architecture [6] - 83:10, 106:9, 120:2, 120:3, 120:9, 168:3</p> <p>area [36] - 2:7, 15:12, 15:19, 17:5, 17:8, 17:10, 19:7, 30:3, 33:6, 35:8, 41:7, 41:17, 52:12, 60:5, 79:13, 80:14, 80:17, 84:16, 90:10, 95:19, 112:19, 117:2, 119:1, 130:15,</p> | <p>141:16, 142:1, 145:1, 145:10, 145:13, 145:18, 147:9, 153:14, 168:13, 169:3, 187:11, 210:13</p> <p>Area [5] - 2:13, 14:18, 36:17, 40:17, 42:14</p> <p>areas [6] - 16:15, 18:19, 108:14, 146:8, 197:17, 210:5</p> <p>Arrax [1] - 131:19</p> <p>Array [1] - 131:19</p> <p>arrows [1] - 41:11</p> <p>Article [20] - 18:10, 31:5, 34:17, 38:15, 155:12, 160:9, 160:13, 160:15, 160:17, 161:1, 162:4, 173:4, 193:19, 200:4, 202:9, 205:7, 205:8, 205:12, 210:9, 211:11</p> <p>articles [1] - 204:17</p> <p>Ashburton [1] - 132:5</p> <p>aside [1] - 172:4</p> <p>aspect [2] - 147:13, 147:14</p> <p>aspects [3] - 148:16, 149:1, 149:6</p> <p>aspirations [1] - 121:19</p> <p>Assistant [3] - 1:13, 2:2, 3:11</p> <p>association [2] - 59:16, 150:9</p> <p>Association [1] - 57:5</p> <p>assume [1] - 160:8</p> <p>assuming [1] - 138:1</p> <p>assumption [1] - 169:18</p> <p>assumptions [1] - 32:14</p> <p>assurances [1] - 168:9</p> <p>asterisk [1] - 219:10</p> <p>atmosphere [1] - 61:10</p> <p>attempt [2] - 130:3, 144:3</p> <p>attended [2] - 66:13, 115:2</p> <p>attention [2] - 12:12, 189:2</p> <p>ATTORNEY [11] - 8:10, 8:16, 49:8, 153:11, 154:9, 155:2, 156:3, 185:12, 206:1,</p> | <p>206:4, 206:13</p> <p>attractive [2] - 73:12, 175:2</p> <p>AUDIENCE [9] - 56:17, 57:1, 65:8, 66:5, 71:8, 74:17, 109:10, 112:10, 140:5</p> <p>Authority's [1] - 70:11</p> <p>auto [2] - 31:19, 33:12</p> <p>automobile [2] - 32:7, 84:5</p> <p>available [3] - 2:17, 68:16, 69:5</p> <p>Ave [24] - 2:10, 37:4, 37:7, 38:19, 39:4, 41:9, 44:2, 44:7, 45:8, 47:17, 49:4, 57:18, 59:1, 59:2, 59:3, 67:2, 81:4, 84:11, 93:4, 136:15, 147:11, 177:16, 178:6, 197:12</p> <p>Avenue [10] - 2:8, 46:17, 52:3, 57:19, 97:4, 128:17, 139:18, 140:4, 185:13, 194:10</p> <p>average [1] - 106:19</p> <p>avoid [2] - 69:12, 117:7</p> <p>avoiding [1] - 42:13</p> <p>awaiting [1] - 77:16</p> <p>aware [2] - 56:6, 122:10</p> <p>awful [3] - 67:3, 166:13, 185:1</p> <p>awnings [1] - 48:19</p> | <p>178:9</p> <p>bag [1] - 23:10</p> <p>Bagonis [1] - 71:4</p> <p>balance [3] - 35:11, 196:5, 196:7</p> <p>balances [1] - 33:19</p> <p>balconies [1] - 200:17</p> <p>ball [1] - 90:17</p> <p>banks [4] - 25:8, 52:13, 129:2, 129:6</p> <p>Barbara [2] - 91:9, 93:13</p> <p>BARBARA [1] - 93:12</p> <p>BARRETT [3] - 109:13, 112:7, 112:11</p> <p>Barrett [3] - 109:15, 112:4, 115:4</p> <p>Barry [1] - 98:5</p> <p>base [10] - 18:4, 40:3, 41:8, 44:13, 100:12, 101:1, 107:9, 126:19, 199:8, 199:10</p> <p>Base [1] - 19:9</p> <p>based [17] - 33:9, 35:2, 35:5, 75:18, 96:1, 110:11, 110:14, 113:6, 142:4, 145:19, 146:2, 146:3, 153:9, 154:15, 154:16, 187:11, 216:9</p> <p>basic [1] - 144:3</p> <p>basis [1] - 32:17</p> <p>BB [1] - 18:4</p> <p>beautiful [2] - 120:9, 201:15</p> <p>became [1] - 111:14</p> <p>become [2] - 67:4, 70:8</p> <p>becomes [3] - 98:16, 99:18, 213:8</p> <p>bed [1] - 67:9</p> <p>bedroom [9] - 2:15, 21:2, 64:2, 117:13, 155:4, 155:8, 155:9, 170:11, 170:12</p> <p>bedrooms [3] - 21:19, 69:19, 98:19</p> <p>beef [2] - 53:4, 54:7</p> <p>before [1] - 46:4</p> <p>begin [4] - 6:18, 8:9, 78:11, 136:9</p> <p>beginning [7] - 12:1, 22:3, 112:15, 114:5, 140:18, 156:17, 203:10</p> <p>behalf [1] - 52:5</p> <p>behave [1] - 59:8</p> <p>behavior [2] - 32:4,</p> | <p>34:1</p> <p>behind [4] - 45:18, 86:18, 87:16, 108:2</p> <p>Bejoian [2] - 51:18, 52:2</p> <p>BEJOIAN [1] - 52:1</p> <p>Bellew [3] - 85:11, 88:19, 89:1</p> <p>BELLEW [1] - 88:19</p> <p>belong [2] - 108:14, 168:7</p> <p>below [4] - 2:18, 35:8, 99:14, 99:18</p> <p>benefit [8] - 53:5, 80:18, 114:10, 114:11, 115:17, 119:7, 147:18, 193:8</p> <p>benefits [8] - 19:15, 23:6, 26:6, 56:11, 74:15, 75:5, 113:19, 187:15</p> <p>best [4] - 59:10, 59:13, 63:6, 68:3</p> <p>bet [1] - 61:14</p> <p>better [23] - 9:11, 9:12, 25:11, 56:18, 62:12, 65:2, 72:7, 80:12, 82:18, 84:18, 88:10, 106:16, 106:17, 106:18, 114:6, 120:7, 131:1, 141:13, 159:18, 170:2, 170:3, 188:8, 201:17</p> <p>between [12] - 22:17, 28:16, 38:19, 45:5, 46:15, 48:12, 49:4, 53:14, 87:12, 123:11, 133:16, 155:1</p> <p>beyond [5] - 12:6, 26:8, 65:15, 178:6, 184:18</p> <p>bible [1] - 180:14</p> <p>bid [1] - 29:18</p> <p>bidding [1] - 30:1</p> <p>big [14] - 20:14, 21:8, 24:6, 24:16, 25:8, 76:5, 130:3, 131:3, 133:19, 175:4, 185:8, 186:12, 197:14</p> <p>bigger [5] - 64:17, 70:9, 106:5, 141:16</p> <p>biggest [3] - 81:17, 92:11, 106:10</p> <p>Bigolin [2] - 1:15, 143:19</p> <p>bike [7] - 32:9, 44:9, 44:10, 79:12, 84:7,</p> |
| B | | | | |
| | | <p>B-e-j-o-i-a-n [1] - 52:3</p> <p>B-r-e-t-h-o-l-t-z [1] - 135:13</p> <p>B-y-r-n-s [1] - 71:9</p> <p>BA [2] - 18:4, 110:11</p> <p>baby [1] - 113:12</p> <p>baby-sitter [1] - 113:12</p> <p>BACCI [14] - 198:10, 198:16, 203:1, 208:4, 212:13, 213:4, 213:11, 213:14, 213:18, 214:5, 215:10, 217:8, 217:19, 218:3</p> <p>Bacci [1] - 1:11</p> <p>background [1] - 8:8</p> <p>backyard [2] - 64:19</p> <p>bad [3] - 178:7, 178:8,</p> | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|---|---|
| <p>84:11, 85:6 biking [1] - 33:1 bill [1] - 61:1 biotech [1] - 15:1 Bishop [19] - 2:8, 19:3, 29:11, 38:19, 39:8, 39:10, 44:4, 46:19, 49:4, 87:17, 99:1, 126:9, 147:9, 148:4, 164:15, 185:1, 191:4, 193:9, 211:19 bit [13] - 30:9, 32:12, 33:2, 33:8, 40:10, 40:14, 44:17, 45:3, 48:4, 96:14, 110:6, 149:7, 180:8 bite [1] - 197:18 blind [1] - 200:2 block [11] - 17:1, 29:16, 42:1, 46:6, 48:10, 57:18, 62:15, 83:3, 83:4, 134:2, 142:13 blocking [1] - 88:5 blocks [4] - 68:1, 121:6, 141:19, 145:3 blue [2] - 36:14, 42:12 Bluestone [1] - 98:5 bluff [1] - 120:14 blunt [1] - 201:19 Board [52] - 3:5, 3:10, 4:4, 4:8, 6:9, 8:12, 11:13, 13:13, 49:11, 53:7, 55:6, 56:11, 77:15, 88:8, 97:9, 97:15, 107:10, 115:9, 142:4, 142:6, 142:7, 142:11, 144:6, 144:18, 146:18, 148:1, 149:19, 151:14, 152:5, 152:8, 152:11, 157:13, 157:14, 162:9, 163:15, 170:19, 180:5, 182:8, 182:18, 204:19, 205:18, 210:8, 210:17, 211:5, 212:6, 212:11, 216:9, 217:7, 218:7, 219:17, 220:6, 220:15 board [3] - 109:17, 143:2, 211:19 BOARD [1] - 1:2 Board's [4] - 6:10, 211:3, 212:3, 212:10</p> | <p>bodies [1] - 17:6 body [1] - 199:13 boiler [1] - 202:18 bonus [4] - 100:13, 126:14, 126:16, 126:18 booming [1] - 14:19 Boston [10] - 94:1, 97:16, 97:19, 113:10, 129:17, 153:14, 153:17, 161:6, 174:9, 174:10 bothers [1] - 102:3 bottom [3] - 42:5, 89:16, 184:5 bought [1] - 27:2 boy [1] - 69:16 Boyes [2] - 121:2, 121:5 BOYES [1] - 121:4 Boyes-Watson [2] - 121:2, 121:5 BOYES-WATSON [1] - 121:4 brand [1] - 113:14 break [4] - 40:6, 40:19, 48:9, 143:2 breaking [2] - 41:6, 43:17 breath [1] - 169:2 BREHOLTZ [3] - 135:12, 136:3, 139:10 Bretholtz [1] - 135:13 brick [1] - 186:13 brief [2] - 143:17, 144:16 briefly [1] - 152:14 brightness [1] - 47:6 brilliant [1] - 198:19 bring [11] - 19:16, 20:1, 26:7, 73:8, 75:10, 94:17, 121:18, 132:16, 132:17, 148:13, 217:9 bringing [1] - 92:17 brings [2] - 201:2, 201:11 BRISTOL [1] - 221:3 Broad [3] - 109:8, 109:15, 109:19 broad [3] - 34:15, 124:6, 173:6 broadened [1] - 26:3 broader [2] - 35:1, 109:3 Broadway [4] - 1:7, 91:13, 109:11, 109:16</p> | <p>broken [4] - 214:15, 215:2, 216:11, 217:12 brother [1] - 52:6 brought [3] - 53:1, 89:3, 92:18 brush [1] - 34:15 Brustlin [1] - 31:1 budget [5] - 22:16, 53:11, 58:13, 97:14, 103:1 build [24] - 22:2, 62:12, 68:13, 69:13, 72:14, 73:14, 77:12, 79:3, 82:17, 88:11, 90:11, 107:7, 108:17, 110:14, 120:3, 120:14, 122:12, 123:7, 128:6, 130:4, 130:19, 134:9, 213:6, 213:10 builders [3] - 69:12, 128:18, 131:8 building [84] - 2:10, 4:15, 17:13, 30:4, 38:8, 38:13, 39:15, 40:3, 40:5, 40:17, 41:1, 41:8, 41:14, 41:18, 42:3, 42:19, 43:16, 44:12, 47:1, 47:18, 48:8, 48:13, 58:5, 62:3, 64:2, 67:4, 68:16, 69:10, 77:7, 78:14, 80:10, 80:16, 81:1, 81:11, 84:10, 87:1, 88:4, 89:7, 89:16, 90:3, 90:5, 91:1, 91:2, 92:1, 92:2, 92:7, 96:4, 96:8, 107:1, 107:16, 107:19, 108:1, 113:14, 114:12, 118:17, 119:5, 120:15, 122:8, 123:3, 126:5, 131:3, 134:7, 135:6, 136:18, 136:19, 137:1, 137:5, 137:9, 138:19, 156:11, 165:14, 165:17, 176:11, 176:12, 177:2, 185:18, 186:13, 186:17, 186:18, 194:12, 212:5 Building [1] - 4:19 buildings [18] - 39:12, 48:1, 48:7, 63:13, 86:14, 86:15, 90:1, 91:4, 92:7, 94:9, 103:15, 106:12,</p> | <p>113:11, 145:8, 145:10, 145:11, 165:19, 198:1 built [11] - 94:14, 96:3, 96:11, 106:13, 122:16, 124:2, 124:12, 134:10, 168:5, 177:8, 184:2 bulk [4] - 39:7, 39:10, 42:17, 42:19 bulky [1] - 80:9 bump [1] - 29:13 bunch [3] - 23:10, 194:9, 194:18 bundle [1] - 185:2 burden [2] - 28:3, 28:8 burn [1] - 198:1 bus [3] - 84:15, 129:19, 142:1 Business [1] - 57:5 BUSINESS [1] - 2:2 business [9] - 55:9, 59:16, 60:5, 105:13, 129:5, 134:6, 174:2, 181:1, 219:14 businesses [4] - 55:18, 86:10, 88:2, 90:10 busses [1] - 31:12 bustling [1] - 62:13 busy [1] - 59:4 button [1] - 86:2 buy [5] - 60:7, 102:5, 113:15, 129:13, 130:18 Byrns [2] - 71:9, 71:12 BYRNS [1] - 71:12</p> | <p>123:17, 124:7, 124:14, 132:18, 133:1, 133:14, 134:1, 141:1, 165:12, 166:9, 169:9, 187:10, 187:18, 188:17, 190:6, 190:14, 191:11, 192:19, 195:5, 199:7, 200:10, 210:19, 214:18 Cafe [1] - 48:17 calculate [1] - 126:4 calculates [1] - 190:19 CAMBRIDGE [1] - 1:3 Cambridge [50] - 1:8, 2:6, 31:15, 52:4, 52:19, 55:7, 61:11, 61:16, 62:4, 66:17, 70:2, 70:3, 70:7, 70:11, 71:14, 72:10, 78:3, 80:2, 80:4, 80:5, 81:13, 81:18, 82:9, 83:6, 89:15, 90:14, 92:4, 93:18, 95:9, 95:10, 95:11, 105:16, 107:6, 107:7, 108:8, 109:5, 113:14, 116:18, 118:15, 119:6, 122:6, 122:8, 124:10, 129:1, 129:14, 138:7, 139:7, 165:19, 171:19, 174:5 Cambridge's [2] - 55:9, 62:1 CambridgePark [1] - 5:4 Cambridgeport [4] - 14:18, 40:17, 42:15, 87:14 candy [1] - 64:11 cannot [3] - 96:9, 104:8, 118:1 capped [1] - 17:14 captures [1] - 83:15 CAPTURING [1] - 1:18 car [17] - 20:2, 28:7, 31:17, 31:18, 32:2, 32:5, 64:5, 72:13, 80:14, 84:3, 85:6, 128:10, 161:15, 202:10, 208:6, 208:14, 208:16 carbon [3] - 61:10, 62:9, 63:3 care [1] - 160:10 careers [2] - 138:4,</p> |
| C | | | | |
| <p>C-1 [1] - 16:11 C-a-r-o-l-y-n [1] - 63:9 C-h-i-l-i-n-s-k-i [1] - 80:2 C2 [66] - 11:15, 13:1, 18:12, 18:15, 18:18, 20:13, 21:14, 24:9, 25:3, 26:9, 26:12, 26:15, 28:16, 29:12, 29:14, 32:13, 32:17, 32:18, 34:9, 34:14, 35:1, 35:6, 37:10, 38:5, 38:17, 42:8, 42:11, 55:16, 56:2, 77:1, 77:15, 100:16, 100:17, 101:1, 109:16, 109:17, 111:7, 115:19, 117:7, 121:15,</p> | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| <p>138:5 carefully [1] - 189:14 Carl [1] - 5:11 carlone [1] - 53:10 CARLONE [1] - 97:2 Carlone [6] - 95:7, 97:4, 110:8, 111:14, 111:15, 115:6 CAROL [1] - 88:19 Carol [2] - 85:11, 88:19 Carolyn [2] - 61:2, 63:8 CAROLYN [1] - 63:8 carried [1] - 150:9 cars [9] - 27:11, 27:16, 31:19, 50:4, 62:8, 62:15, 64:3, 72:10, 194:4 case [3] - 104:18, 191:3, 207:2 cases [3] - 146:2, 149:3, 212:4 casual [1] - 204:9 categories [1] - 200:3 category [1] - 21:10 catenary [3] - 45:4, 46:12, 49:2 Catherine [7] - 1:9, 4:10, 65:7, 175:18, 199:2, 221:4, 221:12 CATHERINE [14] - 60:11, 65:11, 65:19, 139:8, 139:12, 167:1, 195:14, 199:4, 203:7, 203:16, 213:19, 214:7, 215:14, 215:18 causes [1] - 108:15 caution [1] - 207:9 cautionary [1] - 127:15 CBT [1] - 36:3 CDD [1] - 38:5 CDD's [1] - 122:1 celebrating [1] - 37:12 Center [1] - 4:13 center [4] - 37:5, 62:14, 77:6, 136:17 central [2] - 180:17, 210:3 Central [102] - 2:7, 14:14, 14:16, 15:18, 16:6, 16:8, 16:9, 16:13, 16:18, 18:5, 35:8, 37:1, 37:4, 37:14, 52:11, 54:9, 55:19, 57:4, 57:12,</p> | <p>57:14, 58:5, 58:6, 58:19, 59:3, 59:9, 59:12, 60:17, 62:13, 63:10, 63:11, 67:14, 72:7, 73:17, 74:12, 74:15, 75:5, 75:16, 76:2, 77:18, 80:19, 83:15, 83:16, 87:19, 88:1, 89:4, 89:7, 89:9, 90:1, 90:6, 90:19, 93:16, 95:1, 104:4, 104:7, 105:12, 106:13, 107:1, 109:4, 111:2, 112:13, 112:14, 114:10, 117:8, 121:12, 121:14, 124:16, 124:19, 130:4, 130:8, 130:9, 132:6, 133:3, 135:1, 135:6, 136:17, 137:12, 141:17, 144:14, 145:5, 146:12, 147:5, 148:14, 149:14, 149:15, 164:3, 164:7, 165:6, 165:12, 166:12, 166:14, 171:9, 172:9, 173:17, 174:8, 176:2, 177:16, 177:17, 178:17, 183:18, 184:15, 192:10, 194:19 CEOC's [1] - 96:15 certain [4] - 105:4, 149:1, 161:19, 193:15 certainly [8] - 28:12, 108:19, 109:1, 133:6, 137:17, 144:16, 148:7, 179:11 CERTIFICATION [1] - 221:16 Certified [2] - 221:4, 221:13 certify [1] - 221:5 CERTIFYING [1] - 221:18 chain [1] - 129:8 chair [6] - 8:11, 9:17, 49:9, 155:3, 206:2, 207:1 Chair [2] - 1:9, 1:9 Chairman [1] - 55:5 challenge [2] - 81:17, 122:3 challenges [2] - 29:7, 121:16 chamber [1] - 56:6</p> | <p>Chamber [1] - 55:7 chance [2] - 62:19, 69:4 CHANGE [6] - 220:8, 220:9, 220:10, 220:11, 220:12, 220:13 change [14] - 24:6, 32:3, 61:14, 63:1, 85:15, 95:16, 96:2, 145:19, 146:10, 168:18, 168:19, 205:4, 220:6 changed [3] - 119:8, 195:1, 205:12 changes [17] - 2:9, 7:8, 10:17, 11:2, 56:10, 57:15, 76:1, 93:5, 136:12, 144:9, 148:12, 149:5, 178:16, 181:12, 194:18, 218:15, 220:16 changing [2] - 48:8, 181:2 character [4] - 87:12, 106:7, 168:15, 194:19 characteristic [1] - 207:4 characteristics [1] - 108:13 CHARLES [1] - 141:9 Charles [3] - 89:1, 141:8, 141:11 chart [1] - 183:14 checks [1] - 18:13 cherished [1] - 77:19 Cherry [2] - 68:1, 73:3 Cheung [1] - 165:16 children's [1] - 70:4 Chilinski [2] - 76:10, 80:1 CHILINSKI [1] - 79:19 choice [1] - 123:11 choices [2] - 37:16, 37:19 choosing [1] - 68:13 chose [1] - 151:12 chunk [1] - 128:3 circulation [1] - 45:17 circumstances [1] - 146:7 cities [2] - 63:19, 64:8 city [63] - 2:2, 3:17, 15:3, 20:7, 29:16, 41:3, 41:19, 42:16, 43:19, 46:1, 47:4, 53:14, 58:12, 58:14, 61:15, 61:16, 63:4, 63:6, 67:14, 68:7,</p> | <p>69:8, 70:15, 78:19, 79:9, 80:12, 82:16, 83:8, 92:12, 92:17, 93:6, 93:8, 95:3, 96:13, 96:18, 97:14, 98:3, 98:16, 99:9, 99:12, 102:5, 103:2, 103:11, 110:8, 115:16, 117:10, 122:15, 122:16, 124:18, 140:13, 142:7, 158:6, 158:7, 158:14, 165:7, 170:14, 172:2, 179:18, 180:1, 180:18, 200:8, 201:1, 210:12, 210:15 CITY [1] - 1:3 City [47] - 1:13, 2:6, 2:9, 3:11, 3:17, 3:19, 5:17, 21:13, 22:15, 22:16, 25:19, 31:15, 33:3, 53:6, 53:11, 53:13, 56:7, 56:13, 73:6, 74:1, 81:17, 97:13, 97:16, 97:19, 98:1, 98:9, 101:7, 103:9, 103:19, 115:11, 119:14, 133:6, 134:7, 151:1, 151:3, 151:5, 151:12, 152:3, 153:14, 156:9, 157:4, 157:5, 157:17, 164:19, 179:5, 203:6 city's [3] - 70:16, 169:4, 182:3 City's [2] - 22:14, 54:4 citywide [2] - 5:19, 210:9 clamoring [2] - 64:15, 64:17 clarification [1] - 190:4 clarifications [1] - 209:12 clarified [2] - 159:18, 162:1 clarify [1] - 210:5 clarifying [1] - 173:2 clarity [4] - 13:14, 180:15, 182:6, 190:3 Clark [2] - 55:3, 55:6 CLARK [1] - 55:4 class [1] - 158:6 cleaner [2] - 65:1, 191:16 clear [23] - 11:9, 12:9, 18:8, 18:10, 21:5,</p> | <p>27:2, 28:17, 68:3, 69:1, 81:16, 89:19, 157:13, 157:15, 160:9, 160:15, 181:9, 203:15, 203:17, 204:8, 204:9, 204:10, 205:12, 208:7 clearer [5] - 18:9, 162:12, 205:4, 209:4, 211:12 clearly [5] - 96:15, 149:9, 176:14, 200:5, 213:8 Clement [2] - 43:11, 47:8 clicker [1] - 9:16 climate [2] - 61:8, 62:2 close [9] - 14:9, 22:9, 70:12, 82:11, 130:16, 140:17, 151:5, 184:5, 185:15 closely [3] - 48:5, 56:2, 172:16 closer [2] - 74:18, 147:11 closest [2] - 14:8, 116:4 Clover [2] - 59:19, 94:18 code [6] - 181:1, 181:2, 181:3, 181:8, 181:16, 182:3 Code [1] - 182:9 COE [1] - 55:7 Cohen [4] - 1:9, 1:11, 55:5, 107:5 COHEN [115] - 3:3, 3:8, 6:13, 6:17, 8:14, 49:10, 50:17, 51:1, 55:1, 56:15, 61:1, 65:6, 65:9, 65:17, 66:2, 66:7, 67:17, 71:3, 71:10, 72:19, 74:3, 76:9, 82:4, 82:10, 85:9, 91:8, 93:11, 95:5, 109:7, 109:12, 112:4, 114:17, 121:1, 125:4, 128:14, 131:18, 135:11, 136:1, 139:14, 140:1, 141:4, 141:7, 142:17, 143:1, 143:6, 150:13, 151:8, 151:16, 152:2, 152:12, 152:16, 152:18, 153:3, 153:13,</p> |
|---|--|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| <p>153:18, 156:1, 156:5, 157:18, 158:5, 159:1, 173:12, 173:14, 182:15, 183:1, 189:19, 190:2, 190:3, 190:10, 190:16, 191:2, 191:18, 192:4, 193:11, 194:1, 194:5, 195:2, 195:16, 196:14, 197:3, 198:8, 198:9, 202:19, 203:4, 203:17, 204:3, 205:1, 206:3, 206:7, 206:9, 207:6, 207:14, 207:16, 208:2, 208:18, 209:5, 209:7, 209:18, 211:8, 213:1, 213:6, 213:12, 214:2, 214:3, 215:7, 215:11, 217:15, 217:17, 218:2, 218:8, 218:19, 219:3, 219:5, 219:8, 219:9, 219:12</p> <p>cohesive [1] - 83:13</p> <p>cohesively [1] - 83:12</p> <p>collaborative [1] - 11:3</p> <p>colleague [1] - 183:13</p> <p>colleagues [2] - 105:5, 189:8</p> <p>Columbia [13] - 2:8, 2:12, 23:17, 23:19, 24:1, 39:18, 43:1, 45:8, 48:3, 93:14, 102:14, 104:15, 132:14</p> <p>combined [1] - 25:7</p> <p>comfort [1] - 20:12</p> <p>comfortable [2] - 23:5, 172:11</p> <p>coming [12] - 33:18, 46:9, 50:2, 75:17, 90:12, 101:17, 102:18, 102:19, 137:11, 137:19, 188:2, 219:13</p> <p>comment [7] - 107:4, 156:8, 165:17, 197:6, 198:7, 211:2, 212:1</p> <p>comments [26] - 7:5, 7:12, 10:13, 10:15, 51:3, 51:8, 60:12, 136:6, 142:4, 144:5, 148:2, 148:10, 159:3, 160:2, 160:4,</p> | <p>165:3, 167:18, 171:17, 189:7, 201:5, 204:13, 204:16, 211:9, 217:6, 218:14, 218:15</p> <p>Commerce [1] - 55:7</p> <p>commercial [7] - 12:3, 12:18, 55:11, 68:11, 80:10, 90:8, 91:4</p> <p>Commission [3] - 57:11, 121:13, 221:14</p> <p>commitment [7] - 21:9, 25:16, 169:13, 170:15, 170:18, 172:2, 172:12</p> <p>Committee [7] - 3:18, 5:9, 9:2, 121:15, 144:12, 151:15, 188:17</p> <p>committee [2] - 77:1, 122:1</p> <p>common [1] - 126:3</p> <p>COMMONWEALTH [1] - 221:2</p> <p>communities [2] - 64:3, 75:14</p> <p>Community [10] - 1:14, 2:3, 2:17, 36:7, 38:4, 40:9, 41:15, 95:12, 134:12, 220:3</p> <p>community [27] - 16:2, 16:3, 23:6, 24:9, 28:9, 53:4, 59:15, 59:17, 65:15, 69:14, 74:15, 75:6, 75:19, 76:3, 78:1, 79:2, 92:15, 94:3, 94:8, 113:18, 119:7, 122:1, 122:3, 130:17, 130:19, 136:14, 168:8</p> <p>commute [1] - 62:11</p> <p>compact [1] - 47:17</p> <p>compacted [3] - 42:10, 42:13, 47:13</p> <p>compacting [2] - 40:12, 47:2</p> <p>comparable [3] - 116:3, 118:15, 147:12</p> <p>compare [3] - 34:5, 49:14, 147:1</p> <p>compared [2] - 90:1, 175:14</p> <p>comparing [2] - 89:19, 133:9</p> <p>comparison [4] -</p> | <p>34:8, 47:7, 50:6, 199:13</p> <p>comparisons [1] - 46:3</p> <p>compensable [1] - 68:9</p> <p>competing [1] - 122:19</p> <p>compile [1] - 197:13</p> <p>complete [2] - 15:4, 99:5</p> <p>completed [1] - 131:7</p> <p>completely [4] - 111:15, 138:3, 138:11, 159:7</p> <p>complex [1] - 109:5</p> <p>compliant [1] - 17:19</p> <p>complication [3] - 204:5, 204:7</p> <p>comply [6] - 17:18, 17:19, 160:19, 161:1, 164:11</p> <p>component [5] - 53:18, 54:3, 57:17, 66:19, 175:10</p> <p>composed [1] - 126:15</p> <p>comprehensive [2] - 88:17, 104:3</p> <p>Comprehensive [1] - 85:19</p> <p>compromise [1] - 89:15</p> <p>concept [7] - 83:6, 133:18, 158:2, 165:16, 166:5, 177:13, 178:13</p> <p>concepts [1] - 183:7</p> <p>conceptual [1] - 142:3</p> <p>conceptually [1] - 20:7</p> <p>concern [4] - 73:9, 136:9, 137:2, 209:14</p> <p>concerned [5] - 26:19, 87:8, 116:9, 136:10, 213:16</p> <p>concerns [8] - 107:15, 121:13, 168:6, 176:4, 178:19, 192:7, 192:15</p> <p>conclude [1] - 106:15</p> <p>concluded [2] - 6:4, 57:15</p> <p>concludes [1] - 49:9</p> <p>conclusions [1] - 145:17</p> <p>condition [3] - 26:14, 45:14, 157:8</p> | <p>confident [2] - 28:4, 65:16</p> <p>configuration [1] - 47:2</p> <p>conflation [1] - 167:16</p> <p>conflicts [1] - 159:11</p> <p>conform [1] - 22:12</p> <p>conforming [1] - 155:13</p> <p>confusing [5] - 30:10, 149:7, 159:13, 161:16, 167:8</p> <p>confusion [1] - 214:10</p> <p>conjugate [1] - 201:12</p> <p>connect [1] - 25:11</p> <p>connection [3] - 45:15, 46:8, 48:10</p> <p>Connection [1] - 44:9</p> <p>connections [4] - 12:8, 17:6, 25:10, 45:18</p> <p>connects [1] - 67:2</p> <p>CONNOLLY [12] - 60:11, 139:8, 139:12, 167:1, 195:14, 199:4, 203:7, 203:16, 213:19, 214:7, 215:14, 215:18</p> <p>Connolly [3] - 1:9, 4:10, 142:8</p> <p>consensus [1] - 28:9</p> <p>consequences [1] - 188:12</p> <p>consider [7] - 28:13, 56:11, 82:1, 97:16, 170:4, 184:12, 187:14</p> <p>considerably [1] - 125:16</p> <p>consideration [3] - 70:1, 201:7, 211:4</p> <p>considerations [3] - 149:18, 150:6, 150:8</p> <p>considering [3] - 184:8, 211:13, 211:14</p> <p>consistency [1] - 209:15</p> <p>consistent [12] - 18:12, 20:13, 123:16, 127:6, 149:3, 188:18, 189:1, 200:8, 200:10, 200:11, 210:2, 214:18</p> <p>consistently [1] -</p> | <p>24:9</p> <p>constant [1] - 174:11</p> <p>constraints [1] - 79:3</p> <p>construction [6] - 77:11, 92:8, 92:9, 96:16, 98:6, 99:7</p> <p>contemplated [3] - 184:15, 184:17, 184:18</p> <p>contemplating [1] - 192:16</p> <p>contemporary [1] - 83:18</p> <p>context [6] - 9:7, 86:12, 86:16, 119:2, 145:2, 216:2</p> <p>continue [8] - 41:5, 64:1, 78:3, 97:8, 143:7, 150:8, 151:11, 209:19</p> <p>Continued [1] - 2:5</p> <p>continued [1] - 6:19</p> <p>continuing [6] - 17:2, 39:11, 45:8, 46:6, 46:7, 144:10</p> <p>continuity [1] - 48:17</p> <p>contributing [2] - 83:17, 83:18</p> <p>contribution [1] - 27:6</p> <p>CONTROL [1] - 221:17</p> <p>control [1] - 124:10</p> <p>controlled [1] - 30:1</p> <p>controls [1] - 159:12</p> <p>conventional [2] - 200:15, 201:8</p> <p>conversation [13] - 13:5, 26:4, 26:8, 41:15, 110:18, 110:19, 133:1, 148:8, 197:6, 199:2, 203:10, 216:18, 217:1</p> <p>conversations [1] - 40:7</p> <p>convoluted [1] - 181:15</p> <p>cool [1] - 37:13</p> <p>Coolidge [1] - 44:8</p> <p>coordinates [1] - 202:7</p> <p>copies [2] - 135:19</p> <p>copy [3] - 5:12, 125:8, 156:2</p> <p>core [5] - 11:19, 14:15, 15:2, 63:19, 122:16</p> <p>corner [7] - 36:16, 39:16, 42:5, 129:3, 176:10, 186:18,</p> |
|--|--|---|---|---|

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| <p>194:11 correct [3] - 118:12, 214:6, 218:3 corrected [1] - 137:5 correction [1] - 220:7 corrections [1] - 220:16 correspondence [1] - 9:10 cost [7] - 23:12, 25:15, 53:14, 58:15, 99:14, 99:18, 102:9 costing [1] - 53:18 costs [8] - 23:1, 61:7, 77:11, 79:4, 122:4, 124:10, 124:11 Council [29] - 3:18, 3:19, 4:5, 5:15, 5:17, 5:18, 53:2, 53:6, 56:8, 56:13, 73:6, 74:1, 109:2, 115:2, 115:12, 123:19, 133:6, 141:13, 151:1, 151:3, 151:6, 151:12, 152:3, 152:10, 152:14, 157:14, 165:1, 202:18, 203:6 COUNCILLOR [1] - 97:2 Councillor [9] - 95:6, 100:8, 110:7, 111:15, 113:17, 115:6, 165:16, 179:5 councillor [1] - 111:14 Councillors [1] - 119:14 councillors [1] - 105:4 count [1] - 171:14 counted [1] - 190:14 counterproductive [1] - 102:12 couple [5] - 8:7, 97:10, 111:2, 132:8, 132:19 course [5] - 6:10, 32:7, 109:2, 111:16, 175:8 courthouse [4] - 89:5, 89:8, 89:13, 90:2 covered [5] - 198:17, 211:17, 217:10, 218:6, 218:9 CPA [1] - 97:18 cranes [1] - 114:14 crazy [1] - 114:13 create [11] - 22:18,</p> | <p>44:16, 45:5, 45:10, 49:2, 49:5, 59:17, 79:10, 79:14, 96:17, 117:9 created [4] - 96:12, 112:1, 183:19, 210:15 creates [3] - 25:13, 95:18, 133:15 creating [20] - 2:7, 12:1, 23:12, 37:17, 37:18, 38:7, 40:14, 41:9, 45:1, 45:2, 46:11, 47:17, 47:19, 48:14, 48:17, 48:18, 49:3, 61:19, 95:19 creation [2] - 14:12, 60:3 credit [1] - 96:4 credits [1] - 96:3 crisis [6] - 61:6, 61:7, 61:8, 62:1, 62:2, 70:9 criteria [1] - 173:1 criterion [1] - 22:14 critical [6] - 14:10, 34:16, 79:7, 95:13, 96:11, 96:18 criticism [1] - 84:1 critique [1] - 124:14 cross [1] - 126:12 crossing [2] - 44:18, 46:6 crosswalk [1] - 44:18 crowd [1] - 7:3 crucial [1] - 183:13 crunch [1] - 93:18 crystal [1] - 204:8 cultural [1] - 95:2 culture [1] - 37:14 curb [1] - 78:11 curious [1] - 212:14 current [9] - 2:11, 32:11, 45:14, 61:17, 64:10, 110:12, 110:14, 146:4, 179:3 curve [2] - 41:14, 131:14 custom [1] - 116:11 cut [3] - 70:17, 86:17, 203:1 cycle [6] - 174:2, 174:13, 174:14, 174:16, 182:13</p> <p style="text-align: center;">D</p> <p>Dana [2] - 66:11, 85:14</p> | <p>dangerous [1] - 197:8 darn [1] - 120:8 Dash [1] - 1:15 dashed [1] - 42:12 data [5] - 33:3, 49:19, 50:14, 172:10, 172:16 date [4] - 154:4, 163:13, 163:16, 220:7 dated [2] - 33:2, 164:3 dates [3] - 163:12, 163:18, 210:2 David [10] - 10:4, 19:17, 30:16, 32:8, 36:3, 74:4, 74:6, 74:9, 76:10, 79:19 DAVID [2] - 36:2, 79:19 days [4] - 8:7, 13:1, 64:4, 152:7 dead [2] - 12:7, 67:4 deal [7] - 19:5, 27:7, 99:16, 133:19, 142:11, 173:9, 187:7 dealing [1] - 87:1 deals [1] - 20:18 debacle [1] - 90:2 debate [1] - 23:4 debated [1] - 169:10 decades [2] - 24:2, 111:2 decide [3] - 131:5, 196:17, 216:12 decision [3] - 76:5, 216:7, 216:9 decisions [1] - 195:12 deck [1] - 51:7 decline [1] - 78:5 deemed [1] - 210:16 deeper [3] - 40:15, 41:2, 47:3 defer [2] - 196:19, 207:14 define [1] - 207:12 defined [2] - 138:2, 207:5 defining [2] - 16:19, 207:4 definition [4] - 162:13, 162:18, 193:1, 209:12 definitions [1] - 125:13 degree [2] - 39:7, 114:9 delay [3] - 66:16, 67:7, 76:7 delaying [1] - 62:3 deliberations [1] -</p> | <p>143:9 delights [1] - 121:13 deliver [2] - 16:1, 29:3 delivered [1] - 220:3 delivering [1] - 29:7 demand [3] - 61:13, 78:7, 128:5 demands [1] - 22:4 Democratic [1] - 9:6 demonstrates [1] - 81:16 Dennis [5] - 65:10, 66:2, 67:19, 97:3, 110:7 DENNIS [2] - 67:18, 97:2 dense [1] - 62:12 densest [1] - 115:15 densities [2] - 13:7, 15:17 density [29] - 29:5, 55:13, 77:10, 82:17, 83:5, 83:8, 83:9, 83:10, 86:10, 105:14, 106:1, 118:2, 133:4, 135:5, 140:9, 141:1, 145:12, 146:19, 147:5, 147:9, 147:12, 147:16, 171:14, 176:13, 177:19, 184:3, 184:14, 195:7, 201:8 deny [3] - 66:3, 156:10, 157:4 Department [6] - 2:18, 36:8, 38:4, 157:3, 220:4 dependence [1] - 32:7 derail [1] - 110:18 derailed [1] - 77:15 DeRosa [2] - 95:6, 95:8 DEROSA [1] - 95:8 described [1] - 200:14 deserve [6] - 119:19, 120:1, 120:2, 120:13, 120:17, 120:18 deserves [1] - 91:1 design [32] - 25:10, 26:11, 26:12, 26:15, 30:17, 36:4, 36:6, 38:8, 38:14, 38:15, 81:5, 82:15, 83:2, 83:4, 83:5, 99:5, 103:17, 106:7, 106:9, 110:12,</p> | <p>120:8, 135:4, 149:14, 149:16, 150:3, 164:3, 164:6, 164:11, 168:10, 188:10, 210:3, 210:10 designations [1] - 141:2 designed [3] - 83:11, 175:1, 177:10 designs [2] - 139:3, 139:6 desirable [2] - 194:10, 214:19 desire [1] - 168:8 desired [1] - 48:6 desperately [3] - 66:16, 78:10, 90:6 despite [1] - 122:14 destroys [1] - 133:18 detail [4] - 144:17, 148:7, 153:3, 217:6 details [2] - 63:5, 173:9 determine [2] - 57:13, 215:16 determined [2] - 137:15, 193:16 develop [1] - 140:14 developable [1] - 191:5 developed [11] - 96:6, 171:2, 212:19, 213:2, 213:16, 214:9, 214:13, 214:15, 215:2, 215:4, 217:12 developer [13] - 7:6, 52:18, 54:1, 54:4, 69:18, 72:3, 73:13, 86:1, 101:11, 118:1, 118:19, 142:12, 204:11 developer's [5] - 86:4, 113:7, 125:9, 172:1, 172:7 developers [16] - 68:4, 68:19, 72:15, 75:18, 77:12, 87:6, 90:14, 92:3, 92:13, 100:2, 101:9, 103:15, 116:11, 116:18, 158:11, 191:12 developing [1] - 118:14 Development [11] - 1:14, 2:3, 2:17, 24:10, 36:7, 38:4, 40:9, 41:16, 107:5, 134:12, 220:4</p> |
|---|--|--|---|---|

development [46] - 12:9, 22:8, 26:5, 28:5, 28:18, 30:7, 39:6, 52:19, 64:1, 64:8, 77:3, 79:10, 81:7, 84:6, 87:11, 87:15, 90:17, 91:3, 109:5, 111:10, 111:12, 113:11, 118:17, 121:17, 133:10, 133:12, 141:16, 147:1, 147:15, 160:12, 160:13, 170:17, 171:1, 173:17, 174:8, 176:8, 178:1, 184:2, 184:3, 190:17, 193:8, 193:12, 194:4, 205:6, 205:7, 205:9

developments [3] - 12:3, 63:18, 81:19

diagram [2] - 38:1, 42:7

diagrams [1] - 73:11

difference [11] - 24:2, 25:9, 34:10, 46:15, 98:7, 100:15, 126:13, 133:16, 186:10, 186:13, 193:7

differences [3] - 18:19, 28:16, 125:12

different [17] - 23:10, 28:11, 32:3, 75:12, 88:14, 94:4, 104:19, 145:8, 145:9, 148:17, 161:9, 163:18, 166:1, 183:7, 184:4, 201:4, 204:15

differently [2] - 159:7, 167:12

difficult [3] - 146:3, 183:10, 199:16

DIRECT [1] - 221:17

direct [1] - 14:6

DIRECTION [1] - 221:17

directly [2] - 14:3, 84:13

director [1] - 95:10

disabled [1] - 52:7

discouraged [1] - 72:12

discouraging [1] - 69:12

discuss [1] - 143:3

discussed [6] - 36:11, 142:5, 156:19,

178:11, 218:16, 218:18

discussing [3] - 38:5, 142:8, 192:3

discussion [12] - 4:13, 5:3, 5:13, 98:14, 133:5, 135:4, 156:6, 180:4, 182:19, 184:13, 197:7, 219:3

discussions [4] - 144:11, 195:5, 195:13, 196:9

disingenuous [1] - 124:8

dispel [1] - 89:6

displace [1] - 62:19

displaced [1] - 62:8

distances [1] - 62:12

distant [1] - 164:8

District [5] - 14:15, 16:7, 16:10, 16:11, 16:18

district [16] - 19:8, 37:14, 83:16, 83:17, 87:15, 95:3, 105:13, 105:14, 159:9, 159:10, 160:18, 161:6, 161:7, 176:11, 178:17, 200:12

district's [1] - 199:7

districts [3] - 16:11, 55:9, 87:16

Districts [1] - 204:15

ditto [1] - 54:15

diverse [2] - 77:5, 94:3

diversity [6] - 37:15, 63:2, 77:19, 78:5, 78:16, 79:9

document [1] - 180:18

DOES [1] - 221:16

dollars [4] - 22:17, 53:15, 58:15, 97:13

domain [1] - 93:2

donating [1] - 147:19

done [15] - 5:11, 6:7, 59:13, 69:3, 115:13, 141:18, 145:4, 148:3, 152:15, 172:18, 182:12, 184:10, 185:6, 190:5, 199:6

door [1] - 105:3

doors [1] - 59:7

doubling [1] - 76:16

doubts [1] - 77:9

Douglass [5] - 2:8, 2:12, 61:5, 63:10,

104:16

down [25] - 11:1, 11:9, 16:12, 29:2, 40:6, 40:19, 41:6, 43:17, 48:1, 48:9, 48:17, 75:2, 92:7, 130:7, 130:16, 143:8, 175:3, 177:15, 178:5, 179:11, 186:17, 197:11, 198:1, 198:18, 199:5

downright [1] - 103:6

draft [3] - 116:1, 167:11, 180:15

drafted [3] - 159:7, 167:6, 202:18

drafting [5] - 159:4, 180:12, 180:13, 181:2

dramatically [1] - 107:13

drawing [2] - 98:12, 98:13

dreaming [1] - 124:15

drive [3] - 32:19, 72:10, 72:12

Drive [11] - 2:8, 5:4, 82:9, 87:17, 126:9, 147:10, 148:5, 164:15, 185:2, 193:9, 211:19

driven [1] - 132:11

druthers [1] - 159:5

dug [2] - 28:14, 183:4

duplication [1] - 159:19

duplicative [2] - 160:6, 162:5

during [8] - 22:15, 33:13, 34:12, 43:8, 50:3, 53:10, 111:12, 138:9

dwelling [2] - 15:5, 155:5

dysfunctional [1] - 138:16

E

E-I-d-e-r [1] - 91:13

e-mail [1] - 7:14

e-mails [1] - 9:9

early [9] - 10:9, 10:11, 13:1, 13:3, 13:18, 25:15, 26:18, 27:8, 68:14

ears [1] - 45:11

East [6] - 89:14, 90:14, 107:6, 107:7, 118:14, 119:6

easy [2] - 67:8, 70:17

economic [4] - 104:6, 104:9, 130:9, 171:3

Economic [1] - 95:10

economics [1] - 100:19

economies [1] - 168:19

economists [1] - 100:2

economy [2] - 15:1, 174:4

edge [7] - 27:18, 29:10, 37:1, 133:18, 133:19, 134:2, 135:1

edit [1] - 167:4

Edmunds [1] - 141:11

effect [3] - 42:14, 164:12, 193:17

efficiency [1] - 206:16

efficient [1] - 206:5

effort [1] - 11:3

efforts [1] - 57:15

eight [2] - 21:14, 202:11

either [5] - 62:10, 63:17, 163:13, 168:11, 202:12

Elaine [2] - 95:6, 95:8

ELAINE [1] - 95:8

elapsed [1] - 4:3

Elder [2] - 91:9, 91:12

ELDER [1] - 91:11

electronically [1] - 220:4

element [1] - 105:18

elements [4] - 40:5, 41:13, 48:19, 106:8

eligible [5] - 96:4, 155:15, 155:16, 157:5, 171:19

elsewhere [7] - 105:4, 105:8, 149:4, 165:6, 192:13, 208:3, 209:19

embodies [1] - 58:1

embrace [1] - 63:17

embraced [1] - 20:5

emerge [1] - 5:14

Emilia [2] - 82:5, 85:10

eminent [1] - 93:2

emotional [1] - 86:2

emphasis [2] - 31:11, 32:5

employee [1] - 70:16

employees [1] - 62:10

enacted [2] - 187:18, 199:15

encourage [2] -

116:10, 174:7

encourages [1] - 79:11

encumbered [2] - 193:14, 197:13

End [7] - 94:1, 94:2, 94:6, 132:10, 132:11, 132:14, 132:17

end [9] - 18:18, 24:15, 43:5, 112:16, 126:9, 127:7, 168:16, 179:14, 186:1

ending [1] - 64:5

enforce [1] - 172:2

enforceable [1] - 157:16

enforcing [1] - 172:4

engage [1] - 30:3

enhance [2] - 12:7, 84:14

enhancing [1] - 84:7

enormously [1] - 102:7

enriching [2] - 37:11, 37:16

entertainment [1] - 95:2

entire [5] - 2:16, 111:12, 112:19, 118:16, 159:6

entirely [5] - 56:16, 122:7, 126:10, 149:3, 200:8

entirety [1] - 126:7

entitled [1] - 214:16

entry [1] - 44:12

envelope [3] - 42:11, 43:2, 173:6

environment [1] - 65:1

envision [1] - 55:18

Errata [2] - 220:2, 220:7

ERRATA [1] - 220:1

escalating [1] - 122:4

especially [5] - 52:14, 65:13, 101:14, 122:16, 166:3

esque [1] - 15:18

essentially [5] - 4:6, 132:11, 151:18, 153:17, 184:16

Essex [2] - 52:8, 91:17

established [2] - 123:16, 210:12

establishment [1] - 160:7

estate [1] - 113:9

Estate [1] - 2:5

| | | | | |
|--|---|---|---|---|
| <p>Esther [2] - 76:10, 76:11 ESTHER [3] - 76:11, 76:19 estimates [1] - 58:14 etcetera [3] - 162:4, 200:18 ethnic [1] - 94:4 evening [18] - 3:3, 3:4, 3:8, 6:15, 30:18, 33:18, 34:3, 36:2, 55:4, 66:10, 67:19, 80:3, 80:7, 91:11, 121:4, 132:4, 136:7, 143:4 eventually [1] - 171:1 everyday [1] - 130:17 everywhere [2] - 102:10, 105:11 evident [1] - 167:18 evolution [4] - 36:4, 36:6, 39:13, 39:19 evolve [1] - 41:5 exactly [7] - 11:6, 18:17, 161:19, 166:6, 168:17, 204:12, 216:3 example [1] - 116:4 examples [1] - 43:4 exceeds [1] - 137:1 excellent [1] - 120:1 except [6] - 85:17, 89:14, 107:16, 107:17, 127:16, 220:15 excited [2] - 36:5, 93:5 exciting [2] - 93:17, 94:16 excluded [1] - 51:12 executive [1] - 6:6 exempt [1] - 61:12 exempted [1] - 25:1 exercise [1] - 145:5 exist [1] - 102:17 existing [20] - 12:6, 45:2, 48:1, 48:13, 50:1, 73:15, 90:3, 100:12, 123:6, 123:10, 126:11, 145:6, 145:11, 145:12, 146:1, 175:15, 186:17, 218:1 exists [2] - 133:14, 199:12 expand [1] - 26:8 expect [4] - 31:16, 107:11, 145:18 expedite [1] - 124:17 expeditiously [1] -</p> | <p>7:19 expensive [3] - 123:7, 123:8, 129:15 experience [3] - 48:18, 122:9, 131:8 expiration [2] - 11:1, 150:18 expire [2] - 115:12, 134:13 expired [1] - 152:6 Expires [1] - 221:14 explain [6] - 17:15, 100:18, 126:2, 150:14, 156:17, 172:3 explained [2] - 148:11, 148:17 explaining [2] - 38:2, 218:17 explicitly [2] - 133:11, 150:7 explored [1] - 85:2 express [1] - 76:13 expressed [1] - 195:19 extended [3] - 70:13, 151:9, 151:10 extending [1] - 178:5 extension [2] - 46:7, 197:15 extent [3] - 156:12, 195:3, 195:4 exterior [4] - 45:6, 46:12, 48:14, 49:2 extra [4] - 19:3, 100:5, 104:14, 106:1 extraordinarily [1] - 78:4 extraordinary [3] - 126:19, 127:1, 202:4 extreme [3] - 35:9, 116:9, 116:14 extremely [1] - 104:10 exurbia [1] - 64:1 eye [1] - 48:15 eyes [1] - 45:11 eyesore [1] - 87:2</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">F</p> <hr/> <p>F-i-s-k-e [1] - 54:13 fabric [2] - 83:19, 88:9 facade [1] - 5:5 facing [2] - 45:7, 81:18 fact [16] - 68:5, 89:6, 100:6, 103:13, 108:16, 116:16, 118:13, 122:13,</p> | <p>131:2, 146:2, 177:18, 178:1, 178:8, 195:6, 200:7, 214:13 factor [1] - 155:4 factory [2] - 64:11, 64:18 failure [1] - 152:4 fair [6] - 50:8, 111:1, 111:3, 169:7, 199:12, 210:17 fairly [3] - 127:4, 151:4, 159:3 faith [3] - 22:2, 61:13, 142:15 falling [1] - 79:4 false [1] - 123:11 familiar [1] - 121:16 families [2] - 23:18, 70:2 family [4] - 21:2, 70:6, 78:15, 94:12 FAR [43] - 2:13, 17:17, 19:3, 19:10, 30:4, 104:16, 110:11, 115:15, 116:1, 116:3, 116:6, 116:7, 116:9, 116:14, 126:2, 126:5, 126:10, 126:17, 126:18, 126:19, 127:9, 127:11, 128:7, 139:19, 140:17, 175:5, 177:11, 177:13, 178:2, 179:1, 179:3, 181:18, 187:4, 190:6, 192:9, 192:19, 197:16, 201:2, 201:9, 214:10, 214:14, 214:16, 215:4 far [6] - 62:14, 75:19, 83:2, 93:7, 118:13, 159:17 Farooq [2] - 1:13, 111:8 FAROOQ [2] - 3:13, 153:16 Farris [2] - 114:18, 115:1 FARRIS [2] - 114:19, 115:1 fast [1] - 176:18 favor [11] - 54:14, 71:19, 72:18, 74:13, 82:2, 82:13, 128:17, 131:14, 202:17, 203:2, 219:6 favorable [4] - 56:12, 189:6, 217:4,</p> | <p>218:13 fear [2] - 105:2, 217:11 feasible [1] - 213:9 February [3] - 144:7, 152:9, 164:4 federal [3] - 79:1, 79:5, 162:17 feedback [1] - 38:3 feelings [1] - 175:6 feet [28] - 2:10, 2:12, 2:12, 12:10, 19:10, 25:4, 29:1, 39:2, 39:4, 39:17, 39:18, 42:17, 100:5, 106:19, 107:2, 107:3, 149:17, 171:10, 178:3, 184:10, 186:7, 187:1, 191:1, 191:10, 201:16, 202:1 fellow [1] - 201:14 felt [9] - 13:6, 26:2, 40:18, 77:13, 134:11, 149:12, 149:15, 167:15, 179:12 Fenway [1] - 129:18 few [11] - 18:18, 30:15, 59:8, 71:18, 83:7, 91:18, 102:15, 104:10, 121:6, 136:6, 190:19 fewer [4] - 62:5, 62:6, 62:14, 65:3 fiction [3] - 110:16, 110:17, 111:6 fifth [1] - 202:2 figure [2] - 27:14, 104:8 figured [1] - 119:19 filing [2] - 151:17, 151:19 filled [1] - 117:15 final [3] - 149:12, 150:18, 211:18 finalized [1] - 26:17 finally [4] - 47:15, 48:15, 119:18, 169:16 financial [2] - 21:8, 177:4 financially [1] - 213:9 financier [1] - 204:11 financing [1] - 79:2 findings [1] - 98:5 fine [8] - 120:14, 120:16, 141:7, 143:1, 158:14, 185:14, 193:6,</p> | <p>209:18 fingerprints [1] - 181:6 finishing [1] - 77:8 fire [1] - 186:11 firm [2] - 61:18, 84:18 firmly [2] - 66:14, 108:13 first [23] - 8:17, 36:13, 51:6, 51:18, 57:18, 82:15, 90:13, 90:17, 91:16, 95:13, 117:9, 130:3, 144:13, 160:6, 163:14, 166:12, 167:14, 173:16, 176:3, 176:6, 182:17, 192:7, 209:3 FISKE [1] - 54:12 Fiske [2] - 51:19, 54:13 fit [5] - 39:12, 106:3, 145:1, 176:15, 212:17 fitting [1] - 43:1 five [7] - 28:1, 93:15, 107:1, 134:5, 134:13, 140:18, 143:2 flag [1] - 35:9 flagged [1] - 24:10 flexible [2] - 55:14, 137:14 Floor [2] - 1:7, 2:13 floor [9] - 2:16, 19:12, 19:14, 26:12, 39:2, 47:14, 60:3, 90:13, 207:10 floors [3] - 89:16, 100:5, 184:12 flow [1] - 160:16 flying [1] - 60:13 focal [1] - 81:3 focus [5] - 4:12, 11:17, 19:5, 60:4, 96:16 focuses [2] - 3:14, 3:15 focussed [4] - 15:19, 31:8, 122:7, 138:13 foggy [1] - 202:13 folk [3] - 122:19, 179:19, 180:3 folks [5] - 13:6, 20:12, 81:10, 179:17, 206:14 follow [6] - 115:4, 191:19, 192:1, 192:6, 194:6, 195:18 follow-up [1] - 192:6</p> |
|--|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| <p>followed [1] - 115:3 follows [1] - 56:1 fond [1] - 73:17 food [1] - 176:19 foot [7] - 22:5, 39:3, 80:9, 107:8, 165:17, 207:10, 207:13 footage [3] - 50:13, 68:11, 101:4 footprint [2] - 60:4, 63:3 footprint's [1] - 185:19 FOR [1] - 1:3 force [2] - 6:4, 6:11 foregoing [1] - 220:15 FOREGOING [1] - 221:16 Forest [1] - 134:7 forever [4] - 22:11, 23:4, 169:10, 215:13 forget [3] - 8:18, 87:5, 103:16 forgive [1] - 191:18 forgot [1] - 134:12 form [1] - 202:10 former [4] - 27:8, 77:1, 100:9, 115:7 formulas [1] - 101:7 forth [6] - 160:12, 162:3, 167:9, 205:7, 212:16, 221:6 fortunate [1] - 75:16 forward [15] - 13:12, 26:1, 56:9, 63:1, 78:18, 90:18, 114:12, 117:12, 118:1, 135:8, 150:9, 164:13, 169:17, 182:13, 189:6 forwarded [1] - 3:19 forwarding [1] - 6:8 four [7] - 5:9, 21:2, 89:16, 103:5, 103:12, 154:7, 186:1 Four [1] - 132:5 frame [1] - 151:5 Franklin [1] - 194:13 frankly [2] - 167:6, 180:1 free [1] - 152:10 friendly [1] - 49:1 FROM [9] - 56:17, 57:1, 65:8, 66:5, 71:8, 74:17, 109:10, 112:10, 140:5 front [14] - 27:10, 27:12, 27:18, 42:2, 45:10, 59:6, 61:16,</p> | <p>82:18, 98:12, 98:18, 99:4, 125:13, 186:11, 186:14 frontage [3] - 24:19, 25:12, 27:13 fruit [1] - 84:12 fulfill [1] - 215:8 full [5] - 3:19, 31:6, 70:15, 86:12, 193:2 full-time [1] - 70:15 fuller [1] - 35:14 FULLER [2] - 63:8, 63:9 Fuller [2] - 61:2, 63:8 Fullers [1] - 14:9 fully [1] - 176:6 function [2] - 35:1, 35:4 funds [1] - 79:1 funky [2] - 37:13, 88:10 future [16] - 35:10, 42:1, 46:2, 61:14, 70:1, 81:19, 84:18, 91:3, 146:11, 148:3, 159:16, 164:8, 170:17, 195:13, 208:17, 212:9</p> <p style="text-align: center;">G</p> <p>GALLUCCIO [11] - 8:10, 8:16, 49:8, 153:11, 154:9, 155:2, 156:3, 185:12, 206:1, 206:4, 206:13 game [1] - 29:1 gap [3] - 85:7, 96:1, 96:12 garage [6] - 27:2, 110:9, 126:8, 142:1, 185:1 GENERAL [2] - 1:4, 2:2 general [9] - 75:6, 82:13, 83:5, 161:13, 167:5, 178:18, 204:5, 210:9, 214:18 generally [4] - 18:15, 128:5, 161:8, 207:1 generated [1] - 34:12 generating [1] - 32:15 generation [1] - 173:18 generic [2] - 86:15, 206:7 gentleman [2] - 91:16, 92:13 gentlemen [1] - 53:6</p> | <p>George [5] - 55:3, 56:17, 57:2, 57:5, 60:14 gift [1] - 120:12 girl [1] - 69:16 given [7] - 12:12, 77:10, 78:7, 99:15, 116:13, 146:6, 169:15 glad [1] - 183:3 goal [7] - 22:12, 57:16, 99:4, 102:10, 167:11, 167:14, 180:14 goals [5] - 11:18, 123:16, 170:14, 181:8, 188:19 Gold [1] - 25:17 gonna [1] - 141:16 gosh [2] - 134:9, 181:19 govern [2] - 200:4, 212:7 government [1] - 199:13 government's [1] - 96:7 grab [1] - 23:9 grade [1] - 99:14 graduate [1] - 137:10 grandchildren [1] - 65:2 grandfather [2] - 92:19, 212:15 grandfathering [1] - 163:11 grant [1] - 195:6 granted [2] - 162:7, 162:8 granting [2] - 137:3, 161:3 great [15] - 65:16, 72:14, 75:17, 76:2, 97:6, 98:4, 120:17, 129:16, 130:1, 165:11, 175:16, 176:18, 179:19, 182:5, 199:1 greater [2] - 77:7, 148:13 greatest [1] - 131:11 green [5] - 4:15, 5:2, 37:18, 62:17, 140:6 Green [1] - 4:19 grew [1] - 23:16 Grey [1] - 80:1 gritty [1] - 173:8 ground [5] - 2:16, 44:1, 44:6, 48:15, 60:3 groups [1] - 94:4</p> | <p>grow [2] - 55:11, 90:16 growing [2] - 63:4, 92:5 growth [1] - 81:6 guaranteed [1] - 140:17 guess [12] - 22:19, 101:19, 171:12, 173:15, 179:4, 179:9, 180:10, 185:11, 188:12, 195:2, 204:1 guidance [1] - 5:14 guidelines [19] - 26:11, 26:12, 26:15, 120:8, 149:14, 149:16, 150:7, 164:3, 164:7, 164:12, 173:6, 184:16, 210:4, 210:11, 210:14, 210:18, 211:1, 211:3, 211:13 guidepost [1] - 87:3 guiding [1] - 37:10 guys [5] - 114:2, 114:8, 114:14, 134:18, 198:16</p> <p style="text-align: center;">H</p> <p>half [11] - 21:15, 73:14, 86:6, 98:6, 98:8, 98:10, 100:7, 100:13, 103:5, 134:2, 154:13 Hamilton [2] - 65:19, 125:6 hand [7] - 39:16, 42:5, 73:12, 97:3, 110:6, 215:7, 221:8 hands [3] - 168:18, 219:7, 219:11 Hangen [1] - 30:19 hanging [1] - 84:12 Hanig [1] - 76:10 HANIG [3] - 76:11, 76:12, 76:19 happy [7] - 15:18, 19:5, 25:16, 27:18, 28:15, 100:18, 150:11 harbor [2] - 174:10 hard [11] - 14:2, 70:6, 72:4, 72:16, 122:11, 122:13, 178:3, 188:5, 192:11 hardly [1] - 207:10 harm [2] - 61:19, 62:4 harmonious [1] - 88:9</p> | <p>Harry [1] - 128:15 Harvard [8] - 92:7, 93:15, 113:12, 129:7, 130:6, 130:11, 130:12, 132:15 haunt [1] - 195:10 HAWKINSON [6] - 3:6, 74:7, 76:17, 140:6, 152:13, 152:17 head [1] - 209:9 heads [1] - 139:5 healthy [2] - 55:10, 99:6 hear [9] - 3:6, 7:8, 8:12, 10:5, 99:2, 119:15, 137:8, 163:19, 175:10 heard [18] - 3:16, 7:7, 10:9, 11:4, 11:12, 11:14, 13:6, 13:16, 21:4, 67:5, 89:4, 91:16, 92:11, 108:16, 110:3, 113:17, 143:3, 157:1 hearing [16] - 4:7, 4:14, 7:1, 7:4, 7:10, 10:13, 22:16, 51:2, 58:14, 144:6, 144:19, 152:8, 163:14, 176:3, 182:13, 221:6 HEARING [2] - 1:4, 2:5 hearings [3] - 9:2, 143:4, 151:13 heart [1] - 63:11 Heather [2] - 114:18, 118:11 HEATHER [1] - 118:10 Height [1] - 2:10 height [51] - 2:10, 2:11, 2:12, 17:9, 19:9, 19:14, 19:16, 26:14, 29:4, 39:5, 42:18, 55:12, 67:6, 67:10, 77:6, 80:19, 83:6, 85:17, 86:11, 100:5, 100:6, 104:14, 107:16, 116:2, 116:14, 133:16, 133:17, 138:4, 140:10, 171:7, 171:9, 171:11, 171:13, 175:4, 177:19, 178:2, 184:10, 187:16, 188:1, 192:8, 194:8, 195:7,</p> |
|--|--|--|---|--|

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| <p>197:8, 197:9, 197:15, 197:17, 198:4, 201:11, 202:2, 202:5, 211:4 heights [1] - 13:7, 15:16, 17:14, 29:9, 37:4, 37:6, 39:6, 42:9, 100:17, 149:16, 150:1 hell [1] - 58:17 hello [2] - 109:14, 118:10 help [5] - 25:19, 69:14, 79:7, 79:8, 79:14 helped [2] - 26:7, 26:8 helpful [8] - 10:11, 10:14, 26:10, 30:9, 153:12, 201:13, 206:18, 210:17 helping [1] - 98:1 helps [1] - 170:14 hereby [1] - 220:16 herein [1] - 221:6 hereunto [1] - 221:8 hi [2] - 85:13, 128:16 hidden [1] - 194:14 high [1] - 52:14, 102:9, 105:14, 107:8, 132:12, 133:2, 133:3, 138:8, 140:9 higher [6] - 21:4, 64:15, 120:16, 155:18, 171:8, 202:2 highest [3] - 103:18, 106:11, 177:2 Highland [1] - 128:17 highlights [1] - 14:13 highly [1] - 137:14 highrise [1] - 116:5 highways [2] - 64:4, 64:18 historian [1] - 85:16 historic [8] - 63:17, 83:15, 83:17, 88:6, 103:14, 145:7, 145:9, 197:14 history [1] - 64:7 Hoffman [2] - 114:18, 118:11 HOFFMAN [1] - 118:10 holding [1] - 137:8 holds [1] - 148:3 home [4] - 15:8, 64:10, 67:8, 93:1 homeowners [1] - 61:17 homes [2] - 62:5,</p> | <p>62:11 honest [1] - 104:17 honestly [1] - 103:16 honorable [1] - 53:7 Honorable [2] - 8:11, 8:17 hope [12] - 31:2, 72:17, 88:7, 108:18, 114:14, 115:11, 118:6, 124:2, 125:1, 131:16, 154:3, 159:16 hopefully [6] - 5:13, 6:7, 13:14, 26:3, 97:8, 124:17 hoping [3] - 132:15, 135:3, 147:16 horrible [1] - 114:3 horror [1] - 78:2 hot [1] - 86:2 hour [3] - 34:2, 34:11, 43:13 hours [4] - 17:6, 33:14, 34:13, 94:19 household [5] - 154:5, 154:6, 154:7, 154:13, 154:19 households [2] - 2:15, 154:13 houses [4] - 66:14, 94:11, 94:12, 102:17 housing [150] - 10:10, 12:2, 13:8, 14:12, 15:2, 15:7, 17:18, 21:6, 22:8, 22:18, 23:11, 26:4, 37:16, 52:15, 53:12, 55:16, 56:3, 58:9, 58:12, 58:16, 58:17, 61:6, 61:7, 62:1, 62:13, 62:17, 62:19, 63:18, 64:9, 64:11, 64:12, 65:13, 66:17, 67:12, 68:15, 68:17, 69:2, 69:4, 72:1, 72:2, 72:5, 72:15, 75:7, 75:15, 77:3, 77:10, 77:13, 78:2, 78:7, 78:9, 78:17, 78:19, 85:19, 86:2, 86:3, 86:19, 88:3, 88:11, 89:10, 89:17, 90:7, 92:11, 93:18, 94:8, 94:15, 95:14, 95:18, 95:19, 96:2, 96:6, 96:8, 96:15, 97:12, 97:15, 98:7, 98:18, 99:4, 99:13, 101:10, 102:8, 102:15, 104:3, 108:5, 111:18, 116:13,</p> | <p>117:1, 117:4, 118:13, 118:14, 119:5, 119:8, 119:10, 119:12, 119:13, 121:9, 122:4, 122:8, 122:12, 122:14, 122:15, 123:4, 123:5, 123:6, 123:7, 123:8, 123:10, 123:11, 123:12, 123:13, 123:18, 124:2, 124:5, 124:9, 124:11, 124:12, 127:7, 128:6, 130:4, 132:12, 134:9, 134:10, 134:13, 134:17, 136:11, 137:9, 137:12, 141:17, 163:7, 165:5, 165:6, 165:8, 166:17, 169:14, 170:9, 170:10, 170:11, 179:13, 179:18, 181:13, 181:19, 182:4, 193:2, 196:1, 196:4, 200:16, 209:17, 216:14 Housing [3] - 2:14, 5:8, 70:11 hub [4] - 59:4, 62:14, 137:19, 138:15 Hubway [1] - 84:7 huge [4] - 21:16, 84:4, 100:15, 193:7 Hugh [5] - 1:10, 19:1, 28:14, 142:6, 182:15 HUGH [17] - 49:13, 50:8, 50:16, 182:16, 183:3, 185:14, 190:9, 190:13, 190:18, 191:6, 192:2, 192:18, 194:8, 196:2, 207:8, 215:16, 218:12 Hugh's [1] - 199:6 human [1] - 87:19 hungry [1] - 176:19 Hurley [1] - 118:11 Huron [1] - 52:3</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">I</p> <hr/> <p>idea [14] - 40:1, 40:9, 41:1, 44:5, 45:17, 45:18, 46:8, 47:3, 47:17, 48:5, 48:16, 49:1, 121:11, 214:16</p> | <p>ideally [1] - 117:7 ideas [2] - 28:1, 121:18 identified [1] - 146:5 identifies [1] - 17:5 image [6] - 36:13, 37:2, 40:16, 46:18 images [1] - 201:13 imagine [6] - 134:17, 146:9, 177:6, 185:16, 192:4, 213:1 imagined [2] - 200:10, 202:3 immense [2] - 120:12 immersed [1] - 138:11 impact [10] - 24:4, 41:2, 42:16, 43:7, 43:10, 43:14, 44:11, 50:10, 52:11, 62:7 impacting [1] - 88:6 impacts [9] - 36:5, 36:10, 40:7, 40:10, 40:15, 43:18, 47:4, 47:10, 172:17 implement [1] - 183:6 implemented [1] - 76:7 importance [1] - 14:13 important [19] - 11:7, 21:13, 31:17, 53:1, 55:13, 60:17, 77:13, 81:3, 88:7, 97:12, 106:6, 149:18, 150:5, 157:11, 171:15, 173:5, 175:11, 184:6, 196:15 importantly [2] - 58:19, 177:11 importing [1] - 88:11 improve [4] - 59:14, 107:13, 123:12, 181:5 improved [3] - 13:13, 97:6, 149:5 improvement [3] - 46:15, 60:8, 182:5 improvements [4] - 31:14, 58:7, 64:16, 182:12 IN [2] - 221:8, 221:17 inappropriate [1] - 171:17 inaudible [3] - 39:5, 48:6, 111:13 INC [1] - 1:17 incentive [3] - 5:10, 25:3</p> | <p>Incentive [3] - 2:11, 5:16, 102:19 incentives [3] - 87:11, 177:5, 177:8 incentivize [2] - 174:7, 195:8 incentivized [1] - 176:14 include [6] - 2:9, 126:5, 126:8, 170:8, 180:8, 214:12 included [4] - 2:16, 20:8, 86:4, 162:16 includes [2] - 7:6, 22:19 including [11] - 2:9, 2:14, 10:3, 57:10, 74:16, 75:6, 75:7, 134:11, 136:19, 162:15, 218:14 inclusion [1] - 78:14 inclusionary [5] - 26:4, 29:13, 70:17, 79:6, 209:16 Inclusionary [2] - 2:14, 102:18 Income [2] - 2:7, 2:11 income [31] - 2:15, 20:16, 21:10, 23:14, 65:13, 76:16, 96:9, 102:16, 117:4, 119:12, 122:19, 137:16, 153:5, 153:9, 154:4, 154:12, 154:14, 154:15, 154:16, 162:13, 169:14, 170:11, 179:17, 179:19, 180:3, 180:8, 196:1, 196:4, 209:13 incomes [7] - 12:2, 17:7, 75:7, 81:10, 94:4, 96:14, 155:18 incoming [1] - 96:1 incomplete [1] - 50:5 incorporate [1] - 149:18 incorporated [1] - 69:18 incorporates [2] - 169:4, 169:5 incorporation [1] - 124:19 increase [10] - 35:18, 76:15, 78:8, 103:19, 105:3, 146:19, 178:3, 179:3, 180:6, 180:7 increased [4] - 2:13, 2:14, 106:1, 116:15</p> |
|---|---|---|--|---|

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| <p>increasing [5] - 41:13, 45:12, 46:16, 55:12, 123:18</p> <p>incredible [1] - 126:14</p> <p>incredibly [2] - 10:11, 59:4</p> <p>incumbered [1] - 216:11</p> <p>indeed [1] - 123:8</p> <p>independent [2] - 52:13, 67:1</p> <p>Index [1] - 2:19</p> <p>indicated [1] - 9:19</p> <p>indicates [1] - 155:11</p> <p>individuals [1] - 82:17</p> <p>industries [1] - 64:7</p> <p>industry [6] - 64:9, 108:6, 108:10, 108:11, 108:12</p> <p>influenced [1] - 9:13</p> <p>information [5] - 50:5, 77:17, 145:4, 145:15, 154:2</p> <p>infusion [1] - 80:18</p> <p>inhabit [1] - 195:13</p> <p>initial [3] - 139:3, 148:19, 152:8</p> <p>innocent [1] - 77:11</p> <p>innovation [1] - 92:17, 92:18, 137:19, 161:4, 161:6, 161:7, 163:6, 163:8, 205:17, 205:19, 207:5</p> <p>input [2] - 106:17, 106:18</p> <p>inseparable [1] - 122:4</p> <p>inserted [1] - 42:9</p> <p>inside [3] - 32:10, 87:19, 113:10</p> <p>install [1] - 4:15</p> <p>instance [1] - 154:16</p> <p>instead [4] - 67:3, 128:6, 181:14, 216:16</p> <p>institution [1] - 36:15</p> <p>INSTRUCTIONS [2] - 220:1, 220:5</p> <p>instrument [1] - 201:19</p> <p>integrate [1] - 38:5</p> <p>integrates [1] - 108:2</p> <p>integrity [1] - 23:9</p> <p>intended [3] - 87:10, 160:9, 183:12</p> <p>intent [1] - 200:18</p> <p>interact [1] - 11:15</p> <p>interaction [1] - 36:7</p> <p>interest [2] - 174:2,</p> | <p>174:3</p> <p>interested [4] - 89:18, 128:19, 133:7</p> <p>interesting [13] - 4:17, 6:2, 14:16, 15:16, 83:14, 86:12, 115:5, 125:17, 127:3, 139:1, 166:5, 182:16, 188:15</p> <p>interests [1] - 145:9</p> <p>intersection [2] - 35:12, 166:2</p> <p>intersections [4] - 34:18, 35:3, 35:7, 35:19</p> <p>intriguing [1] - 146:17</p> <p>introduce [1] - 182:8</p> <p>intrusive [1] - 88:4</p> <p>invest [1] - 122:14</p> <p>invested [3] - 60:9, 60:16, 138:5</p> <p>investment [2] - 75:15</p> <p>invigorates [1] - 83:16</p> <p>invigorating [1] - 56:4</p> <p>involved [2] - 128:19, 138:10</p> <p>involves [1] - 55:17</p> <p>IRAM [2] - 3:13, 153:16</p> <p>Iram [4] - 1:13, 13:10, 111:8, 143:13</p> <p>issue [14] - 19:1, 20:14, 26:15, 28:11, 30:1, 53:1, 69:9, 77:14, 97:13, 103:3, 109:3, 136:10, 156:19, 206:17</p> <p>issued [1] - 157:7</p> <p>issues [11] - 10:12, 17:12, 24:12, 25:6, 28:11, 88:14, 124:4, 143:14, 189:4, 200:13, 211:10</p> <p>item [3] - 3:15, 4:17, 6:18</p> <p>items [1] - 4:11</p> <p>iterations [1] - 56:10</p> <p>itself [7] - 41:14, 98:1, 138:16, 148:19, 158:10, 160:4, 180:13</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">J</p> <hr/> <p>Jamaica [1] - 113:10</p> <p>jarring [1] - 86:16</p> <p>Jean [2] - 71:4, 109:10</p> <p>JEFF [23] - 6:16,</p> | <p>71:12, 143:16, 150:17, 151:10, 151:18, 152:7, 153:7, 154:1, 154:11, 156:16, 203:9, 203:19, 204:4, 205:15, 206:19, 207:18, 208:5, 209:10, 210:1, 211:15, 217:2, 218:6</p> <p>Jeff [20] - 1:14, 10:10, 26:18, 28:13, 71:4, 71:6, 71:8, 71:12, 92:18, 116:2, 143:12, 143:16, 150:14, 152:19, 153:4, 154:9, 155:11, 156:8, 183:14, 190:19</p> <p>Jeff's [1] - 197:9</p> <p>Jill [1] - 25:12</p> <p>job [4] - 65:16, 131:15, 185:6, 188:5</p> <p>jobs [1] - 81:9</p> <p>JOHN [9] - 3:6, 74:7, 76:17, 82:7, 82:8, 82:12, 140:6, 152:13, 152:17</p> <p>John [2] - 82:5, 82:7</p> <p>joined [2] - 10:1, 95:15</p> <p>joint [1] - 29:19</p> <p>Joseph [2] - 91:9, 91:12</p> <p>JOSEPH [1] - 91:11</p> <p>JR [14] - 198:10, 198:16, 203:1, 208:4, 212:13, 213:4, 213:11, 213:14, 213:18, 214:5, 215:10, 217:8, 217:19, 218:3</p> <p>Jr [1] - 1:11</p> <p>jump [1] - 157:19</p> <p>June [2] - 6:1</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">K</p> <hr/> <p>K2-C2 [2] - 58:2, 121:15</p> <p>Kaiser [3] - 20:3, 121:3, 125:6</p> <p>KAISER [1] - 125:5</p> <p>Kaiser's [1] - 201:5</p> <p>Kasper [2] - 51:18, 52:1</p> <p>KASPER [2] - 52:1, 52:2</p> | <p>keep [7] - 7:5, 21:9, 70:6, 76:5, 108:8, 166:8, 169:7</p> <p>keeping [2] - 63:3, 193:9</p> <p>Kelly [2] - 55:2, 55:6</p> <p>KELLY [1] - 55:4</p> <p>Ken [3] - 115:3, 115:7, 119:15</p> <p>Kendall [5] - 24:13, 57:11, 57:12, 81:8, 87:13</p> <p>kept [6] - 21:18, 125:18, 125:19, 167:19, 171:4</p> <p>key [2] - 91:2, 97:12</p> <p>Keyword [1] - 2:19</p> <p>kick [1] - 156:6</p> <p>kid [1] - 113:9</p> <p>kidding [1] - 109:16</p> <p>kids [1] - 113:13</p> <p>kind [23] - 14:15, 15:18, 16:12, 16:19, 23:3, 27:3, 34:15, 73:16, 77:3, 77:12, 77:14, 79:15, 81:10, 88:12, 99:9, 103:10, 147:2, 178:15, 183:8, 187:7, 197:15, 206:14, 213:15</p> <p>kinds [2] - 72:3, 141:17</p> <p>knock [1] - 185:16</p> <p>knocked [1] - 29:2</p> <p>knowing [1] - 68:11</p> <p>known [1] - 206:8</p> <p>knows [4] - 90:4, 174:16, 175:7, 180:14</p> <p style="text-align: center;">L</p> <p>lab [12] - 12:5, 12:7, 36:15, 46:5, 62:9, 62:17, 62:18, 66:18, 80:10, 108:18, 120:15, 134:7</p> <p>Labs [1] - 17:4</p> <p>labs [6] - 62:19, 68:6, 69:13, 108:6, 108:12, 108:14</p> <p>ladies [1] - 53:5</p> <p>lady [1] - 92:15</p> <p>Lafayette [7] - 25:12, 40:1, 40:14, 43:7, 43:9, 44:3, 46:7</p> <p>laid [1] - 10:12</p> <p>land [23] - 22:11, 22:19, 23:1, 23:2, 23:3, 30:3, 33:15,</p> | <p>98:11, 99:16, 99:17, 102:4, 102:6, 102:9, 102:10, 104:14, 105:19, 110:8, 110:10, 145:6, 180:17, 193:3</p> <p>landmark [1] - 58:5</p> <p>lanes [1] - 84:11</p> <p>language [10] - 26:17, 27:19, 125:14, 149:2, 149:7, 161:15, 164:18, 165:4, 183:4, 189:9</p> <p>languages [1] - 149:4</p> <p>Lansdowne [1] - 116:5</p> <p>LAPIDUS [5] - 56:16, 56:19, 57:3, 57:4, 60:13</p> <p>Lapidus [1] - 57:3</p> <p>large [6] - 7:2, 18:11, 31:11, 66:19, 99:10, 142:1</p> <p>larger [6] - 117:18, 118:16, 119:2, 119:4, 145:2, 160:3</p> <p>largest [1] - 103:18</p> <p>last [31] - 8:3, 10:13, 10:16, 11:1, 11:10, 13:11, 15:6, 18:7, 22:15, 43:8, 52:2, 53:2, 53:9, 73:6, 74:1, 107:4, 115:2, 115:3, 119:16, 125:9, 138:17, 144:5, 144:19, 146:18, 162:2, 180:10, 194:6, 195:18, 198:13</p> <p>lastly [1] - 108:6</p> <p>late [3] - 8:2, 43:12, 125:8</p> <p>laugh [1] - 107:12</p> <p>laughed [1] - 107:10</p> <p>Law [2] - 130:6, 157:3</p> <p>law [2] - 29:17, 30:1</p> <p>Lawrence [4] - 71:9, 71:10, 71:13, 71:16</p> <p>laws [1] - 61:12</p> <p>Lawson [1] - 221:4</p> <p>lawyer [1] - 109:13</p> <p>lawyers [1] - 182:18</p> <p>lead [3] - 112:16, 112:17, 112:18</p> <p>leap [1] - 61:13</p> <p>learn [1] - 131:7</p> <p>learning [1] - 131:14</p> <p>lease [2] - 157:9, 158:12</p> <p>least [7] - 11:5, 118:4, 138:18, 179:17,</p> |
|--|--|--|---|--|

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|---|---|
| <p>180:4, 181:4, 181:5 leave [5] - 21:12, 57:6, 128:9, 193:5, 213:9 leaving [2] - 33:17, 34:2 led [1] - 182:18 Lee [3] - 114:18, 114:19, 118:12 LEE [2] - 114:19 LEED [1] - 25:16 left [2] - 39:16, 135:19 left-hand [1] - 39:16 legal [5] - 9:7, 114:8, 156:10, 172:6, 189:12 legislation [1] - 86:8 legislative [1] - 199:13 lenders [1] - 191:15 length [3] - 125:16, 136:15, 201:3 lengthy [2] - 7:4, 13:4 Leonard [1] - 128:15 less [7] - 32:2, 35:15, 43:13, 62:1, 113:15, 116:8, 122:7 letter [8] - 7:13, 14:4, 14:7, 57:8, 135:18, 136:2, 136:8, 202:12 letting [1] - 125:3 level [3] - 34:19, 48:15, 150:1 levels [1] - 145:9 Lexington [2] - 139:18, 140:4 library [1] - 130:7 License [1] - 221:13 lie [1] - 111:5 lies [1] - 58:4 life [3] - 92:4, 124:5, 138:6 lifelong [1] - 70:3 light [3] - 108:11, 140:6, 186:15 lighting [3] - 45:4, 46:12, 49:2 likely [4] - 50:10, 56:9, 117:15, 215:4 limit [10] - 2:11, 2:12, 24:14, 51:8, 79:3, 112:5, 127:17, 184:9, 188:2, 208:11 limitation [1] - 24:11 limitations [1] - 19:12 limited [6] - 7:12, 20:11, 24:18, 123:1, 187:11, 197:17 limits [5] - 73:14,</p> | <p>103:15, 153:9, 154:14, 154:15 LINE [1] - 220:8 line [7] - 18:15, 24:8, 42:12, 69:6, 167:3, 184:5 Line [4] - 31:12, 31:13, 84:15, 138:15 lines [3] - 48:6, 84:15, 181:11 link [1] - 2:18 list [3] - 51:14, 70:11, 71:1 listened [6] - 68:19, 75:19, 119:9, 119:11, 119:15, 189:14 listening [2] - 119:17, 131:15 literally [3] - 36:18, 63:12, 64:19 litigation [1] - 108:16 live [41] - 14:9, 17:6, 52:3, 52:7, 54:13, 59:6, 59:8, 59:12, 59:18, 61:4, 61:18, 62:6, 63:4, 63:9, 63:10, 66:11, 71:12, 71:16, 74:10, 79:13, 80:1, 80:16, 81:11, 82:8, 91:12, 93:6, 93:13, 96:4, 109:15, 118:11, 125:6, 128:17, 129:13, 129:15, 129:16, 130:2, 131:11, 132:5, 134:2, 158:16 live/work [1] - 161:10 liveability [1] - 37:17 lived [11] - 23:17, 52:4, 71:17, 72:9, 80:3, 91:18, 92:4, 93:19, 130:5, 163:8, 166:11 lives [1] - 62:7 living [4] - 91:17, 129:13, 130:14, 139:7 load [1] - 156:13 lobbies [1] - 24:11 lobby [1] - 24:16 local [7] - 52:13, 60:5, 67:1, 75:9, 90:15, 129:8, 162:19 location [11] - 12:11, 49:6, 81:3, 81:7, 86:11, 91:19, 115:19, 121:10, 137:6, 165:15,</p> | <p>175:5 locations [3] - 13:7, 45:11, 166:1 look [27] - 13:12, 37:3, 69:8, 78:18, 86:15, 88:8, 98:10, 100:6, 100:11, 101:1, 108:19, 110:15, 114:5, 114:7, 114:12, 147:3, 149:19, 172:15, 174:9, 186:5, 187:9, 200:1, 201:19, 205:15, 208:18, 210:17, 216:1 looked [9] - 31:4, 145:6, 145:7, 145:10, 146:16, 178:10, 198:6, 201:3, 209:14 looking [44] - 26:18, 31:7, 32:13, 33:3, 34:18, 36:19, 37:11, 39:8, 39:19, 40:4, 40:12, 40:16, 43:6, 43:10, 44:1, 44:5, 44:8, 44:9, 44:14, 45:1, 45:7, 45:16, 46:18, 46:19, 47:8, 48:12, 49:19, 56:18, 69:6, 79:16, 86:19, 92:2, 99:3, 107:17, 114:3, 135:8, 137:12, 147:4, 182:13, 189:4, 190:8, 206:16, 209:1 looks [2] - 134:4, 166:13 Lord [2] - 175:7, 180:13 lose [2] - 130:15, 212:17 losing [2] - 62:16, 119:4 lots [1] - 2:9 Lou [2] - 198:13, 202:19 loud [1] - 21:5 Louis [1] - 1:11 LOUIS [14] - 198:10, 198:16, 203:1, 208:4, 212:13, 213:4, 213:11, 213:14, 213:18, 214:5, 215:10, 217:8, 217:19, 218:3 love [2] - 71:17, 182:6 low [16] - 28:6, 33:13, 33:14, 65:13, 76:16,</p> | <p>84:12, 102:16, 117:3, 122:19, 128:1, 128:10, 174:3, 176:13, 179:16, 193:10 lower [11] - 23:13, 30:4, 44:15, 50:10, 53:17, 116:1, 116:2, 154:14, 172:10, 179:14, 194:12 lowest [1] - 103:6 loyal [1] - 133:13 lucrative [1] - 68:12 Luna [2] - 14:7, 48:17 luxury [3] - 86:5, 123:11, 132:12 Lydia [3] - 71:7, 72:19, 73:2 LYDIA [1] - 73:1</p> | <p>MARILEE [2] - 85:13, 85:14 mark [2] - 121:2, 121:5 Mark [1] - 10:2 MARK [1] - 121:4 market [10] - 25:7, 45:17, 52:12, 62:5, 68:8, 70:18, 72:2, 79:14, 90:11, 174:5 mass [4] - 40:1, 47:2, 87:1 Mass [46] - 2:7, 2:10, 36:16, 37:4, 37:7, 38:19, 39:4, 41:9, 44:2, 44:7, 45:8, 46:17, 47:16, 49:4, 52:9, 55:19, 57:18, 57:19, 59:1, 59:2, 59:3, 63:14, 64:12, 66:12, 67:2, 68:2, 70:5, 74:13, 81:4, 83:3, 84:11, 91:14, 91:15, 121:8, 124:1, 128:18, 136:15, 145:14, 147:8, 147:11, 177:15, 177:18, 178:5, 185:13, 194:10, 197:11 Mass./Main [1] - 93:16 MASSACHUSETTS [1] - 221:2 Massachusetts [2] - 1:8, 2:8 massing [18] - 19:17, 38:18, 40:13, 42:4, 42:8, 42:11, 46:10, 47:12, 47:13, 47:18, 48:9, 83:5, 83:13, 135:5, 166:4, 200:9 massive [2] - 14:18, 92:6 master [3] - 67:6, 67:10, 104:6 materials [3] - 2:17, 48:8, 106:8 math [5] - 29:13, 29:14, 30:5, 53:16, 184:4 matter [4] - 41:6, 158:13, 215:1, 215:12 max [1] - 107:8 maximize [1] - 44:13 maximum [5] - 127:17, 127:19, 128:1, 128:10, 161:18 Mayor [3] - 27:8,</p> |
|--|--|---|---|---|

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| <p>100:9, 115:7 McAvinney [2] - 61:1, 61:4 McAVINNEY [1] - 61:3 McDonald's [3] - 17:1, 48:16, 176:18 McMansions [2] - 64:2, 65:4 meager [1] - 95:14 mean [17] - 12:14, 55:12, 75:3, 93:7, 108:3, 111:16, 155:5, 174:8, 176:5, 180:3, 182:4, 191:19, 192:14, 195:4, 205:2, 208:3, 214:13 meaning [1] - 135:4 means [6] - 4:2, 32:6, 53:17, 122:17, 137:16, 137:17 meant [1] - 208:8 meanwhile [1] - 125:1 measure [1] - 133:9 mechanical [1] - 24:17 mechanicals [1] - 24:12 mechanism [1] - 191:13 median [12] - 20:17, 153:5, 153:14, 154:4, 154:5, 154:11, 154:13, 154:18, 155:6, 155:11, 155:13, 180:9 meet [3] - 32:10, 78:16, 83:11 meeting [13] - 3:5, 3:9, 3:14, 3:15, 4:12, 5:8, 6:14, 13:2, 14:1, 73:6, 73:9, 74:6, 98:13 Meeting [2] - 1:7, 2:4 meetings [7] - 5:17, 9:3, 9:9, 38:3, 66:14, 89:12, 151:3 member [5] - 77:1, 121:15, 201:14, 203:3, 211:19 Member [4] - 1:10, 1:10, 1:11, 1:11 Members [5] - 8:11, 8:17, 11:13, 49:11, 55:5 members [6] - 8:19, 10:3, 76:2, 180:5, 182:14, 188:16 memo [12] - 10:11,</p> | <p>18:8, 143:10, 143:15, 143:18, 143:19, 148:9, 150:2, 156:9, 197:10, 198:2, 202:12 Memorial [1] - 82:9 memorializing [1] - 27:1 memory's [1] - 202:13 mention [5] - 10:1, 97:10, 99:2, 126:1, 175:9 mentioned [9] - 13:10, 58:13, 103:3, 103:6, 105:3, 115:6, 115:15, 115:19, 142:2 merchants [1] - 80:17 merits [1] - 83:4 mess [1] - 189:12 message [1] - 206:17 messy [1] - 191:15 methodology [1] - 50:15 Metzker [2] - 55:3, 56:15 Metzker's [1] - 60:14 Meyer [2] - 85:11, 85:13 MEYER [2] - 85:13, 85:14 mic [4] - 8:13, 74:7, 74:18, 82:11 MICHA [3] - 139:17, 140:3, 140:8 Micha [2] - 139:18, 140:3 micro [6] - 206:2, 206:6, 206:18, 207:7, 207:9, 207:11 mid [2] - 46:6, 48:10 mid-block [2] - 46:6, 48:10 middle [21] - 2:15, 20:16, 21:9, 23:13, 72:7, 93:3, 117:3, 119:12, 154:10, 154:16, 155:14, 155:17, 162:13, 169:13, 170:10, 179:18, 180:3, 180:8, 195:19, 196:3, 209:13 midpoint [1] - 44:18 might [16] - 32:1, 72:10, 119:1, 134:16, 137:18, 146:3, 148:2, 153:12, 180:5,</p> | <p>186:1, 188:7, 198:3, 199:17, 206:12, 216:12 milling [1] - 93:2 million [6] - 53:19, 54:4, 102:8, 113:15, 113:16, 114:1 mind [4] - 76:6, 173:16, 175:17, 183:12 minds [2] - 173:14, 182:10 minimize [1] - 44:11 minimum [5] - 2:15, 127:17, 127:18, 161:17, 208:8 minute [3] - 10:16, 93:15, 143:2 minutes [3] - 7:12, 30:15, 51:8 misquoted [1] - 100:8 miss [2] - 174:15, 175:8 missed [2] - 174:14, 217:3 MIT [4] - 81:9, 92:7, 113:13, 137:9 mix [6] - 12:2, 17:7, 55:11, 58:9, 75:7, 200:7 Mixed [2] - 2:7, 2:11 mixed [2] - 31:9, 78:13 mixtures [1] - 201:12 mobility [1] - 84:17 mode [5] - 31:9, 31:15, 32:16, 33:12, 34:8 moderate [4] - 117:3, 119:12, 122:18, 137:16 moderately [1] - 129:10 modernism [1] - 105:17 modes [1] - 32:3 modicum [1] - 79:9 moment [5] - 63:17, 69:7, 185:16, 199:19, 209:9 Monday [1] - 125:11 money [6] - 53:12, 94:6, 102:5, 103:8, 119:5, 185:2 month [2] - 11:10, 151:4 Morgan [2] - 43:11, 47:9 morning [2] - 33:18, 34:2 mortgage [2] -</p> | <p>162:14, 162:16 Moshofsky [1] - 107:4 most [12] - 8:1, 66:14, 69:1, 73:3, 84:8, 85:7, 96:5, 102:3, 146:15, 186:7, 189:3, 191:8 mostly [1] - 198:17 mother [1] - 52:6 motion [2] - 203:5, 218:11 motivation [1] - 177:4 move [7] - 55:14, 63:1, 81:5, 124:4, 149:13, 166:15, 218:12 moved [4] - 71:15, 94:2, 166:12, 201:6 moves [2] - 26:1, 90:18 moving [4] - 40:1, 46:10, 48:4, 169:17 MS [1] - 153:18 multiple [1] - 170:14 must [6] - 52:16, 68:17, 106:14, 113:4, 181:18, 212:8</p> <p style="text-align: center;">N</p> <p>Nagahiro [3] - 10:4, 30:16, 36:3 NAGAHIRO [1] - 36:2 name [20] - 51:9, 52:2, 54:12, 55:6, 66:10, 67:19, 73:2, 74:10, 79:19, 91:12, 93:12, 109:14, 114:19, 118:10, 125:5, 128:16, 132:4, 135:12, 140:2, 161:9 names [1] - 51:17 NANCY [1] - 132:4 Nancy [1] - 132:5 nature [1] - 37:14 near [3] - 63:19, 81:8, 108:14 nearby [1] - 64:8 nearest [1] - 140:10 necessarily [1] - 178:8 necessary [2] - 162:11, 204:7 need [44] - 4:4, 7:14, 7:16, 8:5, 9:16, 19:2, 20:10, 35:11, 55:10, 65:13, 66:16, 67:10, 68:7, 72:1, 72:2, 73:4, 78:8,</p> | <p>78:17, 79:7, 84:16, 88:17, 89:14, 96:18, 98:4, 98:6, 99:9, 114:8, 114:11, 126:11, 126:12, 127:7, 128:12, 129:6, 130:18, 130:19, 136:4, 160:15, 162:6, 165:5, 165:6, 169:11, 175:10, 207:11 needed [10] - 78:10, 90:6, 121:9, 132:7, 144:17, 150:11, 191:1, 195:6, 196:13, 196:14 needing [1] - 31:19 needs [18] - 31:13, 64:9, 84:2, 84:5, 84:9, 84:17, 85:2, 112:14, 141:18, 149:8, 164:11, 171:3, 176:19, 199:11, 200:8, 204:8, 204:10 negatively [2] - 115:10, 118:7 negotiation [1] - 29:18 neighbor [1] - 112:3 neighborhood [19] - 24:2, 28:3, 28:10, 29:10, 36:8, 37:1, 40:8, 62:17, 67:3, 78:1, 78:5, 79:16, 88:1, 108:2, 117:17, 133:18, 133:19, 134:2, 135:1 neighborhoods [1] - 90:16 neighbors [4] - 59:1, 59:9, 62:8, 62:11 nerd [3] - 180:17, 204:1, 209:8 net [1] - 56:11 NetZero [1] - 6:3 never [4] - 52:16, 90:19, 158:9 nevertheless [1] - 68:12 new [37] - 2:10, 12:2, 12:9, 12:16, 12:18, 14:13, 14:19, 25:10, 33:3, 46:8, 47:1, 47:13, 48:11, 48:13, 62:9, 63:18, 68:6, 68:8, 75:14, 75:15, 80:18, 98:6, 99:6, 107:18, 108:1, 110:6, 113:14, 123:5, 123:8,</p> |
|---|---|--|--|---|

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| <p>123:11, 123:12, 124:6, 164:6, 176:10, 177:7, 181:3, 208:17 New [3] - 2:15, 88:12, 98:9 next [19] - 4:12, 5:18, 37:2, 37:13, 39:13, 51:19, 55:2, 55:18, 71:6, 72:8, 74:2, 74:9, 98:11, 104:19, 111:18, 129:4, 166:11, 185:18, 186:18 nice [3] - 59:11, 92:1, 119:17 night [13] - 13:12, 22:15, 53:2, 53:9, 67:9, 71:2, 72:18, 104:5, 107:14, 115:3, 119:16 night's [2] - 73:6, 74:1 Nine [1] - 97:4 nine [4] - 69:16, 100:5, 103:4, 137:1 nitty [1] - 173:8 nitty-gritty [1] - 173:8 nobody [1] - 140:15 noisy [1] - 108:10 Non [1] - 57:15 Non-Zoning [1] - 57:15 none [3] - 6:16, 114:2, 187:4 Norfolk [1] - 115:1 normally [1] - 106:5 Normandy [11] - 2:5, 3:15, 7:1, 53:18, 57:19, 60:10, 65:14, 68:9, 76:13, 115:10, 136:13 north [3] - 41:17, 147:9, 148:4 noses [1] - 53:9 NOT [1] - 221:16 notable [1] - 55:19 Notary [2] - 221:5, 221:12 note [2] - 8:1, 220:6 noted [1] - 220:16 nothing [4] - 60:6, 113:4, 113:6, 164:16 notice [1] - 163:14 noticed [1] - 130:8 notified [1] - 70:13 notion [1] - 189:17 Novartis [1] - 136:19 number [30] - 9:19, 10:3, 10:12, 20:18, 22:10, 23:5, 26:16,</p> | <p>33:13, 53:17, 54:4, 68:15, 75:11, 79:3, 96:10, 97:12, 97:17, 98:17, 103:3, 126:17, 134:10, 137:11, 155:4, 169:14, 180:6, 188:16, 189:15, 197:17, 198:5, 203:11, 208:9 numbers [6] - 64:15, 101:3, 101:8, 104:10, 196:17, 196:19 numerous [2] - 52:10, 101:11</p> <p style="text-align: center;">O</p> <p>objecting [1] - 190:11 objection [3] - 177:13, 178:4, 200:6 objectives [1] - 210:10 obligation [1] - 193:14 observing [1] - 52:18 obtain [1] - 122:11 obviously [7] - 7:2, 22:12, 29:16, 84:13, 84:14, 93:19, 165:18 occasions [1] - 198:5 occupant [1] - 157:9 occupied [1] - 49:17 occur [1] - 31:16 odd [4] - 59:17, 94:3, 102:8, 162:18 OF [5] - 1:3, 221:2, 221:16, 221:17, 221:17 offense [1] - 57:1 offer [3] - 26:6, 50:7, 69:6 offered [2] - 129:9, 129:10 offering [2] - 90:12, 113:8 offers [4] - 53:16, 58:9, 74:14, 75:4 offhand [1] - 153:9 office [14] - 12:5, 34:5, 34:6, 34:9, 34:12, 36:15, 50:13, 66:18, 68:6, 69:13, 80:4, 80:10, 89:14, 161:8 offices [2] - 161:12, 207:2 OFFICIAL [1] - 1:18</p> | <p>offshoot [1] - 102:13 oft [1] - 2:16 often [3] - 62:18, 212:1, 212:2 Olivia [2] - 51:19, 54:12 OLIVIA [1] - 54:12 on-site [1] - 128:6 once [3] - 109:2, 174:17, 186:6 One [1] - 80:1 one [59] - 3:14, 13:5, 17:13, 19:14, 35:3, 40:15, 41:11, 58:15, 59:2, 70:19, 71:6, 83:7, 84:1, 89:13, 94:10, 97:11, 101:19, 102:15, 103:3, 106:4, 108:7, 113:7, 118:17, 127:13, 133:7, 134:1, 135:16, 136:9, 144:4, 145:16, 147:13, 153:3, 154:4, 155:6, 155:8, 158:6, 159:1, 164:18, 168:9, 175:11, 175:15, 176:12, 186:19, 191:18, 192:7, 194:11, 194:13, 194:17, 196:13, 198:9, 202:2, 202:7, 202:11, 210:6, 211:19, 212:5, 214:8, 217:8, 218:1 one's [1] - 209:8 one-story [1] - 176:12 one-third [1] - 196:13 open [18] - 13:18, 17:5, 56:3, 60:1, 62:9, 66:13, 73:16, 93:4, 94:18, 98:16, 99:13, 105:2, 108:4, 144:6, 171:4, 200:14, 200:19, 201:1 operate [1] - 18:4 operating [1] - 116:18 opinion [5] - 69:1, 74:14, 122:12, 156:12, 188:17 opponents [1] - 54:6 opportunities [4] - 99:11, 121:17, 180:1, 180:2 opportunity [11] - 45:16, 46:1, 46:11, 48:11, 51:13, 55:15, 58:6, 60:7, 84:10, 146:6, 181:4</p> | <p>Opportunity [1] - 95:11 opposed [6] - 80:13, 137:3, 137:6, 158:1, 163:7, 165:13 opposition [1] - 14:5 opt [3] - 17:16, 18:3 opt-in [3] - 17:16, 18:3 options [2] - 55:15, 176:8 order [2] - 55:9, 195:7 Ordinance [14] - 2:6, 3:18, 5:16, 9:2, 98:13, 144:12, 149:5, 151:15, 158:3, 158:10, 158:17, 159:12, 162:10, 163:17 ordinance [1] - 209:17 Ordinances [1] - 159:16 oriented [5] - 28:5, 79:10, 81:6, 107:16, 206:16 orienting [1] - 44:2 original [6] - 15:14, 20:9, 85:3, 113:2, 139:6, 220:2 originally [3] - 43:6, 94:10, 111:19 otherwise [4] - 58:18, 69:13, 117:14, 159:11 ought [3] - 54:10, 187:13, 188:13 ourselves [1] - 27:7 outbid [1] - 62:10 outdated [1] - 155:7 outline [1] - 11:11 outs [1] - 33:17 outside [3] - 16:8, 32:10, 118:3 overall [7] - 116:7, 165:3, 171:13, 171:14, 193:8, 200:12, 201:6 overarching [1] - 82:16 overcrowded [1] - 64:14 overdue [1] - 58:7 overlaps [1] - 16:14 Overlay [7] - 14:14, 16:6, 16:9, 16:10, 16:13, 16:18, 18:5 overplayed [1] - 25:5 overstatement [1] - 33:9 overview [4] - 31:3,</p> | <p>143:13, 143:17, 144:14 own [11] - 29:14, 29:15, 31:19, 32:1, 62:15, 69:10, 93:7, 99:17, 101:19, 110:9, 116:11 owned [3] - 15:10, 92:19, 176:12 owner [5] - 14:7, 60:10, 60:16, 177:5, 204:11 owners [3] - 92:14, 169:10, 195:8 ownership [2] - 32:1, 98:10 owns [2] - 101:11, 118:19</p> <p style="text-align: center;">P</p> <p>p.m [4] - 1:6, 34:13, 50:7, 219:16 pace [1] - 85:15 Pacific [1] - 121:5 PAGE [2] - 2:1, 220:8 page [2] - 183:14, 190:11 paid [3] - 23:2, 23:3, 27:3 pairs [1] - 51:5 Pam [2] - 128:15, 128:16 PAM [1] - 128:16 pants [1] - 60:14 paragraph [2] - 160:6, 162:2 parcel [6] - 16:16, 126:6, 126:7, 178:2, 194:16, 214:15 parcels [6] - 16:8, 169:5, 184:1, 197:11, 201:6, 214:14 pardon [1] - 206:3 parent [1] - 69:15 parents [1] - 91:17 Park [7] - 25:12, 37:8, 43:11, 47:9, 116:6, 116:8, 129:18 park [3] - 43:14, 47:9, 206:12 Parking [2] - 156:13, 157:2 parking [95] - 2:9, 17:11, 19:19, 20:12, 27:1, 27:4, 27:11, 27:17, 28:2, 28:11, 30:15, 32:10, 41:3, 42:16, 43:19, 44:4, 45:9, 45:13, 47:5,</p> |
|--|---|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|
| <p>84:1, 84:19, 85:4, 86:4, 86:18, 88:5, 98:16, 99:3, 99:13, 99:14, 99:18, 101:11, 107:18, 108:3, 113:14, 117:6, 117:10, 124:18, 126:6, 126:8, 127:18, 128:4, 128:5, 134:3, 134:5, 134:16, 134:19, 140:11, 140:12, 140:14, 142:1, 146:8, 156:10, 156:14, 157:5, 157:6, 157:7, 157:10, 158:7, 163:9, 166:6, 168:5, 172:7, 172:13, 184:19, 185:1, 187:2, 187:5, 187:8, 189:11, 190:15, 191:4, 193:15, 202:7, 202:15, 203:14, 206:14, 208:11, 208:12, 208:15, 212:5, 212:17, 212:18, 213:3, 213:5, 213:10, 214:6, 215:8, 215:9, 215:13, 216:3, 216:6, 217:11, 217:14</p> <p>part [18] - 31:5, 64:7, 67:7, 73:3, 85:1, 118:16, 119:3, 119:6, 137:19, 145:5, 146:16, 158:12, 159:15, 168:12, 194:1, 197:9, 202:7, 212:2</p> <p>partial [1] - 187:10</p> <p>participant [1] - 58:3</p> <p>participate [1] - 59:14</p> <p>participating [1] - 138:6</p> <p>particular [22] - 5:1, 33:6, 33:15, 35:19, 40:16, 45:11, 81:11, 105:12, 105:13, 108:3, 112:6, 145:1, 156:11, 158:6, 159:9, 159:15, 165:14, 166:2, 166:3, 199:19, 210:12, 210:19</p> <p>particularly [6] - 21:5, 76:14, 78:12, 82:14, 113:17, 199:16</p> <p>Partners [1] - 2:5</p> <p>partnership [2] - 10:2,</p> | <p>15:10</p> <p>pass [1] - 131:16</p> <p>passable [1] - 120:18</p> <p>passage [1] - 121:8</p> <p>passageway [1] - 49:3</p> <p>passed [4] - 4:1, 91:19, 111:2, 133:15</p> <p>passes [2] - 120:6, 124:3</p> <p>passionate [1] - 63:15</p> <p>past [4] - 57:9, 69:8, 111:1, 156:19</p> <p>Pat [1] - 109:8</p> <p>patch [1] - 183:9</p> <p>path [1] - 113:3</p> <p>Patrick [5] - 74:4, 74:10, 109:10, 109:14, 115:4</p> <p>PATRICK [6] - 74:5, 74:8, 74:19, 109:13, 112:7, 112:11</p> <p>pattern [1] - 200:12</p> <p>PAUL [1] - 67:18</p> <p>Paul [5] - 52:7, 65:10, 66:2, 67:17, 67:19</p> <p>Paul's [1] - 14:4</p> <p>pay [1] - 189:2</p> <p>payment [1] - 179:11</p> <p>payments [2] - 162:15, 162:16</p> <p>peak [4] - 33:14, 34:2, 34:10, 34:13</p> <p>pedestrian [1] - 49:1</p> <p>penalty [1] - 127:9</p> <p>people [77] - 9:4, 9:12, 11:5, 13:2, 13:19, 14:8, 16:13, 21:10, 22:3, 23:5, 23:16, 25:1, 26:3, 28:16, 30:5, 30:10, 31:18, 32:19, 33:17, 50:4, 51:5, 55:2, 59:5, 59:8, 59:12, 59:15, 60:7, 61:9, 61:10, 62:5, 67:5, 69:6, 70:19, 72:3, 72:9, 75:12, 80:15, 81:12, 94:6, 94:9, 96:12, 105:8, 108:17, 112:1, 113:17, 113:18, 115:14, 118:18, 128:19, 130:2, 130:14, 130:19, 131:6, 137:11, 137:13, 137:18, 138:2, 138:3, 138:13, 139:6, 142:2, 155:4, 155:8,</p> | <p>155:10, 161:12, 163:8, 166:17, 166:19, 167:19, 169:8, 187:12, 188:16, 189:2, 196:10, 198:15, 199:8, 207:2</p> <p>people's [2] - 51:17, 62:7</p> <p>per [3] - 101:4, 172:8, 216:16</p> <p>percent [46] - 20:11, 20:17, 20:19, 21:11, 21:15, 21:18, 21:19, 22:6, 24:18, 24:19, 32:18, 32:19, 33:6, 33:7, 52:15, 69:10, 76:16, 94:14, 96:9, 96:10, 100:3, 101:6, 117:3, 154:12, 154:17, 155:6, 155:10, 155:13, 155:16, 155:17, 165:8, 165:9, 165:11, 175:13, 179:2, 179:3, 179:10, 179:15, 180:6, 180:9, 181:18, 181:19, 196:6, 202:1</p> <p>percentage [2] - 52:14, 68:16</p> <p>perfect [1] - 189:8</p> <p>perfectly [1] - 172:11</p> <p>perhaps [7] - 80:15, 99:4, 164:6, 168:6, 174:16, 178:6, 182:17</p> <p>period [8] - 4:3, 108:15, 123:5, 150:18, 151:7, 151:9, 151:19, 152:2</p> <p>permanent [7] - 15:4, 21:7, 22:18, 58:11, 86:7, 117:6, 134:5</p> <p>permanently [2] - 67:12, 75:8</p> <p>permit [9] - 124:1, 157:6, 157:7, 157:10, 158:8, 203:15, 215:15</p> <p>Permit [16] - 2:12, 38:15, 39:2, 86:8, 120:16, 162:3, 162:7, 173:1, 186:4, 212:7, 213:17, 214:1, 214:2, 215:17, 215:19, 216:2</p> <p>Permits [2] - 142:9, 161:3</p> | <p>permits [4] - 122:12, 156:10, 156:15, 163:9</p> <p>permitted [3] - 122:15, 123:9, 172:10</p> <p>permitting [3] - 123:4, 124:12, 164:10</p> <p>perpetuity [2] - 216:5, 216:12</p> <p>person [14] - 21:1, 51:6, 51:7, 51:18, 51:19, 74:2, 110:7, 130:5, 154:4, 154:5, 154:7, 154:19, 155:6, 175:11</p> <p>personally [2] - 165:13, 192:11</p> <p>persons [1] - 154:6</p> <p>perspective [2] - 75:13, 177:4</p> <p>Petition [12] - 2:6, 3:16, 5:1, 7:2, 38:11, 82:14, 125:2, 125:8, 168:2, 170:4, 170:5, 198:19</p> <p>petition [53] - 2:17, 10:18, 11:19, 12:4, 13:14, 15:12, 15:19, 16:5, 16:14, 16:17, 17:8, 20:9, 20:15, 22:1, 23:8, 23:9, 38:6, 55:8, 56:1, 56:6, 57:19, 58:4, 58:8, 63:14, 68:10, 68:14, 73:15, 76:4, 76:14, 80:6, 82:2, 85:4, 87:10, 101:5, 105:9, 115:11, 115:12, 117:11, 117:19, 118:4, 118:7, 120:4, 121:8, 124:1, 124:13, 125:9, 125:15, 126:3, 147:8, 150:16, 150:17, 167:17, 195:15</p> <p>petitioner [3] - 148:11, 148:17, 150:5</p> <p>petitioner's [1] - 148:1</p> <p>petitioners [1] - 85:5</p> <p>petitions [1] - 12:14</p> <p>Pharmaceutical [1] - 49:15</p> <p>phase [2] - 105:15, 170:19</p> <p>phonetic [4] - 71:4, 107:5, 131:19</p> <p>phonetic [1] - 82:6</p> | <p>photograph [1] - 185:11</p> <p>photographer [1] - 136:14</p> <p>photographing [1] - 136:17</p> <p>phrases [1] - 205:5</p> <p>PHYLLIS [3] - 135:12, 136:3, 139:10</p> <p>Phyllis [1] - 135:13</p> <p>physically [1] - 215:5</p> <p>picking [3] - 48:5, 174:4, 180:11</p> <p>picture [2] - 76:5, 173:1</p> <p>pictures [1] - 73:11</p> <p>piece [15] - 46:5, 83:19, 95:17, 110:10, 110:16, 118:19, 144:8, 144:13, 144:18, 148:9, 149:12, 178:16, 183:13, 187:6</p> <p>pieces [2] - 16:7, 99:8</p> <p>piggeries [2] - 108:8, 111:17</p> <p>pile [1] - 185:17</p> <p>piled [1] - 186:1</p> <p>Pine [1] - 76:12</p> <p>pittance [1] - 89:17</p> <p>place [24] - 45:3, 46:10, 48:14, 61:11, 62:12, 63:5, 72:5, 72:7, 72:11, 72:14, 94:5, 102:2, 110:19, 129:16, 130:2, 131:11, 140:19, 147:16, 152:9, 171:8, 177:19, 191:17, 205:19, 216:18</p> <p>Place [3] - 44:8, 95:9, 132:6</p> <p>placement [1] - 22:13</p> <p>places [7] - 55:13, 83:7, 163:17, 174:9, 186:7, 186:8</p> <p>Plain [1] - 113:10</p> <p>plan [15] - 5:19, 41:5, 42:10, 42:13, 47:14, 67:6, 83:3, 86:1, 88:17, 104:3, 104:4, 104:6, 111:7, 113:5, 142:7</p> <p>plane [8] - 39:7, 39:10, 42:17, 42:19, 44:1, 44:6, 48:15</p> <p>planners [1] - 134:18</p> <p>planning [16] - 18:16, 39:14, 55:16, 67:10,</p> |
|---|---|---|--|---|

| | | | | |
|--|--|---|--|--|
| <p>88:9, 117:8, 124:19, 134:19, 135:7, 142:12, 174:13, 177:3, 178:15, 180:18, 192:5</p> <p>PLANNING [1] - 1:2</p> <p>Planning [42] - 3:5, 3:10, 4:4, 4:8, 6:9, 6:10, 8:12, 11:13, 13:13, 53:7, 55:5, 56:10, 57:12, 77:15, 88:7, 97:9, 97:15, 107:10, 115:9, 142:6, 142:7, 142:11, 144:6, 144:18, 146:18, 148:1, 149:19, 151:14, 152:5, 152:8, 152:11, 157:13, 157:14, 162:8, 163:15, 170:19, 204:19, 212:3, 217:7, 219:17, 220:6, 220:15</p> <p>plans [2] - 52:12, 210:11</p> <p>plate [4] - 19:12, 26:13, 39:2, 39:3</p> <p>play [5] - 29:1, 38:8, 79:13, 147:2, 204:18</p> <p>played [1] - 23:19</p> <p>plaza [4] - 44:17, 48:12, 49:5, 175:3</p> <p>Pleasant [1] - 95:9</p> <p>pleased [5] - 14:3, 76:14, 78:12, 99:2, 116:15</p> <p>pleasure [1] - 121:11</p> <p>plenty [1] - 172:9</p> <p>plot [3] - 104:13, 135:6</p> <p>plot-by-plot [1] - 104:13</p> <p>plus [3] - 21:17, 70:18, 126:16</p> <p>podium [3] - 8:15, 40:3, 44:16</p> <p>point [48] - 4:3, 4:6, 6:3, 11:6, 12:10, 15:9, 36:16, 38:10, 42:4, 42:10, 47:17, 70:4, 73:8, 75:10, 94:10, 101:9, 103:9, 107:12, 113:1, 113:7, 116:16, 136:5, 138:18, 139:4, 139:19, 140:9, 148:7, 151:2, 151:5, 152:11, 153:6, 169:8, 174:1,</p> | <p>180:11, 183:9, 186:9, 188:14, 197:4, 198:9, 203:14, 204:6, 205:17, 207:1, 207:19, 208:1, 211:1, 213:8, 215:19</p> <p>pointed [3] - 16:14, 118:18, 173:18</p> <p>points [5] - 19:18, 140:10, 175:18, 189:16, 199:6</p> <p>police [1] - 156:14</p> <p>policy [2] - 98:9, 182:3</p> <p>politic [1] - 199:18</p> <p>polluted [2] - 108:11, 108:12</p> <p>population [2] - 84:6, 111:4</p> <p>populous [1] - 177:1</p> <p>portfolio [2] - 146:5, 147:4</p> <p>portion [7] - 27:10, 27:12, 44:16, 170:9, 176:2, 179:13, 179:15</p> <p>position [4] - 52:10, 114:3, 172:3, 199:16</p> <p>positive [3] - 9:14, 149:13, 175:6</p> <p>possibilities [1] - 176:8</p> <p>possible [7] - 7:6, 7:19, 10:8, 56:11, 78:16, 82:11, 106:3</p> <p>possibly [2] - 69:10, 165:1</p> <p>posted [1] - 18:7</p> <p>pot [1] - 88:16</p> <p>potential [3] - 57:14, 58:4, 176:7</p> <p>potentially [2] - 81:12, 201:18</p> <p>pouring [2] - 61:9, 88:15</p> <p>powerless [1] - 124:9</p> <p>practical [2] - 215:1, 215:12</p> <p>practice [1] - 210:7</p> <p>pre [1] - 85:4</p> <p>pre-petition [1] - 85:4</p> <p>precedent [15] - 73:9, 87:7, 103:16, 103:18, 116:10, 142:3, 142:14, 192:16, 195:4, 195:11, 196:15, 197:8, 197:9, 198:3</p> | <p>precious [1] - 62:16</p> <p>preclude [2] - 214:9, 216:19</p> <p>preclusion [1] - 170:16</p> <p>predates [1] - 16:9</p> <p>preemptive [1] - 10:16</p> <p>preferred [2] - 196:4, 196:6</p> <p>prepare [1] - 76:4</p> <p>prepared [1] - 131:13</p> <p>present [1] - 68:10</p> <p>presentation [4] - 8:9, 9:18, 11:12, 49:9</p> <p>policy [2] - 98:9, 182:3</p> <p>presentations [1] - 31:8</p> <p>presented [3] - 98:13, 174:19, 176:16</p> <p>presenting [2] - 86:14, 121:11</p> <p>preservation [1] - 96:16</p> <p>preserve [1] - 79:8</p> <p>preserving [3] - 44:8, 56:3, 63:2</p> <p>pressed [2] - 178:3, 192:12</p> <p>pressing [2] - 27:6, 79:7</p> <p>pressure [3] - 14:18, 123:6, 123:9</p> <p>PRESTON [12] - 60:11, 139:8, 139:12, 167:1, 195:14, 199:4, 203:7, 203:16, 213:19, 214:7, 215:14, 215:18</p> <p>Preston [2] - 1:9, 4:10</p> <p>presumably [1] - 208:12</p> <p>pretty [8] - 28:17, 67:8, 73:5, 188:6, 188:18, 190:5, 194:14, 217:10</p> <p>prevailing [1] - 212:10</p> <p>previous [1] - 47:1</p> <p>previously [1] - 47:12</p> <p>price [4] - 99:16, 99:17, 102:9, 102:15</p> <p>priced [1] - 129:11</p> <p>prices [3] - 78:2, 78:11, 102:17</p> <p>principal [1] - 106:4</p> <p>principle [3] - 167:5, 206:5, 206:14</p> <p>principles [1] - 37:11</p> <p>priorities [1] - 181:8</p> | <p>private [4] - 52:17, 98:11, 116:17, 158:13</p> <p>privately [2] - 22:10, 58:11</p> <p>pro [2] - 10:7, 179:9</p> <p>pro-active [1] - 10:7</p> <p>proactively [1] - 69:9</p> <p>problem [11] - 70:8, 70:9, 98:1, 122:5, 123:3, 123:4, 166:3, 179:1, 187:3, 189:12, 198:12</p> <p>problems [6] - 35:10, 100:16, 108:15, 130:9, 175:4, 191:14</p> <p>procedure [2] - 126:4, 205:6</p> <p>procedures [3] - 87:9, 160:12, 160:14</p> <p>proceed [2] - 51:10, 218:7</p> <p>proceedings [1] - 221:7</p> <p>process [23] - 9:1, 9:6, 9:11, 11:14, 13:2, 38:16, 55:16, 55:17, 58:2, 111:9, 111:12, 122:1, 124:7, 124:15, 131:4, 139:3, 142:5, 144:10, 151:11, 159:17, 173:4, 173:8, 189:5</p> <p>processes [1] - 57:10</p> <p>producing [1] - 47:5</p> <p>product [1] - 16:1</p> <p>production [2] - 15:2, 123:18</p> <p>productive [1] - 38:3</p> <p>profile [1] - 106:8</p> <p>program [1] - 70:17</p> <p>programs [1] - 97:18</p> <p>prohibit [2] - 27:11, 27:17</p> <p>prohibition [3] - 25:8, 189:10, 214:12</p> <p>Project [1] - 2:11</p> <p>project [83] - 2:13, 18:11, 31:10, 37:6, 52:9, 54:6, 54:9, 54:15, 61:19, 63:6, 63:15, 66:13, 66:15, 67:13, 68:2, 69:19, 71:19, 72:18, 73:10, 74:14, 75:3, 75:4, 75:17, 76:6, 79:8, 79:18, 89:3, 93:9, 93:17, 97:5, 99:10, 106:6, 106:10,</p> | <p>106:16, 109:19, 112:12, 112:16, 113:19, 115:8, 116:12, 117:5, 121:6, 124:17, 125:18, 126:5, 127:11, 127:19, 132:15, 136:13, 137:2, 142:10, 150:1, 160:4, 164:9, 164:13, 167:17, 168:1, 168:6, 168:9, 168:15, 172:14, 173:3, 174:18, 175:19, 176:16, 177:10, 188:3, 188:6, 193:2, 194:2, 200:5, 201:18, 204:18, 210:8, 212:3, 212:4, 212:15, 216:8, 217:17, 218:2</p> <p>project's [1] - 56:8</p> <p>project-specific [1] - 168:9</p> <p>projects [3] - 69:11, 112:17, 164:5</p> <p>promised [1] - 140:17</p> <p>promises [1] - 4:17</p> <p>promote [1] - 32:5</p> <p>prompted [2] - 40:19, 43:16</p> <p>properties [6] - 15:10, 15:13, 15:14, 101:13, 104:15, 197:19</p> <p>Properties [1] - 2:6</p> <p>property [6] - 14:8, 29:15, 60:9, 60:16, 102:17, 199:12</p> <p>proponent [1] - 8:9</p> <p>proponents [1] - 133:8</p> <p>proposal [24] - 9:12, 12:12, 29:3, 36:18, 42:9, 42:10, 53:5, 53:15, 56:8, 65:12, 78:10, 83:13, 85:17, 85:18, 95:12, 112:6, 123:14, 148:13, 148:19, 175:12, 184:4, 188:14, 189:9, 199:3</p> <p>propose [1] - 100:3</p> <p>proposed [32] - 2:9, 50:9, 52:17, 61:5, 63:12, 68:2, 77:7, 77:10, 82:14, 84:6, 94:14, 117:1, 117:2, 124:2, 125:19, 126:1, 127:12, 133:17, 146:19,</p> |
|--|--|---|--|--|

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|---|
| <p>147:7, 147:13, 148:7, 150:4, 157:8, 169:17, 170:2, 170:3, 175:5, 179:1, 179:8, 218:14 proposes [1] - 121:9 proposing [1] - 126:15 prospect [1] - 87:2 Prospect [2] - 178:6, 194:11 protect [1] - 200:19 protections [1] - 145:8 proud [2] - 25:18, 58:3 proved [1] - 140:13 provide [11] - 55:15, 58:6, 79:1, 87:10, 87:12, 87:15, 119:8, 181:18, 193:14, 193:18, 217:14 provided [4] - 78:9, 79:5, 116:19, 200:15 provides [1] - 116:13 providing [4] - 32:9, 118:13, 119:13, 200:17 provision [11] - 5:2, 17:16, 127:15, 128:5, 157:16, 162:3, 203:15, 205:2, 208:6, 208:10, 212:2 provisions [11] - 127:7, 161:2, 163:11, 167:8, 181:13, 181:15, 184:2, 205:8, 205:9, 205:11, 212:7 PUBLIC [1] - 2:5 public [37] - 4:14, 7:10, 7:11, 8:19, 12:8, 13:17, 15:11, 22:9, 25:7, 25:9, 29:17, 37:12, 41:9, 44:17, 46:9, 46:16, 47:19, 48:12, 49:5, 51:2, 52:12, 56:4, 57:10, 63:19, 64:14, 65:2, 69:1, 79:11, 88:2, 98:10, 106:18, 151:13, 163:14, 179:18, 189:5, 198:5 Public [2] - 221:5, 221:12 PUD [1] - 107:9 pull [1] - 153:7 pulled [2] - 145:14,</p> | <p>201:14 purchase [2] - 84:19, 140:16 purchased [1] - 68:4 purely [1] - 9:5 push [2] - 64:1, 202:9 pushed [1] - 110:17 pushing [4] - 40:13, 41:1, 41:8, 44:15 put [12] - 75:12, 86:16, 86:17, 99:14, 109:17, 111:18, 125:12, 185:3, 185:10, 194:4, 208:13, 213:3 Putnam [1] - 93:4 puts [3] - 59:1, 72:5, 172:2 putting [7] - 6:5, 35:16, 54:2, 64:3, 99:12, 110:9, 114:1</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Q</p> <hr/> <p>quality [2] - 106:7, 124:5 quarters [1] - 102:16 Quest [10] - 15:14, 17:4, 49:15, 50:11, 67:3, 85:1, 146:5, 147:3, 169:5 questioning [1] - 53:10 questions [15] - 49:11, 50:18, 104:11, 143:11, 143:18, 144:2, 144:5, 150:12, 150:14, 152:19, 183:4, 192:6, 197:5, 203:11, 217:9 quick [2] - 143:13, 192:6 quickly [4] - 18:6, 43:3, 127:13, 185:10 quid [1] - 179:9 quite [7] - 33:14, 56:2, 70:6, 71:18, 95:13, 115:4, 185:15 quo [1] - 179:9 quote [1] - 87:10</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">R</p> <hr/> <p>R-o-d-r-i-g-u-e-z [1] - 93:13 raise [2] - 109:1, 192:14 raised [5] - 19:2,</p> | <p>144:5, 146:17, 148:1, 198:4 raises [2] - 102:9, 176:4 raising [1] - 102:6 ramific [1] - 176:5 ramifications [1] - 192:17 ran [1] - 16:12 range [3] - 20:1, 154:18, 216:4 ranging [2] - 37:6, 37:8 rapid [2] - 78:4, 78:6 rate [5] - 62:5, 72:2, 78:4, 78:6, 103:7 rates [2] - 174:2, 174:3 rather [10] - 86:15, 159:12, 171:15, 183:6, 191:13, 197:6, 205:5, 205:13, 216:5, 216:13 ratio [4] - 27:15, 172:13, 202:11, 216:3 Ratio [1] - 2:13 rational [1] - 178:4 rationale [3] - 101:18, 105:19, 163:19 ratios [1] - 172:7 re [2] - 151:17, 151:19 re-filing [2] - 151:17, 151:19 reaching [1] - 47:11 read [5] - 7:15, 8:4, 18:9, 136:4, 220:15 reader [1] - 204:9 reading [4] - 4:1, 13:11, 154:10, 220:6 reads [2] - 149:9, 182:2 ready [2] - 67:12, 143:7 real [14] - 24:15, 25:15, 38:7, 38:12, 50:14, 58:4, 62:7, 113:9, 165:10, 173:10, 186:9, 187:16, 189:12, 199:18 realize [2] - 77:4, 77:6 really [112] - 8:5, 9:14, 10:15, 10:18, 11:3, 11:8, 11:10, 12:7, 13:3, 13:4, 13:8, 13:12, 13:18, 14:2, 14:3, 14:12, 14:14, 15:3, 15:17, 16:3,</p> | <p>18:3, 18:8, 19:16, 22:4, 24:8, 25:10, 26:2, 26:7, 26:10, 27:3, 28:4, 28:6, 30:2, 31:7, 31:8, 31:9, 31:17, 31:18, 32:2, 32:4, 32:5, 34:10, 37:11, 38:2, 38:7, 38:9, 38:10, 38:13, 40:2, 40:4, 40:5, 40:12, 40:13, 40:18, 41:7, 41:8, 41:18, 42:8, 42:13, 42:15, 43:16, 43:18, 44:5, 44:10, 44:18, 45:7, 45:10, 45:12, 46:10, 46:18, 48:10, 49:3, 49:5, 50:6, 60:8, 60:17, 70:16, 72:4, 72:14, 72:16, 96:11, 96:18, 104:1, 116:14, 128:3, 128:9, 130:13, 135:3, 136:4, 136:11, 142:15, 146:12, 165:9, 167:17, 169:12, 169:15, 172:19, 182:12, 183:3, 186:4, 186:8, 188:13, 199:12, 201:15, 202:8, 204:8, 207:3 realm [6] - 37:12, 41:9, 44:17, 46:9, 46:16, 47:19 Realty [1] - 2:5 rear [2] - 44:5, 210:11 REASON [6] - 220:9, 220:10, 220:11, 220:12, 220:13, 220:14 reason [3] - 175:15, 184:18, 220:7 reasonable [2] - 99:16, 208:15 reasonably [1] - 73:12 reasoning [1] - 218:17 reasons [7] - 79:17, 82:1, 97:11, 108:7, 141:12, 171:3, 199:17 reassuring [2] - 197:16, 198:2 receive [1] - 8:2 received [3] - 7:14, 136:1, 143:10 receiving [2] - 44:19, 147:17 recent [1] - 71:14</p> | <p>recently [3] - 43:15, 70:13, 106:13 recess [1] - 143:5 recognition [1] - 84:18 recommend [4] - 121:7, 123:19, 125:2, 205:19 recommendation [12] - 4:5, 4:7, 56:13, 152:4, 152:5, 152:11, 164:18, 189:7, 203:6, 211:7, 217:4, 218:13 recommendations [17] - 6:6, 38:18, 56:1, 58:1, 77:8, 77:9, 100:16, 101:12, 109:18, 144:15, 146:12, 146:14, 147:6, 148:14, 148:15, 183:19, 200:11 recommended [1] - 147:6 recommending [1] - 203:8 reconcile [1] - 182:11 reconfiguration [1] - 43:15 RECORD [1] - 1:18 record [4] - 7:15, 25:17, 220:17, 221:6 Red [6] - 31:12, 31:13, 57:11, 84:15, 121:12, 138:15 red [2] - 39:7, 185:18 redevelop [3] - 146:3, 187:6, 195:8 redeveloped [2] - 176:15, 177:7 redeveloping [2] - 174:11, 187:3 redevelopment [3] - 112:13, 112:18, 146:13 redraft [1] - 159:7 reduce [3] - 32:6, 125:16, 137:11 reduced [3] - 41:3, 166:4, 208:12 reduces [3] - 33:4, 128:4, 128:7 reducing [6] - 2:12, 31:19, 42:15, 43:18, 47:4, 63:3 reduction [1] - 208:10 Reeves [7] - 100:9, 113:18, 115:3, 115:7, 119:16,</p> |
|--|---|--|--|---|

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| <p>179:6 refer [3] - 151:12, 163:2, 210:18 reference [13] - 19:18, 26:12, 37:10, 38:10, 132:9, 149:13, 153:6, 159:13, 162:7, 163:7, 164:2, 204:17, 205:14 referenced [3] - 85:5, 202:12, 210:13 referencing [1] - 155:12 referred [1] - 183:15 referring [2] - 161:7, 167:19 reflect [1] - 181:7 reflected [2] - 150:2, 150:6 reflection [2] - 36:10, 41:12 reflective [1] - 34:1 reflects [1] - 177:2 refreshing [1] - 85:15 regard [6] - 150:15, 164:1, 174:18, 182:4, 198:2, 205:1 regarding [3] - 5:14, 132:18, 210:13 regardless [7] - 9:4, 9:12, 13:6, 26:2, 26:6, 28:10, 158:15 regime [1] - 147:2 regimen [1] - 84:3 region [1] - 153:17 regular [2] - 5:17, 181:16 regulations [2] - 87:9, 160:19 reinforce [1] - 122:9 relate [3] - 11:15, 18:17, 214:4 related [4] - 10:14, 100:1, 211:1, 211:4 relates [1] - 28:5 relating [3] - 161:2, 161:15, 163:6 relation [1] - 12:13 relative [2] - 197:7, 202:6 relatively [8] - 12:13, 71:14, 138:1, 146:6, 176:13, 181:14, 201:7, 208:17 relatives [1] - 91:18 relativity [1] - 106:4 relegated [1] - 41:17 relentless [1] - 20:4 relevantly [1] - 208:7 relief [1] - 132:16 relies [2] - 117:5,</p> | <p>117:6 relieves [1] - 123:9 relinquish [2] - 73:4, 74:2 rely [1] - 156:13 remain [1] - 55:14 remains [1] - 148:16 remarks [2] - 112:5, 183:15 remember [6] - 7:11, 26:18, 107:9, 111:8, 134:6, 134:14 removed [1] - 19:4 rendering [1] - 46:13 renderings [1] - 47:16 renegotiating [1] - 169:1 rent [1] - 23:14 rental [1] - 102:16 renumbered [2] - 163:3, 163:4 repeat [4] - 7:16, 18:13, 89:2, 141:10 repeated [1] - 87:4 repeating [1] - 87:4 replace [1] - 99:15 replacing [1] - 202:14 report [3] - 5:11, 5:12, 122:2 REPORTER [1] - 221:18 Reporter [2] - 221:4, 221:13 REPORTERS [1] - 1:17 represent [2] - 10:2, 103:1 representative [1] - 6:11 represented [1] - 150:3 represents [6] - 9:18, 13:15, 13:17, 15:4, 16:5, 17:10 REPRODUCTION [1] - 221:16 requested [1] - 12:10 requesting [1] - 115:9 require [3] - 117:19, 151:13, 170:19 required [4] - 29:17, 32:9, 117:14, 208:9 requirement [5] - 2:15, 19:13, 20:3, 101:14, 215:9 Requirements [1] - 2:14 requirements [5] - 2:16, 18:1, 18:2, 26:1, 32:11 requires [1] - 141:19</p> | <p>reread [1] - 161:18 reservation [2] - 68:14, 219:8 residence [2] - 48:2, 55:17 residences [2] - 108:9, 108:10 residency [1] - 70:3 resident [8] - 71:14, 74:12, 77:18, 157:4, 157:10, 171:19, 172:12, 189:10 residential [38] - 12:17, 16:11, 16:15, 17:17, 19:8, 19:15, 26:5, 27:13, 33:5, 33:12, 36:19, 39:1, 44:12, 50:9, 55:11, 57:17, 58:10, 66:18, 68:5, 68:10, 68:13, 75:6, 80:11, 86:9, 87:11, 87:16, 91:2, 94:13, 105:14, 108:14, 111:18, 116:5, 161:11, 174:5, 174:7, 193:4, 207:3, 213:15 Residential [2] - 2:7, 2:11 residents [15] - 32:19, 75:9, 79:11, 80:19, 83:18, 84:14, 115:17, 119:9, 119:11, 156:11, 158:5, 158:7, 158:14, 171:19, 201:1 resource [1] - 123:1 respect [1] - 16:6 RESPECT [1] - 221:17 respond [5] - 11:4, 13:9, 17:12, 144:4, 144:9 responding [1] - 10:8 Response [5] - 50:19, 141:6, 142:19, 153:2, 219:4 responsibility [1] - 82:16 responsive [1] - 22:6 rest [9] - 84:9, 84:17, 125:15, 141:1, 171:9, 182:8, 189:4, 192:10, 209:10 restaurants [3] - 80:17, 88:3, 90:8 restriction [1] - 26:13 result [3] - 69:3, 122:17, 147:11 resultant [1] - 42:5</p> | <p>resulted [1] - 168:11 results [1] - 77:16 retail [30] - 2:16, 12:8, 15:16, 17:2, 17:7, 24:8, 24:14, 24:16, 24:19, 25:1, 25:4, 25:7, 36:19, 44:7, 44:13, 45:1, 45:7, 48:18, 52:13, 57:17, 60:3, 67:1, 75:9, 79:15, 90:11, 90:12, 91:5, 120:10, 132:13, 162:19 retain [1] - 78:15 rethink [1] - 20:5 return [2] - 64:6, 179:7 returning [2] - 34:3, 70:5 reuse [1] - 27:17 review [20] - 8:4, 18:12, 38:15, 53:11, 76:4, 106:7, 124:18, 150:1, 155:3, 160:12, 160:14, 168:10, 168:15, 193:19, 202:9, 204:18, 205:6, 205:8, 205:9, 212:3 reviewed [2] - 80:7, 212:2 reviewing [6] - 175:18, 175:19, 176:1, 188:9, 188:10, 210:8 revised [1] - 19:19 revisions [8] - 5:5, 5:16, 8:2, 9:19, 10:14, 11:17, 18:14, 148:10 revisited [1] - 142:10 revitalization [1] - 87:14 rezone [1] - 178:1 rezoning [3] - 142:12, 168:10, 173:19 Rhone [1] - 25:12 Ribbon [2] - 57:11, 121:12 rich [1] - 61:17 richer [1] - 196:6 rid [2] - 128:11, 189:9 ride [1] - 129:19 right-hand [1] - 42:5 rights [10] - 12:5, 12:9, 12:17, 28:18, 30:8, 133:11, 133:12, 147:15, 191:3, 193:12 rise [2] - 124:9, 124:11</p> | <p>rising [1] - 79:4 risky [1] - 61:13 ROBERTS [22] - 6:16, 143:16, 150:17, 151:10, 151:18, 152:7, 153:7, 154:1, 154:11, 156:16, 203:9, 203:19, 204:4, 205:15, 206:19, 207:18, 208:5, 209:10, 210:1, 211:15, 217:2, 218:6 Roberts [6] - 1:14, 10:10, 26:18, 116:3, 135:19, 143:16 ROBIN [4] - 56:16, 56:19, 57:3, 60:13 Robin [1] - 57:3 rock [1] - 75:1 rocketing [1] - 61:8 RODRIGUEZ [1] - 93:12 Rodriguez [2] - 91:10, 93:13 rolling [1] - 90:18 roof [2] - 4:15, 5:2 roofs [1] - 200:17 room [4] - 45:6, 46:12, 49:3, 69:17 Room [1] - 1:7 rooming [1] - 94:11 roommates [1] - 117:16 Roopianian [1] - 10:2 rose [2] - 64:7, 64:10 Rose [1] - 52:6 Ross [2] - 128:15, 128:16 ROSS [1] - 128:16 Rossi [1] - 53:13 Rossi's [1] - 53:17 Rossiter [3] - 10:4, 30:14, 30:19 ROSSITER [3] - 30:18, 49:18, 50:12 roughly [2] - 117:2, 117:13 roundtable [1] - 5:18 ruled [1] - 64:5 rules [1] - 18:11 rumors [2] - 89:4, 89:6 run [4] - 16:8, 18:6, 22:13, 80:4 running [1] - 22:11 RUSSELL [17] - 49:13, 50:8, 50:16, 182:16, 183:3, 185:14, 190:9, 190:13, 190:18,</p> |
|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|---|
| <p>191:6, 192:2, 192:18, 194:8, 196:2, 207:8, 215:16, 218:12 Russell [3] - 1:10, 28:14, 142:6 RYAN [1] - 132:4 Ryan [1] - 132:5</p> | <p>second [15] - 4:1, 13:11, 40:11, 46:14, 46:18, 51:6, 82:19, 144:8, 144:18, 148:9, 183:12, 208:19, 209:3, 219:1, 219:2 Section [8] - 160:5, 160:7, 160:8, 161:2, 162:2, 162:14, 164:2, 164:15 section [9] - 39:9, 125:13, 126:16, 159:15, 162:19, 167:10, 181:5, 202:6 sections [5] - 35:17, 159:13, 181:3, 181:6, 181:7 security [1] - 45:12 see [56] - 5:15, 14:15, 16:4, 16:19, 31:9, 33:11, 33:15, 33:19, 34:7, 36:9, 36:14, 37:5, 38:17, 39:6, 39:9, 39:16, 41:7, 41:10, 41:11, 42:4, 42:7, 42:9, 42:12, 42:17, 44:3, 45:14, 46:14, 49:19, 51:14, 69:2, 69:14, 70:10, 77:3, 78:4, 78:5, 92:5, 92:6, 92:9, 112:15, 112:16, 117:12, 124:13, 164:19, 169:3, 170:1, 170:16, 177:6, 180:2, 182:7, 182:12, 186:8, 195:1, 214:11, 216:5, 216:13 seeing [1] - 213:7 seek [2] - 157:10, 173:19 seeking [3] - 75:14, 77:4, 206:10 seem [1] - 149:2 Seiderman [1] - 5:11 selection [1] - 169:6 sell [2] - 120:5 sells [1] - 111:3 send [4] - 9:9, 166:19, 218:13 sending [1] - 202:17 sense [5] - 12:4, 24:3, 34:4, 122:2, 180:6 sensibility [1] - 88:12 sent [5] - 10:10, 14:4, 57:8, 135:19, 211:6 sentence [3] - 180:13, 208:19, 209:3</p> | <p>sentiment [1] - 65:15 sequence [1] - 44:12 series [4] - 41:11, 42:2, 46:3, 47:15 serious [3] - 75:4, 133:1, 135:3 serve [6] - 64:12, 84:4, 84:8, 84:13, 85:6, 176:19 served [5] - 6:10, 31:13, 64:10, 72:6, 121:14 service [2] - 34:19, 125:3 session [1] - 7:10 set [12] - 25:19, 113:3, 116:9, 128:1, 160:12, 162:3, 173:6, 198:3, 205:7, 208:8, 221:6, 221:8 setback [2] - 41:10, 44:14 setbacks [3] - 48:7, 200:9, 200:13 sets [2] - 73:10, 81:19 setting [7] - 36:19, 41:10, 47:18, 48:7, 192:15, 195:3, 197:8 seven [4] - 21:17, 71:9, 110:13, 127:19 Seven [2] - 71:10, 71:13 several [7] - 57:9, 62:3, 74:13, 88:14, 88:16, 161:18, 163:12 shadow [10] - 40:10, 42:15, 43:4, 43:6, 43:14, 43:18, 47:4, 47:10, 63:12 shadows [6] - 41:3, 43:3, 43:9, 43:12, 47:11, 211:10 shall [1] - 160:13 shame [1] - 174:15 share [2] - 33:5, 69:17 shared [2] - 91:17, 128:4 shares [3] - 32:16, 33:12, 34:8 sharing [14] - 20:3, 31:17, 31:18, 32:6, 84:3, 84:8, 85:6, 128:10, 161:16, 202:10, 208:6, 208:14, 208:16 sheet [3] - 51:3, 135:16, 220:7 SHEET [1] - 220:1</p> | <p>Sheet [2] - 220:3, 220:7 shift [2] - 21:16, 24:7 shifted [1] - 21:14 shooken [1] - 114:13 shop [1] - 79:13 short [4] - 8:3, 65:11, 143:5, 203:2 Shorthand [2] - 221:4, 221:13 shots [1] - 86:12 shovel [1] - 59:7 show [6] - 25:10, 33:8, 38:12, 43:5, 46:13, 219:7 showed [4] - 43:7, 43:11, 47:9, 92:3 showing [3] - 36:5, 38:7, 42:13 shown [3] - 47:13, 70:1, 138:16 shows [3] - 36:18, 68:7, 188:11 shy [1] - 71:15 side [8] - 19:3, 29:11, 45:1, 93:15, 101:19, 140:11, 176:17, 200:2 Sidney [1] - 74:11 Sieniewicz [1] - 1:10 SIENIEWICZ [14] - 156:7, 158:4, 158:18, 193:13, 194:3, 197:2, 197:4, 198:12, 198:18, 199:5, 203:3, 213:17, 219:2, 219:11 sight [1] - 136:18 sign [3] - 51:3, 132:6, 135:14 Sign [1] - 220:7 sign-up [1] - 51:3 SIGNATURE [1] - 220:1 signed [2] - 51:11, 135:16 significant [8] - 15:6, 52:10, 63:18, 133:16, 145:19, 178:2, 178:15, 179:13 similar [2] - 89:5, 207:7 similarities [1] - 125:17 similarly [1] - 78:6 Simmons [1] - 27:8 simple [1] - 181:10 simplicity [2] - 180:16, 182:6</p> | <p>simplify [1] - 125:14 simply [5] - 140:19, 141:14, 163:1, 181:16, 195:18 single [8] - 21:1, 69:15, 94:12, 117:16, 136:18, 136:19, 142:11, 142:12 single-family [1] - 94:12 sit [2] - 113:5, 143:7 site [24] - 2:18, 28:4, 28:7, 34:7, 47:16, 80:10, 81:15, 83:2, 109:4, 116:6, 126:18, 128:6, 145:13, 146:2, 146:7, 147:11, 176:9, 176:10, 177:7, 179:4, 202:16, 212:5, 212:6, 212:9 sites [12] - 99:11, 101:16, 102:1, 103:12, 103:14, 145:18, 146:9, 146:11, 147:19, 148:4, 187:4, 212:18 sitter [1] - 113:12 sitting [2] - 74:9, 183:2 situation [1] - 200:16 six [7] - 5:9, 69:16, 70:12, 110:13, 186:14, 216:13, 216:15 size [6] - 86:6, 89:8, 146:4, 206:11, 207:5, 207:6 sizzling [1] - 174:5 sketch [1] - 99:10 skewed [1] - 179:14 sky [3] - 47:5, 61:7, 88:5 skyrocket [1] - 78:3 skyrocketing [1] - 78:11 slab [2] - 39:15, 47:1 slant [1] - 205:14 sleep [1] - 67:9 slight [1] - 44:14 slightly [2] - 41:1, 194:12 SLOAN [3] - 30:18, 49:18, 50:12 Sloan [3] - 10:4, 30:14, 30:19 SLOAN-ROSSITER [3] - 30:18, 49:18,</p> |
| S | | | | |
| <p>safety [1] - 45:12 Saint [1] - 14:4 sake [1] - 70:4 saluted [2] - 100:4 SAME [1] - 221:17 Sanzone [2] - 82:5, 82:7 SANZONE [3] - 82:7, 82:8, 82:12 satisfies [1] - 200:18 satisfying [1] - 128:2 saves [1] - 185:2 saw [1] - 167:15 scale [14] - 4:16, 40:6, 40:19, 41:6, 48:9, 81:1, 87:13, 87:19, 88:6, 115:18, 141:1, 186:16, 193:9, 207:11 scaling [3] - 40:4, 41:13, 48:18 scattered [1] - 61:9 scenario [1] - 210:16 scene [1] - 52:19 SCHATTNER [3] - 139:17, 140:3, 140:8 Schattner [2] - 139:18, 140:3 scheduled [2] - 6:1, 151:3 scheme [1] - 8:4 school [4] - 23:18, 93:3, 93:4, 138:8 School [1] - 130:7 schools [1] - 92:19 science [2] - 110:16, 110:17 scope [1] - 160:7 scratch [1] - 183:7 screen [3] - 38:17, 73:11, 185:11 scrutiny [2] - 12:15, 38:14 season [1] - 73:16 seasonal [1] - 45:16 seat [1] - 60:14 seated [1] - 4:10 Second [1] - 1:7</p> | | | | |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|--|
| <p>50:12</p> <p>Sloan-Rossiter [3] - 10:4, 30:14, 30:19</p> <p>slow [2] - 124:9, 124:11</p> <p>small [15] - 12:13, 24:16, 25:1, 35:15, 60:4, 60:7, 89:17, 123:18, 141:15, 173:1, 176:2, 176:11, 178:16, 207:12, 213:12</p> <p>smaller [9] - 4:16, 25:2, 39:3, 86:4, 185:19, 206:5, 206:11, 206:15, 217:18</p> <p>smallest [1] - 15:3</p> <p>smart [1] - 81:6</p> <p>smarter [1] - 198:14</p> <p>socks [1] - 60:6</p> <p>solid [1] - 17:3</p> <p>solvable [1] - 183:5</p> <p>solve [2] - 25:6, 62:1</p> <p>someone [5] - 51:11, 67:8, 69:15, 169:16, 183:11</p> <p>sometimes [2] - 204:6</p> <p>somewhat [4] - 145:1, 149:2, 150:3, 180:7</p> <p>somewhere [2] - 51:4, 72:9</p> <p>soon [4] - 93:4, 96:1, 124:3, 125:10</p> <p>sorely [2] - 78:10, 121:9</p> <p>sorry [15] - 5:7, 71:8, 71:11, 89:1, 101:4, 102:2, 109:8, 112:8, 141:8, 155:19, 194:6, 195:16, 195:17, 197:3, 214:3</p> <p>sort [24] - 14:17, 18:14, 19:14, 25:5, 26:19, 28:9, 36:15, 37:13, 38:12, 39:13, 39:15, 45:19, 46:4, 46:5, 48:9, 134:15, 145:2, 145:4, 177:9, 182:5, 186:16, 192:15, 205:13, 210:4</p> <p>sought [1] - 117:7</p> <p>south [4] - 19:3, 29:11, 46:19, 121:6</p> <p>South [8] - 94:1, 94:2, 94:6, 132:10, 132:11, 132:14, 132:17, 174:10</p> <p>space [24] - 12:7,</p> | <p>13:17, 15:11, 24:15, 24:16, 25:7, 25:13, 48:12, 52:12, 56:3, 56:4, 62:17, 62:18, 66:18, 68:6, 69:13, 98:16, 99:13, 108:4, 161:8, 200:14, 200:19, 201:1</p> <p>spaces [15] - 20:10, 25:2, 44:10, 60:4, 62:9, 85:4, 88:5, 127:18, 172:8, 202:15, 207:3, 208:9, 208:14, 216:16</p> <p>speaking [7] - 7:11, 31:2, 51:12, 52:5, 82:13, 95:9, 121:7</p> <p>Special [18] - 2:11, 38:15, 39:1, 86:8, 120:16, 142:9, 161:3, 162:3, 162:7, 173:1, 186:4, 212:7, 213:17, 214:1, 214:2, 215:17, 215:19, 216:2</p> <p>special [3] - 44:19, 61:11, 160:18</p> <p>specific [11] - 27:19, 34:18, 162:3, 168:3, 168:6, 168:9, 168:13, 175:19, 178:19, 204:16, 216:8</p> <p>specified [2] - 160:14, 205:9</p> <p>spend [2] - 53:11, 130:11</p> <p>spending [1] - 22:17</p> <p>spent [1] - 189:3</p> <p>spill [1] - 16:16</p> <p>spirit [2] - 58:1, 81:6</p> <p>split [1] - 212:16</p> <p>spoken [1] - 52:9</p> <p>sports [1] - 23:19</p> <p>spot [4] - 57:7, 105:7, 114:7, 178:13</p> <p>square [23] - 12:10, 25:4, 39:3, 50:13, 68:11, 80:9, 81:2, 88:10, 90:10, 91:1, 91:3, 91:6, 92:6, 94:18, 100:5, 101:4, 105:10, 105:11, 121:12, 121:18, 124:16, 207:10, 207:13</p> <p>Square [114] - 2:7, 14:14, 14:16, 15:18, 16:6, 16:8, 16:10, 16:13, 16:18, 18:5, 24:13, 35:8, 37:1,</p> | <p>37:4, 37:15, 40:2, 40:14, 43:7, 44:3, 46:8, 52:11, 54:9, 55:19, 57:4, 57:5, 57:11, 57:12, 58:5, 58:6, 58:19, 59:3, 59:9, 59:12, 60:17, 62:13, 63:10, 63:11, 67:15, 72:7, 73:17, 74:12, 74:15, 75:5, 75:17, 76:2, 77:18, 80:19, 81:9, 83:15, 83:17, 87:13, 88:1, 89:4, 89:7, 89:9, 90:1, 90:6, 90:19, 92:5, 93:16, 95:1, 104:4, 104:7, 105:12, 106:13, 107:1, 109:4, 111:2, 112:13, 112:14, 114:10, 117:9, 121:12, 121:14, 124:16, 125:1, 129:7, 130:4, 130:8, 130:9, 130:12, 132:6, 133:3, 135:1, 135:7, 136:17, 137:12, 144:14, 145:5, 146:12, 147:5, 148:15, 149:14, 149:15, 164:3, 164:7, 165:6, 165:12, 166:12, 166:14, 171:10, 172:9, 173:17, 174:8, 176:2, 177:16, 177:17, 178:17, 183:18, 184:15, 192:11, 194:19</p> <p>Square's [1] - 57:14</p> <p>square's [1] - 37:12</p> <p>Square-esque [1] - 15:18</p> <p>SS [1] - 221:3</p> <p>Staff [1] - 1:14</p> <p>staff [9] - 103:11, 142:7, 143:10, 143:12, 144:12, 153:1, 203:8, 207:15, 211:2</p> <p>staff's [1] - 211:9</p> <p>stand [2] - 8:14, 9:13</p> <p>standard [2] - 25:19, 133:13</p> <p>standards [5] - 106:11, 110:15, 133:14, 178:5, 209:16</p> <p>standing [1] - 186:11</p> <p>standpoint [1] - 32:15</p> <p>star [1] - 75:2</p> | <p>stars [1] - 174:17</p> <p>start [15] - 3:10, 22:4, 38:2, 56:7, 88:2, 96:14, 131:3, 143:9, 143:12, 152:1, 159:2, 164:5, 196:11, 199:1</p> <p>started [6] - 20:1, 22:1, 39:14, 111:9, 144:13, 166:15</p> <p>starting [2] - 21:2, 159:8</p> <p>starts [2] - 90:17, 160:6</p> <p>state [9] - 29:17, 30:1, 78:19, 79:4, 103:7, 133:11, 140:1, 153:15, 162:18</p> <p>statement [1] - 160:15</p> <p>statement(s) [1] - 220:17</p> <p>static [1] - 123:1</p> <p>station [2] - 72:8, 186:11</p> <p>status [1] - 3:17</p> <p>statutory [1] - 151:7</p> <p>stay [6] - 29:10, 55:10, 70:6, 73:7, 74:6, 96:13</p> <p>stays [1] - 19:8</p> <p>step [2] - 88:8, 123:18</p> <p>Stephen [1] - 201:5</p> <p>stepping [2] - 47:19, 186:16</p> <p>steps [1] - 87:19</p> <p>STEVE [1] - 125:5</p> <p>Steve [5] - 20:3, 121:2, 125:5, 173:13, 215:3</p> <p>Steven [2] - 1:11, 183:13</p> <p>STEVEN [30] - 153:3, 153:13, 153:18, 156:1, 173:14, 189:19, 190:3, 190:10, 190:16, 191:2, 191:18, 192:4, 193:11, 194:1, 194:5, 195:2, 195:16, 196:14, 197:3, 198:9, 206:7, 207:14, 209:5, 213:12, 214:3, 215:7, 215:11, 217:17, 218:2, 219:8</p> <p>stick [2] - 163:13, 163:15</p> <p>stickers [2] - 172:1, 172:12</p> | <p>still [12] - 18:10, 20:6, 68:7, 77:16, 93:7, 117:5, 117:6, 124:15, 149:7, 166:7, 191:5, 206:18</p> <p>stock [2] - 123:7, 123:10</p> <p>stop [5] - 73:13, 111:17, 112:2, 173:11, 184:9</p> <p>stopped [1] - 104:7</p> <p>stops [1] - 17:2</p> <p>storage [1] - 44:9</p> <p>stores [3] - 129:8, 129:9, 130:16</p> <p>stories [6] - 87:17, 107:1, 137:1, 185:17, 186:1, 186:14</p> <p>story [3] - 176:12, 186:17, 186:19</p> <p>straight [1] - 43:17</p> <p>straightforward [2] - 30:11, 149:10</p> <p>Street [46] - 37:5, 39:18, 43:1, 44:3, 44:7, 48:3, 52:8, 54:14, 61:5, 63:10, 66:1, 66:11, 68:1, 71:9, 71:11, 71:13, 71:17, 73:3, 74:11, 76:12, 80:1, 81:4, 84:12, 85:14, 88:3, 89:1, 91:18, 92:8, 93:1, 93:14, 93:15, 102:14, 109:9, 109:15, 109:19, 115:1, 116:5, 118:11, 121:5, 125:6, 135:17, 141:12, 178:6, 194:12, 194:14, 213:7</p> <p>street [6] - 88:4, 129:3, 163:1, 164:15, 175:3, 194:13</p> <p>Streets [3] - 2:8, 2:13, 136:16</p> <p>streets [5] - 37:18, 57:18, 99:6</p> <p>streetscape [2] - 27:13, 86:13</p> <p>streetscapes [1] - 88:6</p> <p>stress [1] - 38:9</p> <p>stressed [2] - 15:8, 136:8</p> <p>stretched [1] - 29:6</p> <p>stretching [1] - 98:19</p> |
|---|---|---|---|--|

strip [1] - 162:10
strips [1] - 193:4
strong [8] - 10:18, 22:1, 68:7, 76:13, 78:7, 79:14, 174:4, 177:12
stronger [1] - 131:1
strongly [2] - 52:8, 170:12
struck [1] - 162:18
structure [4] - 99:18, 197:14, 213:5, 213:10
structures [2] - 82:15, 83:9
struggling [1] - 96:13
Stuart [1] - 1:15
stuck [2] - 183:8, 199:18
students [1] - 137:10
studied [2] - 178:11, 199:8
studies [4] - 43:4, 58:9, 184:10, 187:11
studio [1] - 155:6
study [16] - 18:16, 32:17, 32:18, 34:14, 35:6, 56:2, 67:11, 77:16, 104:1, 104:6, 145:5, 148:15, 166:9, 172:15, 188:11, 202:3
Study [2] - 57:13, 121:16
stuff [3] - 54:17, 191:10, 201:16
style [1] - 39:15
sub [1] - 209:2
sub-500 [1] - 207:12
Subdistrict [1] - 2:7
subdistrict [1] - 61:6
subdistricts [2] - 134:1, 193:4
subject [4] - 2:14, 103:10, 106:10, 160:13
submit [2] - 53:7, 189:6
submitted [5] - 7:13, 95:13, 95:15, 125:7, 135:18
subparagraph [1] - 208:19
subscribe [1] - 220:16
subsection [1] - 160:18
subsequent [1] - 122:2
subsidies [1] - 79:5

subsidized [7] - 21:7, 22:10, 58:11, 94:7, 96:6, 125:19, 127:8
subsidy [3] - 22:9, 23:14
substantial [3] - 123:14, 128:3, 148:11
substantiate [1] - 102:7
suburb [1] - 80:14
suburbia [1] - 65:4
subway [1] - 130:1
successful [1] - 188:1
succinct [2] - 7:5, 7:9
suddenly [1] - 165:10
suffer [3] - 130:10, 130:13, 130:15
sufficient [1] - 77:10
suggest [1] - 124:8
suggested [2] - 124:7, 214:8
suggestion [1] - 42:18
suggestions [2] - 38:6, 38:19
suit [1] - 90:4
suitable [1] - 60:5
suite [1] - 85:1
suited [1] - 121:10
summary [2] - 6:6, 145:15
sums [1] - 34:16
super [2] - 64:4, 64:17
superintendent [1] - 92:18
supply [6] - 14:12, 14:13, 27:4, 61:12, 78:8, 122:18
support [29] - 14:5, 14:7, 52:8, 54:8, 55:8, 63:14, 64:8, 65:12, 66:12, 76:13, 79:17, 80:6, 83:4, 83:10, 89:2, 90:8, 90:15, 91:14, 91:15, 93:16, 103:14, 106:1, 110:12, 134:18, 165:19, 179:19, 188:13, 197:15, 218:18
supportable [1] - 172:13
supporter [1] - 63:15
supporters [1] - 20:14
supportive [1] - 14:10
supports [1] - 172:10
suppose [1] - 127:4
supposed [1] - 97:7
surely [2] - 64:4, 64:6
surface [15] - 27:1,

27:7, 84:19, 117:6, 134:3, 134:19, 146:8, 168:5, 170:17, 171:1, 171:3, 191:4, 214:17, 215:12, 216:6
surrounded [1] - 15:15
surrounding [1] - 145:2
surroundings [1] - 83:12
survey [2] - 33:4, 103:2
SUSAN [3] - 30:18, 49:18, 50:12
Susan [4] - 10:4, 20:5, 30:13, 30:19
suspect [1] - 32:1
sustain [1] - 79:15
sustainability [3] - 18:1, 25:14, 26:5
sustainable [2] - 12:1, 77:5
Suzannah [3] - 1:15, 143:18, 150:12
sweep [1] - 59:6

T

T-r-a-m-o-n-t [1] - 66:9
table [2] - 113:16, 114:1
tactic [1] - 67:7
takeaway [1] - 145:17
talks [2] - 14:11, 162:14
tall [7] - 74:19, 86:9, 87:1, 141:14, 186:19, 187:1, 213:5
taller [3] - 88:13, 165:19, 187:14
tandem [2] - 20:9, 20:10
Tanous [1] - 71:5
target [2] - 155:11, 155:14
task [2] - 6:4, 6:11
taught [1] - 138:8
tax [4] - 22:8, 96:3, 96:4, 103:6
taxes [1] - 103:5
TEAGUE [1] - 141:9
Teague [1] - 141:11
team [2] - 10:3, 10:5
tech [1] - 64:13
Tech [1] - 92:5

technical [3] - 149:1, 159:3, 178:13
technology [2] - 15:1, 92:6
Ted [5] - 3:6, 3:13, 167:4, 171:16, 173:18
Ted's [1] - 180:11
template [1] - 18:16
temporary [1] - 70:15
ten [5] - 21:19, 97:17, 118:5, 124:15, 174:17
tend [1] - 204:5
tension [1] - 29:6
term [5] - 204:2, 205:18, 206:8, 207:7, 207:19
terminal [1] - 142:2
terminating [1] - 48:11
terms [17] - 22:13, 34:10, 127:5, 148:18, 185:8, 186:14, 186:15, 186:16, 188:19, 191:9, 193:7, 198:2, 198:3, 202:13, 202:14, 209:11
Terrace [3] - 23:17, 23:19, 24:1
terrible [1] - 172:3
terribly [2] - 112:14, 183:10
testimony [1] - 188:15
text [5] - 2:16, 148:10, 148:19, 211:18, 218:15
THE [15] - 1:3, 1:18, 56:17, 57:1, 65:8, 66:5, 71:8, 74:17, 109:10, 112:10, 140:5, 221:16, 221:17, 221:17
THEODORE [85] - 3:3, 3:8, 6:13, 6:17, 8:14, 49:10, 50:17, 51:1, 55:1, 56:15, 61:1, 65:6, 65:9, 65:17, 66:2, 66:7, 67:17, 71:3, 71:10, 72:19, 74:3, 76:9, 82:4, 82:10, 85:9, 91:8, 93:11, 95:5, 109:7, 109:12, 112:4, 114:17, 121:1, 125:4, 128:14, 131:18, 135:11, 136:1, 139:14, 140:1, 141:4, 141:7, 142:17, 143:1, 143:6, 150:13, 151:8, 151:16, 152:2, 152:12, 152:16, 152:18, 156:5, 157:18, 158:5, 159:1, 173:12, 182:15, 183:1, 190:2, 198:8, 202:19, 203:4, 203:17, 204:3, 205:1, 206:3, 206:9, 207:6, 207:16, 208:2, 208:18, 209:7, 209:18, 211:8, 213:1, 213:6, 214:2, 217:15, 218:8, 218:19, 219:3, 219:5, 219:9, 219:12
Theodore [1] - 1:9
therefor [1] - 220:7
therefore [3] - 137:3, 168:2, 173:5
they've [4] - 59:13, 102:11, 129:10, 193:18
thinking [2] - 148:2, 188:19
third [1] - 196:13
thirds [2] - 89:8, 196:13
THIS [1] - 221:16
Thompson [2] - 55:2, 55:6
THOMPSON [1] - 55:4
thoughtful [1] - 133:1
thoughts [2] - 128:8, 195:19
thousand [4] - 110:2, 110:3, 165:17, 191:1
Three [1] - 66:11
three [32] - 2:15, 7:12, 9:1, 21:2, 21:18, 21:19, 51:8, 69:19, 71:16, 98:19, 100:12, 100:13, 101:1, 103:12, 110:9, 117:13, 126:19, 134:1, 141:12, 151:3, 154:6, 154:19, 155:9, 155:17, 170:11, 170:12, 182:17, 184:12, 185:17, 186:12, 186:17, 197:5
three-bedroom [5] - 2:15, 21:2, 117:13, 170:11, 170:12

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| <p>three-person ^[1] - 154:19</p> <p>three-story ^[1] - 186:17</p> <p>thrilled ^[1] - 119:15</p> <p>throttle ^[1] - 122:18</p> <p>throughout ^[3] - 11:14, 78:14, 105:10</p> <p>throw ^[1] - 159:5</p> <p>thrown ^[1] - 196:19</p> <p>Thursday ^[2] - 5:7, 125:9</p> <p>tied ^[3] - 214:6, 217:19, 218:4</p> <p>ties ^[1] - 93:8</p> <p>timeline ^[1] - 12:19</p> <p>timing ^[2] - 150:15, 171:2</p> <p>tiny ^[1] - 187:6</p> <p>TIS ^[1] - 31:6</p> <p>TO ^[1] - 221:16</p> <p>TOD ^[2] - 193:17, 202:16</p> <p>today ^[7] - 4:16, 23:16, 50:7, 90:3, 113:16, 121:7, 129:13</p> <p>today's ^[1] - 3:14</p> <p>together ^[9] - 6:5, 57:10, 99:8, 109:17, 141:18, 145:15, 183:9, 194:16, 209:3</p> <p>TOM ^[14] - 156:7, 158:4, 158:18, 193:13, 194:3, 197:2, 197:4, 198:12, 198:18, 199:5, 203:3, 213:17, 219:2, 219:11</p> <p>Tom ^[3] - 1:10, 6:9, 197:3</p> <p>Tom's ^[1] - 171:17</p> <p>tomorrow ^[2] - 5:7, 64:13</p> <p>ton ^[2] - 9:3, 23:17</p> <p>tone ^[1] - 81:19</p> <p>tonight ^[21] - 6:19, 9:8, 9:13, 11:12, 11:17, 17:11, 27:19, 28:15, 36:9, 52:5, 55:8, 66:12, 100:8, 100:18, 167:15, 167:18, 184:13, 188:15, 189:18, 218:16, 218:18</p> <p>tonight's ^[2] - 4:7, 9:17</p> <p>took ^[3] - 50:13,</p> | <p>145:3, 152:9</p> <p>top ^[6] - 86:17, 100:14, 104:2, 177:17, 213:6, 213:10</p> <p>topic ^[2] - 99:19, 148:8</p> <p>torn ^[1] - 171:7</p> <p>total ^[5] - 33:16, 68:18, 111:5, 191:1, 208:10</p> <p>totally ^[2] - 138:12, 172:13</p> <p>towards ^[4] - 27:9, 55:14, 90:11, 179:14</p> <p>tower ^[5] - 86:5, 107:7, 185:17, 187:15, 194:15</p> <p>towers ^[2] - 105:15, 194:9</p> <p>town ^[1] - 120:15</p> <p>townhouses ^[1] - 216:15</p> <p>track ^[1] - 25:17</p> <p>tractors ^[1] - 111:13</p> <p>tradeoff ^[1] - 186:3</p> <p>traffic ^[17] - 30:15, 32:14, 34:11, 35:3, 35:5, 35:12, 35:15, 35:16, 49:13, 49:15, 50:1, 50:2, 50:10, 172:15, 193:19, 216:7</p> <p>Traffic ^[3] - 49:16, 156:13, 157:2</p> <p>tragedy ^[1] - 174:15</p> <p>train ^[2] - 72:8, 80:14</p> <p>Tramont ^[2] - 66:8, 66:11</p> <p>TRAMONT ^[1] - 66:9</p> <p>transcript ^[4] - 220:2, 220:6, 220:15, 220:16</p> <p>TRANSCRIPT ^[1] - 221:16</p> <p>Transcript(s) ^[1] - 2:4</p> <p>transcripts ^[1] - 6:14</p> <p>transfer ^[9] - 28:17, 30:7, 39:6, 133:10, 133:12, 147:15, 184:1, 193:6, 197:19</p> <p>transferred ^[4] - 147:1, 147:10, 190:16, 191:11</p> <p>transferring ^[2] - 191:3, 193:12</p> <p>transit ^[12] - 28:5, 31:11, 33:1, 33:7, 59:4, 59:5, 62:14,</p> | <p>64:14, 79:10, 81:6, 177:18, 206:15</p> <p>transit-oriented ^[3] - 28:5, 79:10, 81:6</p> <p>transition ^[4] - 48:2, 87:12, 87:15, 87:18</p> <p>Transportation ^[1] - 157:2</p> <p>transportation ^[9] - 31:4, 31:10, 31:15, 63:19, 65:3, 79:12, 81:13, 86:10, 138:15</p> <p>travel ^[3] - 32:2, 32:3, 34:1</p> <p>trend ^[2] - 68:6, 140:19</p> <p>tried ^[16] - 10:7, 10:17, 11:4, 13:9, 17:12, 18:8, 22:4, 23:7, 23:8, 24:8, 27:14, 86:18, 109:2, 111:11, 113:3, 183:6</p> <p>trip ^[1] - 28:6</p> <p>trips ^[3] - 33:13, 34:2, 50:2</p> <p>trouble ^[1] - 215:6</p> <p>troubled ^[2] - 178:12, 178:14</p> <p>true ^[3] - 99:15, 180:19, 221:6</p> <p>truly ^[1] - 63:16</p> <p>trust ^[2] - 134:6, 139:11</p> <p>trusting ^[1] - 139:2</p> <p>try ^[12] - 18:17, 19:17, 59:16, 117:9, 144:1, 144:8, 144:15, 153:7, 168:14, 187:5, 203:12, 210:5</p> <p>trying ^[14] - 32:5, 40:6, 44:5, 44:11, 45:5, 45:10, 49:5, 113:1, 129:4, 141:9, 183:8, 188:5, 197:5, 217:5</p> <p>Tuesday ^[1] - 1:5</p> <p>turn ^[4] - 73:4, 74:2, 134:16, 210:10</p> <p>turns ^[1] - 26:7</p> <p>twenty ^[1] - 52:15</p> <p>twice ^[1] - 9:3</p> <p>Twining ^[16] - 2:6, 3:15, 7:1, 10:1, 53:19, 57:19, 60:10, 65:14, 68:9, 76:14, 89:3, 89:7, 89:9, 90:5, 114:13, 136:13</p> | <p>Twining-Normandy ^[1] - 57:19</p> <p>two ^[41] - 17:8, 45:5, 46:15, 62:15, 70:14, 73:14, 77:2, 82:17, 86:5, 89:8, 89:19, 93:19, 98:19, 100:6, 111:1, 127:18, 128:8, 138:18, 139:4, 144:3, 151:2, 154:5, 155:8, 155:9, 169:9, 173:14, 173:19, 182:10, 182:11, 183:17, 185:6, 187:12, 187:19, 192:6, 196:13, 200:17, 205:5, 205:12, 210:4, 213:16, 219:11</p> <p>two-thirds ^[1] - 196:13</p> <p>type ^[4] - 33:15, 54:5, 158:15, 212:1</p> <p>types ^[1] - 26:1</p> <p>typos ^[1] - 163:2</p> | <p>22:18, 22:19, 53:13, 53:15, 58:15, 69:11, 101:5, 123:5, 123:9, 155:5, 158:16, 171:14, 172:8, 206:15, 207:5, 207:12, 207:13, 216:16</p> <p>units ^[75] - 2:14, 2:15, 15:5, 20:16, 21:7, 21:17, 23:12, 23:15, 24:1, 24:3, 39:17, 39:18, 53:16, 54:1, 55:15, 56:2, 58:10, 58:12, 62:6, 65:14, 67:12, 68:5, 68:8, 68:10, 68:15, 69:4, 69:7, 70:18, 75:8, 76:15, 76:16, 78:9, 78:13, 78:15, 78:17, 79:5, 89:17, 92:10, 94:13, 96:10, 96:17, 98:18, 100:14, 101:4, 101:6, 110:9, 110:10, 110:12, 113:8, 123:15, 125:18, 125:19, 127:5, 127:8, 127:10, 129:11, 137:17, 157:9, 161:4, 161:10, 161:11, 162:13, 163:9, 166:17, 170:9, 170:11, 170:13, 175:13, 205:17, 205:19, 206:5, 207:3, 209:13, 216:13</p> <p>University ^[3] - 37:7, 116:6, 116:8</p> <p>UNLESS ^[1] - 221:17</p> <p>unless ^[3] - 70:19, 94:7, 140:16</p> <p>unnecessary ^[1] - 128:11</p> <p>unprecedented ^[1] - 81:14</p> <p>unquestionably ^[1] - 205:13</p> <p>unused ^[1] - 56:5</p> <p>unusual ^[2] - 52:14, 212:6</p> <p>up ^[66] - 2:10, 17:5, 18:15, 20:18, 21:3, 23:16, 24:8, 24:15, 29:12, 30:14, 33:7, 37:8, 38:17, 39:11, 48:5, 51:3, 51:6, 51:9, 51:11, 53:2, 60:12, 60:15, 60:18, 73:8, 76:17, 82:18, 96:14, 98:7, 102:19,</p> |
| U | | | | |
| | | <p>ugly ^[1] - 184:19</p> <p>unanimous ^[1] - 219:12</p> <p>unblock ^[1] - 57:13</p> <p>uncomfortable ^[1] - 167:16</p> <p>under ^[13] - 12:6, 18:4, 53:9, 147:5, 161:13, 175:15, 184:4, 190:6, 190:14, 191:11, 210:8</p> <p>UNDER ^[1] - 221:17</p> <p>undergo ^[1] - 145:19</p> <p>undergoing ^[1] - 146:10</p> <p>underground ^[1] - 213:3</p> <p>underlying ^[1] - 80:8</p> <p>undersigned ^[1] - 221:4</p> <p>underutilized ^[1] - 56:5</p> <p>underwear ^[1] - 60:6</p> <p>undeveloped ^[1] - 193:5</p> <p>unfortunately ^[1] - 70:10</p> <p>unheard ^[1] - 54:5</p> <p>unique ^[2] - 12:4, 146:6</p> <p>unit ^[19] - 21:12,</p> | | |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|
| <p>104:11, 117:15, 124:14, 125:13, 126:9, 127:7, 132:6, 135:14, 135:16, 136:16, 139:9, 140:5, 141:8, 150:19, 153:8, 154:3, 156:17, 158:8, 166:7, 168:16, 174:4, 178:4, 180:11, 183:16, 185:11, 186:1, 191:19, 192:1, 192:6, 194:7, 195:9, 195:18, 197:11, 201:7, 202:16, 207:16</p> <p>upcoming [1] - 4:11</p> <p>Update [1] - 2:2</p> <p>update [1] - 3:11</p> <p>updated [3] - 47:16, 164:4, 199:11</p> <p>upper [2] - 19:14, 39:16</p> <p>upzoning [5] - 101:15, 103:11, 115:10, 116:12, 117:5</p> <p>urban [12] - 62:14, 77:5, 81:5, 83:19, 88:9, 99:5, 106:9, 121:11, 124:16, 149:14, 177:3, 210:10</p> <p>urge [5] - 56:10, 56:12, 62:19, 79:17, 121:7</p> <p>urgent [2] - 78:8, 78:16</p> <p>uses [9] - 2:16, 24:11, 24:18, 57:17, 84:18, 87:13, 145:7, 200:6, 200:7</p> <p>usual [1] - 84:10</p> <p>utilities [2] - 162:15</p> <p>utilization [1] - 31:11</p> <p>utilizes [1] - 117:10</p> | <p>variance [1] - 137:4</p> <p>Variance [1] - 202:1</p> <p>varied [2] - 15:16, 37:15</p> <p>variety [1] - 196:10</p> <p>various [2] - 57:13, 58:8</p> <p>Vassar [1] - 136:16</p> <p>vast [1] - 16:17</p> <p>vehicular [1] - 32:15</p> <p>venture [1] - 29:19</p> <p>Verbeke [2] - 74:4, 74:10</p> <p>VERBEKE [3] - 74:5, 74:8, 74:19</p> <p>version [1] - 125:10</p> <p>versus [1] - 34:16</p> <p>vertical [1] - 200:16</p> <p>VHB [1] - 31:1</p> <p>vibrant [1] - 77:5</p> <p>Vice [1] - 1:9</p> <p>Vickers [3] - 71:7, 72:19, 73:2</p> <p>VICKERS [1] - 73:1</p> <p>view [8] - 47:8, 48:16, 75:5, 101:10, 185:14, 186:9, 211:5, 212:10</p> <p>vigilant [1] - 63:5</p> <p>vision [1] - 77:4</p> <p>vital [1] - 86:9</p> <p>vitality [1] - 94:17</p> <p>voice [1] - 30:13</p> <p>Volpe [2] - 4:13, 165:16</p> <p>volume [1] - 220:6</p> <p>vote [7] - 54:8, 72:17, 82:2, 115:10, 118:6, 125:1, 219:12</p> <p>voters [2] - 64:15, 64:16</p> <p>voting [1] - 165:1</p> | <p>96:7</p> <p>wall [4] - 17:3, 40:18, 42:14, 43:17</p> <p>wants [9] - 4:15, 51:14, 73:13, 117:17, 129:1, 131:10, 131:12, 159:2, 172:17</p> <p>warm [1] - 67:9</p> <p>Washington [1] - 97:4</p> <p>waste [1] - 94:15</p> <p>watch [1] - 87:6</p> <p>watching [1] - 78:2</p> <p>Watson [2] - 121:2, 121:5</p> <p>WATSON [1] - 121:4</p> <p>ways [4] - 57:13, 86:19, 148:5, 201:4</p> <p>wealthy [1] - 94:9</p> <p>web [1] - 2:18</p> <p>website [1] - 154:3</p> <p>week [5] - 4:12, 6:8, 8:3, 11:1, 18:7</p> <p>weighed [1] - 198:6</p> <p>welcome [8] - 3:4, 3:9, 64:18, 78:18, 90:9, 91:5, 112:11, 114:14</p> <p>welcoming [1] - 63:4</p> <p>well-to-do [1] - 122:18</p> <p>whatsoever [1] - 119:8</p> <p>whereas [1] - 89:13</p> <p>WHEREOF [1] - 221:8</p> <p>whole [8] - 10:5, 72:14, 92:4, 120:1, 169:3, 172:5, 187:9, 194:18</p> <p>wholly [1] - 11:8</p> <p>widely [1] - 61:9</p> <p>wife [1] - 71:16</p> <p>WILLIAM [1] - 61:3</p> <p>William [1] - 61:3</p> <p>willing [3] - 28:13, 193:5, 196:10</p> <p>winds [1] - 211:10</p> <p>winter [3] - 13:19, 43:12, 47:11</p> <p>wisdom [1] - 199:14</p> <p>wise [1] - 184:9</p> <p>wisest [1] - 203:3</p> <p>wish [5] - 71:5, 141:5, 161:4, 161:8, 202:8</p> <p>wishes [2] - 132:2, 139:15</p> <p>WITNESS [1] - 221:8</p> <p>woman [1] - 132:10</p> <p>wonder [1] - 217:2</p> <p>wonderful [2] - 188:11, 189:15</p> | <p>wondering [2] - 143:11, 202:15</p> <p>word [5] - 180:12, 205:4, 205:11, 207:17, 211:14</p> <p>worded [1] - 160:11</p> <p>words [1] - 53:4</p> <p>workers [6] - 14:19, 64:9, 64:11, 64:13, 64:18, 80:13</p> <p>works [1] - 175:14</p> <p>world [2] - 64:5, 107:3</p> <p>worse [2] - 167:8, 180:19</p> <p>worst [2] - 130:10, 180:19</p> <p>worth [1] - 202:14</p> <p>worthy [1] - 12:15</p> <p>wrap [5] - 60:12, 60:15, 60:18, 124:14, 139:9</p> <p>wraps [1] - 16:12</p> <p>write [2] - 75:2, 109:14</p> <p>written [4] - 54:17, 110:1, 158:2, 158:9</p> <p>wrote [3] - 126:3, 198:18, 199:5</p> <p>www.reportersinc.com [1] - 1:19</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">Z</p> <p>Z-u-s-y [1] - 65:12</p> <p>ZBA [1] - 162:8</p> <p>Zelinski [2] - 221:4, 221:12</p> <p>zero [2] - 97:13, 99:17</p> <p>ZipCars [2] - 84:4</p> <p>Zone [1] - 2:10</p> <p>zone [3] - 67:4, 100:12, 107:8</p> <p>zoned [2] - 110:11, 134:4</p> <p>zones [1] - 17:9</p> <p>zoning [21] - 2:17, 5:10, 5:11, 18:4, 79:6, 105:7, 114:7, 116:1, 134:19, 174:13, 175:9, 175:12, 175:13, 178:13, 179:8, 181:13, 199:9, 199:10, 204:1, 209:8, 218:4</p> <p>Zoning [111] - 2:6, 3:16, 4:13, 4:19, 5:15, 7:1, 12:6, 18:2, 18:9, 18:16, 19:9, 19:10, 19:19, 26:13, 29:12, 32:11, 38:6, 38:11, 38:18, 57:14, 57:15, 63:1, 73:15, 80:8, 82:14, 85:19, 88:16, 100:11, 101:1, 101:8, 102:18, 102:19, 103:17, 103:18, 104:13, 105:1, 105:3, 107:2, 107:12, 108:7, 110:18, 111:17, 111:19, 112:1, 112:18, 113:2, 114:3, 120:4, 120:6, 121:8, 124:6, 125:2, 125:7, 126:11, 142:9, 144:15, 147:7, 148:10, 148:15, 148:18, 149:2, 149:4, 150:10, 153:4, 157:15, 158:2, 159:11, 159:12, 159:16, 161:14, 167:7, 167:16, 168:2, 168:7, 169:3, 170:3, 170:4, 170:8, 170:15, 171:5, 171:18, 175:15, 176:1, 176:7, 176:10, 177:8,</p> |
| <p style="text-align: center;">V</p> <p>vacant [1] - 214:4</p> <p>vacuum [1] - 199:7</p> <p>vague [1] - 149:2</p> <p>valid [1] - 110:18</p> <p>valuable [1] - 127:14</p> <p>value [7] - 11:19, 55:16, 102:4, 102:6, 102:10, 105:19, 146:1</p> <p>values [1] - 181:8</p> <p>Vanasse [1] - 30:19</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">W</p> <p>wait [11] - 4:4, 22:3, 113:5, 152:3, 166:9, 166:10, 166:11, 170:1, 174:16, 198:11</p> <p>waiting [7] - 4:6, 70:11, 77:2, 132:18, 132:19, 169:7, 173:16</p> <p>walk [3] - 79:12, 93:16, 129:18</p> <p>walkability [2] - 37:17, 84:16</p> <p>walked [1] - 136:15</p> <p>walking [2] - 33:1,</p> | <p style="text-align: center;">Y</p> <p>year [3] - 43:8, 97:14, 134:5</p> <p>years [36] - 4:19, 28:2, 52:5, 52:18, 57:9, 62:3, 63:13, 70:12, 70:14, 71:16, 71:18, 77:2, 77:19, 80:5, 90:12, 94:1, 94:3, 97:17, 111:1, 118:5, 119:18, 122:7, 124:15, 132:19, 134:10, 134:14, 138:8, 138:18, 139:4, 169:9, 174:1, 174:17, 183:17, 185:6, 187:13, 187:19</p> <p>yellow [1] - 36:17</p> <p>yesterday [2] - 58:13, 125:11</p> <p>York [2] - 88:12, 98:9</p> <p>Young [1] - 92:18</p> <p>young [4] - 117:16, 138:2, 138:3, 138:12</p> | | |

178:5, 178:16,
179:4, 180:17,
182:9, 184:15,
187:10, 188:9,
188:12, 198:19,
199:3, 199:15,
200:2, 200:4,
200:10, 200:19,
201:19, 204:15,
210:14, 214:11,
216:4, 216:19,
218:14

zonings ^[1] - 168:14

Zusy ^[2] - 65:8, 65:9

ZUSY ^[2] - 65:11,
65:19