

PLANNING BOARD  
FOR THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

GENERAL HEARING

Tuesday, November 17, 2015

7:00 p.m.

in

Second Floor Meeting Room  
344 Broadway  
Cambridge, Massachusetts

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

Iram Farooq, Assistant City Manager

**Community Development Staff:**

Liza Paden  
Stuart Dash  
Jeff Roberts  
Suzannah Bigolin

---

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

## I N D E X

	<u>PAGE</u>
<b>GENERAL BUSINESS</b>	
Update from the Community Development	4
Adoption of the Meeting Transcript(s)	7
 <b>Public Hearings</b>	
<p>7:00 p.m. City of Cambridge proposal to dispose of approximately 1,042 square feet of City owned land known as Coolidge Place, which is an eight-foot wide public way that connects Massachusetts Avenue to the city-owned Municipal Parking Lot #6 on Bishop Allen Drive. The public hearing is being held pursuant to the requirements of Section 2.110 of the Cambridge Municipal Code, regarding Disposition of City Property. The City would sell the land with the condition that it would be combined with other land to enable the construction of a residential building with ground floor retail. The residential units would include seventeen percent affordable units and three percent middle income units for a combined twenty percent permanently and privately subsidized housing units. The development would be consistent with the 2015 rezoning and subject to a special permit from the Planning Board. The developer would also be responsible for the construction of two pedestrian connections between Mass. Ave. and Parking Lot #6 and drain and sewer connections</p>	
<b>(Index Continued on the Following Page)</b>	

**I N D E X****PAGE**

between Mass. Ave and Parking Lot #6 to support the City's installation of stormwater management tanks in the Parking Lot. 8

**8:00 (Continued)** Planning Board Zoning Petition to amend Section 13.10 of the Cambridge Zoning Ordinance so as to change the development controls applicable in the Planned Unit Development at Kendall Square (PUD-KS) Overlay District. The majority of the PUD-KS District is occupied by the Volpe Transportation Systems Research Center operated by the U.S. Department of Transportation. 34

KeyWord Index

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

H. THEODORE COHEN: Good evening, everyone, and welcome to the November 17th meeting of the Planning Board.

We'll start with our usual update from the Assistant City Manager, Community Development.

IRAM FAROOQ: Thank you, Mr. Chair. So today's agenda has two public hearings: The land disposition hearing for Coolidge Place in Central Square, which is a follow up to the Mass. and Main Zoning that the Board had recommended. And there will be an opportunity where the project will actually come before the Board for project review special permit to review that. But this is very focussed on just the land disposition piece.

And then the second item is the

continued hearing -- so continued hearing of the Volpe PUD KS Zoning.

And in terms of what's coming up at the next few meetings, first of all, no meeting next week so Happy Thanksgiving.

And December 1st will be a few public -- a public hearing on the Manning apartments which is a CHA property where they will be making some improvements and they have to come before the Board for a Special Permit. There will also be a hearing on Cushing Street as well as an extension request for the MIT project, which will actually come before you in January, early January.

Other things that are coming up not at Planning Board are a series of Ordinance Committee hearings. The -- those are Volpe PUD-KS hearing last week, and there will be a continuation of that hearing on December 1st.

But before that on November 18th, the Ordinance Committee will hear the carsharing zoning.

November 19th will be Barrett Petition.

And then in December there will be a series of hearings also on the Alexandra petition, on December 8th. The Kroon Petition, December 9th. And the Milford medicinal which is an expansion of the medical marijuana zoning on December 10th.

The only other update I wanted to mention is that this morning we had a visit from the GSA administrator Denise Turner Roth who was in the area from Washington, D.C. and she met with Lisa Peterson the Deputy City Manager, the Mayor, and Ordinance Committee Chair to just extend the collaborative discussions that the City has been having with the GSA and Volpe. And she also was

premiering a program that the GSA is working on to tie economic development with GSA work across the country. So she was on a tour of several cities.

So that is all for the update. Back to you, Mr. Chair.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Liza are there any transcripts?

LIZA PADEN: So we have transcripts for October 6th and October 13th.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And they are all certified?

LIZA PADEN: Yes, they've been certified.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Do we have a motion to accept them?

HUGH RUSSELL: So moved.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Second?

All those in favor?

(Raising hands.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Unanimous.

We will now go our hearing on the Coolidge Place land disposition. We'll first hear from Lisa Peterson Deputy City Manager.

LISA PETERSON: Good evening. So Lisa Peterson, Deputy City Manager, and I'm joined by our city engineer Katherine Watkins and tonight we want to talk about, as Iram was saying, a very narrow question on the disposition of Coolidge Place. Coolidge Place is an eight-foot wide pedestrian walkway that connects Mass. Ave. to the municipal parking lot 6 in Central Square. It's about 1,042 square feet. I'm going to ask -- Kathy is going to review the disposition process and answer any questions. But I do sort of want to emphasize this



important role the Planning Board has in this process.

This is under the Cambridge Municipal Code Chapter 2.110, any disposition of city-owned property needs to ultimately be voted on by the City Council, but there needs to be a recommendation from the Planning Board. So we're hoping there will be a recommendation from the Planning Board tonight so then we can forward it with the City Manager's report to the City Council. And then the City Council will then decide whether or not they're going to approve the disposition.

The City Manager's report was forwarded to you, so you should all have a copy of it. We also have copies available tonight if any members of the public need a copy, and it is also available on the CDD website.

But at this point I think that I will -- and the report is important because it outlines the disposition process, the requests for proposals, the Normandy Twining proposal, and the City Manager's recommendation. So I'll hand it over to Kathy Watkins.

Thank you.

KATHERINE WATKINS: Hi, I'm going to go through a little bit of walking through the disposition, the recommendation from the City Manager's report, because I think it sort of outlines the process as well as gives an overview of where we are and what the pros and cons of the whole business issue. So we've handed out copies of the report and hopefully you guys all have those. I do have extra copies if anybody needs any.

We'll talk about the background. As

Lisa said, it's an eight-foot wide walkway. Most people are familiar with it, Coolidge Ave. between Mass. Ave. and parking lot 6. So it shows up in this image here. This is Mass. Ave. and the city's parking lot 6. So, again, an eight-foot wide walkway that's currently serving that pedestrian access needs.

Earlier this year the City Council passed the Mass. and Main Zoning. Subsequent to that we got a request from Normandy Twining asking that the City Manager dispose of this property and sell it to the developers to facilitate that development.

And I want to emphasize I think Lisa said, the details of that development will come back to this group to really look at, you know, what the development looks like and the details of that. Tonight is really

focusing on the disposition of the Coolidge Place.

On September 21, 2015, the City Council declared Coolidge Place available for disposition and authorized the City Manager to initiate this process.

The City subsequently advertised requests for proposals, and we received one proposal from the Normandy Twining team.

The evaluation committee has reviewed the proposal and has determined that it's responsive and responsible proposal and advantageous to the City.

So if we look at -- what's included in that proposal, and that's summarized in the report, the Normandy Twining team is proposing to develop, you know, 200,000 square feet of residential and 10,000 square feet of ground floor retail, which is

consistent with the zoning. And that includes a minimum of 17 percent affordable units for low and moderate income and three percent middle income. Again, consistent with the zoning.

There was a couple of key infrastructure improvements that were included in the proposal, and those are to provide two alternative pedestrian and utility connections so that, you know, from the City perspective we end up with two pedestrian and utility connections as opposed to the single Coolidge Place, and they would be on either side of that existing area.

So I'll just highlight those quickly on here. This is the existing Coolidge Place and these are the two alternative pedestrian and utility corridors. So within those corridors the development team will be

responsible for designing and constructing pedestrian access as well as providing drain and sewer connections for some critical infrastructure that the City has upcoming looking at, making improvements for the area for port neighborhoods, providing stormwater tanks in that neighborhood, and then we need the connections across to Mass. Avenue. As part of this development, the development team will be responsible for those connections between parking lot 6 and Mass. Ave.

And then the also sort of key element of the proposal is \$325,000 payment to the City. That's sort of the full package.

Under the City's disposition ordinance, the City holds a community meeting. So we held that committee meeting on October 20, 2015. And, again, we provided similar

background to the project and update and really asking people for input into the process. And sort of I just want to highlight some of the key concerns, issues that people raised at that meeting.

So people raised concerns about the overall about the zoning process. Some concerns that there were last minute changes and people didn't understand what was being voted on at the time.

People also raised concerns about the number of percentage of microunits. So there was concerns that there was not a cap on the number of microunits and so the developer could come in and build an entire building of all microunits outside of the commitment to the three-bedroom units.

There was a desire to see more affordable units required by the developer,

and then also some general concerns on how the pedestrian walkways would function, and just wanting to make sure they serve the pedestrians desire lines. I think those were sort of the key elements that came up from the community discussion.

The considerations for disposition -- so these are outlined in the City's disposition ordinance. I think a lot of them sort of applied more likely to larger development parcels where the City could develop it or you could sell it for development parcel. So given that this is a smaller parcel, some of those aren't so clearly as applicable, but I think some of the key elements is really looking at does the disposition benefit the City? And so we looked at that, you know, really looked at the piece of land, how it's used today, how



it could be used in the future by the City. And given that, the developer is replacing the existing pedestrian connection utility connection with two. We feel like that's a more equivalent when in fact better alternative to the existing Coolidge Place. So with that, the \$325,000 cash, the utility connections, we really feel like this is advantageous to the City to proceed. And so that's the recommendation from the City Manager report is to proceed.

So that's really the conclusion. I've hit the highlights. I'm happy to answer any questions. I don't know your format in terms of the details if there's questions or if you want me to go into more details about any of those elements, I'm happy to.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Do any members of the Board have any questions?

MARY FLYNN: I just have one.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Please.

MARY FLYNN: My question pertains to the payment for the utilities. I realize it said up to 300,000 and anything over that would be the burden of the City. What's your estimate for what the actual work would cost?

KATHERINE WATKINS: So the piece of the -- the utility connections are part of a much larger construction project, and I forgot the exact number, but the City's allocated about \$35 million over the next three years for utility work in this area. In terms of those connections, you know, we've estimated that it's probably 300,000 to 500,000. It really depends on when they're constructed and what kind of soil conditions we encounter, so it's a little unclear. But, you know, the City has appropriated a

significant amount of money for that particular project.

MARY FLYNN: Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Any other questions?

THACHER TIFFANY: I have one, quick one.

Who owns the parking lot that is right next to Coolidge?

KATHERINE WATKINS: So if you look at -- this is Coolidge Place here. The development team owns these buildings and this section of parking lot, and then the parking lot in the back is owned by the City.

THACHER TIFFANY: Got it. Okay.

KATHLEEN WATKINS: So right now the parcel is bifurcated. So they own a piece of parcel here and a parcel here, and then ours is bifurcating those two pieces.

THACHER TIFFANY: (Inaudible).

KATHERINE WATKINS: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Any other questions now from the Board?

(No Response.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: If not, we'll go to the public hearing. Thank you.

Is there a sign-up sheet?

LIZA PADEN: Nobody has signed up.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Nobody has signed up. Is there anyone who wishes to speak?

JAMES WILLIAMSON: Thank you. James Williamson, 1000 Jackson Place.

I'm against the City selling this. I just want to start out by saying that. I think it's a mistake to endorse this, to me, horrendous project and proposal for Central Square. So we have a -- you have a chance to

take another look at this and decide whether you think it's good to have a 19-story building right in the middle of the historic retail core of Central Square. You have an opportunity to reflect on how this zoning got changed. Just look at the campaign finance data at the site of the office of campaign and clinical finance and look at the pattern of contributions, major contributions, to the seven of nine councillors who voted to change the zoning. It's all pretty clear. Of course everybody says that has no effect on how we vote. I urge you to reflect on citizens united and how you feel about that and why that shouldn't be part of how we think about campaign finance and its influence on zoning in the City of Cambridge.

On the specifics, the pathway where it currently is an important connection between

Central Square and Area 4 now called by many The Port and officially renamed The Port. That pathway is an important link to the neighborhood and to Central Square. I don't think people in that neighborhood know very much at all about what's happening in this location. I think they're gonna be shocked when they see a 19-story building go up, and I think they're going to be dismayed when they learn this pathway that has been used for decades is going to be moved. I gather the proposal is to move it over adjacent to the McDonald's. Some of you may know that the McDonald's, the entry to McDonald's is often a trouble spot. And my own view is that in a reconfiguring here, in addition to the problem of taking away something that people are accustomed to enjoying, putting it right next to the entrance and exit to the

McDonald's is going to lead to an aggravation of what is already a site of conflict, not all the time, but enough to be discussed by the police department and the owner of McDonald's at City-conducted discussions about some of the issues in Central Square. There is an issue that has been identified and was identified in the report which I had a chance to glance at earlier today that I missed the -- I thought there would be the usual 15-minute or so discussion of a BZA case. Sorry I got here and missed the presentation. But there was a note taken of an issue raised specifically by me at the urging of someone who is involved in preservation in the City of Cambridge about the fence that surrounds the parcel that is owned by Normandy Twining and what would happen to that fence. It's the same fence

that's around behind the back of the Kennedy School of Government adjacent to an important park. And I don't know that that question has been answered. I think it should be. What's -- is there going to be some effort to preserve that. That's kind of a side question because for me the essential thing is I think a 19-story building is a big mistake. I think it happened in a way that we shouldn't feel good about, and I think selling off -- and I'll say my last observation is the way in which the bid was constructed, made it so that only one person could actually -- although the law specifies there has to be a bidding, the way the bidding document was constructed, meant that only one bidder was actually eligible to bid and that was Normandy Twining, because it had to be somebody who could connect it with



adjacent properties, and they're the only ones that met that criteria. So I think there's a question of potentially an ethical question in how the bid document was constructed. So I hope you'll think carefully before you give away City-owned property for Normandy Twining.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Is there anyone else who wishes to speak?

(No Response.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: If not, Board Members, you have questions, comments?

AHMED NUR: Mr. Chair, can I just request an unusual request? Since the public, we only had one public speak and we have a the Law Department here, can they respond to some of these questions that James

had raised such as selling it -- such as offering it to only one person?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, I could answer that --

AHMED NUR: Okay.

H. THEODORE COHEN: -- as a former --

JOHN HAWKINSON: Excuse me, Mr. Chair, is your mic on?

H. THEODORE COHEN: It says it is.

-- as a former town council, I've been involved in drafting many requests for proposals, and in a situation like this where there's proposed swap for purchase by an abutter which is someone else, it's usual that the documents are written in a way that they can only be complied with, let's say, by the person who is seeking the proposal. Obviously someone else could have, could seek

to purchase it and then they could turn around and try to sell it to Normandy Twining, but this type of a request for proposal is a very common thing that does comply with the bidding requirements and state law. So I don't think that that is a real issue.

You know, since I'm speaking I might as well go forward. And we voted, this Board voted to recommend the Normandy Twining zoning. We are not here passing upon any particular proposal that will come before, you know, assuming this disposition goes through, and the proposal moves forward. It will come before the Planning Board at some future date. The way this disposition has been structured, if this Board were any other Board that has permitting jurisdiction, does not grant the necessary permits, then this

disposition does not occur and everything is back to point zero.

My personal point of view is that the two alternative pathways, one of which leads to Jill Rhone Park in Lafayette Place is a very sensible pathway and really is in keeping with the desire line of the public I think. The City is getting the \$325,000 and the sewer work for another 300 plus thousand and there's also a transfer. Normandy Twining is giving up current easements it currently has over the city parking lot in exchange for some I think lesser easements. You know, I know there are some people who oppose the project for, you know, various reasons, but I think as it is in this disposition, we have a very limited question about whether to recommend the disposition.

AHMED NUR: Thank you very much.

I'm satisfied with your answer.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Anyone else?

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: I just wanted to not only echo what Ted was saying, but also note that I think that given how the existing walkway bifurcates a parcel, regardless of what ends up getting built in this location, the consolidation of the parcel so that it's not two separate things makes a lot of sense. Whether the development -- I think it's clear that something will be built in this location of some height that requires consolidation of the parcels, and, you know, whatever that is, will be before us later and regardless of what it is, I think this disposition makes a lot of sense.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: I would say one of the tenants of zoning, and that's what we're

looking at is our zoning documents is the rational use of land and its disposition does in fact do that in my opinion. It moves the City land and this area to a more rational configuration and it's consistent entirely with the intent and purpose of the Zoning Ordinance and also the -- it's absolutely within the purview of the Planning Board to make such judgments and I concur with my fellow Board Members.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Any other comments? Hugh.

HUGH RUSSELL: Since we're not unduly pressed for time I will say that I used to get mail for the apartment building at One Coolidge Place that was where the parking lot was because the post office sometimes couldn't tell the difference between Carlos Place and Coolidge Place. But

that I would concur that this is a very, very good idea to make this happen.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Mary.

MARY FLYNN: I just want to say that I am in total agreement with my colleagues. I think the proposal does make a tremendous amount of sense and it is a narrower issue than the zoning discussion was, but that has gone passed and has been voted on. We do have the opportunity to review this again at the permitting level, and so I support it.

I will say I do think the fence is lovely and, you know, I would encourage the City to try to preserve it and maybe use it in another city park if possible.

That's all.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Anyone else? If not, could we have a motion to recommend to the City Council the disposition of Coolidge

Place in accordance with the bid received by the City -- by the City and in accordance with the recommendation from the City Manager?

Anything else that needs to be stated?

AHMED NUR: Do we want to second the concern of the outlined from the community meeting? Some of the stuff that was concerned in the bulletin?

H. THEODORE COHEN: I think City Council will have a hearing on it and will have an opportunity to hear anyone who wishes to speak.

Do you have such a motion?

HUGH RUSSELL: I would be happy to make that motion.

STEVEN COHEN: So moved.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Second?

MARY FLYNN: Second.



H. THEODORE COHEN: All those in favor?

(Raising hands.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: Anyone opposed?

(No Response.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: It's unanimous.

Thank you very much.

Our next hearing isn't scheduled until eight.

Do people have any questions for Iram or Jeff or Liza or Suzannah?

JEFF ROBERTS: Mr. Chair, if I might request -- since we do have time, I might request that we take a little break because we're having a technical difficulties that we're going to try to remedy with the projector.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Sure, we'll take a break until ten to eight.

(A short recess was taken.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: Good evening.

If we can all quiet down. Thank you.

We're -- eight o'clock having come, this is a continuation of the hearing on the Planning Board Zoning Petition to amend Section 13.10 of the Cambridge Zoning Ordinance relating to development controls for the planned unit development in Kendall Square which is commonly known as the Volpe Site Rezoning.

Iram, you're going to start?

IRAM FAROOQ: Yes. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I am -- I'm just going to mention a few quick things, but you've heard me talk about this a lot so I'm not going to spend a whole lot of time on that piece, but what I wanted to remind everybody is just how long we've been talking about this process and

where the genesis of it is because we've, over the last few hearings, heard some concern but how fast things are moving and also some concern about the public process. So we just put together this little timeline that essentially shows where we started with the K2 study in 2011 where we had an advisory committee made up of a diverse set of stakeholders, including neighborhood representatives and also area business institutions, Kendall Square association and Cambridgeport -- and then all of the meetings were public of the committee, as well as we held a series of public meetings during the course of that process and hands-on workshops. And following that, the various -- when we brought the recommendations to the Planning Board, and there were four different PUD areas that were addressed in the Kendall

Square study area. And the Planning Board actually advised us that it would be a more thoughtful way instead of trying to do all of it together, that for the Kendall Square piece it would be better to go PUD by PUD so we could have a more detailed conversation about the specifics of each of those areas.

So the first piece was the MIT Zoning, and we're now on the second piece which is the Volpe site or PUD-KS as it is known in the zoning world.

But we had a set of -- this was filed earlier this year, and we had a set of hearings at Planning Board and at City Council, and because there was a desire particularly from City Council that we engage with the community a little bit further than we had after the conclusion of the K2 process, we spent the summer holding a series

of drop-in sessions at different parks and public venues around -- in Kendall Square and Area 4, East Cambridge, Wellington-Harrington, to try to make sure that we met with and spoke to the neighborhood groups, East Cambridge Planning Team and the Area 4 Port Coalition, but also with folks who don't get -- who don't necessarily attend those meetings or our meetings. But just to be able to let people know who live in the area or happen to be out with their kids at the local park. So we think we reached -- we reached approximately 300 people during the course of that process. And then the Council re-filed the zoning in August, and so this is the second set, second series of hearings which started last week at the Ordinance Committee of the City Council and at the Planning Board a week, two

weeks -- in October and then here, this is the continued hearing at the Planning Board. So that's kind of our timeline.

And I'm just going to leave you with this because I've talked about this slide so often, but this is really the basis of the K2 recommendations which form the basis for the zoning. And the idea is to make sure that we retain room for the innovation economy to grow while making sure that we transform Kendall Square to a real neighborhood that includes places for people to live and recreate and innovate and continue to, the transformation that began 10, 15 years ago to much more of a place, a liveable and sustainable place.

So with that, I'm going to turn it over to Jeff Roberts who will walk you through the various changes in the zoning that have been

made based on comments from the Planning Board, from the Ordinance -- well, the City Council, as well as what we heard from the community.

Suzannah Bigolin will then walk you through the urban design framework. And we, we know we've promised you for sometime some further transportation analysis and some economic analysis, so following that, Susanne Rasmussen will talk about an update to the transportation analysis that she presented when we met in October, and then Tom Evans from the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority who is partnered with us to work on the economic analysis will present some work that the CRA's consultant HRNA have done for this area.

So, Jeff.

JEFF ROBERTS: Thanks.

To add some numbers to what Iram was saying, I looked over the past work on this and I saw that since November 18, 2014, which was when we first came to the Board, along with the GSA, to discuss the potential for the land transfer agreement, this is the Planning Board's tenth discussion on Volpe so I think you all get a free sub or something.

So as Iram said, I'm going to talk about zoning, and this is just an overview of what she was describing, that this PUD-KS District is one of four puzzle pieces that make-up the Kendall Square study area which was the subject of that process and the subject of a set of zoning recommendations which were tailored to each particular area and we're talking about the orange one.

So the -- I'm going to jump right in because at the last hearing we talked over



all of the full overview of zoning changes, and I'm happy to go back over anything that you have questions about, but I really just want to jump into what we are now suggesting for a modified version of the zoning petition. This is just a suggestion at this point. This hasn't been filed. It would need to be recommended by either the Planning Board or the Ordinance Committee and then incorporated by the Council as a substitution.

But the changes, very briefly, have to do with affordable housing, open space, height, active uses at the ground floor, and urban design and that's the piece that Suzannah will be taking over and talking about.

So, on affordable housing, fairly simply we have suggested increasing the

requirement for affordability to require 15 percent of total housing to be affordable to low to moderate income households. And in addition to that, to have five percent of the total housing be affordable to middle income households. We've written the language in such a way that we acknowledge that in that middle income housing program there may need to be some flexibility in terms of how programatically we are dealing with the pricing and the administration and basically how those units will function. So that's something that we're learning more about a lot especially as we, for the first time, have units that our housing division is working with, middle income housing units for rent in the Alexandria project through the middle income provisions in that zoning.

The second piece having to do with open

space, one of the changes is really trying to draw more from the results of the Connect Kendall Square competition which looked at different ways to think about open space and integrated connected network to provides different types of resources in different places, but has them all interconnected. So we have -- we've made stipulations in the zoning that all the public open space that's required would be, need to be knitted together in this kind of a system, and we need to include at least one significant civic gathering space which could take a variety of forms, but the purpose as we heard both through the -- through that process and through the many community engagement discussions is to really create a community focal point for Kendall Square and something that would draw in residents as well as other

users of the area.

On the federal site there was some discussion at the previous round of hearings about how open space on the federal site would fit into an overall system, and the one thing that's important to acknowledge is that if there is a federal facility in the site, it will have open space. So there's nothing really in the zoning that will dictate whether or not there will be open space, and there's really nothing in the zoning that can put direct controls on that open space, but what we can do is we can encourage through incentives that open space to be public and to be tied into the overall system.

Now at the previous round of hearings we made that case and the concern was brought up, well, what if then all of the required open space becomes part of the, becomes part

of the federal site? And I don't think that was our intention. So we have been working on ways to craft the zoning in a slightly more nuanced way so that we're encouraging the -- we're encouraging the federal open space to be a part of that overall public system, but we are not allowing all of it to be -- all of the public open space to be on the federal site. And at this point we're suggesting limiting it that no more than half of the required open space can be on that federal site and the rest of it would have to be on the -- would be under some control and jurisdiction by the City. So that would be -- it would be at least 50 percent.

So switching over to heights. This is just an overview of what the current height limits are in the district. This is a reminder of how those height bans work going

from taller heights and a very narrow band along Broadway to much lower height along Binney Street. In the initial petition that the Planning Board submitted this was the height limit scheme. It provided some more flexibility, but still had that overall sort of height ban philosophy that the taller heights would be along Broadway and then it would step down in the middle of the site and then down even further along Binney.

The current suggestion looks, looks -- it expands the area and sort of turns around the corner that area of the site that would allow taller heights. And the purpose of that is to allow more flexibility. So as the density would be the same as in the initial proposal, expanding the height ban would allow the ability for some of the taller heights to be located more in the center and

create some potential for either lower heights or more open space in the areas closer to Broadway. As you saw at the last hearing, we had -- part of the community discussions involved having those movable models and some site diagramming exercises. And those exercises revealed that there's some benefit in opening up more flexibility and potentially putting some more of the building height in the center of the site in order to open up those areas closer to Broadway.

I should note, too, on this map we've included, because of the MXD Zoning Petition is also now before the Council, that we've included those height limits as in that petition, not yet adopted, but that's all on the map as well.

Oh, this is a chart that explains a

little bit of how the heights above -- building height and bulk above 250 feet is controlled and can people -- I didn't realize, can people see around me to the screen?

So the idea is that -- and this is, so this is the original proposal showing this smaller area in which heights are allowed to go up, and this showing the expanded area, but there is still that limitation, in this case, no more than ten percent of the parcel area which on the Volpe parcel is about 62,000 square feet, could extend above that plane and moreover each building could have no more than 15,000 square feet of floor plate. So you can see here up to maybe four buildings at that 15,000 square foot floor plate level allowed to break that 250-foot plane.



One of the other changes had to do with the idea of allowing the Planning Board to approve up to one building that would go -- that could go above 350 feet to a maximum of 500 feet. We had in the initial petition that the Planning Board submitted, it had language saying that it would be a building of exceptional architectural character.

There was some discussion about what exactly does that mean. And so we worked for quite a bit to come up with some language that might be a little bit more targeted, and we came up with the notion of a distinctive landmark.

At the hearing last week some people raised the question and they've raised similar questions, well, what does a distinctive landmark mean? What if it's an ugly building that's a distinctive landmark? And so we're still sort of work shopping those ideas. And

I think that ultimately we're -- we're putting those ideas together. The notion is that this is a building that due to the fact that it would be very visible from around the city, it's a building that should be worthy in terms of its quality and its character of being -- serving as that type of a landmark. So that's something we could work on. And in the urban design framework that Suzannah will talk about, there is some additional guidance as to how that assessment might be made by the Planning Board.

I think the real operative change is that we make it clear that if the Planning Board finds that, that the taller building isn't providing that benefit, the Planning Board has the ability to limit any -- all the building heights in a development plan, to 350 feet.

So switching to active ground floors, we made some changes to be a little bit more descriptive as to what active uses meant. At first we were, we really said it was retail and then maybe a few other uses. Here we're trying to be a little more specific in some areas requesting that some kind of a general merchandise store, like a grocery store or a market or perhaps a pharmacy or convenience store would have to be a component of this active use plan in order to serve the residence of the area. And also that an amount space would need to be set aside for smaller operators which we've defined as being operators in spaces that are 2500 square feet or less. It could be spaces that are very small, sort of, it could be sort of an open market type of space where there's smaller retail stalls or stands where with a

low startup cost for independent operators.

The other thing that we've done is expanded the definition to include some uses that aren't specifically retail uses, including child care uses, recreational uses, and cultural uses that would be welcoming and serve the public, but again don't fall under the strict category of retail.

We've made it even more clear than we did before that not only lobbies are not included in active uses but banks are also not included as active uses.

So, those are the key zoning changes. Leaving urban design aside for a second, just a reminder that this is the -- this is how we anticipate the proposed zoning playing out in terms of a development, an overall development on the Volpe site, a little over 1.6 million square feet of office and lab,

1.1 million square feet of residential, and again that residential's a minimum. The office lab is a maximum, that could be readjusted in the case of a development plan.

We included at the bottom just to -- as a reminder, that the replacement of a Volpe facility as it's contemplated, would be in addition to the private development. So just making that clear because that question came up last time of what's the total development. So the total development is the private plus the replacement of the Volpe.

This is an overview of the, just the overall zoning in terms of the benefits that we see it providing. I covered the housing, exit ground floors, and open space with the suggested modifications innovation space that's shown before is about 84,000 square feet. That's space for smaller companies and

startups. Sustainability requirements are still as recommended and would still be ratcheted up as the NetZero, the recommendations of the NetZero action plan are phased in over across the city. And community funds, \$10 per square foot contribution that would support open space programming, transit improvements, which we'll hear about a little bit later, and a workforce readiness programs.

So now I'm going to turn it over to Suzannah.

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: Thanks, Jeff.

Based on the sort of feedback we've been receiving from the Planning Board and their community and also as a way to link the K2 study and design guidelines as well as the Connect Kendall framework plan, we've been working on an urban design framework for the

site. It's not a detailed design for how the Volpe site would develop. It's like the City's other design guidelines, it's intended to be a guiding document to inform development review processes. It's also important to note that the draft is a working draft that we've circulated. As we continue to receive a lot of feedback from various stakeholders, we'll be making changes and we really appreciate the Planning Board's comments as well.

The vision we've continued to work on specific to the Volpe site that was circulated as part of the initial rezoning proposal, it's focussed on how the site can become a part of the community in Kendall Square as far as ensuring high quality architecture, urban design, and open space outcomes. And it's really about how we can

create a desirable urban design place.

The urban design framework articulates key urban design and physical planning recommendations pertaining to those five key elements, and that's through a series of diagrams, images, and guidelines.

The first element is connections, and that describes the desired level of connectivity through the site. And the objective is to create a highly legible circulation network and a fine urban grain. The importance of Fifth Street as a north/south connector is identified, and that would be primarily a pedestrian connection. And then also the extension of Broad Canal Way and the Sixth Street walkway are also important connections that should be enhanced through any future development proposal.

We've also identified the need for



different types of connections that will have different qualities and characters so that we can create more of an intimate, intricate neighborhood feel so avoiding the corporate campus outcome.

The objective of the open space element is to create a high quality contiguous open space network, and that's to provide opportunities with play, rest, meander through the site, so it's about meeting different user needs.

The diagram identifies potential locations that have positive open space assets. So they're prominent at strategic intersections and have good access to sunlight.

Another important aspect of the open space element in the draft is providing a balance between sort of passive, natural open

space places and more livelier, animated open spaces, and so that's what we heard a lot from the community is the desire to escape the urban environment and also the desire to have more animation and active spaces and we -- we feel there are opportunities to accommodate this throughout the site.

JAMES WILLIAMSON: Can you just say where Fifth Street is? Or remind us where for some of us who don't remember?

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: That's the street.

James WILLIAMSON: Thank you.

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: We've also looked at active ground floors and clarifying where ground floor uses are a priority, and that would be on the primary and the secondary connections and also on important corners. And we've also, in this section, identified

preferred location for destination type activities or attractions, and that's places where these sort of community cultural places should be emphasized. And that's a way to draw people through the site and to really foster a sense of place and community.

This section also provides guidance on the types of active uses that are most desired by the community, and that was an aspect of the community engagement; so the grocery store, the CVS Pharmacy, diverse and affordable retail and cultural spaces.

The built form aspect is primarily based on massing and locations and ensuring that response to the site context. As the zoning changes now look to provide some more flexibility and height, the diagram identifies some of the key areas and interfaces that require careful consideration

and also sensitive treatments. The diagram also identifies a potential cluster for taller buildings central to the site, and that reflects some of the thinking about the height that Jeff already mentioned and it's something that came up quite a bit in the community engagement process. So that central location does lack sensitive interfaces and it optimizes sunlight to open space areas on Broadway as well.

Another aspect that we've heard throughout this whole process is the importance of providing housing for families with children. So we've included an element that focuses on some of the site and design issues for family housing. It's relatively brief, but it gets at some of those key issues about providing access to open space and visibility from family units.

And then as an overall sort of consolidation of these ideas and principles, we've prepared a massing study that just for illustrative purposes, shows the types of open spaces and built form that might be developed on the site. It doesn't present any preferred architectural open space designs. And in this overall view of Kendall Square, the -- we've also included the MIT Special Permit application in the orange and the CRA, MXD rezoning proposal and the Ames Street housing is shown in the brown. And some of the key features of the massing study, the breaking up of the site to increase permeability and workability. The strong north/south connections as well as the east/west connections and the physical and visual connections to Broad Canal. Maximizing open space with access to

sunlight. Also the importance of the Broadway and Third Street corner as a gateway location that should be emphasized through open space and architecture. We've shown sort of lively urban plaza as a focal point for this corner and also a connection to a possible cultural space. And that example is an indoor market.

Just moving around to the Binney Street side. The massing study identifies the sensitive transitions to the Third Square Apartments, also shows the potential for a larger park within a landscape setting adjoining the Sixth Street walkway, and that's consistent with the Connect Kendall framework plan. And also how we've thought about spacing the towers to provide outlook, sunlight, and sky views through the site. And that's to sort of enhance the public

realm.

And that summarizes the urban design framework and the main elements. And Susanne's up next.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Before we get there, I just want to remind all the public and the Members of the Board that the sketches you see there are purely for illustrative purposes. They are not indications of what would be built under the zoning, it's just a possibility. So we're not going to be talking about any individual building or the placement of any individual building in the context of the zoning, that is simply for illustration purposes.

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Good evening. My presentation will be an update of the presentation I gave in October. We've had the opportunity to reanalyze the proposed

build out and that's before you right now, and look at how that differs from what we assumed back in 2012.

I'm going to start with --

JOHN HAWKINSON: Is your mic still on?

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: It is not.

For those who were not here the last time, we have a quick review of traffic 101. The analysis we do starts with looking at the proposed build out. So we do it in sort of very broad buckets. We look at housing, office, R&D, or retail and those are the analysis buckets. And we use national statistics around how many people are likely to be coming to a site as employees or residents or customers by type of land use. And then we have done some modifications to make those numbers fit better to Cambridge.



We then, based on a lot of experience of how people commute in Cambridge, figure out who of the people that are being, the person trips that are being generated which will be done by people walking to the site, who will take a bike, who will drive, who will take transit, and who will come by car? And then the last little element is sometimes people actually carpool, so you don't, you don't have one car per each person, that gets translated into car trips based on assumed vehicle occupancy rates. So these are the steps involved in figuring out when you build X square feet of this type of development, how many people will be walking, biking, taking transit or driving to a site.

This is a graphic to illustrate the basically the difference between the analysis we did in 2012 and the updated analysis we

just did. The overall amount of permitted development is essentially the same between what was considered in the K2-C2 study and what's being considered now, but we have changed the analysis in terms of what we're expecting for pace of development. We've learned what MIT thinks that their build out speed were going to be or the pace of development will be for that site. We know a lot more about the Volpe site than we did in 2012 when we made assumptions about the development, but Volpe actually was not at all interested at the time. So the assumptions we made in 2012, essentially, were that we thought that by 2030, 33 percent of the Volpe site zoning envelope that we agreed to as part of the K2-C2 study would be realized by 2030. And for the rest of the area we would realize 80 percent of the

allowed development.

Based on what we know now, we think it's more reasonable and it is certainly conservative, but we think it's more reasonable to do an analysis that looks at 100 percent build out by 2030. So this is not a fact. This is not -- I'm not telling you that this is going to happen, but we think it's more reasonable to look at 100 percent build out likelihood than what we assumed before. So, and this is just an attempt to show you -- to explain why it is that the numbers, I'll present in a moment, are different than the numbers in 2012. It's not because more development is being proposed but the speed of development is faster.

This chart shows the first two bars, the first one is the amount of square footage

proposed in 2012 by land use type. So the green is R&D, the blue is general office, red is residential, and purple is retail. And so the two first bars look the same. Let's see. They would have looked the same if we had assumed the same pace of development, but because we're assuming a much faster pace now that bar gets higher. So more square footage is realized by 2030.

And the last two bars we did as a, if you will, a sensitivity analysis because we wanted to see what is the difference if you're maximizing the office development, if you're assuming that all of the commercial development would be office development, office development has more people per square footage than R&D does. So we did a sensitivity analysis where we just said all the commercial development will be office, no

R&D, and then we did the opposite. We said what will happen if all the commercial is R&D? And so we call it high employee density and low employee density and it's an attempt to say okay, if things are a little different from what we're assuming, what will the impact of that be?

So, this translates that square footage into person trips. So if you built this amount of development, we expect this many people to result from that. And it's the same four things, again, and you can see they are more person trips, the sort of blended scenario of where we assume a certain amount of office and a certain amount of R&D is the middle bar. If you only build the office, you have more person trips. And if you only build R&D, you have less. And, again, this is just the same sensitivity analysis you saw

but now we're looking at person trips rather than square footage.

So then we look at how does that influence the kind of transportation we see? So how does that influence car trips versus transit trips, walking, and biking? And again, it's the same four scenarios. So the of course -- and you see the same outcome again. You see more cars if you have high employee density and less if you have low employee density in the commercial pieces, but this chart generally illustrates how many more trips the current analysis produces compared to what we assumed in 2012.

So then we looked at what does that mean if -- when you get to an intersection? So on the street if -- when cars are arriving into a particular intersection, and this is, this chart shows that of course there's a

difference because we're increasing the amount of square footage we assume, but it's not -- they're not huge changes, but you do see increased number of cars, 13 intersections that we analyzed.

And this is sort of the very last thing that we did in the analysis. We did this critical sums analysis, which is sort of the varied thumbnail way of explaining what this means is that if you're exceeding a threshold of 150 conflicting car movements in an intersection, you start seeing deteriorating conditions. You have to wait through more than two light cycles to try to get through the intersections. And with the accelerated pace of development, the intersection that we were watching before which is Third and Broadway was the one we were, that was getting close to the threshold in 2012

analysis is now tipping over into the -- a little bit passed the threshold so it's becoming more problematic.

So, sort to just summarize quickly that we've accelerated what we assume the pace of development will be that does result in an increase of trip making both in -- that we're concerned about or that is important to note in both, in terms of cars and in terms of transit trips, and that's a new thing. We didn't look at that so much back in 2012. It wasn't as big of a concern as we're -- we're becoming much more focussed on it now. And what is important as far as the zoning goes, is that just there are other -- the development approval process, there are the steps, the zoning that you're considering now and when the PUD Special Permit is being considered, now you're looking at individual



projects. So the way the zoning reads right now is that it requires a traffic study and traffic analysis and it is prudent to make amendments to that we believe that would also really focus on transit because we are seeing a lot of transit trips as a result of the development that, so we would propose that the zoning reflect that as detailed analysis of transit impacts and transit communication should be included.

It is also in other instances of the zoning, the traffic impacts, be they transit or vehicle impacts, have been tied to certain milestones or thresholds and it would be -- this zoning proposal could reflect a similar approach. This was done in North Point, for example, and somewhat similarly a long time ago in the University Park zoning, that the -- since this project will develop over a

long time, that it would be possible to tie the trip making, whether they be transit trips or vehicle trips to certain milestones where things would have to take place or certain thresholds and we don't know what those are now, but that is something that could be reflected in the zoning that the final development plan would take these things into -- would be included in the final development plan. It's also as was noted before, important that the zoning proposal proposes to raise funds for transit improvements. We know that they're going to have to be transit improvements in the future. And the \$10 per square foot, 67 percent of that is set aside for open space and transit, so there will be funds generated to help with transit communication activities.

And then just the final thing, again, the final development plan that's -- will be a part of the PUD Special Permit will obviously have much more specific and concrete strategies to address traffic and transit impacts from the projects. So I think that's it. That's it.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

AHMED NUR: Thank you.

THOMAS EVANS: Mr. Chair, Planning Board members, I'm Tom Evans, Cambridge Redevelopment Authority, and we were asked to do a quick preliminary analysis of the zoning as proposed before you through our real estate consultants, HR&A Advisors. They have been working with us in a number of projects in Kendall Square including the Foundry and the MXD Rezoning and had a pretty good start on baseline understanding of commercial and

housing costs and pro forma analysis. And so we were asked to step in and do a quick preliminary analysis to see the value that comes out of the zoning for the Volpe parcel would be.

And so I want -- a little awkward, because I have just a few charts but they have lots of things in them. And so I will have to awkwardly spin around. Am I allowed to do this?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Sure.

THOMAS EVANS: Thank you.

So just some assumptions. The overall program is, as Jeff described, for 2,972,000 square feet of development. So key assumptions that went into this was the 15 percent affordable housing which we've priced out at a rent at 65 percent of area median income. And then five percent of middle

income housing units that would be affordable. Again, we price it out at 95 percent of area median income. These are generalities when the housing division looked at. That's feeling awkward.

When they look at the list of available applicants, they could come above or below that from the AMI list.

There's an interest rate assumption, a loan to value assumption that goes into this analysis.

And then we also had them sample a number of projects in Boston and Cambridge area to look at construction costs. And these are core constructions costs for building. So providing volume building and basic site planning and parking and underground parking is a high cost item for these projects. And there's some variability

between different types of projects. And, for example, lab buildings have a higher level of -- infrastructure requirements.

And but then items such as housing actually have come in with a higher level of finish when you're renting. So you don't, you know, rent an apartment and then come in and bring in a kitchen. Whereas if you're renting office space, you're then as a tenant, responsible for coming in and doing the fit out.

JAMES WILLIAMSON: What is LTV?

THOMAS EVANS: Loan to value ratio. So that's how much you're able to finance as a master developer into the value of the project.

So another -- a few other assumptions just to talk through the methodology.

First off, this is a preliminary cash

flow analysis that's looking at money in and money out over a project, assuming it would function as a horizontal development deal. And so to explain that is that when developers often think about things as creating sites and horizontal development, you're preparing the site, dealing with remediation, dealing with streets and so forth, and then you have the vertical development that's the building that's come out of the ground. Now we're not presuming that exactly how the GSA's selected developer may function and there may be some hybrid. So, for example, the Cambridge Research Park when Lion Properties developed that, they functioned as the horizontal developer and then when the vertical developers for the biotech buildings, and then had another developer, Twining, do the vertical and

residential.

So what this pro forma is looking at is the value that can be created for a horizontal developer by selling sites to vertical development based on anticipated rents that can be assumed in 2015.

The land value is generated out of basically the delivery of three phases of disposition. I was just kind of the way the model was working. And each of those phases was balanced between a sampling of the commercial and residential development. The result of this analysis is basically the supportable site costs that you would have on the project. And so this is how much money could come in from the sale of these vertical projects, that then is available for what we're calling the site costs. And those include the cost of the build new facility



for the GSA. They include a number of other things. Actually I'll detail it in a second. And it's using internal rate of return, the IRR number, at 15 percent which is an industry standard on the low end really. I've worked on projects that expected a much higher IRR rates. This is a little bit different than a cash on cash return analysis that often as you may have seen looked at projects that are looking at five or six percent of cash return. And IRR is a different kind of number that comes out of a long-term project, and looking at the time value of money as it goes into the project which may come in at different times at the start of the project or later on. So that's the way that master developers often look at big projects like this.

So, just on the output from the land

value, what we've assumed in this is that the cost that went into the pro forma, the building construction, the soft costs for the building construction, design and permitting, on-site improvements including parking, basic landscaping right around the buildings, it includes the inclusionary and the middle income housing requirements. It also includes an innovation space requirement which comes in at different rent level. It includes the linkage or incentive payments and the community fund that was described earlier.

What it does not include and what sort of comes out of the cash available at the end of this analysis, and this is to support the construction of the federal facility, any site remediation which we anticipate there will be site remediation costs associated

with the ground field, the previous industrial uses on the area, we found that throughout the Kendall Square area. Public streets and parks for the site or around the site and off-site infrastructure which might include stormwater, sewer, mitigations, or transportation mitigations as Susanne described.

So the initial results of that analysis came out again looking at the two sets of numbers here:

One is residual value per different land types. Land on a per square foot basis. So that residential has a value of \$58 per square foot. Office comes in at 155, and lab 199 for on a per square foot basis. And you roll that up and look at the delivery of project sites to a vertical developer and the horizontal development project would come out

with a value of \$283 million based on our, again, preliminary analysis of what this zoning can provide in future rents and within those projects. So what it does not look at is really sort of the feasibility based on a lot of unknowns. The unknowns as the cost of the GSA facility. The unknown costs on issues related to Brownfield. We can start to make some assumptions on that, and some of those initial assumptions and costs, for example, took a look at the most recent expensive Broad expansion on Ames Street which is a 240,000 -- 240,000 square foot building with kind of all the bells and whistles to -- if you ever been in the building, so we're trying to imagine how much a building like that might cost. And the GSA was asking for all the bells and whistles. And that building cost \$188 million just as a

comparable within the same construction price range that we're working on now. And that was actually built a few years ago.

So that's just kind of an initial balance of where things might come. We can't necessarily declare that makes it feasible or infeasible but provides some baseline numbers to look at the public benefit balance for the project.

I think that's it for my --

JAMES WILLIAMSON: That's a per year number?

THOMAS EVANS: That's total. That's what you get as if you take, if that's -- if you take this on, that's 2015 value, in 2015 values.

H. THEODORE COHEN: People, please don't call it during the presentation. You'll have an opportunity --

JAMES WILLIAMSON: I thought it would help to get clarification.

H. THEODORE COHEN: -- to speak later.

THOMAS EVANS: That wraps up my presentation and I'll pass it back over to the CDD staff.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you. Board Members have any questions right now or do you want to wait until after we hear from the public?

HUGH RUSSELL: Well, I guess I'd like to ask Tom one question, which is I think you're more familiar with looking at all these numbers. I sort of -- my question is: Does this work? That is to say, does that analysis indicate with the constraints we have, it's reasonable to expect that the site would get transformed? Is it a gold

mine for somebody? Is it marginal? Where does sort of on that scale in your judgment would that fall?

THOMAS EVANS: So with a lot of unknowns out there, I certainly don't think this is a gold mine based on what we expect to be the needs of a new Volpe facility what we understand to be the site challenges. Remediation costs are not -- they're kind of an unknown and they are often surprise developers and they're usually not cheap. There's a -- I think a pretty high expectation of this project to come in with high sustainability measures, really strong open space contribution, and transportation mitigations. So I think we're in a margin really, I mean and a quick snapshot. But we don't know -- there's a lot of unknowns on the other side of the equation and this is a

pretty quick analysis, but so it's, it's seems doable but not a slam dunk.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

AHMED NUR: May I ask him a question as well, please?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes.

AHMED NUR: Your last paper residual -- yeah. I'm wondering if you could explain to me, I'm not a developer, why is the residual for office is almost three times more than the residential?

THOMAS EVANS: Well --

AHMED NUR: The land is the land, I don't understand how --

THOMAS EVANS: -- the value not of the land. The land piece of it is a little kind of an odd term in developer speak. That's the value of basically the development allowance. So the value of the \$40 percent



of the allowed development that can be residential is at \$58 per square foot and we've, we hear it all the time in Kendall Square, there's a lot of pressure to want to develop office and lab because if you get a square foot of space to build and you get a lot more rent out of an office or lab building. So it's not that the land is value, it's the assigned allowable square footage of different land uses within that land.

AHMED NUR: Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Anyone else have questions right now? If not, why don't we go to the public.

So is there a sign-up sheet? When you come up, please state your name and address for the record and spell your name if it is anything other than the most common name

around. Generally you'll speak for three minutes. People who spoke at the last session on October 20th, we appreciate it if you not simply reiterate what you said at that time. If you could direct your comments to the new information that was presented today or in the staff's latest revisions, we have heard what you said before. And we'll start with Gerald O'Leary.

GERALD O'LEARY: I'm Gerald O'Leary, 303 Third Street. What I'd like to talk about is not the particulars of the development but some of the processes that go into the, the discussions we've been having about it. A traditional zoning regulations define for a parcel of land, the required space, the development density, the specified floor area ratio, and things like that. But the Volpe exchange, I don't think fits this

traditional model. The Volpe parcel is being split up in a unique way here and between the federal and non-federal land. The zoning petition links these things together in a way that seems to me sort of contort the definition of floor area ratio and has led to a lot of misunderstanding and discussion which I think is detracted from the general flow of the discussion that really needs to take place with -- which is the -- what the final development project would look like and not just the gain of the numbers.

What I would propose is that the zoning petition be modified to simply separate the two parcels for zoning purposes. The zoning would be based entirely on the area of the non-federal land as determined by the competitive building process. The zoning process would specify the FAR for the public

open and public open space numbers for this parcel, and the description of the parcel would follow from that without any relationship to what goes on on the federal parcel. The change could be implemented pretty simply. Most of the numbers in the zoning petition really are based on a proportion of the parcel area. The significant change in this approach is the resulting gross floor area to be delivered will depend on the amount of land included in the federal parcel.

To clarify, it is if the federal parcel takes more land, there will be less land available for which this parcel would -- for which this zoning would apply and would result in reduced amount of gross floor area, but at the same time the -- what we really consider important for an aesthetics purpose

is the density of the parcel. This would be a scheme of keeping the density of the parcel the same while adapting to the unknowns of this unique situation.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY:

Mr. O'Leary, can you wrap up your comments? You're out of time.

GERALD O'LEARY: Okay.

Basically the idea to remember is that the, the numbers will control the things more closely as they're described, but the -- there will be this different numbers than -- slightly different numbers that we're used to. We submitted a written version of this as part of the thing. You can read those numbers there. I just like to say what the -- I think the advantages of this proposal would be -- it would make the definitions much clearer, and so that when

we're talking about floor area ratio, we're talking about, you know, the floor area ratio on the thing where we've named here. I think this approach would provide the adaptability.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY:

Mr. O'Leary, please.

GERALD O'LEARY: And would provide a method for Cambridge to push back on the uncertainties of the development process.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

James Williamson.

JAMES WILLIAMSON: Thank you. James Williamson, 1000 Jackson place. Thank you. First of all, there's already innovation space planned for the MIT press building according to MIT's, the MIT initiative. I question how much additional innovation space. Particularly I don't like the jargon, but I question how much more of that is

needed.

Public transportation, it's ironic we're talking about innovation and a Volpe Transportation Research Center and we have a broken transportation system and we're going full speed ahead. Unthinkingly I wonder whether the realities of the public transportation system are actually factored in to the traffic analysis on the modal split. Is there a contingency? People make decisions based on their procession of the broken transportation system. Is that part of the traffic study? And how is that quantified? I don't think that there's an easy way to quantify it if it is even considered.

On housing, Cory Booker the Senator from New Jersey interviewed recently said when he was Mayor of Newark, he pushed for,

it wasn't easy, but he got 50 percent of affordable housing. This is a miniscule percentage, and it's shocking in a city like Cambridge, the wealth of the city, and the extent of the housing crisis that we should be talking about, really, a miniscule amount of housing, affordable housing. I do have to say that I get tired of hearing about how diverse K2, the K2 -- well, the C2, I'm more familiar with the C2 piece of it. It was not diverse. It led to the creation of the Cambridge Residents Alliance which I think helped inspire the Fresh Pond Residence Alliance which helped lead to the election of the new City Councilor who is here tonight. Let's just drop this pretense of how diversities processes have been in the city when so many people are unhappy with the way they have been put together.



There is a question about MIT's plans and whether they should, we should see that this is an opportunity to revisit what MIT are failing to do with their holdings which could help mitigate the transportation issues among others and the members of the Planning Board has happily I think paid attention to this. How about having graduate students living in Kendall Square on MIT owned property so as to relieve some of the pressures on the broken public transportation system?

On the numbers, if I -- you know, I don't see that there's any other opportunity to ask about the numbers for clarification when sometimes when somebody's up presenting because there's not an opportunity for colloquy if you're a member of the pro bono protocol. As I understand it, there was \$283

million going to be gained and it would cost 188,000, maybe 200,000 to do a building with bells and whistles, that's a surplus of -- I mean, I don't get those numbers. So, you know, we would maybe need an additional workshop on that.

But I think the key issue for me is should we allow ourselves as a city and as a community to be held hostage by the demands within this overall re-visioning of the zoning for a Volpe Transportation Center at a certain price and profit for developers, two different phases of developers, as I understand it. Should we be in the business of guaranteeing those two levels of, those two pieces of profit --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY:

Mr. Williamson.

JAMES WILLIAMSON: -- and the

building and when the final result may not be what we want. I think we should try to think about what we want here and then look at the numbers and make a decision about whether or not it's worth it to the City of Cambridge.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Lee Farris.

LEE FARRIS: Would it be okay for me to pass for now and let another couple -- other people to go first.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, there's no one else listed on this list. Are there other people who wish to speak?

JOHN HAWKINSON: Good evening, members of the Planning Board, Mr. Chair.

I was pretty shocked by Tom's analysis, or HRA's analysis. You know, I thought -- my recollection was --

H. THEODORE COHEN: John, would you mention your name and address?

JOHN HAWKINSON: Oh, I'm sorry.  
John Hawkinson, 84 Massachusetts Avenue.

I thought my recollection was the Volpe building could well cost 300 million or 400 million. So to hear that there's only \$283 million of value seems really, really quite concerning. So I guess I would hope we could, then, I guess we should further or not it would be wonderful for the public to have that analysis prior to public comment. It's very difficult to imagine anyone operating any commentary on the fly. But I would love to know how much uncertainty is in those number, so 10 percent or 50 percent or 100 percent? And, you know, what could be done to increase that value? And is there some sort of ballpark on what the environmental

costs for remediation could be? I realize that no one knows the reality, but look at the average, you know, are they likely to be 10 million or 100 million themselves? And, you know, also probably some attention to what the knobs are that the Board has, for instance, the obvious one that comes to mind, which no one wants to touch but -- or may be reluctant to, is the percentage of residential versus commercial. And that analysis had 38 percent residential. And then, you know, if that number dropped, suddenly there would be a lot more supportable value. And its supportable value is required then, you know, that very much changes thing. So what are the other knobs? I think that's all critical information that the Board really ought to hear about, and I think at least some of that could be done on

the fly. So also the estimated value for lab was 413 per square foot versus 358 per office, and I understood that included all the costs, but I thought the lab fit out costs were much, much higher and they typically (inaudible) on the tenant. So I was a little unclear on that number and it struck me as maybe previous -- I realize these are mostly questions and not comments, but I hope they will help you all.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you. Who else wishes to speak? This gentleman here. And, Ma'am, you'll be next.

LARRY STEBILE: My name is Larry Stebile, S-t-e-b-i-l-e, 303 Third Street. And I'm a direct abutter to the Volpe site. In fact, I look right out upon it. And the -- obviously I'm very interested in what we

expect in terms of building massing, building proximity, and so forth. And I understand that the sketches we saw tonight aren't -- are not plans, however, the Zoning Amendment does call for a substantial increase in just the overall amount of building that we're going to be able to see there. And I'd like to know if the traffic analysis that was done so far and the financial analysis that has been done so far has actually compared the traffic and economic factors of the current zoning or even just, you know, a wee bit more as opposed to this 50 percent or so increase that we see versus just looking at what we see now in front of us. Now the previous comment about 280 million versus 200 million for building annual Volpe building, I think is really pertinent. If you have to have a developer be able to support that and be able

to make money, then we might just simply be in an untenable situation. I really don't know the answer. I've been involved in things before, never something like this land swap thing. Who knows, it might be better to let the whole thing be sold as one piece. You know, that might work out better for all of us. So I'm really not convinced, especially looking at numbers, you know, looking at the proposed plans, that this is really the right thing for us as a city and as a neighborhood.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

BETHANY STEVENS: Good evening.

Bethany Stevens, 100 Spring Street. I just wanted to say that I was really heartened to hear when I watched the Ordinance Committee hearing this past week and hearing the



Councillors expressing some reservation about whether this is really a good deal for Cambridge and this is really worth the \$400 million gift to the government on top of the profits to the developer. And I'm hoping that there is going to be some serious thought about whether this is really what Cambridge wants and if this is something that is for Cambridge or if we're stuck with this parameter because of the negotiation or because of the parameters of the deal. And, you know, I think a lot of the residents really want to get back to zoning based on the principals of zoning, what can the City sustain? What is good for the City? What is it we want to see there? You know, with respect to the transportation study, I absolutely appreciate all the work that the city staff has been putting into this. We're

stuck in this place where we already have the ultimate thing set and we're just kind of fiddling around the edges, but with respect to the transportation study, I recognize that it's really just measuring likely the employees and the customers of the buildings, but I think something that should be taken into the consideration of all the delivery trips that are being made, people aren't necessarily driving anymore but they're certainly having all different sorts of deliveries and deliveries adding to the traffic. So it isn't a matter of somebody driving back and forth once, it's now driving six times as they, you know, my husband actually works for one of the delivery companies Instacart where he does shopping for people and so that's one thing I wanted to point out.

And the other thing I just wanted to mention is that, you know, there's a constant recitation about how this has been a long process, that the community has been involved from the start starting from the K2 study and this is branching back from the K2 study. I think everything recognizes that this is a substantial difference than what we bargained for in the K2 study, and we haven't been a part of the process that's changed from there. So I think it's a little bit disingenuous to say that we should be counting this back to the K2 study and that this has all been a long process since then. I appreciate the time. I'm interested in looking at the new information that we've gotten and spend some more time looking at it to provide more thoughtful comments.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Anyone else wish to speak?

PETER CROWLEY: I'll speak.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Please.

PETER CROWLEY: Thank you. Peter Crowley from 88 Thorndike Street. I did also want to thank the City and -- for a lot of the work that's been done and a number of modifications which I think are improvements. And I guess I'm also speaking as the President of the East Cambridge Planning Team. I should make that clear. And you -- I assume received our letter outlining a number of concerns that we had. I won't repeat many of those, but I'm gonna highlight maybe four.

In terms of the open space, we were, we were encouraged that you put a limit on the amount it could be on the federal site. And

obviously if the Federal Government, which is outside the control of the City, decides for security reasons, terror events and such that those -- it's not going to be accessible to the public, then it won't be which leaves the City with 1.75 acres of open space. Our view is that is just inadequate. It is not reasonable to achieve the goal of significant civic gathering space, creation, and a number of the other connection goals that the K2 plan and I think CDD at least in narrative put out there. So we would really ask you to reconsider the amount of open space.

We also want to point out that parks in the long run increase the value of buildings. Ask any landowner on Central Park West or even on Post Office Square. So I think in the long run the idea that parks are like give away space is not the right financial

analysis in the long run. And I also think we should think about the environmental benefits of parks in terms of heat island effect, water management, and the social benefits. And all of these things are very tough to quantify, to put into a financial analysis. I know New York City is very interested in parks for the social equity benefits of parks. It's where everybody can go and have a, you know, a healthy and pleasant experience without reference to your socioeconomic background. So -- open space.

The infrastructure challenges obviously are extremely intense here, and in particular related to the public transportation and the train line. We all know how stressed the Red Line is. Many of us in the neighborhood experienced it during last winter. I actually work in One Broadway in Kendall

Square and there were days last year where our building was maybe 20 percent full because people just couldn't get to Kendall Square because of the snow situation.

So we have traffic studies, but I just, I just highlight the fact that numbers tell a certain story and we experienced a certain reality and I would just ask folks to plan for likely, you know, climate change and different weather conditions that will impact mobility. Not to mention the MBTA's financial and political situation right now with a \$7.3 billion backlog on maintenance and the idea that capacity there will be significantly increased is very low.

In the hearing at the town meeting Iram mentioned that there could be a possibility of peer review of the zoning and economics. I think given it won't be part of the

citywide planning, that that possibility might be explored.

And the last thing I'll mention is, you know, there's no EIR, environmental impact report with this, during this presentation and planning exercise and I guess you're waiting for the individual buildings for when they go for their individual approval to have a full EIR. But things like -- we're seeing some traffic study but things like wind and shadow and noise and water management, who's gonna look at those in total? In totality.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Sir.

PETER CROWLEY: So I think that's something that since you're setting the whole envelope, might be a really important thing to look at.

So thank you very much.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.



Lee Farris.

LEE FARRIS: Lee Farris, 269 Norfolk Street. I want to respond to Iram's point about it's been a long process. It has been a long process, but from my point of view the Kendall Square process there were a few residents that were chosen to participate in that, and the rules for everybody else were the same as C2, which is that you could get up at the end of a two to three hour meeting and you could speak for three minutes and there was no sense that what you said was heard or incorporated. And we were told specifically for both K2 and C2 oh, don't worry about this little problem that I just described, we were told, you will get your fair chance to speak when the zoning actually goes to the Planning Board and the City Council. So that's what I thought. And yes,

we are getting a fair chance to speak now, but to me that means you don't just say oh, this has all been discussed endlessly and you guys have already had your chance.

I would also say that while I appreciated the public process that the City did over the summer, they didn't do what we understood when we met with them numerous times last year, which was that the City would meet with residents before they drew up the zoning. And so many of the things that Ms. Farooq talked about on the timeline, yes, there was a meeting with the Area 4 Coalition, the basic parameters of the zoning were already drawn. We never got to say, we'd rather you go in this whole different direction. That was never an option. And that's not what other folks understood. Many people understood, it had been agreed upon

with the City at the end of the meetings last year about the planning process. So those are obviously more overarching.

One other point, it's my understanding of why the petition was filed over the end of the summer was because the Planning Board and the City Council as well as the residents weren't very happy with it. It wasn't just to get more resident input. That's not the case. And I'm sure you guys remember that.

So, I want to note Mr. Evans only showed 38 percent housing there. The zoning says that it's going to be at least 40 percent. The Cambridge Residents Alliance still thinks the proportion of housing should be significantly higher and we think that the proportion of affordable housing should be significantly higher.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Is there anyone else who wishes to speak?

JOHN SANZONE: John Sanzone, S-a-n-z-o-n-e, 540 Memorial Drive. First off, I advocate for ecological integration which includes open space but also some kind of measurement or set of measurements for more we determine that the project meets a certain ecological threshold. That's water retention, wildlife. And water generally I think should be integral to the site due to the site's history, our responsibility to sustainable planning, and the opportunity for the site to become defined by water and contribute to its place.

An extension of the Broad Canal and wetland and other water features should be included. We should very seriously look to

on this note the brilliant winning submission to the Connect Kendall Square design competition which included these aspects.

Moreover on all the aspects we can and should be as prescriptive as we could on the site. There's no incentive for us not to be ambitious and visionary. Some of these ambitions are infeasible when it comes to actual development times, so be it. But we should work and negotiate from that place.

On the federal facility, it doesn't have to be Fort Knox. It's hard for us to make that call as a city, but if we have a compelling vision and a strong case for a true neighborhood, Volpe and the GSA might be less reflexive about needing the -- overdue the security setback plans.

Binney Street, the north side of the parcel. An executive from Genzyme a few

months ago referred to Binney Street as the biotech Shanzelize. We should take full ownership of that. We should be able to accommodate another flagship for an institution. When we look to the iconic tower, just throwing it out there, maybe something worthy of the Pritzker Prize. There's no reason to not be really ambitious with the site. We have literally an architectural site at MIT, two blocks away, Harvard down the street. It's important, of course, that the site's penetrable as the city has noted, avoiding the corporate campus outcome, and that's exactly what we need to do. The built and unbuilt environment must look outward and welcome the public in.

The transportation piece, one thing that's obvious is including those surface parking and only minimal structured parking.

Remember there's a garage one building away for instance. And my open question would be would it be cheaper to build the complete grand junction path, which would carry thousands on foot and bike and the indigo line on the station and grand junction line and throw in a couple light rail trolleys under the tracks. Again accommodating more users. Would that all be cheaper than build a structure for a thousand cars. And obviously the walking bike corridor and transit service would serve this parcel as well as Kendall Square generally and relieve what is really enormous pressure already on the Red Line.

A couple of specific things. The interplay with the Marriott lobby and the southeast corners interplay with Kendall Square proper are -- that's very important

and that should really guide the site generally.

Thanks.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Anyone else who would like to -- Heather.

HEATHER HOFFMAN: Hello. Heather Hoffman, 213 Hurley Street, and just to make one preliminary remark that I would have gone home because the migraine medicine hasn't worked yet, but this I think this is really important. This is my neighborhood. I have lived there 31 years and I plan on living there until they take me out feet first in a pine box. And I want to reemphasize what people before me said about this process. And the one thing that they didn't talk about is what I think is an artificial deadline that's been put on this. I think the City Council has -- understands that really well,



but why was this re-filed? Why did we not take the lessons that we learned from the first round of this where pretty much everybody decided that this was in need of a whole lot of surgery, and not re-file it which starts the clock again? And so we are once again under the gun. Why did we not work on it first? I mean, it's obvious that CDD has now put in a bunch of time, but they put this time in during the time that we're counting down until oh, my God, we're gonna have to vote or re-file it or whatever. I think this process has been handled so poorly. I used the analogy at the City -- that the Ordinance Committee the other night that, as you all know, I'm a knitter and sometimes you look at your knitting and you say, you know, it's just time to rip this up and start over. And I think we have reached

that point with this.

Another point that was made at the ordinance committee and that Jeff Roberts alluded to was the idea of this distinctive landmark. And the specific distinctive landmark that was mentioned is the one that you probably imagined, it's else where in the neighborhood. We don't need another. I think that we are finally turning the corner to insisting on much better architecture in Kendall Square. And every single building in this should not be another piece of the urban office park that we currently have. And I understand there are all kinds of reasons and they are not malicious reasons or anything else, they are reasons of the times when all of these buildings were built. And they're also reasons that we didn't think that we deserved any better. But I think we do. So

this zoning should reflect all of those things. This zoning should reflect what we deserve, and that is as several people before me have said, and I have said before you many times, open space. The open space, the two acres that is nearby this but on the other side of Third Street doesn't count for this. That is for Alexandria. We've been promised a substantial piece of open space. It actually says seven-and-a-half acres as you know, but everybody's decided that that was a typo. So I think that we need more of the economic analysis. Several people before me brought up some really good questions about that, and I was happy that they did because it was sort of vaguely running through my fevered brain and they've said it much better than I could have.

But I think this is truly not ready.

We really, really need to stop this and sit down and think about where we actually want to go instead of running on this treadmill and thinking oh, we have to do this. We don't. We have to do a good job.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Is there anyone else who wishes to speak?

CAROL BELLEAU: Carol Belleau, 257 Charles Street. Part of the East Cambridge Planning Team. I know I've sat on several of these committees and one of the things that I'm really pushing is the Broad Canal be extended up to Sixth Street. It's a waterway. It's been there forever or used to be there forever, and these open spaces that we were promised, even though that's been cut back, this would extend some of that open

space on to that site. We do feel that some of these meetings should be held down in East Cambridge because that's where this piece of land is and we're trying to get some of these meetings pushed down there. We don't feel that a lot of what we've said has been brought to the table correctly and I just wanted to state that. There's a lot of development that can be done on this. I think some of this, some of the suggestions that were made were great as far as other options for bringing these people in and out. If anybody's been on Third Street -- I was just on Third Street at 6:30 and it's still like a parking lot. So put this into that and you can imagine what East Cambridge will be like in the next ten years.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Anyone else who wishes to speak?

(No Response.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: If not, then we'll start the Board's discussion.

Does anyone have any questions or comments they want to start with? Hugh, we'll start with you.

HUGH RUSSELL: I'm going to start with a looking at my results of looking at a letter that Barry Zevin sent us on open space and like communication has in it is the other parts of the City and Boston that are familiar to us presented at the same scale as the essentially the open space study that was found which is very similar to the urban design plan which wasn't available when Barry did his analysis. And so one thing I did is I tried to understand in the urban design plan what are those two spaces, how big are they compared to what I know? And I know

Harvard Square better than other parts of the city. My office has been there for 45 years and I'm there on a daily basis. I was a student. And, you know, I don't know the South End very well so I was very surprised to discover the size of the spaces of the design plan. So I said how big does it compare to, say, Holyoke Center? Or how big is it as far as Winthrop Square? And the answer is none of that's the wrong comparison. The size comparison is how big is it compared to the Old Yard in Harvard and the new yard? Those are the comparables.

Now I'm measuring the open space as an architect would, which is I'm looking at the container, the surrounding buildings. And so Harvard Yard is an old yard and described by a series of buildings and mostly dormitories, they're mostly five stories tall, they're

probably 60 or 70 feet tall. And the new yard buildings are a little taller, but again it's contained mostly by buildings.

Surprisingly those two spaces are the same general area. And I hadn't realized that, and the new yard is basically square and the old yard is a rectangle, it's about two and a half to one in proportions, but there's about the same amount of space between the buildings. And if you take the -- what is called Broad Square and Point Park as a space that is defined by, you know, the One Broadway, the MIT Development, the triangle development, and then the proposed new development, it's almost the same size as both of those spaces. It's not quite -- not quite as big, maybe 80 or 90 percent the size. But that's a lot of space. Now, a lot of spa space is actually in the roadways



rather than -- it's not all grass and trees like Harvard Yard, although there are very minor roadways in the yard, not Third Street and not like Broadway, but in terms of how much -- what do you see? Where do the buildings? What are the boundaries? The amount of space is similar.

The space that abuts the Sixth Street walkway in the illustrative plans is actually a little larger than the two Harvard Yard spaces. It's about a two to one rectangle. It's kind of equivalent to the old yard but it's wider. Those are big, those are substantial aggregations of open space.

So my conclusion is that this plan has actually substantial open spaces in it. There are other open spaces in the plan and there are other places that are of good -- say the Holyoke Center Plaza. Is there one

equivalent to Winthrop Square? I'm not quite sure whether they're -- and of course we won't know. But we might say, yeah, we want to see a Winthrop Square. And maybe that's the kind of scale space you get around the DOT. So this is just -- it's important to understand that you actually get significant amounts of volumes of open space with the rules that are going to be applied here. And part of the reason is that because if you put the space next to streets, you make -- you get the advantage of that expanse. The boundaries are going to be much higher. And so they're not going to seem like they're the same paces, but there's a lot of turf there.

I was very interested in Tom's analysis conveying the financial analysis, and these things are very, they have many assumptions. They're very difficult to reproduce. If

you're like a scientist, you say, okay, give it to three different financial firms. You will come up with different assumptions and different numbers, but to me it's important to understand that this isn't the give away. Within the current proposal we're probably extracting the maximum amount of public benefit. And by public benefit we're talking about open space, we're talking about housing, we're talking about retail and services. The public benefit is we're taking 14 acres that are not very lively to say the best but are quite green, and making them more lively and less green, but -- and that's sort of the tradeoff and we're getting a thousand units of housing. And we're getting a certain number of affordable units and a percentage more than there have ever been done in a market. And we do have thousands

of, you know, units on housing and that have had much higher subsidies and so it's like, you know, they're like Jefferson Park is 100 percent affordable.

So then we -- so it really comes down to like, well, are the specific changes proposed improvements in this proposal? And I think they all are. I think they've looked at some of the plots that could be improved and they've come up with formulations to improve them.

Am I happy with the cluster of big buildings in the middle of the site on the illustrative plan? Not particularly. But if I convert those to residential and I take away half of them, I'm pretty sure the finances will say, the GSA won't go forward with this. And so the alternative would be under that zoning we'd be nothing will

happen, again or, you know, nothing happened on this site under the previous zoning, nothing -- so nothing will happen again. It seems to me the -- there's an opportunity presented by the GSA's proposal there to accomplish integrating this office park if you will. This aging, falling apart, not serving its client very well office park into the city. And the question should we take it? I am very heartened by the analysis that says we looked at this at very great length in the K2 process, and the results that are before us are consistent in very light rate measure that came out of K2. Now, if K2 didn't result in the answers that the Cambridge Residents Alliance wished to come out of that, and I think they feel that if they've been listened to, maybe it would have been different. But I think this is a --

this was a process trying to balance a bunch of different extras. And I think the interesting one less development and more open space were heard in that process. They didn't -- the people who wanted those things, it didn't come out of the process that way because of the attempt to come up with something that balanced a variety of issues. I've spoken before that as an American citizen I would like to see the Department of Transportation research center upgrade facilities.

They're providing services to all of us in the country analyzing all kinds of transportation problems, and I would like to see them have a better facility. So that their work can be improved and enhanced. That's not the only reason to do this, but I think stepping aside -- I'm very proud to

live in Cambridge where we are doing -- I say we -- I'm not doing it. You know, Catherine isn't doing it. Isn't doing research at the cutting edge of bio tech. You know, I don't -- but others are doing that here and we're being asked to look at that, say that it's valuable work, and that it is benefitting all of us on this planet. And so I think it's important that we actually say yes, this work is valuable and we need to support it as a City.

My bottom line, then, is that we should send the proposal to the Council with the proposed changes that were viewed by Jeff and hope that the Council will take this up and send it forward in the period of time so that there's a chance that we can actually happen. That's it for me.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Who would like

to speak next?

AHMED NUR: I guess we'll go this way.

My colleague said the suggestion of moving forward. One of the questions that I asked is that Tom Evans said that the Planning Board can limit the building height to 350. I don't know, when I saw on this Board writing the zoning, I thought we decided that -- if we're going to do tall buildings this would be the area to do it with. So, therefore, I was hoping for actually instead of cutting it back, is it written in stone. Can we go up one building? I know in Boston, for example, there's at least four, five buildings right now being built at 41-stories, about 500. And so if we're going to go height and we need housing and we need this and that, this would be the



place to do it instead of trying to cut back the buildings I wonder if you could up that building from 500 to 700? That was one comment I wanted to make.

I do like East Cambridge. I'm not happy that the East Cambridge is not happy, rather with this proposal, because they have done a good job working with the developers in the area and it is, I agree it is a footstep so I appreciate it if the City can work with East Cambridge Planning Board in trying to solve the situation because that also the Broad Canal, being Broad Canal to Sixth Street, I think that's a brilliant idea. There's a lot of hearthscape there and less water. It would be great to bring it over to that.

And the other comment that I have is the transportation. The type of

transportation that were mentioned in different percentages, but I think we covered 100 percent. There's walking, biking, transit, and driving. And there was the other, I wonder what the other is. Is it a boat?

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Mary?

MARY FLYNN: Thank you. I too am in favor of moving the petition forward. I think that -- I do think that the recommendations that the staff have made have improved the petition.

In terms of open space, I haven't done the details analysis that Hugh did which was very, very helpful, but I realize that the staff has not proposed a change in the percentage. I would actually like to see a higher percentage of open space. I think

what the staff is suggesting is that having it at 25 percent and then, you know, perhaps it would be greater than that depending on, you know, the developer and what the development scheme was. I'd actually like to say, you know, do maybe 30 percent and say that if the Board determined that it would be more beneficial to reduce the open space, because of massing or whatever other concerns there might be, that we could reduce it to no less than 25 percent but it would at least give us a starting point a little bit, a little bit higher which might get us some additional usable open space.

So that's just for consideration.

The other concern I had is that -- and correct me if I'm wrong, staff, I'm assuming the general amount of office and R&D that's projected is just a lump sum and you could do

either general office or R&D within that amount?

JEFF ROBERTS: That's right.

MARY FLYNN: Okay, so it seems as though the R&D generates less trips. So I'm wondering if for the purposes of this petition we could look at separating out the two amounts, the two categories and stating that, you know, the general office should not exceed a certain amount and, you know, the rest would be for R&D. I'm just thinking, I don't know what that would do to overall trips, what the right amount would be, but it might help reduce some of the traffic impacts. So just a thought. Not necessarily that, you know, you have to figure this all out before it goes to the City Council but at least have these thoughts in your I guess bag for discussion at the City Council.

And then, you know, the economic model, you know I agree it's complicated. We haven't seen it before tonight. It is a lot to take into consideration. And I think it might be helpful, too, to look at different models based on different use scenarios, not just what the maximum would be to build things out, but say if you did do the 40 percent residential or, you know, it's just a different mix. Just to see what we could come up with.

So, again, I think we should try to keep the process moving, but I'd like it -- well, first -- it depends on what the other board members feel, too. But I think some of those things are worth taking a look at.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thacher?

THACHER TIFFANY: No.

H. THEODORE COHEN: No? Catherine?

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: I think to a certain extent this process has always felt a little bit backwards which is usually when we get development proposals, we have situations where a developer has a pretty firm idea of what they want to do, they come in and they ask for zoning, to do it, and we discuss how to tweak that zoning to meet our needs. And then we always complain that the developer should have come to us earlier and ask what we wanted and, you know, giving us a chance to do real planning and talk about what should be on the site in the first place before they came up with their plans. And now we have that situation where we're being asked to do the planning and come up with that situation, come up with what we want before GSA goes out and solicits proposals, but at the same time we're not as con

constrained as I think we would have been which is to say there are economic realities at play here that mean that we can't just ask for everything we want. And I think Tom's analysis really brought that home to me. You know, I understand there's certainly lots of assumptions, lots of margin for error. But it did -- gives you pause when you look at those numbers and say we're somewhere near the edge. We might be over the edge, we might be -- you know, in a situation where it can be done, but if we want something to happen here, we're close to asking for too much such as that nothing would happen. And I for -- I want something to happen here. I, I think that the space as it exists, while I can appreciate that abutters like how much open space is around there and how much air and light gets into their places now, as a

place in the middle of the city in a vibrant and growing neighborhood, it isn't -- that space doesn't work as a public space. It only works to give light and air to abutters and those buildings, and it doesn't lend anything else to the surrounding neighborhood or to the frankly the occupant of the buildings. So, I really do want something to happen, and for those reasons I feel like staff has really hit the, a reasonable balance here with the proposed zoning. And I do appreciate the changes that have been made. I do think it gets us further along. And I also anticipate frankly that even if City Council were doing this, that once the RFP goes out and once there's no developer identified, that they will come back and ask for other changes and we will be back in the situation of saying well, you know, here's



what we want and here's your program and we're tweaking it again. And that's okay. I mean, that's part of this iterative process in my view, that is just starting at a different stage than we often start, but I expect we're going to be revisiting the zoning and I expect after that that we will have a project review special permit. So I look forward to many dozens more meetings about the Volpe site in years to come. But I do think that we're at a good place to move it forward, to get the information out there so that GSA can get some proposals back, and we can start all talking about what is actually, what actually could happen on this site moving forward.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Steve?

STEVEN COHEN: Well, as usual I'm a little bit confused and conflicted. And, you

know, I guess as usual we have to make the big decisions based on what frequently feels like inadequate information, but I think that's the nature of our work frequently is to -- the nature of my work in the private sector and it's the nature of the work on the Board. I certainly agree with some of the grand thoughts that Hugh expressed as a Cantabrigian, as an American, you know, I feel the responsibility to foster the work that gets done in Kendall Square. Kendall Square is not just important to the city, it's important to the region, and it's important to the country. And as I frequently said, I tend to look at these things from a regional perspective and not just a municipal perspective. This is an important locomotive to the economy, and -- but it's an important contributor to the

advancement of society and understanding. And so this is an important location. I very much support the dense development of this site for both R&D and residential. But having voiced that sort of general support, fine. How much of that development on this specific site? And, you know, we're talking about a roughly a 5.5 FAR, and I'm frankly not entirely confident what that means, 5.5 FAR. You know, if we were just coming at this from a purely planning perspective, I suspect that I would be supporting a little bit less intensity of development on the site. As Catherine pointed out, certainly our economic realities here and my understanding is the economic reality is that we have to generate enough value in the land here to support construction of the new replacement of the Volpe Transportation

Facility. And I mean that's pretty complex, sophisticated analysis to go through with that. I mean, how much will it really cost to create that facility? Tom went through an interesting analysis but, you know, I certainly don't have enough to add in front of me to evaluate that analysis, and even if I did, there would be by necessity so many assumptions built into that analysis that it would be difficult to, you know, achieve a high level of confidence and that those are the real numbers.

Could the Federal Government ultimately kick in something to make the Volpe facility possible? I have absolutely no idea. That's politics that's even more complicated than financial analysis. So I mean there are so many unknowns here.

What does density mean on this site?

I'm not sure what three million feet really mean and look like here. Though I must say in all the massing studies that I've seen to date, they don't thrill me. They look, you know, kind of congested and, well, as I said from my perspective, it's not the ideal development plan. But, you know, how far are we willing to stretch our ideal in order to make it happen? And it's difficult because we don't know the economics of what is really required to make it happen. So, you know, I'm just concerned.

One -- a couple of specific items that I do have. It may be that providing greater height to one or more of the buildings here gives us more flexibility down the road to come up with a design that really works from an urban planning perspective. Ahmed, alluded to that. And I see in the proposal

something I'm not sure I understand perfectly well, but it seems to be a 10 percent limit on square footage that can exceed what, 250 feet? Or 350 --

H. THEODORE COHEN: 250.

STEVEN COHEN: 250 feet.

HUGH RUSSELL: Ten percent of the land area of the site.

STEVEN COHEN: Yeah. And, again, I'm not sure how that plays out, but it seems to impose a constraint on both the developer and on us that, you know, it may be unnecessary and that may be ruling out development plans here that, you know, upon review we may find to be desirable and possibly the best options for development of the site. So, you know, I'd love to hear from staff what that's about and whether it's necessary, and based on my limited

understanding of it, I would be inclined to eliminate that restriction.

I guess the only other thing that I would say is, you know, when it does come back to us with specific plans, I don't know if this is something that you can build into the zoning per se, but especially given at least from my personal perspective some concerns about whether you can really generate a good, desirable, aesthetically pleasing, appropriate plan with the proposed zoning.

A, I really would like to see the developers come to us early with their plans and not with the plan that's, you know, pretty much fully baked. Because when it comes to us fully baked, I've said this before, is we know how much work has gone into it, and, you know, we feel constrained

in the extent that we can say, tear it up and go back to the drawing board. So, you know, I'd love to encourage the ultimate developer to come to us early, and if we could build in such a requirement into the zoning, I think that would be a good thing. And, you know, for the gentleman who suggested that this should be Pritzker Prize quality design here, I -- you know we are being pressed maybe to go further than we would wish on the zoning here and to permit greater density of development but you know if we have to make that compromise, we shouldn't be pressed now or down the road to make compromises in the architecture and the design. I mean, you know, this really should be great architecture. It shouldn't be a work-a-day, you know, suburban office park here. And, again, I don't know how you build that into



the zoning other than to maybe, you know, state it as an ideal and make sure that the ultimate developer isn't surprised, you know, when we push him or her to really raise the bar and do great stuff. I don't want to hear that it's too difficult or too expensive then. You know, if we're being pushed to go this route, I mean we should demand and only ultimately approve really great design here.

So, you know, as I say I'm kind of conflicted. Yeah, I'm going to vote in favor of this ultimately and I do want to see it go to the next step but, you know, we keep talking about giving the developer flexibility down the road and we do want that, but I also want the Planning Board to have as much flexibility as we can possibly retain to maintain the best massing plan and the best design that we possibly can when an

individual proposals ultimately come before us.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Lou?

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Well, most everything I had was covered. I agree with a lot of my colleagues. We have to have some really good design and good architecture, but I'm not so sure we can afford it. And what I have seen tonight maybe this is on the precipice of being a positive or a negative outcome of this project. How do we get good design and good architecture with a small budget? Information, information, information.

I haven't seen -- we're depending on the federal piece of this, the new Volpe piece of this development to carry -- it could be half of the open space. I still haven't seen a guideline from the feds on

what they would require on their site for open space. It's very little information on a lot of this stuff, and I don't know a lot of work on this, but it's always -- we're always looking into the dark. We don't have enough information.

I guess when we do our plan -- our review of the development, I guess we'll have to do it then, but information is crucial in these things and I don't think we have enough.

Thanks.

H. THEODORE COHEN: All right, well, most everybody has covered all of my points. I do want to raise a couple of issues.

I personally believe that this Board and hopefully the City Council acts in the very near future because I truly -- well, first of all, we don't own the land. The

City does not own the land in question. The land is owned by the Federal Government. It's not subject to zoning. They could do whatever they want with it. And I am, you know, I think what GSA and public transportation has suggested is a very clever proposition which gets the Department of Transportation the building they want. And I think that if this extends beyond November 2016 and January 2017, then maybe a different administration and a very different view of what the GSA and the Department of Transportation can do, and we may end up in a situation -- again, we're all looking into crystal balls and don't know, but we may end up in a situation where the Federal Government may decide to do whatever they want on that property or to just raise the building and, you know, leave it vacant which

maybe some people would like, but I think the opportunity to plan for what we would like to see is now and that there is a significant time horizon that may change things a lot. So I think we should act, you know, City Council then they have a lot of political concerns that they will take into account and that would be up to them.

You know, with regard to transportation, you know, Susanne and the presentation made with regard to the CRA and the MXD District, it's clear that if the state and the MBTA had the will and the money to do things about the Red Line and Kendall station, they could do it. And yes, the City, you know, this city, in Somerville, and lots of other communities in Boston ought to be lobbying as hard as they can for those improvements. But, you know, in the 40s and

50s the Red Line carried a lot more people than it's carrying now. Longer trains, more work on the stations could resolve the problem which basically exists at rush hour in Kendall Square. So I for one don't believe that we can't move forward because there would be transportation issues. I think what the city is doing with regard to promoting bicycling beds and car sharing and reducing parking all goes to, you know, helping to alleviate the transportation problem, and yes public transportation is a major issue. We can do as much as we can but it's in other people's hands.

You know, I think disclosure, I spoke to staff about some things in this that I think were just really in the nature of typos and conforming things and I don't feel the need to go into them right now just a word

here or there to clarify what was done.

You know, I think a couple of issues have been raised, you know with regard to architecture. I think we probably all have a different points of view of what is going to be great landmark architecture and I think that will be up to the Board as it may be comprised at the time when the project comes before it. We've all been thinking about Paris lately. I always wondered what would Cambridge Planning Board thought if the Pompidou Center had come before it. It is a landmark in Paris now. What did the Parisian Planning Board think? You know, what did -- a lot of people hated the Eiffel Tower when it was built and wanted it demolished right away.

HUGH RUSSELL: We improved the Stata Center.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Pardon me?

HUGH RUSSELL: We've improved the Stata Center.

H. THEODORE COHEN: We've got the Stata Center, you know. And maybe we all agree that the courthouse was not an architectural landmark, but I think we also have difference of opinions of what we like and what we don't like and what we like to see there.

I personally think that taller buildings could deal with the density issue and, you know, I have always questioned the 10 percent limitation. And I, you know, I would go beyond, you know, whether 350 is the right now or 500. You know, when we talked about this months ago, 500 seemed to be a rational compromise between the thousand foot that had been tossed out, and the 200 or 250



that we were talking about and the 350. So, you know, we all have difference of opinions as to height and as to massing things.

The illustrative massing does not appeal to me terribly much.

I don't necessarily agree that the one tall building should be in the back.

I think if we're going to have a landmark, it ought to be viewed by everyone that comes into the Cambridge. I would be more in favor of it being at the Broadway and Third Street corner, but I know a lot of people don't agree with that. So I mean there are issues that are going to be addressed in the future, but, you know, I think -- first of all, we've pretty much reached the point where staff has worked this and we've worked it several times. You know, I'm prepared to go forward.

I think, you know, a couple of issues. Mary raised, you know, do we think open space should increase to 30 percent? Do we want to talk about that? Does staff want to address that?

There's also the issue whether it makes sense to separate office from R&D?

And then the third issue, I guess, would be the ten percent. Maybe staff wants to talk about that.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Ted, one more. Does it make sense to separate these two, the federal from the private and maybe we can get --

H. THEODORE COHEN: I don't see how.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: What's the rationale?

H. THEODORE COHEN: I don't see how you do separate them now where, you know,

it's the federal's land and they want what they want, and to a certain extent they're going to say where they want it to be.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Right, and that's exactly my point is that we have nothing to do with the federal side.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: And what we want on the private side and the feds are going to get us what we get.

HUGH RUSSELL: I guess I would like -- before Jeff responds, I just would like to speak to the suggestion that has been spoken to --

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay.

HUGH RUSSELL: -- because then he can tell me whether I'm wrong.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay.

HUGH RUSSELL: There seems to be one

thing that we might do is switch some of the requirements with the guidelines. So that say the ten percent rule becomes a guideline as to how we're going to evaluate it. And I'm not quite sure how we would do that with open space, but I think the same idea -- maybe there's a guideline that says well, we really would like to see 30 percent as a guideline, but, you know, 25 percent is the new rule.

And I guess the only other comment I would make is that -- to be clear, the Pritzker Prize is a prize to an architect at which recognizes a long lifetime body of work. It is not a prize for buildings. So if you were going to do that, we should make it a Harleston Parker quality building which is the Boston Society Architects each year votes on the best in the building in Boston

which, for example, our public library addition received that award a couple years ago.

AHMED NUR: In Cambridge you mean?

HUGH RUSSELL: In Cambridge, yes.  
That's just a footnote for the record.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And well, if I could just comment about what you said.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: My concern about switching some of the requirements to guidelines is that I think we can't be so open ended with the zoning that it's not going to tell people what they need to do is a minimum. And I think that there probably has to be some minimums put in so that they can't go below a certain point. But perhaps, you know, going above that is subject to a waiver or the discretion of the Planning

Board as its own entity.

Jeff, do you want to --

JEFF ROBERTS: I think this microphone is on a different setting from the rest. Okay?

So, I'll go over -- I was trying to make note and underlining different things that were suggested, and I'll start on that last point.

So I didn't dwell on this before. I have dwelled on it in previous meetings, that this is a special kind of zoning. It's PUD Zoning, and the whole framework for PUD Zoning is that everything we're putting in here is all subject to Planning Board approval. So it's not, it's not like where you have base zoning that says this is your entitlement for FAR, and this is your entitlement for height and dwelling units,

and if the project is coming before the Planning Board, it's only because the Planning Board needs to review the urban design impact and the base zoning impact. The notion here is the base zoning is low, and the PUD zoning says you can get this extra flexibility and this extra development capacity, but you have to come to the Planning Board and convince the Planning Board that your proposal is providing public benefits that balance that additional development capacity. So it's good to start with that and we talked with those particular issues.

Now, what are some of the strategies? What that does is it reveals some different strategies that you can use when approaching these things. One way is to say well, we know what we want. Let's put it the zoning

as a hard limitation and say that the Planning Board can't change it. That's one approach.

Another approach is to do I think what you were suggesting, Mary, and we do in some other areas where we say, this is what the requirement is, but we are going to provide a little bit of flexibility with the Planning Board to modify that if there's some other reason why that results in a better development plan that's more beneficial. So that's, so that's one approach.

So the approach -- so you've mentioned open space, saying well, instead of if we're really aiming for closer to 30 percent open space, we can say 30 percent open space but the Planning Board can modify it within that five percent if it, if it's demonstrated that results in a better plan.



And then the other approach is I think you were suggesting, Ted, is that you could say we don't want to put a strict number on it, but we want to put a guideline or maybe we do put a number as a guideline that just gives an indication of what the Board is -- what the Board is going to be looking at, whether they're going to be looking for, but the implications is more flexible.

Functionally there's still the same flexibility, but it sends a slightly different message to the developer.

That's just the overall idea and we could go either way. Certainly the guidelines and the framework that Suzannah presented has a lot of this. I think a lot of what was discussed is reflected in those guidelines. So some of those questions are, you know, do you want to, do some of them

need to be beefed up in the zoning or could essentially some pieces of the zoning rely better in the design guidelines.

So open space we talked about, that's something that we could introduce if the Planning Board wanted to.

The office and R&D mix, when we were talking about this before the meeting, one kind of curious idea came up that the potential arose involving that difference between office and R&D particularly in terms of traffic generation. So the parking requirements as they've recommended have one ratio for office and another parking ratio for lab R&D. And that's based on what we know about the overall differences in employee density in those buildings. Acknowledging that in Kendall Square it tends to be not as much of sort of binary

proposition. There's a lot of fluidity in these commercials. A lot have both and so it's really more of a spectrum of different sort of employee densities. But one of the ideas that came up is, well, if we want to limit traffic generation at that lower level of R&D, that we can impose that same, just a uniform parking ratio across those sites. Now, that may be challenging for developers, but it would put some more, it would put a little bit more of a, of a hard line on the traffic generation for commercial uses and we wouldn't have to guess as much as to how much of it is office, how dense is it going to be, and then how is that going to push the traffic generation. So that's the a thought.

I think doing it the other way by saying, well, there's only a certain amount of office and a certain amount of R&D, it

would probably be more restrictive and it would require us to have to take a much more detailed look at these buildings to determine well is this office or R&D to, you know, how do we draw that line.

IRAM FAROOQ: I was just going to say that also poses a real challenge in terms of just the nature of what innovation and research is going to be today, what we understand today versus what it is in the future. So it could pose some unforeseen challenges in the future. So I think some proxies would be the better way to go.

JEFF ROBERTS: So those are my off the cuff thoughts about that.

And then on the next things I had underlined were whether the ten percent limit on square foot could compose a constrained, again, we could look at that as a guideline

not as a requirement. We could also do it by saying it's a requirement and the Planning Board can improve modifications. And the point of that is to acknowledge that what we have now in Kendall Square 200 -- in fact, for a long time, 250 feet has been a limit that's been in place and a lot of development has gone up to that limit. So we wanted to make sure that if we went to taller heights, we would be sort of breaking that 250-foot plane, the floor plates would be limited enough to provide light and air would be sort of coming with those heights and that we end up with someone proposing a very, very large building, very bulky building or a very tall height.

So, again, if we wanted to start that differently we could. But that was based on the study we did, that seems a reasonable

approach to getting the kinds of outcomes that we wanted.

Seeing developers come in early, that's a good point. I think that in some ways the PUD zoning, while we try to be expansive in our review, it's also constrained by the Chapter 40A Special Permit limitation to say, you know, you submit an application, you get a hearing and you get a decision within 90 days unless everyone agrees to an extension. It would be -- the PUD zoning does provide for as an optional pre-application conference. We could, in this case, try to make it a little bit more forceful. That pre-application conference is not, is not as optional as it might otherwise be, and try to lay out some expectations of what would be involved in that process. And we also would be talking in the future about how the Board

is discussing introducing more broader public outreach in the process. So part of the challenge is figuring out how to line up all those different points in the process and what should happen at what stage.

So demanding -- demanding great design, great architectural design, again, a lot of reflective guidelines that we could, you know, if there was sort of an element of that that we wanted to point out. I think the point about, you know, everybody wants great architecture, not everyone agrees on how to define great architecture and it's a big challenge. We really hit our heads against the wall trying to do some language. But I think the language in the design framework does hit a lot of good points.

The wording clarifications, I'll note that I did receive those and they are minor

corrections that we can incorporate.

And I think guess there was a question of the 500 feet, I don't know if the Board was going to explore that.

Oh, and finally the last point, I'm glad you brought the question about the federal -- about separating the federal from the private. I heard Mr. O'Leary's comment, and I agree 100 percent, we don't want to end up with something where there's total uncertainty as to what the results are going to be, that is actually the motivation for proposing the zoning the way we have, because under normal circumstances you would say if here's your district and your requirements are based on the area of the district, so if you divide up the lot, then the lots are sold separate. They each follow the zoning. The result is the same. The problem here is that



when the lot is split, you -- the result is you have one lot that has to follow zoning requirements and another lot that doesn't have to follow zoning requirements. So you, again, it makes it completely uncertain how that gets carved up, dictates how much development there's going to be, how much housing there's going to be, how much open space there's going to be. We wouldn't really have any way of predicting what the outcome would be. So that's why we structured this to say that we want to encourage that federal -- we know that the federal site is not going to be required to following the zoning, but we want to encourage that site to be incorporated into this overall master planning for the site. And the only way to do that is to provide incentives for that to happen, and not to put

measures in the zoning that would, that would cause the Federal Government to say it's not in their interests to be involved in this in any way, and therefore they would sort of back out of that overall site planning process.

So, I think that's it. So if there were suggestions that we would reframe any of the requirements or change any of the requirements, I request note those and do it before it goes out.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Jeff, before we go on the other issue was whether 50 percent of the open space maximum could come from the property. Could I have your thoughts on that?

JEFF ROBERTS: There's nothing -- I'll submit that there's nothing really scientific about a 50 percent figure. It's

really just, it's like I explained, splitting the difference between the desire to incentivize the federal site to be incorporated into the public open space system, but not to have the federal site absorb all of the open space in the public open space system. We could make the proportions different if we wanted to or we could take a different approach and just say well there's a certain amount that must be a part that's controlled by the City, and then that would necessarily exclude the federal site from being counted as part of that. So, again, this is one of those things where a lot more work will need to be done at the review stage, so by providing inability for the federal site to play a part in that open space and then when it gets looked at at the review stage, the Planning Board has a lot

more ability to get a good outcome.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I guess other -- I'm sorry, the other question I have is timing. You know, what is -- our constraints, the City Council's constraints, our constraints. I believe that things ought to be done in 2016 that GSA can do this in 2016. Where are we right now?

JEFF ROBERTS: I can't speak for the federal process with much certainty. I don't know what their -- I know they were in discussion about it today. While she's doing that, I'll look up the expiration of the zoning petition.

LIZA PADEN: February 8th.

JEFF ROBERTS: I won't bother.

IRAM FAROOQ: So I don't really have perfect answers about the timing other than to say that what we understand from the GSA

is that their -- they would like to go to -- put out an RFP next spring in order to meet the goal of having a contract signed with a potential developer with this current administration, because obviously the process takes sometime. And for all the reasons that Jeff spoke and you all have spoken about, it's from our perspective from the zoning was in place by the time the GSA puts out its RFP. So which essentially it means ideally this pick zoning cycle which expires in February. So there is a, there is a scenario where the City Council theoretically could vote in December, but I would say that that window is quickly disappearing.

The other scenario is that they might vote on it in January or February which only can happen if the zoning has been moved. My understanding is that only happens if the

zoning has moved to a second reading at City Council which means they do need to receive the Planning Board's recommendation unless they choose to act without it, which I would doubt. So the Ordinance Committee is still considering this. They have their next hearing on the 1st of December. So if the Ordinance Committee was to send it up to the full Council, they would be able to move it to a second reading before the end of the year. And then that could be enacted next year. If that doesn't happen, then it could expire and then be re-filed and be reconsidered and you would have another set of hearings in the spring.

So from our perspective, yes, it would be ideal if we could do -- if we can provide the Council with all of the possibility of being able to vote on it in the spring to be

able to keep advancing it, but, you know, the Council may choose not to do that. We don't really know for sure whether to go --

H. THEODORE COHEN: I guess my timing question was really if we were to say not to act this evening and suggest that given the four or five areas we might want to see some different language in, some proposed language, if that were able to come back to us say by the next meeting and we were then to vote on it at that time, does that work or is that --

IRAM FAROOQ: I think that would be challenging because the only date that that could possibly happen is, Liza, what, December?

LIZA PADEN: 8th.

IRAM FAROOQ: December 8th. So it would be very touch and go in terms of being

able to get it to Council in a timely fashion where they could act because they -- just because of the schedule of the Council this year. So there are two Council meetings in December, one is on the 7th and then the next one is on the 21st. So they would either have to choose to act without the Planning Board's recommendation -- I mean, to advance it to full Council without Planning Board's recommendation. Or if they chose to wait, it would be very difficult for them to move it in a timely fashion.

JOHN HAWKINSON: Or have a special meeting like yesterday.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And what if we were to make a recommendation this evening, but indicate that there were four or five areas where there was suggestions that language be modified?



IRAM FAROOQ: That's absolutely doable, and I think the Board has done that in the past because you can send, you can provide the signals as to what the issues are as well as some sense of direction, absolutely.

I would just throw one other question into the list that Jeff had which is the point that Susanne had raised about some language about the, you know, giving the Board some flexibility on the transportation analysis and what that, and utilizing that in order to, in order to influence the phasing of the project at the stage of Special Permit.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Hugh, did you want to comment?

HUGH RUSSELL: No, I think Iram actually answered the point I said. But I

think what we should do now is look at those five areas and sort out the ones that we want to have as full recommendations and ones we want to have as options, because I think we can do that pretty quickly.

H. THEODORE COHEN: If we could take a short break and just come back to talk about those issues.

(A short recess was taken.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: Steve, start.

STEVEN COHEN: Just for the sake of starting the conversation, you know, several issues we had, height was one I mentioned about this ten percent limit. And maybe for height, as for other things here, we can sort of include the most restrictive possible regulation but then provide that the Board could waive it. And so assuming that there's some rationale for that ten percent, you say

fine, there's that ten percent limit, but the Board can either waive it entirely or it can increase the ten percent to, you know, the 20 or 25 percent or something, but the point is to include the most restrictive and then give the Board the right to waive it. And in the same rationale could apply to open space. You know, I don't know and we don't know really in the ultimate planning how much open space you could get here. So maybe you require 30 percent or 33 percent, but, again, the Board could reduce it to as little as 25 percent. And it gives us a sector of flexibility depending on what's brought to us. You know, without such a provision we don't have the flexibility that we might want and need to come up with the best plan down the road.

The only other thing you're -- picking

up on some of the stuff that Jeff talked about, the pre-application meetings, I would -- especially for the master plan, you know, I would try to make it a mandatory sort of thing and not just for them to come and hear what we want, because at that point we don't really know what we want. What we -- I think, I think what we would like, certainly what I would like would be for them to come in with a preliminary massing study, you know, not well worked out stuff, but just blocks, some massing study of, you know, heights and then buildings and get some feedback from us at that point. So that, you know, we at least get an idea of what they're thinking and we can give them feedback long before they've put in tens of thousands of dollars of architectural work and study and they come to us with these fully baked plans,

and then we just feel like, you know, all we can do is, you know, work around the edges of the plan.

And one thing that I'm not clear about, where are we on the 500-foot height? Are we saying there's only one building?

H. THEODORE COHEN: That's what it says.

STEVEN COHEN: Exactly. So, you know, that could be waived. It could be permitted up to two buildings. I'm just looking for us to have as much flexibility as we can have to, you know, to help and motivate a developer to come up with a best plan that we think we can do. I'm looking to unshackle our review.

AHMED NUR: Mr. Chair, if I -- one opportunity to second that notion, why are we limiting ourselves in terms of flexibility?

Let us take a look at it when they -- when we are approached and presented with the stuff. If we're cutting already ourselves off the air at 500, we're going to go across the street and just build a 500 for them in Boston and they come in everyday.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: I'll have to agree with both of you. If we could get two taller buildings and eliminate a another -- eliminate a building from the site, it makes more sense. It's not as all pushed together. All the renderings seem to have everything big mass. And I know we're trying to avoid the shadow impact, so I don't know where they go or what they do, but we do need some more flexibility.

AHMED NUR: If anyone wants to see a 500, we just completed it right next to MGH. Right at the -- adjacent to the Boston

Garden. 41-story times 12 feet, 500.

That's, it's not big. It really isn't. You barely recognize it.

MARY FLYNN: I think you might, I think in that context you probably don't see it, but I think in Kendall Square you would. You know, it's going to be so much bigger than everything else. But, you know, times change. Maybe we'll have a Cambridge garden before it's over.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: If there's more green around it, around the site because we had two taller buildings.

MARY FLYNN: Yes, well, I agree the flexibility is important. I don't disagree. I just think that 500 feet is tall.

STEVEN COHEN: But we're not agreeing that we want that.

MARY FLYNN: Right, no, I

understand.

STEVEN COHEN: We're just trying to give us the discretion if we're persuaded.

MARY FLYNN: I understand.

I also think that the notion that Jeff talked about the parking for office being the same as R&D, again, that could be framed as most restrictive as Steve was saying and then, you know, giving the Planning Board the option to go back up to, you know, what the parking ratio would be for office if we left it that way. So, you know, obviously this is going to take time to develop, and all of the transportation issues are going to keep evolving over time. So, again, I think more flexibility is better so I agree, let's be restrictive but give flexibility.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: I got one more, Ted, and I don't know --



H. THEODORE COHEN: Let's --

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Just a quick question actually.

H. THEODORE COHEN: All right.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Is there any way we can get information on the guidelines that the feds would use on their piece just to get a general knowledge of what they would require themselves to have for open space and so forth? What their -- what they would use in building out their section of this. It might help to see what their kind of expected to build or to do.

IRAM FAROOQ: So the Council is asking very similar questions and we've conveyed that to the GSA and they often have people in the audience who are listening as well. So they know that we need the specificity. They are working -- what

they've said to us is that they themselves are working to develop things like here's the amount of open space we will require or here's the, here's the actual program for their building. So that is all under development. And they've obviously given themselves time until they have to put out the RFP. So they -- because they are working with Volpe and with other state -- federal agencies to make those determinations. They did share with us in -- which we had shown in an earlier presentation, the nature of open space and public space that they now build. But that amount they have not provided to us. So since they have been working with us collaboratively, we are taking that at face value, that they are still in progress trying to pin those numbers down.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Hugh.

HUGH RUSSELL: So I'm trying to interpret what I've just heard, and I think we all are on board with the recommendation on the parking as Jeff stated. That would clarify -- that would set a hard limit on the doable amount of parking based on the hard, the calculation and that would solve the problem. I think we all want flexibility on the height and the amount of volume above 250 feet, and so I would think we should propose that we move some of those requirements over to the guidelines. That gives us the maximum flexibility.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, can I just stop you there. Are we saying that we can go above -- the 500 feet will be a guideline and that --

HUGH RUSSELL: I wouldn't --

H. THEODORE COHEN: Pardon?

HUGH RUSSELL: I wouldn't -- I disagree with my colleague. I think we have to set a hard line. I think --

H. THEODORE COHEN: That's what I'm trying to figure out.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, I think we need to leave that hard line in, but I think we should take the amount and the floor plates and that stuff as no longer being hard limits but to be guidelines. That gives us the flexibility and the number of (inaudible), all of those pieces.

H. THEODORE COHEN: You're suggesting -- I think we're going to have to break this down into a lot of different pieces.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: That there be a limit, an absolute limit of 500 feet, but

that the number of buildings that might be 500 feet could be greater than one. And that --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: It would be greater than 350 feet.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right. That would be greater than 350 feet.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Right.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Up to a maximum of 500.

STEVEN COHEN: What's the significance of the 350?

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: (Inaudible).

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, the 350 was --

STEVEN COHEN: If we're saying anything goes up to 500, what's the 350?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, the 500 still has got to be one or more buildings of

architectural significance.

HUGH RUSSELL: The 350 came in in terms of really, 250 is sort of a notion of that's what we like to see, but we're allowing ten percent of the site under the present formulation to go up to 350 and one of those buildings to go to 500.

STEVEN COHEN: Right.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And the 350 is in only one portion of the district.

HUGH RUSSELL: Correct.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Because other portions have different limitations.

STEVEN COHEN: No, I understand how it is now. I'm trying to understand what Hugh is proposing.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: That type of residential.

STEVEN COHEN: And whether 350 still

plays a role.

HUGH RUSSELL: I would say that we would keep those same things, but they would be guidelines rather than specific formulas. It would be a guideline that, you know, the amount of area on the site that went over 350 feet was ten percent, but it's only a good line so you don't need elaborate language that says somebody comes in at 12 percent, we've got to do something.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, I'm afraid if we just leave everything so open, that City Council is going to feel well, what's going to end up here? And that it might make sense to leave, say, the ten percent using that as an example, as the requirement by which the provision is in an appropriate circumstances that could be waived.

STEVEN COHEN: Mostly the same

thing --

H. THEODORE COHEN: I know it amounts to the same thing.

STEVEN COHEN: No, I'm agreeing. That's what I proposed.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I think, you know, it's totally open. If it's going to be a lot of opposition to it.

STEVEN COHEN: Well, I'm just saying to, Hugh, I think --

HUGH RUSSELL: I think functionally they're the same thing. I think that we can -- and I don't think it -- I think we want something that works. So I would say we put this in exactly how this is implemented and throw it to our brothers and sisters on the Council via the staff.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right.

HUGH RUSSELL: And so we're saying



if you want more flexibility, there are a couple of ways of to do it.

STEVEN COHEN: But this level of detail you don't want to leave to the Council. I mean this -- either we do it or staff does it, but this is not a level of detail that the Council is equipped to deal with, I think, about exactly what that mechanism is.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. Which is why I prefer myself to say, okay, it's in the guidelines, and not in the Ordinance, but my colleagues feel the alternative formulation of it's a rule but we can break it, and so whether they want to see the proposal, I'm happy to endorse that.

STEVEN COHEN: I just don't understand what you mean by a guideline. Would you be saying that there's a hard limit

of 500? There's a guideline, though, of doing this or this?

HUGH RUSSELL: Right.

STEVEN COHEN: But, but I mean there's no normal mechanism for a waiver of it?

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: You don't need a waiver if it's a guideline.

STEVEN COHEN: Yes, exactly.

STUART DASH: In either case the developer would have to make a case to the Board that it should be different, and the case is just a little bit stronger with something where it says that to get the waiver you have to show the Board it's a better outcome. And with the guidelines you're showing the Board it's a better outcome. It's a similar notion.

STEVEN COHEN: How would you guys --

because we're agreeing in concept, so it's just the mechanism. You know, do you call it just a waiver or do you say that it's ten percent -- I'm sorry, you call it just a guideline or do you say that, you know, that the ten percent limit but it can be waived?

JEFF ROBERTS: If the Board really thinks that it's important to and agrees that it's important to promote this sort of layered approach to heights, which is really what the intent is, to have certain cut-off points to result in a variety of heights at the different levels rather than, you know, single masses just up standing out on their own in one height. Then putting it -- keeping it in the zoning but allowing the Planning Board to waive it means that when they come to us as staff, we can tell them this is the requirement and if you want to do

something different, you have to really convince the Board that it's a better idea. So that is the stronger way to do it in -- from that point of view of trying to get it early in the process. And I mean another -- I mean it's sort of the same point, but you know, developers will usually start by saying, you know, what are our -- what are our real limits? And then from there they will work with the guidelines. So, again, it's really just a question of how strong and how firm does the Board suggest that we should be.

AHMED NUR: And I'm convinced by your suggestion.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I think the waiver makes more sense. So what we're -- to be clear, so we're still saying there's 500-foot limit --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Right.

H. THEODORE COHEN: -- on one or more buildings. And to go beyond that they have to get a Variance?

HUGH RUSSELL: Or rezoning.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Or a rezoning, right.

IRAM FAROOQ: Well, how many more?

STEVEN COHEN: We're saying that there's a ten percent limit on height in excess of 250 feet which can be waived.

H. THEODORE COHEN: No, no, no. The ten percent is something different. Let's just stick with the height limit. I mean, I think Hugh is strongly opposed to anything over 500 feet?

AHMED NUR: You do?

HUGH RUSSELL: I am opposed because I think from a public expectation point of

view we want to say that's it.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: I agree.

STEVEN COHEN: Okay. I think we all agree with that.

HUGH RUSSELL: Personally I think 500, 600, it's not that -- you can hardly tell.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: But it should be a hard cap.

STEVEN COHEN: This is a hard number. 500 feet is a hard number.

H. THEODORE COHEN: The number of buildings, and so the Ordinance as proposed now says one.

STEVEN COHEN: One building in excess of 350.

H. THEODORE COHEN: One building in excess of 350.

STEVEN COHEN: But no greater than 500.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right. One building in excess of 350 up to 500 if it's architecturally significant.

Are we saying more than one building?

HUGH RUSSELL: I think we should have the ability to waive that requirement.

H. THEODORE COHEN: All right.

IRAM FAROOQ: And do you want to limit that to a certain number or do you just want to --

AHMED NUR: No, just flexible. Really make it flexible.

HUGH RUSSELL: I think the overall numbers on the site being that --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: It's not going to be six.

MARY FLYNN: It's not going to be a

lot.

AHMED NUR: The building, we're up to three.

IRAM FAROOQ: And then the ten percent.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And so then the ten percent is that the buildings up to three -- up to 350 or going up to 500 can only cover ten percent of the --

AHMED NUR: Area.

H. THEODORE COHEN: -- of the area. Well, it's in the one district, but it's still the 62,000 square feet.

STEVEN COHEN: Right, and that too can be waived. That's what I'm proposing.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Yes, it would be subject to waiver.

THACHER TIFFANY: It's over 250.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right, the ten



percent is over --

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: That extra height wasn't tied to just the residential building?

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: No, it's not.

H. THEODORE COHEN: It's not tied into anything.

HUGH RUSSELL: At one point it was.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: That's what I'm trying to keep on running the tapes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And a developer could -- that height would be difficult for residential.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY:  
Correct. So we can't.

STEVEN COHEN: Can you explain to me, though, I mean, you know, if you have a building within a wider base and then it

starts doing the usual wedding cake thing  
what is it that the ten percent applies to?

HUGH RUSSELL: So the, it's how  
much --

STEVEN COHEN: Which portion of the  
footprint?

HUGH RUSSELL: How much of the air  
space above 250 feet can have buildings in  
it?

STEVEN COHEN: So you're basically  
looking at the footprint of the massing  
above --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: At that  
height.

STEVEN COHEN: 250?

IRAM FAROOQ: 250.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: As the  
plane cuts the grid.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Really? Because

I always thought it was.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: No.

It's as the plane cuts through it --

H. THEODORE COHEN: I thought the 62,000 was the footprint of the building.

H. THEODORE COHEN. It was the plane.

AHMED NUR: (Inaudible).

THACHER TIFFANY: And may --

HUGH RUSSELL: 250 years from now when that's the sea level, that's all you'll see.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Suzannah's presentation had some really excellent diagrams showing the plane cutting through it.

H. THEODORE COHEN: All right. So we are in agreement that that ten percent could be waived, too?

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: All right, so the other issues that --

HUGH RUSSELL: The open space.

H. THEODORE COHEN: The open space, oh, that's right, yes.

HUGH RUSSELL: And what I would like to do with the open space is I'd like to not -- I'd like to give that as a tool to the CDD Department as some suggestions if the Council wishes to increase the open space. Here's a couple of suggestions of how they might do it.

H. THEODORE COHEN: So leave the current 25 percent minimum?

HUGH RUSSELL: And the recommendation and the actual it's written in the language.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And then say

that --

HUGH RUSSELL: If you feel that you have to do this, this is how we think you ought to do it.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: But do we get the 25 percent on the private side?

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: No, that's not what it says. We get --

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Well, I know what it says. We're writing it what it says.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Right. Because we can't control what's on the federal side, right? And we've down from 40 to 25, already, right? This started out that way.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: The total nature of open space has changed from publicly accessible to public.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Right. And --

HUGH RUSSELL: And I think --

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: -- so if the feds say it's too scary and we don't have any public access, we lose half of the -- possibly half of the open space?

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. I think they have the wrong number myself. The DOT building is ten percent of the building development. So ten percent of the development adding 50 percent of the open space doesn't make sense to me. I think it's the --

MARY FLYNN: Yeah.

HUGH RUSSELL: I mean, I think if they could take a 25 percent or 20 percent, but still because I don't think you can design that to achieve the open space guidelines if half of it's in the federal

camp.

STEVEN COHEN: So what's the number, 20, 25?

HUGH RUSSELL: I think something like that. Indicative of twice as much as every proportion as the other people, that would be --

STEVEN COHEN: That would be 20.

H. THEODORE COHEN: That's 20 percent.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: It seems --

AHMED NUR: 20 percent sounds good.

HUGH RUSSELL: If you learn from GSA then they're going to require more, then I think we have to go to a new thinking which is well that extra space in the federal is -- we're not comfortable saying it's going to achieve the public open space goals because.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: It's

not --

HUGH RUSSELL: We can't, ultimate -- they're making decisions about other open space using as much as they would like it to be used by the public and the -- what's that, the guy from GSA showed us all those pictures of what they've been doing. You know, still, another event or two aimed at the noxious government facilities might change, might require them to.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Put a fence around the whole thing.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. Just like what it's like today.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Right, right back here again.

AHMED NUR: We should do the 20 percent because we don't know what the --

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: I would like



to control as much as we can on the private side.

JEFF ROBERTS: I want to put one thing out there, this could be a complicated thing especially late. And it's important to know that we're not really controlling the amount of open space that's going to be on the federal site. We're not really controlling that in any way.

HUGH RUSSELL: Can't.

JEFF ROBERTS: All we're doing is saying do we count that as the total open space system? We could say no. We could say well, no, we don't think that should count and then that would be, either doing that or making a very small core allowing a very small percentage, but essentially be saying okay, we're not -- we don't, we don't really think this is public open space, so you know,

it would sort of be, it's sort of a disincentive to making it public open space.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: But it's not really a public open space if they could shut it off.

STUART DASH: It could be, that's what we're trying --

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: I understand it could be. But if we put it on the private side it will be.

STUART DASH: If we go with the assumption that something in the order of federal property out of 14, around 21 percent. So that's what we've been trying. So you could sort of bump it up from there and say no, no more than something like 25 percent or that kind of thing, you would be in the ballpark closer to what you would say rather than, you know, 50 is too high.

AHMED NUR: Yes.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: 20 percent sounds good.

AHMED NUR: 20 percent sounds good to all of us.

MARY FLYNN: Me, too.

HUGH RUSSELL: The other thing to remember from the pictures you were shown in the federal open spaces, they seem to be two distances off in the building. There was like the first so many feet were really not accessible, but then there was more land that was accessible and intensively developed for public use. So that's what we have to expect, that the result -- that will be the result of it.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right, I mean right now in Boston you've got the O'Neill building which has got bollards all around it

and, you know, you can't get in it. Versus the Moakley Courthouse on the harbor which is just --

STEVEN COHEN: Wide open.

H. THEODORE COHEN: -- wide open.

HUGH RUSSELL: And the Federal Reserve is halfway in between.

H. THEODORE COHEN: It's wide open until you walk inside.

HUGH RUSSELL: Pedestrians have free access.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right.

HUGH RUSSELL: The vehicular barriers out at street level.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right.

HUGH RUSSELL: And that limits these open space.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I mean it seems 20 percent is --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: It seems reasonable.

H. THEODORE COHEN: -- a fair reasonable --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: And, again, if it's not, when they come back with an RFP, they will tell us.

MARY FLYNN: Right, right, yeah.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And so then the last question is --

JEFF ROBERTS: Before you get away from that question, is this one of the provisions that you want to give Planning Board flexibility on or is this a hard not modifiable.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I think 20 percent is a hard --

JEFF ROBERTS: Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: That -- not more

than 20 percent from the federal can be counted towards the total amount of open space that's required which then brings us to the next question of is that number still 25 percent or do we pick a higher number and say it can be waived?

HUGH RUSSELL: I think the political thing is if the Council -- I think we should give the Council the ability to raise that number a little bit, but I think we should say if you do raise it, you should give us the ability to make that, to waive it if we have to.

STEVEN COHEN: But no lower than 25.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Suggesting leaving it at 25 and let them raise it if they want to subject to --

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

STEVEN COHEN: But if you have that?

If the City Council wants to raise the number, that we still have the right to, you know, by waiver reduce the number as low as 25.

AHMED NUR: Mr. Chair, can I just --

HUGH RUSSELL: Which is the highest in the district in the city.

AHMED NUR: Mr. Chair, can I add a quick note on the open space suggestion.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes.

AHMED NUR: Since we live in winter land and we have all this open space, I wondered if maybe if 10,000 let's say, minimum of 5,000 to 10,000 could be enclosed glass for all year round public space, whether it's food, vegetable market, and whatever it is, and we're not just piling snow on it, and no one can go near it during the winter. I wonder if anyone is interested

in putting something like that in the zoning language that way.

HUGH RUSSELL: If we allowed such space to be counted as open space --

AHMED NUR: It's open space.

HUGH RUSSELL: -- is 20 percent.  
I'm not sure.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: The design --

HUGH RUSSELL: Some of the open space can be covered, weather protected.

AHMED NUR: Yeah.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Flexible space for sure.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And whatever the proposal is because if we tell them they have to do it, then there will be people saying well, we want a large space where we can celebrate the Patriots victory, you know, at the Superbowl.



AHMED NUR: Okay, sure.

HUGH RUSSELL: (Inaudible).

H. THEODORE COHEN: Move to  
Cambridge.

And then I think we're all in agreement  
that the idea, you know, required the  
development coming at some earlier stage.

STEVEN COHEN: With the massing  
study? Usually they just come in and say  
here I am.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: This is what  
we're trying to do.

STEVEN COHEN: It doesn't do us any  
good.

HUGH RUSSELL: And the PUD is  
approved with illustrative massing for all  
the blocks. That was, that was where it was  
when the PUD was approved. You know, you  
know, in accordance with that but not in

accordance with that but in accordance so far. And it's so we have had other people coming in with PUDs with building designs.

STEVEN COHEN: Right.

HUGH RUSSELL: Do we have an opinion as to what, is this any different than we let the proponent decide? Weren't they representing at the PUD level?

STEVEN COHEN: My only fear, Hugh, is that the, you know, on the one hand you say well, the more advanced the design, the better for us. I'm afraid as a practical manner the more the design, the more constrained we feel and we end up just as I said, you know, just working around the edges rather than really making substantial changes. And if they just come in with a massing study, you know, then we feel like we have full flexibility. Well, no, you know, I

mean you can move the masses around. That's too tall, how about moving this around? So I, I feel actually it works better for us if we just have that massive study in that first meeting.

HUGH RUSSELL: I would say massing/open space.

STEVEN COHEN: Well, yes, exactly. That's what I mean.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: And we could do this again.

IRAM FAROOQ: Well, what I was going to say is that we don't really know for sure what the GSA's going to be asking for in their request for proposals, but I'm sure they will ask for more information than just for the Volpe building. So there will be some material that will be available about their thoughts for the sake as early as when

the developer is selected. So they should be able to come to us for this project particularly very early in the process. So you could have that and then you could still have -- we could just invite them to come and talk to the Board and hear about our --

H. THEODORE COHEN: But massing/open space --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Phase.

H. THEODORE COHEN: -- would be the right place to do that.

Are there any other points that we need to address?

(No Response.)

IRAM FAROOQ: Would the Board be comfortable with us adding the transportation language that Susanne talked about?

MARY FLYNN: Yes.

JEFF ROBERTS: To be clear about

that, what we would be looking at is taking the existing language in the zoning that talks about traffic, required traffic mitigation measures and bolstering that a bit with more discussion of overall transportation network capacity including transportation.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: I think the reason you haven't heard much discussion with it is that everyone is on board that it's necessary and appropriate in this case.

IRAM FAROOQ: Okay.

MARY FLYNN: Yes.

AHMED NUR: Speaking about it, I'd like to hear what my Board Members need to say about the canal, Broad Canal extension. Maybe a water taxi. I mean, we're going to come to that with this traffic back and forth.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: A water feature in this place would be really nice.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: But it doesn't need to be in the zoning. It would -- let's see what the proposal has. We'll have heard from the community.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Design guidelines.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Right. Connect Kendall.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right, the other thing that you have to think about if you extend the water service at Broad Canal and it's going to be 10 or 15 people pedestrian walking surface and that produces big design challenges, you know, do you want to go up to a railing and look down at a kayak? I mean, the present Broad Canal has a number of interesting features; like the pedestrian

walkways go down, they get close to the water. The whole area's stepped down, and of course, the land I think is sloping down there so it's a little higher by the time you get to Volpe. And on the other hand, what happened, though, there must have been stonewalls on that canal.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: The Sixth Street canal?

HUGH RUSSELL: So maybe it's just sitting there in the parking lot.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: I know that gets filled.

JOHN HAWKINSON: Allegedly. That's what the brick proposal said.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: This would come into the cool design.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yeah.

H. THEODORE COHEN: All sorts of

federal agencies like to expand the Broad Canal which may be --

HUGH RUSSELL: Warfare to protect themselves.

AHMED NUR: Sorry, guys, carry on.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: That's a good idea.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Are there any other points that we have not addressed?

MARY FLYNN: I don't think so.

H. THEODORE COHEN: All right, so then I guess I would suggest that we recommend to the City Council that they adopt the zoning for Section 13.10 in substantially the format as presented in the staff revisions dated November 9, 2015, as further amended by the couple of comments we've made today with regard to definite limitations and with suggestions that if they change the



other areas that we suggested this evening, that those changes be made in accordance with the further recommendations that we just discussed which would be that the 500-foot height would be fixed but we, the Planning Board could waive the number of -- the -- not necessarily be limited to one, but the Planning Board could waive to have more than one.

That the percentage of the overall development that can be used for buildings in excess of 250 feet is fixed at ten percent, but that that number could be waived.

That the open space would be a minimum of 25 percent, but that if it were increased, that the, there should be a provision for reducing it by waiver from the Planning Board but no less than 25 percent.

That no more than 20 percent of the

required public open space could be accommodated on federal land.

That there would be an early involvement process which would require the developers to come into the Planning Board at a minimum, with a massing and open space plan.

And that there would be reference to transportation requirements in the TDM and other plans.

STEVEN COHEN: Ted, just my understanding is that for all of that, those were actually part of that -- our proposal except for open space, and that it was only an open space where we said if they want to increase the open space --

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right.

STEVEN COHEN: -- then we're giving them a few ways.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right.

STEVEN COHEN: But the other ones  
are explicit --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY:  
Recommendations.

STEVEN COHEN: -- recommendations.

MARY FLYNN: And the parking one.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Yes.

MARY FLYNN: Office.

H. THEODORE COHEN: The parking  
requirement for office and R&D would be the  
same at the higher level which I guess is the  
office.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: At the  
higher level?

MARY FLYNN: No, the lower level.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: The  
lower level which is the R&D.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Which is the

R&D.

Someone be willing to make that motion?

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: I think you get a so moved on that.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Someone willing to second it?

MARY FLYNN: Second. Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: All those in favor?

(Raising hands.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: All those opposed?

(No Response.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: It's unanimous. Well, this was great. Thank you, all.

(Whereupon, at 11:30 p.m., the Planning Board Adjourned.)

\* \* \* \* \*

**ERRATA SHEET AND SIGNATURE INSTRUCTIONS**

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

**INSTRUCTIONS**

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

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

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 4th day of December, 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.**

\$	2	29 <sup>[1]</sup> - 238:14	190:18, 191:1, 191:16, 195:16, 196:19, 197:2, 197:10, 197:17, 197:18, 198:7, 202:1, 205:16, 206:7, 206:12, 207:2, 207:4, 208:8	A
<p><b>\$10</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 54:6, 74:15  <b>\$188</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 84:19  <b>\$283</b> <sup>[3]</sup> - 84:1, 97:19,  100:7  <b>\$325,000</b> <sup>[3]</sup> - 14:14,  17:7, 28:8  <b>\$35</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 18:12  <b>\$40</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 88:19  <b>\$400</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 105:3  <b>\$58</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 83:14, 89:2</p>	<p><b>2,972,000</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 76:14  <b>2.110</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 2:10, 9:4  <b>20</b> <sup>[16]</sup> - 14:18, 111:2,  187:3, 214:16,  215:3, 215:8, 215:9,  215:12, 216:17,  219:2, 219:4,  220:19, 221:16,  222:1, 224:6,  233:19  <b>200</b> <sup>[3]</sup> - 103:16,  160:19, 173:5  <b>200,000</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 12:17,  98:2  <b>2011</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 35:7  <b>2012</b> <sup>[9]</sup> - 64:3, 65:19,  66:11, 66:14, 67:14,  68:1, 70:14, 71:19,  72:11  <b>2014</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 40:3  <b>2015</b> <sup>[9]</sup> - 1:4, 2:15,  12:3, 14:19, 80:6,  85:15, 232:16,  238:9  <b>2016</b> <sup>[3]</sup> - 156:10,  180:7, 180:8  <b>2017</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 156:10  <b>2022</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 238:14  <b>2030</b> <sup>[4]</sup> - 66:15,  66:18, 67:6, 68:9  <b>20th</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 90:3  <b>21</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 12:3, 218:13  <b>213</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 120:7  <b>21st</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 184:6  <b>240,000</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 84:13  <b>25</b> <sup>[17]</sup> - 139:2,  139:11, 164:9,  187:4, 187:12,  212:15, 213:6,  213:15, 214:16,  215:3, 218:16,  222:4, 222:14,  222:16, 223:4,  233:15, 233:18  <b>250</b> <sup>[15]</sup> - 48:2, 150:3,  150:5, 150:6,  160:19, 173:6,  195:9, 198:3,  205:11, 208:18,  210:8, 210:15,  210:16, 211:10,  233:12  <b>250-foot</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 48:18,  173:10  <b>2500</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 51:15  <b>257</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 124:10  <b>269</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 113:2  <b>280</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 103:16</p>	<p><b>3</b></p> <p><b>30</b> <sup>[6]</sup> - 139:6, 162:3,  164:8, 168:15,  168:16, 187:11  <b>300</b> <sup>[3]</sup> - 28:9, 37:14,  100:6  <b>300,000</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 18:5,  18:15  <b>303</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 90:11,  102:16  <b>31</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 120:12  <b>33</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 66:15, 187:11  <b>34</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 3:9  <b>344</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 1:6  <b>350</b> <sup>[20]</sup> - 49:4, 50:19,  136:8, 150:4,  160:15, 161:1,  197:5, 197:7,  197:12, 197:14,  197:17, 198:2,  198:6, 198:9,  198:19, 199:6,  206:17, 206:19,  207:4, 208:8  <b>358</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 102:2  <b>38</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 101:11,  115:12</p>	<p><b>500,000</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 18:16  <b>500-foot</b> <sup>[3]</sup> - 189:5,  204:19, 233:4  <b>50s</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 158:1  <b>540</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 116:5</p>	<p><b>ability</b> <sup>[6]</sup> - 46:18,  50:17, 180:1, 207:8,  222:9, 222:12  <b>able</b> <sup>[12]</sup> - 37:10,  78:14, 103:7,  103:19, 118:3,  182:9, 182:19,  183:1, 183:9, 184:1,  228:2  <b>absolute</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 196:19  <b>absolutely</b> <sup>[5]</sup> - 30:7,  105:18, 148:15,  185:1, 185:6  <b>absorb</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 179:6  <b>abuts</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 129:8  <b>abutter</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 26:15,  102:17  <b>abutters</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 143:17,  144:4  <b>accelerated</b> <sup>[2]</sup> -  71:15, 72:5  <b>accept</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 7:16  <b>access</b> <sup>[7]</sup> - 11:7,  14:2, 57:15, 60:18,  61:19, 214:5,  220:11  <b>accessible</b> <sup>[4]</sup> -  109:4, 213:19,  219:12, 219:13  <b>accommodate</b> <sup>[2]</sup> -  58:7, 118:4  <b>accommodated</b> <sup>[1]</sup> -  234:2  <b>accommodating</b> <sup>[1]</sup> -  119:8  <b>accomplish</b> <sup>[1]</sup> -  133:6  <b>accordance</b> <sup>[6]</sup> -  32:1, 32:2, 225:19,  226:1, 233:2  <b>according</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 94:16  <b>account</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 157:7  <b>accurate</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 237:16,  238:7  <b>accustomed</b> <sup>[1]</sup> -  22:18  <b>achieve</b> <sup>[4]</sup> - 109:8,  148:10, 214:18,  215:18  <b>acknowledge</b> <sup>[3]</sup> -  42:7, 44:6, 173:4  <b>acknowledging</b> <sup>[1]</sup> -  170:18  <b>acres</b> <sup>[4]</sup> - 109:6,  123:6, 123:10,  131:12  <b>act</b> <sup>[5]</sup> - 157:5, 182:4,  183:6, 184:2, 184:7</p>
1			6	
<p><b>1,042</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 2:6, 8:16  <b>1.1</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 53:1  <b>1.6</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 52:19  <b>1.75</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 109:6  <b>10</b> <sup>[6]</sup> - 38:14, 100:16,  101:4, 150:2,  160:14, 230:14  <b>10,000</b> <sup>[3]</sup> - 12:18,  223:13, 223:14  <b>100</b> <sup>[8]</sup> - 67:6, 67:9,  100:16, 101:4,  104:16, 132:3,  138:3, 176:9  <b>1000</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 20:14,  94:13  <b>101</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 64:9  <b>10th</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 6:10  <b>11:30</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 236:16  <b>12</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 191:1, 199:9  <b>13</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 71:4  <b>13.10</b> <sup>[3]</sup> - 3:5, 34:7,  232:14  <b>13th</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 7:10  <b>14</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 131:12,  218:13  <b>147703</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 238:13  <b>15</b> <sup>[5]</sup> - 38:14, 42:1,  76:16, 81:4, 230:14  <b>15,000</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 48:15,  48:17  <b>15-minute</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 23:11  <b>150</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 71:11  <b>155</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 83:15  <b>17</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 1:4, 13:2  <b>17th</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 4:3  <b>18</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 40:3  <b>188,000</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 98:2  <b>18th</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 6:1  <b>19-story</b> <sup>[3]</sup> - 21:2,  22:8, 24:8  <b>199</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 83:16  <b>19th</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 6:4  <b>1st</b> <sup>[3]</sup> - 5:6, 5:19,  182:7</p>	<p><b>2011</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 35:7  <b>2012</b> <sup>[9]</sup> - 64:3, 65:19,  66:11, 66:14, 67:14,  68:1, 70:14, 71:19,  72:11  <b>2014</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 40:3  <b>2015</b> <sup>[9]</sup> - 1:4, 2:15,  12:3, 14:19, 80:6,  85:15, 232:16,  238:9  <b>2016</b> <sup>[3]</sup> - 156:10,  180:7, 180:8  <b>2017</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 156:10  <b>2022</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 238:14  <b>2030</b> <sup>[4]</sup> - 66:15,  66:18, 67:6, 68:9  <b>20th</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 90:3  <b>21</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 12:3, 218:13  <b>213</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 120:7  <b>21st</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 184:6  <b>240,000</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 84:13  <b>25</b> <sup>[17]</sup> - 139:2,  139:11, 164:9,  187:4, 187:12,  212:15, 213:6,  213:15, 214:16,  215:3, 218:16,  222:4, 222:14,  222:16, 223:4,  233:15, 233:18  <b>250</b> <sup>[15]</sup> - 48:2, 150:3,  150:5, 150:6,  160:19, 173:6,  195:9, 198:3,  205:11, 208:18,  210:8, 210:15,  210:16, 211:10,  233:12  <b>250-foot</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 48:18,  173:10  <b>2500</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 51:15  <b>257</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 124:10  <b>269</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 113:2  <b>280</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 103:16</p>	<p><b>3</b></p> <p><b>30</b> <sup>[6]</sup> - 139:6, 162:3,  164:8, 168:15,  168:16, 187:11  <b>300</b> <sup>[3]</sup> - 28:9, 37:14,  100:6  <b>300,000</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 18:5,  18:15  <b>303</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 90:11,  102:16  <b>31</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 120:12  <b>33</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 66:15, 187:11  <b>34</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 3:9  <b>344</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 1:6  <b>350</b> <sup>[20]</sup> - 49:4, 50:19,  136:8, 150:4,  160:15, 161:1,  197:5, 197:7,  197:12, 197:14,  197:17, 198:2,  198:6, 198:9,  198:19, 199:6,  206:17, 206:19,  207:4, 208:8  <b>358</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 102:2  <b>38</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 101:11,  115:12</p>	<p><b>6</b></p> <p><b>6</b> <sup>[7]</sup> - 2:8, 2:18, 3:3,  8:15, 11:3, 11:5,  14:11  <b>60</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 128:1  <b>600</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 206:7  <b>617.786.7783/617.</b>  <b>639.0396</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 1:19  <b>62,000</b> <sup>[3]</sup> - 48:13,  208:13, 211:5  <b>65</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 76:18  <b>67</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 74:15  <b>6:30</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 125:14  <b>6th</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 7:10</p>	<p><b>6</b></p> <p><b>6</b> <sup>[7]</sup> - 2:8, 2:18, 3:3,  8:15, 11:3, 11:5,  14:11  <b>60</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 128:1  <b>600</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 206:7  <b>617.786.7783/617.</b>  <b>639.0396</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 1:19  <b>62,000</b> <sup>[3]</sup> - 48:13,  208:13, 211:5  <b>65</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 76:18  <b>67</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 74:15  <b>6:30</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 125:14  <b>6th</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 7:10</p>
			7	
<p><b>1,042</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 2:6, 8:16  <b>1.1</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 53:1  <b>1.6</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 52:19  <b>1.75</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 109:6  <b>10</b> <sup>[6]</sup> - 38:14, 100:16,  101:4, 150:2,  160:14, 230:14  <b>10,000</b> <sup>[3]</sup> - 12:18,  223:13, 223:14  <b>100</b> <sup>[8]</sup> - 67:6, 67:9,  100:16, 101:4,  104:16, 132:3,  138:3, 176:9  <b>1000</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 20:14,  94:13  <b>101</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 64:9  <b>10th</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 6:10  <b>11:30</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 236:16  <b>12</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 191:1, 199:9  <b>13</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 71:4  <b>13.10</b> <sup>[3]</sup> - 3:5, 34:7,  232:14  <b>13th</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 7:10  <b>14</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 131:12,  218:13  <b>147703</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 238:13  <b>15</b> <sup>[5]</sup> - 38:14, 42:1,  76:16, 81:4, 230:14  <b>15,000</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 48:15,  48:17  <b>15-minute</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 23:11  <b>150</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 71:11  <b>155</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 83:15  <b>17</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 1:4, 13:2  <b>17th</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 4:3  <b>18</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 40:3  <b>188,000</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 98:2  <b>18th</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 6:1  <b>19-story</b> <sup>[3]</sup> - 21:2,  22:8, 24:8  <b>199</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 83:16  <b>19th</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 6:4  <b>1st</b> <sup>[3]</sup> - 5:6, 5:19,  182:7</p>	<p><b>2011</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 35:7  <b>2012</b> <sup>[9]</sup> - 64:3, 65:19,  66:11, 66:14, 67:14,  68:1, 70:14, 71:19,  72:11  <b>2014</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 40:3  <b>2015</b> <sup>[9]</sup> - 1:4, 2:15,  12:3, 14:19, 80:6,  85:15, 232:16,  238:9  <b>2016</b> <sup>[3]</sup> - 156:10,  180:7, 180:8  <b>2017</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 156:10  <b>2022</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 238:14  <b>2030</b> <sup>[4]</sup> - 66:15,  66:18, 67:6, 68:9  <b>20th</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 90:3  <b>21</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 12:3, 218:13  <b>213</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 120:7  <b>21st</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 184:6  <b>240,000</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 84:13  <b>25</b> <sup>[17]</sup> - 139:2,  139:11, 164:9,  187:4, 187:12,  212:15, 213:6,  213:15, 214:16,  215:3, 218:16,  222:4, 222:14,  222:16, 223:4,  233:15, 233:18  <b>250</b> <sup>[15]</sup> - 48:2, 150:3,  150:5, 150:6,  160:19, 173:6,  195:9, 198:3,  205:11, 208:18,  210:8, 210:15,  210:16, 211:10,  233:12  <b>250-foot</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 48:18,  173:10  <b>2500</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 51:15  <b>257</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 124:10  <b>269</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 113:2  <b>280</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 103:16</p>	<p><b>4</b></p> <p><b>4</b> <sup>[5]</sup> - 2:3, 22:1, 37:3,  37:7, 114:13  <b>40</b> <sup>[3]</sup> - 115:13, 141:8,  213:14  <b>400</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 100:6  <b>40A</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 174:7  <b>40s</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 157:19  <b>41-stories</b> <sup>[1]</sup> -  136:17  <b>41-story</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 191:1  <b>413</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 102:2  <b>45</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 127:2  <b>4th</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 238:9</p>	<p><b>7</b></p> <p><b>7</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 2:4  <b>7.3</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 111:13  <b>70</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 128:1  <b>700</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 137:3  <b>7:00</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 1:5, 2:6  <b>7th</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 184:5</p>	<p><b>7</b></p> <p><b>7</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 2:4  <b>7.3</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 111:13  <b>70</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 128:1  <b>700</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 137:3  <b>7:00</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 1:5, 2:6  <b>7th</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 184:5</p>
			8	
<p><b>1,042</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 2:6, 8:16  <b>1.1</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 53:1  <b>1.6</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 52:19  <b>1.75</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 109:6  <b>10</b> <sup>[6]</sup> - 38:14, 100:16,  101:4, 150:2,  160:14, 230:14  <b>10,000</b> <sup>[3]</sup> - 12:18,  223:13, 223:14  <b>100</b> <sup>[8]</sup> - 67:6, 67:9,  100:16, 101:4,  104:16, 132:3,  138:3, 176:9  <b>1000</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 20:14,  94:13  <b>101</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 64:9  <b>10th</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 6:10  <b>11:30</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 236:16  <b>12</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 191:1, 199:9  <b>13</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 71:4  <b>13.10</b> <sup>[3]</sup> - 3:5, 34:7,  232:14  <b>13th</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 7:10  <b>14</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 131:12,  218:13  <b>147703</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 238:13  <b>15</b> <sup>[5]</sup> - 38:14, 42:1,  76:16, 81:4, 230:14  <b>15,000</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 48:15,  48:17  <b>15-minute</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 23:11  <b>150</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 71:11  <b>155</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 83:15  <b>17</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 1:4, 13:2  <b>17th</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 4:3  <b>18</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 40:3  <b>188,000</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 98:2  <b>18th</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 6:1  <b>19-story</b> <sup>[3]</sup> - 21:2,  22:8, 24:8  <b>199</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 83:16  <b>19th</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 6:4  <b>1st</b> <sup>[3]</sup> - 5:6, 5:19,  182:7</p>	<p><b>2011</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 35:7  <b>2012</b> <sup>[9]</sup> - 64:3, 65:19,  66:11, 66:14, 67:14,  68:1, 70:14, 71:19,  72:11  <b>2014</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 40:3  <b>2015</b> <sup>[9]</sup> - 1:4, 2:15,  12:3, 14:19, 80:6,  85:15, 232:16,  238:9  <b>2016</b> <sup>[3]</sup> - 156:10,  180:7, 180:8  <b>2017</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 156:10  <b>2022</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 238:14  <b>2030</b> <sup>[4]</sup> - 66:15,  66:18, 67:6, 68:9  <b>20th</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 90:3  <b>21</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 12:3, 218:13  <b>213</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 120:7  <b>21st</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 184:6  <b>240,000</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 84:13  <b>25</b> <sup>[17]</sup> - 139:2,  139:11, 164:9,  187:4, 187:12,  212:15, 213:6,  213:15, 214:16,  215:3, 218:16,  222:4, 222:14,  222:16, 223:4,  233:15, 233:18  <b>250</b> <sup>[15]</sup> - 48:2, 150:3,  150:5, 150:6,  160:19, 173:6,  195:9, 198:3,  205:11, 208:18,  210:8, 210:15,  210:16, 211:10,  233:12  <b>250-foot</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 48:18,  173:10  <b>2500</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 51:15  <b>257</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 124:10  <b>269</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 113:2  <b>280</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 103:16</p>	<p><b>5</b></p> <p><b>5,000</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 223:14  <b>5.5</b> <sup>[2]</sup> - 147:8, 147:9  <b>50</b> <sup>[8]</sup> - 45:15, 96:1,  100:16, 103:13,  178:13, 178:19,  214:11, 218:19  <b>500</b> <sup>[25]</sup> - 49:5,  136:17, 137:3,  160:16, 160:17,  176:3, 190:4, 190:5,</p>	<p><b>8</b></p> <p><b>8</b> <sup>[1]</sup> - 3:4  <b>80</b></p>	

<p><b>action</b> [1] - 54:4</p> <p><b>active</b> [9] - 41:14, 51:1, 51:3, 51:11, 52:11, 52:12, 58:5, 58:15, 59:8</p> <p><b>activities</b> [2] - 59:2, 74:19</p> <p><b>acts</b> [1] - 155:17</p> <p><b>actual</b> [4] - 18:7, 117:9, 194:4, 212:17</p> <p><b>adaptability</b> [1] - 94:4</p> <p><b>adapting</b> [1] - 93:3</p> <p><b>add</b> [3] - 40:1, 148:6, 223:8</p> <p><b>adding</b> [3] - 106:12, 214:11, 228:16</p> <p><b>addition</b> [4] - 22:16, 42:4, 53:8, 165:2</p> <p><b>additional</b> [5] - 50:10, 94:17, 98:5, 139:14, 167:11</p> <p><b>address</b> [5] - 75:5, 89:17, 100:2, 162:4, 228:13</p> <p><b>addressed</b> [3] - 35:19, 161:15, 232:9</p> <p><b>adjacent</b> [4] - 22:12, 24:2, 25:1, 190:19</p> <p><b>adjoining</b> [1] - 62:14</p> <p><b>Adjourned</b> [1] - 236:17</p> <p><b>administration</b> [3] - 42:11, 156:11, 181:5</p> <p><b>administrator</b> [1] - 6:13</p> <p><b>adopt</b> [1] - 232:13</p> <p><b>adopted</b> [1] - 47:17</p> <p><b>Adoption</b> [1] - 2:4</p> <p><b>advance</b> [1] - 184:8</p> <p><b>advanced</b> [1] - 226:11</p> <p><b>advancement</b> [1] - 147:1</p> <p><b>advancing</b> [1] - 183:1</p> <p><b>advantage</b> [1] - 130:12</p> <p><b>advantageous</b> [2] - 12:13, 17:9</p> <p><b>advantages</b> [1] - 93:17</p> <p><b>advertised</b> [1] - 12:7</p> <p><b>advised</b> [1] - 36:2</p> <p><b>Advisors</b> [1] - 75:15</p> <p><b>advisory</b> [1] - 35:7</p> <p><b>advocate</b> [1] - 116:6</p> <p><b>aesthetically</b> [1] - 151:10</p> <p><b>aesthetics</b> [1] - 92:19</p> <p><b>afford</b> [1] - 154:8</p>	<p><b>affordability</b> [1] - 42:1</p> <p><b>affordable</b> [15] - 2:13, 13:2, 15:19, 41:13, 41:18, 42:2, 42:5, 59:12, 76:17, 77:2, 96:2, 96:7, 115:17, 131:17, 132:4</p> <p><b>afraid</b> [2] - 199:11, 226:12</p> <p><b>agencies</b> [2] - 194:10, 232:1</p> <p><b>agenda</b> [1] - 4:9</p> <p><b>aggravation</b> [1] - 23:1</p> <p><b>aggregations</b> [1] - 129:14</p> <p><b>aging</b> [1] - 133:7</p> <p><b>ago</b> [6] - 38:14, 73:18, 85:3, 118:1, 160:17, 165:3</p> <p><b>agree</b> [13] - 137:9, 141:2, 146:7, 154:5, 160:6, 161:6, 161:13, 176:9, 190:8, 191:14, 192:16, 206:3, 206:5</p> <p><b>agreed</b> [2] - 66:17, 114:19</p> <p><b>agreeing</b> [3] - 191:18, 200:4, 203:1</p> <p><b>agreement</b> [4] - 31:5, 40:6, 211:18, 225:5</p> <p><b>agrees</b> [3] - 174:10, 175:12, 203:8</p> <p><b>ahead</b> [1] - 95:6</p> <p><b>Ahmed</b> [2] - 1:11, 149:18</p> <p><b>AHMED</b> [31] - 25:15, 26:5, 28:19, 32:6, 75:9, 88:4, 88:7, 88:13, 89:12, 136:2, 165:4, 189:17, 190:17, 204:14, 205:17, 207:13, 208:2, 208:10, 211:8, 215:12, 216:17, 219:1, 219:4, 223:5, 223:8, 223:11, 224:5, 224:11, 225:1, 229:14, 232:5</p> <p><b>aimed</b> [1] - 216:8</p> <p><b>aiming</b> [1] - 168:15</p> <p><b>air</b> [5] - 143:18, 144:4, 173:12, 190:4, 210:7</p> <p><b>Alexandra</b> [1] - 6:6</p> <p><b>Alexandria</b> [2] - 42:17, 123:8</p> <p><b>allegedly</b> [1] - 231:14</p> <p><b>Allen</b> [1] - 2:9</p>	<p><b>alleviate</b> [1] - 158:11</p> <p><b>Alliance</b> [4] - 96:12, 96:14, 115:14, 133:16</p> <p><b>allocated</b> [1] - 18:12</p> <p><b>allow</b> [4] - 46:14, 46:15, 46:18, 98:8</p> <p><b>allowable</b> [1] - 89:9</p> <p><b>allowance</b> [1] - 88:19</p> <p><b>allowed</b> [6] - 48:8, 48:18, 67:1, 76:9, 89:1, 224:3</p> <p><b>allowing</b> [5] - 45:7, 49:2, 198:5, 203:16, 217:16</p> <p><b>alluded</b> [2] - 122:4, 149:19</p> <p><b>almost</b> [2] - 88:10, 128:15</p> <p><b>alternative</b> [6] - 13:9, 13:17, 17:6, 28:4, 132:18, 201:13</p> <p><b>ambitions</b> [1] - 117:8</p> <p><b>ambitious</b> [2] - 117:7, 118:8</p> <p><b>amend</b> [2] - 3:5, 34:6</p> <p><b>amended</b> [1] - 232:17</p> <p><b>Amendment</b> [1] - 103:4</p> <p><b>amendments</b> [1] - 73:4</p> <p><b>American</b> [2] - 134:9, 146:9</p> <p><b>Ames</b> [2] - 61:11, 84:12</p> <p><b>AMI</b> [1] - 77:8</p> <p><b>amount</b> [33] - 19:1, 31:7, 51:13, 66:1, 67:19, 69:10, 69:14, 69:15, 71:2, 92:11, 92:17, 96:6, 103:6, 108:19, 109:13, 128:9, 129:7, 131:7, 139:18, 140:2, 140:10, 140:13, 171:18, 171:19, 179:10, 194:3, 194:14, 195:6, 195:9, 196:8, 199:6, 217:7, 222:2</p> <p><b>amounts</b> [3] - 130:8, 140:8, 200:3</p> <p><b>analogy</b> [1] - 121:14</p> <p><b>analysis</b> [53] - 39:8, 39:9, 39:11, 39:15, 64:10, 64:14, 65:18, 65:19, 66:5, 67:5, 68:11, 68:18, 69:19, 70:13, 71:7, 71:8, 72:1, 73:3, 73:8, 75:13, 76:1, 76:3,</p>	<p>77:11, 79:1, 80:13, 81:8, 82:16, 83:9, 84:2, 86:17, 88:1, 95:9, 99:17, 99:18, 100:12, 101:11, 103:8, 103:9, 110:1, 110:7, 123:13, 126:16, 130:16, 130:17, 133:10, 138:15, 143:5, 148:2, 148:5, 148:7, 148:9, 148:17, 185:12</p> <p><b>analyzed</b> [1] - 71:5</p> <p><b>analyzing</b> [1] - 134:14</p> <p><b>AND</b> [1] - 237:1</p> <p><b>AND/OR</b> [1] - 238:17</p> <p><b>animated</b> [1] - 58:1</p> <p><b>animation</b> [1] - 58:5</p> <p><b>annual</b> [1] - 103:17</p> <p><b>answer</b> [6] - 8:18, 17:13, 26:4, 29:1, 104:3, 127:10</p> <p><b>answered</b> [2] - 24:4, 185:19</p> <p><b>answers</b> [2] - 133:15, 180:18</p> <p><b>anticipate</b> [3] - 52:16, 82:18, 144:14</p> <p><b>anticipated</b> [1] - 80:5</p> <p><b>ANY</b> [2] - 238:16, 238:16</p> <p><b>apart</b> [1] - 133:7</p> <p><b>apartment</b> [2] - 30:15, 78:7</p> <p><b>apartments</b> [1] - 5:7</p> <p><b>Apartments</b> [1] - 62:12</p> <p><b>appeal</b> [1] - 161:5</p> <p><b>applicable</b> [2] - 3:6, 16:15</p> <p><b>applicants</b> [1] - 77:7</p> <p><b>application</b> [5] - 61:10, 174:8, 174:12, 174:15, 188:2</p> <p><b>applied</b> [2] - 16:10, 130:9</p> <p><b>applies</b> [1] - 210:2</p> <p><b>APPLY</b> [1] - 238:16</p> <p><b>apply</b> [2] - 92:16, 187:7</p> <p><b>appreciate</b> [7] - 55:10, 90:3, 105:18, 107:15, 137:10, 143:17, 144:12</p> <p><b>appreciated</b> [1] - 114:6</p> <p><b>approach</b> [11] - 73:16, 92:9, 94:4, 168:3, 168:4, 168:12,</p>	<p>168:13, 169:1, 174:1, 179:9, 203:10</p> <p><b>approached</b> [1] - 190:2</p> <p><b>approaching</b> [1] - 167:17</p> <p><b>appropriate</b> [3] - 151:11, 199:17, 229:11</p> <p><b>appropriated</b> [1] - 18:19</p> <p><b>approval</b> [3] - 72:16, 112:8, 166:16</p> <p><b>approve</b> [3] - 9:13, 49:3, 153:9</p> <p><b>approved</b> [2] - 225:16, 225:18</p> <p><b>april</b> [1] - 238:14</p> <p><b>architect</b> [2] - 127:15, 164:13</p> <p><b>Architects</b> [1] - 164:18</p> <p><b>architectural</b> [7] - 49:8, 61:7, 118:10, 160:7, 175:7, 188:18, 198:1</p> <p><b>architecturally</b> [1] - 207:5</p> <p><b>architecture</b> [11] - 55:18, 62:4, 122:10, 152:15, 152:17, 154:7, 154:12, 159:4, 159:6, 175:12, 175:13</p> <p><b>Area</b> [4] - 22:1, 37:3, 37:7, 114:13</p> <p><b>area</b> [40] - 6:14, 13:14, 14:5, 18:13, 30:4, 35:10, 36:1, 37:11, 39:17, 40:13, 40:16, 44:1, 46:12, 46:13, 48:8, 48:9, 48:12, 51:12, 66:19, 76:18, 77:3, 77:14, 83:2, 83:3, 90:18, 91:6, 91:16, 92:8, 92:10, 92:17, 94:1, 94:2, 128:5, 136:11, 137:9, 150:8, 176:16, 199:6, 208:10, 208:11</p> <p><b>area's</b> [1] - 231:2</p> <p><b>areas</b> [12] - 35:19, 36:7, 47:2, 47:11, 51:7, 59:18, 60:10, 168:6, 183:7, 184:18, 186:2, 233:1</p> <p><b>arose</b> [1] - 170:10</p> <p><b>arriving</b> [1] - 70:17</p>
---	---	---	---	---



<p><b>articulates</b> [1] - 56:2  <b>artificial</b> [1] - 120:17  <b>aside</b> [4] - 51:13, 52:14, 74:16, 134:19  <b>aspect</b> [4] - 57:17, 59:10, 59:13, 60:11  <b>aspects</b> [2] - 117:3, 117:4  <b>assessment</b> [1] - 50:11  <b>assets</b> [1] - 57:14  <b>assigned</b> [1] - 89:9  <b>Assistant</b> [2] - 1:13, 4:6  <b>Associate</b> [1] - 1:12  <b>associated</b> [1] - 82:19  <b>association</b> [1] - 35:11  <b>assume</b> [4] - 69:14, 71:2, 72:5, 108:13  <b>assumed</b> [7] - 64:3, 65:11, 67:11, 68:6, 70:14, 80:6, 82:1  <b>assuming</b> [7] - 27:13, 68:7, 68:14, 69:6, 79:2, 139:17, 186:18  <b>assumption</b> [3] - 77:9, 77:10, 218:12  <b>assumptions</b> [11] - 66:11, 66:14, 76:13, 76:16, 78:17, 84:9, 84:10, 130:18, 131:3, 143:7, 148:9  <b>attempt</b> [3] - 67:12, 69:4, 134:7  <b>attend</b> [1] - 37:9  <b>attention</b> [2] - 97:7, 101:5  <b>attractions</b> [1] - 59:2  <b>audience</b> [1] - 193:17  <b>August</b> [1] - 37:16  <b>Authority</b> [2] - 39:13, 75:12  <b>authorized</b> [1] - 12:5  <b>available</b> [9] - 9:17, 9:19, 12:4, 77:6, 80:17, 82:15, 92:15, 126:15, 227:18  <b>Ave</b> [7] - 2:17, 3:3, 8:14, 11:3, 11:5, 14:12  <b>Avenue</b> [3] - 2:8, 14:8, 100:4  <b>average</b> [1] - 101:3  <b>avoid</b> [1] - 190:13  <b>avoiding</b> [2] - 57:4, 118:13  <b>award</b> [1] - 165:2  <b>awkward</b> [2] - 76:6,</p>	<p>77:5  <b>awkwardly</b> [1] - 76:9</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>B</b></p> <hr/> <p><b>BACCI</b> [34] - 154:4, 162:11, 162:16, 163:4, 163:8, 190:7, 191:11, 192:18, 193:2, 193:5, 197:13, 198:17, 209:2, 209:10, 213:5, 213:9, 213:12, 214:1, 214:3, 215:11, 216:11, 216:15, 216:19, 218:3, 218:8, 224:8, 224:12, 225:11, 227:10, 230:1, 231:8, 231:12, 231:16, 232:6  <b>Bacci</b> [1] - 1:10  <b>background</b> [3] - 10:19, 15:1, 110:12  <b>backlog</b> [1] - 111:13  <b>backwards</b> [1] - 142:3  <b>bag</b> [1] - 140:18  <b>baked</b> [3] - 151:16, 151:17, 188:19  <b>balance</b> [6] - 57:19, 85:5, 85:8, 134:1, 144:11, 167:11  <b>balanced</b> [2] - 80:11, 134:8  <b>ballpark</b> [2] - 100:19, 218:18  <b>balls</b> [1] - 156:15  <b>ban</b> [2] - 46:7, 46:17  <b>band</b> [1] - 46:1  <b>banks</b> [1] - 52:11  <b>bans</b> [1] - 45:19  <b>bar</b> [3] - 68:8, 69:16, 153:5  <b>barely</b> [1] - 191:3  <b>bargained</b> [1] - 107:8  <b>Barrett</b> [1] - 6:4  <b>barriers</b> [1] - 220:14  <b>Barry</b> [2] - 126:9, 126:15  <b>bars</b> [3] - 67:18, 68:4, 68:10  <b>base</b> [4] - 166:17, 167:4, 167:5, 209:19  <b>based</b> [21] - 39:1, 54:14, 59:14, 65:1, 65:11, 67:2, 80:5, 84:1, 84:5, 87:6, 91:16, 92:7, 95:11, 105:13, 141:6,</p>	<p>146:2, 150:19, 170:15, 173:18, 176:16, 195:6  <b>baseline</b> [2] - 75:19, 85:7  <b>basic</b> [3] - 77:17, 82:5, 114:14  <b>basis</b> [5] - 38:6, 38:7, 83:13, 83:16, 127:3  <b>become</b> [2] - 55:16, 116:15  <b>becomes</b> [3] - 44:19, 164:3  <b>becoming</b> [2] - 72:3, 72:13  <b>bedroom</b> [1] - 15:17  <b>beds</b> [1] - 158:9  <b>beefed</b> [1] - 170:1  <b>began</b> [1] - 38:14  <b>behind</b> [1] - 24:1  <b>BELLEAU</b> [1] - 124:10  <b>Belleau</b> [1] - 124:10  <b>bells</b> [3] - 84:14, 84:18, 98:3  <b>below</b> [2] - 77:7, 165:17  <b>beneficial</b> [2] - 139:8, 168:11  <b>benefit</b> [7] - 16:17, 47:8, 50:16, 85:8, 131:8, 131:11  <b>benefits</b> [5] - 53:14, 110:3, 110:5, 110:9, 167:11  <b>benefitting</b> [1] - 135:8  <b>best</b> [7] - 131:13, 150:16, 153:18, 153:19, 164:19, 187:17, 189:14  <b>BETHANY</b> [1] - 104:15  <b>Bethany</b> [1] - 104:16  <b>better</b> [20] - 17:5, 36:5, 64:19, 104:5, 104:7, 122:10, 122:19, 123:17, 127:1, 134:16, 168:10, 168:19, 170:3, 172:13, 192:16, 202:16, 202:17, 204:2, 226:12, 227:3  <b>between</b> [17] - 2:17, 3:3, 11:3, 14:11, 21:19, 30:19, 57:19, 65:18, 66:2, 78:1, 80:11, 91:2, 128:9, 160:18, 170:11, 179:2, 220:7  <b>beyond</b> [3] - 156:9,</p>	<p>160:15, 205:3  <b>bicycling</b> [1] - 158:9  <b>bid</b> [4] - 24:12, 24:17, 25:4, 32:1  <b>bidder</b> [1] - 24:17  <b>bidding</b> [3] - 24:15, 24:16, 27:5  <b>bifurcated</b> [1] - 19:17  <b>bifurcates</b> [1] - 29:6  <b>bifurcating</b> [1] - 19:19  <b>big</b> [15] - 24:8, 72:12, 81:18, 126:18, 127:7, 127:8, 127:11, 128:17, 129:13, 132:12, 146:2, 175:13, 190:13, 191:2, 230:15  <b>bigger</b> [1] - 191:7  <b>BIGOLIN</b> [3] - 54:13, 58:11, 58:14  <b>Bigolin</b> [2] - 1:16, 39:5  <b>bike</b> [3] - 65:6, 119:5, 119:11  <b>biking</b> [3] - 65:15, 70:6, 138:3  <b>billion</b> [1] - 111:13  <b>binary</b> [1] - 170:19  <b>Binney</b> [5] - 46:3, 46:10, 62:9, 117:18, 118:1  <b>bio</b> [1] - 135:4  <b>biotech</b> [2] - 79:18, 118:2  <b>Bishop</b> [1] - 2:8  <b>bit</b> [23] - 10:10, 36:17, 48:1, 49:11, 49:12, 51:2, 54:9, 60:6, 72:2, 81:7, 103:12, 107:11, 139:12, 139:13, 142:3, 145:19, 147:13, 168:8, 171:11, 174:14, 202:13, 222:10, 229:4  <b>blended</b> [1] - 69:13  <b>blocks</b> [3] - 118:10, 188:12, 225:17  <b>blue</b> [1] - 68:2  <b>Board</b> [94] - 2:16, 3:5, 4:4, 4:12, 4:15, 5:10, 5:16, 9:1, 9:8, 9:9, 17:19, 20:4, 25:13, 27:9, 27:15, 27:17, 27:18, 30:8, 30:10, 34:6, 35:18, 36:1, 36:14, 37:19, 38:2, 39:2, 40:4, 41:9, 46:4, 49:2, 49:6, 50:12, 50:15,</p>	<p>50:17, 54:15, 63:7, 75:11, 97:7, 99:16, 101:6, 101:18, 113:18, 115:6, 136:7, 136:9, 137:11, 139:7, 146:7, 153:16, 155:16, 159:7, 159:11, 159:14, 166:1, 166:15, 167:2, 167:3, 167:9, 167:10, 168:2, 168:9, 168:17, 169:6, 169:7, 170:6, 173:3, 174:19, 176:3, 179:19, 185:2, 185:11, 186:17, 187:2, 187:6, 187:12, 192:9, 202:12, 202:15, 202:17, 203:7, 203:17, 204:2, 204:12, 221:14, 228:6, 228:15, 229:15, 233:6, 233:8, 233:17, 234:5, 236:17, 237:6, 237:15  <b>BOARD</b> [1] - 1:1  <b>board</b> [5] - 86:9, 141:15, 152:2, 195:3, 229:10  <b>Board's</b> [6] - 40:7, 55:10, 126:3, 182:3, 184:8, 184:9  <b>boat</b> [1] - 138:6  <b>body</b> [1] - 164:14  <b>bollards</b> [1] - 219:19  <b>bolstering</b> [1] - 229:4  <b>bono</b> [1] - 97:18  <b>Booker</b> [1] - 95:17  <b>Boston</b> [9] - 77:13, 126:11, 136:15, 157:17, 164:18, 164:19, 190:6, 190:19, 219:18  <b>bother</b> [1] - 180:16  <b>bottom</b> [2] - 53:5, 135:12  <b>boundaries</b> [2] - 129:6, 130:13  <b>box</b> [1] - 120:14  <b>brain</b> [1] - 123:17  <b>branching</b> [1] - 107:6  <b>break</b> [6] - 33:14, 33:19, 48:18, 186:7, 196:15, 201:14  <b>breaking</b> [2] - 61:14, 173:10  <b>brick</b> [1] - 231:15</p>
--	--	--	--	---

<p><b>brief</b> [1] - 60:17  <b>briefly</b> [1] - 41:12  <b>brilliant</b> [2] - 117:1, 137:14  <b>bring</b> [2] - 78:8, 137:16  <b>bringing</b> [1] - 125:12  <b>brings</b> [1] - 222:3  <b>BRISTOL</b> [1] - 238:4  <b>Broad</b> [12] - 56:15, 61:18, 84:12, 116:17, 124:14, 128:11, 137:13, 229:16, 230:13, 230:18, 232:1  <b>broad</b> [1] - 64:12  <b>broader</b> [1] - 175:1  <b>Broadway</b> [12] - 1:6, 46:2, 46:8, 47:3, 47:12, 60:10, 62:2, 71:18, 110:19, 128:13, 129:4, 161:11  <b>broken</b> [3] - 95:5, 95:12, 97:11  <b>brothers</b> [1] - 200:16  <b>brought</b> [7] - 35:17, 44:17, 123:14, 125:7, 143:5, 176:6, 187:14  <b>brown</b> [1] - 61:12  <b>Brownfield</b> [1] - 84:8  <b>buckets</b> [2] - 64:12, 64:14  <b>budget</b> [1] - 154:13  <b>build</b> [20] - 15:15, 64:1, 64:11, 65:13, 66:7, 67:6, 67:10, 69:16, 69:18, 80:19, 89:6, 119:3, 119:9, 141:7, 151:6, 152:4, 152:19, 190:5, 193:13, 194:13  <b>building</b> [69] - 2:12, 15:15, 21:3, 22:8, 24:8, 30:15, 47:10, 48:2, 48:14, 49:3, 49:7, 49:17, 50:3, 50:5, 50:15, 50:18, 63:13, 63:14, 77:16, 79:10, 82:3, 82:4, 84:14, 84:16, 84:17, 84:19, 89:8, 91:18, 94:15, 98:2, 99:1, 100:6, 103:1, 103:6, 103:17, 111:2, 119:1, 122:11, 136:7, 136:14, 137:3, 156:8, 156:19, 161:7, 164:17, 164:19,</p>	<p>173:15, 189:6, 190:10, 193:11, 194:5, 206:16, 206:18, 207:4, 207:6, 208:2, 209:4, 209:19, 211:5, 214:9, 219:10, 219:19, 226:3, 227:17  <b>buildings</b> [39] - 19:12, 48:17, 60:3, 78:2, 79:18, 82:6, 106:6, 109:15, 112:7, 122:17, 127:16, 127:18, 128:2, 128:3, 128:10, 129:6, 132:13, 136:11, 136:16, 137:2, 144:5, 144:8, 149:15, 160:12, 164:15, 170:17, 172:3, 188:13, 189:11, 190:9, 191:13, 197:1, 197:19, 198:7, 205:3, 206:14, 208:7, 210:8, 233:11  <b>built</b> [12] - 29:7, 29:12, 59:13, 61:5, 63:10, 69:9, 85:3, 118:15, 122:17, 136:17, 148:9, 159:16  <b>bulk</b> [1] - 48:2  <b>bulky</b> [1] - 173:15  <b>bulletin</b> [1] - 32:9  <b>bump</b> [1] - 218:15  <b>bunch</b> [2] - 121:9, 134:1  <b>burden</b> [1] - 18:6  <b>business</b> [3] - 10:15, 35:10, 98:14  <b>BUSINESS</b> [1] - 2:2  <b>BZA</b> [1] - 23:11</p>	<p>108:11, 115:14, 124:11, 125:3, 125:16, 133:16, 135:1, 137:5, 137:6, 137:11, 159:11, 161:10, 165:4, 165:5, 191:9, 225:4  <b>Cambridgeport</b> [1] - 35:12  <b>camp</b> [1] - 215:1  <b>campaign</b> [3] - 21:6, 21:7, 21:16  <b>campus</b> [2] - 57:5, 118:13  <b>canal</b> [3] - 229:16, 231:7, 231:9  <b>Canal</b> [10] - 56:15, 61:18, 116:17, 124:14, 137:13, 229:16, 230:13, 230:18, 232:2  <b>Cantabrigian</b> [1] - 146:9  <b>cap</b> [2] - 15:13, 206:10  <b>capacity</b> [4] - 111:14, 167:8, 167:12, 229:6  <b>CAPTURING</b> [1] - 1:18  <b>car</b> [6] - 65:7, 65:10, 65:11, 70:5, 71:11, 158:9  <b>care</b> [1] - 52:5  <b>careful</b> [1] - 59:19  <b>carefully</b> [1] - 25:6  <b>Carlos</b> [1] - 30:19  <b>CAROL</b> [1] - 124:10  <b>Carol</b> [1] - 124:10  <b>carpool</b> [1] - 65:9  <b>carried</b> [1] - 158:1  <b>carry</b> [3] - 119:4, 154:17, 232:5  <b>carrying</b> [1] - 158:2  <b>cars</b> [5] - 70:9, 70:17, 71:4, 72:9, 119:10  <b>carsharing</b> [1] - 6:2  <b>carved</b> [1] - 177:6  <b>case</b> [11] - 23:12, 44:17, 48:11, 53:4, 115:10, 117:14, 174:13, 202:10, 202:11, 202:13, 229:11  <b>cash</b> [6] - 17:7, 78:19, 81:8, 81:11, 82:15  <b>categories</b> [1] - 140:8  <b>category</b> [1] - 52:8  <b>Catherine</b> [6] - 1:8, 135:2, 141:19, 147:14, 238:5,</p>	<p>238:11  <b>CATHERINE</b> [36] - 29:3, 93:5, 94:5, 98:17, 112:13, 142:1, 197:4, 197:8, 202:7, 205:1, 206:2, 206:9, 207:17, 208:16, 209:5, 209:15, 210:13, 210:17, 211:2, 211:13, 212:1, 213:7, 213:17, 215:19, 219:2, 221:1, 221:5, 228:9, 229:8, 230:3, 230:9, 235:4, 235:8, 235:14, 235:17, 236:3  <b>CDD</b> [5] - 9:19, 86:7, 109:11, 121:9, 212:10  <b>celebrate</b> [1] - 224:18  <b>Center</b> [9] - 3:8, 95:4, 98:11, 127:8, 129:19, 159:12, 159:19, 160:3, 160:5  <b>center</b> [3] - 46:19, 47:10, 134:11  <b>central</b> [2] - 60:3, 60:8  <b>Central</b> [8] - 4:11, 8:15, 20:18, 21:4, 22:1, 22:4, 23:6, 109:16  <b>certain</b> [19] - 69:14, 69:15, 73:13, 74:3, 74:5, 98:12, 111:7, 116:10, 131:17, 140:10, 142:2, 163:2, 165:17, 171:18, 171:19, 179:10, 203:11, 207:11  <b>certainly</b> [9] - 67:3, 87:5, 106:11, 143:6, 146:7, 147:14, 148:6, 169:14, 188:8  <b>certainty</b> [1] - 180:10  <b>CERTIFICATION</b> [1] - 238:15  <b>certified</b> [2] - 7:12, 7:14  <b>Certified</b> [2] - 238:5, 238:12  <b>certify</b> [1] - 238:6  <b>CERTIFYING</b> [1] - 238:17  <b>CHA</b> [1] - 5:8  <b>Chair</b> [3] - 1:8, 1:8, 6:17</p>	<p><b>chair</b> [11] - 4:8, 7:6, 25:15, 26:9, 33:12, 34:14, 75:10, 99:16, 189:17, 223:5, 223:8  <b>challenge</b> [3] - 172:7, 175:3, 175:14  <b>challenges</b> [4] - 87:8, 110:13, 172:12, 230:16  <b>challenging</b> [2] - 171:9, 183:14  <b>chance</b> [7] - 20:19, 23:9, 113:17, 114:1, 114:4, 135:17, 142:12  <b>change</b> [14] - 3:6, 21:10, 50:13, 92:5, 92:9, 111:9, 138:17, 157:4, 168:2, 178:9, 191:9, 216:9, 232:19, 237:6  <b>CHANGE</b> [6] - 237:8, 237:9, 237:10, 237:11, 237:12, 237:13  <b>changed</b> [4] - 21:6, 66:5, 107:10, 213:18  <b>changes</b> [19] - 15:8, 38:19, 41:1, 41:12, 43:1, 49:1, 51:2, 52:13, 55:9, 59:16, 71:3, 101:16, 132:6, 135:14, 144:12, 144:18, 226:17, 233:2, 237:16  <b>Chapter</b> [2] - 9:4, 174:7  <b>character</b> [2] - 49:8, 50:6  <b>characters</b> [1] - 57:2  <b>Charles</b> [1] - 124:11  <b>chart</b> [4] - 47:19, 67:18, 70:12, 70:19  <b>charts</b> [1] - 76:7  <b>cheap</b> [1] - 87:11  <b>cheaper</b> [2] - 119:3, 119:9  <b>child</b> [1] - 52:5  <b>children</b> [1] - 60:14  <b>choose</b> [3] - 182:4, 183:2, 184:7  <b>chose</b> [1] - 184:10  <b>chosen</b> [1] - 113:7  <b>circulated</b> [2] - 55:7, 55:14  <b>circulation</b> [1] - 56:11  <b>circumstances</b> [2] - 176:14, 199:18  <b>cities</b> [1] - 7:4</p>
	<p><b>C</b></p>			
	<p><b>C2</b> [4] - 96:9, 96:10, 113:9, 113:14  <b>cake</b> [1] - 210:1  <b>calculation</b> [1] - 195:7  <b>CAMBRIDGE</b> [1] - 1:2  <b>Cambridge</b> [39] - 1:7, 2:6, 2:10, 3:6, 9:3, 21:17, 23:16, 34:7, 37:3, 37:6, 39:13, 64:19, 65:2, 75:11, 77:13, 79:14, 94:8, 96:4, 96:12, 99:5, 105:3, 105:8, 105:9,</p>			

<p><b>citizen</b> [1] - 134:10</p> <p><b>citizens</b> [1] - 21:14</p> <p><b>city</b> [22] - 2:8, 8:9, 9:5, 28:12, 31:15, 50:5, 54:5, 96:3, 96:4, 96:17, 98:8, 104:11, 105:19, 117:13, 118:13, 127:2, 133:9, 144:1, 146:12, 157:16, 158:8, 223:7</p> <p><b>CITY</b> [1] - 1:2</p> <p><b>City</b> [85] - 1:13, 2:6, 2:7, 2:10, 2:11, 4:6, 6:15, 6:18, 8:6, 8:8, 9:6, 9:11, 9:12, 9:15, 10:5, 10:12, 11:9, 11:12, 12:3, 12:5, 12:7, 12:13, 13:11, 14:4, 14:15, 14:17, 16:11, 16:17, 17:1, 17:9, 17:10, 18:6, 18:19, 19:14, 20:15, 21:17, 23:5, 23:16, 25:6, 28:8, 30:4, 31:14, 31:19, 32:2, 32:3, 32:10, 36:14, 36:16, 37:18, 39:2, 45:14, 96:15, 99:5, 105:14, 105:15, 108:7, 109:2, 109:6, 110:7, 113:18, 114:6, 114:9, 115:1, 115:7, 120:18, 121:14, 126:11, 135:11, 137:10, 140:17, 140:19, 144:15, 155:17, 156:1, 157:5, 157:16, 179:11, 180:5, 181:13, 182:1, 199:13, 223:1, 232:13</p> <p><b>City's</b> [5] - 3:3, 14:16, 16:8, 18:11, 55:3</p> <p><b>city's</b> [1] - 11:5</p> <p><b>City-conducted</b> [1] - 23:5</p> <p><b>City-owned</b> [1] - 25:6</p> <p><b>city-owned</b> [2] - 2:8, 9:5</p> <p><b>citywide</b> [1] - 112:1</p> <p><b>civic</b> [2] - 43:13, 109:9</p> <p><b>clari</b> [1] - 195:5</p> <p><b>clarification</b> [2] - 86:2, 97:15</p> <p><b>clarifications</b> [1] - 175:18</p> <p><b>clarify</b> [2] - 92:13, 159:1</p>	<p><b>clarifying</b> [1] - 58:15</p> <p><b>clear</b> [11] - 21:11, 29:11, 50:14, 52:9, 53:9, 108:12, 157:12, 164:12, 189:4, 204:18, 228:19</p> <p><b>clearer</b> [1] - 93:19</p> <p><b>clearly</b> [1] - 16:15</p> <p><b>clever</b> [1] - 156:6</p> <p><b>client</b> [1] - 133:8</p> <p><b>climate</b> [1] - 111:9</p> <p><b>clinical</b> [1] - 21:8</p> <p><b>clock</b> [1] - 121:6</p> <p><b>close</b> [3] - 71:19, 143:13, 231:1</p> <p><b>closely</b> [1] - 93:11</p> <p><b>closer</b> [4] - 47:3, 47:11, 168:15, 218:18</p> <p><b>cluster</b> [2] - 60:2, 132:12</p> <p><b>Coalition</b> [2] - 37:7, 114:14</p> <p><b>Code</b> [2] - 2:10, 9:4</p> <p><b>Cohen</b> [2] - 1:8, 1:9</p> <p><b>COHEN</b> [188] - 4:2, 7:7, 7:11, 7:15, 7:18, 8:2, 17:18, 18:2, 19:4, 20:3, 20:6, 20:10, 25:9, 25:13, 26:3, 26:6, 26:10, 29:2, 30:11, 31:3, 31:17, 32:10, 32:17, 32:18, 33:1, 33:4, 33:6, 33:18, 34:2, 63:5, 75:8, 76:11, 85:17, 86:3, 86:8, 88:6, 89:13, 94:10, 99:7, 99:12, 100:1, 102:12, 104:14, 108:1, 108:4, 112:19, 116:1, 120:4, 124:7, 125:18, 126:2, 135:19, 138:8, 141:17, 141:19, 145:17, 145:18, 150:5, 150:6, 150:9, 154:3, 155:13, 160:1, 160:4, 162:15, 162:18, 163:7, 163:15, 163:18, 165:7, 165:10, 178:12, 180:2, 183:4, 184:15, 185:16, 186:6, 186:10, 186:11, 189:7, 189:9, 191:17, 192:2, 193:1, 193:4, 194:19, 195:14,</p>	<p>195:19, 196:4, 196:13, 196:18, 197:6, 197:9, 197:11, 197:14, 197:16, 197:18, 198:8, 198:9, 198:12, 198:14, 198:19, 199:11, 199:19, 200:2, 200:4, 200:6, 200:9, 200:18, 201:3, 201:17, 202:4, 202:9, 202:19, 204:16, 205:2, 205:6, 205:9, 205:12, 206:4, 206:11, 206:13, 206:16, 206:18, 207:1, 207:3, 207:9, 208:6, 208:11, 208:14, 208:19, 209:7, 209:12, 209:17, 210:5, 210:10, 210:15, 210:19, 211:4, 211:6, 211:17, 212:2, 212:5, 212:14, 212:19, 215:2, 215:8, 215:9, 219:17, 220:4, 220:5, 220:8, 220:12, 220:15, 220:18, 221:3, 221:9, 221:16, 221:19, 222:14, 222:15, 222:19, 223:10, 224:14, 225:3, 225:8, 225:13, 226:4, 226:9, 227:8, 228:7, 228:10, 230:7, 231:19, 232:8, 232:11, 234:11, 234:17, 234:18, 235:1, 235:2, 235:6, 235:10, 235:19, 236:5, 236:8, 236:11, 236:14</p> <p><b>collaborative</b> [1] - 6:17</p> <p><b>collaboratively</b> [1] - 194:16</p> <p><b>colleague</b> [2] - 136:4, 196:2</p> <p><b>colleagues</b> [3] - 31:5, 154:6, 201:13</p> <p><b>colloquy</b> [1] - 97:18</p> <p><b>combined</b> [2] - 2:11, 2:14</p> <p><b>comfortable</b> [2] - 215:17, 228:16</p> <p><b>coming</b> [9] - 5:3, 5:15,</p>	<p>64:16, 78:10, 147:10, 167:1, 173:13, 225:7, 226:3</p> <p><b>comment</b> [8] - 100:12, 103:16, 137:4, 137:18, 164:11, 165:8, 176:8, 185:17</p> <p><b>commentary</b> [1] - 100:14</p> <p><b>comments</b> [10] - 25:14, 30:12, 39:1, 55:11, 90:5, 93:6, 102:9, 107:18, 126:5, 232:17</p> <p><b>commercial</b> [8] - 68:14, 68:19, 69:2, 70:11, 75:19, 80:12, 101:10, 171:12</p> <p><b>commercials</b> [1] - 171:2</p> <p><b>Commission</b> [1] - 238:14</p> <p><b>commitment</b> [1] - 15:16</p> <p><b>committee</b> [5] - 12:10, 14:18, 35:8, 35:13, 122:3</p> <p><b>Committee</b> [9] - 5:17, 6:2, 6:16, 37:18, 41:9, 104:18, 121:15, 182:5, 182:8</p> <p><b>committees</b> [1] - 124:13</p> <p><b>common</b> [2] - 27:4, 89:19</p> <p><b>commonly</b> [1] - 34:10</p> <p><b>COMMONWEALTH</b> [1] - 238:3</p> <p><b>communication</b> [3] - 73:9, 74:18, 126:10</p> <p><b>communities</b> [1] - 157:17</p> <p><b>community</b> [21] - 14:17, 16:6, 32:7, 36:17, 39:4, 43:16, 43:17, 47:4, 54:6, 54:16, 55:16, 58:3, 59:3, 59:6, 59:9, 59:10, 60:7, 82:12, 98:9, 107:4, 230:6</p> <p><b>Community</b> [4] - 1:14, 2:3, 4:6, 237:3</p> <p><b>commute</b> [1] - 65:2</p> <p><b>companies</b> [2] - 53:19, 106:17</p> <p><b>comparable</b> [1] - 85:1</p> <p><b>comparables</b> [1] - 127:13</p>	<p><b>compare</b> [1] - 127:8</p> <p><b>compared</b> [4] - 70:14, 103:10, 126:19, 127:12</p> <p><b>comparison</b> [2] - 127:11</p> <p><b>compelling</b> [1] - 117:14</p> <p><b>competition</b> [2] - 43:3, 117:3</p> <p><b>competitive</b> [1] - 91:18</p> <p><b>complain</b> [1] - 142:9</p> <p><b>complete</b> [1] - 119:3</p> <p><b>completed</b> [1] - 190:18</p> <p><b>completely</b> [1] - 177:5</p> <p><b>complex</b> [1] - 148:1</p> <p><b>complicated</b> [3] - 141:2, 148:16, 217:4</p> <p><b>complied</b> [1] - 26:17</p> <p><b>comply</b> [1] - 27:5</p> <p><b>component</b> [1] - 51:10</p> <p><b>compose</b> [1] - 172:18</p> <p><b>comprised</b> [1] - 159:8</p> <p><b>compromise</b> [2] - 152:13, 160:18</p> <p><b>compromises</b> [1] - 152:14</p> <p><b>con</b> [1] - 142:19</p> <p><b>concept</b> [1] - 203:1</p> <p><b>concern</b> [7] - 32:7, 35:3, 35:4, 44:17, 72:12, 139:16, 165:10</p> <p><b>concerned</b> [3] - 32:9, 72:8, 149:12</p> <p><b>concerning</b> [1] - 100:9</p> <p><b>concerns</b> [10] - 15:4, 15:6, 15:8, 15:11, 15:13, 16:1, 108:14, 139:9, 151:9, 157:7</p> <p><b>conclusion</b> [3] - 17:12, 36:18, 129:15</p> <p><b>concrete</b> [1] - 75:5</p> <p><b>concur</b> [2] - 30:9, 31:1</p> <p><b>condition</b> [1] - 2:11</p> <p><b>conditions</b> [3] - 18:17, 71:13, 111:10</p> <p><b>conducted</b> [1] - 23:5</p> <p><b>conference</b> [2] - 174:13, 174:15</p> <p><b>confidence</b> [1] - 148:11</p> <p><b>confident</b> [1] - 147:9</p>
--	--	--	--	--

<p><b>configuration</b> [1] - 30:5</p> <p><b>conflict</b> [1] - 23:2</p> <p><b>conflicted</b> [2] - 145:19, 153:11</p> <p><b>conflicting</b> [1] - 71:11</p> <p><b>conforming</b> [1] - 158:18</p> <p><b>confused</b> [1] - 145:19</p> <p><b>congested</b> [1] - 149:5</p> <p><b>connect</b> [2] - 24:19, 230:10</p> <p><b>Connect</b> [4] - 43:2, 54:18, 62:15, 117:2</p> <p><b>connected</b> [1] - 43:5</p> <p><b>connection</b> [6] - 17:3, 17:4, 21:19, 56:14, 62:6, 109:10</p> <p><b>connections</b> [17] - 2:17, 2:18, 13:10, 13:12, 14:3, 14:8, 14:11, 17:8, 18:9, 18:14, 56:7, 56:17, 57:1, 58:18, 61:16, 61:17, 61:18</p> <p><b>connectivity</b> [1] - 56:9</p> <p><b>connector</b> [1] - 56:13</p> <p><b>connects</b> [2] - 2:8, 8:14</p> <p><b>Connolly</b> [1] - 1:8</p> <p><b>CONNOLLY</b> [36] - 29:3, 93:5, 94:5, 98:17, 112:13, 142:1, 197:4, 197:8, 202:7, 205:1, 206:2, 206:9, 207:17, 208:16, 209:5, 209:15, 210:13, 210:17, 211:2, 211:13, 212:1, 213:7, 213:17, 215:19, 219:2, 221:1, 221:5, 228:9, 229:8, 230:3, 230:9, 235:4, 235:8, 235:14, 235:17, 236:3</p> <p><b>cons</b> [1] - 10:15</p> <p><b>conservative</b> [1] - 67:4</p> <p><b>consider</b> [1] - 92:19</p> <p><b>consideration</b> [4] - 59:19, 106:8, 139:15, 141:4</p> <p><b>considerations</b> [1] - 16:7</p> <p><b>considered</b> [4] - 66:3, 66:4, 72:19, 95:16</p> <p><b>considering</b> [2] - 72:17, 182:6</p>	<p><b>consistent</b> [6] - 2:15, 13:1, 13:4, 30:5, 62:15, 133:13</p> <p><b>consolidation</b> [3] - 29:8, 29:13, 61:2</p> <p><b>constant</b> [1] - 107:2</p> <p><b>constrained</b> [5] - 143:1, 151:19, 172:18, 174:6, 226:14</p> <p><b>constraint</b> [1] - 150:11</p> <p><b>constraints</b> [4] - 86:17, 180:5, 180:6</p> <p><b>constructed</b> [4] - 18:17, 24:13, 24:16, 25:5</p> <p><b>constructing</b> [1] - 14:1</p> <p><b>construction</b> [9] - 2:12, 2:17, 18:10, 77:14, 82:3, 82:4, 82:17, 85:1, 147:18</p> <p><b>constructions</b> [1] - 77:15</p> <p><b>consultant</b> [1] - 39:16</p> <p><b>consultants</b> [1] - 75:15</p> <p><b>contained</b> [1] - 128:3</p> <p><b>container</b> [1] - 127:16</p> <p><b>contemplated</b> [1] - 53:7</p> <p><b>context</b> [3] - 59:15, 63:14, 191:5</p> <p><b>contiguous</b> [1] - 57:7</p> <p><b>contingency</b> [1] - 95:10</p> <p><b>continuation</b> [2] - 5:19, 34:5</p> <p><b>continue</b> [2] - 38:13, 55:7</p> <p><b>Continued</b> [2] - 2:19, 3:5</p> <p><b>continued</b> [4] - 5:1, 38:2, 55:12</p> <p><b>contort</b> [1] - 91:5</p> <p><b>contract</b> [1] - 181:3</p> <p><b>contribute</b> [1] - 116:16</p> <p><b>contribution</b> [2] - 54:7, 87:15</p> <p><b>contributions</b> [2] - 21:9</p> <p><b>contributor</b> [1] - 146:19</p> <p><b>CONTROL</b> [1] - 238:17</p> <p><b>control</b> [5] - 45:13, 93:10, 109:2, 213:13, 217:1</p> <p><b>controlled</b> [2] - 48:3,</p>	<p>179:11</p> <p><b>controlling</b> [2] - 217:6, 217:9</p> <p><b>controls</b> [3] - 3:6, 34:8, 44:12</p> <p><b>convenience</b> [1] - 51:9</p> <p><b>conversation</b> [2] - 36:6, 186:12</p> <p><b>convert</b> [1] - 132:15</p> <p><b>conveyed</b> [1] - 193:16</p> <p><b>conveying</b> [1] - 130:17</p> <p><b>convince</b> [2] - 167:9, 204:2</p> <p><b>convinced</b> [2] - 104:8, 204:14</p> <p><b>cool</b> [1] - 231:17</p> <p><b>Coolidge</b> [16] - 2:7, 4:10, 8:5, 8:12, 11:2, 12:1, 12:4, 13:13, 13:16, 17:6, 19:9, 19:11, 30:16, 30:19, 31:19</p> <p><b>copies</b> [3] - 9:17, 10:16, 10:18</p> <p><b>copy</b> [2] - 9:16, 9:18</p> <p><b>core</b> [3] - 21:4, 77:15, 217:16</p> <p><b>corner</b> [5] - 46:13, 62:2, 62:6, 122:9, 161:12</p> <p><b>corners</b> [2] - 58:18, 119:18</p> <p><b>corporate</b> [2] - 57:4, 118:13</p> <p><b>correct</b> [3] - 139:17, 198:11, 209:16</p> <p><b>correction</b> [1] - 237:7</p> <p><b>corrections</b> [2] - 176:1, 237:16</p> <p><b>correctly</b> [1] - 125:7</p> <p><b>corridor</b> [1] - 119:11</p> <p><b>corridors</b> [2] - 13:18, 13:19</p> <p><b>Cory</b> [1] - 95:17</p> <p><b>cost</b> [11] - 18:7, 52:1, 77:18, 80:19, 82:2, 84:6, 84:17, 84:19, 98:1, 100:6, 148:3</p> <p><b>costs</b> [13] - 76:1, 77:14, 77:15, 80:14, 80:18, 82:3, 82:19, 84:7, 84:10, 87:9, 101:1, 102:4, 102:5</p> <p><b>Council</b> [43] - 9:6, 9:11, 9:12, 11:9, 12:3, 31:19, 32:11, 36:15, 36:16, 37:15, 37:18, 39:3, 41:10, 47:15, 113:19,</p>	<p>115:7, 120:19, 135:13, 135:15, 140:17, 140:19, 144:15, 155:17, 157:6, 181:13, 182:2, 182:9, 182:18, 183:2, 184:1, 184:3, 184:4, 184:9, 193:14, 199:13, 200:17, 201:5, 201:7, 212:11, 222:8, 222:9, 223:1, 232:13</p> <p><b>council</b> [1] - 26:11</p> <p><b>Council's</b> [1] - 180:5</p> <p><b>Councillors</b> [1] - 105:1</p> <p><b>councillors</b> [1] - 21:10</p> <p><b>Councilor</b> [1] - 96:15</p> <p><b>count</b> [3] - 123:7, 217:12, 217:14</p> <p><b>counted</b> [3] - 179:13, 222:2, 224:4</p> <p><b>counting</b> [2] - 107:13, 121:11</p> <p><b>country</b> [3] - 7:3, 134:14, 146:14</p> <p><b>couple</b> [12] - 13:6, 99:10, 119:7, 119:16, 149:13, 155:15, 159:2, 162:1, 165:2, 201:2, 212:12, 232:17</p> <p><b>course</b> [8] - 21:12, 35:15, 37:14, 70:8, 70:19, 118:12, 130:2, 231:3</p> <p><b>courthouse</b> [1] - 160:6</p> <p><b>Courthouse</b> [1] - 220:2</p> <p><b>cover</b> [1] - 208:9</p> <p><b>covered</b> [5] - 53:15, 138:2, 154:5, 155:14, 224:10</p> <p><b>CRA</b> [2] - 61:11, 157:11</p> <p><b>CRA's</b> [1] - 39:16</p> <p><b>craft</b> [1] - 45:3</p> <p><b>create</b> [7] - 43:17, 47:1, 56:1, 56:10, 57:3, 57:7, 148:4</p> <p><b>created</b> [1] - 80:3</p> <p><b>creating</b> [1] - 79:6</p> <p><b>creation</b> [2] - 96:11, 109:9</p> <p><b>crisis</b> [1] - 96:5</p> <p><b>criteria</b> [1] - 25:2</p> <p><b>critical</b> [3] - 14:3,</p>	<p>71:8, 101:17</p> <p><b>CROWLEY</b> [3] - 108:3, 108:5, 112:14</p> <p><b>Crowley</b> [1] - 108:6</p> <p><b>crucial</b> [1] - 155:9</p> <p><b>crystal</b> [1] - 156:15</p> <p><b>cuff</b> [1] - 172:15</p> <p><b>cultural</b> [4] - 52:6, 59:3, 59:12, 62:7</p> <p><b>curious</b> [1] - 170:9</p> <p><b>current</b> [8] - 28:11, 45:17, 46:11, 70:13, 103:11, 131:6, 181:4, 212:15</p> <p><b>Cushing</b> [1] - 5:11</p> <p><b>customers</b> [2] - 64:17, 106:6</p> <p><b>cut</b> [3] - 124:18, 137:1, 203:11</p> <p><b>cut-off</b> [1] - 203:11</p> <p><b>cuts</b> [2] - 210:18, 211:3</p> <p><b>cutting</b> [4] - 135:4, 136:13, 190:3, 211:15</p> <p><b>CVS</b> [1] - 59:11</p> <p><b>cycle</b> [1] - 181:11</p> <p><b>cycles</b> [1] - 71:14</p>
<b>D</b>				
<p><b>D.C</b> [1] - 6:14</p> <p><b>daily</b> [1] - 127:3</p> <p><b>dark</b> [1] - 155:5</p> <p><b>DASH</b> [3] - 202:10, 218:6, 218:11</p> <p><b>Dash</b> [1] - 1:15</p> <p><b>data</b> [1] - 21:7</p> <p><b>date</b> [4] - 27:16, 149:4, 183:14, 237:7</p> <p><b>dated</b> [1] - 232:16</p> <p><b>days</b> [2] - 111:1, 174:10</p> <p><b>deadline</b> [1] - 120:17</p> <p><b>deal</b> [5] - 79:3, 105:2, 105:11, 160:12, 201:7</p> <p><b>dealing</b> [3] - 42:10, 79:7, 79:8</p> <p><b>decades</b> [1] - 22:11</p> <p><b>December</b> [12] - 5:6, 5:19, 6:5, 6:7, 6:8, 6:10, 181:14, 182:7, 183:16, 183:18, 184:5, 238:9</p> <p><b>decide</b> [4] - 9:12, 21:1, 156:17, 226:7</p> <p><b>decided</b> [3] - 121:4,</p>				

<p>123:11, 136:10  <b>decides</b> [1] - 109:2  <b>decision</b> [2] - 99:4, 174:9  <b>decisions</b> [3] - 95:11, 146:2, 216:3  <b>declare</b> [1] - 85:6  <b>declared</b> [1] - 12:4  <b>define</b> [2] - 90:16, 175:13  <b>defined</b> [3] - 51:14, 116:15, 128:12  <b>definite</b> [1] - 232:18  <b>definition</b> [2] - 52:3, 91:6  <b>definitions</b> [1] - 93:19  <b>delivered</b> [2] - 92:10, 237:3  <b>deliveries</b> [2] - 106:12  <b>delivery</b> [4] - 80:8, 83:17, 106:8, 106:16  <b>demand</b> [1] - 153:8  <b>demanding</b> [2] - 175:6  <b>demands</b> [1] - 98:9  <b>demolished</b> [1] - 159:16  <b>demonstrated</b> [1] - 168:18  <b>Denise</b> [1] - 6:13  <b>dense</b> [2] - 147:3, 171:14  <b>densities</b> [1] - 171:4  <b>density</b> [12] - 46:16, 69:3, 69:4, 70:10, 70:11, 90:17, 93:1, 93:2, 148:19, 152:11, 160:12, 170:17  <b>department</b> [1] - 23:4  <b>Department</b> [7] - 3:9, 25:18, 134:10, 156:7, 156:12, 212:10, 237:4  <b>Deputy</b> [3] - 6:15, 8:6, 8:8  <b>described</b> [6] - 76:14, 82:12, 83:8, 93:11, 113:16, 127:17  <b>describes</b> [1] - 56:8  <b>describing</b> [1] - 40:11  <b>description</b> [1] - 92:2  <b>descriptive</b> [1] - 51:3  <b>deserve</b> [1] - 123:3  <b>deserved</b> [1] - 122:19  <b>design</b> [38] - 39:6, 41:15, 50:9, 52:14, 54:17, 54:19, 55:1, 55:3, 55:18, 56:1, 56:2, 56:3, 60:15,</p>	<p>63:2, 82:4, 117:2, 126:15, 126:17, 127:7, 149:17, 152:8, 152:15, 153:9, 153:19, 154:7, 154:12, 167:4, 170:3, 175:6, 175:7, 175:16, 214:18, 224:8, 226:11, 226:13, 230:7, 230:15, 231:17  <b>designing</b> [1] - 14:1  <b>designs</b> [2] - 61:8, 226:3  <b>desirable</b> [3] - 56:1, 150:15, 151:10  <b>desire</b> [7] - 15:18, 16:4, 28:7, 36:15, 58:3, 58:4, 179:2  <b>desired</b> [2] - 56:8, 59:9  <b>destination</b> [1] - 59:1  <b>detail</b> [3] - 81:2, 201:4, 201:7  <b>detailed</b> [4] - 36:6, 55:1, 73:8, 172:3  <b>details</b> [5] - 11:16, 11:19, 17:15, 17:16, 138:15  <b>deteriorating</b> [1] - 71:12  <b>determinations</b> [1] - 194:10  <b>determine</b> [2] - 116:9, 172:3  <b>determined</b> [3] - 12:11, 91:17, 139:7  <b>detracted</b> [1] - 91:8  <b>develop</b> [7] - 12:17, 16:12, 55:2, 73:19, 89:5, 192:13, 194:2  <b>developed</b> [3] - 61:6, 79:15, 219:13  <b>developer</b> [28] - 2:16, 15:14, 15:19, 17:2, 78:15, 79:12, 79:16, 79:19, 80:4, 83:18, 88:9, 88:17, 103:19, 105:5, 139:4, 142:5, 142:10, 144:16, 150:11, 152:3, 153:3, 153:14, 169:12, 181:4, 189:14, 202:11, 209:12, 228:1  <b>developers</b> [13] - 11:14, 79:5, 79:17, 81:17, 87:11, 98:12, 98:13, 137:8, 151:14, 171:9,</p>	<p>174:3, 204:7, 234:5  <b>Development</b> [6] - 1:14, 2:3, 3:7, 4:7, 128:13, 237:4  <b>development</b> [85] - 2:15, 3:6, 7:2, 11:14, 11:16, 11:18, 13:19, 14:9, 16:11, 16:13, 19:12, 29:11, 34:8, 34:9, 50:18, 52:17, 52:18, 53:4, 53:8, 53:10, 53:11, 55:5, 56:18, 65:14, 66:2, 66:6, 66:9, 66:12, 67:1, 67:15, 67:16, 68:6, 68:13, 68:15, 68:16, 68:19, 69:10, 71:16, 72:6, 72:16, 73:7, 74:8, 74:10, 75:2, 76:15, 79:3, 79:6, 79:10, 80:5, 80:12, 83:19, 88:18, 89:1, 90:13, 90:17, 91:11, 94:9, 117:9, 125:9, 128:14, 128:15, 134:3, 139:5, 142:4, 147:3, 147:6, 147:13, 149:7, 150:14, 150:16, 152:12, 154:17, 155:8, 167:7, 167:12, 168:11, 173:7, 177:7, 194:6, 214:10, 214:11, 225:7, 233:11  <b>diagram</b> [3] - 57:12, 59:17, 60:1  <b>diagramming</b> [1] - 47:6  <b>diagrams</b> [2] - 56:6, 211:15  <b>dictate</b> [1] - 44:9  <b>dictates</b> [1] - 177:6  <b>difference</b> [9] - 30:18, 65:18, 68:12, 71:1, 107:8, 160:8, 161:2, 170:10, 179:2  <b>differences</b> [1] - 170:16  <b>different</b> [52] - 35:18, 37:1, 43:4, 43:6, 57:1, 57:2, 57:11, 67:14, 69:5, 78:1, 81:8, 81:12, 81:15, 82:10, 83:12, 89:10, 93:12, 93:13, 98:13, 106:11, 111:10, 114:16, 131:2, 131:3, 131:4, 133:19, 134:2, 138:2, 141:5, 141:6,</p>	<p>141:10, 145:5, 156:10, 156:11, 159:5, 166:4, 166:7, 167:16, 169:12, 171:3, 175:4, 179:8, 179:9, 183:8, 196:15, 198:13, 202:12, 203:13, 204:1, 205:13, 226:6  <b>differently</b> [1] - 173:18  <b>differs</b> [1] - 64:2  <b>difficult</b> [7] - 100:13, 130:19, 148:10, 149:9, 153:6, 184:11, 209:13  <b>difficulties</b> [1] - 33:15  <b>DIRECT</b> [1] - 238:17  <b>direct</b> [3] - 44:12, 90:5, 102:17  <b>direction</b> [2] - 114:17, 185:5  <b>DIRECTION</b> [1] - 238:17  <b>disagree</b> [2] - 191:15, 196:2  <b>disappearing</b> [1] - 181:15  <b>disclosure</b> [1] - 158:15  <b>discover</b> [1] - 127:6  <b>discretion</b> [2] - 165:19, 192:3  <b>discuss</b> [2] - 40:5, 142:8  <b>discussed</b> [4] - 23:3, 114:3, 169:17, 233:4  <b>discussing</b> [1] - 175:1  <b>discussion</b> [13] - 16:6, 23:11, 31:8, 40:7, 44:3, 49:9, 91:7, 91:9, 126:3, 140:19, 180:12, 229:5, 229:9  <b>discussions</b> [5] - 6:18, 23:5, 43:17, 47:5, 90:14  <b>disincentive</b> [1] - 218:2  <b>disingenuous</b> [1] - 107:12  <b>dismayed</b> [1] - 22:9  <b>dispose</b> [2] - 2:6, 11:12  <b>disposition</b> [24] - 4:10, 4:17, 8:5, 8:12, 8:18, 9:4, 9:14, 10:3, 10:11, 12:1, 12:5, 14:16,</p>	<p>16:7, 16:9, 16:17, 27:13, 27:16, 28:1, 28:17, 28:18, 29:16, 30:2, 31:19, 80:9  <b>Disposition</b> [1] - 2:10  <b>distances</b> [1] - 219:10  <b>distinctive</b> [5] - 49:13, 49:16, 49:18, 122:4, 122:5  <b>District</b> [4] - 3:7, 3:8, 40:12, 157:12  <b>district</b> [6] - 45:18, 176:15, 176:16, 198:10, 208:12, 223:7  <b>diverse</b> [4] - 35:8, 59:11, 96:9, 96:11  <b>diversities</b> [1] - 96:17  <b>divide</b> [1] - 176:17  <b>division</b> [2] - 42:15, 77:4  <b>doable</b> [3] - 88:2, 185:2, 195:6  <b>document</b> [3] - 24:16, 25:4, 55:4  <b>documents</b> [2] - 26:16, 30:1  <b>DOES</b> [1] - 238:16  <b>dollars</b> [1] - 188:18  <b>done</b> [20] - 39:16, 52:2, 64:18, 65:5, 73:16, 100:17, 101:19, 103:8, 103:10, 108:8, 125:9, 131:19, 137:8, 138:14, 143:12, 146:11, 159:1, 179:15, 180:7, 185:2  <b>dormitories</b> [1] - 127:18  <b>DOT</b> [2] - 130:6, 214:8  <b>doubt</b> [1] - 182:5  <b>down</b> [20] - 34:3, 46:9, 46:10, 118:11, 121:11, 124:2, 125:2, 125:5, 132:5, 149:16, 152:14, 153:15, 187:17, 194:18, 196:15, 213:14, 230:17, 231:1, 231:2, 231:3  <b>dozens</b> [1] - 145:9  <b>draft</b> [3] - 55:6, 55:7, 57:18  <b>drafting</b> [1] - 26:12  <b>drain</b> [2] - 2:18, 14:2  <b>draw</b> [4] - 43:2, 43:19, 59:5, 172:5  <b>drawing</b> [1] - 152:2  <b>drawn</b> [1] - 114:15</p>
---	--	--	--	---

<p><b>drew</b> [1] - 114:10  <b>Drive</b> [2] - 2:9, 116:5  <b>drive</b> [1] - 65:6  <b>driving</b> [5] - 65:16, 106:10, 106:14, 138:4  <b>drop</b> [2] - 37:1, 96:16  <b>drop-in</b> [1] - 37:1  <b>dropped</b> [1] - 101:12  <b>due</b> [2] - 50:3, 116:12  <b>dunk</b> [1] - 88:2  <b>during</b> [7] - 35:14, 37:14, 85:18, 110:18, 112:5, 121:10, 223:18  <b>dwell</b> [1] - 166:10  <b>dwelled</b> [1] - 166:11  <b>dwelling</b> [1] - 166:19</p>	<p><b>EIR</b> [2] - 112:4, 112:9  <b>either</b> [10] - 13:14, 41:8, 47:1, 140:1, 169:14, 184:6, 187:2, 201:5, 202:10, 217:15  <b>elaborate</b> [1] - 199:8  <b>election</b> [1] - 96:14  <b>electronically</b> [1] - 237:4  <b>element</b> [7] - 14:13, 56:7, 57:6, 57:18, 60:14, 65:8, 175:9  <b>elements</b> [5] - 16:5, 16:16, 17:17, 56:5, 63:3  <b>eligible</b> [1] - 24:17  <b>eliminate</b> [3] - 151:2, 190:9, 190:10  <b>emphasize</b> [2] - 8:19, 11:15  <b>emphasized</b> [2] - 59:4, 62:3  <b>employee</b> [6] - 69:3, 69:4, 70:10, 70:11, 170:17, 171:4  <b>employees</b> [2] - 64:16, 106:6  <b>enable</b> [1] - 2:12  <b>enacted</b> [1] - 182:11  <b>enclosed</b> [1] - 223:14  <b>encounter</b> [1] - 18:18  <b>encourage</b> [5] - 31:13, 44:13, 152:3, 177:13, 177:16  <b>encouraged</b> [1] - 108:18  <b>encouraging</b> [2] - 45:4, 45:5  <b>end</b> [13] - 13:11, 81:5, 82:15, 113:10, 115:1, 115:5, 156:13, 156:15, 173:13, 176:9, 182:10, 199:14, 226:14  <b>End</b> [1] - 127:5  <b>ended</b> [1] - 165:13  <b>endlessly</b> [1] - 114:3  <b>endorse</b> [2] - 20:17, 201:16  <b>ends</b> [1] - 29:7  <b>engage</b> [1] - 36:16  <b>engagement</b> [3] - 43:16, 59:10, 60:7  <b>engineer</b> [1] - 8:9  <b>enhance</b> [1] - 62:19  <b>enhanced</b> [2] - 56:17, 134:17  <b>enjoying</b> [1] - 22:18  <b>enormous</b> [1] -</p>	<p>119:14  <b>ensuring</b> [2] - 55:17, 59:14  <b>entire</b> [1] - 15:15  <b>entirely</b> [4] - 30:5, 91:16, 147:9, 187:2  <b>entitlement</b> [2] - 166:18, 166:19  <b>entity</b> [1] - 166:1  <b>entrance</b> [1] - 22:19  <b>entry</b> [1] - 22:14  <b>envelope</b> [2] - 66:16, 112:16  <b>environment</b> [2] - 58:4, 118:15  <b>environmental</b> [3] - 100:19, 110:2, 112:4  <b>equation</b> [1] - 87:19  <b>equipped</b> [1] - 201:7  <b>equity</b> [1] - 110:8  <b>equivalent</b> [3] - 17:5, 129:12, 130:1  <b>ERRATA</b> [1] - 237:1  <b>Errata</b> [2] - 237:2, 237:7  <b>error</b> [1] - 143:7  <b>escape</b> [1] - 58:3  <b>especially</b> [5] - 42:14, 104:9, 151:7, 188:3, 217:5  <b>essential</b> [1] - 24:7  <b>essentially</b> [7] - 35:6, 66:2, 66:14, 126:13, 170:2, 181:10, 217:17  <b>estate</b> [1] - 75:15  <b>estimate</b> [1] - 18:7  <b>estimated</b> [2] - 18:15, 102:1  <b>ethical</b> [1] - 25:3  <b>evaluate</b> [2] - 148:7, 164:4  <b>evaluation</b> [1] - 12:10  <b>EVANS</b> [8] - 75:10, 76:12, 78:13, 85:13, 86:5, 87:4, 88:12, 88:15  <b>Evans</b> [4] - 39:12, 75:11, 115:11, 136:6  <b>evening</b> [9] - 4:2, 8:7, 34:2, 63:16, 99:15, 104:15, 183:6, 184:16, 233:1  <b>event</b> [1] - 216:8  <b>events</b> [1] - 109:3  <b>everyday</b> [1] - 190:6  <b>evolving</b> [1] - 192:15  <b>exact</b> [1] - 18:11  <b>exactly</b> [9] - 49:9,</p>	<p>79:12, 118:14, 163:5, 189:9, 200:15, 201:8, 202:9, 227:8  <b>example</b> [8] - 62:7, 73:17, 78:2, 79:14, 84:11, 136:15, 165:1, 199:16  <b>exceed</b> [2] - 140:10, 150:3  <b>exceeding</b> [1] - 71:10  <b>excellent</b> [1] - 211:14  <b>except</b> [2] - 234:14, 237:15  <b>exceptional</b> [1] - 49:8  <b>excess</b> [5] - 205:11, 206:17, 206:19, 207:4, 233:12  <b>exchange</b> [2] - 28:13, 90:19  <b>exclude</b> [1] - 179:12  <b>excuse</b> [1] - 26:8  <b>executive</b> [1] - 117:19  <b>exercise</b> [1] - 112:6  <b>exercises</b> [2] - 47:6, 47:7  <b>existing</b> [6] - 13:14, 13:16, 17:3, 17:6, 29:6, 229:2  <b>exists</b> [2] - 143:16, 158:4  <b>exit</b> [2] - 22:19, 53:16  <b>expand</b> [1] - 232:1  <b>expanded</b> [2] - 48:9, 52:3  <b>expanding</b> [1] - 46:17  <b>expands</b> [1] - 46:12  <b>expanse</b> [1] - 130:12  <b>expansion</b> [2] - 6:9, 84:12  <b>expansive</b> [1] - 174:5  <b>expect</b> [7] - 69:10, 86:18, 87:6, 103:1, 145:6, 145:7, 219:15  <b>expectation</b> [2] - 87:13, 205:19  <b>expectations</b> [1] - 174:17  <b>expected</b> [2] - 81:6, 193:12  <b>expecting</b> [1] - 66:6  <b>expensive</b> [2] - 84:12, 153:6  <b>experience</b> [2] - 65:1, 110:11  <b>experienced</b> [2] - 110:18, 111:7  <b>expiration</b> [1] - 180:13  <b>expire</b> [1] - 182:13</p>	<p><b>Expires</b> [1] - 238:14  <b>expires</b> [1] - 181:11  <b>explain</b> [4] - 67:12, 79:4, 88:9, 209:17  <b>example</b> [1] - 179:1  <b>explaining</b> [1] - 71:9  <b>explains</b> [1] - 47:19  <b>explicit</b> [1] - 235:3  <b>explore</b> [1] - 176:4  <b>explored</b> [1] - 112:2  <b>expressed</b> [1] - 146:8  <b>expressing</b> [1] - 105:1  <b>extend</b> [4] - 6:17, 48:13, 124:19, 230:13  <b>extended</b> [1] - 124:15  <b>extends</b> [1] - 156:9  <b>extension</b> [5] - 5:12, 56:15, 116:17, 174:10, 229:16  <b>extent</b> [4] - 96:5, 142:2, 152:1, 163:2  <b>extra</b> [5] - 10:18, 167:7, 209:2, 215:16  <b>extracting</b> [1] - 131:7  <b>extras</b> [1] - 134:2  <b>extremely</b> [1] - 110:14</p>
<b>E</b>				
<p><b>early</b> [8] - 5:14, 151:14, 152:4, 174:3, 204:5, 227:19, 228:3, 234:3  <b>easements</b> [2] - 28:11, 28:13  <b>East</b> [9] - 37:3, 37:6, 108:11, 124:11, 125:2, 125:16, 137:5, 137:6, 137:11  <b>east/west</b> [1] - 61:17  <b>easy</b> [2] - 95:15, 96:1  <b>echo</b> [1] - 29:4  <b>ecological</b> [2] - 116:6, 116:10  <b>economic</b> [9] - 7:2, 39:9, 39:15, 103:11, 123:13, 141:1, 143:2, 147:15, 147:16  <b>economics</b> [2] - 111:18, 149:10  <b>economy</b> [2] - 38:9, 146:18  <b>edge</b> [3] - 135:4, 143:10  <b>edges</b> [3] - 106:3, 189:2, 226:15  <b>effect</b> [2] - 21:12, 110:4  <b>effort</b> [1] - 24:5  <b>Eiffel</b> [1] - 159:15  <b>eight</b> [7] - 2:7, 8:13, 11:1, 11:6, 33:9, 33:19, 34:4  <b>eight-foot</b> [4] - 2:7, 8:13, 11:1, 11:6</p>	<p><b>enormous</b> [1] -</p>	<p><b>enormous</b> [1] -</p>	<p><b>enormous</b> [1] -</p>	
<b>F</b>				
<p><b>face</b> [1] - 194:16  <b>facilitate</b> [1] - 11:14  <b>facilities</b> [2] - 134:12, 216:9  <b>Facility</b> [1] - 148:1  <b>facility</b> [10] - 44:7, 53:7, 80:19, 82:17, 84:7, 87:7, 117:11, 134:16, 148:4, 148:14  <b>fact</b> [7] - 17:5, 30:3, 50:3, 67:7, 102:18, 111:6, 173:5  <b>factored</b> [1] - 95:8  <b>factors</b> [1] - 103:11  <b>failing</b> [1] - 97:4  <b>fair</b> [3] - 113:17, 114:1, 221:3  <b>fairly</b> [1] - 41:18  <b>fall</b> [2] - 52:7, 87:3  <b>falling</b> [1] - 133:7  <b>familiar</b> [4] - 11:2, 86:14, 96:10, 126:12  <b>families</b> [1] - 60:13  <b>family</b> [2] - 60:16, 60:19  <b>far</b> [8] - 55:17, 72:14,</p>	<p><b>face</b> [1] - 194:16  <b>facilitate</b> [1] - 11:14  <b>facilities</b> [2] - 134:12, 216:9  <b>Facility</b> [1] - 148:1  <b>facility</b> [10] - 44:7, 53:7, 80:19, 82:17, 84:7, 87:7, 117:11, 134:16, 148:4, 148:14  <b>fact</b> [7] - 17:5, 30:3, 50:3, 67:7, 102:18, 111:6, 173:5  <b>factored</b> [1] - 95:8  <b>factors</b> [1] - 103:11  <b>failing</b> [1] - 97:4  <b>fair</b> [3] - 113:17, 114:1, 221:3  <b>fairly</b> [1] - 41:18  <b>fall</b> [2] - 52:7, 87:3  <b>falling</b> [1] - 133:7  <b>familiar</b> [4] - 11:2, 86:14, 96:10, 126:12  <b>families</b> [1] - 60:13  <b>family</b> [2] - 60:16, 60:19  <b>far</b> [8] - 55:17, 72:14,</p>	<p><b>face</b> [1] - 194:16  <b>facilitate</b> [1] - 11:14  <b>facilities</b> [2] - 134:12, 216:9  <b>Facility</b> [1] - 148:1  <b>facility</b> [10] - 44:7, 53:7, 80:19, 82:17, 84:7, 87:7, 117:11, 134:16, 148:4, 148:14  <b>fact</b> [7] - 17:5, 30:3, 50:3, 67:7, 102:18, 111:6, 173:5  <b>factored</b> [1] - 95:8  <b>factors</b> [1] - 103:11  <b>failing</b> [1] - 97:4  <b>fair</b> [3] - 113:17, 114:1, 221:3  <b>fairly</b> [1] - 41:18  <b>fall</b> [2] - 52:7, 87:3  <b>falling</b> [1] - 133:7  <b>familiar</b> [4] - 11:2, 86:14, 96:10, 126:12  <b>families</b> [1] - 60:13  <b>family</b> [2] - 60:16, 60:19  <b>far</b> [8] - 55:17, 72:14,</p>	<p><b>face</b> [1] - 194:16  <b>facilitate</b> [1] - 11:14  <b>facilities</b> [2] - 134:12, 216:9  <b>Facility</b> [1] - 148:1  <b>facility</b> [10] - 44:7, 53:7, 80:19, 82:17, 84:7, 87:7, 117:11, 134:16, 148:4, 148:14  <b>fact</b> [7] - 17:5, 30:3, 50:3, 67:7, 102:18, 111:6, 173:5  <b>factored</b> [1] - 95:8  <b>factors</b> [1] - 103:11  <b>failing</b> [1] - 97:4  <b>fair</b> [3] - 113:17, 114:1, 221:3  <b>fairly</b> [1] - 41:18  <b>fall</b> [2] - 52:7, 87:3  <b>falling</b> [1] - 133:7  <b>familiar</b> [4] - 11:2, 86:14, 96:10, 126:12  <b>families</b> [1] - 60:13  <b>family</b> [2] - 60:16, 60:19  <b>far</b> [8] - 55:17, 72:14,</p>	

<p>103:9, 103:10, 125:11, 127:9, 149:7, 226:2  <b>FAR</b> [4] - 91:19, 147:8, 147:10, 166:18  <b>FAROOQ</b> [15] - 4:8, 34:13, 172:6, 180:17, 183:13, 183:18, 185:1, 193:14, 205:8, 207:10, 208:4, 210:16, 227:12, 228:15, 229:12  <b>Farooq</b> [2] - 1:13, 114:12  <b>Farris</b> [3] - 99:8, 113:1, 113:2  <b>FARRIS</b> [2] - 99:9, 113:2  <b>fashion</b> [2] - 184:1, 184:12  <b>fast</b> [1] - 35:3  <b>faster</b> [2] - 67:17, 68:7  <b>favor</b> [6] - 7:19, 33:2, 138:10, 153:11, 161:11, 236:9  <b>fear</b> [1] - 226:9  <b>feasibility</b> [1] - 84:5  <b>feasible</b> [1] - 85:6  <b>feature</b> [1] - 230:2  <b>features</b> [3] - 61:13, 116:18, 230:19  <b>February</b> [3] - 180:15, 181:12, 181:17  <b>federal</b> [38] - 44:2, 44:4, 44:7, 45:1, 45:5, 45:9, 45:12, 82:17, 91:3, 91:17, 92:4, 92:12, 92:13, 108:19, 117:11, 154:16, 162:13, 163:6, 176:7, 177:13, 177:14, 179:3, 179:5, 179:12, 179:17, 180:10, 194:9, 213:14, 214:19, 215:16, 217:8, 218:13, 219:9, 222:1, 232:1, 234:2  <b>Federal</b> [6] - 109:1, 148:13, 156:2, 156:16, 178:2, 220:6  <b>federal's</b> [1] - 163:1  <b>feds</b> [4] - 154:19, 163:9, 193:7, 214:4  <b>feedback</b> [4] - 54:14, 55:8, 188:14, 188:16</p>	<p><b>feet</b> [39] - 2:6, 8:16, 12:18, 12:19, 48:2, 48:13, 48:15, 49:4, 49:5, 50:19, 51:16, 52:19, 53:1, 53:19, 65:14, 76:15, 120:13, 128:1, 149:1, 150:4, 150:6, 173:6, 176:3, 191:1, 191:16, 195:10, 195:16, 196:19, 197:2, 197:5, 197:7, 199:7, 205:11, 205:16, 206:12, 208:13, 210:8, 219:11, 233:12  <b>fellow</b> [1] - 30:10  <b>felt</b> [1] - 142:3  <b>fence</b> [5] - 23:17, 23:19, 31:12, 216:11  <b>fevered</b> [1] - 123:17  <b>few</b> [11] - 5:4, 5:6, 34:15, 35:2, 51:5, 76:7, 78:17, 85:3, 113:6, 117:19, 234:19  <b>fiddling</b> [1] - 106:3  <b>field</b> [1] - 83:1  <b>Fifth</b> [2] - 56:12, 58:9  <b>figure</b> [4] - 65:2, 140:16, 178:19, 196:5  <b>figuring</b> [2] - 65:13, 175:3  <b>file</b> [2] - 121:5, 121:12  <b>filed</b> [6] - 36:12, 37:15, 41:7, 115:5, 121:1, 182:13  <b>filled</b> [1] - 231:13  <b>final</b> [6] - 74:8, 74:9, 75:1, 75:2, 91:11, 99:1  <b>finally</b> [2] - 122:9, 176:5  <b>finance</b> [4] - 21:6, 21:8, 21:16, 78:14  <b>finances</b> [1] - 132:17  <b>financial</b> [7] - 103:9, 109:19, 110:6, 111:12, 130:17, 131:2, 148:17  <b>fine</b> [3] - 56:11, 147:6, 187:1  <b>finish</b> [1] - 78:6  <b>firm</b> [2] - 142:6, 204:12  <b>firms</b> [1] - 131:2  <b>first</b> [23] - 5:4, 8:5, 36:8, 40:4, 42:14, 51:4, 56:7, 67:18,</p>	<p>67:19, 68:4, 78:19, 94:14, 99:11, 116:5, 120:13, 121:3, 121:8, 141:14, 142:13, 155:19, 161:16, 219:11, 227:4  <b>fit</b> [4] - 44:5, 64:19, 78:11, 102:4  <b>fits</b> [1] - 90:19  <b>five</b> [10] - 42:4, 56:4, 76:19, 81:10, 127:19, 136:16, 168:18, 183:7, 184:17, 186:2  <b>fixed</b> [2] - 233:5, 233:12  <b>flagship</b> [1] - 118:4  <b>flexibility</b> [26] - 42:9, 46:6, 46:15, 47:8, 59:17, 149:16, 153:15, 153:17, 167:7, 168:8, 169:11, 185:11, 187:14, 187:16, 189:12, 189:19, 190:16, 191:15, 192:16, 192:17, 195:8, 195:13, 196:11, 201:1, 221:14, 226:19  <b>flexible</b> [4] - 169:9, 207:13, 207:14, 224:12  <b>Floor</b> [1] - 1:6  <b>floor</b> [14] - 2:12, 12:19, 41:14, 48:15, 48:17, 58:16, 90:18, 91:6, 92:10, 92:17, 94:1, 94:2, 173:11, 196:8  <b>floors</b> [3] - 51:1, 53:16, 58:15  <b>flow</b> [2] - 79:1, 91:9  <b>fluidity</b> [1] - 171:1  <b>fly</b> [2] - 100:14, 102:1  <b>FLYNN</b> [22] - 18:1, 18:3, 19:3, 31:4, 32:19, 138:9, 140:4, 191:4, 191:14, 191:19, 192:4, 207:19, 214:14, 219:6, 221:8, 228:18, 229:13, 232:10, 235:7, 235:9, 235:16, 236:7  <b>Flynn</b> [1] - 1:11  <b>focal</b> [2] - 43:18, 62:5  <b>focus</b> [1] - 73:5  <b>focuses</b> [1] - 60:15</p>	<p><b>focusing</b> [1] - 12:1  <b>focused</b> [3] - 4:17, 55:15, 72:13  <b>folks</b> [3] - 37:8, 111:8, 114:18  <b>follow</b> [5] - 4:11, 92:3, 176:18, 177:2, 177:4  <b>Following</b> [1] - 2:19  <b>following</b> [3] - 35:16, 39:9, 177:15  <b>food</b> [1] - 223:16  <b>foot</b> [17] - 2:7, 8:13, 11:1, 11:6, 48:17, 54:6, 74:15, 83:13, 83:15, 83:16, 84:13, 89:2, 89:6, 102:2, 119:5, 160:18, 172:18  <b>footage</b> [8] - 67:19, 68:8, 68:17, 69:8, 70:2, 71:2, 89:10, 150:3  <b>footnote</b> [1] - 165:6  <b>footprint</b> [3] - 210:6, 210:11, 211:5  <b>footstep</b> [1] - 137:10  <b>FOR</b> [1] - 1:2  <b>forceful</b> [1] - 174:14  <b>foregoing</b> [1] - 237:15  <b>FOREGOING</b> [1] - 238:15  <b>forever</b> [2] - 124:16, 124:17  <b>forgot</b> [1] - 18:11  <b>form</b> [3] - 38:7, 59:13, 61:5  <b>forma</b> [3] - 76:1, 80:2, 82:2  <b>format</b> [2] - 17:14, 232:15  <b>former</b> [2] - 26:7, 26:11  <b>forms</b> [1] - 43:14  <b>formulas</b> [1] - 199:4  <b>formulation</b> [2] - 198:6, 201:13  <b>formulations</b> [1] - 132:10  <b>Fort</b> [1] - 117:12  <b>forth</b> [6] - 79:9, 103:2, 106:14, 193:10, 229:19, 238:7  <b>forward</b> [12] - 9:10, 27:9, 27:14, 132:17, 135:16, 136:5, 138:10, 145:9, 145:12, 145:16, 158:6, 161:19  <b>forwarded</b> [1] - 9:15  <b>foster</b> [2] - 59:6,</p>	<p>146:10  <b>Foundry</b> [1] - 75:17  <b>four</b> [9] - 35:18, 40:12, 48:16, 69:12, 70:7, 108:16, 136:16, 183:7, 184:17  <b>framed</b> [1] - 192:7  <b>framework</b> [10] - 39:6, 50:9, 54:18, 54:19, 56:2, 62:16, 63:3, 166:13, 169:15, 175:16  <b>frankly</b> [3] - 144:7, 144:14, 147:8  <b>free</b> [2] - 40:8, 220:10  <b>frequently</b> [3] - 146:2, 146:4, 146:15  <b>Fresh</b> [1] - 96:13  <b>front</b> [2] - 103:15, 148:6  <b>full</b> [10] - 14:15, 41:1, 95:6, 111:2, 112:9, 118:2, 182:9, 184:9, 186:3, 226:19  <b>fully</b> [3] - 151:16, 151:17, 188:19  <b>function</b> [4] - 16:2, 42:12, 79:3, 79:13  <b>functionally</b> [2] - 169:10, 200:11  <b>functioned</b> [1] - 79:16  <b>fund</b> [1] - 82:12  <b>funds</b> [3] - 54:6, 74:12, 74:17  <b>future</b> [10] - 17:1, 27:16, 56:18, 74:15, 84:3, 155:18, 161:15, 172:11, 172:12, 174:19</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>G</b></p> <hr/> <p><b>gain</b> [1] - 91:12  <b>gained</b> [1] - 98:1  <b>garage</b> [1] - 119:1  <b>Garden</b> [1] - 191:1  <b>garden</b> [1] - 191:9  <b>gateway</b> [1] - 62:2  <b>gather</b> [1] - 22:11  <b>gathering</b> [2] - 43:13, 109:9  <b>general</b> [10] - 16:1, 51:7, 68:2, 91:8, 128:5, 139:18, 140:1, 140:9, 147:5, 193:8  <b>GENERAL</b> [2] - 1:3, 2:2  <b>generalities</b> [1] - 77:4</p>
--	---	---	--	--

<p><b>generally</b> [5] - 70:12, 90:1, 116:11, 119:13, 120:2</p> <p><b>generate</b> [2] - 147:17, 151:10</p> <p><b>generated</b> [3] - 65:4, 74:17, 80:7</p> <p><b>generates</b> [1] - 140:5</p> <p><b>generation</b> [4] - 170:12, 171:6, 171:12, 171:16</p> <p><b>genesis</b> [1] - 35:1</p> <p><b>gentleman</b> [2] - 102:13, 152:7</p> <p><b>Genzyme</b> [1] - 117:19</p> <p><b>Gerald</b> [2] - 90:9, 90:10</p> <p><b>GERALD</b> [3] - 90:10, 93:8, 94:7</p> <p><b>gift</b> [1] - 105:4</p> <p><b>given</b> [7] - 16:13, 17:2, 29:5, 111:19, 151:7, 183:7, 194:6</p> <p><b>glad</b> [1] - 176:6</p> <p><b>glance</b> [1] - 23:9</p> <p><b>glass</b> [1] - 223:15</p> <p><b>goal</b> [2] - 109:8, 181:3</p> <p><b>goals</b> [2] - 109:10, 215:18</p> <p><b>God</b> [1] - 121:11</p> <p><b>gold</b> [2] - 86:19, 87:6</p> <p><b>gonna</b> [4] - 22:7, 108:15, 112:12, 121:11</p> <p><b>Government</b> [6] - 24:2, 109:1, 148:13, 156:2, 156:17, 178:2</p> <p><b>government</b> [2] - 105:4, 216:9</p> <p><b>graduate</b> [1] - 97:8</p> <p><b>grain</b> [1] - 56:11</p> <p><b>grand</b> [3] - 119:4, 119:6, 146:8</p> <p><b>grant</b> [1] - 27:19</p> <p><b>graphic</b> [1] - 65:17</p> <p><b>grass</b> [1] - 129:1</p> <p><b>great</b> [12] - 125:11, 133:11, 137:16, 152:16, 153:5, 153:9, 159:6, 175:6, 175:7, 175:11, 175:13, 236:15</p> <p><b>greater</b> [7] - 139:3, 149:14, 152:11, 197:2, 197:5, 197:7, 207:1</p> <p><b>green</b> [4] - 68:2, 131:13, 131:14, 191:12</p> <p><b>grid</b> [1] - 210:18</p>	<p><b>grocery</b> [2] - 51:8, 59:11</p> <p><b>gross</b> [2] - 92:10, 92:17</p> <p><b>ground</b> [9] - 2:12, 12:19, 41:14, 51:1, 53:16, 58:15, 58:16, 79:11, 83:1</p> <p><b>group</b> [1] - 11:17</p> <p><b>groups</b> [1] - 37:6</p> <p><b>grow</b> [1] - 38:10</p> <p><b>growing</b> [1] - 144:2</p> <p><b>GSA</b> [20] - 6:13, 6:19, 7:1, 7:2, 40:5, 81:1, 84:7, 84:17, 117:15, 132:17, 142:18, 145:13, 156:5, 156:12, 180:7, 180:19, 181:9, 193:16, 215:13, 216:6</p> <p><b>GSA's</b> [3] - 79:12, 133:5, 227:14</p> <p><b>guaranteeing</b> [1] - 98:15</p> <p><b>guess</b> [20] - 86:12, 100:9, 100:10, 108:10, 112:6, 136:2, 140:18, 146:1, 151:3, 155:7, 155:8, 162:8, 163:11, 164:11, 171:13, 176:2, 180:2, 183:4, 232:12, 235:12</p> <p><b>guidance</b> [2] - 50:10, 59:7</p> <p><b>guide</b> [1] - 120:1</p> <p><b>guideline</b> [13] - 154:19, 164:3, 164:7, 164:9, 169:4, 169:5, 172:19, 195:16, 199:5, 201:18, 202:1, 202:8, 203:5</p> <p><b>guidelines</b> [18] - 54:17, 55:3, 56:6, 164:2, 165:12, 169:15, 169:18, 170:3, 175:8, 193:6, 195:12, 196:10, 199:4, 201:12, 202:16, 204:10, 214:19, 230:8</p> <p><b>guiding</b> [1] - 55:4</p> <p><b>gun</b> [1] - 121:7</p> <p><b>guy</b> [1] - 216:6</p> <p><b>guys</b> [5] - 10:17, 114:4, 115:10, 202:19, 232:5</p>	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>H</b></p> <p><b>half</b> [8] - 45:10, 123:10, 128:8, 132:16, 154:18, 214:5, 214:6, 214:19</p> <p><b>halfway</b> [1] - 220:7</p> <p><b>hand</b> [4] - 10:6, 226:10, 231:5, 238:9</p> <p><b>handed</b> [1] - 10:16</p> <p><b>handled</b> [1] - 121:13</p> <p><b>hands</b> [5] - 8:1, 33:3, 35:15, 158:14, 236:10</p> <p><b>hands-on</b> [1] - 35:15</p> <p><b>happily</b> [1] - 97:7</p> <p><b>happy</b> [10] - 17:13, 17:17, 32:15, 41:2, 115:8, 123:15, 132:12, 137:6, 201:16</p> <p><b>Happy</b> [1] - 5:5</p> <p><b>harbor</b> [1] - 220:2</p> <p><b>hard</b> [15] - 117:12, 157:18, 168:1, 171:11, 195:5, 195:6, 196:3, 196:7, 196:9, 201:19, 206:10, 206:11, 206:12, 221:14, 221:17</p> <p><b>hardly</b> [1] - 206:7</p> <p><b>Harleston</b> [1] - 164:17</p> <p><b>Harrington</b> [1] - 37:4</p> <p><b>Harvard</b> [6] - 118:11, 127:1, 127:12, 127:17, 129:2, 129:10</p> <p><b>hated</b> [1] - 159:15</p> <p><b>Hawkinson</b> [1] - 100:4</p> <p><b>HAWKINSON</b> [6] - 26:8, 64:5, 99:15, 100:3, 184:13, 231:14</p> <p><b>heads</b> [1] - 175:14</p> <p><b>healthy</b> [1] - 110:10</p> <p><b>hear</b> [14] - 6:2, 8:6, 32:12, 54:9, 86:10, 89:3, 100:7, 101:18, 104:18, 150:17, 153:5, 188:5, 228:6, 229:15</p> <p><b>heard</b> [13] - 34:15, 35:2, 39:3, 43:14, 58:2, 60:11, 90:8, 113:13, 134:4, 176:8, 195:2, 229:9,</p>	<p>230:6</p> <p><b>HEARING</b> [1] - 1:3</p> <p><b>hearing</b> [24] - 2:9, 4:10, 5:1, 5:7, 5:11, 5:18, 5:19, 8:4, 20:7, 32:11, 33:8, 34:5, 38:2, 40:19, 47:4, 49:14, 96:8, 104:19, 111:16, 174:9, 182:7, 238:7</p> <p><b>hearings</b> [9] - 4:9, 5:17, 6:6, 35:2, 36:14, 37:17, 44:3, 44:16, 182:15</p> <p><b>Hearings</b> [1] - 2:5</p> <p><b>heartened</b> [2] - 104:17, 133:10</p> <p><b>heartscape</b> [1] - 137:15</p> <p><b>heat</b> [1] - 110:3</p> <p><b>Heather</b> [2] - 120:5, 120:6</p> <p><b>HEATHER</b> [1] - 120:6</p> <p><b>height</b> [30] - 29:13, 41:14, 45:17, 45:19, 46:2, 46:5, 46:7, 46:17, 47:10, 47:16, 48:2, 59:17, 60:5, 136:7, 136:18, 149:15, 161:3, 166:19, 173:16, 186:13, 186:15, 189:5, 195:9, 203:15, 205:10, 205:14, 209:3, 209:13, 210:14, 233:5</p> <p><b>heights</b> [14] - 45:16, 46:1, 46:8, 46:14, 46:19, 47:2, 48:1, 48:8, 50:18, 173:9, 173:13, 188:13, 203:10, 203:12</p> <p><b>held</b> [5] - 2:9, 14:18, 35:14, 98:9, 125:2</p> <p><b>hello</b> [1] - 120:6</p> <p><b>help</b> [7] - 74:18, 86:2, 97:5, 102:10, 140:14, 189:13, 193:12</p> <p><b>helped</b> [2] - 96:13, 96:14</p> <p><b>helpful</b> [2] - 138:16, 141:5</p> <p><b>helping</b> [1] - 158:11</p> <p><b>hereby</b> [1] - 237:16</p> <p><b>herein</b> [1] - 238:7</p> <p><b>hereunto</b> [1] - 238:9</p> <p><b>hi</b> [1] - 10:9</p> <p><b>high</b> [9] - 55:17, 57:7, 69:3, 70:9, 77:18,</p>	<p>87:12, 87:14, 148:11, 218:19</p> <p><b>higher</b> [15] - 68:8, 78:2, 78:5, 81:7, 102:5, 115:16, 115:18, 130:13, 132:2, 138:19, 139:13, 222:5, 231:4, 235:12, 235:15</p> <p><b>highest</b> [1] - 223:6</p> <p><b>highlight</b> [4] - 13:15, 15:4, 108:15, 111:6</p> <p><b>highlights</b> [1] - 17:13</p> <p><b>highly</b> [1] - 56:10</p> <p><b>historic</b> [1] - 21:3</p> <p><b>history</b> [1] - 116:13</p> <p><b>hit</b> [4] - 17:13, 144:10, 175:14, 175:17</p> <p><b>HOFFMAN</b> [1] - 120:6</p> <p><b>Hoffman</b> [1] - 120:7</p> <p><b>holding</b> [1] - 36:19</p> <p><b>holdings</b> [1] - 97:4</p> <p><b>holds</b> [1] - 14:17</p> <p><b>Holyoke</b> [2] - 127:8, 129:19</p> <p><b>home</b> [2] - 120:9, 143:5</p> <p><b>hope</b> [4] - 25:5, 100:9, 102:10, 135:15</p> <p><b>hopefully</b> [2] - 10:17, 155:17</p> <p><b>hoping</b> [3] - 9:8, 105:5, 136:12</p> <p><b>horizon</b> [1] - 157:4</p> <p><b>horizontal</b> [5] - 79:3, 79:6, 79:16, 80:4, 83:19</p> <p><b>horrendous</b> [1] - 20:18</p> <p><b>hostage</b> [1] - 98:9</p> <p><b>hour</b> [2] - 113:10, 158:4</p> <p><b>households</b> [2] - 42:3, 42:6</p> <p><b>housing</b> [32] - 2:15, 41:13, 41:18, 42:2, 42:5, 42:8, 42:15, 42:16, 53:15, 60:13, 60:16, 61:12, 64:12, 76:1, 76:17, 77:1, 77:4, 78:4, 82:8, 95:17, 96:2, 96:5, 96:7, 115:12, 115:15, 115:17, 131:10, 131:16, 132:1, 136:18, 177:8</p> <p><b>HR&amp;A</b> [1] - 75:15</p> <p><b>HRA's</b> [1] - 99:18</p> <p><b>HRNA</b> [1] - 39:16</p>
--	--	---	--	---



**huge** [1] - 71:3  
**Hugh** [11] - 1:9, 30:12, 126:5, 138:15, 146:8, 185:16, 194:19, 198:16, 200:10, 205:15, 226:9  
**HUGH** [68] - 7:17, 30:13, 32:15, 86:12, 88:3, 126:7, 150:7, 159:18, 160:2, 163:11, 163:16, 163:19, 165:5, 165:9, 185:18, 195:1, 195:18, 196:1, 196:6, 196:17, 198:2, 198:11, 199:2, 200:11, 200:19, 201:10, 202:3, 205:5, 205:18, 206:6, 207:7, 207:15, 209:9, 210:3, 210:7, 211:10, 212:4, 212:7, 212:16, 213:2, 213:11, 214:2, 214:7, 214:15, 215:4, 215:13, 216:2, 216:13, 217:10, 219:7, 220:6, 220:10, 220:13, 220:16, 222:7, 222:18, 223:6, 224:3, 224:6, 224:9, 225:2, 225:15, 226:5, 227:6, 230:11, 231:10, 231:18, 232:3  
**Hurley** [1] - 120:7  
**husband** [1] - 106:15  
**hybrid** [1] - 79:13

## I

**iconic** [1] - 118:5  
**idea** [18] - 31:2, 38:8, 48:6, 49:2, 93:9, 109:18, 111:14, 122:4, 137:15, 142:6, 148:15, 164:6, 169:13, 170:9, 188:15, 204:2, 225:6, 232:7  
**ideal** [4] - 149:6, 149:8, 153:2, 182:17  
**ideally** [1] - 181:10  
**ideas** [4] - 49:19, 50:2, 61:2, 171:5

**identified** [6] - 23:7, 23:8, 56:13, 56:19, 58:19, 144:17  
**identifies** [4] - 57:12, 59:18, 60:2, 62:10  
**illustrate** [1] - 65:17  
**illustrates** [1] - 70:12  
**illustration** [1] - 63:15  
**illustrative** [6] - 61:4, 63:9, 129:9, 132:14, 161:4, 225:16  
**image** [1] - 11:4  
**images** [1] - 56:6  
**imagine** [3] - 84:16, 100:13, 125:16  
**imagined** [1] - 122:7  
**impact** [6] - 69:7, 111:10, 112:4, 167:4, 190:14  
**impacts** [5] - 73:9, 73:12, 73:13, 75:6, 140:15  
**implemented** [2] - 92:5, 200:15  
**implications** [1] - 169:9  
**importance** [3] - 56:12, 60:13, 62:1  
**important** [31] - 9:1, 10:2, 21:19, 22:3, 24:2, 44:6, 55:6, 56:17, 57:17, 58:18, 72:8, 72:14, 74:11, 92:19, 112:16, 118:11, 119:19, 120:11, 130:6, 131:4, 135:9, 146:12, 146:13, 146:14, 146:18, 146:19, 147:2, 191:15, 203:8, 203:9, 217:5  
**impose** [2] - 150:11, 171:7  
**improve** [2] - 132:11, 173:3  
**improved** [5] - 132:9, 134:17, 138:13, 159:18, 160:2  
**improvements** [10] - 5:9, 13:7, 14:5, 54:8, 74:13, 74:14, 82:5, 108:9, 132:7, 157:19  
**IN** [2] - 238:9, 238:16  
**inability** [1] - 179:16  
**inadequate** [2] - 109:7, 146:3  
**inaudible** [2] - 102:6, 196:11  
**Inaudible** [2] - 197:13, 225:2  
**inaudible** [2] - 20:1, 211:8  
**INC** [1] - 1:18  
**incentive** [2] - 82:11, 117:6  
**incentives** [2] - 44:14, 177:19  
**incentivize** [1] - 179:3  
**inclined** [1] - 151:1  
**include** [9] - 2:13, 43:12, 52:3, 80:19, 81:1, 82:14, 83:6, 186:16, 187:5  
**included** [15] - 12:14, 13:8, 47:14, 47:16, 52:11, 52:12, 53:5, 60:14, 61:9, 73:10, 74:9, 92:11, 102:3, 116:19, 117:3  
**includes** [6] - 13:2, 38:12, 82:7, 82:9, 82:11, 116:7  
**including** [6] - 35:9, 52:5, 75:17, 82:5, 118:18, 229:6  
**inclusionary** [1] - 82:7  
**income** [12] - 2:14, 13:3, 13:4, 42:3, 42:5, 42:8, 42:16, 42:18, 76:19, 77:1, 77:3, 82:8  
**incorporate** [1] - 176:1  
**incorporated** [4] - 41:10, 113:13, 177:16, 179:4  
**increase** [10] - 61:15, 72:7, 100:18, 103:5, 103:13, 109:15, 162:3, 187:3, 212:11, 234:16  
**increased** [3] - 71:4, 111:15, 233:15  
**increasing** [2] - 41:19, 71:1  
**independent** [1] - 52:1  
**Index** [2] - 2:19, 3:10  
**indicate** [2] - 86:17, 184:17  
**indication** [1] - 169:6  
**indications** [1] - 63:10  
**indicative** [1] - 215:5  
**indigo** [1] - 119:5  
**individual** [6] - 63:12, 63:13, 72:19, 112:7, 112:8, 154:1  
**indoor** [1] - 62:8

**industrial** [1] - 83:2  
**industry** [1] - 81:5  
**infeasible** [2] - 85:7, 117:8  
**influence** [4] - 21:17, 70:4, 70:5, 185:13  
**inform** [1] - 55:4  
**information** [13] - 90:6, 101:17, 107:16, 145:12, 146:3, 154:13, 154:14, 155:2, 155:6, 155:9, 193:6, 227:16  
**infrastructure** [5] - 13:7, 14:4, 78:3, 83:5, 110:13  
**initial** [7] - 46:3, 46:16, 49:5, 55:14, 83:9, 84:10, 85:4  
**initiate** [1] - 12:6  
**initiative** [1] - 94:16  
**innovate** [1] - 38:13  
**innovation** [7] - 38:9, 53:17, 82:9, 94:14, 94:17, 95:3, 172:8  
**input** [2] - 15:2, 115:9  
**inside** [1] - 220:9  
**insisting** [1] - 122:10  
**inspire** [1] - 96:13  
**Instacart** [1] - 106:17  
**installation** [1] - 3:3  
**instance** [2] - 101:7, 119:2  
**instances** [1] - 73:11  
**instead** [5] - 36:3, 124:3, 136:13, 137:1, 168:14  
**institution** [1] - 118:5  
**institutions** [1] - 35:11  
**INSTRUCTIONS** [2] - 237:1, 237:5  
**integral** [1] - 116:12  
**integrated** [1] - 43:5  
**integrating** [1] - 133:6  
**integration** [1] - 116:6  
**intended** [1] - 55:3  
**intense** [1] - 110:14  
**intensity** [1] - 147:13  
**intensively** [1] - 219:13  
**intent** [2] - 30:6, 203:11  
**intention** [1] - 45:2  
**interconnected** [1] - 43:7  
**interest** [1] - 77:9  
**interested** [6] - 66:13, 102:19, 107:15, 110:8, 130:16,

223:19  
**interesting** [3] - 134:3, 148:5, 230:19  
**interests** [1] - 178:3  
**interfaces** [2] - 59:19, 60:9  
**internal** [1] - 81:3  
**interplay** [2] - 119:17, 119:18  
**interpret** [1] - 195:2  
**intersection** [4] - 70:16, 70:18, 71:12, 71:16  
**intersections** [3] - 57:15, 71:5, 71:15  
**interviewed** [1] - 95:18  
**intimate** [1] - 57:3  
**intricate** [1] - 57:3  
**introduce** [1] - 170:5  
**introducing** [1] - 175:1  
**invite** [1] - 228:5  
**involved** [8] - 23:15, 26:12, 47:5, 65:13, 104:3, 107:4, 174:18, 178:3  
**involvement** [1] - 234:4  
**involving** [1] - 170:10  
**Iram** [8] - 1:13, 8:10, 33:10, 34:12, 40:1, 40:9, 111:16, 185:18  
**IRAM** [15] - 4:8, 34:13, 172:6, 180:17, 183:13, 183:18, 185:1, 193:14, 205:8, 207:10, 208:4, 210:16, 227:12, 228:15, 229:12  
**Iram's** [1] - 113:3  
**ironic** [1] - 95:2  
**IRR** [3] - 81:4, 81:7, 81:11  
**island** [1] - 110:3  
**issue** [11] - 10:15, 23:7, 23:14, 27:7, 31:7, 98:7, 158:13, 160:12, 162:6, 162:8, 178:13  
**issues** [18] - 15:4, 23:6, 60:16, 60:18, 84:8, 97:5, 134:8, 155:15, 158:7, 159:2, 161:14, 162:1, 167:14, 185:4, 186:8, 186:13, 192:14,

<p>212:3  <b>item</b> [2] - 4:19, 77:18  <b>items</b> [2] - 78:4, 149:13  <b>iterative</b> [1] - 145:3</p>	<p><b>judgment</b> [1] - 87:2  <b>judgments</b> [1] - 30:9  <b>jump</b> [2] - 40:18, 41:4  <b>junction</b> [2] - 119:4, 119:6  <b>jurisdiction</b> [2] - 27:18, 45:14</p>	<p>153:10, 166:12, 170:9, 193:12, 218:17  <b>kinds</b> [3] - 122:14, 134:14, 174:1  <b>kitchen</b> [1] - 78:8  <b>knitted</b> [1] - 43:10  <b>knitter</b> [1] - 121:16  <b>knitting</b> [1] - 121:17  <b>knobs</b> [2] - 101:6, 101:16  <b>knowledge</b> [1] - 193:8  <b>known</b> [3] - 2:7, 34:10, 36:10  <b>knows</b> [2] - 101:2, 104:5  <b>Knox</b> [1] - 117:12  <b>Kroon</b> [1] - 6:7  <b>KS</b> [6] - 3:7, 3:8, 5:2, 5:18, 36:10, 40:11</p>	<p>224:17  <b>larger</b> [4] - 16:10, 18:10, 62:13, 129:10  <b>LARRY</b> [1] - 102:15  <b>Larry</b> [1] - 102:15  <b>last</b> [23] - 5:18, 15:8, 24:11, 35:2, 37:17, 40:19, 47:3, 49:14, 53:10, 64:8, 65:8, 68:10, 71:6, 88:7, 90:2, 110:18, 111:1, 112:3, 114:9, 115:1, 166:9, 176:5, 221:10  <b>late</b> [1] - 217:5  <b>lately</b> [1] - 159:10  <b>latest</b> [1] - 90:7  <b>law</b> [2] - 24:14, 27:6  <b>Law</b> [1] - 25:18  <b>Lawson</b> [1] - 238:5</p>	<p><b>level</b> [17] - 31:11, 48:18, 56:8, 78:3, 78:5, 82:10, 148:11, 171:6, 201:3, 201:6, 211:11, 220:14, 226:8, 235:12, 235:15, 235:16, 235:18  <b>levels</b> [2] - 98:15, 203:13  <b>library</b> [1] - 165:1  <b>License</b> [1] - 238:13  <b>lifetime</b> [1] - 164:14  <b>light</b> [6] - 71:14, 119:7, 133:13, 143:19, 144:4, 173:12  <b>likelihood</b> [1] - 67:10  <b>likely</b> [5] - 16:10, 64:15, 101:3, 106:5, 111:9  <b>limit</b> [20] - 46:5, 50:17, 108:18, 136:7, 150:2, 171:6, 172:17, 173:6, 173:8, 186:14, 187:1, 195:5, 196:19, 201:19, 203:6, 204:19, 205:10, 205:14, 207:11  <b>limitation</b> [4] - 48:10, 160:14, 168:1, 174:7  <b>limitations</b> [2] - 198:13, 232:18  <b>limited</b> [4] - 28:17, 150:19, 173:11, 233:7  <b>limiting</b> [2] - 45:10, 189:19  <b>limits</b> [5] - 45:18, 47:16, 196:9, 204:9, 220:16  <b>Line</b> [4] - 110:17, 119:15, 157:14, 158:1  <b>LINE</b> [1] - 237:8  <b>line</b> [11] - 28:7, 110:16, 119:6, 135:12, 171:11, 172:5, 175:3, 196:3, 196:7, 199:8  <b>lines</b> [1] - 16:4  <b>link</b> [2] - 22:3, 54:16  <b>linkage</b> [1] - 82:11  <b>links</b> [1] - 91:4  <b>Lion</b> [1] - 79:15  <b>Lisa</b> [5] - 6:15, 8:6, 8:8, 11:1, 11:15  <b>LISA</b> [1] - 8:7</p>
<b>J</b>	<b>K</b>	<b>L</b>		
<p><b>Jackson</b> [2] - 20:14, 94:13  <b>JAMES</b> [7] - 20:13, 58:8, 78:12, 85:11, 86:1, 94:12, 98:19  <b>James</b> [5] - 20:13, 25:19, 58:13, 94:11, 94:12  <b>January</b> [4] - 5:14, 156:10, 181:17  <b>jargon</b> [1] - 94:18  <b>JEFF</b> [14] - 33:12, 39:19, 140:3, 166:3, 172:14, 178:17, 180:9, 180:16, 203:7, 217:3, 217:11, 221:11, 221:18, 228:19  <b>Jeff</b> [17] - 1:15, 33:11, 38:18, 39:18, 54:13, 60:5, 76:14, 122:3, 135:14, 163:12, 166:2, 178:12, 181:7, 185:8, 188:1, 192:5, 195:4  <b>Jefferson</b> [1] - 132:3  <b>Jersey</b> [1] - 95:18  <b>Jill</b> [1] - 28:5  <b>job</b> [2] - 124:5, 137:8  <b>John</b> [3] - 100:1, 100:4, 116:4  <b>JOHN</b> [7] - 26:8, 64:5, 99:15, 100:3, 116:4, 184:13, 231:14  <b>joined</b> [1] - 8:9  <b>JR</b> [34] - 154:4, 162:11, 162:16, 163:4, 163:8, 190:7, 191:11, 192:18, 193:2, 193:5, 197:13, 198:17, 209:2, 209:10, 213:5, 213:9, 213:12, 214:1, 214:3, 215:11, 216:11, 216:15, 216:19, 218:3, 218:8, 224:8, 224:12, 225:11, 227:10, 230:1, 231:8, 231:12, 231:16, 232:6  <b>Jr</b> [1] - 1:10</p>	<p><b>K2</b> [15] - 35:7, 36:18, 38:6, 54:17, 96:9, 107:5, 107:6, 107:9, 107:13, 109:10, 113:14, 133:12, 133:14  <b>K2-C2</b> [2] - 66:3, 66:17  <b>Katherine</b> [1] - 8:9  <b>KATHERINE</b> [4] - 10:9, 18:8, 19:10, 20:2  <b>KATHLEEN</b> [1] - 19:16  <b>Kathy</b> [2] - 8:17, 10:7  <b>kayak</b> [1] - 230:17  <b>keep</b> [6] - 141:13, 153:13, 183:1, 192:14, 199:3, 209:11  <b>keeping</b> [3] - 28:7, 93:2, 203:16  <b>Kendall</b> [33] - 3:7, 34:9, 35:11, 35:19, 36:4, 37:2, 38:11, 40:13, 43:3, 43:18, 54:18, 55:16, 61:8, 62:15, 75:17, 83:3, 89:3, 97:9, 110:19, 111:3, 113:6, 117:2, 119:13, 119:18, 122:11, 146:11, 157:14, 158:5, 170:18, 173:5, 191:6, 230:10  <b>Kennedy</b> [1] - 24:1  <b>key</b> [13] - 13:6, 14:13, 15:4, 16:5, 16:16, 52:13, 56:3, 56:4, 59:18, 60:17, 61:13, 76:15, 98:7  <b>Keyword</b> [1] - 3:10  <b>kick</b> [1] - 148:14  <b>kids</b> [1] - 37:12  <b>kind</b> [22] - 18:17, 24:6, 38:3, 43:11, 51:7, 70:4, 80:9, 81:12, 84:14, 85:4, 87:9, 88:17, 106:2, 116:7, 129:12, 130:5, 149:5,</p>	<p>lab [9] - 52:19, 53:3, 78:2, 83:15, 89:5, 89:7, 102:1, 102:4, 170:15  <b>lack</b> [1] - 60:8  <b>Lafayette</b> [1] - 28:5  <b>land</b> [41] - 2:7, 2:11, 2:11, 4:10, 4:17, 8:5, 16:19, 30:2, 30:4, 40:6, 64:17, 68:1, 80:7, 81:19, 83:13, 88:13, 88:16, 89:8, 89:10, 89:11, 90:16, 91:3, 91:17, 92:11, 92:14, 104:4, 125:4, 147:17, 150:8, 155:19, 156:1, 156:2, 163:1, 219:12, 223:12, 231:3, 234:2  <b>landmark</b> [10] - 49:13, 49:17, 49:18, 50:7, 122:5, 122:6, 159:6, 159:13, 160:7, 161:9  <b>landowner</b> [1] - 109:16  <b>landscape</b> [1] - 62:13  <b>landscaping</b> [1] - 82:6  <b>language</b> [14] - 42:6, 49:7, 49:11, 175:15, 175:16, 183:8, 183:9, 184:19, 185:10, 199:8, 212:18, 224:2, 228:17, 229:2  <b>large</b> [2] - 173:14,</p>	<p>224:17  <b>larger</b> [4] - 16:10, 18:10, 62:13, 129:10  <b>LARRY</b> [1] - 102:15  <b>Larry</b> [1] - 102:15  <b>last</b> [23] - 5:18, 15:8, 24:11, 35:2, 37:17, 40:19, 47:3, 49:14, 53:10, 64:8, 65:8, 68:10, 71:6, 88:7, 90:2, 110:18, 111:1, 112:3, 114:9, 115:1, 166:9, 176:5, 221:10  <b>late</b> [1] - 217:5  <b>lately</b> [1] - 159:10  <b>latest</b> [1] - 90:7  <b>law</b> [2] - 24:14, 27:6  <b>Law</b> [1] - 25:18  <b>Lawson</b> [1] - 238:5  <b>lay</b> [1] - 174:17  <b>layered</b> [1] - 203:10  <b>lead</b> [2] - 23:1, 96:14  <b>leads</b> [1] - 28:4  <b>learn</b> [2] - 22:10, 215:13  <b>learned</b> [2] - 66:7, 121:2  <b>learning</b> [1] - 42:13  <b>least</b> [10] - 43:12, 45:15, 101:19, 109:11, 115:13, 136:16, 139:11, 140:18, 151:8, 188:15  <b>leave</b> [7] - 38:4, 156:19, 196:7, 199:12, 199:15, 201:4, 212:14  <b>leaves</b> [1] - 109:5  <b>leaving</b> [2] - 52:14, 222:16  <b>led</b> [2] - 91:6, 96:11  <b>Lee</b> [3] - 99:8, 113:1, 113:2  <b>LEE</b> [2] - 99:9, 113:2  <b>left</b> [1] - 192:11  <b>legible</b> [1] - 56:10  <b>lend</b> [1] - 144:5  <b>length</b> [1] - 133:11  <b>less</b> [12] - 51:16, 69:18, 70:10, 92:14, 117:16, 131:14, 134:3, 137:16, 139:11, 140:5, 147:13, 233:18  <b>lesser</b> [1] - 28:13  <b>lessons</b> [1] - 121:2  <b>letter</b> [2] - 108:13, 126:9</p>	<p><b>level</b> [17] - 31:11, 48:18, 56:8, 78:3, 78:5, 82:10, 148:11, 171:6, 201:3, 201:6, 211:11, 220:14, 226:8, 235:12, 235:15, 235:16, 235:18  <b>levels</b> [2] - 98:15, 203:13  <b>library</b> [1] - 165:1  <b>License</b> [1] - 238:13  <b>lifetime</b> [1] - 164:14  <b>light</b> [6] - 71:14, 119:7, 133:13, 143:19, 144:4, 173:12  <b>likelihood</b> [1] - 67:10  <b>likely</b> [5] - 16:10, 64:15, 101:3, 106:5, 111:9  <b>limit</b> [20] - 46:5, 50:17, 108:18, 136:7, 150:2, 171:6, 172:17, 173:6, 173:8, 186:14, 187:1, 195:5, 196:19, 201:19, 203:6, 204:19, 205:10, 205:14, 207:11  <b>limitation</b> [4] - 48:10, 160:14, 168:1, 174:7  <b>limitations</b> [2] - 198:13, 232:18  <b>limited</b> [4] - 28:17, 150:19, 173:11, 233:7  <b>limiting</b> [2] - 45:10, 189:19  <b>limits</b> [5] - 45:18, 47:16, 196:9, 204:9, 220:16  <b>Line</b> [4] - 110:17, 119:15, 157:14, 158:1  <b>LINE</b> [1] - 237:8  <b>line</b> [11] - 28:7, 110:16, 119:6, 135:12, 171:11, 172:5, 175:3, 196:3, 196:7, 199:8  <b>lines</b> [1] - 16:4  <b>link</b> [2] - 22:3, 54:16  <b>linkage</b> [1] - 82:11  <b>links</b> [1] - 91:4  <b>Lion</b> [1] - 79:15  <b>Lisa</b> [5] - 6:15, 8:6, 8:8, 11:1, 11:15  <b>LISA</b> [1] - 8:7</p>

**list** [4] - 77:6, 77:8, 99:13, 185:8  
**listed** [1] - 99:13  
**listened** [1] - 133:18  
**listening** [1] - 193:17  
**literally** [1] - 118:9  
**live** [4] - 37:11, 38:12, 135:1, 223:11  
**liveable** [1] - 38:15  
**lived** [1] - 120:12  
**livelier** [1] - 58:1  
**lively** [3] - 62:5, 131:12, 131:14  
**living** [2] - 97:9, 120:12  
**LIZA** [5] - 7:9, 7:13, 20:9, 180:15, 183:17  
**Liza** [4] - 1:14, 7:8, 33:11, 183:15  
**loan** [2] - 77:10, 78:13  
**lobbies** [1] - 52:10  
**lobby** [1] - 119:17  
**lobbying** [1] - 157:18  
**local** [1] - 37:12  
**located** [1] - 46:19  
**location** [7] - 22:7, 29:8, 29:12, 59:1, 60:8, 62:3, 147:2  
**locations** [2] - 57:13, 59:14  
**locomotive** [1] - 146:18  
**long-term** [1] - 81:13  
**look** [45] - 11:17, 12:14, 19:10, 21:1, 21:6, 21:8, 59:16, 64:2, 64:12, 67:9, 68:4, 70:3, 72:11, 77:6, 77:14, 81:17, 83:17, 84:4, 84:11, 85:8, 91:11, 99:3, 101:2, 102:18, 112:12, 112:17, 116:19, 118:5, 118:16, 121:17, 135:6, 140:7, 141:5, 141:16, 143:8, 145:9, 146:15, 149:2, 149:4, 172:3, 172:19, 180:13, 186:1, 190:1, 230:17  
**looked** [12] - 16:18, 40:2, 43:3, 58:14, 68:5, 70:15, 77:4, 81:9, 132:8, 133:11, 179:18  
**looking** [28] - 14:5, 16:16, 30:1, 64:10, 70:1, 72:19, 79:1,

80:2, 81:10, 81:13, 83:10, 86:14, 103:14, 104:9, 104:10, 107:16, 107:17, 126:8, 127:15, 155:5, 156:14, 169:7, 169:8, 189:12, 189:15, 210:11, 229:1

**looks** [4] - 11:18, 46:11, 67:5  
**lose** [1] - 214:5  
**Lou** [1] - 154:3  
**Louis** [1] - 1:10  
**LOUIS** [34] - 154:4, 162:11, 162:16, 163:4, 163:8, 190:7, 191:11, 192:18, 193:2, 193:5, 197:13, 198:17, 209:2, 209:10, 213:5, 213:9, 213:12, 214:1, 214:3, 215:11, 216:11, 216:15, 216:19, 218:3, 218:8, 224:8, 224:12, 225:11, 227:10, 230:1, 231:8, 231:12, 231:16, 232:6  
**love** [3] - 100:14, 150:17, 152:3  
**lovely** [1] - 31:13  
**low** [9] - 13:3, 42:3, 52:1, 69:4, 70:10, 81:5, 111:15, 167:5, 223:3  
**lower** [6] - 46:2, 47:1, 171:6, 222:14, 235:16, 235:18  
**LTV** [1] - 78:12  
**lump** [1] - 139:19

## M

**Ma'am** [1] - 102:14  
**mail** [1] - 30:15  
**Main** [2] - 4:12, 11:10  
**main** [1] - 63:3  
**maintain** [1] - 153:18  
**maintenance** [1] - 111:13  
**major** [2] - 21:9, 158:13  
**majority** [1] - 3:7  
**make-up** [1] - 40:13  
**malicious** [1] - 122:15  
**management** [3] - 3:4, 110:4, 112:11

**Manager** [9] - 1:13, 4:6, 6:16, 8:6, 8:8, 11:12, 12:5, 17:11, 32:4  
**Manager's** [4] - 9:11, 9:15, 10:5, 10:12  
**mandatory** [1] - 188:4  
**manner** [1] - 226:13  
**Manning** [1] - 5:7  
**map** [2] - 47:13, 47:18  
**margin** [2] - 87:16, 143:7  
**marginal** [1] - 87:1  
**marijuana** [1] - 6:10  
**market** [5] - 51:9, 51:18, 62:8, 131:19, 223:16  
**Marriott** [1] - 119:17  
**Mary** [5] - 1:11, 31:3, 138:8, 162:2, 168:5  
**MARY** [22] - 18:1, 18:3, 19:3, 31:4, 32:19, 138:9, 140:4, 191:4, 191:14, 191:19, 192:4, 207:19, 214:14, 219:6, 221:8, 228:18, 229:13, 232:10, 235:7, 235:9, 235:16, 236:7  
**mass** [1] - 190:13  
**Mass** [9] - 2:17, 3:3, 4:12, 8:14, 11:3, 11:5, 11:10, 14:8, 14:11  
**Massachusetts** [3] - 1:7, 2:8, 100:4  
**MASSACHUSETTS** [1] - 238:3  
**masses** [2] - 203:14, 227:1  
**massing** [17] - 59:14, 61:3, 61:13, 62:10, 103:1, 139:9, 149:3, 153:18, 161:3, 161:4, 188:10, 188:12, 210:11, 225:8, 225:16, 226:18, 234:6  
**massing/open** [2] - 227:7, 228:7  
**massive** [1] - 227:4  
**master** [4] - 78:15, 81:17, 177:17, 188:3  
**material** [1] - 227:18  
**matter** [1] - 106:13  
**maximizing** [2] - 61:19, 68:13  
**maximum** [7] - 49:4,

53:3, 131:7, 141:7, 178:14, 195:12, 197:9  
**Mayor** [2] - 6:16, 95:19  
**MBTA** [1] - 157:13  
**MBTA's** [1] - 111:11  
**McDonald's** [5] - 22:13, 22:14, 23:1, 23:5  
**mean** [32] - 49:10, 49:17, 70:16, 87:17, 98:4, 121:8, 143:3, 145:3, 148:1, 148:3, 148:17, 148:19, 149:2, 152:15, 153:8, 161:13, 165:4, 184:8, 201:5, 201:18, 202:4, 204:5, 204:6, 205:14, 209:18, 214:15, 219:17, 220:18, 227:1, 227:9, 229:17, 230:17  
**meander** [1] - 57:9  
**means** [6] - 71:10, 114:2, 147:9, 181:10, 182:2, 203:17  
**meant** [2] - 24:16, 51:3  
**measure** [1] - 133:14  
**measurement** [1] - 116:8  
**measurements** [1] - 116:8  
**measures** [3] - 87:14, 178:1, 229:4  
**measuring** [2] - 106:5, 127:14  
**mechanism** [3] - 201:9, 202:5, 203:2  
**median** [2] - 76:18, 77:3  
**medical** [1] - 6:10  
**medicinal** [1] - 6:9  
**medicine** [1] - 120:9  
**meet** [3] - 114:10, 142:8, 181:2  
**meeting** [14] - 4:4, 5:4, 14:17, 14:18, 15:5, 32:8, 57:10, 111:16, 113:10, 114:13, 170:8, 183:10, 184:14, 227:5  
**Meeting** [2] - 1:6, 2:4  
**meetings** [12] - 5:4, 35:12, 35:14, 37:9, 37:10, 115:1, 125:2,

125:5, 145:9, 166:11, 184:4, 188:2  
**meets** [1] - 116:9  
**member** [1] - 97:18  
**Member** [7] - 1:9, 1:9, 1:10, 1:10, 1:11, 1:11, 1:12  
**Members** [5] - 25:14, 30:10, 63:7, 86:9, 229:15  
**members** [6] - 9:18, 17:18, 75:11, 97:6, 99:16, 141:15  
**Memorial** [1] - 116:5  
**mention** [6] - 6:12, 34:14, 100:2, 107:2, 111:11, 112:3  
**mentioned** [6] - 60:5, 111:17, 122:6, 138:1, 168:13, 186:13  
**merchandise** [1] - 51:8  
**message** [1] - 169:12  
**met** [5] - 6:15, 25:2, 37:5, 39:12, 114:8  
**method** [1] - 94:8  
**methodology** [1] - 78:18  
**MGH** [1] - 190:18  
**mic** [2] - 26:9, 64:5  
**microphone** [1] - 166:4  
**microunits** [3] - 15:12, 15:14, 15:16  
**middle** [13] - 2:14, 13:4, 21:3, 42:5, 42:8, 42:16, 42:18, 46:9, 69:16, 76:19, 82:7, 132:13, 144:1  
**might** [34] - 27:8, 33:12, 33:13, 49:11, 50:11, 61:5, 83:5, 84:17, 85:5, 104:1, 104:5, 104:7, 112:2, 112:16, 117:15, 130:3, 139:10, 139:13, 140:14, 141:5, 143:10, 143:11, 164:1, 174:16, 181:16, 183:7, 187:16, 191:4, 193:12, 197:1, 199:14, 212:13, 216:9  
**migraine** [1] - 120:9  
**milestones** [2] - 73:14, 74:3  
**Milford** [1] - 6:8  
**million** [15] - 18:12,

<p>52:19, 53:1, 84:1, 84:19, 98:1, 100:6, 100:7, 100:8, 101:4, 103:16, 105:4, 149:1</p> <p><b>mind</b> [1] - 101:7</p> <p><b>mine</b> [2] - 87:1, 87:6</p> <p><b>minimal</b> [1] - 118:19</p> <p><b>minimum</b> [7] - 13:2, 53:2, 165:15, 212:15, 223:14, 233:14, 234:6</p> <p><b>minimums</b> [1] - 165:16</p> <p><b>miniscale</b> [2] - 96:2, 96:6</p> <p><b>minor</b> [2] - 129:3, 175:19</p> <p><b>minute</b> [1] - 15:8</p> <p><b>minutes</b> [2] - 90:2, 113:11</p> <p><b>missed</b> [2] - 23:10, 23:12</p> <p><b>mistake</b> [2] - 20:17, 24:9</p> <p><b>misunderstanding</b> [1] - 91:7</p> <p><b>MIT</b> [10] - 5:13, 36:8, 61:9, 66:7, 94:15, 94:16, 97:3, 97:9, 118:10, 128:13</p> <p><b>MIT's</b> [2] - 94:16, 97:1</p> <p><b>mitigate</b> [1] - 97:5</p> <p><b>mitigation</b> [1] - 229:4</p> <p><b>mitigations</b> [3] - 83:6, 83:7, 87:16</p> <p><b>mix</b> [2] - 141:10, 170:7</p> <p><b>Moakley</b> [1] - 220:2</p> <p><b>mobility</b> [1] - 111:11</p> <p><b>modal</b> [1] - 95:9</p> <p><b>model</b> [3] - 80:10, 91:1, 141:1</p> <p><b>models</b> [2] - 47:6, 141:6</p> <p><b>moderate</b> [2] - 13:3, 42:3</p> <p><b>modifiable</b> [1] - 221:15</p> <p><b>modifications</b> [4] - 53:17, 64:18, 108:9, 173:3</p> <p><b>modified</b> [3] - 41:5, 91:14, 184:19</p> <p><b>modify</b> [2] - 168:9, 168:17</p> <p><b>moment</b> [1] - 67:13</p> <p><b>money</b> [7] - 19:1, 79:1, 79:2, 80:15, 81:14, 104:1, 157:13</p>	<p><b>months</b> [2] - 118:1, 160:17</p> <p><b>moreover</b> [2] - 48:14, 117:4</p> <p><b>morning</b> [1] - 6:12</p> <p><b>most</b> [10] - 11:2, 59:8, 84:11, 89:19, 92:6, 154:4, 155:14, 186:16, 187:5, 192:8</p> <p><b>mostly</b> [5] - 102:9, 127:18, 127:19, 128:3, 199:19</p> <p><b>motion</b> [5] - 7:16, 31:18, 32:14, 32:16, 236:2</p> <p><b>motivate</b> [1] - 189:14</p> <p><b>motivation</b> [1] - 176:12</p> <p><b>movable</b> [1] - 47:5</p> <p><b>move</b> [8] - 22:12, 145:11, 158:6, 182:9, 184:11, 195:11, 225:3, 227:1</p> <p><b>moved</b> [6] - 7:17, 22:11, 32:17, 181:18, 182:1, 236:4</p> <p><b>movements</b> [1] - 71:11</p> <p><b>moves</b> [2] - 27:14, 30:3</p> <p><b>moving</b> [7] - 35:3, 62:9, 136:5, 138:10, 141:13, 145:16, 227:2</p> <p><b>Municipal</b> [3] - 2:8, 2:10, 9:3</p> <p><b>municipal</b> [2] - 8:15, 146:17</p> <p><b>must</b> [4] - 118:15, 149:2, 179:10, 231:6</p> <p><b>MXD</b> [4] - 47:14, 61:11, 75:18, 157:12</p>	<p>146:5, 146:6, 158:17, 172:8, 194:12, 213:18</p> <p><b>near</b> [3] - 143:9, 155:18, 223:18</p> <p><b>nearby</b> [1] - 123:6</p> <p><b>necessarily</b> [7] - 37:9, 85:6, 106:10, 140:15, 161:6, 179:12, 233:7</p> <p><b>necessary</b> [3] - 27:19, 150:19, 229:11</p> <p><b>necessity</b> [1] - 148:8</p> <p><b>need</b> [31] - 9:18, 14:7, 41:8, 42:8, 43:10, 43:12, 51:13, 56:19, 98:5, 118:14, 121:4, 122:8, 123:12, 124:1, 135:10, 136:18, 136:19, 158:19, 165:14, 170:1, 179:15, 182:2, 187:17, 190:15, 193:18, 196:6, 199:8, 202:8, 228:12, 229:15, 230:4</p> <p><b>needed</b> [1] - 95:1</p> <p><b>needing</b> [1] - 117:16</p> <p><b>needs</b> [10] - 9:5, 9:6, 10:18, 11:8, 32:5, 57:11, 87:7, 91:9, 142:9, 167:3</p> <p><b>negative</b> [1] - 154:10</p> <p><b>negotiate</b> [1] - 117:10</p> <p><b>negotiation</b> [1] - 105:10</p> <p><b>neighborhood</b> [14] - 14:7, 22:4, 22:5, 35:9, 37:6, 38:11, 57:4, 104:12, 110:17, 117:15, 120:11, 122:8, 144:2, 144:6</p> <p><b>neighborhoods</b> [1] - 14:6</p> <p><b>network</b> [4] - 43:5, 56:11, 57:8, 229:6</p> <p><b>NetZero</b> [2] - 54:3, 54:4</p> <p><b>never</b> [3] - 104:4, 114:15, 114:17</p> <p><b>new</b> [14] - 72:10, 80:19, 87:7, 90:6, 96:15, 107:16, 127:13, 128:1, 128:6, 128:14, 147:18, 154:16, 164:10, 215:15</p> <p><b>New</b> [2] - 95:18, 110:7</p> <p><b>Newark</b> [1] - 95:19</p>	<p><b>next</b> [20] - 5:4, 5:5, 18:12, 19:9, 22:19, 33:8, 63:4, 102:14, 125:17, 130:11, 136:1, 153:13, 172:16, 181:2, 182:6, 182:11, 183:10, 184:5, 190:18, 222:4</p> <p><b>nice</b> [1] - 230:2</p> <p><b>night</b> [1] - 121:15</p> <p><b>nine</b> [1] - 21:10</p> <p><b>nobody</b> [2] - 20:9, 20:10</p> <p><b>nocuous</b> [1] - 216:8</p> <p><b>noise</b> [1] - 112:11</p> <p><b>non</b> [2] - 91:3, 91:17</p> <p><b>non-federal</b> [2] - 91:3, 91:17</p> <p><b>none</b> [1] - 127:10</p> <p><b>Norfolk</b> [1] - 113:2</p> <p><b>normal</b> [2] - 176:14, 202:5</p> <p><b>Normandy</b> [10] - 10:4, 11:11, 12:9, 12:16, 23:18, 24:18, 25:7, 27:2, 27:10, 28:10</p> <p><b>north</b> [1] - 117:18</p> <p><b>North</b> [1] - 73:16</p> <p><b>north/south</b> [2] - 56:13, 61:16</p> <p><b>NOT</b> [1] - 238:16</p> <p><b>Notary</b> [2] - 238:6, 238:12</p> <p><b>note</b> [12] - 23:13, 29:5, 47:13, 55:6, 72:8, 115:11, 117:1, 166:7, 175:18, 178:10, 223:9, 237:6</p> <p><b>noted</b> [3] - 74:10, 118:13, 237:16</p> <p><b>nothing</b> [10] - 44:8, 44:11, 132:19, 133:1, 133:3, 143:14, 163:6, 178:17, 178:18</p> <p><b>notion</b> [7] - 49:13, 50:2, 167:5, 189:18, 192:5, 198:3, 202:18</p> <p><b>November</b> [7] - 1:4, 4:3, 6:1, 6:4, 40:3, 156:9, 232:16</p> <p><b>nuanced</b> [1] - 45:4</p> <p><b>number</b> [35] - 15:12, 15:14, 18:11, 71:4, 75:16, 77:13, 81:1, 81:4, 81:12, 85:12, 100:16, 101:12, 102:7, 108:8,</p>	<p>108:14, 109:9, 131:17, 169:3, 169:5, 196:11, 197:1, 206:12, 206:13, 207:11, 214:8, 215:2, 222:4, 222:5, 222:10, 223:2, 223:3, 230:18, 233:6, 233:13</p> <p><b>numbers</b> [25] - 40:1, 64:19, 67:13, 67:14, 83:11, 85:7, 86:15, 91:12, 92:1, 92:6, 93:10, 93:12, 93:13, 93:16, 97:13, 97:15, 98:4, 99:4, 104:9, 111:6, 131:4, 143:9, 148:12, 194:18, 207:16</p> <p><b>numerous</b> [1] - 114:8</p> <p><b>NUR</b> [31] - 25:15, 26:5, 28:19, 32:6, 75:9, 88:4, 88:7, 88:13, 89:12, 136:2, 165:4, 189:17, 190:17, 204:14, 205:17, 207:13, 208:2, 208:10, 211:8, 215:12, 216:17, 219:1, 219:4, 223:5, 223:8, 223:11, 224:5, 224:11, 225:1, 229:14, 232:5</p> <p><b>Nur</b> [1] - 1:11</p>
<b>O</b>				
<p><b>o'clock</b> [1] - 34:4</p> <p><b>O'Leary</b> [4] - 90:9, 90:10, 93:6, 94:6</p> <p><b>O'LEARY</b> [3] - 90:10, 93:8, 94:7</p> <p><b>O'Leary's</b> [1] - 176:8</p> <p><b>O'Neill</b> [1] - 219:18</p> <p><b>objective</b> [2] - 56:10, 57:6</p> <p><b>observation</b> [1] - 24:12</p> <p><b>obvious</b> [3] - 101:7, 118:18, 121:8</p> <p><b>obviously</b> [10] - 26:19, 75:4, 102:19, 109:1, 110:13, 115:3, 119:11, 181:5, 192:12, 194:6</p> <p><b>occupancy</b> [1] - 65:12</p> <p><b>occupant</b> [1] - 144:7</p> <p><b>occupied</b> [1] - 3:8</p>				

<p><b>occur</b> [1] - 28:1  <b>October</b> [7] - 7:10, 14:18, 38:1, 39:12, 63:18, 90:3  <b>odd</b> [1] - 88:17  <b>OF</b> [5] - 1:2, 238:3, 238:15, 238:16, 238:17  <b>off-site</b> [1] - 83:5  <b>offering</b> [1] - 26:2  <b>office</b> [38] - 21:7, 30:17, 52:19, 53:3, 64:13, 68:2, 68:13, 68:15, 68:16, 68:19, 69:15, 69:16, 78:9, 83:15, 88:10, 89:5, 89:7, 102:3, 122:13, 127:2, 133:6, 133:8, 139:18, 140:1, 140:9, 152:18, 162:7, 170:7, 170:11, 170:14, 171:14, 171:19, 172:4, 192:6, 192:11, 235:9, 235:11, 235:13  <b>Office</b> [1] - 109:17  <b>OFFICIAL</b> [1] - 1:18  <b>officially</b> [1] - 22:2  <b>often</b> [8] - 22:15, 38:6, 79:5, 81:9, 81:17, 87:10, 145:5, 193:16  <b>Old</b> [1] - 127:12  <b>old</b> [3] - 127:17, 128:7, 129:12  <b>on-site</b> [1] - 82:5  <b>once</b> [4] - 106:14, 121:7, 144:15, 144:16  <b>One</b> [3] - 30:16, 110:19, 128:12  <b>one</b> [86] - 12:8, 18:1, 19:6, 19:7, 24:13, 24:17, 25:17, 26:2, 28:4, 29:18, 40:12, 40:17, 43:1, 43:12, 44:5, 49:1, 49:3, 65:10, 67:19, 71:18, 83:12, 86:13, 99:13, 101:2, 101:7, 101:8, 104:6, 106:16, 106:18, 115:4, 118:17, 119:1, 120:8, 120:16, 122:6, 124:13, 126:16, 128:8, 129:11, 129:19, 134:3, 136:5, 136:14, 137:3, 149:13, 149:15, 158:5, 161:6,</p>	<p>162:11, 163:19, 167:18, 168:2, 168:12, 170:8, 170:13, 171:4, 177:2, 179:14, 184:5, 184:6, 185:7, 186:13, 189:4, 189:6, 189:17, 192:18, 197:2, 197:19, 198:6, 198:10, 203:15, 205:2, 206:15, 206:16, 206:18, 207:3, 207:6, 208:12, 209:9, 217:3, 221:12, 223:18, 226:10, 233:7, 233:9, 235:7  <b>ones</b> [4] - 25:2, 186:2, 186:3, 235:2  <b>open</b> [114] - 41:13, 42:19, 43:4, 43:9, 44:4, 44:8, 44:10, 44:12, 44:14, 44:19, 45:5, 45:8, 45:11, 47:2, 47:11, 51:18, 53:16, 54:7, 55:18, 57:6, 57:7, 57:13, 57:17, 57:19, 58:1, 60:9, 60:18, 61:5, 61:7, 61:19, 62:4, 74:16, 87:15, 92:1, 108:17, 109:6, 109:13, 110:12, 116:7, 119:2, 123:5, 123:9, 124:17, 124:19, 126:9, 126:13, 127:14, 129:14, 129:16, 129:17, 130:8, 131:9, 134:4, 138:14, 138:19, 139:8, 139:14, 143:18, 154:18, 155:2, 162:2, 164:6, 165:13, 168:14, 168:15, 168:16, 170:4, 177:8, 178:14, 179:4, 179:6, 179:7, 179:17, 187:7, 187:9, 193:9, 194:3, 194:12, 199:12, 200:7, 212:4, 212:5, 212:8, 212:11, 213:18, 214:6, 214:11, 214:18, 215:18, 216:3, 217:7, 217:12, 217:19, 218:2, 218:4, 219:9, 220:4, 220:5, 220:8,</p>	<p>220:17, 222:2, 223:9, 223:12, 224:4, 224:5, 224:9, 233:14, 234:1, 234:6, 234:14, 234:15, 234:16  <b>opening</b> [1] - 47:8  <b>operated</b> [1] - 3:9  <b>operating</b> [1] - 100:13  <b>operative</b> [1] - 50:13  <b>operators</b> [3] - 51:14, 51:15, 52:1  <b>opinion</b> [2] - 30:3, 226:5  <b>opinions</b> [2] - 160:8, 161:2  <b>opportunities</b> [2] - 57:9, 58:6  <b>opportunity</b> [13] - 4:14, 21:5, 31:10, 32:12, 63:19, 85:19, 97:3, 97:14, 97:17, 116:14, 133:4, 157:2, 189:18  <b>oppose</b> [1] - 28:15  <b>opposed</b> [6] - 13:12, 33:4, 103:13, 205:15, 205:18, 236:12  <b>opposite</b> [1] - 69:1  <b>opposition</b> [1] - 200:8  <b>optimizes</b> [1] - 60:9  <b>option</b> [2] - 114:17, 192:10  <b>optional</b> [2] - 174:12, 174:16  <b>options</b> [3] - 125:12, 150:16, 186:4  <b>orange</b> [2] - 40:17, 61:10  <b>order</b> [7] - 47:11, 51:11, 149:8, 181:2, 185:13, 218:12  <b>ordinance</b> [3] - 14:16, 16:9, 122:3  <b>Ordinance</b> [15] - 3:6, 5:16, 6:2, 6:16, 30:7, 34:8, 37:18, 39:2, 41:9, 104:18, 121:15, 182:5, 182:8, 201:12, 206:14  <b>original</b> [2] - 48:7, 237:2  <b>otherwise</b> [1] - 174:16  <b>ought</b> [5] - 101:18, 157:17, 161:9, 180:6, 213:4  <b>ourselves</b> [3] - 98:8, 189:19, 190:3  <b>outcome</b> [8] - 57:5,</p>	<p>70:8, 118:14, 154:11, 177:11, 180:1, 202:16, 202:18  <b>outcomes</b> [2] - 55:19, 174:1  <b>outlined</b> [2] - 16:8, 32:7  <b>outlines</b> [2] - 10:3, 10:13  <b>outlining</b> [1] - 108:13  <b>outlook</b> [1] - 62:17  <b>output</b> [1] - 81:19  <b>outreach</b> [1] - 175:2  <b>outside</b> [2] - 15:16, 109:2  <b>outward</b> [1] - 118:16  <b>overall</b> [2] - 15:7, 44:5, 44:15, 45:6, 46:6, 52:17, 53:14, 61:1, 61:8, 66:1, 76:13, 98:10, 103:6, 140:12, 169:13, 170:16, 177:17, 178:5, 207:15, 229:5, 233:10  <b>overarching</b> [1] - 115:3  <b>overdue</b> [1] - 117:16  <b>Overlay</b> [1] - 3:7  <b>overview</b> [5] - 10:14, 40:10, 41:1, 45:17, 53:13  <b>own</b> [6] - 19:17, 22:15, 155:19, 156:1, 166:1, 203:15  <b>owned</b> [8] - 2:7, 2:8, 9:5, 19:14, 23:18, 25:6, 97:9, 156:2  <b>owner</b> [1] - 23:4  <b>ownership</b> [1] - 118:3  <b>owns</b> [2] - 19:8, 19:12</p>	<p><b>paper</b> [1] - 88:7  <b>parameter</b> [1] - 105:10  <b>parameters</b> [2] - 105:11, 114:14  <b>parcel</b> [24] - 16:13, 16:14, 19:17, 19:18, 23:17, 29:6, 29:9, 48:11, 48:12, 76:4, 90:16, 91:1, 92:2, 92:5, 92:8, 92:12, 92:13, 92:15, 93:1, 93:2, 117:19, 119:12  <b>parcels</b> [3] - 16:11, 29:14, 91:15  <b>pardon</b> [2] - 160:1, 195:19  <b>Paris</b> [2] - 159:10, 159:13  <b>Parisian</b> [1] - 159:13  <b>park</b> [8] - 24:3, 31:15, 37:12, 62:13, 122:13, 133:6, 133:8, 152:18  <b>Park</b> [6] - 28:5, 73:18, 79:14, 109:16, 128:11, 132:3  <b>Parker</b> [1] - 164:17  <b>Parking</b> [4] - 2:8, 2:17, 3:3, 3:4  <b>parking</b> [26] - 8:15, 11:3, 11:5, 14:11, 19:8, 19:13, 19:14, 28:12, 30:17, 77:17, 77:18, 82:5, 118:19, 125:15, 158:10, 170:12, 170:14, 171:8, 192:6, 192:11, 195:4, 195:6, 231:11, 235:7, 235:10  <b>parks</b> [7] - 37:1, 83:4, 109:14, 109:18, 110:3, 110:8, 110:9  <b>part</b> [23] - 14:9, 18:9, 21:15, 44:19, 45:6, 47:4, 55:14, 55:16, 66:17, 75:3, 93:15, 95:12, 107:10, 111:19, 124:11, 130:10, 145:3, 175:2, 179:11, 179:13, 179:17, 234:13  <b>participate</b> [1] - 113:7  <b>particular</b> [6] - 19:2, 27:12, 40:16, 70:18, 110:14, 167:13  <b>particularly</b> [5] - 36:16, 94:18,</p>
<b>P</b>				
			<p><b>p.m</b> [3] - 1:5, 2:6, 236:16  <b>pace</b> [6] - 66:6, 66:8, 68:6, 68:7, 71:16, 72:5  <b>paces</b> [1] - 130:15  <b>package</b> [1] - 14:15  <b>PADEN</b> [5] - 7:9, 7:13, 20:9, 180:15, 183:17  <b>Paden</b> [1] - 1:14  <b>PAGE</b> [3] - 2:1, 3:1, 237:8  <b>Page</b> [1] - 2:19  <b>paid</b> [1] - 97:7</p>	

<p>132:14, 170:11, 228:3</p> <p><b>particulars</b> [1] - 90:12</p> <p><b>partnered</b> [1] - 39:14</p> <p><b>parts</b> [2] - 126:11, 127:1</p> <p><b>pass</b> [2] - 86:6, 99:10</p> <p><b>passed</b> [3] - 11:10, 31:9, 72:2</p> <p><b>passing</b> [1] - 27:11</p> <p><b>passive</b> [1] - 57:19</p> <p><b>past</b> [3] - 40:2, 104:19, 185:3</p> <p><b>path</b> [1] - 119:4</p> <p><b>pathway</b> [4] - 21:18, 22:3, 22:10, 28:6</p> <p><b>pathways</b> [1] - 28:4</p> <p><b>Patriots</b> [1] - 224:18</p> <p><b>pattern</b> [1] - 21:8</p> <p><b>pause</b> [1] - 143:8</p> <p><b>payment</b> [2] - 14:14, 18:4</p> <p><b>payments</b> [1] - 82:11</p> <p><b>pedestrian</b> [12] - 2:17, 8:13, 11:7, 13:9, 13:12, 13:17, 14:2, 16:2, 17:3, 56:14, 230:14, 230:19</p> <p><b>pedestrians</b> [2] - 16:4, 220:10</p> <p><b>peer</b> [1] - 111:18</p> <p><b>penetrable</b> [1] - 118:12</p> <p><b>people</b> [50] - 11:2, 15:2, 15:5, 15:6, 15:9, 15:11, 22:5, 22:18, 28:14, 33:10, 37:10, 37:14, 38:12, 48:3, 48:4, 49:14, 59:5, 64:15, 65:2, 65:3, 65:5, 65:9, 65:15, 68:16, 69:11, 85:17, 90:2, 95:10, 96:18, 99:11, 99:14, 106:9, 106:18, 111:3, 114:19, 120:15, 123:3, 123:13, 125:12, 134:5, 157:1, 158:1, 159:15, 161:13, 165:14, 193:17, 215:6, 224:16, 226:2, 230:14</p> <p><b>people's</b> [1] - 158:14</p> <p><b>per</b> [13] - 54:6, 65:10, 68:16, 74:15, 83:12, 83:13, 83:14, 83:16, 85:11, 89:2, 102:2, 151:7</p> <p><b>percent</b> [97] - 2:13, 2:14, 13:2, 13:4,</p>	<p>42:2, 42:4, 45:15, 48:11, 66:15, 66:19, 67:6, 67:10, 74:16, 76:17, 76:18, 76:19, 77:3, 81:4, 81:11, 88:19, 96:1, 100:16, 100:17, 101:11, 103:13, 111:2, 115:12, 115:14, 128:17, 132:4, 138:3, 139:2, 139:6, 139:11, 141:9, 150:2, 150:7, 160:14, 162:3, 162:9, 164:3, 164:8, 164:9, 168:15, 168:16, 168:18, 172:17, 176:9, 178:13, 178:19, 186:14, 186:19, 187:1, 187:3, 187:4, 187:11, 187:13, 198:5, 199:7, 199:9, 199:15, 203:4, 203:6, 205:10, 205:13, 208:5, 208:7, 208:9, 209:1, 210:2, 211:18, 212:15, 213:6, 214:9, 214:10, 214:11, 214:16, 215:10, 215:12, 216:18, 218:14, 218:17, 219:3, 219:4, 220:19, 221:17, 222:1, 222:5, 224:6, 233:12, 233:15, 233:18, 233:19</p> <p><b>percentage</b> [8] - 15:12, 96:3, 101:9, 131:18, 138:18, 138:19, 217:17, 233:10</p> <p><b>percentages</b> [1] - 138:2</p> <p><b>perfect</b> [1] - 180:18</p> <p><b>perfectly</b> [1] - 150:1</p> <p><b>perhaps</b> [3] - 51:9, 139:2, 165:17</p> <p><b>period</b> [1] - 135:16</p> <p><b>permanently</b> [1] - 2:14</p> <p><b>permeability</b> [1] - 61:15</p> <p><b>permit</b> [4] - 2:16, 4:16, 145:8, 152:11</p> <p><b>Permit</b> [6] - 5:10, 61:10, 72:18, 75:3, 174:7, 185:15</p> <p><b>permits</b> [1] - 27:19</p> <p><b>permitted</b> [2] - 66:1,</p>	<p>189:11</p> <p><b>permitting</b> [3] - 27:18, 31:11, 82:4</p> <p><b>person</b> [9] - 24:13, 26:2, 26:18, 65:4, 65:10, 69:9, 69:13, 69:17, 70:1</p> <p><b>personal</b> [2] - 28:3, 151:8</p> <p><b>personally</b> [3] - 155:16, 160:11, 206:6</p> <p><b>perspective</b> [9] - 13:11, 146:16, 146:17, 147:11, 149:6, 149:18, 151:8, 181:8, 182:16</p> <p><b>persuaded</b> [1] - 192:3</p> <p><b>pertaining</b> [1] - 56:4</p> <p><b>pertains</b> [1] - 18:3</p> <p><b>pertinent</b> [1] - 103:18</p> <p><b>PETER</b> [3] - 108:3, 108:5, 112:14</p> <p><b>Peter</b> [1] - 108:5</p> <p><b>Peterson</b> [3] - 6:15, 8:6, 8:8</p> <p><b>PETERSON</b> [1] - 8:7</p> <p><b>Petition</b> [5] - 3:5, 6:4, 6:8, 34:6, 47:14</p> <p><b>petition</b> [13] - 6:7, 41:6, 46:3, 47:17, 49:5, 91:4, 91:14, 92:7, 115:5, 138:10, 138:13, 140:7, 180:14</p> <p><b>Pharmacy</b> [1] - 59:11</p> <p><b>pharmacy</b> [1] - 51:9</p> <p><b>phase</b> [1] - 228:9</p> <p><b>phased</b> [1] - 54:5</p> <p><b>phases</b> [3] - 80:8, 80:10, 98:13</p> <p><b>phasing</b> [1] - 185:13</p> <p><b>philosophy</b> [1] - 46:7</p> <p><b>physical</b> [2] - 56:3, 61:17</p> <p><b>pick</b> [2] - 181:11, 222:5</p> <p><b>picking</b> [1] - 187:19</p> <p><b>pictures</b> [2] - 216:6, 219:8</p> <p><b>piece</b> [20] - 4:18, 16:19, 18:8, 19:17, 34:17, 36:5, 36:8, 36:9, 41:15, 42:19, 88:16, 96:10, 104:6, 118:17, 122:12, 123:9, 125:3, 154:16, 154:17, 193:7</p> <p><b>pieces</b> [7] - 19:19,</p>	<p>40:12, 70:11, 98:16, 170:2, 196:12, 196:16</p> <p><b>piling</b> [1] - 223:17</p> <p><b>pin</b> [1] - 194:18</p> <p><b>pine</b> [1] - 120:14</p> <p><b>place</b> [18] - 38:15, 38:16, 56:1, 59:6, 74:4, 91:10, 94:13, 106:1, 116:16, 117:10, 137:1, 142:13, 144:1, 145:11, 173:7, 181:9, 228:11, 230:2</p> <p><b>Place</b> [17] - 2:7, 4:11, 8:5, 8:12, 8:13, 12:2, 12:4, 13:13, 13:16, 17:6, 19:11, 20:14, 28:5, 30:16, 30:19, 32:1</p> <p><b>placement</b> [1] - 63:13</p> <p><b>places</b> [7] - 38:12, 43:7, 58:1, 59:2, 59:3, 129:18, 143:19</p> <p><b>plan</b> [31] - 50:18, 51:11, 53:4, 54:4, 54:18, 62:16, 74:8, 74:10, 75:2, 109:11, 111:8, 120:12, 126:15, 126:18, 127:7, 129:15, 129:17, 132:14, 149:7, 151:11, 151:15, 153:18, 155:7, 157:2, 168:11, 168:19, 187:17, 188:3, 189:3, 189:15, 234:7</p> <p><b>plane</b> [7] - 48:14, 48:19, 173:11, 210:18, 211:3, 211:7, 211:15</p> <p><b>planet</b> [1] - 135:8</p> <p><b>planned</b> [2] - 34:9, 94:15</p> <p><b>Planned</b> [1] - 3:7</p> <p><b>planning</b> [13] - 56:3, 77:17, 112:1, 112:6, 115:2, 116:14, 142:12, 142:16, 147:11, 149:18, 177:17, 178:5, 187:9</p> <p><b>PLANNING</b> [1] - 1:1</p> <p><b>Planning</b> [64] - 2:16, 3:5, 4:4, 5:16, 9:1, 9:7, 9:9, 27:15, 30:8, 34:6, 35:18, 36:1, 36:14, 37:6,</p>	<p>37:19, 38:2, 39:1, 40:7, 41:9, 46:4, 49:2, 49:6, 50:12, 50:14, 50:16, 54:15, 55:10, 75:10, 97:6, 99:16, 108:11, 113:18, 115:6, 124:12, 136:7, 137:11, 153:16, 159:11, 159:14, 165:19, 166:15, 167:2, 167:3, 167:9, 168:2, 168:8, 168:17, 170:6, 173:2, 179:19, 182:3, 184:7, 184:9, 192:9, 203:17, 221:13, 233:5, 233:8, 233:17, 234:5, 236:17, 237:6, 237:15</p> <p><b>plans</b> [11] - 97:1, 103:4, 104:10, 117:17, 129:9, 142:14, 150:14, 151:5, 151:14, 188:19, 234:10</p> <p><b>plate</b> [2] - 48:16, 48:18</p> <p><b>plates</b> [2] - 173:11, 196:8</p> <p><b>play</b> [3] - 57:9, 143:3, 179:17</p> <p><b>playing</b> [1] - 52:16</p> <p><b>plays</b> [2] - 150:10, 199:1</p> <p><b>plaza</b> [1] - 62:5</p> <p><b>Plaza</b> [1] - 129:19</p> <p><b>pleasant</b> [1] - 110:11</p> <p><b>pleasing</b> [1] - 151:11</p> <p><b>plots</b> [1] - 132:9</p> <p><b>plus</b> [2] - 28:9, 53:11</p> <p><b>point</b> [33] - 10:1, 28:2, 28:3, 41:7, 43:18, 45:9, 62:5, 106:19, 109:14, 113:3, 113:5, 115:4, 122:1, 122:2, 139:12, 161:17, 163:5, 165:17, 166:9, 173:4, 174:4, 175:10, 175:11, 176:5, 185:9, 185:19, 187:4, 188:6, 188:14, 204:4, 204:6, 205:19, 209:9</p> <p><b>Point</b> [2] - 73:16, 128:11</p> <p><b>pointed</b> [1] - 147:14</p> <p><b>points</b> [7] - 155:14, 159:5, 175:4,</p>
---	---	--	---	--

<p>175:17, 203:12, 228:12, 232:9</p> <p><b>police</b> [1] - 23:4</p> <p><b>political</b> [3] - 111:12, 157:6, 222:7</p> <p><b>politics</b> [1] - 148:16</p> <p><b>Pompidou</b> [1] - 159:12</p> <p><b>Pond</b> [1] - 96:13</p> <p><b>poorly</b> [1] - 121:14</p> <p><b>Port</b> [3] - 22:2, 37:7</p> <p><b>port</b> [1] - 14:6</p> <p><b>portion</b> [2] - 198:10, 210:5</p> <p><b>portions</b> [1] - 198:13</p> <p><b>pose</b> [1] - 172:11</p> <p><b>poses</b> [1] - 172:7</p> <p><b>positive</b> [2] - 57:13, 154:10</p> <p><b>possibility</b> [4] - 63:11, 111:17, 112:1, 182:18</p> <p><b>possible</b> [5] - 31:15, 62:7, 74:1, 148:15, 186:16</p> <p><b>possibly</b> [5] - 150:16, 153:17, 153:19, 183:15, 214:6</p> <p><b>Post</b> [1] - 109:17</p> <p><b>post</b> [1] - 30:17</p> <p><b>potential</b> [7] - 40:5, 47:1, 57:12, 60:2, 62:12, 170:10, 181:4</p> <p><b>potentially</b> [2] - 25:3, 47:9</p> <p><b>practical</b> [1] - 226:12</p> <p><b>pre</b> [3] - 174:12, 174:15, 188:2</p> <p><b>pre-application</b> [3] - 174:12, 174:15, 188:2</p> <p><b>precipice</b> [1] - 154:10</p> <p><b>predicting</b> [1] - 177:10</p> <p><b>prefer</b> [1] - 201:11</p> <p><b>preferred</b> [2] - 59:1, 61:7</p> <p><b>preliminary</b> [6] - 75:13, 76:3, 78:19, 84:2, 120:8, 188:10</p> <p><b>premiering</b> [1] - 7:1</p> <p><b>prepared</b> [2] - 61:3, 161:19</p> <p><b>preparing</b> [1] - 79:7</p> <p><b>prescriptive</b> [1] - 117:5</p> <p><b>present</b> [5] - 39:15, 61:6, 67:13, 198:6, 230:18</p> <p><b>presentation</b> [9] -</p>	<p>23:13, 63:17, 63:18, 85:18, 86:6, 112:5, 157:11, 194:12, 211:14</p> <p><b>presented</b> [7] - 39:11, 90:6, 126:12, 133:5, 169:16, 190:2, 232:15</p> <p><b>presenting</b> [1] - 97:16</p> <p><b>preservation</b> [1] - 23:16</p> <p><b>preserve</b> [2] - 24:6, 31:14</p> <p><b>President</b> [1] - 108:11</p> <p><b>press</b> [1] - 94:15</p> <p><b>pressed</b> [3] - 30:14, 152:9, 152:13</p> <p><b>pressure</b> [2] - 89:4, 119:14</p> <p><b>pressures</b> [1] - 97:11</p> <p><b>Preston</b> [1] - 1:8</p> <p><b>PRESTON</b> [36] - 29:3, 93:5, 94:5, 98:17, 112:13, 142:1, 197:4, 197:8, 202:7, 205:1, 206:2, 206:9, 207:17, 208:16, 209:5, 209:15, 210:13, 210:17, 211:2, 211:13, 212:1, 213:7, 213:17, 215:19, 219:2, 221:1, 221:5, 228:9, 229:8, 230:3, 230:9, 235:4, 235:8, 235:14, 235:17, 236:3</p> <p><b>presuming</b> [1] - 79:11</p> <p><b>pretense</b> [1] - 96:16</p> <p><b>pretty</b> [13] - 21:11, 75:18, 87:12, 88:1, 92:6, 99:17, 121:3, 132:16, 142:5, 148:1, 151:16, 161:16, 186:5</p> <p><b>previous</b> [7] - 44:3, 44:16, 83:1, 102:8, 103:15, 133:2, 166:11</p> <p><b>price</b> [3] - 77:2, 85:1, 98:12</p> <p><b>priced</b> [1] - 76:17</p> <p><b>pricing</b> [1] - 42:11</p> <p><b>primarily</b> [2] - 56:14, 59:13</p> <p><b>primary</b> [1] - 58:17</p> <p><b>principals</b> [1] - 105:14</p> <p><b>principles</b> [1] - 61:2</p> <p><b>priority</b> [1] - 58:16</p> <p><b>Pritzker</b> [3] - 118:7,</p>	<p>152:8, 164:13</p> <p><b>private</b> [9] - 53:8, 53:11, 146:5, 162:13, 163:9, 176:8, 213:6, 217:1, 218:9</p> <p><b>privately</b> [1] - 2:14</p> <p><b>Prize</b> [3] - 118:7, 152:8, 164:13</p> <p><b>prize</b> [2] - 164:13, 164:15</p> <p><b>pro</b> [4] - 76:1, 80:2, 82:2, 97:18</p> <p><b>problem</b> [6] - 22:17, 113:15, 158:4, 158:12, 176:19, 195:8</p> <p><b>problematic</b> [1] - 72:3</p> <p><b>problems</b> [1] - 134:15</p> <p><b>proceed</b> [2] - 17:9, 17:11</p> <p><b>proceedings</b> [1] - 238:8</p> <p><b>process</b> [46] - 8:18, 9:2, 10:3, 10:13, 12:6, 15:3, 15:7, 34:19, 35:4, 35:15, 36:19, 37:14, 40:14, 43:15, 60:7, 60:12, 72:16, 91:18, 91:19, 94:9, 107:4, 107:10, 107:14, 113:4, 113:5, 113:6, 114:6, 115:2, 120:15, 121:13, 133:12, 134:1, 134:4, 134:6, 141:13, 142:2, 145:3, 174:18, 175:2, 175:4, 178:6, 180:10, 181:5, 204:5, 228:3, 234:4</p> <p><b>processes</b> [3] - 55:5, 90:13, 96:17</p> <p><b>procession</b> [1] - 95:11</p> <p><b>produces</b> [2] - 70:13, 230:15</p> <p><b>profit</b> [2] - 98:12, 98:16</p> <p><b>profits</b> [1] - 105:5</p> <p><b>program</b> [5] - 7:1, 42:8, 76:14, 145:1, 194:4</p> <p><b>programatically</b> [1] - 42:10</p> <p><b>programming</b> [1] - 54:8</p> <p><b>programs</b> [1] - 54:10</p> <p><b>progress</b> [1] - 194:17</p> <p><b>project</b> [28] - 4:14, 4:15, 5:13, 15:1,</p>	<p>18:10, 19:2, 20:18, 28:15, 42:17, 73:19, 78:16, 79:2, 80:15, 81:13, 81:14, 81:16, 83:18, 83:19, 85:9, 87:13, 91:11, 116:9, 145:8, 154:11, 159:8, 167:1, 185:14, 228:2</p> <p><b>projected</b> [1] - 139:19</p> <p><b>projector</b> [1] - 33:17</p> <p><b>projects</b> [11] - 73:1, 75:6, 75:16, 77:13, 77:19, 78:1, 80:17, 81:6, 81:10, 81:18, 84:4</p> <p><b>prominent</b> [1] - 57:14</p> <p><b>promised</b> [3] - 39:7, 123:8, 124:18</p> <p><b>promote</b> [1] - 203:9</p> <p><b>promoting</b> [1] - 158:9</p> <p><b>proper</b> [1] - 119:19</p> <p><b>Properties</b> [1] - 79:15</p> <p><b>properties</b> [1] - 25:1</p> <p><b>Property</b> [1] - 2:10</p> <p><b>property</b> [8] - 5:8, 9:5, 11:13, 25:7, 97:10, 156:18, 178:15, 218:13</p> <p><b>proponent</b> [1] - 226:7</p> <p><b>proportion</b> [4] - 92:8, 115:15, 115:17, 215:6</p> <p><b>proportions</b> [2] - 128:8, 179:8</p> <p><b>proposal</b> [35] - 2:6, 10:5, 12:9, 12:11, 12:12, 12:15, 13:8, 14:14, 20:18, 22:12, 26:18, 27:4, 27:12, 27:14, 31:6, 46:17, 48:7, 55:15, 56:18, 61:11, 73:15, 74:11, 93:18, 131:6, 132:7, 133:5, 135:13, 137:7, 149:19, 167:10, 201:15, 224:15, 230:5, 231:15, 234:13</p> <p><b>proposals</b> [8] - 10:4, 12:8, 26:13, 142:4, 142:18, 145:13, 154:1, 227:15</p> <p><b>propose</b> [3] - 73:7, 91:13, 195:10</p> <p><b>proposed</b> [17] - 26:14, 52:16, 63:19, 64:11, 67:16, 68:1, 75:14, 104:10, 128:14, 132:7, 135:14, 138:17,</p>	<p>144:11, 151:11, 183:8, 200:5, 206:14</p> <p><b>proposes</b> [1] - 74:12</p> <p><b>proposing</b> [5] - 12:17, 173:14, 176:13, 198:16, 208:15</p> <p><b>proposition</b> [2] - 156:7, 171:1</p> <p><b>pros</b> [1] - 10:14</p> <p><b>protect</b> [1] - 232:3</p> <p><b>protected</b> [1] - 224:10</p> <p><b>protocol</b> [1] - 97:19</p> <p><b>proud</b> [1] - 134:19</p> <p><b>provide</b> [15] - 13:9, 57:8, 59:16, 62:17, 84:3, 94:4, 94:7, 107:18, 168:7, 173:12, 174:11, 177:18, 182:17, 185:4, 186:17</p> <p><b>provided</b> [3] - 14:19, 46:5, 194:14</p> <p><b>provides</b> [3] - 43:5, 59:7, 85:7</p> <p><b>providing</b> [12] - 14:2, 14:6, 50:16, 53:15, 57:18, 60:13, 60:18, 77:16, 134:13, 149:14, 167:10, 179:16</p> <p><b>provision</b> [3] - 187:15, 199:17, 233:16</p> <p><b>provisions</b> [2] - 42:18, 221:13</p> <p><b>proxies</b> [1] - 172:13</p> <p><b>proximity</b> [1] - 103:2</p> <p><b>prudent</b> [1] - 73:3</p> <p><b>Public</b> [3] - 2:5, 238:6, 238:12</p> <p><b>public</b> [59] - 2:7, 2:9, 4:9, 5:6, 5:7, 9:18, 20:7, 25:17, 28:7, 35:4, 35:13, 35:14, 37:2, 43:9, 44:14, 45:6, 45:8, 52:7, 62:19, 63:6, 83:3, 85:8, 86:11, 89:15, 91:19, 92:1, 95:2, 95:7, 97:11, 100:11, 100:12, 109:5, 110:15, 114:6, 118:16, 131:7, 131:8, 131:11, 144:3, 156:5, 158:12, 165:1, 167:10, 175:1, 179:4, 179:6, 194:13, 205:19, 213:19, 214:5,</p>
---	---	---	--	---

<p>215:18, 216:5, 217:19, 218:2, 218:4, 219:14, 223:15, 234:1</p> <p><b>publicly</b> [1] - 213:19</p> <p><b>PUD</b> [19] - 3:7, 3:8, 5:2, 5:18, 35:19, 36:5, 36:10, 40:11, 72:18, 75:3, 166:12, 166:13, 167:6, 174:5, 174:11, 225:15, 225:18, 226:8</p> <p><b>PUD-KS</b> [5] - 3:7, 3:8, 5:18, 36:10, 40:11</p> <p><b>PUDs</b> [1] - 226:3</p> <p><b>purchase</b> [2] - 26:14, 27:1</p> <p><b>purely</b> [2] - 63:8, 147:11</p> <p><b>purple</b> [1] - 68:3</p> <p><b>purpose</b> [4] - 30:6, 43:14, 46:14, 92:19</p> <p><b>purposes</b> [5] - 61:4, 63:9, 63:15, 91:15, 140:6</p> <p><b>pursuant</b> [1] - 2:9</p> <p><b>purview</b> [1] - 30:8</p> <p><b>push</b> [3] - 94:8, 153:4, 171:15</p> <p><b>pushed</b> [4] - 95:19, 125:5, 153:7, 190:11</p> <p><b>pushing</b> [1] - 124:14</p> <p><b>put</b> [26] - 35:5, 44:12, 96:19, 108:18, 109:12, 110:6, 120:18, 121:9, 121:10, 125:15, 130:10, 165:16, 167:19, 169:3, 169:4, 169:5, 171:10, 177:19, 181:2, 188:17, 194:7, 200:15, 216:11, 217:3, 218:9</p> <p><b>puts</b> [1] - 181:9</p> <p><b>putting</b> [7] - 22:18, 47:9, 50:2, 105:19, 166:14, 203:15, 224:1</p> <p><b>puzzle</b> [1] - 40:12</p>	<p><b>quantify</b> [2] - 95:15, 110:6</p> <p><b>questioned</b> [1] - 160:13</p> <p><b>questions</b> [19] - 8:18, 17:14, 17:15, 17:19, 19:5, 20:4, 25:14, 25:19, 33:10, 41:3, 49:16, 86:9, 89:14, 102:9, 123:14, 126:4, 136:5, 169:18, 193:15</p> <p><b>quick</b> [9] - 19:6, 34:15, 64:9, 75:13, 76:2, 87:17, 88:1, 193:2, 223:9</p> <p><b>quickly</b> [4] - 13:15, 72:4, 181:15, 186:5</p> <p><b>quiet</b> [1] - 34:3</p> <p><b>quite</b> [8] - 49:10, 60:6, 100:8, 128:16, 128:17, 130:1, 131:13, 164:5</p>	<p>137:7, 199:4, 203:13, 218:19, 226:16</p> <p><b>ratio</b> [9] - 78:13, 90:18, 91:6, 94:1, 94:2, 170:14, 171:8, 192:11</p> <p><b>rational</b> [3] - 30:2, 30:4, 160:18</p> <p><b>rationale</b> [3] - 162:17, 186:19, 187:7</p> <p><b>re</b> [6] - 37:15, 98:10, 121:1, 121:5, 121:12, 182:13</p> <p><b>re-file</b> [2] - 121:5, 121:12</p> <p><b>re-filed</b> [3] - 37:15, 121:1, 182:13</p> <p><b>re-visioning</b> [1] - 98:10</p> <p><b>reached</b> [4] - 37:13, 121:19, 161:17</p> <p><b>read</b> [2] - 93:15, 237:15</p> <p><b>readiness</b> [1] - 54:10</p> <p><b>reading</b> [3] - 182:1, 182:10, 237:6</p> <p><b>readjusted</b> [1] - 53:4</p> <p><b>reads</b> [1] - 73:1</p> <p><b>ready</b> [1] - 123:19</p> <p><b>real</b> [8] - 27:7, 38:11, 50:13, 75:14, 142:12, 148:12, 172:7, 204:9</p> <p><b>realities</b> [3] - 95:7, 143:2, 147:15</p> <p><b>reality</b> [3] - 101:2, 111:8, 147:16</p> <p><b>realize</b> [6] - 18:4, 48:4, 66:19, 101:1, 102:8, 138:16</p> <p><b>realized</b> [3] - 66:18, 68:9, 128:5</p> <p><b>really</b> [96] - 11:17, 11:19, 15:2, 16:16, 16:18, 17:8, 17:12, 18:16, 28:6, 38:6, 41:3, 43:1, 43:17, 44:9, 44:11, 51:4, 55:10, 55:19, 59:5, 73:5, 81:5, 84:5, 87:14, 87:17, 91:9, 92:7, 92:18, 96:6, 100:8, 101:18, 103:18, 104:2, 104:8, 104:11, 104:17, 105:2, 105:3, 105:7, 105:13, 106:5, 109:12, 112:16, 118:8, 119:14,</p>	<p>120:1, 120:10, 120:19, 123:14, 124:1, 124:14, 132:5, 143:5, 144:8, 144:10, 148:3, 149:1, 149:10, 149:17, 151:9, 151:13, 152:16, 153:4, 153:9, 154:7, 158:17, 164:8, 168:15, 171:3, 175:14, 177:10, 178:18, 179:1, 180:17, 183:3, 183:5, 187:9, 188:7, 191:2, 198:3, 203:7, 203:10, 204:1, 204:11, 207:14, 210:19, 211:14, 217:6, 217:8, 217:18, 218:4, 219:11, 226:16, 227:13, 230:2</p> <p><b>realm</b> [1] - 63:1</p> <p><b>reanalyze</b> [1] - 63:19</p> <p><b>reason</b> [6] - 118:8, 130:10, 134:18, 168:10, 229:9, 237:7</p> <p><b>REASON</b> [6] - 237:9, 237:10, 237:11, 237:12, 237:13, 237:14</p> <p><b>reasonable</b> [9] - 67:3, 67:5, 67:9, 86:18, 109:8, 144:10, 173:19, 221:2, 221:4</p> <p><b>reasons</b> [8] - 28:16, 109:3, 122:14, 122:15, 122:16, 122:18, 144:9, 181:6</p> <p><b>receive</b> [3] - 55:8, 175:19, 182:2</p> <p><b>received</b> [4] - 12:8, 32:1, 108:13, 165:2</p> <p><b>receiving</b> [1] - 54:15</p> <p><b>recent</b> [1] - 84:11</p> <p><b>recently</b> [1] - 95:18</p> <p><b>recess</b> [2] - 34:1, 186:9</p> <p><b>recitation</b> [1] - 107:3</p> <p><b>recognize</b> [2] - 106:4, 191:3</p> <p><b>recognizes</b> [2] - 107:7, 164:14</p> <p><b>recollection</b> [2] - 99:19, 100:5</p> <p><b>recommend</b> [4] - 27:10, 28:18, 31:18, 232:13</p>	<p><b>recommendation</b> [12] - 9:7, 9:9, 10:6, 10:11, 17:10, 32:3, 182:3, 184:8, 184:10, 184:16, 195:3, 212:17</p> <p><b>recommendations</b> [10] - 35:17, 38:7, 40:15, 54:4, 56:4, 138:12, 186:3, 233:3, 235:5, 235:6</p> <p><b>recommended</b> [4] - 4:13, 41:8, 54:2, 170:13</p> <p><b>reconfiguring</b> [1] - 22:16</p> <p><b>reconsider</b> [1] - 109:13</p> <p><b>reconsidered</b> [1] - 182:14</p> <p><b>RECORD</b> [1] - 1:18</p> <p><b>record</b> [4] - 89:18, 165:6, 237:17, 238:7</p> <p><b>recreate</b> [1] - 38:13</p> <p><b>recreational</b> [1] - 52:5</p> <p><b>rectangle</b> [2] - 128:7, 129:11</p> <p><b>Red</b> [4] - 110:16, 119:15, 157:14, 158:1</p> <p><b>red</b> [1] - 68:2</p> <p><b>Redevelopment</b> [2] - 39:13, 75:12</p> <p><b>reduce</b> [5] - 139:8, 139:10, 140:14, 187:12, 223:3</p> <p><b>reduced</b> [1] - 92:17</p> <p><b>reducing</b> [2] - 158:10, 233:17</p> <p><b>reemphasize</b> [1] - 120:14</p> <p><b>reference</b> [2] - 110:11, 234:8</p> <p><b>referred</b> [1] - 118:1</p> <p><b>reflect</b> [6] - 21:5, 21:13, 73:8, 73:15, 123:1, 123:2</p> <p><b>reflected</b> [2] - 74:7, 169:17</p> <p><b>reflective</b> [1] - 175:8</p> <p><b>reflects</b> [1] - 60:4</p> <p><b>reflexive</b> [1] - 117:16</p> <p><b>reframe</b> [1] - 178:8</p> <p><b>regard</b> [5] - 157:9, 157:11, 158:8, 159:3, 232:18</p> <p><b>regarding</b> [1] - 2:10</p> <p><b>regardless</b> [2] - 29:7, 29:15</p> <p><b>region</b> [1] - 146:13</p>
<b>Q</b>	<b>R</b>			
<p><b>qualities</b> [1] - 57:2</p> <p><b>quality</b> [5] - 50:6, 55:17, 57:7, 152:8, 164:17</p> <p><b>quantified</b> [1] - 95:14</p>	<p><b>R&amp;D</b> [23] - 64:13, 68:2, 68:17, 69:1, 69:3, 69:15, 69:18, 139:18, 140:1, 140:5, 140:11, 147:4, 162:7, 170:7, 170:11, 170:15, 171:7, 171:19, 172:4, 192:7, 235:11, 235:18, 236:1</p> <p><b>racheted</b> [1] - 54:3</p> <p><b>rail</b> [1] - 119:7</p> <p><b>railing</b> [1] - 230:17</p> <p><b>raise</b> [8] - 74:12, 153:4, 155:15, 156:18, 222:9, 222:11, 222:16, 223:1</p> <p><b>raised</b> [10] - 15:5, 15:6, 15:11, 23:14, 26:1, 49:14, 49:15, 159:3, 162:2, 185:9</p> <p><b>Raising</b> [3] - 8:1, 33:3, 236:10</p> <p><b>range</b> [1] - 85:2</p> <p><b>Rasmussen</b> [1] - 39:10</p> <p><b>RASMUSSEN</b> [2] - 63:16, 64:7</p> <p><b>rate</b> [3] - 77:9, 81:3, 133:13</p> <p><b>rates</b> [2] - 65:12, 81:7</p> <p><b>rather</b> [8] - 70:1, 114:16, 129:1,</p>			



<p><b>regional</b> [1] - 146:16  <b>regulation</b> [1] - 186:17  <b>regulations</b> [1] - 90:15  <b>reiterate</b> [1] - 90:4  <b>related</b> [2] - 84:8, 110:15  <b>relating</b> [1] - 34:8  <b>relationship</b> [1] - 92:4  <b>relatively</b> [1] - 60:16  <b>relieve</b> [2] - 97:10, 119:13  <b>reluctant</b> [1] - 101:9  <b>rely</b> [1] - 170:2  <b>remark</b> [1] - 120:8  <b>remediation</b> [5] - 79:8, 82:18, 82:19, 87:9, 101:1  <b>remedy</b> [1] - 33:16  <b>remember</b> [5] - 58:10, 93:9, 115:10, 119:1, 219:8  <b>remind</b> [3] - 34:18, 58:9, 63:6  <b>reminder</b> [3] - 45:19, 52:15, 53:6  <b>renamed</b> [1] - 22:2  <b>renderings</b> [1] - 190:12  <b>rent</b> [5] - 42:17, 76:18, 78:7, 82:10, 89:7  <b>renting</b> [2] - 78:6, 78:9  <b>rents</b> [2] - 80:6, 84:3  <b>repeat</b> [1] - 108:15  <b>replacement</b> [3] - 53:6, 53:12, 147:19  <b>replacing</b> [1] - 17:2  <b>report</b> [9] - 9:11, 9:15, 10:2, 10:12, 10:16, 12:16, 17:11, 23:8, 112:5  <b>Reporter</b> [2] - 238:5, 238:12  <b>REPORTER</b> [1] - 238:17  <b>REPORTERS</b> [1] - 1:18  <b>representatives</b> [1] - 35:10  <b>representing</b> [1] - 226:8  <b>reproduce</b> [1] - 130:19  <b>REPRODUCTION</b> [1] - 238:16  <b>request</b> [9] - 5:12, 11:11, 25:16, 27:3, 33:13, 33:14, 178:10, 227:15</p>	<p><b>requesting</b> [1] - 51:7  <b>requests</b> [3] - 10:4, 12:8, 26:12  <b>require</b> [10] - 42:1, 59:19, 155:1, 172:2, 187:11, 193:9, 194:3, 215:14, 216:10, 234:4  <b>required</b> [12] - 15:19, 43:10, 44:18, 45:11, 90:16, 101:15, 149:11, 177:14, 222:3, 225:6, 229:3, 234:1  <b>requirement</b> [10] - 42:1, 82:9, 152:5, 168:7, 173:1, 173:2, 199:16, 203:19, 207:8, 235:11  <b>requirements</b> [15] - 2:9, 27:5, 54:1, 78:3, 82:8, 164:2, 165:11, 170:13, 176:15, 177:3, 177:4, 178:9, 178:10, 195:11, 234:9  <b>requires</b> [2] - 29:13, 73:2  <b>research</b> [3] - 134:11, 135:3, 172:9  <b>Research</b> [3] - 3:8, 79:14, 95:4  <b>reservation</b> [1] - 105:1  <b>Reserve</b> [1] - 220:7  <b>residence</b> [1] - 51:12  <b>Residence</b> [1] - 96:13  <b>resident</b> [1] - 115:9  <b>residential</b> [18] - 2:12, 2:13, 12:18, 53:1, 68:3, 80:1, 80:12, 83:14, 88:11, 89:2, 101:10, 101:11, 132:15, 141:9, 147:4, 198:18, 209:3, 209:14  <b>residential's</b> [1] - 53:2  <b>residents</b> [6] - 43:19, 64:17, 105:12, 113:7, 114:10, 115:7  <b>Residents</b> [3] - 96:12, 115:14, 133:16  <b>residual</b> [3] - 83:12, 88:8, 88:10  <b>resolve</b> [1] - 158:3  <b>resources</b> [1] - 43:6  <b>respect</b> [2] - 105:17, 106:3  <b>RESPECT</b> [1] -</p>	<p>238:16  <b>respond</b> [2] - 25:19, 113:3  <b>responds</b> [1] - 163:12  <b>response</b> [1] - 59:15  <b>Response</b> [6] - 20:5, 25:12, 33:5, 126:1, 228:14, 236:13  <b>responsibility</b> [2] - 116:13, 146:10  <b>responsible</b> [5] - 2:16, 12:12, 14:1, 14:10, 78:10  <b>responsive</b> [1] - 12:12  <b>rest</b> [5] - 45:12, 57:9, 66:18, 140:11, 166:5  <b>restriction</b> [1] - 151:2  <b>restrictive</b> [5] - 172:1, 186:16, 187:5, 192:8, 192:17  <b>result</b> [12] - 69:11, 72:6, 73:6, 80:13, 92:17, 99:1, 133:15, 176:19, 177:1, 203:12, 219:15, 219:16  <b>resulting</b> [1] - 92:10  <b>results</b> [7] - 43:2, 83:9, 126:8, 133:12, 168:10, 168:19, 176:11  <b>retail</b> [1] - 2:12, 12:19, 21:4, 51:4, 51:19, 52:4, 52:8, 59:12, 64:13, 68:3, 131:10  <b>retain</b> [2] - 38:9, 153:18  <b>retention</b> [1] - 116:11  <b>return</b> [3] - 81:3, 81:8, 81:11  <b>revealed</b> [1] - 47:7  <b>reveals</b> [1] - 167:16  <b>review</b> [15] - 4:15, 4:16, 8:17, 31:10, 55:5, 64:9, 111:18, 145:8, 150:15, 155:8, 167:3, 174:6, 179:16, 179:19, 189:16  <b>reviewed</b> [1] - 12:10  <b>revisions</b> [2] - 90:7, 232:16  <b>revisit</b> [1] - 97:3  <b>revisiting</b> [1] - 145:6  <b>rezoning</b> [5] - 2:15, 55:14, 61:11, 205:5, 205:6  <b>Rezoning</b> [2] - 34:11,</p>	<p>75:18  <b>RFP</b> [5] - 144:16, 181:2, 181:10, 194:8, 221:7  <b>Rhone</b> [1] - 28:5  <b>rip</b> [1] - 121:18  <b>road</b> [4] - 149:16, 152:14, 153:15, 187:18  <b>roadways</b> [2] - 128:19, 129:3  <b>Roberts</b> [3] - 1:15, 38:18, 122:3  <b>ROBERTS</b> [14] - 33:12, 39:19, 140:3, 166:3, 172:14, 178:17, 180:9, 180:16, 203:7, 217:3, 217:11, 221:11, 221:18, 228:19  <b>role</b> [2] - 9:1, 199:1  <b>roll</b> [1] - 83:17  <b>room</b> [1] - 38:9  <b>Room</b> [1] - 1:6  <b>Roth</b> [1] - 6:13  <b>roughly</b> [1] - 147:8  <b>round</b> [4] - 44:3, 44:16, 121:3, 223:15  <b>route</b> [1] - 153:8  <b>rule</b> [3] - 164:3, 164:10, 201:14  <b>rules</b> [2] - 113:8, 130:9  <b>ruling</b> [1] - 150:13  <b>run</b> [3] - 109:15, 109:18, 110:1  <b>running</b> [3] - 123:16, 124:3, 209:11  <b>rush</b> [1] - 158:4  <b>Russell</b> [1] - 1:9  <b>RUSSELL</b> [68] - 7:17, 30:13, 32:15, 86:12, 88:3, 126:7, 150:7, 159:18, 160:2, 163:11, 163:16, 163:19, 165:5, 165:9, 185:18, 195:1, 195:18, 196:1, 196:6, 196:17, 198:2, 198:11, 199:2, 200:11, 200:19, 201:10, 202:3, 205:5, 205:18, 206:6, 207:7, 207:15, 209:9, 210:3, 210:7, 211:10, 212:4, 212:7, 212:16,</p>	<p>213:2, 213:11, 214:2, 214:7, 214:15, 215:4, 215:13, 216:2, 216:13, 217:10, 219:7, 220:6, 220:10, 220:13, 220:16, 222:7, 222:18, 223:6, 224:3, 224:6, 224:9, 225:2, 225:15, 226:5, 227:6, 230:11, 231:10, 231:18, 232:3</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>S</b></p> <hr/> <p><b>sake</b> [2] - 186:11, 227:19  <b>sale</b> [1] - 80:16  <b>SAME</b> [1] - 238:16  <b>sample</b> [1] - 77:12  <b>sampling</b> [1] - 80:11  <b>SANZONE</b> [2] - 116:4, 116:5  <b>Sanzone</b> [1] - 116:4  <b>sat</b> [1] - 124:12  <b>satisfied</b> [1] - 29:1  <b>saw</b> [5] - 40:3, 47:3, 69:19, 103:3, 136:8  <b>scale</b> [3] - 87:2, 126:12, 130:5  <b>scary</b> [1] - 214:4  <b>scenario</b> [3] - 69:14, 181:12, 181:16  <b>scenarios</b> [2] - 70:7, 141:6  <b>schedule</b> [1] - 184:3  <b>scheduled</b> [1] - 33:8  <b>scheme</b> [3] - 46:5, 93:2, 139:5  <b>School</b> [1] - 24:2  <b>scientific</b> [1] - 178:19  <b>scientist</b> [1] - 131:1  <b>screen</b> [1] - 48:5  <b>se</b> [1] - 151:7  <b>sea</b> [1] - 211:11  <b>Second</b> [1] - 1:6  <b>second</b> [16] - 4:19, 7:18, 32:6, 32:18, 32:19, 36:9, 37:16, 42:19, 52:14, 81:2, 182:1, 182:10, 189:18, 236:6, 236:7  <b>secondary</b> [1] - 58:17  <b>section</b> [4] - 19:13, 58:19, 59:7, 193:11  <b>Section</b> [4] - 2:9, 3:5, 34:7, 232:14</p>
--	--	---	--	---

<p><b>sector</b> [2] - 146:6, 187:13</p> <p><b>security</b> [2] - 109:3, 117:17</p> <p><b>see</b> [42] - 15:18, 22:8, 48:4, 48:16, 53:15, 63:8, 68:4, 68:12, 69:12, 70:4, 70:8, 70:9, 71:4, 76:3, 97:2, 97:14, 103:7, 103:14, 103:15, 105:16, 129:5, 130:4, 134:10, 134:16, 138:18, 141:10, 149:19, 151:13, 153:12, 157:3, 160:10, 162:15, 162:18, 164:8, 183:8, 190:17, 191:5, 193:12, 198:4, 201:15, 211:12, 230:5</p> <p><b>seeing</b> [4] - 71:12, 73:5, 112:9, 174:3</p> <p><b>seek</b> [1] - 26:19</p> <p><b>seeking</b> [1] - 26:18</p> <p><b>seem</b> [3] - 130:14, 190:12, 219:9</p> <p><b>selected</b> [2] - 79:12, 228:1</p> <p><b>sell</b> [4] - 2:11, 11:13, 16:12, 27:2</p> <p><b>selling</b> [4] - 20:15, 24:11, 26:1, 80:4</p> <p><b>Senator</b> [1] - 95:17</p> <p><b>send</b> [4] - 135:13, 135:16, 182:8, 185:3</p> <p><b>sends</b> [1] - 169:11</p> <p><b>sense</b> [12] - 29:10, 29:17, 31:7, 59:6, 113:12, 162:7, 162:12, 185:5, 190:11, 199:15, 204:17, 214:12</p> <p><b>sensible</b> [1] - 28:6</p> <p><b>sensitive</b> [3] - 60:1, 60:8, 62:11</p> <p><b>sensitivity</b> [3] - 68:11, 68:18, 69:19</p> <p><b>sent</b> [1] - 126:9</p> <p><b>separate</b> [6] - 29:9, 91:14, 162:7, 162:12, 162:19, 176:18</p> <p><b>separating</b> [2] - 140:7, 176:7</p> <p><b>September</b> [1] - 12:3</p> <p><b>series</b> [7] - 5:16, 6:6, 35:14, 36:19, 37:17,</p>	<p>56:5, 127:18</p> <p><b>serious</b> [1] - 105:6</p> <p><b>seriously</b> [1] - 116:19</p> <p><b>serve</b> [4] - 16:3, 51:11, 52:7, 119:12</p> <p><b>service</b> [2] - 119:12, 230:13</p> <p><b>services</b> [2] - 131:11, 134:13</p> <p><b>serving</b> [3] - 11:7, 50:7, 133:8</p> <p><b>session</b> [1] - 90:3</p> <p><b>sessions</b> [1] - 37:1</p> <p><b>set</b> [14] - 35:8, 36:12, 36:13, 37:16, 40:15, 51:13, 74:16, 106:2, 116:8, 182:14, 195:5, 196:3, 238:7, 238:9</p> <p><b>setback</b> [1] - 117:17</p> <p><b>sets</b> [1] - 83:10</p> <p><b>setting</b> [3] - 62:13, 112:15, 166:4</p> <p><b>seven</b> [2] - 21:10, 123:10</p> <p><b>seven-and-a-half</b> [1] - 123:10</p> <p><b>seventeen</b> [1] - 2:13</p> <p><b>several</b> [6] - 7:4, 123:3, 123:13, 124:12, 161:18, 186:12</p> <p><b>sewer</b> [4] - 2:18, 14:3, 28:9, 83:6</p> <p><b>shadow</b> [2] - 112:11, 190:14</p> <p><b>Shanzelize</b> [1] - 118:2</p> <p><b>share</b> [1] - 194:11</p> <p><b>sharing</b> [1] - 158:9</p> <p><b>Sheet</b> [2] - 237:3, 237:7</p> <p><b>SHEET</b> [1] - 237:1</p> <p><b>sheet</b> [3] - 20:8, 89:16, 237:7</p> <p><b>shocked</b> [2] - 22:7, 99:17</p> <p><b>shocking</b> [1] - 96:3</p> <p><b>shopping</b> [2] - 49:19, 106:17</p> <p><b>short</b> [3] - 34:1, 186:7, 186:9</p> <p><b>Shorthand</b> [2] - 238:5, 238:12</p> <p><b>show</b> [2] - 67:12, 202:15</p> <p><b>showed</b> [2] - 115:12, 216:6</p> <p><b>showing</b> [4] - 48:7, 48:9, 202:17, 211:15</p> <p><b>shown</b> [5] - 53:18,</p>	<p>61:12, 62:4, 194:11, 219:8</p> <p><b>shows</b> [6] - 11:4, 35:6, 61:4, 62:12, 67:18, 70:19</p> <p><b>shut</b> [1] - 218:4</p> <p><b>side</b> [12] - 13:14, 24:6, 62:10, 87:19, 117:18, 123:7, 163:6, 163:9, 213:6, 213:14, 217:2, 218:10</p> <p><b>SIENIEWICZ</b> [1] - 29:18</p> <p><b>Sieniewicz</b> [1] - 1:10</p> <p><b>Sign</b> [1] - 237:7</p> <p><b>sign</b> [2] - 20:8, 89:16</p> <p><b>sign-up</b> [2] - 20:8, 89:16</p> <p><b>signals</b> [1] - 185:4</p> <p><b>SIGNATURE</b> [1] - 237:1</p> <p><b>signed</b> [3] - 20:9, 20:11, 181:3</p> <p><b>significance</b> [2] - 197:12, 198:1</p> <p><b>significant</b> [7] - 19:1, 43:12, 92:9, 109:8, 130:7, 157:3, 207:5</p> <p><b>significantly</b> [3] - 111:15, 115:16, 115:18</p> <p><b>similar</b> [7] - 14:19, 49:15, 73:15, 126:14, 129:7, 193:15, 202:18</p> <p><b>similarly</b> [1] - 73:17</p> <p><b>simply</b> [6] - 41:19, 63:15, 90:4, 91:14, 92:6, 104:1</p> <p><b>single</b> [3] - 13:13, 122:11, 203:14</p> <p><b>sisters</b> [1] - 200:16</p> <p><b>sit</b> [1] - 124:1</p> <p><b>site</b> [81] - 21:7, 23:2, 36:10, 44:2, 44:4, 44:7, 45:1, 45:9, 45:12, 46:9, 46:13, 47:6, 47:10, 52:18, 55:1, 55:2, 55:13, 55:15, 56:9, 57:10, 58:7, 59:5, 59:15, 60:3, 60:15, 61:6, 61:14, 62:18, 64:16, 65:5, 65:16, 66:9, 66:10, 66:16, 77:17, 79:7, 80:14, 80:18, 82:5, 82:18, 82:19, 83:4, 83:5, 86:19, 87:8, 102:17, 108:19, 116:12,</p>	<p>116:15, 117:6, 118:9, 118:10, 120:1, 125:1, 132:13, 133:2, 142:13, 145:10, 145:16, 147:4, 147:7, 147:14, 148:19, 150:8, 150:17, 155:1, 177:14, 177:16, 177:17, 178:5, 179:3, 179:5, 179:13, 179:17, 190:10, 191:12, 198:5, 199:6, 207:16, 217:8</p> <p><b>Site</b> [1] - 34:11</p> <p><b>site's</b> [2] - 116:13, 118:12</p> <p><b>sites</b> [4] - 79:6, 80:4, 83:18, 171:8</p> <p><b>sitting</b> [1] - 231:11</p> <p><b>situation</b> [12] - 26:13, 93:4, 104:2, 111:4, 111:12, 137:12, 142:15, 142:17, 143:11, 144:19, 156:14, 156:16</p> <p><b>situations</b> [1] - 142:5</p> <p><b>six</b> [3] - 81:10, 106:15, 207:18</p> <p><b>Sixth</b> [6] - 56:16, 62:14, 124:15, 129:8, 137:14, 231:8</p> <p><b>size</b> [4] - 127:6, 127:11, 128:15, 128:18</p> <p><b>sketches</b> [2] - 63:8, 103:3</p> <p><b>sky</b> [1] - 62:18</p> <p><b>slam</b> [1] - 88:2</p> <p><b>slide</b> [1] - 38:5</p> <p><b>slightly</b> [3] - 45:3, 93:13, 169:11</p> <p><b>sloping</b> [1] - 231:3</p> <p><b>small</b> [4] - 51:17, 154:12, 217:16, 217:17</p> <p><b>smaller</b> [5] - 16:14, 48:8, 51:14, 51:19, 53:19</p> <p><b>snapshot</b> [1] - 87:17</p> <p><b>snow</b> [2] - 111:4, 223:18</p> <p><b>social</b> [2] - 110:4, 110:8</p> <p><b>Society</b> [1] - 164:18</p> <p><b>society</b> [1] - 147:1</p> <p><b>socioeconomic</b> [1] - 110:12</p>	<p><b>soft</b> [1] - 82:3</p> <p><b>soil</b> [1] - 18:17</p> <p><b>sold</b> [2] - 104:6, 176:17</p> <p><b>solicits</b> [1] - 142:18</p> <p><b>solve</b> [2] - 137:12, 195:7</p> <p><b>someone</b> [6] - 23:15, 26:15, 26:19, 173:14, 236:2, 236:5</p> <p><b>Somerville</b> [1] - 157:16</p> <p><b>sometime</b> [2] - 39:7, 181:6</p> <p><b>sometimes</b> [4] - 30:18, 65:8, 97:16, 121:17</p> <p><b>somewhat</b> [1] - 73:17</p> <p><b>somewhere</b> [1] - 143:9</p> <p><b>sophisticated</b> [1] - 148:2</p> <p><b>sorry</b> [5] - 23:12, 100:3, 180:3, 203:4, 232:5</p> <p><b>sort</b> [47] - 8:19, 10:13, 14:13, 14:15, 15:3, 16:5, 16:10, 46:6, 46:12, 49:19, 51:17, 54:14, 57:19, 59:3, 61:1, 62:5, 62:19, 64:11, 69:13, 71:6, 71:8, 72:4, 82:14, 84:5, 86:15, 87:2, 91:5, 100:19, 123:16, 131:15, 147:5, 170:19, 171:4, 173:10, 173:12, 175:9, 178:4, 186:2, 186:15, 188:4, 198:3, 203:9, 204:6, 218:1, 218:15</p> <p><b>sorts</b> [2] - 106:11, 231:19</p> <p><b>sounds</b> [3] - 215:12, 219:3, 219:4</p> <p><b>South</b> [1] - 127:5</p> <p><b>southeast</b> [1] - 119:18</p> <p><b>spa</b> [1] - 128:19</p> <p><b>space</b> [132] - 41:13, 43:1, 43:4, 43:9, 43:13, 44:4, 44:8, 44:10, 44:12, 44:14, 44:19, 45:6, 45:8, 45:11, 47:2, 51:13, 51:18, 53:16, 53:17, 53:19, 54:7, 55:18, 57:6, 57:8, 57:13,</p>
--	--	---	---	--

<p>57:18, 58:1, 60:10, 60:18, 61:7, 61:19, 62:4, 62:7, 74:16, 78:9, 82:9, 87:15, 89:6, 90:17, 92:1, 94:15, 94:18, 108:17, 109:6, 109:9, 109:13, 109:19, 110:12, 116:7, 123:5, 123:9, 125:1, 126:9, 126:13, 127:14, 128:9, 128:11, 128:18, 128:19, 129:7, 129:8, 129:14, 130:5, 130:8, 130:11, 131:9, 134:4, 138:14, 138:19, 139:8, 139:14, 143:16, 143:18, 144:3, 154:18, 155:2, 162:2, 164:6, 168:14, 168:16, 170:4, 177:9, 178:14, 179:4, 179:6, 179:7, 179:18, 187:7, 187:10, 193:9, 194:3, 194:13, 210:8, 212:4, 212:5, 212:8, 212:11, 213:18, 214:6, 214:12, 214:18, 215:16, 215:18, 216:4, 217:7, 217:13, 217:19, 218:2, 218:4, 220:17, 222:3, 223:9, 223:12, 223:15, 224:4, 224:5, 224:10, 224:12, 224:17, 227:7, 228:8, 233:14, 234:1, 234:6, 234:14, 234:15, 234:16</p> <p><b>spaces</b> [15] - 51:15, 51:16, 58:2, 58:5, 59:12, 61:5, 124:17, 126:18, 127:6, 128:4, 128:16, 129:11, 129:16, 129:17, 219:9</p> <p><b>spacing</b> [1] - 62:17</p> <p><b>speaking</b> [3] - 27:8, 108:10, 229:14</p> <p><b>special</b> [5] - 2:16, 4:16, 145:8, 166:12, 184:13</p> <p><b>Special</b> [6] - 5:10, 61:10, 72:18, 75:3,</p>	<p>174:7, 185:14</p> <p><b>specific</b> [10] - 51:6, 55:13, 75:4, 119:16, 122:5, 132:6, 147:7, 149:13, 151:5, 199:4</p> <p><b>specifically</b> [3] - 23:14, 52:4, 113:14</p> <p><b>specificity</b> [1] - 193:19</p> <p><b>specifics</b> [2] - 21:18, 36:7</p> <p><b>specified</b> [1] - 90:17</p> <p><b>specifies</b> [1] - 24:14</p> <p><b>specify</b> [1] - 91:19</p> <p><b>spectrum</b> [1] - 171:3</p> <p><b>speed</b> [3] - 66:8, 67:16, 95:6</p> <p><b>spell</b> [1] - 89:18</p> <p><b>spend</b> [2] - 34:16, 107:17</p> <p><b>spent</b> [1] - 36:19</p> <p><b>spin</b> [1] - 76:9</p> <p><b>split</b> [3] - 91:2, 95:10, 177:1</p> <p><b>splitting</b> [1] - 179:1</p> <p><b>spoken</b> [3] - 134:9, 163:14, 181:7</p> <p><b>spot</b> [1] - 22:15</p> <p><b>Spring</b> [1] - 104:16</p> <p><b>spring</b> [3] - 181:2, 182:15, 182:19</p> <p><b>Square</b> [43] - 3:7, 4:11, 8:15, 20:19, 21:4, 22:1, 22:4, 23:6, 34:10, 35:11, 36:1, 36:4, 37:2, 38:11, 40:13, 43:3, 43:18, 55:17, 61:9, 62:11, 75:17, 83:3, 89:4, 97:9, 109:17, 111:1, 111:4, 113:6, 117:2, 119:13, 119:19, 122:11, 127:1, 127:9, 128:11, 130:1, 130:4, 146:11, 146:12, 158:5, 170:18, 173:5, 191:6</p> <p><b>square</b> [33] - 2:6, 8:16, 12:18, 48:13, 48:15, 48:17, 51:16, 52:19, 53:1, 53:18, 54:6, 65:14, 67:19, 68:8, 68:16, 69:8, 70:2, 71:2, 74:15, 76:15, 83:13, 83:15, 83:16, 84:13, 89:2, 89:6, 89:9, 102:2, 128:6, 150:3,</p>	<p>172:18, 208:13</p> <p><b>SS</b> [1] - 238:4</p> <p><b>staff</b> [16] - 86:7, 105:19, 138:12, 138:17, 139:1, 139:17, 144:10, 150:18, 158:16, 161:17, 162:4, 162:9, 200:17, 201:6, 203:18, 232:15</p> <p><b>Staff</b> [1] - 1:14</p> <p><b>staff's</b> [1] - 90:7</p> <p><b>stage</b> [6] - 145:5, 175:5, 179:16, 179:19, 185:14, 225:7</p> <p><b>stakeholders</b> [2] - 35:9, 55:9</p> <p><b>stalls</b> [1] - 51:19</p> <p><b>standard</b> [1] - 81:5</p> <p><b>standing</b> [1] - 203:14</p> <p><b>stands</b> [1] - 51:19</p> <p><b>start</b> [22] - 4:5, 20:16, 34:12, 64:4, 71:12, 75:18, 81:16, 84:8, 90:9, 107:5, 121:19, 126:3, 126:5, 126:6, 126:7, 145:5, 145:14, 166:8, 167:12, 173:17, 186:10, 204:7</p> <p><b>started</b> [3] - 35:6, 37:17, 213:15</p> <p><b>starting</b> [4] - 107:5, 139:12, 145:4, 186:12</p> <p><b>starts</b> [3] - 64:10, 121:6, 210:1</p> <p><b>startup</b> [1] - 52:1</p> <p><b>startups</b> [1] - 54:1</p> <p><b>Stata</b> [3] - 159:18, 160:3, 160:5</p> <p><b>state</b> [6] - 27:6, 89:17, 125:8, 153:2, 157:13, 194:9</p> <p><b>statement(s)</b> [1] - 237:17</p> <p><b>stating</b> [1] - 140:8</p> <p><b>station</b> [2] - 119:6, 157:15</p> <p><b>stations</b> [1] - 158:3</p> <p><b>statistics</b> [1] - 64:15</p> <p><b>STEBILE</b> [2] - 102:15, 102:16</p> <p><b>Stebile</b> [1] - 102:16</p> <p><b>step</b> [3] - 46:9, 76:2, 153:13</p> <p><b>stepped</b> [1] - 231:2</p> <p><b>stepping</b> [1] - 134:19</p> <p><b>steps</b> [2] - 65:13,</p>	<p>72:17</p> <p><b>Steve</b> [3] - 145:17, 186:10, 192:8</p> <p><b>Steven</b> [1] - 1:9</p> <p><b>STEVEN</b> [45] - 32:17, 145:18, 150:6, 150:9, 186:11, 189:9, 191:17, 192:2, 197:11, 197:16, 198:8, 198:14, 198:19, 199:19, 200:4, 200:9, 201:3, 201:17, 202:4, 202:9, 202:19, 205:9, 206:4, 206:11, 206:16, 207:1, 208:14, 209:17, 210:5, 210:10, 210:15, 215:2, 215:8, 220:4, 222:14, 222:19, 225:8, 225:13, 226:4, 226:9, 227:8, 234:11, 234:18, 235:2, 235:6</p> <p><b>STEVENS</b> [1] - 104:15</p> <p><b>Stevens</b> [1] - 104:16</p> <p><b>stick</b> [1] - 205:14</p> <p><b>still</b> [21] - 46:6, 48:10, 49:19, 54:2, 64:5, 115:15, 125:14, 154:18, 169:10, 182:5, 194:17, 197:19, 198:19, 204:18, 208:13, 214:17, 216:7, 222:4, 223:2, 228:4</p> <p><b>stipulations</b> [1] - 43:8</p> <p><b>stone</b> [1] - 136:14</p> <p><b>stonewalls</b> [1] - 231:7</p> <p><b>stop</b> [2] - 124:1, 195:15</p> <p><b>store</b> [4] - 51:8, 51:10, 59:11</p> <p><b>stories</b> [1] - 127:19</p> <p><b>stormwater</b> [3] - 3:3, 14:6, 83:6</p> <p><b>story</b> [1] - 111:7</p> <p><b>strategic</b> [1] - 57:14</p> <p><b>strategies</b> [3] - 75:5, 167:15, 167:17</p> <p><b>Street</b> [28] - 5:12, 46:3, 56:12, 56:16, 58:9, 61:12, 62:2, 62:9, 62:14, 84:12, 90:11, 102:16, 104:16, 108:6, 113:3, 117:18, 118:1, 120:7, 123:7, 124:11, 124:15,</p>	<p>125:13, 125:14, 129:3, 129:8, 137:14, 161:12, 231:9</p> <p><b>street</b> [5] - 58:12, 70:17, 118:11, 190:5, 220:14</p> <p><b>streets</b> [3] - 79:8, 83:4, 130:11</p> <p><b>stressed</b> [1] - 110:16</p> <p><b>stretch</b> [1] - 149:8</p> <p><b>strict</b> [2] - 52:8, 169:3</p> <p><b>strong</b> [4] - 61:16, 87:14, 117:14, 204:11</p> <p><b>stronger</b> [2] - 202:13, 204:3</p> <p><b>strongly</b> [1] - 205:15</p> <p><b>struck</b> [1] - 102:8</p> <p><b>structure</b> [1] - 119:10</p> <p><b>structured</b> [3] - 27:17, 118:19, 177:12</p> <p><b>Stuart</b> [1] - 1:15</p> <p><b>STUART</b> [3] - 202:10, 218:6, 218:11</p> <p><b>stuck</b> [2] - 105:9, 106:1</p> <p><b>student</b> [1] - 127:4</p> <p><b>students</b> [1] - 97:8</p> <p><b>studies</b> [2] - 111:5, 149:3</p> <p><b>study</b> [26] - 35:7, 36:1, 40:13, 54:17, 61:3, 61:14, 62:10, 66:3, 66:17, 73:2, 95:13, 105:17, 106:4, 107:5, 107:6, 107:9, 107:13, 112:10, 126:13, 173:19, 188:10, 188:12, 188:18, 225:9, 226:18, 227:4</p> <p><b>stuff</b> [7] - 32:8, 153:5, 155:3, 188:1, 188:11, 190:2, 196:9</p> <p><b>sub</b> [1] - 40:8</p> <p><b>subject</b> [8] - 2:15, 40:14, 40:15, 156:3, 165:18, 166:15, 208:17, 222:17</p> <p><b>submission</b> [1] - 117:1</p> <p><b>submit</b> [2] - 174:8, 178:18</p> <p><b>submitted</b> [3] - 46:4, 49:6, 93:14</p> <p><b>subscribe</b> [1] - 237:16</p> <p><b>subsequent</b> [1] -</p>
---	---	---	---	---

<p>11:10  <b>subsequently</b> [1] - 12:7  <b>subsidies</b> [1] - 132:2  <b>subsidized</b> [1] - 2:14  <b>substantial</b> [6] - 103:5, 107:8, 123:9, 129:14, 129:16, 226:16  <b>substantially</b> [1] - 232:14  <b>substitution</b> [1] - 41:11  <b>suburban</b> [1] - 152:18  <b>suddenly</b> [1] - 101:13  <b>suggest</b> [3] - 183:6, 204:12, 232:12  <b>suggested</b> [6] - 41:19, 53:17, 152:7, 156:6, 166:8, 233:1  <b>suggesting</b> [7] - 41:4, 45:10, 139:1, 168:5, 169:2, 196:14, 222:15  <b>suggestion</b> [6] - 41:6, 46:11, 136:4, 163:13, 204:15, 223:9  <b>suggestions</b> [6] - 125:10, 178:8, 184:18, 212:10, 212:12, 232:19  <b>sum</b> [1] - 139:19  <b>summarize</b> [1] - 72:4  <b>summarized</b> [1] - 12:15  <b>summarizes</b> [1] - 63:2  <b>summer</b> [3] - 36:19, 114:7, 115:6  <b>sums</b> [1] - 71:8  <b>sunlight</b> [4] - 57:16, 60:9, 62:1, 62:18  <b>Superbowl</b> [1] - 224:19  <b>support</b> [9] - 3:3, 31:11, 54:7, 82:16, 103:19, 135:11, 147:3, 147:5, 147:18  <b>supportable</b> [3] - 80:14, 101:14  <b>supporting</b> [1] - 147:12  <b>surface</b> [2] - 118:18, 230:15  <b>surgery</b> [1] - 121:5  <b>surplus</b> [1] - 98:3  <b>surprise</b> [1] - 87:10  <b>surprised</b> [2] - 127:5, 153:3  <b>surprisingly</b> [1] -</p>	<p>128:4  <b>surrounding</b> [2] - 127:16, 144:6  <b>surrounds</b> [1] - 23:17  <b>Susanne</b> [5] - 39:9, 83:7, 157:10, 185:9, 228:17  <b>SUSANNE</b> [2] - 63:16, 64:7  <b>Susanne's</b> [1] - 63:4  <b>suspect</b> [1] - 147:12  <b>sustain</b> [1] - 105:15  <b>sustainability</b> [2] - 54:1, 87:14  <b>sustainable</b> [2] - 38:16, 116:14  <b>SUZANNAH</b> [3] - 54:13, 58:11, 58:14  <b>Suzannah</b> [7] - 1:16, 33:11, 39:5, 41:16, 50:9, 54:12, 169:15  <b>Suzannah's</b> [1] - 211:13  <b>swap</b> [2] - 26:14, 104:5  <b>switch</b> [1] - 164:1  <b>switching</b> [3] - 45:16, 51:1, 165:11  <b>system</b> [11] - 43:11, 44:5, 44:15, 45:7, 95:5, 95:8, 95:12, 97:12, 179:5, 179:7, 217:13  <b>Systems</b> [1] - 3:8</p>	<p><b>technical</b> [1] - 33:15  <b>Ted</b> [5] - 29:4, 162:11, 169:2, 192:19, 234:11  <b>ten</b> [27] - 33:19, 48:11, 125:17, 150:7, 162:9, 164:3, 172:17, 186:14, 186:19, 187:1, 187:3, 198:5, 199:7, 199:15, 203:3, 203:6, 205:10, 205:13, 208:4, 208:7, 208:9, 208:19, 210:2, 211:18, 214:9, 214:10, 233:12  <b>tenant</b> [2] - 78:10, 102:6  <b>tenants</b> [1] - 29:19  <b>tend</b> [1] - 146:15  <b>tends</b> [1] - 170:18  <b>tens</b> [1] - 188:17  <b>tenth</b> [1] - 40:7  <b>term</b> [2] - 81:13, 88:17  <b>terms</b> [20] - 5:3, 17:14, 18:14, 42:9, 50:6, 52:17, 53:14, 66:5, 72:9, 103:1, 108:17, 110:3, 129:4, 138:14, 170:11, 172:7, 183:19, 189:19, 198:3  <b>terribly</b> [1] - 161:5  <b>terror</b> [1] - 109:3  <b>THACHER</b> [6] - 19:6, 19:15, 20:1, 141:18, 208:18, 211:9  <b>Thacher</b> [2] - 1:12, 141:17  <b>Thanksgiving</b> [1] - 5:5  <b>THE</b> [6] - 1:2, 1:18, 238:15, 238:16, 238:17  <b>themselves</b> [5] - 101:4, 193:9, 194:1, 194:7, 232:4  <b>THEODORE</b> [143] - 4:2, 7:7, 7:11, 7:15, 7:18, 8:2, 17:18, 18:2, 19:4, 20:3, 20:6, 20:10, 25:9, 25:13, 26:3, 26:6, 26:10, 29:2, 30:11, 31:3, 31:17, 32:10, 32:18, 33:1, 33:4, 33:6, 33:18, 34:2, 63:5, 75:8, 76:11, 85:17, 86:3, 86:8,</p>	<p>88:6, 89:13, 94:10, 99:7, 99:12, 100:1, 102:12, 104:14, 108:1, 108:4, 112:19, 116:1, 120:4, 124:7, 125:18, 126:2, 135:19, 138:8, 141:17, 141:19, 145:17, 150:5, 154:3, 155:13, 160:1, 160:4, 162:15, 162:18, 163:7, 163:15, 163:18, 165:7, 165:10, 178:12, 180:2, 183:4, 184:15, 185:16, 186:6, 186:10, 189:7, 193:1, 193:4, 194:19, 195:14, 195:19, 196:4, 196:13, 196:18, 197:6, 197:9, 197:14, 197:18, 198:9, 198:12, 199:11, 200:2, 200:6, 200:18, 204:16, 205:2, 205:6, 205:12, 206:13, 206:18, 207:3, 207:9, 208:6, 208:11, 208:19, 209:7, 209:12, 210:19, 211:4, 211:6, 211:17, 212:2, 212:5, 212:14, 212:19, 215:9, 219:17, 220:5, 220:8, 220:12, 220:15, 220:18, 221:3, 221:9, 221:16, 221:19, 222:15, 223:10, 224:14, 225:3, 228:7, 228:10, 230:7, 231:19, 232:8, 232:11, 234:17, 235:1, 235:10, 235:19, 236:5, 236:8, 236:11, 236:14  <b>Theodore</b> [1] - 1:8  <b>theoretically</b> [1] - 181:13  <b>therefor</b> [1] - 237:7  <b>therefore</b> [2] - 136:12, 178:4  <b>they've</b> [11] - 7:13, 49:15, 123:17, 132:8, 132:10,</p>	<p>133:18, 170:13, 188:17, 194:1, 194:6, 216:7  <b>thinking</b> [6] - 60:4, 124:4, 140:11, 159:9, 188:16, 215:15  <b>thinks</b> [3] - 66:7, 115:15, 203:8  <b>Third</b> [10] - 62:2, 62:11, 71:17, 90:11, 102:16, 123:7, 125:13, 125:14, 129:3, 161:12  <b>third</b> [1] - 162:8  <b>THIS</b> [1] - 238:15  <b>THOMAS</b> [8] - 75:10, 76:12, 78:13, 85:13, 86:5, 87:4, 88:12, 88:15  <b>Thorndike</b> [1] - 108:6  <b>thoughtful</b> [2] - 36:3, 107:18  <b>thoughts</b> [5] - 140:18, 146:8, 172:15, 178:15, 227:19  <b>thousand</b> [4] - 28:9, 119:10, 131:16, 160:18  <b>thousands</b> [3] - 119:5, 131:19, 188:17  <b>three</b> [13] - 2:13, 13:3, 15:17, 18:13, 80:8, 88:10, 90:1, 113:10, 113:11, 131:2, 149:1, 208:3, 208:8  <b>three-bedroom</b> [1] - 15:17  <b>threshold</b> [4] - 71:10, 71:19, 72:2, 116:10  <b>thresholds</b> [2] - 73:14, 74:5  <b>thrill</b> [1] - 149:4  <b>throughout</b> [3] - 58:7, 60:12, 83:3  <b>throw</b> [3] - 119:7, 185:7, 200:16  <b>throwing</b> [1] - 118:6  <b>thumbnail</b> [1] - 71:9  <b>tie</b> [2] - 7:2, 74:1  <b>tied</b> [4] - 44:15, 73:13, 209:3, 209:7  <b>TIFFANY</b> [6] - 19:6, 19:15, 20:1, 141:18, 208:18, 211:9  <b>Tiffany</b> [1] - 1:12  <b>timeline</b> [3] - 35:5, 38:3, 114:12  <b>timely</b> [2] - 184:1, 184:12</p>
	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>T</b></p> <p><b>table</b> [1] - 125:7  <b>tailored</b> [1] - 40:16  <b>talks</b> [1] - 229:3  <b>tall</b> [7] - 127:19, 128:1, 136:10, 161:7, 173:15, 191:16, 227:2  <b>taller</b> [11] - 46:1, 46:7, 46:14, 46:18, 50:15, 60:3, 128:2, 160:11, 173:9, 190:9, 191:13  <b>tanks</b> [2] - 3:4, 14:7  <b>tapes</b> [1] - 209:11  <b>targeted</b> [1] - 49:12  <b>taxi</b> [1] - 229:17  <b>TDM</b> [1] - 234:9  <b>Team</b> [3] - 37:7, 108:12, 124:12  <b>team</b> [5] - 12:9, 12:16, 13:19, 14:10, 19:12  <b>tear</b> [1] - 152:1  <b>tech</b> [1] - 135:4</p>	<p><b>technical</b> [1] - 33:15  <b>Ted</b> [5] - 29:4, 162:11, 169:2, 192:19, 234:11  <b>ten</b> [27] - 33:19, 48:11, 125:17, 150:7, 162:9, 164:3, 172:17, 186:14, 186:19, 187:1, 187:3, 198:5, 199:7, 199:15, 203:3, 203:6, 205:10, 205:13, 208:4, 208:7, 208:9, 208:19, 210:2, 211:18, 214:9, 214:10, 233:12  <b>tenant</b> [2] - 78:10, 102:6  <b>tenants</b> [1] - 29:19  <b>tend</b> [1] - 146:15  <b>tends</b> [1] - 170:18  <b>tens</b> [1] - 188:17  <b>tenth</b> [1] - 40:7  <b>term</b> [2] - 81:13, 88:17  <b>terms</b> [20] - 5:3, 17:14, 18:14, 42:9, 50:6, 52:17, 53:14, 66:5, 72:9, 103:1, 108:17, 110:3, 129:4, 138:14, 170:11, 172:7, 183:19, 189:19, 198:3  <b>terribly</b> [1] - 161:5  <b>terror</b> [1] - 109:3  <b>THACHER</b> [6] - 19:6, 19:15, 20:1, 141:18, 208:18, 211:9  <b>Thacher</b> [2] - 1:12, 141:17  <b>Thanksgiving</b> [1] - 5:5  <b>THE</b> [6] - 1:2, 1:18, 238:15, 238:16, 238:17  <b>themselves</b> [5] - 101:4, 193:9, 194:1, 194:7, 232:4  <b>THEODORE</b> [143] - 4:2, 7:7, 7:11, 7:15, 7:18, 8:2, 17:18, 18:2, 19:4, 20:3, 20:6, 20:10, 25:9, 25:13, 26:3, 26:6, 26:10, 29:2, 30:11, 31:3, 31:17, 32:10, 32:18, 33:1, 33:4, 33:6, 33:18, 34:2, 63:5, 75:8, 76:11, 85:17, 86:3, 86:8,</p>	<p>88:6, 89:13, 94:10, 99:7, 99:12, 100:1, 102:12, 104:14, 108:1, 108:4, 112:19, 116:1, 120:4, 124:7, 125:18, 126:2, 135:19, 138:8, 141:17, 141:19, 145:17, 150:5, 154:3, 155:13, 160:1, 160:4, 162:15, 162:18, 163:7, 163:15, 163:18, 165:7, 165:10, 178:12, 180:2, 183:4, 184:15, 185:16, 186:6, 186:10, 189:7, 193:1, 193:4, 194:19, 195:14, 195:19, 196:4, 196:13, 196:18, 197:6, 197:9, 197:14, 197:18, 198:9, 198:12, 199:11, 200:2, 200:6, 200:18, 204:16, 205:2, 205:6, 205:12, 206:13, 206:18, 207:3, 207:9, 208:6, 208:11, 208:19, 209:7, 209:12, 210:19, 211:4, 211:6, 211:17, 212:2, 212:5, 212:14, 212:19, 215:9, 219:17, 220:5, 220:8, 220:12, 220:15, 220:18, 221:3, 221:9, 221:16, 221:19, 222:15, 223:10, 224:14, 225:3, 228:7, 228:10, 230:7, 231:19, 232:8, 232:11, 234:17, 235:1, 235:10, 235:19, 236:5, 236:8, 236:11, 236:14  <b>Theodore</b> [1] - 1:8  <b>theoretically</b> [1] - 181:13  <b>therefor</b> [1] - 237:7  <b>therefore</b> [2] - 136:12, 178:4  <b>they've</b> [11] - 7:13, 49:15, 123:17, 132:8, 132:10,</p>	<p>133:18, 170:13, 188:17, 194:1, 194:6, 216:7  <b>thinking</b> [6] - 60:4, 124:4, 140:11, 159:9, 188:16, 215:15  <b>thinks</b> [3] - 66:7, 115:15, 203:8  <b>Third</b> [10] - 62:2, 62:11, 71:17, 90:11, 102:16, 123:7, 125:13, 125:14, 129:3, 161:12  <b>third</b> [1] - 162:8  <b>THIS</b> [1] - 238:15  <b>THOMAS</b> [8] - 75:10, 76:12, 78:13, 85:13, 86:5, 87:4, 88:12, 88:15  <b>Thorndike</b> [1] - 108:6  <b>thoughtful</b> [2] - 36:3, 107:18  <b>thoughts</b> [5] - 140:18, 146:8, 172:15, 178:15, 227:19  <b>thousand</b> [4] - 28:9, 119:10, 131:16, 160:18  <b>thousands</b> [3] - 119:5, 131:19, 188:17  <b>three</b> [13] - 2:13, 13:3, 15:17, 18:13, 80:8, 88:10, 90:1, 113:10, 113:11, 131:2, 149:1, 208:3, 208:8  <b>three-bedroom</b> [1] - 15:17  <b>threshold</b> [4] - 71:10, 71:19, 72:2, 116:10  <b>thresholds</b> [2] - 73:14, 74:5  <b>thrill</b> [1] - 149:4  <b>throughout</b> [3] - 58:7, 60:12, 83:3  <b>throw</b> [3] - 119:7, 185:7, 200:16  <b>throwing</b> [1] - 118:6  <b>thumbnail</b> [1] - 71:9  <b>tie</b> [2] - 7:2, 74:1  <b>tied</b> [4] - 44:15, 73:13, 209:3, 209:7  <b>TIFFANY</b> [6] - 19:6, 19:15, 20:1, 141:18, 208:18, 211:9  <b>Tiffany</b> [1] - 1:12  <b>timeline</b> [3] - 35:5, 38:3, 114:12  <b>timely</b> [2] - 184:1, 184:12</p>

**timing** [3] - 180:4, 180:18, 183:5  
**tipping** [1] - 72:1  
**tired** [1] - 96:8  
**TO** [1] - 238:16  
**today** [8] - 16:19, 23:9, 90:7, 172:9, 172:10, 180:12, 216:14, 232:18  
**today's** [1] - 4:9  
**together** [7] - 35:5, 36:4, 43:11, 50:2, 91:4, 96:19, 190:11  
**Tom** [6] - 1:10, 39:12, 75:11, 86:13, 136:6, 148:4  
**TOM** [1] - 29:18  
**Tom's** [3] - 99:17, 130:16, 143:4  
**tonight** [8] - 8:10, 9:10, 9:17, 11:19, 96:15, 103:3, 141:3, 154:9  
**took** [1] - 84:11  
**tool** [1] - 212:9  
**top** [1] - 105:4  
**tossed** [1] - 160:19  
**total** [11] - 31:5, 42:2, 42:5, 53:10, 53:11, 85:13, 112:12, 176:10, 213:18, 217:12, 222:2  
**totality** [1] - 112:12  
**totally** [1] - 200:7  
**touch** [2] - 101:8, 183:19  
**tough** [1] - 110:6  
**tour** [1] - 7:3  
**towards** [1] - 222:2  
**tower** [1] - 118:6  
**Tower** [1] - 159:15  
**towers** [1] - 62:17  
**town** [2] - 26:11, 111:16  
**tracks** [1] - 119:8  
**tradeoff** [1] - 131:15  
**traditional** [2] - 90:15, 91:1  
**traffic** [20] - 64:9, 73:2, 73:3, 73:12, 75:5, 95:9, 95:13, 103:8, 103:11, 106:13, 111:5, 112:10, 140:14, 170:12, 171:6, 171:12, 171:16, 229:3, 229:18  
**train** [1] - 110:16  
**trains** [1] - 158:2  
**TRANSCRIPT** [1] - 238:16

**transcript** [4] - 237:2, 237:6, 237:15, 237:16  
**Transcript(s)** [1] - 2:4  
**transcripts** [2] - 7:8, 7:9  
**transfer** [2] - 28:10, 40:6  
**transform** [1] - 38:10  
**transformation** [1] - 38:14  
**transformed** [1] - 86:19  
**transit** [18] - 54:8, 65:7, 65:16, 70:6, 72:10, 73:5, 73:6, 73:9, 73:12, 74:2, 74:12, 74:14, 74:17, 74:18, 75:6, 119:12, 138:4  
**transitions** [1] - 62:11  
**translated** [1] - 65:11  
**translates** [1] - 69:8  
**Transportation** [8] - 3:8, 3:9, 95:4, 98:11, 134:11, 147:19, 156:8, 156:13  
**transportation** [29] - 39:8, 39:11, 70:4, 83:7, 87:15, 95:2, 95:5, 95:8, 95:12, 97:5, 97:11, 105:17, 106:4, 110:15, 118:17, 134:15, 137:19, 138:1, 156:6, 157:10, 158:7, 158:11, 158:12, 185:11, 192:14, 228:16, 229:6, 229:7, 234:9  
**treadmill** [1] - 124:3  
**treatments** [1] - 60:1  
**trees** [1] - 129:1  
**tremendous** [1] - 31:6  
**triangle** [1] - 128:13  
**tried** [1] - 126:17  
**trip** [2] - 72:7, 74:2  
**trips** [16] - 65:4, 65:11, 69:9, 69:13, 69:17, 70:1, 70:5, 70:6, 70:13, 72:10, 73:6, 74:3, 106:9, 140:5, 140:13  
**trolleys** [1] - 119:7  
**trouble** [1] - 22:15  
**true** [2] - 117:15, 238:7  
**truly** [2] - 123:19, 155:18  
**try** [11] - 27:2, 31:14,

33:16, 37:4, 71:14, 99:2, 141:12, 174:5, 174:13, 174:16, 188:4  
**trying** [21] - 36:3, 43:1, 51:6, 84:16, 125:4, 134:1, 137:1, 137:12, 166:6, 175:15, 190:13, 192:2, 194:17, 195:1, 196:5, 198:15, 204:4, 209:11, 218:7, 218:14, 225:12  
**Tuesday** [1] - 1:4  
**turf** [1] - 130:15  
**turn** [3] - 27:1, 38:17, 54:11  
**Turner** [1] - 6:13  
**turning** [1] - 122:9  
**turns** [1] - 46:12  
**tweak** [1] - 142:8  
**tweaking** [1] - 145:2  
**twenty** [1] - 2:14  
**twice** [1] - 215:5  
**Twining** [11] - 10:4, 11:12, 12:9, 12:16, 23:18, 24:18, 25:7, 27:3, 27:10, 28:11, 79:19  
**two** [36] - 2:17, 4:9, 13:9, 13:11, 13:17, 17:4, 19:19, 28:4, 29:9, 37:19, 67:18, 68:4, 68:10, 71:14, 83:10, 91:15, 98:12, 98:15, 98:16, 113:10, 118:10, 123:5, 126:18, 128:4, 128:7, 129:10, 129:11, 140:8, 162:12, 184:4, 189:11, 190:8, 191:13, 216:8, 219:9  
**type** [9] - 27:3, 50:7, 51:18, 59:1, 64:17, 65:14, 68:1, 137:19, 198:17  
**types** [6] - 43:6, 57:1, 59:8, 61:4, 78:1, 83:13  
**typically** [1] - 102:6  
**typo** [1] - 123:12  
**typos** [1] - 158:17

## U

**U.S.** [1] - 3:9  
**ugly** [1] - 49:17  
**ultimate** [5] - 106:2,

152:3, 153:3, 187:9, 216:2  
**ultimately** [6] - 9:5, 50:1, 148:13, 153:9, 153:12, 154:1  
**unanimous** [3] - 8:3, 33:6, 236:14  
**unbuilt** [1] - 118:15  
**uncertain** [1] - 177:5  
**uncertainties** [1] - 94:9  
**uncertainty** [2] - 100:15, 176:11  
**unclear** [2] - 18:18, 102:7  
**under** [12] - 9:3, 14:16, 45:13, 52:7, 63:10, 119:8, 121:7, 132:19, 133:2, 176:14, 194:5, 198:5  
**UNDER** [1] - 238:16  
**underground** [1] - 77:18  
**underlined** [1] - 172:17  
**underlining** [1] - 166:7  
**undersigned** [1] - 238:5  
**understood** [4] - 102:3, 114:8, 114:18, 114:19  
**unduly** [1] - 30:14  
**unforeseen** [1] - 172:11  
**unhappy** [1] - 96:18  
**uniform** [1] - 171:8  
**unique** [2] - 91:2, 93:4  
**Unit** [1] - 3:7  
**unit** [1] - 34:9  
**united** [1] - 21:14  
**units** [16] - 2:13, 2:13, 2:14, 2:15, 13:3, 15:17, 15:19, 42:12, 42:15, 42:16, 60:19, 77:1, 131:16, 131:17, 132:1, 166:19  
**University** [1] - 73:18  
**unknown** [2] - 84:7, 87:10  
**unknowns** [6] - 84:6, 87:5, 87:18, 93:3, 148:18  
**UNLESS** [1] - 238:16  
**unless** [2] - 174:10, 182:3  
**unnecessary** [1] - 150:13  
**unshackle** [1] -

189:16  
**untenable** [1] - 104:2  
**unthinkingly** [1] - 95:6  
**unusual** [1] - 25:16  
**up** [85] - 4:11, 5:3, 5:15, 11:4, 13:11, 16:5, 18:5, 20:8, 20:9, 20:11, 22:8, 28:11, 29:7, 35:8, 40:13, 44:18, 47:8, 47:11, 48:9, 48:16, 49:3, 49:11, 49:12, 53:10, 54:3, 60:6, 61:14, 63:4, 83:17, 86:5, 89:16, 89:17, 91:2, 93:6, 97:16, 113:10, 114:10, 121:18, 123:14, 124:15, 131:3, 132:10, 134:7, 135:15, 136:14, 137:2, 141:11, 142:14, 142:16, 142:17, 149:17, 152:1, 156:13, 156:16, 157:8, 159:7, 170:1, 170:9, 171:5, 173:8, 173:14, 175:3, 176:10, 176:17, 177:6, 180:13, 182:8, 187:17, 188:1, 189:11, 189:14, 192:10, 197:9, 197:17, 198:6, 199:14, 203:14, 207:4, 208:2, 208:7, 208:8, 218:15, 226:14, 230:16  
**upcoming** [1] - 14:4  
**Update** [1] - 2:3  
**update** [6] - 4:5, 6:11, 7:5, 15:1, 39:10, 63:17  
**updated** [1] - 65:19  
**upgrade** [1] - 134:11  
**urban** [18] - 39:6, 41:15, 50:9, 52:14, 54:19, 55:18, 56:1, 56:2, 56:3, 56:11, 58:4, 62:5, 63:2, 122:12, 126:14, 126:17, 149:18, 167:3  
**urge** [1] - 21:13  
**urging** [1] - 23:15  
**usable** [1] - 139:14  
**user** [1] - 57:11  
**users** [2] - 44:1, 119:9  
**uses** [15] - 41:14,

<p>51:3, 51:5, 52:3, 52:4, 52:5, 52:6, 52:11, 52:12, 58:16, 59:8, 83:2, 89:10, 171:12</p> <p><b>usual</b> [6] - 4:5, 23:11, 26:15, 145:18, 146:1, 210:1</p> <p><b>utilities</b> [1] - 18:4</p> <p><b>utility</b> [7] - 13:10, 13:12, 13:18, 17:3, 17:7, 18:9, 18:13</p> <p><b>utilizing</b> [1] - 185:12</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>V</b></p> <p><b>vacant</b> [1] - 156:19</p> <p><b>vaguely</b> [1] - 123:16</p> <p><b>valuable</b> [2] - 135:7, 135:10</p> <p><b>value</b> [24] - 76:3, 77:10, 78:13, 78:15, 80:3, 80:7, 81:14, 82:1, 83:12, 83:14, 84:1, 85:15, 88:15, 88:18, 88:19, 89:9, 100:8, 100:18, 101:14, 102:1, 109:15, 147:17, 194:17</p> <p><b>values</b> [1] - 85:16</p> <p><b>variability</b> [1] - 77:19</p> <p><b>Variance</b> [1] - 205:4</p> <p><b>varied</b> [1] - 71:9</p> <p><b>variety</b> [3] - 43:14, 134:8, 203:12</p> <p><b>various</b> [4] - 28:15, 35:16, 38:19, 55:8</p> <p><b>vegetable</b> [1] - 223:16</p> <p><b>vehicle</b> [3] - 65:12, 73:13, 74:3</p> <p><b>vehicular</b> [1] - 220:13</p> <p><b>venues</b> [1] - 37:2</p> <p><b>version</b> [2] - 41:5, 93:14</p> <p><b>versus</b> [7] - 70:5, 101:10, 102:2, 103:14, 103:16, 172:10, 220:1</p> <p><b>vertical</b> [6] - 79:9, 79:17, 79:19, 80:5, 80:16, 83:18</p> <p><b>via</b> [1] - 200:17</p> <p><b>vibrant</b> [1] - 144:1</p> <p><b>Vice</b> [1] - 1:8</p> <p><b>victory</b> [1] - 224:18</p> <p><b>view</b> [10] - 22:15, 28:3, 61:8, 109:6, 113:5, 145:4, 156:11, 159:5, 204:4, 206:1</p>	<p><b>viewed</b> [2] - 135:14, 161:9</p> <p><b>views</b> [1] - 62:18</p> <p><b>visibility</b> [1] - 60:19</p> <p><b>visible</b> [1] - 50:4</p> <p><b>vision</b> [2] - 55:12, 117:14</p> <p><b>visionary</b> [1] - 117:7</p> <p><b>visioning</b> [1] - 98:10</p> <p><b>visit</b> [1] - 6:12</p> <p><b>visual</b> [1] - 61:18</p> <p><b>voiced</b> [1] - 147:5</p> <p><b>Volpe</b> [33] - 3:8, 5:2, 5:17, 6:19, 34:10, 36:10, 40:7, 48:12, 52:18, 53:6, 53:12, 55:2, 55:13, 66:10, 66:12, 66:16, 76:4, 87:7, 90:19, 91:1, 95:3, 98:11, 100:5, 102:17, 103:17, 117:15, 145:10, 147:19, 148:14, 154:16, 194:9, 227:17, 231:5</p> <p><b>volume</b> [3] - 77:16, 195:9, 237:6</p> <p><b>volumes</b> [1] - 130:8</p> <p><b>vote</b> [7] - 21:13, 121:12, 153:11, 181:14, 181:17, 182:19, 183:11</p> <p><b>voted</b> [6] - 9:6, 15:10, 21:10, 27:9, 27:10, 31:9</p> <p><b>votes</b> [1] - 164:19</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>W</b></p> <p><b>wait</b> [3] - 71:13, 86:10, 184:10</p> <p><b>waiting</b> [1] - 112:7</p> <p><b>waive</b> [8] - 186:18, 187:2, 187:6, 203:17, 207:8, 222:12, 233:6, 233:8</p> <p><b>waived</b> [8] - 189:10, 199:18, 203:6, 205:11, 208:15, 211:19, 222:6, 233:13</p> <p><b>waiver</b> [9] - 165:19, 202:5, 202:8, 202:15, 203:3, 204:17, 208:17, 223:3, 233:17</p> <p><b>walk</b> [3] - 38:18, 39:5, 220:9</p> <p><b>walking</b> [7] - 10:10, 65:5, 65:15, 70:6,</p>	<p>119:11, 138:3, 230:15</p> <p><b>walkway</b> [7] - 8:14, 11:1, 11:6, 29:6, 56:16, 62:14, 129:9</p> <p><b>walkways</b> [2] - 16:2, 231:1</p> <p><b>wall</b> [1] - 175:15</p> <p><b>wants</b> [6] - 101:8, 105:8, 162:9, 175:11, 190:17, 223:1</p> <p><b>warfare</b> [1] - 232:3</p> <p><b>Washington</b> [1] - 6:14</p> <p><b>watched</b> [1] - 104:18</p> <p><b>watching</b> [1] - 71:17</p> <p><b>water</b> [11] - 110:4, 112:11, 116:10, 116:11, 116:15, 116:18, 137:16, 229:17, 230:1, 230:13, 231:2</p> <p><b>waterway</b> [1] - 124:16</p> <p><b>Watkins</b> [2] - 8:9, 10:7</p> <p><b>WATKINS</b> [5] - 10:9, 18:8, 19:10, 19:16, 20:2</p> <p><b>ways</b> [5] - 43:4, 45:3, 174:4, 201:2, 234:19</p> <p><b>wealth</b> [1] - 96:4</p> <p><b>weather</b> [2] - 111:10, 224:10</p> <p><b>website</b> [1] - 9:19</p> <p><b>wedding</b> [1] - 210:1</p> <p><b>wee</b> [1] - 103:12</p> <p><b>week</b> [6] - 5:5, 5:18, 37:17, 37:19, 49:14, 104:19</p> <p><b>weeks</b> [1] - 38:1</p> <p><b>welcome</b> [2] - 4:3, 118:16</p> <p><b>welcoming</b> [1] - 52:6</p> <p><b>Wellington</b> [1] - 37:4</p> <p><b>Wellington-Harrington</b> [1] - 37:4</p> <p><b>West</b> [1] - 109:16</p> <p><b>wetland</b> [1] - 116:18</p> <p><b>whereas</b> [1] - 78:8</p> <p><b>WHEREOF</b> [1] - 238:9</p> <p><b>whistles</b> [3] - 84:15, 84:18, 98:3</p> <p><b>whole</b> [10] - 10:15, 34:17, 60:12, 104:6, 112:15, 114:16, 121:5, 166:13, 216:12, 231:2</p> <p><b>wide</b> [7] - 2:7, 8:13, 11:1, 11:6, 220:4, 220:5, 220:8</p> <p><b>wider</b> [2] - 129:13,</p>	<p>209:19</p> <p><b>wildlife</b> [1] - 116:11</p> <p><b>WILLIAMSON</b> [8] - 20:13, 58:8, 58:13, 78:12, 85:11, 86:1, 94:12, 98:19</p> <p><b>Williamson</b> [4] - 20:14, 94:11, 94:13, 98:18</p> <p><b>willing</b> [3] - 149:8, 236:2, 236:5</p> <p><b>wind</b> [1] - 112:10</p> <p><b>window</b> [1] - 181:15</p> <p><b>winning</b> [1] - 117:1</p> <p><b>winter</b> [3] - 110:18, 223:11, 223:19</p> <p><b>Winthrop</b> [3] - 127:9, 130:1, 130:4</p> <p><b>wish</b> [3] - 99:14, 108:2, 152:10</p> <p><b>wished</b> [1] - 133:16</p> <p><b>wishes</b> [8] - 20:11, 25:10, 32:12, 102:13, 116:2, 124:8, 125:19, 212:11</p> <p><b>WITNESS</b> [1] - 238:9</p> <p><b>wonder</b> [4] - 95:6, 137:2, 138:5, 223:19</p> <p><b>wondered</b> [2] - 159:10, 223:13</p> <p><b>wonderful</b> [1] - 100:11</p> <p><b>wondering</b> [2] - 88:8, 140:6</p> <p><b>word</b> [1] - 158:19</p> <p><b>wording</b> [1] - 175:18</p> <p><b>work-a-day</b> [1] - 152:17</p> <p><b>workability</b> [1] - 61:15</p> <p><b>workforce</b> [1] - 54:10</p> <p><b>works</b> [5] - 106:16, 144:4, 149:17, 200:14, 227:3</p> <p><b>workshop</b> [1] - 98:6</p> <p><b>workshops</b> [1] - 35:16</p> <p><b>world</b> [1] - 36:11</p> <p><b>worry</b> [1] - 113:15</p> <p><b>worth</b> [3] - 99:5, 105:3, 141:16</p> <p><b>worthy</b> [2] - 50:5, 118:7</p> <p><b>wrap</b> [1] - 93:6</p> <p><b>wraps</b> [1] - 86:5</p> <p><b>writing</b> [2] - 136:9, 213:10</p> <p><b>written</b> [5] - 26:16, 42:6, 93:14, 136:14, 212:17</p>	<p><b>www.reportersinc.com</b> [1] - 1:19</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Y</b></p> <p><b>Yard</b> [4] - 127:12, 127:17, 129:2, 129:10</p> <p><b>yard</b> [7] - 127:13, 127:17, 128:2, 128:6, 128:7, 129:3, 129:12</p> <p><b>year</b> [11] - 11:9, 36:13, 85:11, 111:1, 114:9, 115:2, 164:18, 182:11, 182:12, 184:4, 223:15</p> <p><b>years</b> [9] - 18:13, 38:14, 85:3, 120:12, 125:17, 127:2, 145:10, 165:2, 211:10</p> <p><b>yesterday</b> [1] - 184:14</p> <p><b>York</b> [1] - 110:7</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><b>Z</b></p> <p><b>Zelinski</b> [2] - 238:5, 238:11</p> <p><b>zero</b> [1] - 28:2</p> <p><b>Zevin</b> [1] - 126:9</p> <p><b>zoning</b> [103] - 6:3, 6:10, 13:1, 13:5, 15:7, 21:5, 21:11, 21:17, 27:11, 29:19, 30:1, 31:8, 36:11, 37:15, 38:8, 38:19, 40:10, 40:15, 41:1, 41:5, 42:18, 43:9, 44:9, 44:11, 45:3, 52:13, 52:16, 53:14, 59:16, 63:11, 63:14, 66:16, 72:14, 72:17, 73:1, 73:8, 73:12, 73:15, 73:18, 74:7, 74:11, 75:13, 76:4, 84:3, 90:15, 91:3, 91:13, 91:15, 91:18, 92:7, 92:16, 98:11, 103:12, 105:13, 105:14, 111:18, 113:17, 114:11, 114:14, 115:12, 123:1, 123:2, 132:19, 133:2, 136:9, 142:7, 142:8, 144:11, 145:7, 151:7, 151:12, 152:5, 152:10, 153:1, 156:3,</p>
---	--	--	--	---

165:13, 166:12,  
166:17, 167:4,  
167:5, 167:6,  
167:19, 170:1,  
170:2, 174:5,  
174:11, 176:13,  
176:18, 177:2,  
177:4, 177:15,  
178:1, 180:14,  
181:8, 181:11,  
181:18, 182:1,  
203:16, 224:1,  
229:2, 230:4,  
232:14

**Zoning** <sup>[13]</sup> - 3:5, 3:6,  
4:12, 5:2, 11:10,  
30:6, 34:6, 34:7,  
36:8, 47:14, 103:4,  
166:13, 166:14