

PLANNING BOARD
FOR THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

GENERAL HEARING

Tuesday, January 26, 2016

7:10 p.m.

in

Second Floor Meeting Room

344 Broadway

Cambridge, Massachusetts

H. Theodore Cohen, Chair

Catherine Preston Connolly, Vice Chair

Hugh Russell, Member

Tom Sieniewicz, Member

Steven Cohen, Member

Louis J. Bacci, Jr., Member

Mary Flynn, Member

Ahmed Nur, Associate Member

Iram Farooq, Assistant City Manager

Community Development Staff:

Liza Paden

Jeff Roberts

Stuart Dash

Suzannah Bigolin

Swaathi Joseph

REPORTERS, INC.
CAPTURING THE OFFICIAL RECORD

617.786.7783/617.639.0396

www.reportersinc.com

I N D E X

	<u>PAGE</u>
GENERAL BUSINESS	
Update from the Community Development Department	4
Adoption of the Meeting Transcript(s)	6
7:00 p.m. Planning Board Rules and Regulations review, discussion and possible approval. Public comment will be taken during this General Business item. This item has been rescheduled from December 8, 2015.	7
 Public Hearing	
8:00 p.m. (continued) Peter Kroon, et al Zoning Petition (also known as Friends of MAPOCO) to create anew MAPOCO Subdistrict (to run from Roseland down to Chauncy/Everett) within the Massachusetts Avenue Overlay District with zoning requirements identical to the North Massachusetts Avenue Subdistrict except for some modifications. Full zoning petition texts available online at: www.cambridgema.gov/cdd/zoninganddevelopment/ zoning/amendments	122

(Index Continued on the Following Page)

I N D E X (Continued)
PAGE

General Business

Board of Zoning Appeal Cases	204
9059-2015 - 1815 Mass. Avenue - Special Permit to replace three antennas and add and/or upgrade equipment.	204
9073-2015 - 141 Portland Street - Special Permit to replace three antennas and add and/or upgrade equipment	209
9089-2015 - 675 Massachusetts Avenue - Special Permit to replace three antennas and add and/or upgrade equipment	213
 Keyword Index	

PROCEEDINGS

* * * * *

H. THEODORE COHEN: Good evening everyone. Welcome to the January 26th meeting of the Planning Board. We have one public hearing later this evening about a zoning petition, and prior to that we will be talking about the Planning Board rules and regulations. We'll start off first with the update from Community Development Department.

IRAM FAROOQ: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

In addition to what you described for today's agenda, upcoming meetings February 2nd is going to be focussed on the Town Gown reports. So the reports are all up on the CDD website for folks who would like to -- who would like to read them ahead of time. That meeting is going to be in the Central Square Senior Center.

February 16th is the following meeting, and the principal hearing -- agenda item is a comprehensive permit for -- at Auburn Court which is a new affordable residential development by HRI. So those are the key things.

In terms of other items, the Council's hearing on the Cohen petition which was scheduled for February 3rd has been moved to February 24th at 5:30.

And the only thing I will say since there are folks in the audience, that the deadline for applying to be part of the various committees that will be working on the Envision Cambridge process has been extended to this coming Monday, the 1st of February I believe. And so please -- we are looking for as broad and diverse a group of people to help us with this. There's going to be a series of committees on various --

committees and working groups on various topics, so let us know if you're interested. Spread the word to your friends and neighbors, because we would really like to get a broad set of folks participating in the process.

Thank you so much.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Liza, are there any transcripts?

LIZA PADEN: Not today.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay, thank you.

Just as a very brief follow up on the updating future meetings. At the -- for the Planning Board Members we're going to revert a little bit to some practice in the past in that after we hear from the various groups, we will actually have some questions from the Planning Board itself, some questions and comments. If we have larger issues, we will save that for a

future date, but I think last year there was such a lengthy period of time because of weather and various cancellations between the actual Town Gown meeting and when we got to talk about it, that it seemed like it was too long. And so this time we will address some of the things right away and then, you know, if it happens to go over to another session, we will do that at some future date. So come with your own questions and we'll go from there.

All right. What we're now going to do is take up proposed changes to our Planning Board rules and regulations. I plan to run through them briefly to indicate what some of the changes are and how we got to this point. The draft was prepared by staff working with Catherine and myself, and we met with the City Solicitor's office to go over some matters.

You know, a lot of the things we're doing especially with the early engagement, we're doing in our rules, it's not part of the Zoning Ordinance. The Zoning Ordinance would have more authority let's say, but it would have to go through the whole zoning process. The idea is with the rules is we're pushing it as far as we feel we can, and that some things may still be somewhat experimental, and the idea being that if something doesn't work or is not working the way we intend it to work, that it will be easy to amend it by simply changing our rules.

So that being said, I'm happy to run through things, give you some indication of what we're doing and how we got here. We will then take public comment from the public and after that, we'll have further discussion amongst the Board after we've heard what public comment may

be.

So, if everybody has them, the first issue that I know a lot of people have been concerned about is Section 4.4, which to make clear that all meetings of the Board will -- including Executive Session minutes will be taken. City Solicitor then indicated that meetings of the Board, except Executive Sessions will be transcribed to the extent feasible. It was not intended to say that minutes wouldn't be taken of Executive Sessions. But what it is a policy, I understand throughout the entire City, and to all the Boards, is that Executive Sessions are not stenographically transcribed. That someone does indeed keep minutes, and under the Open Meeting Law at the appropriate time, those minutes are available to the public. And that is what we've done in the past and that is what the

intention is to continue to do in the future.

It's, I would say almost a non-issue for this Board, because I think in probably seven or eight years, I think we've gone into Executive Session maybe twice in my memory, and I think each time was for a City Solicitor to advise us of the status of litigation that was then pending.

So, I would suggest we delete that phrase except Executive Session going back to the language that's been in the rules, for a time just saying that the meetings of the Board will be transcribed to the extent feasible.

Going on, just Section 4.5 is just clarifying that public testimony's taken during a public hearing and whether we take public testimony at non-public hearings is within our discretion. A lot of places there are provisions that things are done in the Board's discretion,

which is the way they have been in the past, and I'm sure we will hear about it if anyone feels that we're using that discretion.

Section 5 is really the heart of the new rules which provides for a pre-application, early community engagement process which is something that, you know, a lot of the public has been asking for which will require that before someone -- a proponent applies, files a formal application for a Special Permit, that they go through an early community engagement process which requires notifying the public and having at least one meeting. The actual details of what has to be provided at that meeting is spelled out a little bit in Section 5, but then there is a separate CDD guidelines for pre-application, early community engagement proceedings that's referenced in the rules. Again, the intent is

that if things are not working out the way they were intended to work, CDD staff can change the guidelines quickly and, you know, then we'll see what happens with the amended guidelines.

The -- before someone can actually file an application for the Special Permit, they have to have gone through this process and they have to have prepared a summary, an engagement summary, giving the details of what they've done and what the response has been and how they, you know, give their response to the community's response, only then will the application be deemed to have been completely filed and then will it be scheduled for a public hearing.

There, we've already received some comments asking that certain things be added to the early community engagement phase. That's something we can hear again from the public this

evening if they wish, but it is intended that it would give enough information to the public at an early point. But we, as we have discussed in the past, we didn't want to make it so onerous on a developer that it would be difficult for them to change things after meeting with the community. We didn't want them to have to go to an enormous expense and then feel that they were committed to that and not be willing to respond to the public. And so, it's a balancing act how much is asked for early on. The idea being that the earlier we can get people to talk to the community and get feedback from the community, the community can hear what the developer is planning, that it will lead to better, a better process all around.

It doesn't say that in here. It really is the intent that Planning Board Members are not part of the early engagement process because we,

the Board, will be hearing the application for the Special Permit and passing just upon that, and there was no intention that we would be involved in the early engagement trying to shape it. Staff obviously will be involved and the public will be involved, but then it will come to us as a fresh proposal that this Board will look at with fresh eyes.

And it's also not intended that what comes out of the early community engagement process is frozen and that's what's going to be approved. I mean, you know, we have had other situations where the developer has met with the public and reached what they think is going to be some conclusions to what's going to happen and this Board or prior Boards have said no, we don't like certain portions of it and we want it to be changed. So it is not intended that a final plan

is going to come out of the early engagement process that's going to be set in stone, it's going to then come to the Board.

Going on into Section 6, there's just some minor verbiage change as to how the Special Permit public hearings are held. It makes clear that in Section 6.1 that all -- if we have a continued hearing, then supplemental materials must be received by CDD at least two weeks prior to the continued hearing date unless the Chair in his or her discretion, shortness of time for submission. It's intended that we would live with the two-week period, that is necessary for everyone. But there may be circumstances when some material is not available until closer to the hearing date, and either it's not that significant or it may be that it is envisioned that we're going to go at least one hearing

beyond that continued hearing, and so it's left open to the Chair to potentially shorten the period of time rather than postponing the hearing. We know that once hearings are scheduled, if we can't go through with them, it may be several weeks or a larger period of time until it can be rescheduled. And so the Chair and the Board will have a balancing act of determining when in its discretion it seems appropriate to shorten the time. The idea is that the public would get as much time as necessary to review everything so that they could be fully informed and have their materials ready for a hearing.

The Section 6.3 talks about what is intended for the applicant's presentation and the intention being that it may include physical model, computerized photo, photo simulations,

drawing renderings, or other means. I know amongst ourselves we have in the past some members prefer models, some members prefer renderings, some members prefer photos and drawings. So it was unclear exactly what could be required, but it is mandated for construction of new buildings or additions containing at least 50,000 square feet of gross floor areas or for proposals between 25,000 and 50,000 square feet seeking Special Permits for heights in excess of the allowable height that a physical model must be provided.

Again, depending upon the project, it will be up to the applicant to meet with CDD to determine the scale and the extent of the model so that we have, you know, as much information as possible.

There's been some -- one of the comments

from the public we've already received is that some people would like to see a model in all circumstances. I think that staff felt that the 50,000 was a logical point to require it for everything, and that between greater than 25,000 was a logical point to require it for a height issue. Some of the other issues that may be of concern relating to FAR or density or setbacks, it may not be that a model would add anything to that discussion.

Going on, Section 6.7 sort of memorializes what we have done to a certain extent in the past. That if there's a group of people who wish to aggregate their time, there is a provision for them doing that. You know, the intent is that they be given -- that they have to notify staff by five p.m. on the Thursday prior to the date of the hearing. You know, perhaps

that timing is a little bit arbitrary for that one thing. A lot of things have been required to be the Thursday before to give staff a period of time to digest it and to disseminate it, that's one that maybe it's not so significant that we know that far in advance.

Again, there's been, in Section 6.6, we haven't changed anything. Again, it talks about in general people get to speak for three minutes. As it's always said that the Board, in its discretion, may reduce to extend the time. I don't know that we've ever reduced the time. It would be a hard circumstance where we've done that. If we had 100 people here and people wanted to speak for three minutes, we may say only two minutes in that circumstance. The likelihood of that happening is pretty rare. I think the three minutes still makes sense,

especially when we have large projects where a lot of people want to speak. We have extended time as need be. We've spoken to staff and they're in the process of investigating and hopefully arranging for a system, I think of lights, which will allow people to know, you know, say give them a one-minute warning. And then, you know, I know the court system uses, you know, you get a green light when you start. When you're a minute before the end of your period to address the Court, it turns yellow. And then when you're time is up, it turns red. Maybe something along those lines. We felt that was a better method than having one of us interrupt people to tell them you only have a minute left or you only have 30 seconds left. And, of course, the Board in its discretion, can let people go on as long as they need to go on as

long as we're willing to let them go on.

Written testimony is -- can be submitted at any time, but Section 6.10 makes clear that if written testimony is received after five p.m. on the Thursday prior to the date of the hearing, it may not be transmitted to the Board for its review or the Board may not have an opportunity to review it since City Hall closes and the staff hopes to get out by noon on Friday. The intent was to give them a rational, a small but a rational period of time to be able to disseminate it to the members of the Board, and if appropriate, to post it on to the website.

You know, we are all volunteers. Most of us have jobs and not having a cut-off date makes it very difficult. Especially on certain Mondays and Tuesdays we get inundated with e-mails, and it's very difficult for people to take time from

their regular work schedules to try to review everything before coming to the hearing. I would say most of us spend the weekend before a hearing familiarizing ourselves with all the materials and having the opportunity to review everything. So that's the rationale for the Thursday, five p.m. on Thursday.

Obviously people can continue to submit after that time and staff may be able to get it to us and we may be able to review it, but the idea is that, you know, try to get it in by five p.m. on Thursday to make certain that it gets to us and we get a chance to review it.

Those are basically the changes. There then is the CDD guidelines on what the proponents are to be doing and what materials they're to be doing and how to handle the early community engagement process.

Other than what I've discussed our rules, it's not proposed to change any of the provisions of the rules that have been in existence. So I guess any Board Members have any questions? We can try to address them now. If not, we'll open it up to the public comment.

STEVEN COHEN: We'll have the opportunity after the discussion?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Certainly after public comment we'll discuss everything.

AHMED NUR: Let's hear from the public.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay. So we'll open things up to the public. As always, try to limit your comments, please, limit your comments to three minutes. When you come up to the podium, please indicate your name and spell it for the stenographer and we'll give you a warning as you're getting close to the end of your time.

John Hawkinson.

JOHN HAWKINSON: Good evening,

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board. John Hawkinson, 84 Massachusetts Avenue. So I'm sorry for sending you so many letters. I hope you got three from me; one way back from May 27th, one from December 3rd, and one from January the 21st. And I do sort of -- I want to -- I maybe preface this by saying that I was a little disappointed that some of the technical comments from May didn't make it into the latest draft so I'm kind of reiterating some things I said in May and I hope staff will be able to work with that.

At a high level, not so much on the rules per se, but as I said in my letter from last week, I think there's a perception that public comment is enforced a little unfairly on the public, and whether that's really true or not,

it's a perception and I think if the Board worked a little harder to counteract that perception, it would be helpful. And, of course, being a little flexible and not always cutting people off when the room is not crowded would go a long way towards that.

On Executive Session, I think they're mostly technical comments and I'll just leave them with respect to my letter, and you can take them or not.

Moving back then to December. So, the Board suggests, you know, this hard cutoff for Thursday, and I think it's confusing because it's in a Special Permit section and it's troubling because staff memos are often not out by then. So I think -- I know staff is working harder and harder to get staff memos out sooner, but until they're reliably out before Thursday afternoon

and well before Thursday, it's really not fair to ask the public to get their comments in by Thursday afternoon if they want to comment on the staff memo, which I think they absolutely should, because staff memos are great and they contribute a lot and that kind of needs to be worked.

And I know the website is likely to change because City Council's has changed and yours is -- I'm told likely to follow. So I think those changes will also help. But I wouldn't want to see a new deadline before the new website happens just because I think that's gonna bring changes and you might as well wait until staff has the most efficient way to post things before adding more requirements to the public.

Maybe I guess for the last point which is not all that significant, but at least -- well,

pre-application community engagement meetings, there needs to be a mechanism for people who are not the directly affected neighbors to find out about this and they should be listed or published on the website or published in the newspaper or however you'd like it to be done, obviously what's easier and less onerous and that's not currently in the guidelines.

And I think that's essentially it. Thank you very much.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Young Kim.

YOUNG KIM: Young Kim, 17 Norris Street.

I like to thank CDD staff for their effort to propose change to the Planning Board rules from all the stakeholders. I am very sorry that I didn't have a chance to send a brief comment to you in advance, but what I would be talking to

you about is in this letter. Because of limited time I'll go very quickly through paragraph by paragraph. In paragraph 4 and 5, when you talk about the discussion about items of the Planning Board, the Board generally does not have public comment. But I would like to request if the applicant is given a chance to present his or her case, then the community should be able to respond to that presentation. This is very critical during design review when significant changes are presented, but affected community has no opportunity to rebut the presentation.

Next is in paragraph 5.3. This is very minor, but very critical about the -- some of the things that we present is the plans. And that plan should be, should be a true scale plan, otherwise it is very difficult for the community to look at them and figure out how, what the

dimensions are and to try to guess at it by extrapolating is very, very difficult.

Now, in paragraph 6.11 I would like to request that that provision be stipulating that if an applicant makes changes to a proposal, subsequent follow-up reviews, that we have a strict document control. I worked in the defense contract business all my life, and the very key thing that everybody -- it's critical, is the document control. You know, every -- it is really the bread and butter depended on that. The government requires you to know exactly what you changed. And when the developer keeps changing his plans, trying to figure out what changed from one version to the next, it's very, very difficult -- confusing if there's no revision letter, no revision history, it's very difficult to do.

Now, one key improvement to this is additional pre -- the community involvement at the beginning. That's fantastic. That's at the front end. But what's missing is the back end. Once the decision is made, there is no rule, no guideline on compliance. Again, defense contract compliance is very, very critical. Once the decision is made, we need to have some mechanism where we do -- the incremental small changes do not completely change the approved plan. So the applicant has to not continue to maintain the revision history. The CDD staff has to monitor those changes and also coordinate with all the other departments to make sure the intent of the decision is follow through. Many times like done with the Board, we say, oh, the company wants to dig a trench over here so that's fine. Let's do it. But Planning Board had gone through long

discussion of where the transformer should be and they do not come back to the Planning Board and say is this okay? So we need to have those two.

And there has to be clear guideline on what constitute deviation from the decision so that they will trigger design review. So there has to be clear guidelines for that.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Sir, sir, can you wrap up?

YOUNG KIM: Thank you very much for your attention.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Nancy Ryan.

NANCY RYAN: Good evening. I'm Nancy Ryan, R-Y-A-N, 4 Ashburton Place. This document has my name on it, but because of the shortness of time that we had between when we were offered the community development draft and the time we

had to present it, we had to present our comments, there was a lot of consultation, but not everyone got to read the final document so my name is on it but it does represent input from a number of different neighborhood groups.

So just a few comments. I think what we're trying to do here, all of us together, is on this side of the table create a three-legged stool with community development and residents and other kinds of input and then, you know, bring that to you -- the applicant on the third point of the stool. And trying to equalize as we can, the role of resident comment and the presentation of the applicant. So time is a piece of that. And I think John Hawkinson commented on that.

So just a few things from our memo. I know you have it. The Executive Session stuff

we've done with.

The other business in Section 4.5, it's been suggested that there are BZA case reviews that come up on your agenda that don't ever get to be discussed in the public and it would be great to have some standards for public comment on these other items, and perhaps add after the word discretion, but with due consideration for the potential benefit therefrom, meaning the public comment on BZA items that may be coming out.

Section 5.2, the whole --

H. THEODORE COHEN: Ms. Ryan, can I comment? I think everything we do here is intended to be with due concern for the public benefit. So I don't think we need to, you know, single out any one thing we do, because we are all acting for the best interest.

NANCY RYAN: It wasn't meant in that way. But you have a lot of with your discretion and this was more like to balance that out with benefit from the other side of the table. So especially the resident side. But I hear what you're saying. It wasn't meant to be a comment on your lack of consideration for the public, for the public good.

Section 5.2, we're looking at just trying to create a little bit more time. So that the applicant must provide a summary to the attendees of the meetings three business days or working days before the first Planning Board hearing. So there's time for us to be able reasonably, and we have jobs and families and all kinds of other things going on in our lives, to be able to meaningfully review things.

In Section 5.3 we were looking for a

little bit more definition of what would be required for the presentation.

And photos of abutting properties. I know you have that in the early engagement section, but we were kind of hoping that it could also go in this section because we have had a couple of situations where those would have brought some light to bear on the impact of a development on the immediate surroundings.

For materials for continued hearings, we'd like a kind of specific period of time for submission. One week prior to the hearing seems reasonable, so we have the opportunity to comment in writing.

And to Section 6.1 to ensure that residents are able to review CDD memos. And John mentioned that as well. We'd like to have CDD memos posted on the Planning Board website no

later than by five p.m., three full business or working days before a hearing. So that's, if there's a holiday in there, if Monday is a holiday, you get very, very little time to review. And the CDD memos have become so valuable. That's something that we've been wanting and CDD has been providing them. We'd like to have enough time to be able to incorporate them into our observations.

I understand about the starting at 50,000 square feet, but we were looking at issues where buildings are less than 25,000 square feet about setback, increased FAR and density, and relief from parking requirements, not just height. We thought perhaps there could be a little bit more incorporated there.

And with regard to the phrase "or other means" at the end of the paragraph 6.3, we'd like

those other means to have been given prior approval by the Community Development Department, not just left to the imagination of the applicant.

So I think that's the -- those are the primary things that we're concerned about. And, again, the last comments we make in Sections 6.6 and 6.10 are about the timing between when materials are available and when the hearing is scheduled and when residents are able to review them.

So, thank you for all this work on this. It's been, you know, germinating for a while and we're looking forward to a final document. Appreciate your time.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

I just want to confirm that Michael Bentley, you want to speak about the next

hearing?

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: Correct.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay.

Heather Hoffman.

HEATHER HOFFMAN: First off, who has a purple pen?

NANCY RYAN: I do. Thank you, Heather.

HEATHER HOFFMAN: Heather Hoffman, 213 Hurley Street. And first of all, I want to thank the Planning Board for the microphone with its own mind and for taking the public's interest in making this whole process work better as seriously as you have. You and CDD and members of the public have really put in a lot of time, and I think it's ultimately going to make your decisions better and possibly even your time more enjoyable.

One of the things that I started thinking

about was the pre-engagement process. And this says that the developer is to host a meeting. Now, that sounds good, but I think that having the developer host the meeting really inhibits public discussion. They set the agenda, they're the people standing in front of the room. I would much prefer that someone else host the meeting, preferably a neighborhood group or groups. And if you have a neighborhood where there doesn't seem to be a group with the presence to do this, then CDD. Because I can tell you from my own experience that although we ask developers very pointed questions and learn a lot, the ability to tell them to leave now and then talk among ourselves is incredibly valuable because otherwise what you will get is much less likely to be the product of the thought of a group and instead a whole bunch of individual

thoughts. I think it will be more valuable to you to have at least one reaction that comes from a group that has sat around and thought and talked about the proposal.

Another thing that I've realized, I think since this was supposed to be discussed, is incredibly important is making it possible for people who don't have perfect vision, perfect hearing, and perfect mobility to take part in these meetings. Some of us are old enough that we've realized that our eyesight is not what it once was. And then there are people who wish that their eyesight were that good. There are pretty good ways that are not onerous for developers to have to do that. They should have to have at least materials in large type for people with old eyes. And there are programs that turn relatively common computer formats into

something that blind people can use. People should not have to crawl and beg for that. It should be done as a matter of course, because really the -- all the developer has to do is provide this stuff in electronic form which you know they're already prepared that way. And it should be in far enough in advance for people to be able to look at it and use it. And I'm talking about for the advanced engagement and also for any other, any meetings for the Planning Board, for whatever.

For other people -- for, you know, accessibility to mobility impaired people, that's kind of a given. We shouldn't be having meetings in places where people can't get to.

For hearing impaired people that might require advanced notice just because that's a little harder to do without some assistance. I

understand that CDD has the ability to help with that. And also for interpreting, especially in neighborhoods where a lot of people don't speak English so well. If we do those things, we'll get much, much broader attendance and thoughts and possibly ideas that none of us would have thought of that would be really glad to have heard.

Thanks.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Lee Farris.

LEE FARRIS: Good evening. Lee, L-E-E Farris, F-A-R-R-I-S, 269 Norfolk Street. I see what you mean.

Again, thank you all very much for working on revisions to the Planning Board rules and also thanks to the CDD staff for holding the community meetings about revisions to the rules.

So these are good progress and I think they can be even better. I think one -- I want to echo what John Hawkinson said about the timing relationship between the CDD memo and the deadline for public comment. The public is going to make much better comments if we can read the CDD memo. So however you set it up, I would say you need to give the public at least 24 hours to -- on a working day to read that memo. So that might mean that typically the memo would be due on the Wednesday and the public comment would be due on the Thursday, but I don't, I don't care about exactly the solution, I just care that there's sometime to read it.

I also want to emphasize that when the developer or the proponent of the special application is doing the community engagement meetings, there needs to be that report back to

the -- that the summary of that meeting that comes here needs to also go to the people that attend the meeting so that if there's a discrepancy, they can know and also so that they can say yes, this is accurately captured. I don't need to go to the Planning Board meeting because my view is represented.

And in the area of 6.7 there's this nice new section about how groups can request to speak together. That needs, that request deadline needs to fit in with those other deadlines, again, so that the CDD memo is before that.

Also, I would like to ask if you could consider that a group might be able to request to speak at the head of the public comment if in fact it's speaking for numbers of people in a neighborhood. So, for example, if that summary report on the community meeting is divergent from

what the community thinks, was talked about, or if the community held a meeting on its own afterwards as Heather was discussing, to further discuss it, then I think it would be helpful to the Planning Board if that group thought could come towards the head of the public comment if it was requested.

And after the decision from the Planning Board it would be great if the decision on the application also is conveyed to the members of the public that attended the early meeting so that they can find out what happened.

In the guidelines paper at the end, No. 4, if there could be strengthened a bit where it says the list of community members that -- it says should be notified. I think it would be good to say must be notified.

And similarly No. 7, if it could say the

information must be presented, not should be presented.

I think that's my main comments. So thank you very much and I look forward to these changes taking place soon I hope.

Oh, one more thing. There was a lot of other stuff that we talked about with CDD in those public meetings and it would be great to have a timeline on when the other thing's going to happen. You mentioned, for example, the countdown clock, but there were a number of other improvements that we talked about that would be good to be updated on from CDD and from the Planning Board.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Since it's been mentioned a couple of times, I just wanted to point out that the

summary of the early engagement process is part of the application and so the -- when the -- it is submitted with the application and presumably would then be posted on the website, and so it would be available to all the people who attended the early engagement meetings far in advance of the public hearing.

LEE FARRIS: Can I respond why I'm saying something different?

I'm saying affirmatively the developer should take that back to the participant so that they don't have to keep checking the CDD website. That the information comes to them. That's the difference.

H. THEODORE COHEN: All right, well, we can consider that.

And the other thing is that the -- our decisions are posted on the website so they are

available to the public to find out indeed what the decision was and what the decision states.

Charles Teague.

CHARLES TEAGUE: Thank you, Charles Teague, 23 Edmunds Street. In general I want to agree with everybody tonight. The CDD memos are excellent. You know, like anything excellent you hate asking for it earlier, but it really should be a couple days earlier. It's just so much beautiful work, you should use it.

I especially -- on the models, I actually, I think you've got it right. I think because some of you will remember for the Bishop petition we actually made a model of my neighborhood and now it's up. Models aren't that useful. They really, you know -- so it's nice for a big building where they've got lots of money, but -- so I think you got that right.

The -- I want to say pay close attention to Heather Hoffman and Nancy Ryan and Lee Farris, and although I'll go along with John Hawkinson's comments from a long time ago at the start of this, he had a -- he came up here and did sort of a comic rendition of moving the podium and all this stuff. And the basics of presentation are it's a disservice to the community and to the Board if you can't see the screen. And we have a little baby projector again here. We've got the -- the whole place is wired for this. And I remember Steve Cohen said that he goes into small towns and they've got great facilities. It's just not right. And, you know, the silly microphone bouncing around. It just goes back to John Hawkinson's original letter on these things.

Just in terms of, in terms of things that I thought was going to be good moving the podium,

I thought well, this is good, you get to stare at Hugh Russell, but it -- I think it's horrible.

And I presented a bunch of times, and then with the podium in this position, you're looking into the projector sometimes. You need two people.

You need someone to hold the laser pointer there because you can't see the screen or you turn away and the microphone's not there. These are trivial things, but they are so important.

They're just so important.

And so -- and, you know, I'll end with saying that, again, pay close attention to everything Young Kim said, especially document control. Having all of these documents with the same names and no dates or things like that, it just, it just -- you have to be very compulsive. People get very confused very easily. So, and I actually have a countdown clock with the three

colors, you know, Liza wants to slip me some money, I'll give it to her at cost.

H. THEODORE COHEN: That would come out of our budget for the new microphone.

CHARLES TEAGUE: But not the projector I hope.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Susan Roberts. You just want to speak on the next matter?

ATTORNEY SUSAN ROBERTS: Correct.

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

Councillor Carlone.

COUNCILLOR DENNIS CARLONE: Just Dennis Carlone, 9 Washington Avenue. Just two quick comments:

The neighbors asked about including photos of abutting properties. Every developer

has photos of the abutting properties. It's one of the first things, as you know, that architects do if not a developer to understand it. So they're available.

But I'm going to disagree on the model. I know for a -- well, we all know there's 20 different, 20-odd different kinds of intelligences and one is spatial. And some people have great spatial intelligence. They go into computers or architecture, construction, but other people don't have it. And I would say that a model, a detailed model, you're absolutely right, maybe it is 25,000 square feet, but less than that, a simple massing model, not a lot of detail that shows the surrounding buildings, massing, and the proposal and its position on the site is not a lot of work. And a young architect can knock it out in a day and a half. So, it's

really minimal. And the Board might understand it, that's why you're on the Board, but a number of people in the public and every town I go to and city, they don't get it until they see three dimensions. And it might actually diffuse some concern. So it seems like a very economic thing to ask for.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Is there anyone else who wishes to speak?

(No Response.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: If not, then why don't we have our discussion.

I guess I'll start asking CDD, you know, there's been a lot of comments about the timing of memos and I know, you know, I've discussed it with members in the past who, you know, have a tough schedule and a lot of work, and in the past

when we haven't been that clear on when material had to come in from developers, it was often that they were under the gun to get something done and to get it done, you know, right before the hearing. With the schedule we're talking about now, do you think it feasible to say that there could be a definite cut-off time for when the CDD memos would be available to us and to the public?

IRAM FAROOQ: So our attempt is always to try to get the memos done and uploaded approximately a week ahead of the hearing. We're just slightly leery because of making that a rule because sometimes there's just multiple hearings, and especially with the schedule now where we've got meetings on consecutive weeks, there are times when it's just -- given that the same staff are working on all projects, it's really sometimes hard to get the memo done with the

exact timeline. So I think something that is, you know, people have talked about, three days or 24 hours, I mean those kinds of things, I think if we say three calendar days as opposed to three working days, that might be a workable thing, because I know that the Board, for instance, reviews things most often over the weekend, and I imagine that many folks pointed out that they are at work during weekdays as well. So perhaps if we include the weekend in that, that might be an easier -- a more achievable timeline for us, but I would, I would be hesitant to do a hardline deadline that involved working days also with, you know, if there's holiday schedules, then that would really throw things off.

If, Stuart or Jeff, if you have anything to add to that.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay.

HUGH RUSSELL: Ted, can I follow up with a question?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Sure.

HUGH RUSSELL: We see written submissions. Are all the submissions that come in now electronic or people actually deliver paper? I think it's a -- if it's everything is electronic, then you're going to have a slightly different schedule.

IRAM FAROOQ: The majority of things are electronic. Every once in a while, though, there will be something that shows up that's not electronic, but I would say the vast majority is electronic in terms of submissions. So it's easier to put the submissions on with the longer lead time, it gets the time from the CDD memo is the, in some ways the harder piece of it.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay.

I mean, I mean it's a difficult issue because if it's the CDD memo that we're waiting for, it seems unfair both to the proponent and to the public to say well, if we didn't get the CDD memo in a timely fashion, then we're going to postpone the hearing. And then, you know, who knows when we end up having the hearing. And I, you know, the memos are great. We all rely upon them a lot. And I understand that the public wants to get them, too, have them as soon as possible and be able to -- either realizing that comments they may have had has already been incorporated into a memo or something has been missed and they want to make sure that gets pointed out. You know, I guess -- I don't know, I guess my personal feeling is given, why don't we not say anything right now, see how things work under the new system where there are

clearcut deadlines for submittals by the applicant and supplementary submittals. You know, if everything is supposed to be supplemental submittal two weeks' in advance, then hopefully that will give CDD a week or so to review the material and get any supplemental memo to us and to the Board.

As I said earlier, you know, not that this is an experiment, but the intent of doing the rules is that we can change things quickly if they're not working. But if people have strong feelings otherwise, you know, please express them.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Is that enough time?

H. THEODORE COHEN: What?

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: For CDD. The week before.

IRAM FAROOQ: Well, I guess I would -- we appreciate tremendously hearing the positive feedback about the memos and we're delighted that they're useful for everybody, but I think if you take the perspective that people are actually making -- should be making comments on the project rather than on the CDD memo, then I think the more central piece is getting the documents related to the project up with a long lead time. And I think, I'm assuming that the Board would not be bothered if they got comments from public that were repetitive of staff comments and perhaps that would substantiate it even more, and presumably folks would catch -- I mean would have pointed out any issues that they have that might be not included in the CDD memo. So I mean, as long as we think that the -- we all acknowledge that the comments are not commenting on the CDD

memo but on the project itself, then I think that becomes a little bit less central to have the CDD memo with a lot of lead time.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right. I mean obviously the public's comments should be about the project.

IRAM FAROOQ: Right.

H. THEODORE COHEN: You know, up until a couple of years ago we didn't get memos and CDD would make a presentation at the time of the hearing, but, you know, getting memos now is great. I know it helps me focus on particular aspects of the project that, you know, CDD is pointing out, you know, this is an issue. And so, you know, I think they're valuable to us, and I'm sure they're valuable to the public, too, to help the public focus on things. But I agree that it's not, you know, did CDD get it right or

wrong? It's just, you know, sort of highlighting the issues for all of us. And so, yes, I agree, getting the project up, you know, as soon as it comes in, is the most important part. And giving everybody presumably the two weeks to review that project and to comment upon it.

Yes, Jeff.

JEFF ROBERTS: Thanks, Mr. Chair. I just want to add one thing this may be along the lines on something that you were saying before. You know, that we try to -- we do try to make this material available because we understand it's helpful for people. We don't want to tie the applicant or the Planning Board or the public to our own workflow, you know, scheduling issues of the week that might be, that might be of concern. So that's the -- I think that's our issue with having it be a deadline.

I'll say in terms of if there are members of the public who are, you know, sitting in -- who are wondering something about the project or have a particular concern about the Zoning or a question about the Zoning or urban design guidelines or anything, you know, you can -- they can always call us and people, you know, routinely do, usually people are talking to Liza or me when they get the notice about the hearing to get information about it, and we can certainly talk through any zoning issues. A lot of what we talk through is the kind of information that will ultimately be found in the memo. So I just wanted to make that clear for everybody.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay.

Hugh?

HUGH RUSSELL: You know, I worked very hard when I was Chair to elicit memos from the

Community Development Department because Beth Rubenstein didn't really want to do that, and so now we're getting memos. It's interesting to me to see what the memos really do. They really aren't recommendations. They're very clear analysis of what's before us, how it relates to the criteria that we're working on, and it takes a lot of judgment and a lot of experience to write those memos. And so -- and what happens is we rely on those memos a lot in looking at the cases and understanding the cases. So it seems to me it's unreasonable to expect that the public can do the same job that, you know, six professional city planners working together can do, and that having a well-informed public is important in getting good comments. So I do think it's important that the CDD memos be available before the comment period from the

public is exhausted. I don't think -- although we asked in these minutes for public comment to come in by Thursday five p.m. In fact, any electronic correspondence that comes in say on Monday gets to us. Now, that's bad for us because we don't have the ability to consider it as Ted says when we're thinking about it over the weekend beforehand. So I think we should try very hard to have a schedule that does have the CDD memos available in enough time for the public to comment. And we should -- if they're, you know, if the CDD memo can't be available, it's then we have to be flexible in receiving the public comment.

Now, does this actually mean we should change any words in this document? I'm not sure that we need to, but I think we really do have to appreciate what the big change in having this

professional analysis of the issues end up in a very fair and even handed approach. That's really quite extraordinary.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right. Steve, one second.

I just want to be clear that the public understands that there is no Thursday at five cutoff that if you haven't made that, we're not going to accept it. That's not the case. The Thursday at five cutoff is if it comes in by that point, it will get transmitted to us and the likelihood is that we will have read it before the hearing. That if it comes in after that time, then, you know, if it comes in say on Friday afternoon, it's clearly not going to get transmitted before Monday at the earliest. And whether we get to read it or not depends on our individual schedules. But, you know, and I agree

with everything you've said, you know, they're valuable documents and we and the public should get them as timely as possible, but it doesn't foreclose any comments thereafter even if they are not a week in advance.

Steve, you had a comment?

STEVEN COHEN: Yes, just a quick comment. First of all, I agree entirely with what Hugh said about the crucial role and value of the staff memos for the public as well as for the Board.

I fully understand the challenge in preparing those memos and reluctance for CDD to commit themselves to a hard deadline, but, you know, we all structure our lives and our workflow on the basis not just on hard deadlines but on goals and aspirations. And I would suggest the possibility of actually including them in the

rules, not a hard deadline, but at least a goal, an aspiration of producing the staff memo by a certain number of days prior to the hearing so there's at least, you know, a reference point, something to work towards with the understanding that circumstances will intervene and you won't always be able to achieve that goal. But it's good to have, you know, clear goals nevertheless.

AHMED NUR: Mr. Chair.

MARY FLYNN: Thank you. I actually, I don't want to go on about this because other people have said very similar things, but my reaction is very similar about that, the memo. I understand that obviously we want comments on the application, but that memo does provide us with a great deal of information and helps us to analyze the project, and I think for folks in the neighborhoods who, you know, some are more

sophisticated than others because they like these issues and they get involved in them on a regular basis. Particularly for folks who don't, you know, sorting through some of that application material could be very, very difficult. So I just want to support what my colleagues have said for, you know, let's strive to get that up there as early as possible and, you know, just keep availing how it's going.

IRAM FAROOQ: Sure.

MARY FLYNN: Can I also just ask one question?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Sure.

MARY FLYNN: And this is actually to CDD. In terms of the meetings that are hosted by the proponent, does CDD staff attend those meetings? No. Okay.

And did you have any discussion about

Heather's point about, you know, whether it should be something that's sponsored by -- I know you have a lot of meetings, but sponsored by the department as proposed by the proponent? And I do understand her point of view that sometimes having a neutral party sponsoring it does make it a lot more comfortable for people to speak their minds.

IRAM FAROOQ: We did talk through this whole series. I'm going to ask Stuart to respond to some of these questions because he's been working on the details of this.

MARY FLYNN: Okay.

STUART DASH: Yes, we talked about it quite a bit, about what should be the proper notion of who's hosting and where it's hosted. And I think when it gets back to Ted's point of we should consider this still as sort of a pilot

trial and see how things go. Because, we've over the years, we've heard things go well and not go well on both sides of such approaches. And I think -- and to Heather's point, the same thing, there are some neighborhood groups that can do it quite well and some that can't do it quite well. And for it to be a matter of that it must be this or it must be that, we felt uncomfortable with. So our approach was let's put the onus on the developer to host it, and if there's problems with that we can keep an eye on that as well.

And I think a developer can also work with neighborhoods as well on that. But certainly the onus is on the developer to do that. And I think we felt that in terms of who's putting the effort out for, you know, that we're asking the developer to put the effort out and put the money that might be required out to host

a meeting in that case, which is often substantial or just involves just that extra amount of work you might want to put on top of a neighborhood.

MARY FLYNN: I can understand and the reason for wanting to have the developer take a stronger role, and I think in many of the neighborhoods that do have very well organized community groups, that it can work because those groups are going to know how to respond and get their voices heard. I'm a little bit more worried with projects in neighborhoods that may not be so well organized where, you know, people will come to a meeting but there's not anybody, a single person representing the group and, you know, it's really, do you then have everybody who goes to that meeting start calling CDD? And, you know, it seems there needs to be a little bit of

organization around those situations. And, you know, perhaps that is in most cases the CDD sponsored meeting.

STUART DASH: Right, and, again, and, you know, we talked about that, should that be a CDD sponsored meeting. And we've had over the years with CDD sponsored meetings and had confusion and problems with such meetings where people felt confused that CDD was somehow the proponent of a project. And also the additional layer sort of administration as well was part of that. So I think we're open to that and certainly we looked at other cities that do versions of that, that kind of thing. So we've also looked at the different variations on who holds a meeting and things like that. So I think it's one of the things that I think we'll keep an eye on and I think we're open to that. There may be

variations on how we do that.

MARY FLYNN: And it may -- this is my last point, sorry.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Go ahead.

MARY FLYNN: It may be helpful in those situations if the developer is going to hold the meeting that there be some informational piece or whatever from community development that gets presented at the same time that can tell those parties who have attended like, you know, what happens next or how do you respond to it and, you know, just to sort of help guide those folks through the process. Again, I'm talking in areas where, you know, people don't really have many to participate.

STUART DASH: We're trying to find a way to balance something that's not a Planning Board meeting and a different animal. But no, it's a

good point.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Stuart, I do think the idea at these meetings that there be an opportunity for the people who are attending to speak amongst themselves without someone from the proponent being present. I mean even if it's just to say let's get together at somebody's house a week from now. I think that may be something that ought to go into the guidelines, that people be given some opportunity to discuss amongst themselves.

IRAM FAROOQ: So, my thought when I was listening to that comment was very similar to yours, and maybe we could ask a proponent to actually, if they're reserving a room, to make sure that there is a half hour right after that because, you know, if people don't really know each other, they may not be able to figure it out

to get it together in terms of exchanging contact information and then figuring out a second, a follow-up meeting. But if we told a developer to allow, you know, enough time and space for -- without them at that same meeting for people to have a discussion, that may get to it at least starting that conversation.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right.

STUART DASH: So we can certainly stress something of that nature.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes.

I'm sorry, Ahmed.

AHMED NUR: Most of what I wanted to say has actually been said. Stuart, I actually do -- I'm going to say something real quick. You talked about the neighborhood cities. So I've been to a few meetings in Boston where the BZA, the Zoning Board of Appeals or the BRA acts like

a Planning Board where the liaison, the city liaison under the councillors would send -- let's say I was going to do something, they'll send an e-mail attached with a flyer; time, date, location, and also the list of the community that they need to contact for that particular project. Then you go to the site. You can't just go anywhere on-site or very nearby, convene as indicated. This liaison is someone from the city normally would be there, but sometimes they can't make it, and it really does get ugly. Some people come out and we don't want your project, we don't want you here, da da da. And some of these people are not very personable and it really gets ugly. So I think personally, very important subject, there should be rules. People like to follow rules. The rules, you know, on the neighbors as well as on the proponents of why

they're meeting and then the outcome. Later on that same councillor or liaison would come in and say I support the project or I oppose the project based on that meeting. And then, you know, then we'll listen to it and based on what happened there and so on and so forth. That's how it is in Boston and it's kind of working. And sometimes, you know -- but I just wanted to say that that's what it is. Because here it's not -- it's community. Who is the community? If I'm building a house in North Cambridge and someone from East Cambridge wants to go over there and, you know, so on and so forth, this should be specific.

STUART DASH: And we expected that would be part of their consultation with CDD prior to holding meetings where we talk about defining who should they contact, which we do when we have

meetings ourselves, we decide, you know, how broad a mailing might go out. So we expect that we have conversations to that. And realizing that for any specific project would be very difficult to define who is the community because it does change depending on the project, but we expect that would be very much a key part of the conversation.

AHMED NUR: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay, could we move on to some other issues.

I mean, what do people think about a model?

STEVEN COHEN: I don't know if you recall, but I've always been a strong advocate for models and I agree entirely with Dennis Carlone on that one. But by the same token, I understand that some projects are bigger than

others, some are more complex than others, and some are in a context where they relate importantly to their surroundings and others less so. I guess the way I was thinking we might do it would be start with a default position that there be a model for all projects, all applications. The default is that you provide a model, and if the applicant wishes either to provide other means such as a lot -- I don't know, video or a sketch-up or other means of other describing the proposal in the three dimensions or feels that because of the circumstances of that particular proposal, that a model is really unnecessary, that, you know, that the applicant, you know, present the suggestion, the alternative or the argument to staff and staff would make that judgment.

But I think it somehow or another would

be helpful to start with the default position of providing, you know, the model which really gives us, you know, that kind of three-dimensionally insight to how it relates to its surroundings, and then waive that requirement or modify it if circumstances so warrant. And I would be happy to defer to staff judgment on that.

I think if you do it the other way around, that certainly the way drafted now, I think staff would be, you know, very reluctant to tell an applicant to provide a model if the rules don't require it. And I also agree with Dennis that perhaps for projects of lesser scope and complexity, a simple massing model would be adequate. We don't need to have the elaborate detailed models as we have from some of our bigger more important projects. Just a simple massing to show how the mass relates to the

surrounding masses.

So that's, you know, I understand the need for flexibility. I mean, and I think this still provides flexibility, but subject to staff judgment.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Tom.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Well, I would say, and this will be a in respect to other comments I want to make that we should join the 21st century here, because I'm in the business, right? And models now it doesn't take some architects a day and a half to do it, Dennis. We 3-D print them now. They're getting increasingly inexpensive to produce and I think they're a powerful tool. And they could be just as deceptive and engaging as a rendering by the way, and you can use them to your advantage. And I've been on the other side of the table in Planning Board hearings. So it's

less and less of an expensive and onerous and time consuming process for architects and designers. It's a relatively straightforward thing to do.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Hugh, do you have a position on this?

HUGH RUSSELL: So, when I started in design school, it was over 52 years ago. We built models because that's all you could do and it was this little periscope device, they called it a modelscope that you would try to -- you could attach to a very sophisticated camera and get a really fuzzy, distorted picture of what you were doing. And I became an expert model builder. I loved making models. And that's why I did well in school because I made pretty models. And now it's -- when the CAD came along about 20 years ago or 15 years ago and 3-D CAD,

Tom is a principal of a prestigious national firm, and I'm a principal of a three-person small firm, but we can still buy the same smart computers, there are things he could do that we can't easily.

I think that I find for my own work as an architect, that the perspective views that the electronic models give us are much more very helpful. I can, you know, paste the model using the photographs. I can look at them. I can get my nose in the right place so that a perspective is actually right. You know, how is it different let's just say if you had a three-dimensional computer model and you tell the vision point to go up to the same place you would stand to look at a physical model. That's -- I mean, it's really no different. So I would say -- or do an aerial perspective that duplicates a model view

and that might -- that shows you just in the same way the relationship and the volumes.

Now it's true that you can make quick block models to understand relationships. I wonder -- I think for an architect, those are quite useful because you can mentally fill in the details. I'm not sure if they put the projects in the proper scale. And, you know, it's like okay, here's a nice little house, here's a nice little house, and here's a house that looks like an ice cube. Do you like it?

So I think I'm -- I'm in a place where I would -- the only change I would make is to say if you don't build a model, then show me some views that are similar to the view you would get of a model from your electronic presentation because that will help -- because that the bird's-eye view let's you see how things relate

to each other even though they may be completely unimportant when you're on the ground. But some people have to understand the project that way.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And would that be for all projects or would there be some size limitation of when you have to do that?

HUGH RUSSELL: I think it's important to get some three-dimensional information on all projects, but I think you can do that through renderings or through models. I think the staff's suggestion of the trigger points when you absolutely have to have a model makes sense to me.

STEVEN COHEN: Mr. Chair, can I say something?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes.

STEVEN COHEN: The only thing I would say about that, Hugh, first of all, as a designer, or

in my case as the developer, working in my office with the computer in front of me, I agree with you entirely. On the computer, I can look at a project from any angle and perspective and get a pretty good understanding internally. And so internally, you know, I rarely feel the need to produce a model. But I -- two qualifications for purposes of the Board:

No. 1, as has been said previously, not everybody can read those two-dimensional images as well as they can read a model.

And No. 2, I am usually an applicant rather than a board member, and as an applicant when I'm putting together an application, you can be darn sure I'm going to be putting together the images which are most favorable to my proposal. I'm going to pick those perspectives and renderings quite carefully. And if there are

some perspectives that are a little more problematic or less appealing, I'm not going to be featuring them in my application. And the virtue of a model, of course is that everybody can understand the three-dimensionality of a model. And they, you know, there's nobody picking one or two or five static perspectives there. They can walk around and they can see the full relationship.

So, again, I agree that there are circumstances where that -- what you have proposed will work fine for some projects, some circumstances, some people. And I would defer to staff in making that judgment on where that might be adequate or appropriate, but I would still, for me, I would start with the default position that a model for everybody is informative, whereas, the renderings not as informative for

everybody. And you can look at from all perspectives and not just those that an applicant deems to be most advantageous to their advocacy.

STUART DASH: Ted?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Stuart.

STUART DASH: Gee, similar to our vast conversation is that we might propose that we engage actually both for some period of time, because my concern would be actually I wouldn't want to eliminate the computer views that we've gotten increasingly better on requiring of the developers and the three-dimensional views that Hugh was speaking of. And I think the concern from my point of view, that often when we have a model, the model is set here before the Planning Board, and the ability to share that with the public, if the model is brought in at the moment if you don't have a viewing period is often

limited. And models, as I think as you said, they can be as deceptive as you like them to be. And with the lights flicked on all of a sudden, everyone is enchanted. And I have concerns about the realistic-ness of, you know, sometimes the impressions from those. So I guess I suggest that maybe we sort of try both for a while and see how that -- and also get some response and see how that goes. Because also staff will be working on deciding on the scale, which is very important because you don't want to feel like you're looking at Disneyland, you know, a miniature Disneyland kind of thing. And you want it to be meaningful and something you can get something out of. And that the public can get something out of when they're sitting in the fifth row back there or whether you're sitting up here with the little twinkly lights on. So we'll

have to figure that out, and work on that as well and get response back from the public.

AHMED NUR: Mr. Chair?

Just while we're at the model, I wonder if it's possible to maybe take a note of also the -- for a larger project, 50,000, you know, or -- when a little bit of wind effect, a small house next to it, and the wind is whipping, reflection the rendering glass or not. Like, how does it fit in the neighborhood? While we have the model. And also the shadow study. You know, maybe it can show something as well. I don't know how you want to put those all together, but, you know, that's what I'd like to say.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: That seems to me to kind of cross the line from Planning Board rules into Special Permit criteria. Which

it is not to say that those aren't really important things to discuss when we have the models or whatever in front of us, but in terms of what impacts the surrounding neighborhood, whether it's beneficial to the community, those kinds of things I think are really the heart of what is in the Special Permit criteria for the individual sites.

AHMED NUR: Right, and I understand that. I just at some point maybe while they're presenting, wouldn't it be great to have the fabric of what they're proposing shown at 3-D if we're going to have the model is all I'm saying. It doesn't have to be that particular time -- sometimes they do bring materials and say that this is what we're making out of it and that's great. But when you're actually driving -- there's a building that we approved on Mass. Ave.

made out of glass, and it gets me every time I'm driving. I'm like, oh, man.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Hugh.

HUGH RUSSELL: I think Stuart hit upon a good point that if you have a model, we have to be able to look at it. And I think what that means is it has to be set up out in the corridor, you know, 20 minutes before the hearing so that people at least can walk by and look at it and I think that would help.

The other thing is if -- you've got a very clear statement from Steve that he finds the models to be very helpful, and if -- I think even a strong minority of the Board agree with that, then I think we have to listen to that. You can't in a sense asking the architects -- we're the wrong people to ask because we need less help in visualizing projects.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Mr. Chair.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Lou.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: It looks like we're heading towards models. The question I have is at what level of detail and scale would we like?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, I think that's left up to staff depending upon the type of project it is and the size and scope of the project.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Even if we started at 50,000?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, it sounded like we were -- have gone beyond the 50,000. So probably a model for everything unless, you know, staff makes a determination that a model is totally pointless. I mean if we're talking about say a Special Permit for a basement apartment --

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Yeah, agreed.

H. THEODORE COHEN: -- you know, a model of the existing six-story building is going to serve no purpose whatsoever.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: I would never expect that.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right. But if our rules say for every Special Permit they have to have a model unless exempted by staff, you know, they're going to have to exercise their discretion to determine what needs it and what doesn't. And if we're talking about MIT's five buildings --

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Right.

H. THEODORE COHEN: -- then I think we're going to expect bigger, more detailed models.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: 3-D printed by the way, those models.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Some of the smaller projects, a lot of -- a lot of the smaller projects that we've been seeing lately, a lot of concern from the public as to -- they can't really tell the scale or the massing. And I don't know if they need to be very detailed, and I agree on the smaller projects, but the larger projects, roads and loading and open space, they need to be included. I think the models have to be really well detailed.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Again, I think that's something we're going to have to leave up to staff. Because I don't see how we can -- I mean, we'll end up, again, I think that's going beyond the scope of rules into, you know, what is required for a Special Permit application. And some of the design guidelines as to, you know, what we expect to see.

STEVEN COHEN: If I could just say to Lou, when we do have a model, it would be the norm to include in the model surrounding buildings, and that's what gives it scale. If you just have the proposed project by itself, I mean you don't really know how it relates, but this is all about how it relates to the surroundings.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: But what scale would we like the model at? Is what I'm saying. We have all these little miniature little buildings and so forth, it kind of takes away.

STEVEN COHEN: Yes. Well, you know, staff knows what we're looking for and I think you have to defer to them to make that decision.

AHMED NUR: (Inaudible). It's just going to end up -- you know.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Well, which one is

it? Which one do we want, you know? That's what I'm saying. What would we like to see?

AHMED NUR: Depending on --

STEVEN COHEN: Full scale.

IRAM FAROOQ: Of the site?

STEVEN COHEN: It's a lot of Styrofoam.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Full scale is not that far away.

No, we use the virtual reality to describe our designs. You wear a set of cardboard glasses that cost a dollar, and we can --

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Walk through it.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: -- you can see the building in context and you can look anywhere you want. And that, that's not five years away, that might be five months away. So, we'll change the rules when that happens. But we've got to be

thinking about the future.

STUART DASH: And everyone will be sitting here with their cardboard glasses on.

H. THEODORE COHEN: They'll probably be watching the ball game.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Yes.

HUGH RUSSELL: So I have a proposal to make.

In the second paragraph of 6.3 we modify it, it's a -- first it says 50,000 square feet or for projects of 25,000 square feet that meet certain criteria. I wonder if that could just be a little -- take out the 25,000 square feet and put a list of the criteria that the staff would use to determine when models either are or aren't depending how you see it. And I think the basic thing is whether the size and the height of the building in relation to the surroundings

represents significant change to the present conditions.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay.

Can we move on to a couple of the other issues?

Photos of abutting properties?

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: I think we usually get them.

AHMED NUR: We already get them.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Just add that to the list.

MARY FLYNN: Yes, that's fine. That's fine.

STEVEN COHEN: Streetscape sort of.

MARY FLYNN: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right.

HUGH RUSSELL: I think for the suggestion when the groups informed that they go to the head

of the agenda, sounds like a good idea to me.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, I would suggest that we leave that say in the Chair's discretion because, you know, a group may be some, you know, might be some splinter off of a larger group that happens to have formed and we may have more than one group.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right.

H. THEODORE COHEN: So I think the point of having them form and notify people, I guess I've changed my mind during the -- during this hearing, that keeping the notification by the Thursday before makes some sense because it gives staff and the Chair an opportunity to say well, you know, let's put this group at this point in time in the presentation or in the public comment because, you know, it would depend on, you know, what we think they're going to say and where it

fits in the overall proposal. But I would think as a matter of course, that a group is going to speak very early on if not first thing because they're going to represent, you know, a larger number of people.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Ted, can I speak to the question of three minutes?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Surely.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Okay.

As the current timekeeper for most of our hearings, I'm really sensitive to the perception of fairness about this. And one of the reasons why I was a strong advocate in the spring for some kind of countdown clock or visual system is so that we could have more transparency about how time is kept. Because frankly I don't love that I'm the only one who sees how much time I let people go over. And I will say I always air on

letting people go over. So just so everyone knows that.

I also don't love that the way it is now if I'm to hold everyone to actually three minutes, I have to be paying attention to the clock, not what they're saying. Which is why I tend to go over is -- and you'll see at times go oh, and that usually means you're over your three minutes and I just realized it. And so I'll give you a little bit of a grace period before I signal with the little button, beep, before I -- so I appreciate that the lack of transparency that our timer has now gives the impression that people are really harsh with the time.

It's really not the intent. And I have talked to other people who have been in the position I am now who are, you know, routinely the timekeepers on these, and I, you know, even

though it may feel like very little time to you, I do want to get it out that I know you have no one to believe -- you know, no way to verify this, because we don't keep records of exactly how much time, but we do air on the side of giving people more time while giving everybody equal time. And I guess that's the balancing part that goes into timekeeping the way we do it at this moment. Is that if the room is full or if the -- you know, there are multiple sides from the public or, frankly, if we've got a lot on the agenda and we don't, you know, and we're here five weeks in a row and we need to keep things moving, the time may be kept more strictly and it may be more like three-and-a-half minutes, not four-and-a-half, which some of them tonight were closer to that four-and-a-half. You know, it -- there is some discretion in it. Now, I want

there to be more transparency, and so I'm really glad to hear that CDD is working on some kind of a timer system that would give that.

I like that the rules as proposed give a discretion to the Chair to extend that time as is appropriate. That's going to be a lot easier when we all know what's going on, because it is hard. And I appreciate from the public's point of view not seeing the timer means you have no idea how long I've given any given person and it's always going to feel like I'm cutting you off faster than a cut someone else off. And I'm sorry for that, and we're trying to do better.

That's all I wanted to say on that.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Can I just build on that topic of public comment?

So I don't want to talk about the clock anymore. I mean, if we had a penny for every ten

minutes we spend talking about it, we could fund it. So just get the clock, okay?

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Amen.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: I mean, there are a couple of City Councillors in here.

Can we get the clock?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Get the clock.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: And relieve the Vice Chair here.

And I guess my other comment goes back to the 21st century town meeting, and we're talking about public comment and yet the people who spoke tonight -- this is going to be a sorry self-criticism here. I actually spend more time face-to-face in the same room with some of the people, the public than I do with some of my family members in any given week.

STEVEN COHEN: You need a clock.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: And so I wonder about okay, how do we -- and by the way, I respect the amount of time that they spend and their passion for issues of planning that they share with this Board, and I don't take anything away from that. I think it's fantastic that they devote as much time as they do to this process. But I wonder about the other voices that can't be here. And here we are in the 21st century and does the town meeting literally mean that you've got to be here? And you look at the demographic in this room, and there's a relative uniformity of age and a relative uniformity of race, and I think that that simply is the reflection of the processes, the rules that we've set up for the way in which you participate in the planning processes. And I think we've got to join the 21st century and have community meetings and

input that relies on the wonderful technology that increasingly is secure.

So, that's not part of the rules but that's part of a plea for the future.

H. THEODORE COHEN: That's an interesting point, but I'm not certain that the Attorney General's rules about public meetings or public hearings does allow for that. You know, I think we can ask City Solicitor to look into it.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: What's the difference between e-mail and participating through some kind of electronic device in a public forum? Other communities are doing it. Other planning processes are doing it.

H. THEODORE COHEN: All right, fine.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: So that, so there are ways to get broader participation and I think we should look into it.

So, the question that was raised, I think by Lee, who represents the community as a fantastic question, and I couldn't agree more, with Mary's sentiment, that those hearings -- that those meetings with developers be facilitated by somebody at Community Development. But simply to work on civil discourse, to layout ground rules, to make sure the processes to answer questions of what the processes are, but also to my point about participation to monitor standing. Who's claiming that they represent the community and do they in fact represent the community? And I think that that would be very, very important to getting bona fide input into the planning processes. I don't know other than burdening our community planners with more public meetings, how else you do that? But I think that is the Community Development's mandate. They do

represent the community. But by the way, they have by a development mandate, they represent the developers as well, right? They work to facilitate the whole discussion around planning. So it's right that they be there and monitor that in order for that to function properly in my opinion.

AHMED NUR: Mr. Chair.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes.

AHMED NUR: I just wanted to -- I'm sorry, I don't want to bring you back, but I did want to mention that 6.3 is well language that's confusing me, and that is the applicant's presentation shall include sufficient information. Shall include sufficient information described in relationship to the proposal to the surrounding context. And it says that such information may include, that whole

thing we were just talking about, the models and all that. May include. I don't though how you feel about that may, as opposed to us.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, if we're -- I think that is now going to be modified. Since the second paragraph required a model in certain circumstances, and now based upon the discussion we had, it's going to get rewritten to, you know, list certain criteria where a model is required and where it is not required, and so I think that's going to be changed.

AHMED NUR: Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And I think, I don't know if CDD wants to talk about the monitoring issue now or if that's something you want to think about and come back with a proposal.

I mean, the issue as I see it, is the whole point of the early engagement process,

which is going to run the gamut of somebody saying well, I'm thinking of buying the house down the block and turning it into a two-family, to I'm MIT and I'm going to build, you know, 100 million feet of offices, and that there are obviously different, you know, levels of involvement. You know, with the first one there might be three or four people who live near the house and want to be involved. And obviously the MIT one is going to involve the whole city. And so, you know, there's going to have to be a lot of discretion, and I think a lot of, you know, experimentation to see what works and what doesn't work. And, you know, I think a lot of it is somebody saying well, I've got this idea, let me see what the neighborhood thinks about it versus somebody who may come in with, you know, I've already spent all this money and I intend to

do X, Y, and Z and be damned if you tell me I can't do it, but I'm hear because I have to listen to you. So I think there's a whole range of things that are going to occur, and at this point we're just trying to tell them as a minimum you must do this. And, you know, if we find that what we set as a minimum and must do isn't enough or in certain circumstances is too much, then the rules and the guidelines will get modified.

IRAM FAROOQ: Yes. I guess I -- the one thing I will add is that our current department staff capacity is based on the work plan that we have and it's already, you know, given the -- given what you've seen as modifications in the Planning Board's agendas, our work plan has mushroomed considerably and we are currently not set up to be able to staff a series of front end outreach meetings by every developer. If that is

something that the Board feels strongly that needs to happen, we would -- it would take a while because we would have to go through a whole bunch of process and rethink our entire staffing to be able to get to that point, which is kind of why we are proposing that as the starting point we start with something that is less staff intensive and see if it works. Because there are communities where it works well to have the developer with a strong set of guidelines in terms of how to run process and have some accountability, which we have a tried to build in by them reporting back to the Planning Board in a way that is open to the community, and everybody has a chance to confirm or not that they went through the process. So that's the reason for our recommendation for the starting point.

And if it seems like it is not working

over the next few months, then we can start to modify our -- the CDD staff role.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Can, we do have another hearing this evening. Can we move on to a couple of other issues?

The issue of document control. Is that something --

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

H. THEODORE COHEN: -- something that we or staff can do something about? I mean, I know on the website now things are posted and you can see the dates of different things. And I know we have received some presentations and materials where they show us page by page the changes from the earlier draft to the current draft, and that's fabulous because, you know, certainly for those of us who do it electronically, it's hard to go back and forth between things, and I'm sure

it's difficult for the public to try to do it, assuming they're sitting at a computer working on it. So if there's something we can do about, you know, document control so that everybody can see what changes are as they're developed, that would be great. I don't, I don't know the mechanics of that.

I don't know if there were other issues that people want to raise. I mean, I think it seems to me clear that these are going to have to go back to staff to, you know, fine tune some of the language and come back to us at another --

STEVEN COHEN: Mr. Chair, can I --

H. THEODORE COHEN: Sure.

STEVEN COHEN: One point amplifying some of Tom's point. Tom wants us to get into the 21st century and I would settle for the 20th. In the 20th century virtually every community that

I've worked in or the majority in any event televised their Planning Board hearings. I mean, in our city of 100,000 people, we have on a good night, you know, significantly less than one-tenth of one percent of the population here. And we keep talking about, you know, public involvement and public information and so forth, but it would be so easy to televise our hearings and, you know, let people -- everybody easily become aware of what we're doing. We're making decisions that really alter and shape the face of our city. This should not be that difficult to pull off. So I don't think that's a matter of the rules --

H. THEODORE COHEN: I don't think those are in our rules. Are the City Councillors still here?

STEVEN COHEN: Yeah. And I bring this up

periodically and I'll keep doing it at every opportunity. It's a no brainer if you ask me.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, I'm surprised --

STUART DASH: We have, in fact, I'd say, Ted, we actually met with Public Works a few months ago actually sort of after hearing this, and talked about the -- being able to televise videotape and stream meetings. And so that is in the works, but it's a multi-step process in terms of equipment and getting the setup for the room, but that is in the works.

STEVEN COHEN: Good.

IRAM FAROOQ: I mean, it has -- I will say that it's a more complex process than we had envisioned, and so it will take a little bit of time, but the plan is to have better visuals in this room for projection, but also recording to

be able to be streamed, and that goes along with, I think, one of -- somebody in the public comment mentioned the change to the City Council's agenda and process. So if you look on the website, they have a different method, different interface for how you can access their agendas and stream the video and such so the Planning Board to transition to that as well it's just a little while away.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I've always been surprised that CCTV didn't show up here at certain hearings and televise it.

But, anything else right now?

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Mr. Chair?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: And I don't know if this is in our purview, going along with the document control, we don't seem to see the final

outcome of some of these projects after they leave our domain, changes that were made along the way for whatever reason. Is there any way along the lines of the document controls or maybe we would be updated at least while at the end of the construction phase of these buildings to see what they turned out to be and what changes were made along the way that we never got to see? I don't know, there's a few buildings around that are quite a bit different than proposed, and I don't know what the answer to that is.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I think that's a great idea. I don't think it's part of our rules and regulations, but I think, you know, we do occasionally have when we have time, we have Liza update us on the status of some of the projects. But you're correct, we don't see -- staff as a matter of course on a daily basis authorizes.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Right.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Obviously if it's a big change and they feel it's not within the scope of what was approved, they bring it back to us. But we don't see the day-to-day little changes. And, you know, I think that's something staff should think about, you know, is how we can work that in. Not that we're second guessing anything, but just that maybe so that we're not surprised when we see a building go up and say gee --

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Yeah, gee, that's a lot different.

H. THEODORE COHEN: -- that's not what it looked like when I saw it.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: So I think, you know, if staff can make some revisions to the rules and

in accordance with our discussion and then bring it back to us and we'll go back out to the public for them to see and then presumably at some future evening we will have a final discussion and hopefully vote to adopt the rules. And then I know we're all anxious to get the early engagement piece up and running as soon as possible.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: And just a question on that. In the meantime I assume CDD is advising new applicants that while these rules have yet to be adopted, they'd be well-advised to be taking these steps?

IRAM FAROOQ: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes. I think a couple of projects already have said I know it's not in place, but this is what we're doing.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Okay.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay. Let's take a five-minute break and then we are coming back to have a hearing about proposed rezoning of North Mass. Ave. from across the street to Porter Square. Everybody is of course welcome to stay.

(A short recess was taken.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: All right, we are back. I apologize to the people who came for an eight o'clock hearing, but sometimes we go over long on other issues. But this is the continuation of the hearing a petition brought by Peter Kroon, et al also known as the Friends of MAPOCO, to create a new subdistrict to run from Roseland to Chancy. Right, from Roseland to Chauncy/Everett. I was thinking of in the other direction. Within the Mass. Overlay District.

So we have had a one session on this and we raised a number of questions for staff and

staff will be giving us their response, and then I think there will be -- the proponent will be speaking and then we will be taking public comment on changes that we've heard, if there are changes to the proposal, and then it will be discussion amongst the Board.

Again, this is a Zoning petition. This Board does not adopt Zoning. What we do is make a recommendation to the City Council because they are the body that adopts Zoning, and people who are here at this hearing will have other options to have their points of view heard before the Ordinance Committee. Have they already heard this? And then I guess City Council is taking it up I think you said at the end of February.

IRAM FAROOQ: That was the Cohen petition.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Oh, I'm sorry, I

misheard. Do you know when City Council is scheduled to take this up?

IRAM FAROOQ: The Ordinance Committee has not yet been formulated -- I mean, the Chairs have not been appointed. So I think their hearings will restart once the Chairs are --

H. THEODORE COHEN: So is this going back to the Ordinance Committee or has it yet been there?

IRAM FAROOQ: Jeff.

JEFF ROBERTS: I don't have any information on that. And I'm not sure that the Ordinance Committee's report has gone to the City Council. I know the Ordinance Committee did not move the petition back to the full Council with any -- they didn't recommend anything to the Council yet, but there is still the potential for them to do that.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay.

JEFF ROBERTS: Sorry, I didn't have information on the tip of my tongue.

So, Mr. Chair and the Board, in the last meeting in December the Board talked about a number of issues, and one of the topics that came up was whether it was appropriate to consider extending the provisions that -- the Zoning provisions that apply to the northern part of Mass. Ave. north of Porter Square, which were adopted in 2012 to the southern part of Porter Square. And an even more basic question than that what is the Mass. Ave. Zoning and what does it do? And that was really the topic that we were aiming to respond to. We put together a report which summarizes some of the provisions and provide some of the background material. I'm going to try to walk through some of it very

briefly and answer questions.

In addition to that, there were some additional information that we provided because it seemed to us that it was important to note that there were a number of issues that are raised in the Friends of MAPOCO petition that really aren't addressed in the North Mass. Ave. Zoning that would require some further consideration. I know that it's Peter Kroon and his co-petitioners submitted some material with some refinements of those issues and hopefully I imagine he'll get a chance to speak to talk about those as well.

And then we'll look to the Planning Board to see if the Board has any advice on how to proceed with any kind of a recommendation or any further work that needs to be done.

So I'll start with this, start with this

brief North Mass. Ave. presentation. So this was a study process that was done and the Zoning was completed back in 2012. If you put one of the lights that should be good enough to see it.

Thanks.

The -- it was worked on by Taha Jennings who was a neighborhood planner in the office at the time and Stuart Dash and myself and I think somebody else in the room may have worked on it, too. As with many of our planning work it was an evolution of some studies that had come before it. Mainly in the 2009 North Cambridge Neighborhood Study there was a group of residents who had raised some issues about the northern part of Mass. Ave. and development that was occurring along that area. And some goals they had for how North Mass. Ave. might shape in the future.

This is the, again, it's sort of a zoom-out of the area that was looked at. So, again, this is north of Porter Square. This is Porter Square, and this is north of Porter Square. And the area that we're looking at is MAPOCO petition is south of Porter Square.

One of the points that was mentioned in the North Mass. Ave. Study was there was a lot of transformation in this neighborhood. As the Red Line extension had come in in the mid-80s, it created some additional, some change and some rethinking about the character of that area now that it was -- it had better transit service.

So these pictures I think illustrate a lot of the issue that was raised. These are examples of residential developments that have happened in that North Mass. Ave. area since about the mid-80s. And so these projects adhere

to the Zoning requirements in place at the time, which are the same Zoning requirements in place at the MAPOCO area. And you can see that the form includes some setbacks at the taller height levels, which is one of the elements that's required. It adheres to the 45-foot height limit. But one of the issues that was raised by residents is really along the ground floor, the -- just that we tended to not have -- include a strong street presence and not including any retail space at the ground floor. And that was something that it was a consensus among the neighbors participating in that process that's something they like to see changed as future development goes on.

So that portion of Mass. Ave. is a fairly diverse and dynamic section of Mass. Ave. similar to the area that we're talking about between

Harvard and Porter. There's a mix of older and newer development. There's a lot of ground floor retail restaurants, as well as some older historic, more historic wood frame buildings that are characteristic of sort of an earlier phase of development before the, before the streetcar line started to bring in more interest in commercial activity.

So the vision that the participants had established for that part of Mass. Ave. was basically to try to create a more active and vibrant streetscape that had greater feeling of safety, better walkability, and particularly that sense of activity at the ground floor. That was a -- that really was the key driver for all of this. Some -- oh, I didn't realize that transition was happening.

But the -- again, some of the pictures

you see here are a little bit more of pictures from around the city that represent a little bit more of the character that was somewhat desired on the streetscape. Some of those were actually areas in the MAPOCO region.

So, so one of the key issues that came up as we were just -- as that group was discussing ground floor activity, is that the way the current Zoning requirements are structured, there is a -- or at the time there was, and MAPOCO still is, a difference in the FAR allowed for residential uses which 1.75 versus commercial uses which is 1.0. And what that means, because there's a mixed use formula in the Zoning, it means that if you are trying to do a mixed use building, you end up stuck somewhere between the 1.75 and the 1.0. So the feeling was that for some developments it provided disincentive to

include that ground floor retail. So one of the changes that was recommended incorporating the North Mass. Ave. Zoning was to sort of counteract that by saying that 1.75 maximum FAR would apply to a mixed use building that includes -- that includes residential over ground floor commercial use and then the one -- and then the lower 1.0 FAR would apply to anything that's purely residential or purely commercial.

Again, some examples of some buildings that represent a little bit more of what the, what the neighborhood was hoping for. The provisions in the North Mass. Ave. Zoning aside from trying to correct the imbalance in the FAR actually require ground floor retail and have specific -- ground floor retail and non-residential use, and the particular requirements are that the frontage of the

building to a minimum of 75 percent of the frontage, a minimum of 40 feet of depth into the building, and a minimum of 15 feet of height would be required to be some mixture of retail; it could be office, it could be any kind of space that provides the potential for a vibrant and sometimes some turnover in retail use as accommodating a variety of different uses that would support the character of the neighborhood but also importantly would be economically viable as retail spaces. And I know one of the issues for discussion in this case is that that issue of the height and providing the 15 feet of retail. And out of that process it emerges a priority that to make, to make that retail space truly viable to accommodate a wide range of uses, that having that 15 feet of ground floor height was really essential.

This is a picture showing, again, some of the comparison of some of the residential developments at 45 feet. Again, some of the mixed use developments around the city that demonstrate a somewhat higher ground floor have a somewhat higher total height and, again, capture a street cape character that was consistent with the vision for that area. Aside from these changes, it should be noted that there was a sense in this process that people didn't want to suggest any extreme changes to the -- to either the Zoning regulations or the character of development that would occur. I think that there was a sense that the scale that was allowed for a new development was appropriate for that area, but that the requirements and the limitations needed to be adjusted a little bit in order to get what was desired.

One of the things that hasn't really been talked about in this process but was talked about a lot in the North Mass. Ave. process was ground floor outdoor seating. And so it's something that there were some Zoning provisions that inhibited the creation of outdoor seating in front of restaurants and that was one of the things that was also incorporated in the Zoning. It's a little bit different from the development controls, but it was part of that package that went along with trying to, trying to create a more active streetscape.

And, again, just some examples representing what the, what the neighborhood desired. One, on this slide is one point to note is that if you look up in the top right, it's an example of a building which, at which there are several in both the Northern Mass. Ave. and in

this MAPOCO area of older buildings. And it was, it was an important part of the discussion that while it was desirable to have new development, have a -- have a character that met the street front with active ground floors, that wasn't a standard that we wanted to apply to historic buildings, and there are actually some examples, I don't have slides, but people, the neighbors who live around there, are familiar with some buildings like that where they have built out retail uses attached to the existing building and it's not, not necessarily creating a desirable character. Although it does provide some interesting space options.

So one of the provisions in the North Mass. Ave. Zoning was to say that, to identify some of these historic buildings and they're identified on this map here, that would not be

subject to the new requirements. So that if there were alterations or changes of use being made to those buildings, they wouldn't be forced into, you know, building out to the street.

So I think that concludes the overview of the North Mass. Ave. Zoning. Just to focus a little bit on the points about the MAPOCO petition, as noted, there are some areas such as the, the allowed height and the establishment size which in the North Mass. Ave. Zoning was limited to no more than 5,000 square feet per establishment that are a little bit different than what the MAPOCO neighbors are suggesting. So those are things that would need to be looked at as variations to the North Mass. Ave. Zoning. There are also some things that are, that were brought up particularly issues around setbacks, which are not really part of the -- they're a

part of the base zoning rather than the overlay zoning, so if those issues were to be addressed it wouldn't necessarily be in the overlay zoning, it would be in revisiting the base zone requirements for those districts. It would require a slightly different approach. And that there were some issues such as the issues around parking in which you tie into other larger zoning and regulatory issues where it would be difficult to try to create provisions that would allow for a more principal use or a general use parking while the Zoning only allows for accessory parking. So parking that would be tied to a particular residential or a commercial type of use.

So I'm happy to answer questions but I also wanted to leave an opportunity if you wanted to review any of the points that you made.

PETER KROON: And I thought you wrote a very nice report and we were very grateful for it, and I think -- well, just the comments that we had.

No. 1 --

IRAM FAROOQ: Peter, maybe you can state your name for the record.

PETER KROON: My name is Peter Kroon and I live on 16 Linnaean Street.

I'd like to say that it's a well supported petition for people on both sides of the Avenue. We have -- essentially there's no direct opposition. There are some people who have opinions about other parts of the city or they've sort of tacked on to this to have an opportunity to air their views, but nobody's against what we're proposing that I know of directly. We've talked to almost all of the City

Councillors and we've had no push back. We've had some encouragement actually.

We put together this little summary of drafting points which actually existed two months ago, but it wasn't the petition itself, and our goal was to try to make it as easy as possible to go down and say yay, nay, whatever. We're not experts on this, we're not lawyers, we're not developers. We do essentially rely on you guys to take it from here. Our goal was to tee it up to say there's neighborhood support. We'll do whatever we can to support the process. We know there are developers looking up and down the Avenue, they're doing surveys, and they're coming through buildings and pretending to be insurance inspectors or whatever. So we know they're there. Things are gonna happen, and we would like to make sure that the development, if it

does come, is a quality development that we can all be happy with in the future.

And I'm going to keep it to that and let you guys get on with your stuff.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, I guess are there any members of the public who wanted to speak now? And there was a list. I'm sorry, I don't have it now. Are you Michael?

MICHAEL BENTLEY: Yes.

My name is Michael Bentley. I'm a Cambridge resident and also owner/developer of commercial property in this district on Mass. Ave.

So I'm very grateful for the activation of our neighborhood. I am in part by reaction to a project that we all thought was going to be a problem. Peter's done a beautiful job of

mobilizing, organizing, and charging us up in a very constructive way. I mean, the comment I wanted to make is something astute of some urban planning, is that I think that this measure is very important. I think it's essentially conservative measure. We were left out, you know, we really wanted to bring the Zoning from lower on Mass. Ave. up, and that's how the conversation started. I'm very grateful for your observations earlier, Tom, that it's not easy to have access to this process. So I'm sort of in the few environments where I don't feel like the oldest person in the room. I have a ten-year-old daughter and very involved in her school and community projects and that, so -- and including something on Tuesday nights. So I kind of got into this. There have been some changes, the access issue is challenging, so I'm hoping this

is my chance to participate in the process.

The short of it is that we want, we all want retail that's diverse and interesting. I think the question I've got, and the thing I'd like to suggest is that we take the 50-foot limit out of this and make that extension of Mass. part of the larger strategic review that's going on over the next couple of years. I think this is a way of holding the bridge until we get to that.

I think height is a legitimate thing, but it's very, very complex.

The tax situation is one thing.

Foot traffic determines a lot.

There are many, many pressures. I can tell you that contemplated FAR change for hybrid space or mixed use is amazing. I mean, I hate -- I've lived with this one-to-one thing. It really

rules your life.

So, yeah, there are many, there are many mechanisms that affect retail. And the retail itself is changing in a very deep way because of it -- the internet, and so I think we're talking about retail may not be five book stores anymore, it may be places to eat. It's gonna be stuff, but this will be an evolving and rich conversation. I don't think we can simply add mass and get the outcome we want. In fact, sometimes if we add mass and we end up with fancier spaces, it could be higher rents and actually drive out some of the diversity and localness. So I think when you're trying to engineer the process, it's very easy to create unintended side effects. I think the time that we really need to be thoughtful is greater than we have right now. So I strongly support the

petition which I'm an original cosigner of, and I want to state a strong reservation and request that we defer going from 45 feet to 50 feet and leave it at 50 feet. And I have a written thing which I'll hand to you and I can e-mail to the appropriate person just as an attempt to do that.

So that's the end of my thing.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Susan Roberts here?

ATTORNEY SUSAN ROBERTS: Good evening, Mr. Chair, Members of the Board. My name is Susan Roberts and I represent Richard Grossman who is a trustee of the 1738-1742 Mass. Ave. Trust, which is the parcel on the corner of Linnaean and Mass. Ave., the Rite Aid drugstore is there now. And I did speak last time and spoke in support of the petition.

Mr. Grossman's in the process of

considering future development of the property, and the proposal to adopt the North Mass. Ave. Zoning scheme for this part of Mass. Ave. is something that we would support.

I did also want to note, though, that we would support the higher height, the 50-foot height, talking now in terms of the differences or the areas of consideration that might be different between the current citizen's petition and the North Mass. Ave. Zoning. So, yes, on the height for us, that's something that we would support.

And the other thing is that with respect to the Zoning limitation on square footage within the retail below, we've got a, I think 5,000 square feet in the North Mass. Ave. scheme, and this citizen's petition is considering a limitation of 2,000 square feet on each retail

space. And so we would support not having a restriction there. If there is going to be a restriction, then we would want the 5,000.

Just to give you an idea, Rite Aid is clearly more than 5,000 square feet. And, you know, we would not support necessarily these small types of retail. I think that, you know, what might be desired right now is maybe not all that realistic. There's, you know, national tenants that may or may not be interested. I know that's not necessarily desirable, but nonetheless, there might be, you know, very suitable tenants with more square footage than 2,000 square feet. So I'm in support of that. And I'm definitely supporting the 1.75 FAR if not higher. Although that's not on the table, but I appreciate your time and consideration and I look forward to hearing your recommendations.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Lauren Kerry.

LAUREN KERRY: Good evening. My name is Lauren Kerry. I live at Three Concord Ave. which is about three or four blocks from this area and I also am part of the housing development staff at Just-A-Start.

So I just want to bring a slightly different perspective to your consideration of this and that is, that even the small change to demanding this retail is going to lead to a reduction in housing. This is a -- the proposal seems maybe not to be moving in the right direction for a city that has recognized housing affordability is a crisis not only for lower income households but also for middle income households that had previously found a place to

live here and presume they would be able to stay.

The Boston foundation each year issues a housing report card, a housing status primarily concerned with the affordability of housing which is becoming increasingly crucial. This year they focussed on the fact that one of the key factors, naturally, the less new housing that's brought in, the more -- the higher demand on existing housing and the more expensive it is to even stay in place, let alone find a new place to live. So this year they have focussed very specifically on Zoning and other land use regulation as it affects the cost of housing. Not only does it limit the numbers of housing, but sometimes restrictions increase the cost of housing, and I just want to point out the diagram that was shown here and which is I think on page 7 of the North Mass. Ave. Overlay materials that Mr. Roberts

included in the attachment to his memo which takes a look at what the schemes are. Currently just the housing proposal would have 1.75 FAR allowable and would have an increase with inclusionary housing that would bring it to I think it's 2.38 or something like that. And all of that could be housing.

If the scheme is adopted for virtually any property to have 75 percent of the frontage and 40 feet depth in the property allocated to a retail or other commercial use, would mean that essentially the first floor would be unavailable for any but the smallest circulatory needs like the lobby and the stairway landing, the elevator lobby, so that approximately 20 to 25 percent of the built square footage that you could provide on a site in this area of Mass. Ave. would be lost to housing. It already is very restrictive,

so that on most sites you could get either 20 or perhaps 28 units. And to have a 20 percent to a quarter of them eliminated means that many of them will become -- if not completely economically unviable to provide housing on the site because of your development costs will be there -- I'm sorry.

So that, that basically is -- it's retail at the cost of housing. It also even -- it's a very heavily trafficked area of the city. It's well served by many resources, including all kinds of transportation. It's an ideal setting for housing. And some of what has been brought up is -- and they rightly place attention on design, but the design that has driven some of what has happened there is because the low FAR that you have available means that you have to fill to the envelope. And I think it would be

allowing more housing rather than taking away square footage that could be housing, that would be a better direction for us to go here.

And I'm sorry not to have graphics, but they did cite some historic places and I just wanted to show you some of the historic buildings that are in the neighborhood that they want to protect. Six stories and 3.25 FAR.

I just see this as heading in the wrong direction.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Ms. Kerry, I have a question. If you were able to go up to five or six stories, does that eliminate the problem?

LAUREN KERRY: I think it compensates for what is being asked for and that would be the point. I mean, if this is a priority, and I can see why it would be, although I think housing can be lively at the first floor, too, if it's a

priority, it shouldn't come at the cost of housing. There should be an incentive for doing it. That means that you're not penalized from creating what is really an essential resource for the city.

H. THEODORE COHEN: All right, thank you.

Fred Meyer.

FRED MEYER: I just wanted to speak quickly to say that there's strong support for this proposal on the Agissiz side of Mass. Ave.. I'm the current moderator of the Agissiz Neighborhood Council and we had experience with this type of proposal before Mr. Kroon so ably came up with one from his side of Mass. Ave., and that was for the Lesley College dorm. Lesley came to us with a proposal, just to inform our monthly neighborhood meeting, the dormitory they could build by-right had a parking lot in back

and a pretty conventional ugly building. And we said to Lesley, look, we suspect you want a much larger dorm, why don't you get what you really want and you give us what we want? And what we want -- and we'll visit all nine City Councillors supporting this if you will agree.

We want contextual architecture, not the design you've shown us. But, for example, the back --

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: Could you speak up, please?

FRED MEYER: The back portion of your lot is a straight mansard houses and maybe a mansard Zoning Ordinance style there.

We want retail on the ground floor, preferably a little bakery which the neighborhood deeply needs.

And we don't want to see parking from the

street. You can have a few cars in back but we don't want to see it from Wendell Street. And they agreed. We agreed. And we got -- we visited all nine City Councillors and got the Zoning changed by an 8/1 vote. And what we asked for was very, very similar to what Peter has been asking.

Now, on the affordable housing issue, I have a double interest in that because I founded a non-profit cooperative in 1963 in this neighborhood at 64-66 Wendell Street. It's -- I arranged the financing for it, and it's totally non-profit. The people there are all low income. I supported a halfway house across the street from my own Victorian house where people with moderate mental disabilities live, 13 of them, with good staff support. And we supported a non-profit city supported housing project over

the Red Line Extension at the corner of Wendell and Mass. Ave.

However, the other side of what I do is I'm a real estate agent and have been for 52 years, and I want to tell you there is no way that any first floor apartments built in this area are going to be affordably priced. I tell you a recent story on that.

There's a new building on Mass. Ave. just east of Harvard Square. It's sort of blue glass in color, so you can picture it. That has apartments in it. I got a call from a Harvard student who wanted extra space because it's sort of crowded living with roommates, and his parents came up and we rented a tiny little apartment in that building for over \$3,000 a month. And when I told the father that he'd have to submit a financial application, he said well, my salary is

three million a year, you really want me to get a credit report? And I showed the landlord his job and he got it.

You could build all the housing you want in this area, but it is not going to go for a reasonable price. So, the previous presentation is very well intentioned and I totally support her goal, but it ain't gonna happen by eliminating retail or a restaurant or office on that ground floor. My neighborhood wants the feeling of safety, of activity on the street. I vividly remember some women saying how they didn't feel safe going by Harvard's building where the old Bent's Pharmacy if you remember that, it's sitting empty. They're scared about that. So a vital retail presence is very, very important and commercial tenants do need more height.

So the neighborhood, I've heard this over and over again, we've had a meeting on the Zoning petition, about 50 people attended. There was no one in opposition. We want contextual housing. We want first floor retail or restaurant, and we don't want it too big, the spaces, to speak to the speaker before that.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Mr. Meyer, can you wrap up?

FRED MEYER: Because you've got more local businesses if you make the space smaller, and if there's a good tenant who needs more space, let them come in for a Variance and we will support it so they won't have a legal cause.

Thank you.

THE STENOGRAPHER: Mr. Meyer, how are you spelling your last name?

FRED MEYER: M-E-Y-E-R and it's 83

Hammond Street.

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

KAREN WELLER: The only thing that worries me --

H. THEODORE COHEN: Please come forward.

KAREN WELLER: My name is Karen Weller.. I live at 12 Humboldt Street. And the only thing that concerns me about making buildings higher and having more square footage is what are you gonna do about the parking? That's why I think I might be opposed to making the buildings taller because it's just increasing space, I think, tends to then call for -- if you have more people, you're gonna have more demand for parking and it seems quite dense and I don't see any place for extra parking. And even some of the street parking has been eliminated because of the

bump outs and what have you on Mass. Avenue. So that's -- would be a concern of mine. But I'm willing to listen to explanations and stuff.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Is there anyone else who wishes to speak?

Councillor Carlone.

COUNCILLOR DENNIS CARLONE: Thank you.

Just a quick comment on retail size. The other thing that's implied and perhaps said earlier in earlier meetings is that the neighborhoods are very concerned about maintaining local retail, like you are, in general, neighborhood-related retail. I can tell you that the Council, I think unanimously is also concerned about that. In fact, we are requiring the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority to have some small space retail locally owned, and we've talked about the notion that we're going to hopefully bring up in

an Ordinance Committee with you on looking at something called neighborhood retail or village retail, whatever that name -- the most appropriate name that really does specify size and the types of uses. Now, we're not saying that everything has to be that, even on this stretch as Mr. Meyer said, but that is a goal. And maybe not in this instance with this effort, but in the future effort it's the goal, and we believe that what it will do is, yes, it will lower the value of land a little bit by requiring retail that can pay half of what a CVS or a Rite Aid can pay. But that's not necessarily a bad thing when the value of land is going up as crazily as it is.

So that's where that came from. And I agree with the notion that if somebody needs double the space, fine, come forward. If it's a

good use, we're all for it. The neighborhood realizes the type of retail effects, the quality of the neighborhood, and the neighborhood affects the quality of the retail. So what we're trying to do is have a say in that, just like other neighborhoods are, including even in Kendall Square.

The height issue, as you know, the five feet, the existing height is 45 feet now. You really can't get more square footage with the extra five feet. That allows the retail to work on the ground floor, and that is an issue because some of the houses are very close to the retail, but I agree with earlier speakers, what makes the most sense is what makes the most sense. We all want the retail to work. And you've looked at that in Northern Cambridge.

And thank you for considering this.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Is there anyone else who wishes to speak?

CHARLOTTE MOORE: I'm Charlotte Moore and I live at Nine Rutland Street. And I have to say that what Mr. Meyer said brought me back to something that Al Vellucci (phonetic) said about 35 years ago on the corner of Langdon and Mass. Ave. the Park Street Church wanted to build a very tall square dormitory, and we, actually, in the neighborhood fought that and had the red house that you see and the carriage house next to it landmarked. And the minister who lives there has been ultimately grateful, he said, to us, that they kept it. And Mr. Vellucci said that those buildings actually reflect the neighborhood and he saw the ecological balance that we're talking about now that Dennis Carlone was talking about. He -- we have here this balance between

retail businesses on the avenue and the -- excuse me, the neighborhoods that live behind.

I am a preservationist by predilection and training and, yes, I'm grateful that you acknowledge the frame buildings that line the avenue. But even more than that, our history of retail, small retail goes back about 100 years and those buildings are still here. And I would -- my preference would be to keep those buildings. They're single-story tax payer buildings and they are all retail. Absent that, we need Zoning protections for the scale and the nature of their ultimate replacements.

Our proposal offers tools to accomplish that small scale ground floor retail spaces favoring local businesses that our neighborhoods really strongly prefer and protections against the proliferation of fast food chains that would

crowd them out. Our part of Mass. Ave. is denser than what is already protected of the avenue and has more pressures from institutions like Lesley and Harvard. While we can use the already established North Ave. requirements, we need to tweak them as we suggest and petition to protect our ecological balance. We -- as has been said before, I know we have a great deal of support from both sides of the avenue and have had no negative reactions and many positive ones from City Councillors. We missed the boat in 2012 by not adopting that North Mass. Ave. Zoning, and now we have a chance to adopt it with measures that are much more tailored to our stretch of the avenue.

Formulating new design guidelines to me is critical, and I believe that they are necessary for maintaining the character and

success of the MAPOCO neighborhood. We've had almost 100 successful years maintaining that balance of residential behind the retail on the avenue and this is about preserving the balance in the future as the city grows.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Is there anyone else who wishes to speak?

(No Response.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: All right, none appearing.

So then, Board Members, what do we think about this? And let me start by asking Jeff and Iram a question. I mean, this, as we discussed last time, this proposal is not in the typical form of the Zoning Amendment proposal and I'm not quite certain how we deal with it and how the Ordinance Committee and City Council will deal

with it, because a lot of it was just conceptual of we'd like to see this, we'd like to see that, we'd like to see the next thing without clearcut, you know, language amend this to change this provision, amend that to change the next provision. And so I'm just curious what you think is -- how we go forward?

JEFF ROBERTS: Mr. Chair, my suggestion, since a lot of the questions are really questions of content, content of the -- or the intent maybe of the regulations, and I think that the petitioners have done a good job of narrowing down some of the issues to some specific points, that if the Planning Board were to advise considering any of these points, you could put that in a recommendation and could direct staff to develop the language that would make that effective. In some cases, I think depending on

what the Planning Board recommends, we might need to revisit that recommendation against what was originally submitted and advertised in the petition and determine whether that required any kind of a re-filing or what the approach would be based on what the recommendation is. But I think as noted, there were a few suggestions in the petition that probably would not be accomplished within the North Mass. Ave. Zoning but would have to look back to the base zoning.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay.

Hugh?

HUGH RUSSELL: So I'll put a proposal on the table which would be to ask the staff to draft a petition that includes item No. 1 which is the incorporation of the North Mass. Ave. District.

Item No. 6, which is extending the list

of historic structures in a way that Jeff suggests by consulting the Historic Commission staff.

And No. 10 which is the five-foot setback which I think might be able to be done as a part of the -- in this Overlay District you would not have to have -- you have to have the five-foot setback.

And that -- and item 3, I really don't know what the pleasure of the Board is, whether that's the -- cutting the establishment size in North Mass. Avenue by 5,000 feet down to 2,000 feet. I can -- I could support it either way. I'm inclined myself to leave the 5,000 feet, but -- and so the reason I would not include the other pieces; two which is the fast food. I think we don't have to do that because fast food is not a permitted use in this district.

Four, the Residence B setback clarification. I think it applies to maybe one lot. And applying it is actually quite inconsistent for the intent of that provision in the Residence B District. So that I think the way the City would enforce it now is fair.

The clarifying that parking is desired as a front use, I don't -- it's -- do we have to clarify it then we should clarify it. But I think it's very clear that none of us think that's right.

And the height, I think we need to have the 50 feet if you want a lot of four-story buildings. Which the way I design them takes 49.13 feet to get a four-story building with a 15-foot clear height in the retail. You could drop the retail to clear height a couple of feet but that just gets too messy.

Keeping the status -- nine says keep the status quo in the Zoning. So I think it doesn't require a change.

And updating the urban design guidelines isn't part of the zoning petition. I think they have to be looked at in the process of working in the city, and I don't think they've served us badly. Frankly, I think if the urban design guidelines have been applied to the proposal on the -- that was out there on the avenue, it would be very clear that that building failed miserably and we would have had no difficulty on meeting of that building to make it either acceptable or go away.

So that's sort of my -- in other words, let's pick the things that are the core ideas and endorse them and try to strip off some of the things that are not essential to do. Again,

given the fact that this may come under consideration of the citywide rezoning, it ought to be because the character of the major avenue is about to be part of that discussion. So that should hold the fort for two or three or four or five years. That's the way -- that's my proposal.

I would be happy to put that in the form of a motion if you wish.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, jumping the gun a little I think.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: I would second that.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Mary, do you have any comments?

MARY FLYNN: I think I would second that as well. I wasn't here for the first hearing, but in general I would support the 5,000 square feet for the retail and the 50-foot height limit.

So I think as Hugh put it so well, you know, this is the thing that would hold us as we proceed through to the citywide plan.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right.

MARY FLYNN: Yes.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: As far as addressing the issue that Ms. Kerry brought up relative to losing housing at the expense of what I think we all agree a good thing is to have retail on that avenue, the 50-foot modification helps to some degree.

I agree with Hugh that's what you're going to need to get the height above the retail. That increases it to some degree to what the petitioner has drafted or the zoning change is drafted. But I think I would see why the master plan should look at, you know, and major transit modes and maybe much higher density of housing

should be consider along that avenue, considering the historic buildings that are there which are not unappealing, right? So especially the ones across from the law school. So the older ones. Right?

And so that's where I am on that. And thank you, Hugh, for -- you took the words right out of my mouth.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Catherine.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: So, I too like Hugh's summary and support it. And in terms of the size of the retail, I would pretty strongly favor the 5,000. And only because as much as I support the Cambridge First and the locally owned retail, I think it's also important in any neighborhood, and I happen to live in Agassiz and this is my neighborhood, too, to have affordable retail there as well. And some of

the -- you know, the Rite Aids and some of those chain stores that we all love to hate provide affordable options for a lot of residents that are not available at the locally-owned places that, you know, have -- need the smaller footprints. And the balance is key and I get that. I, too, cherish all of the locally-owned places, but, you know, having a place where you can buy a cup of coffee for under three dollars is also nice. So that's my thinking on the 5,000 versus 2,000. I'd like to keep the flexibility to have some bigger footprint stores.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I don't -- I, too, agree with most everything that Hugh said. I do have a couple of comments.

Obviously I agree with one.

With regard to three, I think 2,000 is much too small. I think it needs to be the 5,000

because I do love the small stores. I've lived in this neighborhood for 40 years. I walk this strip at least once a day, everyday. I shop in all the stores. The small mom and pop stores and local stores are great. I'm really concerned with the change in retail over the past 10, 20 years and what it's going to continue to change. And I question whether some of these stores are really going to be able to continue in existence. And I think we have to do everything to keep them -- but we have to provide for the Rite Aids. Everybody's talking about we want a drugstore in East Cambridge, we want a drugstore in Kendall Square. Well, this is a smaller drugstore. And we want restaurants and we want other things that will be successful there, and I think we shouldn't kill the size. I think they need the larger height which takes us up to the 50-foot.

I know a lot of people here wouldn't like to hear this, I've always thought this part of Mass. Ave. is very wide, can easily support five- and six-story residential buildings with retail on the first floor. There are already some of them there. They are some of the most beautiful buildings in this neighborhood. I think the Mass. Ave. can deal with it and I think the neighborhood can deal with it, and I really hope that in the master planning discussion this is really looked at because I really think this is something -- I'm not talking about 10, 20 stories, I'm talking about something that's five and six stories that matches what's there.

If staff is convinced that we don't need to do anything to prevent stilt buildings, then I'm fine with that. If there is an issue, then let's fix that loophole.

I think the sidewalks are fine and dandy there, and I am not wild about changing the building line to end up with a jagged back and forth on the hope that 20, 30, 40 years from now, it will all be a new level five feet back. You know, I personally think that new construction should match the street line of the existing construction. But that's not the biggest problem.

Other than that, you know, I think -- and while it's not in this list, I also do not want to turn this area into a Disney World of old fashioned buildings and, you know, so the concept of contextual buildings is fine, but I don't want to foreclose, you know, the Leslie dormitory, the Lunder type building. I think, you know, we are a modern city moving forward in the 21st century, that the architecture should reflect that and

hope that some future Planning Board and CDD staff can make sure that whatever gets built there is appropriate for the neighborhood and is attractive.

Steve?

STEVEN COHEN: Well, I guess to the extent that we want to actually encourage redevelopment of the properties and encourage more residential, you know, the more FAR that you permit, the greater the incentive to redevelop a property. And I guess I agree with the five- or six-story building over there would probably be appropriate. I don't know if that proposal is actually on the table.

H. THEODORE COHEN: It's not.

STEVEN COHEN: But I agree with your thoughts on that, Ted.

On this retail space that everybody

opined on, you know, on the one hand I'm sympathetic with the neighbors who really want to encourage small local-based retail. I mean, we are in an era where as a retail landlord myself, I look for national tenants. They pay higher rent. They have greater security. I don't think it would be a bad idea to try to create incentives here not to go to the national tenants, to have smaller neighborhood-based tenants. So 2,000 feet may be a bit on the small side, but I might be inclined to go to 3,000 feet which actually gives a lot more flexibility. And, but then building -- I'm always for flexibility here. I mean build in a mechanism whereby a larger tenant would be permitted by Special Permit. So at least it would be some, you know, incentive, again, as sort of default position to go with smaller tenants. Frankly, I

think that's where the market would be for the most part for smaller tenants anyway, even if you permit 5,000-foot tenants. But I would do 3,000 plus Special Permit.

One thing which I don't really understand, not because it's badly drafted, I just, you know, fully think through how it plays out, is the parking on these developments. And, you know, where the parking would be provided, if there's flexibility on providing parking. I mean that's going to be -- I think a tough issue in these lots and I'd appreciate, you know, when the staff grapples with this proposal, if you could sort of think through the parking issue and explain how parking might be provided for these buildings and what the options are and what staff would recommend either in how much parking, where the parking would be, or whether there should be

parking requirements at all.

That's it for me.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Lou.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: I agree with everything that everyone has said, and Steve stole my thunder, I had the parking and that was it.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay. So I guess the question now is do we actually take a vote on this right now or do we ask staff to draft something and bring it back to us?

IRAM FAROOQ: Mr. Chair, since size of retail is one of the questions that seems to be dividing the Board, we did a survey of some retail store sizes back in 2004 and I just pulled up some of the information from that if it's helpful. I could mention a few stores that fall below and above.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Please.

IRAM FAROOQ: Okay.

So in the under -- 2,000 and under, some of these don't exist anymore. But there was the Great Eastern Trading Company in Central Square which was about the smallest thing we found which was 580 square feet.

Cafe Luna in Central Square is 900 square feet.

The Flour Shop in Kendall Square is 1369.

Coffee shop in Central Square is 1400 square feet, and Inman Square is 1600 square feet.

New Town Variety is 1790.

The Montrose Spa is 2100.

Grimaldi's on Putnam Ave. is 2400.

McDonald's in Central Square 2400.

Teddy Shoes, 2400.

Formaggio's, 3,000.

Darwin's on Mount Auburn is 4,000.

Kirkland Cleaners is 4300 square feet.

Legal Seafoods in Kendall Square is
5,000.

And then we go, I don't know if you want
higher than 5,000. But Rodney's on the first
floor is 3200, this is when it was larger.

Harvard Bookstore is 6,000. We're
getting over the 5,000 now. But that gives you a
sense of the --

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right, you know,
something like Chong Sho (phonetic) if we stay in
this district. Montrose is probably the smallest
store on the strip and you say that's 2100.

PETER KROON: That's not the smallest
one. Ward Maps is 700.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Which?

PETER KROON: Ward Maps.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay. And the Cambodian is what?

PETER KROON: Cambodian, it's not very deep. It's not much bigger. It's 1200 or something.

H. THEODORE COHEN: But in any event, yes, Councillor Carlone?

COUNCILLOR DENNIS CARLONE: Just a quick thing. New construction, we are going to have retail 40 feet deep for the reasons said. Maybe 50. If it's 5,000 square feet, that means we have one active door for over 100 feet. That's the way to kill a street. And that's one of the reasons why we wanted smaller retail to have more active -- if you look at the characteristics of the street, that's what it is. And Rite Aid works because it's a deep space. But when

there's parking on the ground floor behind the retail, you're not going to have that typically unless you're going to go down below, which we hope people will do for parking. I mean, so it is different. New construction will be quite different and the impact on the sidewalk will be dramatic.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Stuart.

STUART DASH: If I could mention two things: One is the information is available on our website under the North Mass. Ave. Planning Project. So if people want to take a look at.

And also we distinguished, when we did the work on retail in 2004 between what is the perceived sales area or back space or basement space. So there are some stores actually that come across at 2,000 square feet but in fact actually they're 4,000 legal square feet because

they have a basement storage that they use as legal square footage.

HUGH RUSSELL: One of the things about this 2,000 foot proposal is that it didn't clear the basement space or possible second story space. So it's not exactly apples and oranges in comparison. And --

H. THEODORE COHEN: So do we want to -- a majority want to talk 5,000 or do we want to talk something smaller? And I think if we do something smaller, I agree that it ought to have a Special Permit provision built into it. I think a Variance is a bad idea to require that to go larger, but a Special Permit would give the option and flexibility.

HUGH RUSSELL: Well, I'm in the way of thinking that we should support the lone voice that Steve gave, that 3,000 feet, because it, you

know, and given the list of stores that Iram read that seemed like 3,000 feet, would give you a lot of neighborhood serving stores.

H. THEODORE COHEN: With a Special Permit?

TOM SIENIEWICZ: To five.

HUGH RUSSELL: A Special Permit period.

STEVEN COHEN: Yes, period without even limiting it to five.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay.

HUGH RUSSELL: And we have to make sure our guidelines are written that if you're taking 100-foot strip and you've got to put in more than one door.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Right, separate entrances.

HUGH RUSSELL: You may not like it, but it may be what it takes to make it work.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Are people comfortable with that?

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Yes.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Yes.

JEFF ROBERTS: Mr. Chair, can I ask a question? Putting your two points together, would your suggestion of the 3,000 square feet include the basement space or not include the basement space if you're the first floor?

HUGH RUSSELL: Since the present definition -- the 5,000 feet is all the retail space, then I would say a few thousand would be on the same basis. So in theory this is even more restrictive than the proposal which might allow a 4,000 foot space; 2,000 up and 2,000 down. But I think the important thing is that there's a statement of sort of intent and there's an ability to look at a proposal and look at it

on its merits. And that the 3,000 plus the Special Permit gets you there.

H. THEODORE COHEN: So we all comfortable with that?

(All agree).

H. THEODORE COHEN: All right. So then it goes -- do we need to take a vote or staff will prepare something and we'll then vote on it at a subsequent time?

JEFF ROBERTS: I mean, I think that's a question for the Board. If you want to -- I mean, I think the recommendations seem fairly clear. But if the Board wants to review the language again before making a formal recommendation, we can do it either way.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, I guess that brings us back to the timing issue on, you know, we want to make sure that City Council and

Ordinance Committee have the recommendation when they're considering things.

HUGH RUSSELL: I would be comfortable with voting on it tonight. I suspect that the council will -- it's a recommendation, right? The Council is going to --

H. THEODORE COHEN: They're going to do what they want to do.

HUGH RUSSELL: People are in the room going to be encouraging them to support the point of view that they brought to us.

H. THEODORE COHEN: So it's back to you now to make the motion that 45 minutes ago you were happy to make.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. So I move that we recommend the Council adopt the provisions and incorporate Articles 1, as modified by our discussion;

6 and 10 in the MAPOCO rezoning petition sheet that's before us.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I guess the --

STEVEN COHEN: I propose an amendment to sort of as modified by our discussion on retail. And could I ask is the proponent here? What exactly are we saying about parking?

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Yeah, what are we doing?

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: We're not doing anything with it.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: What does that not do?

STEVEN COHEN: What is the applicable parking requirement? I'm sorry.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: It's one space per unit.

STEVEN COHEN: One space per unit?

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Yes.

HUGH RUSSELL: And a certain amount for certain sizes of retail.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Right.

JEFF ROBERTS: So parking is required -- it is, in certain circumstances it is waived. So for small commercial spaces, the parking can be waived. That's generally true throughout the city, where the amount would be kind of de minimus. I think we talked about this at a previous case. But for residential uses, the requirement is one space per unit. There is Special Permit provisions that allow that to be modified or reduced, but, again, that has to go through a review process. But the requirements of the Overlay District don't really apply to the amount of parking required. They do have restrictions on where the parking can be located

on the site. It can't be in the -- in that front section of the building. It either has to be -- it has to be tucked behind the front portion of the building or it has to be below grade.

STEVEN COHEN: Does the required depth of the retail, depending on the configuration of lots here, does that unduly limit the ability to provide on grade parking in the rear?

JEFF ROBERTS: It can. It depends on the -- it depends on the size of the lot and the depth of the lot. So a lot of what -- you know, we actually -- before the North Mass. Ave. area we had studied this area, and one of the things we looked at is the size -- relative size and shapes of lots. And a lot of that has to do with -- you know, a lot of that determined how developable the lot is. So some lots have more depth, and by virtue of that more easily

accommodate parking.

STEVEN COHEN: Does it make sense to have the tool of a Special Permit -- a permit to vary the required depth of retail, you know, to accommodate parking in the rear?

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: No.

JEFF ROBERTS: I'm sorry to interrupt, so the North Mass. Ave. Zoning requirements that we're talking about incorporating can be modified by the Planning Board by Special Permit.

STEVEN COHEN: It can?

JEFF ROBERTS: And the way that works with the Planning Board, only under very extreme circumstances can the Planning Board completely waive the requirement to have that non-residential retail or office type space at the ground floor. But the Planning Board can approve waivers of the height. So can reduce the

height if there's a reason to reduce the retail height at the ground floor. And, of course, that would require bringing the whole building -- you couldn't reduce the retail height and then keep the residential height up.

The Planning Board could also modify the depth or the frontage of retail; could modify the allowed uses within, you know, within the scope of what's allowed in the base zoning district and can modify the size of the individual establishment. So all of those things could be modified by Special Permit so long as the intent of providing that continuous retail frontage is --

STEVEN COHEN: So we have the flexibility we need to make it work.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: And modify the depth, right?

H. THEODORE COHEN: I guess the only thing I might add to what Hugh's motion was that in the event staff determined that -- that there did need to be some provision to prevent stilt buildings, that that would be our recommendation, too, is that the Zoning be amended to that.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right, so that might be, that might have enact in the entire Overlay District or it might not be possible because of advertisement.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right, but staff would have to look into that.

Is there a second?

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: I'll second.

H. THEODORE COHEN: All those in favor?

(Raising hands.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: Unanimous.

Well, thank you. So staff will make that

recommendation and thank you all for --

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: There's a question.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes.

ATTORNEY SUSAN ROBERTS: So, I'm sorry.

I know it's been seconded and voted but I was wondering about eight, because I don't think you mentioned eight. Yet you guys were all in favor of the 50-foot height, and so I just was wondering about --

PETER KROON: Right. If you adopt No. 1, that brings paragraph 8 with it, right?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right.

PETER KROON: And to be honest, we misunderstood. We did not understand -- we're 45 feet now and we didn't understand what a mixed use lot was. It wasn't clearly explained. And we too are in favor of No. 8. And if you adopt No. 1, and say nothing else, you also give us the

50 feet that she wants.

H. THEODORE COHEN: That was my understanding --

STEVEN COHEN: We had intended to approve of the 50 feet.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right, yes. Right.

STEVEN COHEN: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Jeff, that's correct, isn't it?

JEFF ROBERTS: Yes. So I mean I could recap the substance if the Board finds it helpful. I could recap the substance of what's in those points that were in the motion.

So the point No. 1, incorporating that would mean applying the North Mass. Ave. Zoning requirements to the area of -- south of Porter Square and probably accomplish that by simply amending the part of the Zoning that says this

part of the Zoning only applies north of Porter Square. And say this Zoning applies only to Porter Square and south of Porter Square in the Business A-2 District. That would be a simple approach.

As for the other points, I --

H. THEODORE COHEN: And that brings the 50-foot height?

JEFF ROBERTS: Yes, that brings the 50-foot height, the 1.75 FAR for a mixed use building, the required non-residential use at the ground floor 40 feet of depth and 50 feet of height and so forth. All those provisions are in the North Mass. Ave. provision as well as well as the Planning Board to approve modifications by Special Permit.

The other points that were made to be incorporated would be -- or that would be

recommended, could be just incorporated as a side note. For instance, the 3,000 square feet, so as to not impact the North Mass. Ave. area, we might include language that says, you know, in North of Mass. Ave. it's 5,000 square feet. South of Mass. Ave. it's -- or I'm sorry, north of Porter Square is 5,000. South of Porter Square it's 3,000 square feet.

And the other points I think are about maintaining the status quo, and we would look at language that would simply clarify the intent of the prohibition on structured parking at the first floor.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right. And so that picked up six, about the historic structures, and we also --

JEFF ROBERTS: I'm sorry, that's correct. And then so the other point would be to confer

with the Historical Commission to determine which buildings should be added to the list of historic buildings that would be exempt from the ground floor requirements.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Right.

And the motion, I think, did include point 10 which does require the five-foot setback?

JEFF ROBERTS: Yes.

And just on first thought, it's possible that that could be incorporated as a provision in the North Mass. Ave. Overlay District that says: Despite the base district, you have to have the five-foot setback.

If the Planning Board wanted to include this in the recommendation, I know it's already been voted, like everything else in the North Mass. Ave. Overlay District, that could be

modified by the Planning Board by Special Permit if that's where it gets incorporated.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes, that makes sense.

STEVEN COHEN: Yes.

JEFF ROBERTS: I think that's closest with the intent of the proposed rezoning, because otherwise it would be a change to the base zoning which applies to all of the Business A-2.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay, that makes sense.

Okay.

STEVEN COHEN: Good.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you, all. We unfortunately have a couple more things to look at.

Thank you, all. If you could continue your conversations outside, we would appreciate

it because we would all like to get home.

JOHN HAWKINSON: Mr. Chair, I don't think you're audible. I couldn't hear you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I asked if you could continue your conversations outside because we have a couple more matters we have to attend to and we would all like to get home at a not too unreasonable hour. We have three ZBA cases about antennas.

LIZA PADEN: So there's three BZA cases on the antennas.

The first one is 1815 Mass. Avenue which is the Lesley University building, and this is a replacement of existing antenna and a modification of the installation. All three of the applicants are the same group. It's with the AT&T -- sorry, AT&T antennas. You all set?

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, this is Ted's

favorite building.

H. THEODORE COHEN: This is my favorite building.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Pretty soon it will be nothing but an antenna.

H. THEODORE COHEN: It will be nothing but an antenna. That's right.

ATTORNEY BRIAN GROSSMAN: Good evening, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board, Brian Grossman of Anderson and Kreiger on behalf of . New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC, also known as AT&T. I know you've had a long night, I'll walk through quickly and take any questions you may have.

On all three projects there's no increase in the number of antennas, so including in this building. It is -- they're all replacements of existing. One of them there is some antenna

movement. On this one it's fairly straightforward. There's the replacement of three antennas, one per sector. There's some additional equipment added below, a couple of the other existing antennas. A couple of the antennas are moving from one location to another, but they're all gonna stay on existing pipe mounts. A couple of those moves are just to accommodate the needs of the new network antennas.

And you can see in the photograph simulations it's fairly similar to the installation as it exists today. This site and the other two as well, are all compliant with the new FCC order and the approval criteria under 64.09, so they meet that criteria as well.

I'm happy to take any questions on this site.

HUGH RUSSELL: There's one or more antennas that are -- the paint is faded on. Are those your antennas or somebody else's? That --

ATTORNEY BRIAN GROSSMAN: Those would not be AT&T. The AT&T antennas are the ones higher up on the building.

HUGH RUSSELL: That's what I thought. But I was hoping I could get you to repaint that antenna.

MARY FLYNN: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, can you get the antennas to not break the roof line? I know some of the existing ones do. But --

ATTORNEY BRIAN GROSSMAN: I don't think the antennas themselves in terms of actual height break the roof line. I think it's a function of view. We did talk about that with planning staff when we met with them last week. It is something

that if we can accommodate, we're certainly happen to do.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And if you're going to paint them, can -- I don't know if these are painted or not, if you're trying to match the brick, then can the top portion not be red but be closer to the grey that is banded around the roof?

ATTORNEY BRIAN GROSSMAN: For the ones that are, that are near that, yeah, we could -- that's, again, something that can be done.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Any other comments?

STEVEN COHEN: Other than meh?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes, you're not getting my full because it's eleven o'clock now. And AT&T and Lesley ought to be embarrassed by this building and the antenna array on this building because it is truly the worst in the

city. But I guess you're not making it any worse right now.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: We'll take it up at Town Gown as we always do.

H. THEODORE COHEN: As we always do, and they just -- and they're going to say they have a 20-year lease with them and they can't do anything.

Okay. What's the next one?

LIZA PADEN: The next one will be 141 Portland Street.

ATTORNEY BRIAN GROSSMAN: Do you want to keep the plans and the sims? I'm happy to do that. Usually you give them back and we repurpose them at the ZBA.

H. THEODORE COHEN: No, you can have them back.

LIZA PADEN: So 141 Portland Street was

constructed as the U.S. Trust building. It's at the corner of Portland and Broadway.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Okay.

HUGH RUSSELL: I'm curious what this new law that is cited in all the applications. Is that substantive or just procedural?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Substantive and it gives them a lot more rights versus the municipality. But maybe we should ask the City Solicitor to --

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: We seem to get a lot of these, right?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Actually John knows all about it.

ATTORNEY BRIAN GROSSMAN: So, again, for 141 Portland Street, AT&T has an existing array of nine antennas, three antennas per sector. That number will not increase. One antenna per

sector is being swapped out for a new AT&T antenna similar to the last project. The one difference here, each -- there's one antenna per sector that will move from an existing mounting frame and be facade mounted to the building. You can see the existing antenna layout, in each sector there's one frame that has two antennas on it. One of those antennas will move and that will be the one that then is also replaced.

STEVEN COHEN: So in location four there's a white antenna there. Is that one of yours?

ATTORNEY BRIAN GROSSMAN: That is not AT&T.

STEVEN COHEN: You only have the nice ones.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Will your new antennas change in shape and size?

ATTORNEY BRIAN GROSSMAN: They are a little bit shorter and a little bit wider.

STEVEN COHEN: Can we make him paint the other company's antennas?

ATTORNEY BRIAN GROSSMAN: We cannot. We don't have the right to repaint someone else's antennas.

STEVEN COHEN: Just kidding.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Again, if these are breaking the brick up into the concrete band, if they could paint them two tone so that --

ATTORNEY BRIAN GROSSMAN: What -- we are actually going to look at again from conversation with planning staff is to move them down so not to break the roof line. To break them down to break that band visually. And for some reason we can't do that, it will be painted, but I think we can accomplish the move down.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Any other comments?

STEVEN COHEN: Lovely.

LIZA PADEN: The last one is 675 Mass. Avenue which is the corner of Prospect Street and Mass. Ave. Some people may know it as the Topius building (phonetic). Some people may know it as an Agea building. It currently has Leader Bank on the first floor.

HUGH RUSSELL: (Inaudible).

LIZA PADEN: It's the tallest building at that intersection.

I'd also point out that the installation on this building was installed before the enactment of the Special Permit.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Liza, while he's getting ready, are we only meeting three times in February?

LIZA PADEN: Yes. The meeting February

2nd, February 16th, and February 23rd. I'll e-mail the schedule -- ongoing schedule to you tomorrow.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay.

ATTORNEY BRIAN GROSSMAN: So, again, this one is fairly straightforward. There are three existing antenna mounting frames located on the roof of the building. Some of them are actually secured to the penthouse itself. One antenna per sector will be removed and a new antenna will be located in its place. There's no relocation of antennas as part of this proposed project, so everything stays on those existing mounting frames at the top of the building. As with the others, there are some additions of the remote radio head units. Those will be mounted to the existing mounting frame as well.

HUGH RUSSELL: Can everything on those

ugly racks be painted the same color as the antenna? So it's all just monochrome? Because right now it looks like --

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: They already are though.

HUGH RUSSELL: -- the antennas are wide and the frame is darker and the equipment is darker.

ATTORNEY BRIAN GROSSMAN: Can we paint it?

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: It can be painted, but over time it's gonna flake and it's not gonna -- we don't usually paint them. They're galvanized steel. I mean, anything can be painted, the question is how long does it last before anyone notices it?

HUGH RUSSELL: If you paint galvanized steel properly, it lasts forever because you're

actually painting zinc oxide which is a masonry product and masonry paint works fine on it. You have to get rid of the oil. But if it's been sitting up there for years, the oil's all gone by now. So it comes up straight.

UNIDENTIFIED AUDIENCE MEMBER: I mean that's fine.

HUGH RUSSELL: This is another kind of remind me of a stealth installation. You ask me if there were antennas on this building, I would have said no, I don't think so.

STEVEN COHEN: I agree.

HUGH RUSSELL: They're up so high and they blend with the sky, but if they were all the same color, they might be even less.

ATTORNEY BRIAN GROSSMAN: The only thing, I mean, the antennas are kind of that greyish white, and the galvanized grey tends to be

actually a little bit better typically against the northern skyline. Because even in an application such as we have, I know Cambridge doesn't have a tower, but typically if you paint them on a pole, it generally works out much better when you just leave it that galvanized steel and just kind weathered and they're non-reflective. But it's, the painting's a preference. And I'm sure it's something we can do, but it may be actually better than that galvanized non-weathered steel.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: But you ever hear of flat paint?

HUGH RUSSELL: We could require you to have clouds behind the building all the time.

ATTORNEY BRIAN GROSSMAN: When you paint it, it never takes on the characteristic of the sky.

H. THEODORE COHEN: You guys would have to --

HUGH RUSSELL: What do you think, Suzannah?

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: Could the antennas be the galvanized steel like the cover?

ATTORNEY BRIAN GROSSMAN; no.

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: Okay.

ATTORNEY BRIAN GROSSMAN: The antennas have a -- I mean, they do have a cover to them, but it can't be steel, it's got to be --

H. THEODORE COHEN: But can they be painted the same color as the galvanized steel?

ATTORNEY BRIAN GROSSMAN: They can be painted grey.

HUGH RUSSELL: That's different than the galvanized because there's a --

ATTORNEY BRIAN GROSSMAN: Galvanized has

patina --

HUGH RUSSELL: Right.

ATTORNEY BRIAN GROSSMAN: I don't know if patina is the right word.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Oxidizes, anyway.

HUGH RUSSELL: I think try to make them all the same.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Just make them all the same.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: It's the contrast that shows.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Paint it all. Does that work?

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Before it flakes off you'll probably be back with your next generation of antennas.

HUGH RUSSELL: We have to make a pledge

to not buy new cellphones, not to upgrade.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Liza, is there anything else?

LIZA PADEN: Not that is it.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay, we are adjourned. See you all at the Senior Center next week.

LIZA PADEN: Yes, please, at the Senior Center.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Seven o'clock?

LIZA PADEN: Seven o'clock.

(Whereupon, at 11:05 p.m., the
Planning Board Adjourned.)

* * * * *

ERRATA SHEET AND SIGNATURE INSTRUCTIONS

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

INSTRUCTIONS

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

PAGE	LINE	
-----	-----	CHANGE: _____ REASON: _____
-----	-----	CHANGE: _____ REASON: _____
-----	-----	CHANGE: _____ REASON: _____
-----	-----	CHANGE: _____ REASON: _____
-----	-----	CHANGE: _____ REASON: _____
-----	-----	CHANGE: _____ REASON: _____

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

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

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

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 29th day of February, 2016.

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

My Commission Expires:
April 29, 2022

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

<p>\$</p> <p>\$3,000 [1] - 156:16</p> <p>1</p> <p>1 [7] - 86:9, 139:5, 168:15, 191:17, 198:10, 198:18, 199:14</p> <p>1.0 [3] - 131:13, 131:17, 132:7</p> <p>1.75 [6] - 131:12, 131:17, 132:4, 147:15, 150:3, 200:10</p> <p>10 [5] - 169:4, 176:6, 177:12, 192:1, 202:7</p> <p>100 [5] - 19:14, 111:4, 164:7, 166:2, 185:13</p> <p>100,000 [1] - 116:3</p> <p>100-foot [1] - 188:13</p> <p>11:05 [1] - 220:12</p> <p>12 [1] - 159:8</p> <p>1200 [1] - 185:5</p> <p>122 [1] - 2:15</p> <p>13 [1] - 155:16</p> <p>1369 [1] - 183:10</p> <p>1400 [1] - 183:11</p> <p>141 [4] - 3:6, 209:10, 209:18, 210:16</p> <p>147703 [1] - 222:11</p> <p>15 [4] - 82:18, 133:3, 133:13, 133:17</p> <p>15-foot [1] - 170:16</p> <p>16 [1] - 139:9</p> <p>1600 [1] - 183:12</p> <p>16th [2] - 5:1, 214:1</p> <p>17 [1] - 27:13</p> <p>1738-1742 [1] - 145:13</p> <p>1790 [1] - 183:14</p> <p>1815 [2] - 3:4, 204:12</p> <p>1963 [1] - 155:10</p> <p>1st [1] - 5:15</p>	<p>92:8, 150:15, 151:1, 151:2, 176:6, 177:12, 178:4</p> <p>20-odd [1] - 52:7</p> <p>20-year [1] - 209:7</p> <p>2004 [2] - 182:15, 186:14</p> <p>2009 [1] - 127:12</p> <p>2012 [3] - 125:11, 127:3, 165:11</p> <p>2015 [1] - 2:8</p> <p>2016 [2] - 1:3, 222:8</p> <p>2022 [1] - 222:13</p> <p>204 [2] - 3:3, 3:5</p> <p>209 [1] - 3:7</p> <p>20th [2] - 115:17, 115:18</p> <p>2100 [2] - 183:15, 184:15</p> <p>213 [2] - 3:9, 38:8</p> <p>21st [7] - 24:7, 81:9, 105:11, 106:9, 106:18, 115:17, 178:17</p> <p>23 [1] - 48:5</p> <p>23rd [1] - 214:1</p> <p>24 [2] - 43:8, 55:3</p> <p>2400 [3] - 183:16, 183:17, 183:18</p> <p>24th [1] - 5:8</p> <p>25 [1] - 150:15</p> <p>25,000 [6] - 17:9, 18:5, 36:12, 52:13, 98:11, 98:13</p> <p>26 [1] - 1:3</p> <p>269 [1] - 42:13</p> <p>26th [1] - 4:4</p> <p>27th [1] - 24:6</p> <p>28 [1] - 151:2</p> <p>29 [1] - 222:13</p> <p>29th [1] - 222:8</p> <p>2nd [2] - 4:13, 214:1</p>	<p>4</p> <p>4 [4] - 2:3, 28:3, 31:15, 45:14</p> <p>4,000 [3] - 184:2, 186:18, 189:15</p> <p>4.4 [1] - 9:4</p> <p>4.5 [2] - 10:13, 33:2</p> <p>40 [6] - 133:2, 150:10, 176:2, 178:4, 185:11, 200:12</p> <p>4300 [1] - 184:3</p> <p>45 [5] - 134:3, 145:3, 162:9, 191:13, 198:14</p> <p>45-foot [1] - 129:6</p> <p>49.13 [1] - 170:15</p> <p>5</p> <p>5 [3] - 11:4, 11:15, 28:3</p> <p>5,000 [18] - 137:11, 146:15, 147:3, 147:5, 169:12, 169:14, 172:17, 174:13, 175:10, 175:18, 184:5, 184:7, 184:10, 185:12, 187:9, 189:11, 201:5, 201:7</p> <p>5,000-foot [1] - 181:3</p> <p>5.2 [2] - 33:12, 34:9</p> <p>5.3 [2] - 28:13, 34:18</p> <p>50 [8] - 145:3, 145:4, 158:3, 170:13, 185:12, 199:1, 199:5, 200:12</p> <p>50,000 [8] - 17:8, 17:9, 18:4, 36:10, 90:6, 93:11, 93:13, 98:10</p> <p>50-foot [8] - 143:5, 146:6, 172:18, 173:10, 176:18, 198:8, 200:8, 200:10</p> <p>52 [2] - 82:8, 156:4</p> <p>580 [1] - 183:7</p> <p>5:30 [1] - 5:9</p>	<p>6.11 [1] - 29:3</p> <p>6.3 [4] - 16:15, 36:18, 98:9, 109:12</p> <p>6.6 [2] - 19:7, 37:7</p> <p>6.7 [2] - 18:11, 44:8</p> <p>617.786.7783/617.639.0396 [1] - 1:18</p> <p>64-66 [1] - 155:11</p> <p>64.09 [1] - 206:16</p> <p>675 [2] - 3:8, 213:3</p> <p>7</p> <p>7 [3] - 2:8, 45:18, 149:17</p> <p>700 [1] - 184:17</p> <p>75 [2] - 133:1, 150:9</p> <p>7:00 [1] - 2:6</p> <p>7:10 [1] - 1:4</p> <p>8</p> <p>8 [3] - 2:8, 198:11, 198:17</p> <p>8/1 [1] - 155:5</p> <p>83 [1] - 158:18</p> <p>84 [1] - 24:4</p> <p>8:00 [1] - 2:10</p> <p>9</p> <p>9 [1] - 51:15</p> <p>900 [1] - 183:8</p> <p>9059-2015 [1] - 3:4</p> <p>9073-2015 [1] - 3:6</p> <p>9089-2015 [1] - 3:8</p>	<p>accept [1] - 65:9</p> <p>acceptable [1] - 171:13</p> <p>access [3] - 118:6, 142:11, 142:18</p> <p>accessibility [1] - 41:13</p> <p>accessory [1] - 138:12</p> <p>accommodate [5] - 133:16, 195:1, 195:5, 206:9, 208:1</p> <p>accommodating [1] - 133:8</p> <p>accomplish [3] - 164:14, 199:17, 212:18</p> <p>accomplished [1] - 168:8</p> <p>accordance [1] - 121:1</p> <p>accountability [1] - 113:12</p> <p>accurate [2] - 221:16, 222:6</p> <p>accurately [1] - 44:5</p> <p>achievable [1] - 55:11</p> <p>achieve [1] - 67:7</p> <p>acknowledge [2] - 59:17, 164:5</p> <p>act [2] - 13:10, 16:8</p> <p>acting [1] - 33:18</p> <p>activation [1] - 141:15</p> <p>active [5] - 130:11, 135:12, 136:5, 185:13, 185:16</p> <p>activity [4] - 130:8, 130:14, 131:8, 157:11</p> <p>acts [1] - 75:18</p> <p>actual [3] - 7:3, 11:13, 207:15</p> <p>add [12] - 3:5, 3:7, 3:9, 18:9, 33:7, 55:17, 61:9, 99:10, 112:11, 144:9, 144:11, 197:2</p> <p>added [3] - 12:16, 202:2, 206:4</p> <p>adding [1] - 26:15</p> <p>addition [2] - 4:12, 126:2</p> <p>additional [5] - 30:2, 72:10, 126:3, 128:11, 206:4</p> <p>additions [2] - 17:7, 214:15</p> <p>address [3] - 7:6, 20:11, 23:5</p> <p>addressed [2] - 126:7, 138:2</p>
<p>2</p> <p>2 [1] - 86:12</p> <p>2,000 [11] - 146:18, 147:14, 169:12, 175:11, 175:17, 180:10, 183:3, 186:17, 187:4, 189:15</p> <p>2.38 [1] - 150:6</p> <p>20 [9] - 52:6, 82:18,</p>	<p>3</p> <p>3 [1] - 169:9</p> <p>3,000 [9] - 180:11, 181:3, 184:1, 187:18, 188:2, 189:7, 190:1, 201:2, 201:8</p> <p>3-D [4] - 81:12, 82:18, 91:12, 94:16</p> <p>3.25 [1] - 152:8</p> <p>30 [2] - 20:16, 178:4</p> <p>3200 [1] - 184:8</p> <p>344 [1] - 1:5</p> <p>35 [1] - 163:7</p> <p>3rd [2] - 5:8, 24:7</p>	<p>6</p> <p>6 [4] - 2:5, 15:4, 168:18, 192:1</p> <p>6,000 [1] - 184:9</p> <p>6.1 [2] - 15:7, 35:15</p> <p>6.10 [2] - 21:3, 37:8</p>	<p>A</p> <p>A-2 [2] - 200:4, 203:9</p> <p>ability [6] - 39:14, 42:1, 64:6, 88:16, 189:18, 194:7</p> <p>able [24] - 21:11, 22:9, 22:10, 24:13, 28:8, 34:14, 34:16, 35:16, 36:8, 37:10, 41:8, 44:14, 57:11, 67:7, 74:18, 92:6, 112:17, 113:5, 117:8, 118:1, 149:1, 152:12, 169:5, 176:9</p> <p>ably [1] - 153:13</p> <p>absent [1] - 164:11</p> <p>absolutely [3] - 26:4, 52:12, 85:12</p> <p>abutting [4] - 35:3, 51:18, 52:1, 99:6</p>	

<p>addressing [1] - 173:6</p> <p>adequate [2] - 80:15, 87:15</p> <p>adhere [1] - 128:18</p> <p>adheres [1] - 129:6</p> <p>adjourned [1] - 220:6</p> <p>Adjourned [1] - 220:13</p> <p>adjusted [1] - 134:17</p> <p>administration [1] - 72:11</p> <p>adopt [7] - 121:5, 123:8, 146:2, 165:13, 191:16, 198:10, 198:17</p> <p>adopted [3] - 121:12, 125:11, 150:8</p> <p>adopting [1] - 165:12</p> <p>Adoption [1] - 2:5</p> <p>adopts [1] - 123:10</p> <p>advance [6] - 19:6, 27:18, 41:7, 47:6, 58:4, 66:5</p> <p>advanced [2] - 41:9, 41:17</p> <p>advantage [1] - 81:17</p> <p>advantageous [1] - 88:3</p> <p>advertised [1] - 168:3</p> <p>advertisement [1] - 197:10</p> <p>advice [1] - 126:15</p> <p>advise [2] - 10:6, 167:14</p> <p>advised [1] - 121:12</p> <p>advising [1] - 121:11</p> <p>advocacy [1] - 88:3</p> <p>advocate [2] - 78:15, 101:13</p> <p>aerial [1] - 83:18</p> <p>affect [1] - 144:3</p> <p>affected [2] - 27:3, 28:11</p> <p>affects [2] - 149:13, 162:3</p> <p>affirmatively [1] - 47:10</p> <p>affordability [2] - 148:16, 149:4</p> <p>affordable [4] - 5:4, 155:8, 174:18, 175:3</p> <p>affordably [1] - 156:7</p> <p>afternoon [3] - 25:18, 26:3, 65:15</p> <p>afterwards [1] - 45:3</p> <p>Agassiz [1] - 174:17</p> <p>age [1] - 106:12</p> <p>Agea [1] - 213:7</p> <p>agenda [7] - 4:13, 5:2,</p>	<p>33:4, 39:5, 100:1, 103:12, 118:3</p> <p>agendas [2] - 112:15, 118:6</p> <p>agent [1] - 156:4</p> <p>aggregate [1] - 18:14</p> <p>Agissiz [2] - 153:10, 153:11</p> <p>ago [9] - 49:4, 60:9, 82:8, 82:18, 117:7, 140:5, 163:7, 191:13</p> <p>agree [24] - 48:6, 60:17, 61:2, 65:18, 66:8, 78:16, 80:12, 86:2, 87:10, 92:14, 95:7, 108:3, 154:6, 161:17, 162:14, 173:9, 173:12, 175:14, 175:16, 179:11, 179:16, 182:4, 187:11, 216:12</p> <p>agree [1] - 190:5</p> <p>agreed [3] - 93:18, 155:3</p> <p>ahead [3] - 4:17, 54:11, 73:4</p> <p>AHMED [12] - 23:11, 67:9, 75:13, 78:9, 90:3, 91:9, 96:16, 97:3, 99:9, 109:8, 109:10, 110:12</p> <p>Ahmed [2] - 1:10, 75:12</p> <p>Aid [4] - 145:15, 147:4, 161:13, 185:17</p> <p>Aids [2] - 175:1, 176:11</p> <p>aiming [1] - 125:15</p> <p>ain't [1] - 157:8</p> <p>air [3] - 101:18, 103:5, 139:16</p> <p>al [2] - 2:10, 122:12</p> <p>Al [1] - 163:6</p> <p>allocated [1] - 150:10</p> <p>allow [6] - 20:6, 75:4, 107:8, 138:10, 189:15, 193:13</p> <p>allowable [2] - 17:11, 150:4</p> <p>allowed [5] - 131:11, 134:14, 137:9, 196:8, 196:9</p> <p>allowing [1] - 152:1</p> <p>allows [2] - 138:12, 162:11</p> <p>almost [3] - 10:2, 139:18, 166:2</p> <p>alone [1] - 149:10</p>	<p>alter [1] - 116:11</p> <p>alterations [1] - 137:2</p> <p>alternative [1] - 79:16</p> <p>amazing [1] - 143:17</p> <p>amen [1] - 105:3</p> <p>amend [3] - 8:12, 167:4, 167:5</p> <p>amended [2] - 12:4, 197:6</p> <p>amending [1] - 199:18</p> <p>amendment [1] - 192:4</p> <p>Amendment [1] - 166:16</p> <p>amount [5] - 71:3, 106:3, 193:2, 193:9, 193:17</p> <p>amplifying [1] - 115:15</p> <p>analysis [2] - 63:6, 65:1</p> <p>analyze [1] - 67:16</p> <p>AND [1] - 221:1</p> <p>AND/OR [1] - 222:15</p> <p>Anderson [1] - 205:10</p> <p>anew [1] - 2:11</p> <p>angle [1] - 86:4</p> <p>animal [1] - 73:18</p> <p>answer [4] - 108:9, 119:11, 126:1, 138:16</p> <p>antenna [15] - 204:14, 205:5, 205:7, 205:18, 207:9, 208:17, 210:18, 211:2, 211:3, 211:6, 211:11, 214:7, 214:9, 214:10, 215:2</p> <p>antennas [30] - 3:5, 3:7, 3:9, 204:9, 204:11, 204:17, 205:16, 206:3, 206:5, 206:6, 206:10, 207:2, 207:3, 207:5, 207:12, 207:15, 210:17, 211:7, 211:8, 211:18, 212:4, 212:7, 214:12, 215:6, 216:10, 216:17, 218:5, 218:9, 219:17</p> <p>anxious [1] - 121:6</p> <p>ANY [2] - 222:14, 222:15</p> <p>anyway [2] - 181:2, 219:5</p> <p>apartment [2] - 93:17,</p>	<p>156:15</p> <p>apartments [2] - 156:6, 156:12</p> <p>apologize [1] - 122:8</p> <p>Appeal [1] - 3:3</p> <p>appealing [1] - 87:2</p> <p>Appeals [1] - 75:18</p> <p>appearing [1] - 166:11</p> <p>apples [1] - 187:6</p> <p>applicable [1] - 192:14</p> <p>applicant [16] - 17:14, 28:7, 29:5, 30:11, 32:11, 32:14, 34:11, 37:4, 58:2, 61:14, 79:8, 79:15, 80:11, 86:12, 86:13, 88:2</p> <p>applicant's [2] - 16:16, 109:13</p> <p>applicants [2] - 121:11, 204:16</p> <p>application [18] - 11:5, 11:10, 11:16, 12:6, 12:12, 14:1, 27:1, 43:17, 45:10, 47:2, 47:3, 67:15, 68:4, 86:14, 87:3, 95:16, 156:18, 217:3</p> <p>applications [2] - 79:7, 210:5</p> <p>applied [1] - 171:9</p> <p>applies [5] - 11:9, 170:2, 200:1, 200:2, 203:9</p> <p>apply [5] - 125:9, 132:4, 132:8, 136:6, 193:16</p> <p>APPLY [1] - 222:14</p> <p>applying [3] - 5:12, 170:3, 199:15</p> <p>appointed [1] - 124:5</p> <p>appreciate [8] - 37:15, 59:2, 64:18, 102:12, 104:8, 147:17, 181:12, 203:18</p> <p>approach [5] - 65:2, 70:9, 138:6, 168:5, 200:5</p> <p>approaches [1] - 70:3</p> <p>appropriate [11] - 9:16, 16:10, 21:13, 87:15, 104:6, 125:7, 134:15, 145:6, 161:4, 179:3, 179:13</p> <p>approval [3] - 2:6, 37:2, 206:15</p> <p>approve [3] - 195:18,</p>	<p>199:4, 200:15</p> <p>approved [4] - 14:12, 30:10, 91:18, 120:4</p> <p>april [1] - 222:13</p> <p>arbitrary [1] - 19:1</p> <p>architect [3] - 52:17, 83:7, 84:5</p> <p>architects [4] - 52:2, 81:11, 82:2, 92:16</p> <p>architecture [3] - 52:10, 154:7, 178:18</p> <p>area [22] - 44:8, 127:16, 128:2, 128:5, 128:12, 128:17, 129:3, 129:18, 134:8, 134:15, 136:1, 148:6, 150:17, 151:10, 156:7, 157:5, 178:12, 186:15, 194:12, 194:13, 199:16, 201:3</p> <p>areas [5] - 17:8, 73:13, 131:5, 137:8, 146:8</p> <p>argument [1] - 79:16</p> <p>arranged [1] - 155:12</p> <p>arranging [1] - 20:5</p> <p>array [2] - 208:17, 210:16</p> <p>Articles [1] - 191:17</p> <p>Ashburton [1] - 31:15</p> <p>aside [2] - 132:13, 134:8</p> <p>aspects [1] - 60:13</p> <p>aspiration [1] - 67:2</p> <p>aspirations [1] - 66:17</p> <p>assistance [1] - 41:18</p> <p>Assistant [1] - 1:12</p> <p>Associate [1] - 1:10</p> <p>assume [1] - 121:10</p> <p>assuming [2] - 59:10, 115:2</p> <p>astute [1] - 142:3</p> <p>AT&T [9] - 204:17, 205:12, 207:5, 208:16, 210:16, 211:1, 211:14</p> <p>attach [1] - 82:12</p> <p>attached [2] - 76:4, 136:11</p> <p>attachment [1] - 150:1</p> <p>attempt [2] - 54:9, 145:6</p> <p>attend [3] - 44:3, 68:16, 204:6</p> <p>attendance [1] - 42:5</p>
---	--	--	---	--

<p>attended [4] - 45:11, 47:5, 73:10, 158:3</p> <p>attendees [1] - 34:11</p> <p>attending [1] - 74:4</p> <p>attention [5] - 31:11, 49:1, 50:12, 102:5, 151:14</p> <p>Attorney [1] - 107:6</p> <p>ATTORNEY [22] - 51:10, 145:10, 198:4, 205:8, 207:4, 207:14, 208:9, 209:12, 210:15, 211:13, 212:1, 212:5, 212:12, 214:5, 215:9, 216:16, 217:16, 218:7, 218:9, 218:14, 218:18, 219:3</p> <p>attractive [1] - 179:4</p> <p>Auburn [2] - 5:3, 184:2</p> <p>audible [1] - 204:3</p> <p>audience [1] - 5:11</p> <p>AUDIENCE [5] - 38:2, 154:10, 215:4, 215:11, 216:6</p> <p>Authority [1] - 160:16</p> <p>authority [1] - 8:5</p> <p>authorizes [1] - 119:18</p> <p>available [15] - 2:13, 9:17, 15:15, 37:9, 47:5, 48:1, 52:4, 54:8, 61:12, 63:18, 64:10, 64:12, 151:17, 175:4, 186:10</p> <p>availing [1] - 68:9</p> <p>Ave [55] - 91:18, 122:4, 125:10, 125:13, 126:7, 127:1, 127:15, 127:17, 128:8, 128:17, 129:16, 129:17, 130:10, 132:3, 132:13, 135:3, 135:18, 136:16, 137:6, 137:10, 137:15, 141:14, 142:8, 145:13, 145:15, 146:2, 146:3, 146:10, 146:16, 148:5, 149:18, 150:17, 153:14, 156:2, 156:9, 163:8, 165:1, 165:5, 165:12, 168:9, 168:16, 177:2, 177:8, 183:16,</p>	<p>186:11, 194:12, 195:8, 199:15, 200:14, 201:3, 201:5, 201:6, 202:12, 202:18, 213:5</p> <p>Ave. [1] - 153:10</p> <p>Avenue [12] - 2:12, 2:13, 3:4, 3:8, 24:4, 51:15, 139:12, 140:14, 160:1, 169:12, 204:12, 213:4</p> <p>avenue [10] - 164:1, 164:6, 165:2, 165:9, 165:15, 166:4, 171:10, 172:3, 173:10, 174:1</p> <p>aware [1] - 116:10</p> <p>B</p> <p>baby [1] - 49:10</p> <p>BACCI [32] - 58:14, 58:17, 93:1, 93:3, 93:10, 93:18, 94:4, 94:13, 95:1, 96:9, 96:18, 97:13, 99:7, 114:8, 118:14, 118:16, 120:1, 120:12, 120:16, 182:4, 188:15, 189:3, 192:8, 192:12, 196:17, 198:2, 205:4, 210:11, 211:17, 217:12, 219:5, 219:10</p> <p>Bacci [1] - 1:9</p> <p>background [1] - 125:17</p> <p>bad [4] - 64:5, 161:13, 180:7, 187:13</p> <p>badly [2] - 171:8, 181:6</p> <p>bakery [1] - 154:16</p> <p>balance [8] - 34:3, 73:17, 163:16, 163:18, 165:7, 166:3, 166:4, 175:6</p> <p>balancing [3] - 13:10, 16:8, 103:7</p> <p>ball [1] - 98:5</p> <p>band [2] - 212:10, 212:16</p> <p>banded [1] - 208:7</p> <p>Bank [1] - 213:7</p> <p>base [6] - 138:1, 138:4, 168:10, 196:9, 202:13, 203:8</p>	<p>based [7] - 77:4, 77:5, 110:7, 112:12, 168:6, 180:3, 180:9</p> <p>basement [6] - 93:17, 186:15, 187:1, 187:5, 189:8, 189:9</p> <p>basic [2] - 98:16, 125:12</p> <p>basics [1] - 49:7</p> <p>basis [4] - 66:16, 68:3, 119:18, 189:13</p> <p>bear [1] - 35:8</p> <p>beautiful [3] - 48:10, 141:18, 177:6</p> <p>became [1] - 82:14</p> <p>become [3] - 36:5, 116:10, 151:4</p> <p>becomes [1] - 60:2</p> <p>becoming [1] - 149:5</p> <p>beep [1] - 102:11</p> <p>beforehand [1] - 64:8</p> <p>beg [1] - 41:2</p> <p>beginning [1] - 30:3</p> <p>behalf [1] - 205:10</p> <p>behind [5] - 164:2, 166:3, 186:1, 194:3, 217:15</p> <p>below [5] - 146:15, 182:18, 186:3, 194:4, 206:4</p> <p>beneficial [1] - 91:5</p> <p>benefit [3] - 33:9, 33:16, 34:4</p> <p>Bent's [1] - 157:14</p> <p>BENTLEY [1] - 141:10</p> <p>Bentley [2] - 37:18, 141:11</p> <p>best [1] - 33:18</p> <p>Beth [1] - 63:1</p> <p>better [16] - 13:15, 20:14, 38:12, 38:16, 43:2, 43:6, 88:11, 104:13, 117:17, 128:13, 130:13, 152:3, 217:1, 217:6, 217:10</p> <p>between [13] - 7:3, 17:9, 18:5, 31:17, 37:8, 43:4, 107:11, 114:18, 129:18, 131:16, 146:9, 163:18, 186:14</p> <p>beyond [3] - 16:1, 93:13, 95:14</p> <p>big [4] - 48:17, 64:18, 120:3, 158:6</p> <p>bigger [5] - 78:18, 80:17, 94:15, 175:12, 185:5</p> <p>biggest [1] - 178:8</p>	<p>Bigolin [1] - 1:15</p> <p>BIGOLIN [2] - 218:5, 218:8</p> <p>bird's [1] - 84:18</p> <p>bird's-eye [1] - 84:18</p> <p>Bishop [1] - 48:13</p> <p>bit [27] - 6:14, 11:15, 19:1, 34:10, 35:1, 36:15, 45:14, 60:2, 69:15, 71:11, 71:18, 90:7, 102:10, 117:16, 119:10, 131:1, 131:2, 132:11, 134:17, 135:9, 137:7, 137:12, 161:11, 180:10, 212:2, 217:1</p> <p>blend [1] - 216:14</p> <p>blind [1] - 41:1</p> <p>block [2] - 84:4, 111:3</p> <p>blocks [1] - 148:6</p> <p>blue [1] - 156:10</p> <p>BOARD [1] - 1:1</p> <p>board [1] - 86:13</p> <p>Board [91] - 2:6, 3:3, 4:5, 4:8, 6:13, 6:17, 7:12, 8:18, 9:5, 9:8, 10:3, 10:11, 13:17, 14:1, 14:7, 14:16, 15:3, 16:8, 19:10, 20:17, 21:6, 21:7, 21:12, 23:4, 24:3, 25:1, 25:12, 27:15, 28:5, 30:16, 30:18, 31:2, 34:13, 35:18, 38:10, 41:11, 42:16, 44:6, 45:5, 45:9, 46:14, 49:9, 53:1, 53:2, 55:6, 58:7, 59:10, 61:14, 66:11, 73:17, 75:18, 76:1, 81:18, 86:8, 88:16, 90:18, 92:14, 106:5, 113:1, 113:13, 116:2, 118:7, 123:6, 123:8, 125:4, 125:5, 126:14, 126:15, 145:11, 166:12, 167:14, 168:1, 169:10, 179:1, 182:14, 190:11, 190:13, 195:10, 195:13, 195:14, 195:17, 196:6, 199:11, 200:15, 202:15, 203:1, 205:9, 220:13, 221:6, 221:15</p> <p>Board's [2] - 10:18, 112:15</p> <p>Boards [2] - 9:13,</p>	<p>14:16</p> <p>boat [1] - 165:11</p> <p>body [1] - 123:10</p> <p>bona [1] - 108:14</p> <p>book [1] - 144:6</p> <p>Bookstore [1] - 184:9</p> <p>Boston [3] - 75:17, 77:7, 149:2</p> <p>bothered [1] - 59:11</p> <p>bouncing [1] - 49:15</p> <p>BRA [1] - 75:18</p> <p>BRAIN [1] - 207:14</p> <p>brainer [1] - 117:2</p> <p>bread [1] - 29:11</p> <p>break [6] - 122:2, 207:12, 207:16, 212:15, 212:16</p> <p>breaking [1] - 212:10</p> <p>BRIAN [18] - 205:8, 207:4, 208:9, 209:12, 210:15, 211:13, 212:1, 212:5, 212:12, 214:5, 215:9, 216:16, 217:16, 218:7, 218:9, 218:14, 218:18, 219:3</p> <p>Brian [1] - 205:9</p> <p>brick [2] - 208:6, 212:10</p> <p>bridge [1] - 143:9</p> <p>brief [3] - 6:11, 27:17, 127:1</p> <p>briefly [2] - 7:14, 126:1</p> <p>bring [13] - 26:13, 32:11, 91:15, 109:11, 116:18, 120:4, 121:1, 130:7, 142:7, 148:9, 150:5, 160:18, 182:11</p> <p>bringing [1] - 196:3</p> <p>brings [4] - 190:17, 198:11, 200:7, 200:9</p> <p>BRISTOL [1] - 222:3</p> <p>broad [3] - 5:16, 6:4, 78:2</p> <p>broader [2] - 42:5, 107:17</p> <p>Broadway [2] - 1:5, 210:2</p> <p>brought [9] - 35:8, 88:17, 122:11, 137:17, 149:7, 151:13, 163:5, 173:7, 191:11</p> <p>budget [1] - 51:4</p> <p>build [8] - 84:14, 104:15, 111:4,</p>
--	---	---	--	--

<p>113:12, 153:18, 157:4, 163:8, 180:14 builder [1] - 82:15 building [46] - 48:17, 77:11, 91:18, 94:2, 97:15, 98:18, 120:10, 131:16, 132:5, 133:1, 133:3, 135:17, 136:11, 137:4, 154:1, 156:9, 156:16, 157:13, 170:15, 171:11, 171:13, 178:3, 178:16, 179:12, 180:13, 194:2, 194:4, 196:3, 200:11, 204:13, 205:1, 205:3, 205:17, 207:6, 208:17, 208:18, 210:1, 211:5, 213:6, 213:7, 213:10, 213:13, 214:8, 214:14, 216:10, 217:15 buildings [35] - 17:7, 36:12, 52:15, 94:12, 96:4, 96:12, 119:6, 119:9, 130:4, 132:10, 136:1, 136:7, 136:10, 136:17, 137:3, 140:15, 152:6, 159:9, 159:12, 163:15, 164:5, 164:8, 164:10, 164:11, 170:14, 174:2, 177:4, 177:7, 177:16, 178:13, 178:14, 181:16, 197:5, 202:2, 202:3 built [6] - 82:9, 136:10, 150:16, 156:6, 179:2, 187:12 bump [1] - 160:1 bunch [3] - 39:18, 50:3, 113:4 burdening [1] - 108:16 business [5] - 29:8, 33:2, 34:12, 36:1, 81:10 BUSINESS [1] - 2:2 Business [4] - 2:7, 3:2, 200:4, 203:9 businesses [3] - 158:11, 164:1, 164:16 butter [1] - 29:11 button [1] - 102:11</p>	<p>buy [3] - 83:3, 175:9, 220:1 buying [1] - 111:2 by-right [1] - 153:18 BZA [4] - 33:3, 33:10, 75:17, 204:10</p> <hr/> <p>C</p> <p>CAD [2] - 82:17, 82:18 cafe [1] - 183:8 calendar [1] - 55:4 Cambodian [2] - 185:3, 185:4 CAMBRIDGE [1] - 1:1 Cambridge [11] - 1:6, 5:13, 77:11, 77:12, 127:12, 141:12, 160:15, 162:17, 174:14, 176:13, 217:3 camera [1] - 82:12 cancellations [1] - 7:3 cannot [1] - 212:5 capacity [1] - 112:12 cape [1] - 134:7 capture [1] - 134:6 captured [1] - 44:5 CAPTURING [1] - 1:17 card [1] - 149:3 cardboard [2] - 97:11, 98:3 care [2] - 43:12, 43:13 carefully [1] - 86:18 Carlone [6] - 51:13, 51:15, 78:17, 160:6, 163:17, 185:8 CARLONE [3] - 51:14, 160:7, 185:9 carriage [1] - 163:11 cars [1] - 155:1 case [7] - 28:8, 33:3, 65:9, 71:1, 86:1, 133:12, 193:11 Cases [1] - 3:3 cases [6] - 63:11, 72:2, 167:18, 204:8, 204:10 catch [1] - 59:14 CATHERINE [16] - 31:8, 90:16, 101:6, 101:9, 105:3, 121:9, 121:18, 158:8, 174:10, 189:4, 192:10, 192:16, 193:1, 193:4, 195:6, 197:14 Catherine [5] - 1:7, 7:16, 174:9, 222:4,</p>	<p>222:10 CCTV [1] - 118:11 CDD [54] - 4:15, 11:16, 12:2, 15:9, 17:14, 22:15, 27:14, 30:12, 35:16, 35:17, 36:5, 36:7, 38:13, 39:11, 42:1, 42:17, 43:4, 43:7, 44:12, 46:7, 46:13, 47:12, 48:6, 53:14, 54:7, 56:16, 57:2, 57:4, 58:5, 58:17, 59:7, 59:16, 59:18, 60:2, 60:9, 60:13, 60:18, 63:17, 64:10, 64:12, 66:13, 68:14, 68:16, 71:17, 72:2, 72:5, 72:7, 72:9, 77:16, 104:2, 110:14, 114:2, 121:10, 179:1 cellphones [1] - 220:1 Center [3] - 4:18, 220:6, 220:9 central [2] - 59:8, 60:2 Central [5] - 4:18, 183:5, 183:8, 183:11, 183:17 century [7] - 81:9, 105:11, 106:9, 106:18, 115:17, 115:18, 178:17 certain [16] - 12:16, 14:17, 18:12, 21:16, 22:12, 67:3, 98:12, 107:6, 110:6, 110:9, 112:8, 118:12, 166:17, 193:2, 193:3, 193:6 certainly [8] - 23:9, 62:10, 70:14, 72:12, 75:9, 80:9, 114:16, 208:1 CERTIFICATION [1] - 222:14 Certified [2] - 222:4, 222:11 certify [1] - 222:5 CERTIFYING [1] - 222:15 chain [1] - 175:2 chains [1] - 164:18 Chair [10] - 1:7, 1:7, 15:10, 16:2, 16:7, 62:18, 100:14, 104:5, 105:9, 125:4 chair [14] - 4:11, 61:8, 67:9, 85:14, 90:3, 93:1, 109:8, 115:13, 118:14, 145:11, 167:8, 182:12,</p>	<p>189:5, 204:2 Chair's [1] - 100:3 Chairman [2] - 24:3, 205:9 Chairs [2] - 124:4, 124:6 challenge [1] - 66:12 challenging [1] - 142:18 chance [7] - 22:13, 27:17, 28:7, 113:15, 126:12, 143:1, 165:13 Chancy [1] - 122:14 change [28] - 12:2, 13:6, 15:5, 23:2, 26:8, 27:15, 30:10, 58:10, 64:16, 64:18, 78:6, 84:13, 97:17, 99:1, 118:3, 120:3, 128:11, 143:16, 148:11, 167:4, 167:5, 171:3, 173:15, 176:6, 176:7, 203:8, 211:18, 221:6 CHANGE [6] - 221:8, 221:9, 221:10, 221:11, 221:12, 221:13 changed [9] - 14:18, 19:8, 26:8, 29:13, 29:15, 100:11, 110:11, 129:14, 155:5 changes [23] - 7:12, 7:14, 22:14, 26:10, 26:13, 28:11, 29:5, 30:9, 30:13, 46:5, 114:14, 115:5, 119:2, 119:7, 120:6, 123:4, 123:5, 132:2, 134:9, 134:11, 137:2, 142:17, 221:16 changing [4] - 8:12, 29:14, 144:4, 178:2 character [9] - 128:12, 131:3, 133:9, 134:7, 134:12, 136:4, 136:13, 165:18, 172:3 characteristic [2] - 130:5, 217:17 characteristics [1] - 185:16 charging [1] - 142:1 Charles [2] - 48:3, 48:4 CHARLES [2] - 48:4,</p>	<p>51:5 CHARLOTTE [1] - 163:3 Charlotte [1] - 163:3 Chauncy/Everett [2] - 2:11, 122:15 checking [1] - 47:12 cherish [1] - 175:7 Chong [1] - 184:13 Church [1] - 163:8 Cingular [1] - 205:11 circulatory [1] - 150:13 circumstance [2] - 19:13, 19:16 circumstances [11] - 15:14, 18:3, 67:6, 79:13, 80:6, 87:11, 87:13, 110:7, 112:8, 193:6, 195:14 cite [1] - 152:5 cited [1] - 210:5 cities [2] - 72:13, 75:16 citizen's [2] - 146:9, 146:17 city [19] - 53:4, 63:14, 76:1, 76:9, 111:10, 116:3, 116:12, 131:2, 134:4, 139:14, 148:15, 151:10, 153:5, 155:18, 166:5, 171:7, 178:17, 193:9, 209:1 CITY [1] - 1:1 City [23] - 1:12, 7:17, 9:7, 9:12, 10:6, 21:8, 26:8, 105:5, 107:9, 116:16, 118:3, 123:9, 123:14, 124:1, 124:13, 139:18, 154:5, 155:4, 165:11, 166:18, 170:6, 190:18, 210:9 citywide [2] - 172:2, 173:3 civil [1] - 108:7 claiming [1] - 108:11 clarification [1] - 170:2 clarify [3] - 170:9, 201:11 clarifying [2] - 10:14, 170:7 Cleaners [1] - 184:3 clear [18] - 9:5, 15:6, 21:3, 31:4, 31:7, 54:1, 62:14, 63:5,</p>
---	---	--	---	--

<p>65:6, 67:8, 92:12, 115:10, 170:10, 170:16, 170:17, 171:11, 187:4, 190:13</p> <p>clearcut [2] - 58:1, 167:3</p> <p>clearly [3] - 65:15, 147:5, 198:16</p> <p>clock [9] - 46:11, 50:18, 101:14, 102:6, 104:17, 105:2, 105:6, 105:7, 105:18</p> <p>close [4] - 23:18, 49:1, 50:12, 162:13</p> <p>closer [3] - 15:15, 103:17, 208:7</p> <p>closes [1] - 21:8</p> <p>closest [1] - 203:6</p> <p>clouds [1] - 217:15</p> <p>co [1] - 126:10</p> <p>co-petitioners [1] - 126:10</p> <p>coffee [2] - 175:9, 183:11</p> <p>COHEN [186] - 4:3, 6:7, 6:10, 23:7, 23:9, 23:12, 27:11, 31:12, 33:13, 37:16, 38:3, 42:10, 46:16, 47:15, 51:3, 51:7, 51:11, 53:9, 53:12, 55:18, 56:3, 56:18, 58:16, 60:4, 60:8, 62:15, 65:4, 66:7, 68:13, 73:4, 74:2, 75:8, 75:11, 78:10, 78:14, 81:6, 82:5, 85:4, 85:14, 85:16, 85:17, 88:5, 90:15, 92:3, 93:2, 93:6, 93:12, 94:1, 94:6, 94:14, 94:18, 95:11, 96:1, 96:13, 97:4, 97:6, 98:4, 99:3, 99:10, 99:14, 99:16, 100:2, 100:9, 101:8, 105:7, 105:18, 107:5, 107:15, 109:9, 110:4, 110:13, 114:3, 114:9, 115:13, 115:14, 115:15, 116:15, 116:18, 117:3, 117:13, 118:10, 118:15, 119:12, 120:2, 120:14, 120:17, 121:15, 122:1, 122:7, 123:18, 124:7, 125:1, 141:6,</p>	<p>145:8, 148:2, 152:11, 153:6, 159:2, 159:6, 160:4, 163:1, 166:7, 166:10, 168:11, 172:10, 172:13, 173:4, 174:9, 175:13, 179:6, 179:15, 179:16, 182:3, 182:8, 183:1, 184:12, 184:18, 185:2, 185:7, 186:8, 187:8, 188:4, 188:8, 188:10, 189:1, 190:3, 190:6, 190:16, 191:7, 191:12, 192:3, 192:4, 192:14, 192:18, 194:5, 195:2, 195:11, 196:15, 197:1, 197:11, 197:15, 197:17, 198:3, 198:12, 199:2, 199:4, 199:6, 199:7, 199:8, 200:7, 201:14, 202:5, 203:3, 203:5, 203:10, 203:13, 203:14, 204:4, 205:2, 205:6, 207:11, 208:3, 208:12, 208:13, 208:14, 209:5, 209:16, 210:7, 210:13, 211:10, 211:15, 212:3, 212:8, 212:9, 213:1, 213:2, 213:15, 214:4, 216:12, 218:1, 218:12, 219:12, 219:15, 220:2, 220:5, 220:10</p> <p>Cohen [5] - 1:7, 1:9, 5:7, 49:12, 123:16</p> <p>colleagues [1] - 68:6</p> <p>College [1] - 153:15</p> <p>color [4] - 156:11, 215:1, 216:15, 218:13</p> <p>colors [1] - 51:1</p> <p>comfortable [4] - 69:7, 189:2, 190:3, 191:3</p> <p>comic [1] - 49:6</p> <p>coming [5] - 5:14, 22:2, 33:10, 122:2, 140:14</p> <p>comment [35] - 2:7, 8:16, 8:18, 23:6, 23:10, 24:17, 26:3,</p>	<p>27:17, 28:6, 32:13, 33:6, 33:10, 33:14, 34:6, 35:13, 43:5, 43:11, 44:15, 45:6, 61:6, 63:18, 64:2, 64:11, 64:14, 66:6, 66:7, 74:13, 100:16, 104:16, 105:10, 105:12, 118:2, 123:4, 142:2, 160:8</p> <p>commented [1] - 32:16</p> <p>commenting [1] - 59:18</p> <p>comments [31] - 6:17, 12:16, 17:18, 23:14, 24:10, 25:8, 26:2, 32:2, 32:6, 37:7, 43:6, 46:3, 49:4, 51:16, 53:15, 57:12, 59:6, 59:11, 59:12, 59:18, 60:5, 63:16, 66:4, 67:14, 81:8, 139:3, 172:14, 175:15, 208:12, 213:1</p> <p>commercial [9] - 130:7, 131:12, 132:6, 132:9, 138:14, 141:13, 150:11, 157:17, 193:7</p> <p>Commission [3] - 169:2, 202:1, 222:12</p> <p>commit [1] - 66:14</p> <p>committed [1] - 13:8</p> <p>Committee [7] - 123:13, 124:3, 124:8, 124:14, 161:1, 166:18, 191:1</p> <p>Committee's [1] - 124:13</p> <p>committees [3] - 5:12, 5:18, 6:1</p> <p>common [1] - 40:18</p> <p>COMMONWEALTH [1] - 222:2</p> <p>communities [2] - 107:13, 113:9</p> <p>community [40] - 11:6, 11:11, 11:17, 12:17, 13:6, 13:12, 13:13, 14:10, 22:17, 27:1, 28:8, 28:11, 28:17, 30:2, 31:18, 32:9, 42:18, 43:17, 44:18, 45:1, 45:2, 45:15, 49:8, 71:9, 73:8, 76:5, 77:10, 78:5, 91:5, 106:18,</p>	<p>108:2, 108:12, 108:13, 108:16, 109:1, 113:14, 115:18, 142:15</p> <p>Community [8] - 1:13, 2:3, 4:9, 37:2, 63:1, 108:6, 108:18, 221:3</p> <p>community's [1] - 12:11</p> <p>Company [1] - 183:5</p> <p>company [1] - 30:16</p> <p>company's [1] - 212:4</p> <p>comparison [2] - 134:2, 187:7</p> <p>compensates [1] - 152:14</p> <p>completed [1] - 127:3</p> <p>completely [5] - 12:13, 30:10, 85:1, 151:4, 195:14</p> <p>complex [3] - 79:1, 117:15, 143:12</p> <p>complexity [1] - 80:14</p> <p>compliance [2] - 30:6, 30:7</p> <p>compliant [1] - 206:14</p> <p>comprehensive [1] - 5:3</p> <p>compulsive [1] - 50:16</p> <p>computer [6] - 40:18, 83:14, 86:2, 86:3, 88:10, 115:2</p> <p>computerized [1] - 16:18</p> <p>computers [2] - 52:10, 83:4</p> <p>concept [1] - 178:13</p> <p>conceptual [1] - 167:1</p> <p>concern [9] - 18:8, 33:15, 53:6, 61:16, 62:4, 88:9, 88:13, 95:4, 160:2</p> <p>concerned [6] - 9:4, 37:6, 149:4, 160:11, 160:14, 176:5</p> <p>concerns [2] - 89:4, 159:9</p> <p>concludes [1] - 137:5</p> <p>conclusions [1] - 14:15</p> <p>Concord [1] - 148:5</p> <p>concrete [1] - 212:10</p> <p>conditions [1] - 99:2</p> <p>confer [1] - 201:18</p> <p>configuration [1] - 194:6</p> <p>confirm [2] - 37:17,</p>	<p>113:15</p> <p>confused [2] - 50:17, 72:9</p> <p>confusing [3] - 25:13, 29:16, 109:13</p> <p>confusion [1] - 72:7</p> <p>Connolly [1] - 1:7</p> <p>CONNOLLY [16] - 31:8, 90:16, 101:6, 101:9, 105:3, 121:9, 121:18, 158:8, 174:10, 189:4, 192:10, 192:16, 193:1, 193:4, 195:6, 197:14</p> <p>consecutive [1] - 54:15</p> <p>consensus [1] - 129:12</p> <p>conservative [1] - 142:6</p> <p>consider [6] - 44:14, 47:16, 64:6, 69:18, 125:7, 174:1</p> <p>considerably [1] - 112:16</p> <p>consideration [7] - 33:8, 34:7, 126:9, 146:8, 147:17, 148:10, 172:2</p> <p>considering [6] - 146:1, 146:17, 162:18, 167:15, 174:1, 191:2</p> <p>consistent [1] - 134:7</p> <p>constitute [1] - 31:5</p> <p>constructed [1] - 210:1</p> <p>construction [7] - 17:6, 52:10, 119:6, 178:6, 178:8, 185:10, 186:5</p> <p>constructive [1] - 142:2</p> <p>consultation [2] - 32:2, 77:16</p> <p>consulting [1] - 169:2</p> <p>consuming [1] - 82:2</p> <p>contact [3] - 75:1, 76:6, 77:18</p> <p>containing [1] - 17:7</p> <p>contemplated [1] - 143:16</p> <p>content [2] - 167:10</p> <p>context [3] - 79:2, 97:15, 109:17</p> <p>contextual [3] - 154:7, 158:4, 178:14</p> <p>continuation [1] - 122:11</p>
--	--	---	--	--

<p>continue [7] - 10:1, 22:8, 30:11, 176:7, 176:9, 203:17, 204:5</p> <p>continued [5] - 2:10, 15:8, 15:10, 16:1, 35:10</p> <p>Continued [2] - 2:18, 3:1</p> <p>continuous [1] - 196:13</p> <p>contract [2] - 29:8, 30:6</p> <p>contrast [1] - 219:10</p> <p>contribute [1] - 26:5</p> <p>CONTROL [1] - 222:15</p> <p>control [6] - 29:7, 29:10, 50:14, 114:6, 115:4, 118:18</p> <p>controls [2] - 119:4, 135:10</p> <p>convene [1] - 76:8</p> <p>conventional [1] - 154:1</p> <p>conversation [6] - 75:7, 78:8, 88:7, 142:9, 144:9, 212:13</p> <p>conversations [3] - 78:3, 203:18, 204:5</p> <p>conveyed [1] - 45:10</p> <p>convinced [1] - 177:15</p> <p>cooperative [1] - 155:10</p> <p>coordinate [1] - 30:13</p> <p>core [1] - 171:16</p> <p>corner [5] - 145:14, 156:1, 163:7, 210:2, 213:4</p> <p>correct [6] - 38:2, 51:10, 119:17, 132:14, 199:8, 201:17</p> <p>correction [1] - 221:6</p> <p>corrections [1] - 221:15</p> <p>correspondence [1] - 64:4</p> <p>corridor [1] - 92:7</p> <p>cosigner [1] - 145:1</p> <p>cost [6] - 51:2, 97:11, 149:13, 149:15, 151:9, 153:1</p> <p>costs [1] - 151:6</p> <p>council [1] - 191:5</p> <p>Council [12] - 123:9, 123:14, 124:1, 124:14, 124:15, 124:17, 153:12,</p>	<p>160:13, 166:18, 190:18, 191:6, 191:16</p> <p>Council's [3] - 5:6, 26:8, 118:3</p> <p>councillor [3] - 51:13, 77:2, 160:6</p> <p>Councillor [1] - 185:8</p> <p>COUNCILLOR [3] - 51:14, 160:7, 185:9</p> <p>Councillors [6] - 105:5, 116:16, 140:1, 154:5, 155:4, 165:11</p> <p>councillors [1] - 76:2</p> <p>countdown [3] - 46:11, 50:18, 101:14</p> <p>counteract [2] - 25:2, 132:3</p> <p>couple [16] - 35:7, 46:17, 48:9, 60:9, 99:4, 105:5, 114:5, 121:16, 143:8, 170:17, 175:15, 203:15, 204:6, 206:4, 206:5, 206:8</p> <p>course [8] - 20:17, 25:3, 41:3, 87:4, 101:2, 119:18, 122:5, 196:2</p> <p>Court [2] - 5:3, 20:11</p> <p>court [1] - 20:8</p> <p>cover [2] - 218:6, 218:10</p> <p>crawl [1] - 41:2</p> <p>crazily [1] - 161:15</p> <p>create [9] - 2:11, 32:8, 34:10, 122:13, 130:11, 135:11, 138:10, 144:15, 180:7</p> <p>created [1] - 128:11</p> <p>creating [2] - 136:12, 153:4</p> <p>creation [1] - 135:6</p> <p>credit [1] - 157:2</p> <p>crisis [1] - 148:16</p> <p>criteria [8] - 63:7, 90:18, 91:7, 98:12, 98:14, 110:9, 206:15, 206:16</p> <p>critical [5] - 28:10, 28:14, 29:9, 30:7, 165:17</p> <p>criticism [1] - 105:14</p> <p>cross [1] - 90:17</p> <p>crowd [1] - 165:1</p> <p>crowded [2] - 25:5, 156:14</p> <p>crucial [2] - 66:9,</p>	<p>149:5</p> <p>cube [1] - 84:11</p> <p>cup [1] - 175:9</p> <p>curious [2] - 167:6, 210:4</p> <p>current [6] - 101:10, 112:11, 114:15, 131:9, 146:9, 153:11</p> <p>cut [3] - 21:15, 54:7, 104:12</p> <p>cut-off [2] - 21:15, 54:7</p> <p>cutoff [3] - 25:12, 65:8, 65:10</p> <p>cutting [3] - 25:4, 104:11, 169:11</p> <p>CVS [1] - 161:12</p>	<p>decide [1] - 78:1</p> <p>deciding [1] - 89:10</p> <p>decision [9] - 30:5, 30:8, 30:15, 31:5, 45:8, 45:9, 48:2, 96:15</p> <p>decisions [3] - 38:16, 47:18, 116:11</p> <p>deemed [1] - 12:13</p> <p>deems [1] - 88:3</p> <p>deep [4] - 144:4, 185:5, 185:11, 185:18</p> <p>deeply [1] - 154:17</p> <p>default [5] - 79:5, 79:7, 80:1, 87:16, 180:17</p> <p>defense [2] - 29:7, 30:6</p> <p>defer [4] - 80:7, 87:13, 96:15, 145:3</p> <p>define [1] - 78:5</p> <p>defining [1] - 77:17</p> <p>definite [1] - 54:7</p> <p>definitely [1] - 147:15</p> <p>definition [2] - 35:1, 189:11</p> <p>degree [2] - 173:11, 173:14</p> <p>delete [1] - 10:8</p> <p>delighted [1] - 59:3</p> <p>deliver [1] - 56:6</p> <p>delivered [1] - 221:3</p> <p>demand [2] - 149:8, 159:15</p> <p>demanding [1] - 148:12</p> <p>demographic [1] - 106:11</p> <p>demonstrate [1] - 134:5</p> <p>DENNIS [3] - 51:14, 160:7, 185:9</p> <p>Dennis [5] - 51:14, 78:16, 80:12, 81:12, 163:17</p> <p>dense [1] - 159:16</p> <p>denser [1] - 165:1</p> <p>density [3] - 18:8, 36:13, 173:18</p> <p>Department [5] - 2:3, 4:10, 37:2, 63:1, 221:3</p> <p>department [2] - 69:4, 112:11</p> <p>departments [1] - 30:14</p> <p>depended [1] - 29:11</p> <p>depth [9] - 133:2, 150:10, 194:5, 194:11, 194:18,</p>	<p>195:4, 196:7, 196:18, 200:12</p> <p>describe [1] - 97:10</p> <p>described [2] - 4:12, 109:16</p> <p>describing [1] - 79:11</p> <p>design [12] - 28:10, 31:6, 62:5, 82:8, 95:17, 151:15, 154:8, 165:16, 170:14, 171:4, 171:8</p> <p>designer [1] - 85:18</p> <p>designers [1] - 82:3</p> <p>designs [1] - 97:10</p> <p>desirable [3] - 136:3, 136:12, 147:11</p> <p>desired [5] - 131:3, 134:18, 135:15, 147:8, 170:7</p> <p>despite [1] - 202:13</p> <p>detail [2] - 52:15, 93:5</p> <p>detailed [5] - 52:12, 80:16, 94:15, 95:6, 95:10</p> <p>details [4] - 11:13, 12:9, 69:12, 84:7</p> <p>determination [1] - 93:15</p> <p>determine [5] - 17:15, 94:10, 98:15, 168:4, 202:1</p> <p>determined [2] - 194:16, 197:3</p> <p>determines [1] - 143:14</p> <p>determining [1] - 16:9</p> <p>develop [1] - 167:17</p> <p>developable [1] - 194:17</p> <p>developed [1] - 115:5</p> <p>developer [21] - 13:5, 13:14, 14:13, 29:13, 39:2, 39:4, 41:4, 43:16, 47:10, 51:18, 52:3, 70:10, 70:12, 70:14, 70:17, 71:6, 73:6, 75:3, 86:1, 112:18, 113:10</p> <p>developers [8] - 39:13, 40:15, 54:2, 88:12, 108:5, 109:3, 140:9, 140:13</p> <p>development [19] - 5:4, 31:18, 32:9, 35:9, 73:8, 109:2, 127:15, 129:15, 130:2, 130:6, 134:13, 134:15, 135:9, 136:3, 140:18, 141:1,</p>
D				
<p>daily [1] - 119:18</p> <p>damned [1] - 112:1</p> <p>dandy [1] - 178:1</p> <p>darker [2] - 215:7, 215:8</p> <p>darn [1] - 86:15</p> <p>Darwin's [1] - 184:2</p> <p>DASH [10] - 69:14, 72:4, 73:16, 75:9, 77:15, 88:4, 88:6, 98:2, 117:5, 186:9</p> <p>Dash [2] - 1:14, 127:8</p> <p>date [9] - 7:1, 7:9, 15:10, 15:16, 18:18, 21:5, 21:15, 76:4, 221:7</p> <p>dates [2] - 50:15, 114:12</p> <p>daughter [1] - 142:14</p> <p>day-to-day [1] - 120:5</p> <p>days [9] - 34:12, 34:13, 36:2, 48:9, 55:2, 55:4, 55:5, 55:13, 67:3</p> <p>de [1] - 193:9</p> <p>deadline [8] - 5:11, 26:11, 43:5, 44:10, 55:13, 61:18, 66:14, 67:1</p> <p>deadlines [3] - 44:11, 58:1, 66:16</p> <p>deal [6] - 67:16, 165:8, 166:17, 166:18, 177:8, 177:9</p> <p>December [4] - 2:8, 24:7, 25:11, 125:5</p> <p>deceptive [2] - 81:15, 89:2</p>				

<p>146:1, 148:7, 151:6 Development [7] - 1:13, 2:3, 4:10, 37:2, 63:1, 108:6, 221:3 Development's [1] - 108:18 developments [5] - 128:16, 131:18, 134:3, 134:4, 181:8 deviation [1] - 31:5 device [2] - 82:10, 107:12 devote [1] - 106:6 diagram [1] - 149:16 difference [4] - 47:14, 107:10, 131:11, 211:3 differences [1] - 146:7 different [24] - 32:5, 47:9, 52:7, 56:9, 72:15, 73:18, 83:12, 83:17, 111:6, 114:12, 118:5, 119:10, 120:13, 133:8, 135:9, 137:12, 138:6, 146:9, 148:10, 186:5, 186:6, 218:16 difficult [13] - 13:5, 21:16, 21:18, 28:17, 29:2, 29:16, 29:18, 57:1, 68:5, 78:5, 115:1, 116:12, 138:9 difficulty [1] - 171:12 diffuse [1] - 53:5 dig [1] - 30:17 digest [1] - 19:4 dimensional [4] - 83:13, 85:8, 86:10, 88:12 dimensionality [1] - 87:5 dimensionally [1] - 80:3 dimensions [3] - 29:1, 53:5, 79:12 DIRECT [1] - 222:15 direct [2] - 139:13, 167:16 direction [4] - 122:16, 148:15, 152:3, 152:10 DIRECTION [1] - 222:15 directly [2] - 27:3, 139:18 disabilities [1] -</p>	<p>155:16 disagree [1] - 52:5 disappointed [1] - 24:9 discourse [1] - 108:7 discrepancy [1] - 44:4 discretion [14] - 10:17, 10:18, 11:3, 15:11, 16:9, 19:11, 20:17, 33:8, 34:2, 94:10, 100:3, 103:18, 104:5, 111:12 discuss [4] - 23:10, 45:4, 74:10, 91:2 discussed [6] - 13:3, 23:1, 33:5, 40:6, 53:16, 166:14 discussing [2] - 45:3, 131:7 discussion [21] - 2:6, 8:17, 18:10, 23:8, 28:4, 31:1, 39:5, 53:13, 68:18, 75:6, 109:4, 110:7, 121:1, 121:4, 123:6, 133:12, 136:2, 172:4, 177:10, 191:18, 192:5 disincentive [1] - 131:18 Disney [1] - 178:12 Disneyland [2] - 89:12, 89:13 disseminate [2] - 19:4, 21:11 disservice [1] - 49:8 distinguished [1] - 186:13 distorted [1] - 82:13 district [6] - 141:13, 168:17, 169:18, 184:14, 196:9, 202:13 District [9] - 2:12, 122:16, 169:6, 170:5, 193:16, 197:9, 200:4, 202:12, 202:18 districts [1] - 138:5 divergent [1] - 44:18 diverse [3] - 5:16, 129:17, 143:3 diversity [1] - 144:13 dividing [1] - 182:14 document [11] - 29:7, 29:10, 31:15, 32:3, 37:14, 50:13, 64:16, 114:6, 115:4, 118:18, 119:4</p>	<p>documents [3] - 50:14, 59:8, 66:2 DOES [1] - 222:14 dollar [1] - 97:11 dollars [1] - 175:9 domain [1] - 119:2 done [19] - 9:18, 10:18, 12:9, 18:12, 19:13, 27:6, 30:15, 33:1, 41:3, 54:3, 54:4, 54:10, 54:18, 126:17, 127:2, 141:18, 167:12, 169:5, 208:11 door [2] - 185:13, 188:14 dorm [2] - 153:15, 154:3 dormitory [3] - 153:17, 163:9, 178:15 double [2] - 155:9, 161:18 down [11] - 2:11, 111:3, 140:7, 140:13, 167:13, 169:12, 186:3, 189:16, 212:14, 212:15, 212:18 draft [7] - 7:15, 24:11, 31:18, 114:15, 168:15, 182:10 drafted [4] - 80:9, 173:15, 173:16, 181:6 drafting [1] - 140:4 dramatic [1] - 186:7 drawing [1] - 17:1 drawings [1] - 17:5 drive [1] - 144:13 driven [1] - 151:15 driver [1] - 130:15 driving [2] - 91:17, 92:2 drop [1] - 170:17 drugstore [4] - 145:15, 176:12, 176:13, 176:14 due [4] - 33:8, 33:15, 43:11, 43:12 duplicates [1] - 83:18 during [6] - 2:7, 10:14, 28:10, 55:9, 100:11 dynamic [1] - 129:17</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">E</p> <hr/> <p>e-mail [4] - 76:4, 107:11, 145:5, 214:2</p>	<p>e-mails [1] - 21:17 earliest [1] - 65:16 early [20] - 8:2, 11:5, 11:11, 11:17, 12:17, 13:3, 13:11, 13:18, 14:4, 14:10, 15:1, 22:17, 35:4, 45:11, 47:1, 47:6, 68:8, 101:3, 110:18, 121:6 easier [4] - 27:7, 55:11, 56:15, 104:6 easily [5] - 50:17, 83:5, 116:9, 177:3, 194:18 east [1] - 156:10 East [2] - 77:12, 176:13 Eastern [1] - 183:5 easy [5] - 8:11, 116:8, 140:6, 142:10, 144:15 eat [1] - 144:7 echo [1] - 43:3 ecological [2] - 163:16, 165:7 economic [1] - 53:6 economically [2] - 133:10, 151:5 Edmunds [1] - 48:5 effect [1] - 90:7 effective [1] - 167:18 effects [2] - 144:16, 162:2 efficient [1] - 26:14 effort [5] - 27:14, 70:16, 70:17, 161:8, 161:9 eight [4] - 10:3, 122:9, 198:6, 198:7 either [11] - 15:16, 57:11, 79:8, 98:15, 134:11, 151:1, 169:13, 171:13, 181:17, 190:15, 194:2 elaborate [1] - 80:15 electronic [10] - 41:5, 56:6, 56:8, 56:11, 56:13, 56:14, 64:4, 83:8, 84:16, 107:12 electronically [2] - 114:17, 221:4 elements [1] - 129:5 elevator [1] - 150:14 eleven [1] - 208:15 elicit [1] - 62:18 eliminate [2] - 88:10, 152:13 eliminated [2] - 151:3, 159:18</p>	<p>eliminating [1] - 157:9 embarrassed [1] - 208:16 emerges [1] - 133:14 emphasize [1] - 43:15 empty [1] - 157:15 enact [1] - 197:8 enactment [1] - 213:14 enchanted [1] - 89:4 encourage [3] - 179:7, 179:8, 180:3 encouragement [1] - 140:2 encouraging [1] - 191:10 end [18] - 20:10, 23:18, 30:4, 36:18, 45:13, 50:11, 57:7, 65:1, 95:14, 96:17, 112:17, 119:5, 123:15, 131:16, 144:11, 145:7, 178:3 endorse [1] - 171:17 enforce [1] - 170:6 enforced [1] - 24:17 engage [1] - 88:8 engagement [20] - 8:2, 11:6, 11:11, 11:17, 12:8, 12:17, 13:18, 14:4, 14:10, 15:1, 22:18, 27:1, 35:4, 39:1, 41:9, 43:17, 47:1, 47:6, 110:18, 121:7 engaging [1] - 81:15 engineer [1] - 144:15 English [1] - 42:4 enjoyable [1] - 38:17 enormous [1] - 13:7 ensure [1] - 35:15 entire [3] - 9:12, 113:4, 197:8 entirely [3] - 66:8, 78:16, 86:3 entrances [1] - 188:16 envelope [1] - 151:18 environments [1] - 142:12 Envision [1] - 5:13 envisioned [2] - 15:17, 117:16 equal [1] - 103:7 equalize [1] - 32:12 equipment [6] - 3:5, 3:7, 3:9, 117:11, 206:4, 215:7 era [1] - 180:4</p>
---	--	---	--	---

<p>ERRATA [1] - 221:1 Errata [2] - 221:2, 221:7 especially [9] - 8:2, 20:1, 21:16, 34:5, 42:2, 48:11, 50:13, 54:14, 174:3 essential [3] - 133:18, 153:4, 171:18 essentially [5] - 27:9, 139:12, 140:9, 142:5, 150:12 established [2] - 130:10, 165:5 establishment [4] - 137:9, 137:12, 169:11, 196:11 estate [1] - 156:4 et [2] - 2:10, 122:12 evening [11] - 4:3, 4:6, 13:1, 24:2, 31:14, 42:12, 114:4, 121:4, 145:10, 148:4, 205:8 event [3] - 116:1, 185:7, 197:3 everyday [1] - 176:3 evolution [1] - 127:11 evolving [1] - 144:8 exact [1] - 55:1 exactly [6] - 17:5, 29:12, 43:13, 103:4, 187:6, 192:7 example [4] - 44:17, 46:10, 135:17, 154:8 examples [4] - 128:16, 132:10, 135:13, 136:7 excellent [2] - 48:7 except [4] - 2:13, 9:8, 10:9, 221:15 excess [1] - 17:10 exchanging [1] - 75:1 excuse [1] - 164:1 Executive [8] - 9:6, 9:8, 9:11, 9:13, 10:4, 10:9, 25:7, 32:18 exempt [1] - 202:3 exempted [1] - 94:8 exercise [1] - 94:9 exhausted [1] - 64:1 exist [1] - 183:4 existed [1] - 140:4 existence [2] - 23:3, 176:9 existing [16] - 94:2, 136:11, 149:8, 162:9, 178:7, 204:14, 205:18,</p>	<p>206:5, 206:7, 207:13, 210:16, 211:4, 211:6, 214:7, 214:13, 214:17 exists [1] - 206:13 expect [6] - 63:12, 78:2, 78:7, 94:5, 94:15, 95:18 expected [1] - 77:15 expense [2] - 13:8, 173:8 expensive [2] - 82:1, 149:9 experience [3] - 39:12, 63:8, 153:12 experiment [1] - 58:9 experimental [1] - 8:9 experimentation [1] - 111:13 expert [1] - 82:14 experts [1] - 140:8 Expires [1] - 222:12 explain [1] - 181:15 explained [1] - 198:16 explanations [1] - 160:3 express [1] - 58:12 extend [2] - 19:11, 104:5 extended [2] - 5:14, 20:2 extending [2] - 125:8, 168:18 Extension [1] - 156:1 extension [2] - 128:10, 143:6 extent [5] - 9:9, 10:12, 17:15, 18:13, 179:7 extra [4] - 71:2, 156:13, 159:17, 162:11 extraordinary [1] - 65:3 extrapolating [1] - 29:2 extreme [2] - 134:11, 195:13 eye [3] - 70:11, 72:17, 84:18 eyes [2] - 14:8, 40:17 eyesight [2] - 40:11, 40:13</p> <p>F</p> <p>fabric [1] - 91:12 fabulous [1] - 114:16 facade [1] - 211:5 face [3] - 105:15, 116:11</p>	<p>face-to-face [1] - 105:15 facilitate [1] - 109:4 facilitated [1] - 108:6 facilities [1] - 49:13 fact [9] - 44:16, 64:3, 108:12, 117:5, 144:10, 149:6, 160:15, 172:1, 186:17 factors [1] - 149:6 faded [1] - 207:2 failed [1] - 171:11 fair [3] - 26:1, 65:2, 170:6 fairly [5] - 129:16, 190:12, 206:1, 206:12, 214:6 fairness [1] - 101:12 fall [1] - 182:17 familiar [1] - 136:9 familiarizing [1] - 22:4 families [1] - 34:15 family [2] - 105:17, 111:3 fancier [1] - 144:12 fantastic [3] - 30:3, 106:6, 108:3 FAR [13] - 18:8, 36:13, 131:11, 132:4, 132:8, 132:14, 143:16, 147:15, 150:3, 151:16, 152:8, 179:9, 200:10 far [6] - 8:7, 19:6, 41:7, 47:6, 97:8, 173:6 Farooq [1] - 1:12 FAROOQ [18] - 4:11, 54:9, 56:10, 59:1, 60:7, 68:10, 69:9, 74:12, 97:5, 112:10, 117:14, 121:14, 123:16, 124:3, 124:10, 139:6, 182:12, 183:2 Farris [3] - 42:11, 42:13, 49:2 FARRIS [3] - 42:12, 42:13, 47:8 fashion [1] - 57:5 fashioned [1] - 178:13 fast [3] - 164:18, 169:16, 169:17 faster [1] - 104:12 father [1] - 156:17 favor [4] - 174:13, 197:15, 198:7,</p>	<p>198:17 favorable [1] - 86:16 favoring [1] - 164:16 favorite [2] - 205:1, 205:2 FCC [1] - 206:15 feasible [3] - 9:9, 10:12, 54:6 featuring [1] - 87:3 February [11] - 4:13, 5:1, 5:8, 5:15, 123:15, 213:17, 213:18, 214:1, 222:8 feedback [2] - 13:13, 59:3 feelings [1] - 58:12 feet [58] - 17:8, 17:9, 36:11, 36:12, 52:13, 98:10, 98:11, 98:13, 111:5, 133:2, 133:3, 133:13, 133:17, 134:3, 137:11, 145:3, 145:4, 146:16, 146:18, 147:5, 147:14, 150:10, 162:9, 162:11, 169:12, 169:13, 169:14, 170:13, 170:15, 170:17, 172:18, 178:5, 180:10, 180:11, 183:7, 183:9, 183:12, 183:13, 184:3, 185:11, 185:12, 185:13, 186:17, 186:18, 187:18, 188:2, 189:7, 189:11, 198:15, 199:1, 199:5, 200:12, 201:2, 201:5, 201:8 felt [5] - 18:3, 20:13, 70:8, 70:15, 72:8 few [11] - 32:6, 32:17, 75:17, 114:1, 117:6, 119:9, 142:12, 155:1, 168:7, 182:17, 189:12 fide [1] - 108:14 fifth [1] - 89:17 figure [4] - 28:18, 29:14, 74:18, 90:1 figuring [1] - 75:2 file [1] - 12:5 filed [1] - 12:13 files [1] - 11:9 filing [1] - 168:5 fill [2] - 84:6, 151:18 final [5] - 14:18, 32:3,</p>	<p>37:14, 118:18, 121:4 financial [1] - 156:18 financing [1] - 155:12 fine [12] - 30:17, 87:12, 99:12, 99:13, 107:15, 115:11, 161:18, 177:17, 178:1, 178:14, 216:2, 216:7 firm [2] - 83:2, 83:3 First [1] - 174:14 first [23] - 4:9, 9:2, 34:13, 38:5, 38:9, 52:2, 66:8, 85:18, 98:10, 101:3, 111:7, 150:12, 152:18, 156:6, 158:5, 172:16, 177:5, 184:7, 189:9, 201:13, 202:10, 204:12, 213:8 fit [2] - 44:11, 90:10 fits [1] - 101:1 five [29] - 18:17, 21:4, 22:6, 22:11, 36:1, 64:3, 65:7, 65:10, 87:7, 94:11, 97:16, 97:17, 103:13, 122:2, 144:6, 152:12, 162:8, 162:11, 169:4, 169:7, 172:6, 177:3, 177:13, 178:5, 179:11, 188:6, 188:9, 202:7, 202:14 five-foot [4] - 169:4, 169:7, 202:7, 202:14 five-minute [1] - 122:2 fix [1] - 177:18 flake [1] - 215:12 flakes [1] - 219:15 flat [1] - 217:13 flexibility [8] - 81:3, 81:4, 175:11, 180:12, 180:14, 181:10, 187:15, 196:15 flexible [2] - 25:4, 64:13 flicked [1] - 89:3 floor [31] - 17:8, 129:8, 129:11, 130:2, 130:14, 131:8, 132:1, 132:6, 132:15, 132:16, 133:17, 134:5, 135:4, 150:12,</p>
--	--	---	---	--

<p>152:18, 154:15, 156:6, 157:10, 158:5, 162:12, 164:15, 177:5, 184:8, 186:1, 189:9, 195:17, 196:2, 200:12, 201:13, 202:4, 213:8</p> <p>Floor [1] - 1:5</p> <p>floors [1] - 136:5</p> <p>Flour [1] - 183:10</p> <p>flyer [1] - 76:4</p> <p>FLYNN [12] - 67:10, 68:11, 68:14, 69:13, 71:5, 73:2, 73:5, 99:12, 99:15, 172:15, 173:5, 207:10</p> <p>Flynn [1] - 1:10</p> <p>focus [3] - 60:12, 60:17, 137:6</p> <p>focussed [3] - 4:14, 149:6, 149:11</p> <p>folks [8] - 4:16, 5:11, 6:4, 55:8, 59:14, 67:17, 68:3, 73:12</p> <p>follow [7] - 6:11, 26:9, 29:6, 30:15, 56:1, 75:3, 76:17</p> <p>follow-up [2] - 29:6, 75:3</p> <p>Following [1] - 2:18</p> <p>following [1] - 5:1</p> <p>food [3] - 164:18, 169:16, 169:17</p> <p>foot [7] - 143:14, 169:4, 169:7, 187:4, 189:15, 202:7, 202:14</p> <p>footage [7] - 146:14, 147:13, 150:16, 152:2, 159:10, 162:10, 187:2</p> <p>footprint [1] - 175:12</p> <p>footprints [1] - 175:6</p> <p>FOR [1] - 1:1</p> <p>forced [1] - 137:3</p> <p>foreclose [2] - 66:4, 178:15</p> <p>FOREGOING [1] - 222:14</p> <p>foregoing [1] - 221:15</p> <p>forever [1] - 215:18</p> <p>form [5] - 41:5, 100:10, 129:4, 166:16, 172:8</p> <p>Formaggio's [1] - 184:1</p> <p>formal [2] - 11:9, 190:14</p> <p>formats [1] - 40:18</p>	<p>formed [1] - 100:6</p> <p>formula [1] - 131:14</p> <p>formulated [1] - 124:4</p> <p>formulating [1] - 165:16</p> <p>fort [1] - 172:5</p> <p>forth [8] - 77:6, 77:13, 96:12, 114:18, 116:7, 178:4, 200:13, 222:6</p> <p>forum [1] - 107:12</p> <p>forward [7] - 37:14, 46:4, 147:18, 159:6, 161:18, 167:7, 178:17</p> <p>fought [1] - 163:10</p> <p>foundation [1] - 149:2</p> <p>founded [1] - 155:9</p> <p>four [9] - 103:16, 103:17, 111:8, 148:6, 170:1, 170:13, 170:15, 172:5, 211:10</p> <p>four-and-a-half [2] - 103:16, 103:17</p> <p>four-story [2] - 170:13, 170:15</p> <p>frame [6] - 130:4, 164:5, 211:5, 211:7, 214:17, 215:7</p> <p>frames [2] - 214:7, 214:14</p> <p>frankly [4] - 101:16, 103:11, 171:8, 180:18</p> <p>Fred [1] - 153:7</p> <p>FRED [4] - 153:8, 154:12, 158:10, 158:18</p> <p>fresh [2] - 14:7, 14:8</p> <p>Friday [2] - 21:9, 65:15</p> <p>friends [1] - 6:3</p> <p>Friends [3] - 2:10, 122:12, 126:6</p> <p>front [10] - 30:4, 39:6, 86:2, 91:3, 112:17, 135:7, 136:5, 170:8, 194:1, 194:3</p> <p>frontage [5] - 132:18, 133:2, 150:9, 196:7, 196:13</p> <p>frozen [1] - 14:11</p> <p>full [7] - 36:1, 87:9, 97:4, 97:7, 103:9, 124:15, 208:15</p> <p>Full [1] - 2:13</p> <p>fully [3] - 16:13, 66:12, 181:7</p> <p>function [2] - 109:6, 207:16</p>	<p>fund [1] - 105:1</p> <p>future [14] - 6:12, 7:1, 7:9, 10:1, 98:1, 107:4, 121:4, 127:18, 129:14, 141:2, 146:1, 161:9, 166:5, 179:1</p> <p>fuzzy [1] - 82:13</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">G</p> <hr/> <p>galvanized [9] - 215:14, 215:17, 216:18, 217:6, 217:11, 218:6, 218:13, 218:17, 218:18</p> <p>game [1] - 98:5</p> <p>gamut [1] - 111:1</p> <p>gee [3] - 88:6, 120:11, 120:12</p> <p>General [2] - 2:7, 3:2</p> <p>GENERAL [2] - 1:2, 2:2</p> <p>general [5] - 19:9, 48:5, 138:11, 160:12, 172:17</p> <p>General's [1] - 107:7</p> <p>generally [3] - 28:5, 193:8, 217:5</p> <p>generation [1] - 219:16</p> <p>germinating [1] - 37:13</p> <p>given [14] - 18:16, 28:7, 37:1, 41:14, 54:16, 57:16, 74:10, 104:10, 105:17, 112:13, 112:14, 172:1, 188:1</p> <p>glad [2] - 42:7, 104:2</p> <p>glass [3] - 90:9, 92:1, 156:10</p> <p>glasses [2] - 97:11, 98:3</p> <p>goal [7] - 67:1, 67:7, 140:6, 140:10, 157:8, 161:7, 161:9</p> <p>goals [3] - 66:17, 67:8, 127:16</p> <p>gonna [9] - 26:13, 140:17, 144:7, 157:8, 159:11, 159:15, 206:7, 215:12, 215:13</p> <p>government [1] - 29:12</p> <p>Gown [3] - 4:14, 7:4, 209:4</p> <p>gowns [1] - 6:15</p> <p>grace [1] - 102:10</p>	<p>grade [2] - 194:4, 194:8</p> <p>graphics [1] - 152:4</p> <p>grapples [1] - 181:13</p> <p>grateful [5] - 139:2, 141:15, 142:9, 163:13, 164:4</p> <p>great [15] - 26:5, 33:6, 45:9, 46:8, 49:13, 52:9, 57:8, 60:12, 67:16, 91:11, 91:17, 115:6, 119:13, 165:8, 176:5</p> <p>Great [1] - 183:5</p> <p>greater [5] - 18:5, 130:12, 144:17, 179:10, 180:6</p> <p>green [1] - 20:9</p> <p>grey [3] - 208:7, 216:18, 218:15</p> <p>greyish [1] - 216:17</p> <p>Grimaldi's [1] - 183:16</p> <p>gross [1] - 17:8</p> <p>GROSSMAN [19] - 205:8, 207:4, 207:14, 208:9, 209:12, 210:15, 211:13, 212:1, 212:5, 212:12, 214:5, 215:9, 216:16, 217:16, 218:7, 218:9, 218:14, 218:18, 219:3</p> <p>Grossman [2] - 145:12, 205:10</p> <p>Grossman's [1] - 145:18</p> <p>ground [24] - 85:2, 108:8, 129:8, 129:11, 130:2, 130:14, 131:8, 132:1, 132:6, 132:15, 132:16, 133:17, 134:5, 135:3, 136:5, 154:15, 157:10, 162:12, 164:15, 186:1, 195:17, 196:2, 200:12, 202:3</p> <p>group [17] - 5:16, 18:13, 39:8, 39:10, 39:18, 40:3, 44:14, 45:5, 71:15, 100:4, 100:5, 100:7, 100:15, 101:2, 127:13, 131:7, 204:16</p> <p>groups [8] - 6:1, 32:5,</p>	<p>39:9, 44:9, 70:5, 71:9, 71:10, 99:18</p> <p>grows [1] - 166:5</p> <p>guess [22] - 23:4, 26:17, 29:1, 53:14, 57:15, 57:16, 59:1, 79:4, 89:6, 100:10, 103:7, 105:10, 112:10, 123:14, 141:6, 179:6, 179:11, 182:8, 190:16, 192:3, 197:1, 209:1</p> <p>guessing [1] - 120:8</p> <p>guide [1] - 73:12</p> <p>guideline [2] - 30:6, 31:4</p> <p>guidelines [16] - 11:16, 12:3, 12:4, 22:15, 27:8, 31:7, 45:13, 62:6, 74:9, 95:17, 112:9, 113:10, 165:16, 171:4, 171:9, 188:12</p> <p>gun [2] - 54:3, 172:10</p> <p>guys [4] - 140:9, 141:4, 198:7, 218:1</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">H</p> <hr/> <p>half [7] - 52:18, 74:16, 81:12, 103:15, 103:16, 103:17, 161:12</p> <p>halfway [1] - 155:14</p> <p>Hall [1] - 21:8</p> <p>Hammond [1] - 159:1</p> <p>hand [3] - 145:5, 180:1, 222:8</p> <p>handed [1] - 65:2</p> <p>handle [1] - 22:17</p> <p>hands [1] - 197:16</p> <p>happy [8] - 8:13, 80:6, 138:16, 141:2, 172:8, 191:14, 206:17, 209:13</p> <p>hard [10] - 19:13, 25:12, 54:18, 62:18, 64:9, 66:14, 66:16, 67:1, 104:8, 114:17</p> <p>harder [5] - 25:2, 25:16, 25:17, 41:18, 56:17</p> <p>hardline [1] - 55:12</p> <p>harsh [1] - 102:14</p> <p>Harvard [5] - 130:1, 156:10, 156:12, 165:4, 184:9</p> <p>Harvard's [1] - 157:13</p> <p>hate [3] - 48:8,</p>
---	---	--	--	---

<p>143:17, 175:2 Hawkinson [4] - 24:1, 24:4, 32:15, 43:3 HAWKINSON [2] - 24:2, 204:2 Hawkinson's [2] - 49:3, 49:16 head [4] - 44:15, 45:6, 99:18, 214:16 heading [2] - 93:4, 152:9 hear [11] - 6:15, 11:2, 12:18, 13:14, 23:11, 34:5, 104:2, 112:2, 177:1, 204:3, 217:12 heard [8] - 8:18, 42:8, 70:2, 71:11, 123:4, 123:12, 123:13, 158:1 hearing [45] - 4:5, 5:2, 5:7, 10:15, 12:14, 14:1, 15:8, 15:10, 15:16, 15:18, 16:1, 16:4, 16:14, 18:18, 21:5, 22:2, 22:3, 34:13, 35:12, 36:2, 37:9, 38:1, 40:9, 41:16, 47:7, 54:5, 54:11, 57:6, 57:7, 59:2, 60:11, 62:9, 65:13, 67:3, 92:8, 100:12, 114:4, 117:7, 122:3, 122:9, 122:11, 123:11, 147:18, 172:16, 222:6 Hearing [1] - 2:9 HEARING [1] - 1:2 hearings [13] - 10:16, 15:6, 16:4, 35:10, 54:13, 81:18, 101:11, 107:8, 108:4, 116:2, 116:8, 118:12, 124:6 heart [2] - 11:4, 91:6 Heather [5] - 38:4, 38:7, 38:8, 45:3, 49:2 HEATHER [2] - 38:5, 38:8 Heather's [2] - 69:1, 70:4 heavily [1] - 151:10 height [34] - 17:11, 18:6, 36:14, 98:17, 129:4, 129:6, 133:3, 133:13, 133:17, 134:6, 137:9, 143:11, 146:6, 146:7, 146:11, 157:18, 162:8,</p>	<p>162:9, 170:12, 170:16, 170:17, 172:18, 173:13, 176:18, 195:18, 196:1, 196:2, 196:4, 196:5, 198:8, 200:8, 200:10, 200:13, 207:15 heights [1] - 17:10 held [2] - 15:6, 45:2 help [8] - 5:17, 26:10, 42:1, 60:17, 73:12, 84:17, 92:10, 92:17 helpful [9] - 25:3, 45:4, 61:13, 73:5, 80:1, 83:9, 92:13, 182:17, 199:12 helps [3] - 60:12, 67:16, 173:10 hereby [1] - 221:16 herein [1] - 222:6 hereunto [1] - 222:7 hesitant [1] - 55:12 high [2] - 24:14, 216:13 higher [11] - 134:5, 134:6, 144:12, 146:6, 147:16, 149:8, 159:9, 173:18, 180:5, 184:7, 207:5 highlighting [1] - 61:1 historic [10] - 130:4, 136:6, 136:17, 152:5, 152:6, 169:1, 174:2, 201:15, 202:2 Historic [1] - 169:2 Historical [1] - 202:1 history [3] - 29:17, 30:12, 164:6 hit [1] - 92:4 Hoffman [3] - 38:4, 38:8, 49:2 HOFFMAN [2] - 38:5, 38:8 hold [5] - 50:6, 73:6, 102:4, 172:5, 173:2 holding [3] - 42:17, 77:17, 143:9 holds [1] - 72:15 holiday [3] - 36:3, 36:4, 55:14 home [2] - 204:1, 204:7 honest [1] - 198:13 hope [8] - 24:5, 24:13, 46:5, 51:6, 177:9, 178:4, 179:1, 186:4 hopefully [5] - 20:5, 58:5, 121:5, 126:11,</p>	<p>160:18 hopes [1] - 21:9 hoping [4] - 35:5, 132:12, 142:18, 207:8 horrible [1] - 50:2 host [5] - 39:2, 39:4, 39:7, 70:10, 70:18 hosted [2] - 68:15, 69:16 hosting [1] - 69:16 hour [2] - 74:16, 204:8 hours [2] - 43:8, 55:3 house [12] - 74:8, 77:11, 84:9, 84:10, 90:7, 111:2, 111:9, 155:14, 155:15, 163:11 households [2] - 148:17, 148:18 houses [2] - 154:13, 162:13 housing [28] - 148:7, 148:13, 148:15, 149:3, 149:4, 149:7, 149:9, 149:13, 149:14, 149:15, 150:3, 150:5, 150:7, 150:18, 151:5, 151:9, 151:13, 152:1, 152:2, 152:17, 153:2, 155:8, 155:18, 157:4, 158:4, 173:8, 173:18 HRI [1] - 5:5 Hugh [13] - 1:8, 50:2, 62:16, 66:8, 82:5, 85:18, 88:13, 92:3, 168:12, 173:1, 173:12, 174:7, 175:14 HUGH [37] - 56:1, 56:4, 62:17, 82:7, 85:7, 92:4, 98:7, 99:17, 100:8, 168:13, 187:3, 187:16, 188:7, 188:11, 188:17, 189:10, 191:3, 191:9, 191:15, 193:2, 197:7, 204:18, 207:1, 207:7, 210:4, 213:9, 214:18, 215:6, 215:17, 216:8, 216:13, 217:14, 218:3, 218:16, 219:2, 219:6, 219:18 Hugh's [2] - 174:11,</p>	<p>197:2 Humboldt [1] - 159:8 Hurley [1] - 38:9 hybrid [1] - 143:16</p> <p>I</p> <p>ice [1] - 84:11 idea [13] - 8:6, 8:9, 13:11, 16:10, 22:11, 74:3, 100:1, 104:10, 111:15, 119:13, 147:4, 180:7, 187:13 ideal [1] - 151:12 ideas [2] - 42:6, 171:16 identical [1] - 2:12 identified [1] - 136:18 identify [1] - 136:16 illustrate [1] - 128:14 images [2] - 86:10, 86:16 imagination [1] - 37:3 imagine [2] - 55:8, 126:12 imbalance [1] - 132:14 immediate [1] - 35:9 impact [3] - 35:8, 186:6, 201:3 impacts [1] - 91:4 impaired [2] - 41:13, 41:16 implied [1] - 160:9 important [18] - 40:7, 50:9, 50:10, 61:4, 63:16, 63:17, 76:16, 80:17, 85:7, 89:11, 91:2, 108:14, 126:4, 136:2, 142:5, 157:17, 174:15, 189:16 importantly [2] - 79:3, 133:10 impression [1] - 102:13 impressions [1] - 89:6 improvement [1] - 30:1 improvements [1] - 46:12 IN [2] - 222:7, 222:14 inaudible [2] - 96:16, 213:9 INC [1] - 1:17 incentive [3] - 153:2, 179:10, 180:17 incentives [1] - 180:8</p>	<p>inclined [2] - 169:14, 180:11 include [15] - 16:17, 55:10, 96:3, 109:14, 109:15, 109:18, 110:2, 129:9, 132:1, 169:15, 189:8, 201:4, 202:6, 202:15 included [3] - 59:16, 95:9, 150:1 includes [4] - 129:4, 132:5, 132:6, 168:15 including [8] - 9:6, 51:17, 66:18, 129:10, 142:15, 151:11, 162:6, 205:16 inclusionary [1] - 150:5 income [3] - 148:17, 155:13 inconsistent [1] - 170:4 incorporate [2] - 36:9, 191:17 incorporated [7] - 36:16, 57:13, 135:8, 200:18, 201:1, 202:11, 203:2 incorporating [3] - 132:2, 195:9, 199:14 incorporation [1] - 168:16 increase [4] - 149:15, 150:4, 205:15, 210:18 increased [1] - 36:13 increases [1] - 173:14 increasing [1] - 159:13 increasingly [4] - 81:13, 88:11, 107:2, 149:5 incredibly [2] - 39:15, 40:7 incremental [1] - 30:9 indeed [2] - 9:15, 48:1 Index [2] - 2:18, 3:11 indicate [2] - 7:14, 23:16 indicated [2] - 9:7, 76:9 indication [1] - 8:14 individual [4] - 39:18, 65:18, 91:8, 196:10 inexpensive [1] - 81:13 inform [1] - 153:16</p>
---	---	--	---	---

<p>information [18] - 13:2, 17:16, 46:1, 47:13, 62:10, 62:12, 67:16, 75:2, 85:8, 109:15, 109:16, 109:18, 116:7, 124:12, 125:3, 126:3, 182:16, 186:10</p> <p>informational [1] - 73:7</p> <p>informative [2] - 87:17, 87:18</p> <p>informed [3] - 16:13, 63:15, 99:18</p> <p>inhibited [1] - 135:6</p> <p>inhibits [1] - 39:4</p> <p>Inman [1] - 183:12</p> <p>input [4] - 32:4, 32:10, 107:1, 108:14</p> <p>insight [1] - 80:4</p> <p>inspectors [1] - 140:16</p> <p>installation [4] - 204:15, 206:13, 213:12, 216:9</p> <p>installed [1] - 213:13</p> <p>instance [3] - 55:6, 161:8, 201:2</p> <p>instead [1] - 39:18</p> <p>institutions [1] - 165:3</p> <p>INSTRUCTIONS [2] - 221:1, 221:5</p> <p>insurance [1] - 140:15</p> <p>intelligence [1] - 52:9</p> <p>intelligences [1] - 52:8</p> <p>intend [2] - 8:11, 111:18</p> <p>intended [9] - 9:10, 12:2, 13:1, 14:9, 14:18, 15:12, 16:16, 33:15, 199:4</p> <p>intensive [1] - 113:8</p> <p>intent [13] - 11:18, 13:17, 18:16, 21:9, 30:14, 58:9, 102:15, 167:10, 170:4, 189:17, 196:12, 201:11, 203:7</p> <p>intention [3] - 10:1, 14:3, 16:17</p> <p>intentioned [1] - 157:7</p> <p>interest [4] - 33:18, 38:11, 130:7, 155:9</p> <p>interested [2] - 6:2, 147:10</p> <p>interesting [4] - 63:3,</p>	<p>107:5, 136:14, 143:3</p> <p>interface [1] - 118:5</p> <p>internally [2] - 86:5, 86:6</p> <p>internet [1] - 144:5</p> <p>interpreting [1] - 42:2</p> <p>interrupt [2] - 20:14, 195:7</p> <p>intersection [1] - 213:11</p> <p>intervene [1] - 67:6</p> <p>inundated [1] - 21:17</p> <p>investigating [1] - 20:4</p> <p>involve [1] - 111:10</p> <p>involved [7] - 14:4, 14:5, 14:6, 55:13, 68:2, 111:9, 142:14</p> <p>involvement [3] - 30:2, 111:7, 116:7</p> <p>involves [1] - 71:2</p> <p>Iram [3] - 1:12, 166:14, 188:1</p> <p>IRAM [18] - 4:11, 54:9, 56:10, 59:1, 60:7, 68:10, 69:9, 74:12, 97:5, 112:10, 117:14, 121:14, 123:16, 124:3, 124:10, 139:6, 182:12, 183:2</p> <p>issue [20] - 9:3, 10:2, 18:7, 57:1, 60:14, 61:17, 110:15, 110:17, 114:6, 128:15, 133:12, 142:18, 155:8, 162:8, 162:12, 173:7, 177:17, 181:11, 181:14, 190:17</p> <p>issues [29] - 6:18, 18:7, 36:11, 59:15, 61:2, 61:15, 62:11, 65:1, 68:2, 78:11, 99:5, 106:4, 114:5, 115:8, 122:10, 125:6, 126:5, 126:11, 127:14, 129:7, 131:6, 133:11, 137:17, 138:2, 138:7, 138:9, 149:2, 167:13</p> <p>item [6] - 2:7, 5:2, 168:15, 168:18, 169:9</p> <p>items [4] - 5:6, 28:4, 33:7, 33:10</p> <p>itself [6] - 6:17, 60:1, 96:5, 140:5, 144:4,</p>	<p>214:9</p> <p>J</p> <p>jagged [1] - 178:3</p> <p>January [3] - 1:3, 4:4, 24:7</p> <p>JEFF [15] - 61:8, 124:11, 125:2, 167:8, 189:5, 190:10, 193:5, 194:9, 195:7, 195:12, 199:10, 200:9, 201:17, 202:9, 203:6</p> <p>Jeff [7] - 1:14, 55:16, 61:7, 124:10, 166:13, 169:1, 199:8</p> <p>Jennings [1] - 127:6</p> <p>job [4] - 63:13, 141:18, 157:2, 167:12</p> <p>jobs [2] - 21:15, 34:15</p> <p>JOHN [2] - 24:2, 204:2</p> <p>John [8] - 24:1, 24:3, 32:15, 35:16, 43:3, 49:3, 49:16, 210:13</p> <p>join [2] - 81:9, 106:17</p> <p>Joseph [1] - 1:15</p> <p>JR [32] - 58:14, 58:17, 93:1, 93:3, 93:10, 93:18, 94:4, 94:13, 95:1, 96:9, 96:18, 97:13, 99:7, 114:8, 118:14, 118:16, 120:1, 120:12, 120:16, 182:4, 188:15, 189:3, 192:8, 192:12, 196:17, 198:2, 205:4, 210:11, 211:17, 217:12, 219:5, 219:10</p> <p>Jr [1] - 1:9</p> <p>judgment [5] - 63:8, 79:17, 80:7, 81:5, 87:14</p> <p>jumping [1] - 172:10</p> <p>Just-A-Start [1] - 148:8</p> <p>K</p> <p>KAREN [2] - 159:4, 159:7</p> <p>Karen [1] - 159:7</p> <p>keep [16] - 9:15, 47:12, 68:8, 70:11,</p>	<p>72:17, 103:4, 103:13, 116:6, 117:1, 141:3, 164:9, 171:1, 175:11, 176:10, 196:4, 209:13</p> <p>keeping [2] - 100:12, 171:1</p> <p>keeps [1] - 29:13</p> <p>Kendall [4] - 162:6, 176:13, 183:10, 184:4</p> <p>kept [3] - 101:16, 103:14, 163:14</p> <p>Kerry [4] - 148:3, 148:5, 152:11, 173:7</p> <p>KERRY [2] - 148:4, 152:14</p> <p>key [8] - 5:5, 29:8, 30:1, 78:7, 130:15, 131:6, 149:6, 175:6</p> <p>KeyWord [1] - 3:11</p> <p>kidding [1] - 212:8</p> <p>kill [2] - 176:17, 185:14</p> <p>Kim [3] - 27:12, 27:13, 50:13</p> <p>KIM [2] - 27:13, 31:10</p> <p>kind [24] - 24:11, 26:6, 35:5, 35:11, 41:14, 62:12, 72:14, 77:7, 80:3, 89:13, 90:17, 96:12, 101:14, 104:2, 107:12, 113:5, 126:16, 133:5, 142:16, 168:5, 193:9, 216:8, 216:17, 217:7</p> <p>kinds [6] - 32:10, 34:15, 52:7, 55:3, 91:6, 151:12</p> <p>Kirkland [1] - 184:3</p> <p>knock [1] - 52:18</p> <p>known [3] - 2:10, 122:12, 205:11</p> <p>knows [4] - 57:7, 96:14, 102:2, 210:13</p> <p>Kreiger [1] - 205:10</p> <p>Kroon [5] - 2:10, 122:12, 126:9, 139:8, 153:13</p> <p>KROON [7] - 139:1, 139:8, 184:16, 185:1, 185:4, 198:10, 198:13</p>	<p>L</p> <p>lack [2] - 34:7, 102:12</p> <p>land [3] - 149:12, 161:11, 161:14</p> <p>landing [1] - 150:14</p> <p>landlord [2] - 157:2, 180:4</p> <p>landmarked [1] - 163:12</p> <p>Langdon [1] - 163:7</p> <p>language [8] - 10:10, 109:12, 115:12, 167:4, 167:17, 190:14, 201:4, 201:11</p> <p>large [2] - 20:1, 40:16</p> <p>larger [13] - 6:18, 16:6, 90:6, 95:7, 100:5, 101:4, 138:8, 143:7, 154:3, 176:18, 180:15, 184:8, 187:14</p> <p>laser [1] - 50:6</p> <p>last [13] - 7:1, 24:15, 26:17, 37:7, 73:3, 125:4, 145:16, 158:17, 166:15, 207:18, 211:2, 213:3, 215:15</p> <p>lasts [1] - 215:18</p> <p>lately [1] - 95:3</p> <p>latest [1] - 24:11</p> <p>Lauren [2] - 148:3, 148:5</p> <p>LAUREN [2] - 148:4, 152:14</p> <p>Law [1] - 9:16</p> <p>law [2] - 174:4, 210:5</p> <p>Lawson [1] - 222:4</p> <p>lawyers [1] - 140:8</p> <p>layer [1] - 72:10</p> <p>layout [2] - 108:7, 211:6</p> <p>lead [5] - 13:15, 56:16, 59:9, 60:3, 148:12</p> <p>Leader [1] - 213:7</p> <p>learn [1] - 39:13</p> <p>lease [1] - 209:7</p> <p>least [15] - 11:13, 15:9, 15:18, 17:7, 26:18, 40:2, 40:16, 43:8, 67:1, 67:4, 75:6, 92:9, 119:5, 176:3, 180:16</p> <p>leave [9] - 25:8, 39:14, 95:12, 100:3, 119:2, 138:17, 145:4, 169:14,</p>
---	--	---	--	--

<p>217:6 Lee [4] - 42:11, 42:12, 49:2, 108:2 LEE [3] - 42:12, 47:8 leery [1] - 54:12 left [6] - 16:1, 20:15, 20:16, 37:3, 93:7, 142:6 legal [4] - 158:14, 184:4, 186:18, 187:2 legged [1] - 32:8 legitimate [1] - 143:11 lengthy [1] - 7:2 Lesley [6] - 153:15, 154:2, 165:3, 204:13, 208:16 Leslie [1] - 178:15 less [14] - 27:7, 36:12, 39:16, 52:13, 60:2, 79:3, 82:1, 87:2, 92:17, 113:7, 116:4, 149:7, 216:15 lesser [1] - 80:13 letter [5] - 24:15, 25:9, 28:1, 29:17, 49:16 letters [1] - 24:5 letting [1] - 102:1 level [3] - 24:14, 93:5, 178:5 levels [2] - 111:6, 129:5 liaison [4] - 76:1, 76:2, 76:9, 77:2 License [1] - 222:11 life [2] - 29:8, 144:1 light [2] - 20:9, 35:8 lights [4] - 20:6, 89:3, 89:18, 127:4 likelihood [2] - 19:17, 65:12 likely [3] - 26:7, 26:9, 39:17 limit [7] - 23:13, 23:14, 129:7, 143:5, 149:14, 172:18, 194:7 limitation [3] - 85:6, 146:14, 146:18 limitations [1] - 134:16 limited [3] - 28:1, 89:1, 137:11 limiting [1] - 188:9 Line [2] - 128:10, 156:1 LINE [1] - 221:8 line [8] - 90:17, 130:6, 164:5, 178:3, 178:7, 207:12, 207:16, 212:15</p>	<p>lines [3] - 20:13, 61:9, 119:4 Linnaean [2] - 139:9, 145:15 list [10] - 45:15, 76:5, 98:14, 99:11, 110:9, 141:8, 168:18, 178:11, 188:1, 202:2 listed [1] - 27:4 listen [4] - 77:5, 92:15, 112:3, 160:3 listening [1] - 74:13 literally [1] - 106:10 litigation [1] - 10:7 live [12] - 15:12, 111:8, 136:9, 139:9, 148:5, 149:1, 149:10, 155:16, 159:8, 163:4, 164:2, 174:16 lived [2] - 143:18, 176:1 lively [1] - 152:18 lives [3] - 34:16, 66:15, 163:12 living [1] - 156:14 Liza [7] - 1:13, 6:8, 51:1, 62:8, 119:15, 213:15, 220:2 LIZA [10] - 6:9, 204:10, 209:10, 209:18, 213:3, 213:10, 213:18, 220:4, 220:8, 220:11 LLC [1] - 205:11 loading [1] - 95:8 lobby [2] - 150:14, 150:15 local [5] - 158:11, 160:11, 164:16, 176:5, 180:3 local-based [1] - 180:3 locally [4] - 160:17, 174:15, 175:4, 175:7 locally-owned [2] - 175:4, 175:7 localness [1] - 144:14 located [3] - 193:18, 214:7, 214:11 location [3] - 76:5, 206:6, 211:10 logical [2] - 18:4, 18:6 lone [1] - 187:17 look [31] - 14:7, 28:18, 41:8, 46:4, 83:10, 83:15, 86:3, 88:1, 92:6, 92:9,</p>	<p>97:15, 106:11, 107:9, 107:18, 118:4, 126:14, 135:16, 147:17, 150:2, 154:2, 168:10, 173:17, 180:5, 185:16, 186:12, 189:18, 197:12, 201:10, 203:15, 212:13 looked [9] - 72:12, 72:14, 120:15, 128:2, 137:14, 162:16, 171:6, 177:11, 194:14 looking [12] - 5:16, 34:9, 34:18, 36:11, 37:14, 50:4, 63:10, 89:12, 96:14, 128:5, 140:13, 161:1 looks [3] - 84:10, 93:3, 215:3 loophole [1] - 177:18 losing [1] - 173:8 lost [1] - 150:18 Lou [3] - 93:2, 96:2, 182:3 LOUIS [32] - 58:14, 58:17, 93:1, 93:3, 93:10, 93:18, 94:4, 94:13, 95:1, 96:9, 96:18, 97:13, 99:7, 114:8, 118:14, 118:16, 120:1, 120:12, 120:16, 182:4, 188:15, 189:3, 192:8, 192:12, 196:17, 198:2, 205:4, 210:11, 211:17, 217:12, 219:5, 219:10 Louis [1] - 1:9 love [4] - 101:16, 102:3, 175:2, 176:1 loved [1] - 82:15 lovely [1] - 213:2 low [2] - 151:16, 155:13 lower [4] - 132:7, 142:8, 148:16, 161:11 Luna [1] - 183:8 Lunder [1] - 178:16</p>	<p>mails [1] - 21:17 main [1] - 46:3 maintain [1] - 30:11 maintaining [4] - 160:11, 165:18, 166:2, 201:10 major [2] - 172:3, 173:17 majority [4] - 56:10, 56:13, 116:1, 187:9 man [1] - 92:2 Manager [1] - 1:12 mandate [2] - 108:18, 109:2 mandated [1] - 17:6 mansard [2] - 154:13 map [1] - 136:18 MAPOCO [13] - 2:10, 2:11, 122:13, 126:6, 128:6, 129:3, 131:5, 131:10, 136:1, 137:7, 137:13, 166:1, 192:1 Maps [2] - 184:17, 185:1 market [1] - 181:1 Mary [2] - 1:10, 172:13 MARY [12] - 67:10, 68:11, 68:14, 69:13, 71:5, 73:2, 73:5, 99:12, 99:15, 172:15, 173:5, 207:10 Mary's [1] - 108:4 masonry [2] - 216:1, 216:2 Mass [60] - 3:4, 91:18, 122:4, 122:16, 125:10, 125:13, 126:7, 127:1, 127:15, 127:17, 128:8, 128:17, 129:16, 129:17, 130:10, 132:3, 132:13, 135:3, 135:18, 136:16, 137:6, 137:10, 137:15, 141:13, 142:8, 143:6, 145:13, 145:15, 146:2, 146:3, 146:10, 146:16, 149:18, 150:17, 153:10, 153:14, 156:2, 156:9, 160:1, 163:7, 165:1, 165:12, 168:9, 168:16, 169:12, 177:2, 177:8, 186:11, 194:12,</p>	<p>195:8, 199:15, 200:14, 201:3, 201:5, 201:6, 202:12, 202:18, 204:12, 213:3, 213:5 mass [3] - 80:18, 144:10, 144:11 Massachusetts [5] - 1:6, 2:12, 2:12, 3:8, 24:4 MASSACHUSETTS [1] - 222:2 masses [1] - 81:1 massing [5] - 52:14, 52:16, 80:14, 80:18, 95:5 master [2] - 173:16, 177:10 match [2] - 178:7, 208:5 matches [1] - 177:14 material [7] - 15:15, 54:1, 58:6, 61:12, 68:5, 125:17, 126:10 materials [10] - 15:8, 16:13, 22:4, 22:16, 35:10, 37:9, 40:16, 91:15, 114:13, 149:18 matter [6] - 41:3, 51:9, 70:7, 101:2, 116:13, 119:18 matters [2] - 7:18, 204:6 maximum [1] - 132:4 McDonald's [1] - 183:17 mean [43] - 14:12, 42:14, 43:10, 55:3, 57:1, 59:14, 59:16, 60:4, 64:15, 74:6, 78:12, 81:3, 83:16, 93:16, 95:13, 96:6, 104:18, 105:4, 106:10, 110:17, 114:10, 115:9, 116:2, 117:14, 124:4, 142:2, 143:17, 150:11, 152:16, 166:14, 180:3, 180:14, 181:10, 186:4, 190:10, 190:12, 199:10, 199:15, 215:14, 216:6, 216:17, 218:10 meaning [1] - 33:9 meaningful [1] - 89:14</p>
		<p>M</p>		
		<p>mail [4] - 76:4, 107:11, 145:5, 214:2 mailing [1] - 78:2</p>		

<p>meaningfully [1] - 34:17</p> <p>means [14] - 17:1, 36:18, 37:1, 79:9, 79:10, 92:7, 102:8, 104:9, 131:13, 131:15, 151:3, 151:17, 153:3, 185:12</p> <p>meant [2] - 34:1, 34:6</p> <p>meantime [1] - 121:10</p> <p>measure [2] - 142:4, 142:6</p> <p>measures [1] - 165:13</p> <p>mechanics [1] - 115:6</p> <p>mechanism [3] - 27:2, 30:8, 180:14</p> <p>mechanisms [1] - 144:3</p> <p>meet [3] - 17:14, 98:11, 206:16</p> <p>meeting [36] - 4:4, 4:17, 5:1, 7:4, 11:13, 11:14, 13:6, 39:2, 39:4, 39:8, 44:1, 44:3, 44:6, 44:18, 45:2, 45:11, 71:1, 71:14, 71:17, 72:3, 72:6, 72:15, 73:7, 73:18, 75:3, 75:5, 77:1, 77:4, 105:11, 106:10, 125:5, 153:17, 158:2, 171:12, 213:16, 213:18</p> <p>Meeting [3] - 1:5, 2:5, 9:16</p> <p>meetings [31] - 4:13, 6:12, 9:5, 9:8, 10:11, 27:1, 34:12, 40:10, 41:10, 41:14, 42:18, 43:18, 46:8, 47:6, 54:15, 68:15, 68:16, 69:3, 72:7, 72:8, 74:3, 75:17, 77:17, 78:1, 106:18, 107:7, 108:5, 108:17, 112:18, 117:9, 160:10</p> <p>meh [1] - 208:13</p> <p>Member [6] - 1:8, 1:9, 1:9, 1:10, 1:10</p> <p>member [1] - 86:13</p> <p>MEMBER [5] - 38:2, 154:10, 215:4, 215:11, 216:6</p> <p>Members [7] - 6:13, 13:17, 23:4, 24:3, 145:11, 166:12, 205:9</p> <p>members [11] - 17:3,</p>	<p>17:4, 21:12, 38:13, 45:10, 45:15, 53:17, 62:1, 105:17, 141:7</p> <p>memo [23] - 26:4, 32:17, 43:4, 43:7, 43:9, 43:10, 44:12, 54:18, 56:16, 57:2, 57:5, 57:13, 58:6, 59:7, 59:16, 60:1, 60:3, 62:13, 64:12, 67:2, 67:13, 67:15, 150:1</p> <p>memorializes [1] - 18:12</p> <p>memory [1] - 10:5</p> <p>memos [23] - 25:15, 25:17, 26:5, 35:16, 35:18, 36:5, 48:6, 53:16, 54:8, 54:10, 57:8, 59:3, 60:9, 60:11, 62:18, 63:3, 63:4, 63:9, 63:10, 63:17, 64:10, 66:10, 66:13</p> <p>mental [1] - 155:16</p> <p>mentally [1] - 84:6</p> <p>mention [3] - 109:12, 182:17, 186:9</p> <p>mentioned [6] - 35:17, 46:10, 46:17, 118:3, 128:7, 198:7</p> <p>merits [1] - 190:1</p> <p>messy [1] - 170:18</p> <p>met [5] - 7:17, 14:13, 117:6, 136:4, 207:18</p> <p>method [2] - 20:14, 118:5</p> <p>Meyer [5] - 153:7, 158:8, 158:16, 161:7, 163:5</p> <p>MEYER [5] - 153:8, 154:12, 158:10, 158:18</p> <p>Michael [3] - 37:17, 141:9, 141:11</p> <p>MICHAEL [1] - 141:10</p> <p>microphone [3] - 38:10, 49:15, 51:4</p> <p>microphone's [1] - 50:8</p> <p>mid-80s [2] - 128:10, 128:18</p> <p>middle [1] - 148:17</p> <p>might [37] - 26:13, 41:16, 43:10, 44:14, 53:1, 53:5, 55:5, 55:10, 59:15, 61:16, 70:18, 71:3, 78:2, 79:4, 84:1, 87:14, 88:7, 97:17, 100:5,</p>	<p>111:8, 127:17, 146:8, 147:8, 147:12, 159:12, 168:1, 169:5, 180:11, 181:15, 189:14, 197:2, 197:7, 197:8, 197:9, 201:3, 216:15</p> <p>million [2] - 111:5, 157:1</p> <p>mind [2] - 38:11, 100:11</p> <p>minds [1] - 69:8</p> <p>mine [1] - 160:2</p> <p>miniature [2] - 89:13, 96:11</p> <p>minimal [1] - 53:1</p> <p>minimum [5] - 112:5, 112:7, 133:1, 133:2, 133:3</p> <p>minimus [1] - 193:10</p> <p>minister [1] - 163:12</p> <p>minor [2] - 15:5, 28:14</p> <p>minority [1] - 92:14</p> <p>minute [4] - 20:7, 20:10, 20:15, 122:2</p> <p>minutes [17] - 9:6, 9:10, 9:15, 9:17, 19:9, 19:15, 19:16, 19:18, 23:15, 64:2, 92:8, 101:7, 102:5, 102:9, 103:15, 105:1, 191:13</p> <p>miserably [1] - 171:11</p> <p>misheard [1] - 124:1</p> <p>missed [2] - 57:14, 165:11</p> <p>missing [1] - 30:4</p> <p>misunderstood [1] - 198:14</p> <p>MIT [2] - 111:4, 111:10</p> <p>MIT's [1] - 94:11</p> <p>mix [1] - 130:1</p> <p>mixed [7] - 131:14, 131:15, 132:5, 134:4, 143:17, 198:15, 200:10</p> <p>mixture [1] - 133:4</p> <p>mobility [2] - 40:9, 41:13</p> <p>mobilizing [1] - 142:1</p> <p>model [46] - 16:18, 17:11, 17:15, 18:2, 18:9, 48:14, 52:5, 52:12, 52:14, 78:13, 79:6, 79:8, 79:14, 80:2, 80:11, 80:14, 82:14, 83:9, 83:14, 83:16, 83:18, 84:14,</p>	<p>84:16, 85:12, 86:7, 86:11, 87:4, 87:6, 87:17, 88:15, 88:17, 90:4, 90:11, 91:13, 92:5, 93:14, 93:15, 94:1, 94:8, 96:2, 96:3, 96:10, 110:6, 110:9</p> <p>models [21] - 17:3, 48:11, 48:15, 78:16, 80:16, 81:11, 82:9, 82:15, 82:17, 83:8, 84:4, 85:10, 89:1, 91:3, 92:13, 93:4, 94:15, 94:17, 95:9, 98:15, 110:1</p> <p>modelscope [1] - 82:11</p> <p>moderate [1] - 155:16</p> <p>moderator [1] - 153:11</p> <p>modern [1] - 178:17</p> <p>modes [1] - 173:18</p> <p>modification [2] - 173:10, 204:15</p> <p>modifications [3] - 2:13, 112:14, 200:15</p> <p>modified [8] - 110:5, 112:9, 191:17, 192:5, 193:14, 195:9, 196:12, 203:1</p> <p>modify [7] - 80:5, 98:9, 114:2, 196:6, 196:7, 196:10, 196:17</p> <p>mom [1] - 176:4</p> <p>moment [2] - 88:17, 103:9</p> <p>Monday [4] - 5:14, 36:3, 64:5, 65:16</p> <p>Mondays [1] - 21:16</p> <p>money [4] - 48:18, 51:2, 70:18, 111:18</p> <p>monitor [3] - 30:12, 108:10, 109:5</p> <p>monitoring [1] - 110:14</p> <p>monochrome [1] - 215:2</p> <p>month [1] - 156:16</p> <p>monthly [1] - 153:17</p> <p>months [4] - 97:17, 114:1, 117:7, 140:4</p> <p>Montrose [2] - 183:15, 184:14</p> <p>MOORE [1] - 163:3</p> <p>Moore [1] - 163:3</p> <p>most [17] - 21:14, 22:3, 26:14, 55:7,</p>	<p>61:4, 72:2, 75:13, 86:16, 88:3, 101:10, 151:1, 161:3, 162:15, 175:14, 177:6, 181:2</p> <p>mostly [1] - 25:8</p> <p>motion [5] - 172:9, 191:13, 197:2, 199:13, 202:6</p> <p>Mount [1] - 184:2</p> <p>mounted [2] - 211:5, 214:16</p> <p>mounting [4] - 211:4, 214:7, 214:13, 214:17</p> <p>mounts [1] - 206:8</p> <p>mouth [1] - 174:8</p> <p>move [9] - 78:10, 99:4, 114:4, 124:15, 191:15, 211:4, 211:8, 212:14, 212:18</p> <p>moved [1] - 5:8</p> <p>movement [1] - 206:1</p> <p>moves [1] - 206:8</p> <p>moving [7] - 25:11, 49:6, 49:18, 103:14, 148:14, 178:17, 206:6</p> <p>multi [1] - 117:10</p> <p>multi-step [1] - 117:10</p> <p>multiple [2] - 54:13, 103:10</p> <p>municipality [1] - 210:9</p> <p>mushroomed [1] - 112:16</p> <p>must [9] - 15:9, 17:11, 34:11, 45:17, 46:1, 70:7, 70:8, 112:6, 112:7</p> <hr/> <p>N</p> <p>name [12] - 23:16, 31:16, 32:4, 139:7, 139:8, 141:11, 145:11, 148:4, 158:17, 159:7, 161:3, 161:4</p> <p>names [1] - 50:15</p> <p>Nancy [3] - 31:13, 31:14, 49:2</p> <p>NANCY [3] - 31:14, 34:1, 38:7</p> <p>narrowing [1] - 167:12</p> <p>national [4] - 83:1, 147:9, 180:5, 180:8</p> <p>naturally [1] - 149:7</p>
---	---	---	--	---

<p>nature [2] - 75:10, 164:13</p> <p>nay [1] - 140:7</p> <p>near [2] - 111:8, 208:10</p> <p>nearby [1] - 76:8</p> <p>necessarily [5] - 136:12, 138:3, 147:6, 147:11, 161:13</p> <p>necessary [3] - 15:13, 16:12, 165:18</p> <p>need [33] - 20:3, 20:18, 30:8, 31:3, 33:16, 43:8, 44:6, 50:5, 50:6, 64:17, 76:6, 80:15, 81:3, 86:6, 92:17, 95:6, 95:9, 103:13, 105:18, 137:14, 144:17, 157:17, 164:12, 165:5, 168:1, 170:12, 173:13, 175:5, 176:17, 177:15, 190:7, 196:16, 197:4</p> <p>needed [1] - 134:17</p> <p>needs [16] - 26:6, 27:2, 43:18, 44:2, 44:10, 44:11, 71:18, 94:10, 113:2, 126:17, 150:13, 154:17, 158:12, 161:17, 175:18, 206:9</p> <p>negative [1] - 165:10</p> <p>Neighborhood [2] - 127:13, 153:12</p> <p>neighborhood [40] - 32:5, 39:8, 39:9, 44:17, 48:15, 70:5, 71:4, 75:16, 90:10, 91:4, 111:16, 127:7, 128:9, 132:12, 133:9, 135:14, 140:11, 141:16, 152:7, 153:17, 154:16, 155:11, 157:10, 158:1, 160:12, 161:2, 162:1, 162:3, 163:10, 163:15, 166:1, 174:16, 174:17, 176:2, 177:7, 177:9, 179:3, 180:9, 188:3</p> <p>neighborhood-based [1] - 180:9</p> <p>neighborhood-related [1] - 160:12</p> <p>neighborhoods [9] -</p>	<p>42:3, 67:18, 70:13, 71:8, 71:12, 160:10, 162:6, 164:2, 164:16</p> <p>neighbors [8] - 6:3, 27:3, 51:17, 76:18, 129:13, 136:8, 137:13, 180:2</p> <p>ness [1] - 89:5</p> <p>network [1] - 206:9</p> <p>neutral [1] - 69:6</p> <p>never [3] - 94:4, 119:8, 217:17</p> <p>nevertheless [1] - 67:8</p> <p>new [29] - 5:4, 11:4, 17:7, 26:11, 26:12, 44:9, 51:4, 57:18, 121:11, 122:13, 134:15, 136:3, 137:1, 149:7, 149:10, 156:9, 165:16, 178:5, 178:6, 183:14, 185:10, 186:5, 206:9, 206:15, 210:4, 211:1, 211:17, 214:10, 220:1</p> <p>New [1] - 205:11</p> <p>newer [1] - 130:2</p> <p>newspaper [1] - 27:5</p> <p>next [15] - 28:13, 29:15, 37:18, 51:9, 73:11, 90:8, 114:1, 143:8, 163:11, 167:3, 167:5, 209:9, 209:10, 219:16, 220:6</p> <p>nice [7] - 44:8, 48:16, 84:9, 139:2, 175:10, 211:15</p> <p>night [2] - 116:4, 205:12</p> <p>nights [1] - 142:16</p> <p>nine [4] - 154:5, 155:4, 171:1, 210:17</p> <p>Nine [1] - 163:4</p> <p>nobody [1] - 87:6</p> <p>nobody's [1] - 139:16</p> <p>non [10] - 10:2, 10:16, 132:17, 155:10, 155:13, 155:18, 195:16, 200:11, 217:8, 217:11</p> <p>non-issue [1] - 10:2</p> <p>non-profit [3] - 155:10, 155:13, 155:18</p> <p>non-public [1] - 10:16</p>	<p>non-reflective [1] - 217:8</p> <p>non-residential [3] - 132:17, 195:16, 200:11</p> <p>non-weathered [1] - 217:11</p> <p>none [3] - 42:6, 166:10, 170:10</p> <p>nonetheless [1] - 147:12</p> <p>noon [1] - 21:9</p> <p>Norfolk [1] - 42:13</p> <p>norm [1] - 96:3</p> <p>normally [1] - 76:10</p> <p>Norris [1] - 27:13</p> <p>north [5] - 125:10, 128:3, 128:4, 200:1, 201:6</p> <p>North [34] - 2:12, 77:11, 122:3, 126:7, 127:1, 127:12, 127:17, 128:8, 128:17, 132:3, 132:13, 135:3, 136:15, 137:6, 137:10, 137:15, 146:2, 146:10, 146:16, 149:17, 165:5, 165:12, 168:9, 168:16, 169:12, 186:11, 194:12, 195:8, 199:15, 200:14, 201:3, 201:4, 202:12, 202:17</p> <p>Northern [2] - 135:18, 162:17</p> <p>northern [3] - 125:9, 127:14, 217:2</p> <p>nose [1] - 83:11</p> <p>NOT [1] - 222:14</p> <p>Notary [2] - 222:4, 222:10</p> <p>note [6] - 90:5, 126:4, 135:15, 146:5, 201:2, 221:6</p> <p>noted [4] - 134:9, 137:8, 168:7, 221:16</p> <p>nothing [3] - 198:18, 205:5, 205:6</p> <p>notice [2] - 41:17, 62:9</p> <p>notices [1] - 215:16</p> <p>notification [1] - 100:12</p> <p>notified [2] - 45:16, 45:17</p> <p>notify [2] - 18:17, 100:10</p>	<p>notifying [1] - 11:12</p> <p>notion [3] - 69:16, 160:18, 161:17</p> <p>number [10] - 32:5, 46:11, 53:2, 67:3, 101:5, 122:18, 125:6, 126:5, 205:16, 210:18</p> <p>numbers [2] - 44:16, 149:14</p> <p>Nur [1] - 1:10</p> <p>NUR [12] - 23:11, 67:9, 75:13, 78:9, 90:3, 91:9, 96:16, 97:3, 99:9, 109:8, 109:10, 110:12</p> <p>O</p> <p>o'clock [4] - 122:9, 208:15, 220:10, 220:11</p> <p>observations [2] - 36:9, 142:10</p> <p>obviously [9] - 14:5, 22:8, 27:6, 60:5, 67:14, 111:6, 111:9, 120:2, 175:16</p> <p>occasionally [1] - 119:15</p> <p>occur [2] - 112:4, 134:13</p> <p>occurring [1] - 127:16</p> <p>OF [5] - 1:1, 222:2, 222:14, 222:14, 222:15</p> <p>offered [1] - 31:17</p> <p>offers [1] - 164:14</p> <p>office [6] - 7:18, 86:1, 127:7, 133:5, 157:9, 195:16</p> <p>offices [1] - 111:5</p> <p>OFFICIAL [1] - 1:17</p> <p>often [6] - 25:15, 54:2, 55:7, 71:1, 88:14, 88:18</p> <p>oil [1] - 216:3</p> <p>oil's [1] - 216:4</p> <p>old [5] - 40:10, 40:17, 142:13, 157:14, 178:12</p> <p>older [4] - 130:1, 130:3, 136:1, 174:4</p> <p>oldest [1] - 142:13</p> <p>on-site [1] - 76:8</p> <p>once [7] - 16:4, 30:5, 30:7, 40:12, 56:11, 124:6, 176:3</p> <p>one [95] - 4:5, 11:13, 15:18, 17:18, 19:2, 19:5, 20:7, 20:14,</p>	<p>24:6, 24:7, 29:15, 30:1, 33:17, 35:12, 38:18, 40:2, 43:2, 46:6, 52:1, 52:8, 61:9, 65:4, 68:11, 72:16, 78:17, 87:7, 96:18, 97:1, 100:7, 101:12, 101:17, 103:3, 111:7, 111:10, 112:10, 114:8, 115:15, 116:5, 118:2, 122:17, 125:6, 127:3, 128:7, 129:5, 129:7, 131:6, 132:1, 132:7, 133:11, 135:1, 135:7, 135:15, 136:15, 143:13, 143:18, 149:6, 153:14, 158:4, 170:2, 175:16, 180:1, 181:5, 182:13, 184:17, 185:13, 185:14, 186:10, 187:3, 188:14, 192:16, 192:18, 193:12, 194:13, 204:12, 205:18, 206:1, 206:3, 206:6, 207:1, 209:9, 209:10, 210:18, 211:2, 211:3, 211:7, 211:8, 211:9, 211:11, 213:3, 214:6, 214:9</p> <p>one-minute [1] - 20:7</p> <p>one-tenth [1] - 116:5</p> <p>one-to-one [1] - 143:18</p> <p>onerous [4] - 13:4, 27:7, 40:14, 82:1</p> <p>ones [7] - 165:10, 174:3, 174:4, 207:5, 207:13, 208:9, 211:16</p> <p>ongoing [1] - 214:2</p> <p>online [1] - 2:13</p> <p>onus [2] - 70:9, 70:14</p> <p>Open [1] - 9:16</p> <p>open [7] - 16:2, 23:5, 23:12, 72:12, 72:18, 95:8, 113:14</p> <p>opined [1] - 180:1</p> <p>opinion [1] - 109:7</p> <p>opinions [1] - 139:14</p> <p>opportunity [11] - 21:7, 22:5, 23:7, 28:12, 35:13, 74:4, 74:10, 100:14, 117:2, 138:17, 139:16</p>
--	---	---	--	---

<p>oppose [1] - 77:3 opposed [3] - 55:4, 110:3, 159:12 opposition [2] - 139:13, 158:4 option [1] - 187:15 options [4] - 123:11, 136:14, 175:3, 181:16 oranges [1] - 187:6 order [3] - 109:6, 134:17, 206:15 Ordinance [11] - 8:4, 123:13, 124:3, 124:8, 124:13, 124:14, 154:14, 161:1, 166:18, 191:1 organization [1] - 72:1 organized [2] - 71:8, 71:13 organizing [1] - 142:1 original [3] - 49:16, 145:1, 221:2 originally [1] - 168:3 otherwise [4] - 28:17, 39:16, 58:12, 203:8 ought [4] - 74:9, 172:2, 187:11, 208:16 ourselves [4] - 17:2, 22:4, 39:15, 78:1 outcome [3] - 77:1, 119:1, 144:10 outdoor [2] - 135:4, 135:6 outreach [1] - 112:18 outs [1] - 160:1 outside [2] - 203:18, 204:5 overall [1] - 101:1 overlay [3] - 138:1, 138:3, 149:18 Overlay [7] - 2:12, 122:16, 169:6, 193:16, 197:8, 202:12, 202:18 overview [1] - 137:5 own [7] - 7:9, 38:11, 39:12, 45:2, 61:15, 83:6, 155:15 owned [4] - 160:17, 174:15, 175:4, 175:7 owner/developer [1] - 141:12 oxide [1] - 216:1 oxidizes [1] - 219:5</p>	<p>P</p> <p>p.m [10] - 1:4, 2:6, 2:10, 18:17, 21:4, 22:7, 22:12, 36:1, 64:3, 220:12 package [1] - 135:10 PADEN [10] - 6:9, 204:10, 209:10, 209:18, 213:3, 213:10, 213:18, 220:4, 220:8, 220:11 Paden [1] - 1:13 page [3] - 114:14, 149:17 Page [1] - 2:18 PAGE [3] - 2:2, 3:1, 221:8 paint [12] - 207:2, 208:4, 212:3, 212:11, 215:9, 215:13, 215:17, 216:2, 217:4, 217:13, 217:16, 219:12 painted [7] - 208:5, 212:17, 215:1, 215:12, 215:15, 218:13, 218:15 painting [1] - 216:1 painting's [1] - 217:8 paper [2] - 45:13, 56:7 paragraph [9] - 28:2, 28:3, 28:13, 29:3, 36:18, 98:9, 110:6, 198:11 parcel [1] - 145:14 parents [1] - 156:14 Park [1] - 163:8 parking [33] - 36:14, 138:8, 138:11, 138:13, 153:18, 154:18, 159:11, 159:15, 159:17, 159:18, 170:7, 181:8, 181:9, 181:10, 181:14, 181:15, 181:17, 181:18, 182:1, 182:6, 186:1, 186:4, 192:7, 192:15, 193:5, 193:7, 193:17, 193:18, 194:8, 195:1, 195:5, 201:12 part [34] - 5:12, 8:3, 13:18, 40:9, 47:1, 61:4, 72:11, 77:16, 78:7, 103:8, 107:3, 107:4, 119:13,</p>	<p>125:9, 125:11, 127:15, 130:10, 135:10, 136:2, 137:18, 138:1, 141:16, 143:7, 146:3, 148:7, 165:1, 169:5, 171:5, 172:4, 177:2, 181:2, 199:18, 200:1, 214:12 participant [1] - 47:11 participants [1] - 130:9 participate [3] - 73:15, 106:16, 143:1 participating [3] - 6:5, 107:11, 129:13 participation [2] - 107:17, 108:10 particular [7] - 60:12, 62:4, 76:6, 79:13, 91:14, 132:17, 138:14 particularly [3] - 68:3, 130:13, 137:17 parties [1] - 73:10 parts [1] - 139:14 party [1] - 69:6 passing [1] - 14:2 passion [1] - 106:3 past [9] - 6:14, 9:18, 11:1, 13:4, 17:2, 18:13, 53:17, 53:18, 176:6 paste [1] - 83:9 patina [2] - 219:1, 219:4 pay [5] - 49:1, 50:12, 161:12, 161:13, 180:5 payer [1] - 164:10 paying [1] - 102:5 PCS [1] - 205:11 pen [1] - 38:6 penalized [1] - 153:3 pending [1] - 10:7 penny [1] - 104:18 penthouse [1] - 214:9 people [90] - 5:17, 9:3, 13:12, 18:2, 18:14, 19:9, 19:14, 20:2, 20:6, 20:15, 20:18, 21:18, 22:8, 25:4, 27:2, 39:6, 40:8, 40:12, 40:17, 41:1, 41:7, 41:12, 41:13, 41:15, 41:16, 42:3, 44:2, 44:16, 47:5, 50:5, 50:17, 52:9, 52:11, 53:3,</p>	<p>55:2, 56:6, 58:11, 59:5, 61:13, 62:7, 62:8, 67:12, 69:7, 71:13, 72:8, 73:14, 74:4, 74:10, 74:17, 75:5, 76:12, 76:14, 76:16, 78:12, 85:3, 87:13, 92:9, 92:17, 100:10, 101:5, 101:18, 102:1, 102:14, 102:16, 103:6, 105:12, 105:16, 111:8, 115:9, 116:3, 116:9, 122:8, 123:10, 134:10, 136:8, 139:11, 139:13, 155:13, 155:15, 158:3, 159:15, 177:1, 186:4, 186:12, 189:1, 191:9, 213:5, 213:6 per [10] - 24:15, 137:11, 192:17, 192:18, 193:12, 206:3, 210:17, 210:18, 211:3, 214:9 perceived [1] - 186:15 percent [5] - 116:5, 133:1, 150:9, 150:15, 151:2 perception [4] - 24:16, 25:1, 25:2, 101:11 perfect [3] - 40:8, 40:9 perhaps [9] - 18:18, 33:7, 36:15, 55:9, 59:13, 72:2, 80:13, 151:2, 160:9 period [14] - 7:2, 15:13, 16:3, 16:6, 19:3, 20:10, 21:11, 35:11, 63:18, 88:8, 88:18, 102:10, 188:7, 188:8 periodically [1] - 117:1 periscope [1] - 82:10 permit [4] - 5:3, 179:10, 181:3, 195:3 Permit [27] - 3:4, 3:6, 3:9, 11:10, 12:6, 14:2, 15:6, 25:14, 90:18, 91:7, 93:17, 94:7, 95:16, 180:16, 181:4, 187:12, 187:14, 188:5, 188:7, 190:2, 193:13, 195:3,</p> <p>195:10, 196:12, 200:16, 203:1, 213:14 Permits [1] - 17:10 permitted [2] - 169:18, 180:15 person [5] - 71:15, 83:2, 104:10, 142:13, 145:6 personable [1] - 76:14 personal [1] - 57:16 personally [2] - 76:15, 178:6 perspective [6] - 59:5, 83:7, 83:11, 83:18, 86:4, 148:10 perspectives [4] - 86:17, 87:1, 87:7, 88:2 Peter [6] - 2:10, 122:12, 126:9, 139:6, 139:8, 155:6 PETER [7] - 139:1, 139:8, 184:16, 185:1, 185:4, 198:10, 198:13 Peter's [1] - 141:18 Petition [1] - 2:10 petition [24] - 2:13, 4:6, 5:7, 48:14, 122:11, 123:7, 123:17, 124:15, 126:6, 128:6, 137:8, 139:11, 140:5, 145:1, 145:17, 146:9, 146:17, 158:3, 165:6, 168:4, 168:8, 168:15, 171:5, 192:1 petitioner [1] - 173:15 petitioners [2] - 126:10, 167:12 Pharmacy [1] - 157:14 phase [3] - 12:17, 119:6, 130:5 phonetic [2] - 163:6, 184:13 phonetic [1] - 213:6 photo [2] - 16:18 photograph [1] - 206:11 photographs [1] - 83:10 photos [5] - 17:4, 35:3, 51:18, 52:1, 99:6 phrase [2] - 10:8, 36:17 physical [3] - 16:17,</p>
--	---	---	---

<p>17:11, 83:16 pick [2] - 86:17, 171:16 picked [1] - 201:15 picking [1] - 87:7 picture [3] - 82:13, 134:1, 156:11 pictures [3] - 128:14, 130:18, 131:1 piece [5] - 32:15, 56:17, 59:8, 73:7, 121:7 pieces [1] - 169:16 pilot [1] - 69:18 pipe [1] - 206:7 place [15] - 46:5, 49:11, 83:11, 83:15, 84:12, 121:17, 129:1, 129:2, 148:18, 149:10, 151:14, 159:17, 175:8, 214:11 Place [1] - 31:15 places [6] - 10:17, 41:15, 144:7, 152:5, 175:4, 175:8 plan [10] - 7:13, 14:18, 28:16, 30:10, 112:12, 112:15, 117:17, 173:3, 173:17 planner [1] - 127:7 planners [2] - 63:14, 108:16 PLANNING [1] - 1:1 Planning [45] - 2:6, 4:5, 4:8, 6:13, 6:16, 7:12, 13:17, 27:15, 28:4, 30:18, 31:2, 34:13, 35:18, 38:10, 41:10, 42:16, 44:6, 45:5, 45:8, 46:14, 61:14, 73:17, 76:1, 81:18, 88:15, 90:17, 112:15, 113:13, 116:2, 118:7, 126:14, 167:14, 168:1, 179:1, 195:10, 195:13, 195:14, 195:17, 196:6, 200:15, 202:15, 203:1, 220:13, 221:6, 221:15 planning [12] - 13:14, 106:4, 106:16, 107:13, 108:15, 109:4, 127:10, 142:4, 177:10, 186:11, 207:17, 212:14</p>	<p>plans [3] - 28:15, 29:14, 209:13 plays [1] - 181:7 plea [1] - 107:4 pleasure [1] - 169:10 pledge [1] - 219:18 plus [2] - 181:4, 190:1 podium [4] - 23:15, 49:6, 49:18, 50:4 point [39] - 7:15, 13:3, 18:4, 18:6, 26:17, 32:12, 46:18, 65:11, 67:4, 69:1, 69:5, 69:17, 70:4, 73:3, 74:1, 83:14, 88:14, 91:10, 92:5, 100:9, 100:15, 104:8, 107:6, 108:10, 110:18, 112:5, 113:5, 113:6, 113:17, 115:15, 115:16, 135:15, 149:16, 152:16, 191:10, 199:14, 201:18, 202:7, 213:12 pointed [4] - 39:13, 55:8, 57:15, 59:15 pointer [1] - 50:6 pointing [1] - 60:14 pointless [1] - 93:16 points [13] - 85:11, 123:12, 128:7, 137:7, 138:18, 140:4, 167:13, 167:15, 189:6, 199:13, 200:6, 200:17, 201:9 pole [1] - 217:5 policy [1] - 9:12 pop [1] - 176:4 population [1] - 116:5 Porter [14] - 122:4, 125:10, 125:11, 128:3, 128:4, 128:6, 130:1, 199:16, 200:1, 200:3, 201:7 portion [4] - 129:16, 154:12, 194:3, 208:6 portions [1] - 14:17 Portland [5] - 3:6, 209:11, 209:18, 210:2, 210:16 position [8] - 50:4, 52:16, 79:5, 80:1, 82:6, 87:16, 102:17, 180:18 positive [2] - 59:2, 165:10 possibility [1] - 66:18</p>	<p>possible [12] - 2:6, 17:17, 40:7, 57:11, 66:3, 68:8, 90:5, 121:8, 140:6, 187:5, 197:9, 202:10 possibly [2] - 38:16, 42:6 post [2] - 21:13, 26:14 posted [4] - 35:18, 47:4, 47:18, 114:11 postpone [1] - 57:6 postponing [1] - 16:3 potential [3] - 33:9, 124:17, 133:6 potentially [1] - 16:2 powerful [1] - 81:14 practice [1] - 6:14 pre [5] - 11:5, 11:16, 27:1, 30:2, 39:1 pre-application [3] - 11:5, 11:16, 27:1 pre-engagement [1] - 39:1 predilection [1] - 164:3 preface [1] - 24:8 prefer [5] - 17:3, 17:4, 39:7, 164:17 preferably [2] - 39:8, 154:16 preference [2] - 164:9, 217:9 prepare [1] - 190:8 prepared [3] - 7:16, 12:8, 41:6 preparing [1] - 66:13 presence [3] - 39:11, 129:10, 157:16 present [8] - 28:7, 28:15, 32:1, 74:6, 79:15, 99:1, 189:10 presentation [12] - 16:16, 28:9, 28:12, 32:14, 35:2, 49:7, 60:10, 84:16, 100:16, 109:14, 127:1, 157:6 presentations [1] - 114:13 presented [5] - 28:11, 46:1, 46:2, 50:3, 73:9 presenting [1] - 91:11 preservationist [1] - 164:3 preserving [1] - 166:4 pressures [2] - 143:15, 165:3 prestigious [1] - 83:1 PRESTON [16] - 31:8, 90:16, 101:6, 101:9,</p>	<p>105:3, 121:9, 121:18, 158:8, 174:10, 189:4, 192:10, 192:16, 193:1, 193:4, 195:6, 197:14 Preston [1] - 1:7 presumably [4] - 47:3, 59:14, 61:5, 121:3 presume [1] - 149:1 pretending [1] - 140:15 pretty [7] - 19:17, 40:14, 82:16, 86:5, 154:1, 174:12, 205:4 prevent [2] - 177:16, 197:4 previous [2] - 157:6, 193:11 previously [2] - 86:9, 148:18 price [1] - 157:6 priced [1] - 156:7 primarily [1] - 149:3 primary [1] - 37:6 principal [4] - 5:2, 83:1, 83:2, 138:11 print [1] - 81:12 printed [1] - 94:16 priority [3] - 133:14, 152:16, 153:1 problem [3] - 141:18, 152:13, 178:9 problematic [1] - 87:2 problems [2] - 70:10, 72:8 procedural [1] - 210:6 proceed [2] - 126:16, 173:2 proceedings [2] - 11:17, 222:6 process [38] - 5:14, 6:5, 8:6, 11:6, 11:11, 12:7, 13:15, 13:18, 14:11, 15:2, 20:4, 22:18, 38:12, 39:1, 47:1, 73:13, 82:2, 106:7, 110:18, 113:4, 113:11, 113:16, 117:10, 117:15, 118:4, 127:2, 129:13, 133:14, 134:10, 135:2, 135:3, 140:12, 142:11, 143:1, 144:15, 145:18, 171:6, 193:15 processes [6] -</p>	<p>106:15, 106:17, 107:14, 108:8, 108:9, 108:15 produce [2] - 81:14, 86:7 producing [1] - 67:2 product [2] - 39:17, 216:2 professional [2] - 63:14, 65:1 profit [3] - 155:10, 155:13, 155:18 programs [1] - 40:17 progress [1] - 43:1 prohibition [1] - 201:12 project [27] - 17:13, 59:7, 59:9, 60:1, 60:6, 60:13, 61:3, 61:6, 62:3, 67:17, 72:10, 76:6, 76:12, 77:3, 78:4, 78:6, 85:3, 86:4, 90:6, 93:8, 93:9, 96:5, 141:17, 155:18, 211:2, 214:12 Project [1] - 186:12 projection [1] - 117:18 projector [3] - 49:10, 50:5, 51:5 projects [23] - 20:1, 54:17, 71:12, 78:18, 79:6, 80:13, 80:17, 84:7, 85:5, 85:9, 87:12, 92:18, 95:2, 95:3, 95:7, 95:8, 98:11, 119:1, 119:16, 121:16, 128:18, 142:15, 205:15 proliferation [1] - 164:18 proper [2] - 69:15, 84:8 properly [2] - 109:6, 215:18 properties [5] - 35:3, 51:18, 52:1, 99:6, 179:8 property [5] - 141:13, 146:1, 150:9, 150:10, 179:11 proponent [10] - 11:9, 43:16, 57:3, 68:16, 69:4, 72:9, 74:6, 74:14, 123:2, 192:6 proponents [2] - 22:15, 76:18 proposal [29] - 14:7, 29:5, 40:4, 52:16,</p>
--	---	--	--	--

<p>79:11, 79:13, 86:16, 98:7, 101:1, 109:17, 110:16, 123:5, 146:2, 148:13, 150:3, 153:10, 153:13, 153:16, 164:14, 166:15, 166:16, 168:13, 171:9, 172:7, 179:13, 181:13, 187:4, 189:14, 189:18</p> <p>proposals [1] - 17:9</p> <p>propose [3] - 27:15, 88:7, 192:4</p> <p>proposed [10] - 7:12, 23:2, 69:4, 87:12, 96:5, 104:4, 119:10, 122:3, 203:7, 214:12</p> <p>proposing [3] - 91:12, 113:6, 139:17</p> <p>Prospect [1] - 213:4</p> <p>protect [2] - 152:8, 165:6</p> <p>protected [1] - 165:2</p> <p>protections [2] - 164:12, 164:17</p> <p>provide [13] - 34:11, 41:5, 67:15, 79:7, 79:9, 80:11, 125:17, 136:13, 150:16, 151:5, 175:2, 176:11, 194:8</p> <p>provided [6] - 11:14, 17:12, 126:3, 131:18, 181:9, 181:15</p> <p>provides [3] - 11:5, 81:4, 133:6</p> <p>providing [5] - 36:7, 80:2, 133:13, 181:10, 196:13</p> <p>provision [9] - 18:15, 29:4, 167:5, 167:6, 170:4, 187:12, 197:4, 200:14, 202:11</p> <p>provisions [12] - 10:17, 23:2, 125:8, 125:9, 125:16, 132:13, 135:5, 136:15, 138:10, 191:16, 193:13, 200:13</p> <p>Public [5] - 2:6, 2:9, 117:6, 222:4, 222:10</p> <p>public [85] - 4:5, 8:16, 8:18, 9:17, 10:14, 10:15, 10:16, 11:7, 11:12, 12:14, 12:18,</p>	<p>13:2, 13:9, 14:6, 14:14, 15:6, 16:11, 18:1, 23:6, 23:10, 23:11, 23:13, 24:16, 24:18, 26:2, 26:16, 28:5, 33:5, 33:6, 33:10, 33:15, 34:7, 34:8, 38:14, 39:5, 43:5, 43:8, 43:11, 44:15, 45:6, 45:11, 46:8, 47:7, 48:1, 53:3, 54:8, 57:4, 57:9, 59:11, 60:16, 60:17, 61:14, 62:2, 63:12, 63:15, 64:1, 64:2, 64:10, 64:14, 65:6, 66:2, 66:10, 88:17, 89:15, 90:2, 95:4, 100:16, 103:11, 104:16, 105:12, 105:16, 107:7, 107:12, 108:16, 115:1, 116:6, 116:7, 118:2, 121:2, 123:3, 141:7</p> <p>public's [3] - 38:11, 60:5, 104:8</p> <p>published [2] - 27:4, 27:5</p> <p>pull [1] - 116:13</p> <p>pulled [1] - 182:15</p> <p>purely [2] - 132:8, 132:9</p> <p>purple [1] - 38:6</p> <p>purpose [1] - 94:3</p> <p>purposes [1] - 86:8</p> <p>purview [1] - 118:17</p> <p>push [1] - 140:1</p> <p>pushing [1] - 8:7</p> <p>put [18] - 38:14, 56:15, 70:9, 70:17, 70:18, 71:3, 84:7, 90:13, 98:14, 100:15, 125:15, 127:3, 140:3, 167:15, 168:13, 172:8, 173:1, 188:13</p> <p>Putnam [1] - 183:16</p> <p>putting [4] - 70:16, 86:14, 86:15, 189:6</p>	<p>39:13, 69:11, 108:9, 122:18, 126:1, 138:16, 167:9, 182:13, 205:13, 206:17</p> <p>quick [6] - 51:15, 66:7, 75:15, 84:3, 160:8, 185:9</p> <p>quickly [5] - 12:3, 28:2, 58:10, 153:9, 205:13</p> <p>quite [11] - 65:3, 69:15, 70:6, 84:6, 86:18, 119:10, 159:16, 166:17, 170:3, 186:5</p> <p>quo [2] - 171:2, 201:10</p>	<p>realized [3] - 40:5, 40:11, 102:9</p> <p>realizes [1] - 162:2</p> <p>realizing [2] - 57:11, 78:3</p> <p>really [65] - 6:4, 11:4, 13:16, 24:18, 26:1, 29:11, 38:14, 39:4, 41:4, 42:7, 48:8, 48:16, 53:1, 54:17, 55:15, 63:2, 63:4, 64:17, 65:3, 71:16, 73:14, 74:17, 76:11, 76:15, 79:14, 80:2, 82:13, 83:17, 91:1, 91:6, 95:5, 95:10, 96:6, 101:11, 102:14, 102:15, 104:1, 116:11, 125:14, 126:7, 129:8, 130:15, 133:18, 135:1, 137:18, 142:7, 143:18, 144:17, 153:4, 154:3, 157:1, 161:4, 162:10, 164:17, 167:9, 169:9, 176:5, 176:9, 177:9, 177:11, 180:2, 181:5, 193:16</p> <p>rear [2] - 194:8, 195:5</p> <p>REASON [6] - 221:9, 221:10, 221:11, 221:12, 221:13, 221:14</p> <p>reason [7] - 71:6, 113:16, 119:3, 169:15, 196:1, 212:16, 221:7</p> <p>reasonable [2] - 35:13, 157:6</p> <p>reasonably [1] - 34:14</p> <p>reasons [3] - 101:12, 185:11, 185:15</p> <p>rebut [1] - 28:12</p> <p>recap [2] - 199:11, 199:12</p> <p>received [5] - 12:15, 15:9, 18:1, 21:4, 114:13</p> <p>receiving [1] - 64:13</p> <p>recent [1] - 156:8</p> <p>recess [1] - 122:6</p> <p>recognized [1] - 148:15</p> <p>recommend [3] - 124:16, 181:17, 191:16</p> <p>recommendation [12]</p>	<p>- 113:17, 123:9, 126:16, 167:16, 168:2, 168:6, 190:15, 191:1, 191:5, 197:5, 198:1, 202:16</p> <p>recommendations [3] - 63:5, 147:18, 190:12</p> <p>recommended [2] - 132:2, 201:1</p> <p>recommends [1] - 168:1</p> <p>record [3] - 139:7, 221:16, 222:6</p> <p>RECORD [1] - 1:17</p> <p>recording [1] - 117:18</p> <p>records [1] - 103:4</p> <p>red [3] - 20:12, 163:10, 208:6</p> <p>Red [2] - 128:9, 156:1</p> <p>redevelop [1] - 179:10</p> <p>Redevelopment [1] - 160:16</p> <p>redevelopment [1] - 179:8</p> <p>reduce [4] - 19:11, 195:18, 196:1, 196:4</p> <p>reduced [2] - 19:12, 193:14</p> <p>reduction [1] - 148:13</p> <p>reference [1] - 67:4</p> <p>referenced [1] - 11:18</p> <p>refinements [1] - 126:11</p> <p>reflect [2] - 163:15, 178:18</p> <p>reflection [2] - 90:8, 106:14</p> <p>reflective [1] - 217:8</p> <p>regard [2] - 36:17, 175:17</p> <p>region [1] - 131:5</p> <p>regular [2] - 22:1, 68:2</p> <p>regulation [1] - 149:12</p> <p>Regulations [1] - 2:6</p> <p>regulations [5] - 4:8, 7:13, 119:14, 134:12, 167:11</p> <p>regulatory [1] - 138:9</p> <p>reiterating [1] - 24:12</p> <p>relate [2] - 79:2, 84:18</p> <p>related [2] - 59:9, 160:12</p> <p>relates [5] - 63:6, 80:4, 80:18, 96:6, 96:7</p>
<p>Public [5] - 2:6, 2:9, 117:6, 222:4, 222:10</p> <p>public [85] - 4:5, 8:16, 8:18, 9:17, 10:14, 10:15, 10:16, 11:7, 11:12, 12:14, 12:18,</p>	<p>Q</p> <p>qualifications [1] - 86:7</p> <p>quality [3] - 141:1, 162:2, 162:4</p> <p>quarter [1] - 151:3</p> <p>questions [15] - 6:16, 6:17, 7:9, 23:4,</p>	<p>R</p> <p>race [1] - 106:13</p> <p>racks [1] - 215:1</p> <p>radio [1] - 214:16</p> <p>raise [1] - 115:9</p> <p>raised [6] - 108:1, 122:18, 126:6, 127:14, 128:15, 129:7</p> <p>Raising [1] - 197:16</p> <p>range [2] - 112:3, 133:16</p> <p>rare [1] - 19:17</p> <p>rarely [1] - 86:6</p> <p>rather [5] - 16:3, 59:7, 86:13, 138:1, 152:1</p> <p>rational [2] - 21:10, 21:11</p> <p>rationalize [1] - 22:6</p> <p>re [1] - 168:5</p> <p>re-filing [1] - 168:5</p> <p>reached [1] - 14:14</p> <p>reaction [3] - 40:2, 67:13, 141:16</p> <p>reactions [1] - 165:10</p> <p>read [11] - 4:16, 32:3, 43:6, 43:9, 43:14, 65:12, 65:17, 86:10, 86:11, 188:1, 221:15</p> <p>reading [1] - 221:6</p> <p>ready [2] - 16:13, 213:16</p> <p>real [2] - 75:15, 156:4</p> <p>realistic [2] - 89:5, 147:9</p> <p>realistic-ness [1] - 89:5</p> <p>reality [1] - 97:9</p> <p>realize [1] - 130:16</p>	<p>realized [3] - 40:5, 40:11, 102:9</p> <p>realizes [1] - 162:2</p> <p>realizing [2] - 57:11, 78:3</p> <p>really [65] - 6:4, 11:4, 13:16, 24:18, 26:1, 29:11, 38:14, 39:4, 41:4, 42:7, 48:8, 48:16, 53:1, 54:17, 55:15, 63:2, 63:4, 64:17, 65:3, 71:16, 73:14, 74:17, 76:11, 76:15, 79:14, 80:2, 82:13, 83:17, 91:1, 91:6, 95:5, 95:10, 96:6, 101:11, 102:14, 102:15, 104:1, 116:11, 125:14, 126:7, 129:8, 130:15, 133:18, 135:1, 137:18, 142:7, 143:18, 144:17, 153:4, 154:3, 157:1, 161:4, 162:10, 164:17, 167:9, 169:9, 176:5, 176:9, 177:9, 177:11, 180:2, 181:5, 193:16</p> <p>rear [2] - 194:8, 195:5</p> <p>REASON [6] - 221:9, 221:10, 221:11, 221:12, 221:13, 221:14</p> <p>reason [7] - 71:6, 113:16, 119:3, 169:15, 196:1, 212:16, 221:7</p> <p>reasonable [2] - 35:13, 157:6</p> <p>reasonably [1] - 34:14</p> <p>reasons [3] - 101:12, 185:11, 185:15</p> <p>rebut [1] - 28:12</p> <p>recap [2] - 199:11, 199:12</p> <p>received [5] - 12:15, 15:9, 18:1, 21:4, 114:13</p> <p>receiving [1] - 64:13</p> <p>recent [1] - 156:8</p> <p>recess [1] - 122:6</p> <p>recognized [1] - 148:15</p> <p>recommend [3] - 124:16, 181:17, 191:16</p> <p>recommendation [12]</p>	

<p>relating [1] - 18:8 relation [1] - 98:18 relationship [4] - 43:4, 84:2, 87:9, 109:16 relationships [1] - 84:4 relative [4] - 106:12, 106:13, 173:7, 194:14 relatively [2] - 40:18, 82:3 reliably [1] - 25:18 relief [1] - 36:13 relies [1] - 107:1 relieve [1] - 105:8 relocation [1] - 214:11 reluctance [1] - 66:13 reluctant [1] - 80:10 rely [3] - 57:8, 63:10, 140:9 remember [4] - 48:13, 49:12, 157:12, 157:14 remind [1] - 216:9 remote [1] - 214:15 removed [1] - 214:10 rendering [2] - 81:16, 90:9 renderings [5] - 17:1, 17:4, 85:10, 86:18, 87:18 rendition [1] - 49:6 rent [1] - 180:6 rented [1] - 156:15 rents [1] - 144:12 repaint [2] - 207:8, 212:6 repetitive [1] - 59:12 replace [3] - 3:5, 3:7, 3:9 replaced [1] - 211:9 replacement [2] - 204:14, 206:2 replacements [2] - 164:13, 205:17 report [7] - 43:18, 44:18, 124:13, 125:16, 139:2, 149:3, 157:2 Reporter [2] - 222:4, 222:11 REPORTER [1] - 222:15 REPORTERS [1] - 1:17 reporting [1] - 113:13 reports [2] - 4:14, 4:15 represent [9] - 32:4,</p>	<p>101:4, 108:11, 108:12, 109:1, 109:2, 131:2, 132:11, 145:12 represented [1] - 44:7 representing [2] - 71:15, 135:14 represents [2] - 99:1, 108:2 REPRODUCTION [1] - 222:14 repurpose [1] - 209:15 request [6] - 28:6, 29:4, 44:9, 44:10, 44:14, 145:2 requested [1] - 45:7 require [13] - 11:8, 18:4, 18:6, 41:17, 80:12, 126:8, 132:15, 138:6, 171:3, 187:13, 196:3, 202:7, 217:14 required [16] - 17:6, 19:2, 35:2, 70:18, 95:16, 110:6, 110:9, 110:10, 129:6, 133:4, 168:4, 193:5, 193:17, 194:5, 195:4, 200:11 requirement [4] - 80:5, 192:15, 193:12, 195:15 requirements [16] - 2:12, 26:15, 36:14, 129:1, 129:2, 131:9, 132:18, 134:16, 137:1, 138:5, 165:5, 182:1, 193:15, 195:8, 199:16, 202:4 requires [2] - 11:12, 29:12 requiring [3] - 88:11, 160:15, 161:11 rescheduled [2] - 2:7, 16:7 reservation [1] - 145:2 reserving [1] - 74:15 Residence [2] - 170:1, 170:5 resident [3] - 32:13, 34:5, 141:12 residential [15] - 5:4, 128:16, 131:12, 132:6, 132:9, 132:17, 134:2, 138:14, 166:3, 177:4, 179:9,</p>	<p>193:11, 195:16, 196:5, 200:11 residents [6] - 32:9, 35:16, 37:10, 127:13, 129:8, 175:3 resource [1] - 153:4 resources [1] - 151:11 respect [4] - 25:9, 81:8, 106:2, 146:13 RESPECT [1] - 222:15 respond [7] - 13:9, 28:9, 47:8, 69:10, 71:10, 73:11, 125:15 Response [2] - 53:11, 166:9 response [6] - 12:10, 12:11, 12:12, 89:8, 90:2, 123:1 restart [1] - 124:6 restaurant [2] - 157:9, 158:5 restaurants [3] - 130:3, 135:7, 176:15 restriction [2] - 147:2, 147:3 restrictions [2] - 149:15, 193:18 restrictive [2] - 150:18, 189:14 retail [72] - 129:11, 130:3, 132:1, 132:15, 132:16, 133:4, 133:7, 133:11, 133:13, 133:15, 136:11, 143:3, 144:3, 144:6, 146:15, 146:18, 147:7, 148:12, 150:11, 151:8, 154:15, 157:9, 157:16, 158:5, 160:8, 160:11, 160:13, 160:17, 161:2, 161:3, 161:12, 162:2, 162:4, 162:11, 162:13, 162:16, 164:1, 164:7, 164:11, 164:15, 166:3, 170:16, 170:17, 172:18, 173:9, 173:13, 174:12, 174:15, 174:18, 176:6, 177:4, 179:18, 180:3, 180:4, 182:13, 182:15,</p>	<p>185:11, 185:15, 186:2, 186:14, 189:11, 192:5, 193:3, 194:6, 195:4, 195:16, 196:1, 196:4, 196:7, 196:13 rethink [1] - 113:4 rethinking [1] - 128:12 revert [1] - 6:13 review [20] - 2:6, 16:12, 21:7, 21:8, 22:1, 22:5, 22:10, 22:13, 28:10, 31:6, 34:17, 35:16, 36:5, 37:10, 58:6, 61:5, 138:18, 143:7, 190:13, 193:15 reviews [3] - 29:6, 33:3, 55:7 revision [3] - 29:17, 30:12 revisions [3] - 42:16, 42:18, 120:18 revisit [1] - 168:2 revisiting [1] - 138:4 rewritten [1] - 110:8 rezoning [4] - 122:3, 172:2, 192:1, 203:7 rich [1] - 144:8 Richard [1] - 145:12 rid [1] - 216:3 rightly [1] - 151:14 rights [1] - 210:8 Rite [6] - 145:15, 147:4, 161:12, 175:1, 176:11, 185:17 roads [1] - 95:8 ROBERTS [18] - 51:10, 61:8, 124:11, 125:2, 145:10, 167:8, 189:5, 190:10, 193:5, 194:9, 195:7, 195:12, 198:4, 199:10, 200:9, 201:17, 202:9, 203:6 Roberts [5] - 1:14, 51:8, 145:9, 145:12, 149:18 Rodney's [1] - 184:7 role [4] - 32:13, 66:9, 71:7, 114:2 roof [5] - 207:12, 207:16, 208:8, 212:15, 214:8 room [11] - 25:5, 39:6, 74:15, 103:9,</p>	<p>105:15, 106:12, 117:11, 117:18, 127:9, 142:13, 191:9 Room [1] - 1:5 roommates [1] - 156:14 Roseland [3] - 2:11, 122:14 routinely [2] - 62:8, 102:17 row [2] - 89:17, 103:13 Rubenstein [1] - 63:2 rule [2] - 30:5, 54:12 rules [37] - 4:8, 7:13, 8:3, 8:7, 8:12, 10:10, 11:5, 11:18, 23:1, 23:3, 24:14, 27:15, 42:16, 42:18, 58:10, 67:1, 76:16, 76:17, 80:11, 90:18, 94:7, 95:15, 97:18, 104:4, 106:15, 107:3, 107:7, 108:8, 112:9, 116:14, 116:16, 119:13, 120:18, 121:5, 121:11, 144:1 Rules [1] - 2:6 run [6] - 2:11, 7:13, 8:13, 111:1, 113:11, 122:13 running [1] - 121:7 Russell [2] - 1:8, 50:2 RUSSELL [37] - 56:1, 56:4, 62:17, 82:7, 85:7, 92:4, 98:7, 99:17, 100:8, 168:13, 187:3, 187:16, 188:7, 188:11, 188:17, 189:10, 191:3, 191:9, 191:15, 193:2, 197:7, 204:18, 207:1, 207:7, 210:4, 213:9, 214:18, 215:6, 215:17, 216:8, 216:13, 217:14, 218:3, 218:16, 219:2, 219:6, 219:18 Rutland [1] - 163:4 Ryan [4] - 31:13, 31:15, 33:13, 49:2 RYAN [4] - 31:14, 31:15, 34:1, 38:7</p>
---	---	---	---	---

S				
<p>safe [1] - 157:13</p> <p>safety [2] - 130:13, 157:11</p> <p>salary [1] - 156:18</p> <p>sales [1] - 186:15</p> <p>SAME [1] - 222:14</p> <p>sat [1] - 40:3</p> <p>save [1] - 6:18</p> <p>saw [2] - 120:15, 163:16</p> <p>scale [13] - 17:15, 28:16, 84:8, 89:10, 93:5, 95:5, 96:4, 96:9, 97:4, 97:7, 134:14, 164:12, 164:15</p> <p>scared [1] - 157:15</p> <p>schedule [7] - 53:18, 54:5, 54:14, 56:9, 64:9, 214:2</p> <p>scheduled [5] - 5:7, 12:14, 16:5, 37:10, 124:2</p> <p>schedules [3] - 22:1, 55:14, 65:18</p> <p>scheduling [1] - 61:15</p> <p>scheme [3] - 146:3, 146:16, 150:8</p> <p>schemes [1] - 150:2</p> <p>school [4] - 82:8, 82:16, 142:14, 174:4</p> <p>scope [5] - 80:13, 93:8, 95:15, 120:4, 196:8</p> <p>screen [2] - 49:9, 50:7</p> <p>se [1] - 24:15</p> <p>Seafoods [1] - 184:4</p> <p>seating [2] - 135:4, 135:6</p> <p>second [10] - 65:5, 75:2, 98:9, 110:6, 120:8, 172:12, 172:15, 187:5, 197:13, 197:14</p> <p>Second [1] - 1:5</p> <p>seconded [1] - 198:5</p> <p>seconds [1] - 20:16</p> <p>section [9] - 11:4, 25:14, 33:12, 34:9, 35:5, 35:6, 44:9, 129:17, 194:2</p> <p>Section [12] - 9:4, 10:13, 11:15, 15:4, 15:7, 16:15, 18:11, 19:7, 21:3, 33:2, 34:18, 35:15</p>	<p>Sections [1] - 37:7</p> <p>sector [6] - 206:3, 210:17, 211:1, 211:4, 211:7, 214:10</p> <p>secure [1] - 107:2</p> <p>secured [1] - 214:9</p> <p>security [1] - 180:6</p> <p>see [52] - 12:3, 18:2, 26:11, 42:13, 49:9, 50:7, 53:4, 56:4, 57:17, 63:4, 70:1, 84:18, 87:8, 89:8, 89:9, 95:13, 95:18, 97:2, 97:14, 98:16, 102:7, 110:17, 111:13, 111:16, 113:8, 114:12, 115:4, 118:18, 119:6, 119:8, 119:17, 120:5, 120:10, 121:3, 126:15, 127:4, 129:3, 129:14, 131:1, 152:9, 152:17, 154:18, 155:2, 159:16, 163:11, 167:2, 167:3, 173:16, 206:11, 211:6, 220:6</p> <p>seeing [2] - 95:3, 104:9</p> <p>seeking [1] - 17:10</p> <p>seem [4] - 39:10, 118:18, 190:12, 210:11</p> <p>sees [1] - 101:17</p> <p>self [1] - 105:14</p> <p>self-criticism [1] - 105:14</p> <p>send [3] - 27:17, 76:2, 76:3</p> <p>sending [1] - 24:5</p> <p>Senior [3] - 4:18, 220:6, 220:8</p> <p>sense [13] - 19:18, 85:12, 92:16, 100:13, 130:14, 134:10, 134:14, 162:15, 184:11, 195:2, 203:4, 203:11</p> <p>sensitive [1] - 101:11</p> <p>sentiment [1] - 108:4</p> <p>separate [2] - 11:16, 188:15</p> <p>series [3] - 5:18, 69:10, 112:17</p> <p>seriously [1] - 38:13</p> <p>serve [1] - 94:3</p>	<p>served [2] - 151:11, 171:7</p> <p>service [1] - 128:13</p> <p>serving [1] - 188:3</p> <p>session [2] - 7:8, 122:17</p> <p>Session [5] - 9:6, 10:4, 10:9, 25:7, 32:18</p> <p>Sessions [3] - 9:8, 9:11, 9:13</p> <p>set [14] - 6:4, 15:2, 39:5, 43:7, 88:15, 92:7, 97:10, 106:15, 112:7, 112:17, 113:10, 204:17, 222:6, 222:7</p> <p>setback [6] - 36:13, 169:4, 169:8, 170:1, 202:8, 202:14</p> <p>setbacks [3] - 18:8, 129:4, 137:17</p> <p>setting [1] - 151:12</p> <p>settle [1] - 115:17</p> <p>setup [1] - 117:11</p> <p>seven [3] - 10:3, 220:10, 220:11</p> <p>several [2] - 16:6, 135:18</p> <p>shadow [1] - 90:11</p> <p>shall [2] - 109:14, 109:15</p> <p>shape [4] - 14:4, 116:11, 127:17, 211:18</p> <p>shapes [1] - 194:15</p> <p>share [2] - 88:16, 106:4</p> <p>sheet [2] - 192:2, 221:7</p> <p>SHEET [1] - 221:1</p> <p>Sheet [2] - 221:2, 221:7</p> <p>Sho [1] - 184:13</p> <p>Shoes [1] - 183:18</p> <p>Shop [1] - 183:10</p> <p>shop [2] - 176:3, 183:11</p> <p>short [2] - 122:6, 143:2</p> <p>shorten [2] - 16:2, 16:10</p> <p>shorter [1] - 212:2</p> <p>Shorthand [2] - 222:4, 222:11</p> <p>shortness [2] - 15:11, 31:16</p> <p>show [6] - 80:18, 84:14, 90:12, 114:14, 118:11, 152:6</p>	<p>showed [1] - 157:2</p> <p>showing [1] - 134:1</p> <p>shown [3] - 91:12, 149:16, 154:8</p> <p>shows [4] - 52:15, 56:12, 84:1, 219:11</p> <p>side [11] - 32:8, 34:4, 34:5, 81:17, 103:5, 144:16, 153:10, 153:14, 156:3, 180:11, 201:1</p> <p>sides [4] - 70:3, 103:10, 139:11, 165:9</p> <p>sidewalk [1] - 186:6</p> <p>sidewalks [1] - 178:1</p> <p>SIENIEWICZ [18] - 81:7, 94:16, 97:7, 97:14, 98:6, 104:15, 105:4, 105:8, 106:1, 107:10, 107:16, 172:12, 173:6, 188:6, 209:3, 210:3, 219:8, 219:14</p> <p>Sienniewicz [1] - 1:8</p> <p>Sign [1] - 221:7</p> <p>signal [1] - 102:11</p> <p>SIGNATURE [1] - 221:1</p> <p>significant [5] - 15:17, 19:5, 26:18, 28:10, 99:1</p> <p>significantly [1] - 116:4</p> <p>silly [1] - 49:14</p> <p>similar [9] - 67:12, 67:13, 74:13, 84:15, 88:6, 129:17, 155:6, 206:12, 211:2</p> <p>similarly [1] - 45:18</p> <p>simple [4] - 52:14, 80:14, 80:17, 200:4</p> <p>simply [6] - 8:12, 106:14, 108:7, 144:9, 199:17, 201:11</p> <p>sims [1] - 209:13</p> <p>simulations [2] - 16:18, 206:12</p> <p>single [3] - 33:17, 71:15, 164:10</p> <p>single-story [1] - 164:10</p> <p>site [9] - 52:17, 76:7, 76:8, 97:5, 150:17, 151:6, 194:1, 206:13, 206:18</p> <p>sites [2] - 91:8, 151:1</p> <p>sitting [7] - 62:2, 89:16, 89:17, 98:3, 115:2, 157:15,</p>	<p>216:4</p> <p>situation [1] - 143:13</p> <p>situations [4] - 14:13, 35:7, 72:1, 73:6</p> <p>six [8] - 63:13, 94:2, 152:8, 152:13, 177:4, 177:14, 179:12, 201:15</p> <p>six-story [3] - 94:2, 177:4, 179:12</p> <p>size [15] - 85:5, 93:8, 98:17, 137:10, 160:8, 161:4, 169:11, 174:12, 176:17, 182:12, 194:10, 194:14, 196:10, 211:18</p> <p>sizes [2] - 182:15, 193:3</p> <p>sketch [1] - 79:10</p> <p>sketch-up [1] - 79:10</p> <p>sky [2] - 216:14, 217:18</p> <p>skyline [1] - 217:2</p> <p>slide [1] - 135:15</p> <p>slides [1] - 136:8</p> <p>slightly [4] - 54:12, 56:8, 138:6, 148:9</p> <p>slip [1] - 51:1</p> <p>small [16] - 21:10, 30:9, 49:12, 83:2, 90:7, 147:7, 148:11, 160:16, 164:7, 164:15, 175:18, 176:1, 176:4, 180:3, 180:10, 193:7</p> <p>smaller [12] - 95:1, 95:2, 95:7, 158:11, 175:5, 176:14, 180:9, 180:18, 181:2, 185:15, 187:10, 187:11</p> <p>smallest [4] - 150:13, 183:6, 184:14, 184:16</p> <p>smart [1] - 83:3</p> <p>Solicitor [4] - 9:7, 10:6, 107:9, 210:10</p> <p>Solicitor's [1] - 7:17</p> <p>solution [1] - 43:13</p> <p>someone [10] - 9:15, 11:9, 12:5, 39:7, 50:6, 74:5, 76:9, 77:11, 104:12, 212:6</p> <p>sometime [1] - 43:14</p> <p>sometimes [12] - 50:5, 54:13, 54:18, 69:5, 76:10, 77:8, 89:5, 91:15, 122:9, 133:7, 144:11,</p>

<p>149:14</p> <p>somewhat [4] - 8:9, 131:3, 134:5, 134:6</p> <p>somewhere [1] - 131:16</p> <p>soon [5] - 46:5, 57:10, 61:3, 121:7, 205:4</p> <p>sooner [1] - 25:17</p> <p>sophisticated [2] - 68:1, 82:12</p> <p>sorry [18] - 24:4, 27:16, 73:3, 75:12, 104:13, 105:13, 109:11, 123:18, 125:2, 141:8, 151:7, 152:4, 192:15, 195:7, 198:4, 201:6, 201:17, 204:17</p> <p>sort [22] - 18:11, 24:8, 49:5, 61:1, 69:18, 72:10, 73:12, 89:7, 99:14, 117:7, 128:1, 130:5, 132:3, 139:15, 142:11, 156:10, 156:13, 171:15, 180:17, 181:14, 189:17, 192:5</p> <p>sorting [1] - 68:4</p> <p>sounded [1] - 93:12</p> <p>sounds [2] - 39:3, 100:1</p> <p>south [5] - 128:6, 199:16, 200:3, 201:5, 201:7</p> <p>southern [1] - 125:11</p> <p>Spa [1] - 183:15</p> <p>space [28] - 75:4, 95:8, 129:11, 133:5, 133:15, 136:14, 143:17, 147:1, 156:13, 158:11, 158:13, 159:13, 160:16, 161:18, 179:18, 185:18, 186:15, 186:16, 187:5, 187:6, 189:8, 189:9, 189:12, 189:15, 192:17, 192:18, 193:12, 195:16</p> <p>spaces [5] - 133:11, 144:12, 158:6, 164:15, 193:7</p> <p>spatial [2] - 52:8, 52:9</p> <p>speaker [1] - 158:7</p> <p>speakers [1] - 162:14</p> <p>speaking [3] - 44:16, 88:13, 123:3</p> <p>Special [28] - 3:4, 3:6, 3:8, 11:10, 12:6,</p>	<p>14:2, 15:5, 17:10, 25:14, 90:18, 91:7, 93:17, 94:7, 95:16, 180:16, 181:4, 187:12, 187:14, 188:4, 188:7, 190:2, 193:13, 195:3, 195:10, 196:12, 200:16, 203:1, 213:14</p> <p>special [1] - 43:16</p> <p>specific [5] - 35:11, 77:14, 78:4, 132:16, 167:13</p> <p>specifically [1] - 149:11</p> <p>specify [1] - 161:4</p> <p>spell [1] - 23:16</p> <p>spelled [1] - 11:14</p> <p>spelling [1] - 158:17</p> <p>spend [4] - 22:3, 105:1, 105:14, 106:3</p> <p>spent [1] - 111:18</p> <p>splinter [1] - 100:5</p> <p>spoken [1] - 20:3</p> <p>sponsored [5] - 69:2, 69:3, 72:3, 72:6, 72:7</p> <p>sponsoring [1] - 69:6</p> <p>spread [1] - 6:2</p> <p>spring [1] - 101:13</p> <p>Square [24] - 4:18, 122:5, 125:10, 125:12, 128:3, 128:4, 128:5, 128:6, 156:10, 162:7, 176:14, 183:5, 183:8, 183:10, 183:11, 183:12, 183:17, 184:4, 199:17, 200:2, 200:3, 201:7</p> <p>square [34] - 17:8, 17:9, 36:11, 36:12, 52:13, 98:10, 98:11, 98:13, 137:11, 146:14, 146:16, 146:18, 147:5, 147:13, 147:14, 150:16, 152:2, 159:10, 162:10, 163:9, 172:17, 183:7, 183:8, 183:12, 184:3, 185:12, 186:17, 186:18, 187:2, 189:7, 201:2, 201:5, 201:8</p> <p>SS [1] - 222:3</p> <p>Staff [1] - 1:13</p>	<p>staff [65] - 7:16, 12:2, 14:5, 18:3, 18:17, 19:3, 20:3, 21:8, 22:9, 24:13, 25:15, 25:16, 25:17, 26:4, 26:5, 26:14, 27:14, 30:12, 42:17, 54:16, 59:12, 66:10, 67:2, 68:16, 79:16, 79:17, 80:7, 80:10, 81:4, 87:14, 89:9, 93:7, 93:15, 94:8, 95:13, 96:14, 98:14, 100:14, 112:12, 112:17, 113:7, 114:2, 114:10, 115:11, 119:17, 120:7, 120:18, 122:18, 123:1, 148:7, 155:17, 167:16, 168:14, 169:3, 177:15, 179:2, 181:13, 181:16, 182:10, 190:7, 197:3, 197:11, 197:18, 207:17, 212:14</p> <p>staff's [1] - 85:11</p> <p>staffing [1] - 113:4</p> <p>stairway [1] - 150:14</p> <p>stakeholders [1] - 27:16</p> <p>stand [1] - 83:15</p> <p>standard [1] - 136:6</p> <p>standards [1] - 33:6</p> <p>standing [2] - 39:6, 108:11</p> <p>stare [1] - 50:1</p> <p>start [13] - 4:9, 20:9, 49:4, 53:14, 71:17, 79:5, 80:1, 87:16, 113:7, 114:1, 126:18, 166:13</p> <p>Start [1] - 148:8</p> <p>started [5] - 38:18, 82:7, 93:10, 130:7, 142:9</p> <p>starting [4] - 36:10, 75:7, 113:6, 113:17</p> <p>state [2] - 139:6, 145:2</p> <p>statement [2] - 92:12, 189:17</p> <p>statement(s) [1] - 221:17</p> <p>states [1] - 48:2</p> <p>static [1] - 87:7</p> <p>status [6] - 10:7, 119:16, 149:3, 171:1, 171:2, 201:10</p>	<p>stay [5] - 122:5, 149:1, 149:9, 184:13, 206:7</p> <p>stays [1] - 214:13</p> <p>stealth [1] - 216:9</p> <p>steel [7] - 215:14, 215:18, 217:7, 217:11, 218:6, 218:11, 218:13</p> <p>stenographer [1] - 23:17</p> <p>STENOGRAPHER [1] - 158:16</p> <p>stenographically [1] - 9:14</p> <p>step [1] - 117:10</p> <p>steps [1] - 121:13</p> <p>Steve [7] - 49:12, 65:4, 66:6, 92:12, 179:5, 182:5, 187:18</p> <p>STEVEN [36] - 23:7, 66:7, 78:14, 85:14, 85:17, 96:1, 96:13, 97:4, 97:6, 99:14, 105:18, 115:13, 115:15, 116:18, 117:13, 179:6, 179:16, 188:8, 192:4, 192:14, 192:18, 194:5, 195:2, 195:11, 196:15, 199:4, 199:7, 203:5, 203:13, 208:13, 211:10, 211:15, 212:3, 212:8, 213:2, 216:12</p> <p>Steven [1] - 1:9</p> <p>still [10] - 8:8, 19:18, 69:18, 81:4, 83:3, 87:15, 116:16, 124:17, 131:11, 164:8</p> <p>stilt [2] - 177:16, 197:4</p> <p>stipulating [1] - 29:4</p> <p>stole [1] - 182:6</p> <p>stone [1] - 15:2</p> <p>stool [2] - 32:9, 32:12</p> <p>storage [1] - 187:1</p> <p>store [2] - 182:15, 184:15</p> <p>stores [12] - 144:6, 175:2, 175:12, 176:1, 176:4, 176:5, 176:8, 182:17, 186:16, 188:1, 188:3</p> <p>stories [4] - 152:8, 152:13, 177:13,</p>	<p>177:14</p> <p>story [8] - 94:2, 156:8, 164:10, 170:13, 170:15, 177:4, 179:12, 187:5</p> <p>straight [2] - 154:13, 216:5</p> <p>straightforward [3] - 82:3, 206:2, 214:6</p> <p>strategic [1] - 143:7</p> <p>stream [2] - 117:9, 118:6</p> <p>streamed [1] - 118:1</p> <p>Street [16] - 3:6, 27:13, 38:9, 42:13, 48:5, 139:9, 155:2, 155:11, 159:1, 159:8, 163:4, 163:8, 209:11, 209:18, 210:16, 213:4</p> <p>street [12] - 122:4, 129:10, 134:7, 136:4, 137:4, 155:1, 155:14, 157:11, 159:18, 178:7, 185:14, 185:17</p> <p>streetcar [1] - 130:6</p> <p>streetscape [4] - 99:14, 130:12, 131:4, 135:12</p> <p>strengthened [1] - 45:14</p> <p>stress [1] - 75:9</p> <p>stretch [2] - 161:7, 165:14</p> <p>strict [1] - 29:7</p> <p>strictly [1] - 103:14</p> <p>strip [4] - 171:17, 176:3, 184:15, 188:13</p> <p>strive [1] - 68:7</p> <p>strong [8] - 58:11, 78:15, 92:14, 101:13, 113:10, 129:10, 145:2, 153:9</p> <p>stronger [1] - 71:7</p> <p>strongly [4] - 113:1, 144:18, 164:17, 174:13</p> <p>structure [1] - 66:15</p> <p>structured [2] - 131:9, 201:12</p> <p>structures [2] - 169:1, 201:15</p> <p>STUART [10] - 69:14, 72:4, 73:16, 75:9, 77:15, 88:4, 88:6, 98:2, 117:5, 186:9</p> <p>Stuart [9] - 1:14, 55:16, 69:10, 74:2,</p>
---	--	---	--	---

<p>75:14, 88:5, 92:4, 127:8, 186:8</p> <p>stuck [1] - 131:16</p> <p>student [1] - 156:13</p> <p>studied [1] - 194:13</p> <p>studies [1] - 127:11</p> <p>study [2] - 90:11, 127:2</p> <p>Study [2] - 127:13, 128:8</p> <p>stuff [7] - 32:18, 41:5, 46:7, 49:7, 141:4, 144:7, 160:3</p> <p>style [1] - 154:14</p> <p>Styrofoam [1] - 97:6</p> <p>subdistrict [1] - 122:13</p> <p>Subdistrict [2] - 2:11, 2:13</p> <p>subject [3] - 76:16, 81:4, 137:1</p> <p>submission [2] - 15:12, 35:12</p> <p>submissions [4] - 56:5, 56:14, 56:15</p> <p>submit [2] - 22:8, 156:17</p> <p>submittal [1] - 58:4</p> <p>submittals [2] - 58:1, 58:2</p> <p>submitted [4] - 21:2, 47:3, 126:10, 168:3</p> <p>subscribe [1] - 221:16</p> <p>subsequent [2] - 29:6, 190:9</p> <p>substance [2] - 199:11, 199:12</p> <p>substantial [1] - 71:2</p> <p>substantiate [1] - 59:13</p> <p>substantive [2] - 210:6, 210:7</p> <p>success [1] - 166:1</p> <p>successful [2] - 166:2, 176:16</p> <p>sudden [1] - 89:3</p> <p>sufficient [2] - 109:14, 109:15</p> <p>suggest [7] - 10:8, 66:17, 89:6, 100:2, 134:11, 143:5, 165:6</p> <p>suggested [1] - 33:3</p> <p>suggesting [1] - 137:13</p> <p>suggestion [5] - 79:15, 85:11, 99:17, 167:8, 189:7</p> <p>suggestions [1] - 168:7</p>	<p>suggests [2] - 25:12, 169:2</p> <p>suitable [1] - 147:13</p> <p>summarizes [1] - 125:16</p> <p>summary [8] - 12:8, 12:9, 34:11, 44:1, 44:17, 47:1, 140:3, 174:11</p> <p>supplemental [3] - 15:8, 58:4, 58:6</p> <p>supplementary [1] - 58:2</p> <p>support [25] - 68:6, 77:3, 133:9, 140:11, 140:12, 144:18, 145:17, 146:4, 146:6, 146:12, 147:1, 147:6, 147:14, 153:9, 155:17, 157:7, 158:14, 165:8, 169:13, 172:17, 174:11, 174:14, 177:3, 187:17, 191:10</p> <p>supported [4] - 139:11, 155:14, 155:17, 155:18</p> <p>supporting [2] - 147:15, 154:6</p> <p>supposed [2] - 40:6, 58:3</p> <p>surely [1] - 101:8</p> <p>surprised [3] - 117:4, 118:11, 120:10</p> <p>surrounding [5] - 52:15, 81:1, 91:4, 96:3, 109:17</p> <p>surroundings [5] - 35:9, 79:3, 80:4, 96:8, 98:18</p> <p>survey [1] - 182:14</p> <p>surveys [1] - 140:14</p> <p>Susan [3] - 51:8, 145:9, 145:12</p> <p>SUSAN [3] - 51:10, 145:10, 198:4</p> <p>suspect [2] - 154:2, 191:4</p> <p>Suzannah [2] - 1:15, 218:4</p> <p>SUZANNAH [2] - 218:5, 218:8</p> <p>Swaathi [1] - 1:15</p> <p>swapped [1] - 211:1</p> <p>sympathetic [1] - 180:2</p> <p>system [5] - 20:5, 20:8, 57:18, 101:14, 104:3</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">T</p> <p>table [6] - 32:8, 34:4, 81:18, 147:16, 168:14, 179:14</p> <p>tacked [1] - 139:15</p> <p>Taha [1] - 127:6</p> <p>tailored [1] - 165:14</p> <p>talks [2] - 16:15, 19:8</p> <p>tall [1] - 163:9</p> <p>taller [2] - 129:4, 159:12</p> <p>tallest [1] - 213:10</p> <p>tax [2] - 143:13, 164:10</p> <p>TEAGUE [2] - 48:4, 51:5</p> <p>Teague [2] - 48:3, 48:5</p> <p>technical [2] - 24:10, 25:8</p> <p>technology [1] - 107:1</p> <p>Ted [6] - 56:1, 64:7, 88:4, 101:6, 117:6, 179:17</p> <p>Ted's [2] - 69:17, 204:18</p> <p>Teddy [1] - 183:18</p> <p>tee [1] - 140:10</p> <p>televise [3] - 116:8, 117:8, 118:12</p> <p>televised [1] - 116:2</p> <p>ten [2] - 104:18, 142:13</p> <p>ten-year-old [1] - 142:13</p> <p>tenant [2] - 158:12, 180:15</p> <p>tenants [9] - 147:10, 147:13, 157:17, 180:5, 180:9, 180:10, 180:18, 181:2, 181:3</p> <p>tend [1] - 102:7</p> <p>tended [1] - 129:9</p> <p>tends [2] - 159:14, 216:18</p> <p>tenth [1] - 116:5</p> <p>terms [14] - 5:6, 49:17, 56:14, 62:1, 68:15, 70:15, 75:1, 91:3, 113:11, 117:10, 146:7, 174:11, 207:15</p> <p>testimony [3] - 10:16, 21:2, 21:4</p> <p>testimony's [1] - 10:14</p> <p>texts [1] - 2:13</p>	<p>THE [7] - 1:1, 1:17, 158:16, 222:14, 222:14, 222:15, 222:15</p> <p>themselves [4] - 66:14, 74:5, 74:11, 207:15</p> <p>Theodore [1] - 1:7</p> <p>THEODORE [150] - 4:3, 6:7, 6:10, 23:9, 23:12, 27:11, 31:12, 33:13, 37:16, 38:3, 42:10, 46:16, 47:15, 51:3, 51:7, 51:11, 53:9, 53:12, 55:18, 56:3, 56:18, 58:16, 60:4, 60:8, 62:15, 65:4, 68:13, 73:4, 74:2, 75:8, 75:11, 78:10, 81:6, 82:5, 85:4, 85:16, 88:5, 90:15, 92:3, 93:2, 93:6, 93:12, 94:1, 94:6, 94:14, 94:18, 95:11, 98:4, 99:3, 99:10, 99:16, 100:2, 100:9, 101:8, 105:7, 107:5, 107:15, 109:9, 110:4, 110:13, 114:3, 114:9, 115:14, 116:15, 117:3, 118:10, 118:15, 119:12, 120:2, 120:14, 120:17, 121:15, 122:1, 122:7, 123:18, 124:7, 125:1, 141:6, 145:8, 148:2, 152:11, 153:6, 159:2, 159:6, 160:4, 163:1, 166:7, 166:10, 168:11, 172:10, 172:13, 173:4, 174:9, 175:13, 179:15, 182:3, 182:8, 183:1, 184:12, 184:18, 185:2, 185:7, 186:8, 187:8, 188:4, 188:10, 189:1, 190:3, 190:6, 190:16, 191:7, 191:12, 192:3, 197:1, 197:11, 197:15, 197:17, 198:3, 198:12, 199:2, 199:6, 199:8, 200:7, 201:14, 202:5, 203:3, 203:10, 203:14, 204:4, 205:2, 205:6,</p>	<p>207:11, 208:3, 208:12, 208:14, 209:5, 209:16, 210:7, 210:13, 212:9, 213:1, 213:15, 214:4, 218:1, 218:12, 219:12, 219:15, 220:2, 220:5, 220:10</p> <p>theory [1] - 189:13</p> <p>thereafter [1] - 66:4</p> <p>therefor [1] - 221:7</p> <p>therefrom [1] - 33:9</p> <p>they've [5] - 12:9, 48:17, 49:13, 139:15, 171:7</p> <p>thing's [1] - 46:9</p> <p>thinking [8] - 38:18, 64:7, 79:4, 98:1, 111:2, 122:15, 175:10, 187:17</p> <p>thinks [2] - 45:1, 111:16</p> <p>third [1] - 32:11</p> <p>THIS [1] - 222:14</p> <p>thoughtful [1] - 144:17</p> <p>thoughts [3] - 40:1, 42:5, 179:17</p> <p>thousand [1] - 189:12</p> <p>Three [1] - 148:5</p> <p>three [41] - 3:5, 3:7, 3:9, 19:9, 19:15, 19:18, 23:15, 24:6, 32:8, 34:12, 36:1, 50:18, 53:4, 55:2, 55:4, 79:11, 80:3, 83:2, 83:13, 85:8, 87:5, 88:12, 101:7, 102:4, 102:8, 103:15, 111:8, 148:6, 157:1, 172:5, 175:9, 175:17, 204:8, 204:10, 204:15, 205:15, 206:3, 210:17, 213:16, 214:6</p> <p>three-and-a-half [1] - 103:15</p> <p>three-dimensional [3] - 83:13, 85:8, 88:12</p> <p>three-dimensionality [1] - 87:5</p> <p>three-dimensionally [1] - 80:3</p> <p>three-legged [1] - 32:8</p> <p>three-person [1] - 83:2</p>
---	--	--	--	---

<p>throughout [2] - 9:12, 193:8</p> <p>throw [1] - 55:15</p> <p>thunder [1] - 182:6</p> <p>Thursday [15] - 18:17, 19:3, 21:5, 22:6, 22:7, 22:12, 25:13, 25:18, 26:1, 26:3, 43:12, 64:3, 65:7, 65:10, 100:13</p> <p>tie [2] - 61:13, 138:8</p> <p>tied [1] - 138:13</p> <p>timekeeper [1] - 101:10</p> <p>timekeepers [1] - 102:18</p> <p>timekeeping [1] - 103:8</p> <p>timeline [3] - 46:9, 55:1, 55:11</p> <p>timely [2] - 57:5, 66:3</p> <p>timer [3] - 102:13, 104:3, 104:9</p> <p>timing [5] - 19:1, 37:8, 43:3, 53:15, 190:17</p> <p>tiny [1] - 156:15</p> <p>tip [1] - 125:3</p> <p>TO [1] - 222:14</p> <p>today [2] - 6:9, 206:13</p> <p>today's [1] - 4:13</p> <p>together [11] - 32:7, 44:10, 63:14, 74:7, 75:1, 86:14, 86:15, 90:13, 125:15, 140:3, 189:6</p> <p>token [1] - 78:17</p> <p>Tom [5] - 1:8, 81:6, 83:1, 115:16, 142:10</p> <p>TOM [18] - 81:7, 94:16, 97:7, 97:14, 98:6, 104:15, 105:4, 105:8, 106:1, 107:10, 107:16, 172:12, 173:6, 188:6, 209:3, 210:3, 219:8, 219:14</p> <p>Tom's [1] - 115:16</p> <p>tomorrow [1] - 214:3</p> <p>tone [1] - 212:11</p> <p>tongue [1] - 125:3</p> <p>tonight [4] - 48:6, 103:16, 105:13, 191:4</p> <p>took [1] - 174:7</p> <p>tool [2] - 81:14, 195:3</p> <p>tools [1] - 164:14</p> <p>top [4] - 71:3, 135:16, 208:6, 214:14</p> <p>topic [2] - 104:16, 125:14</p>	<p>topics [2] - 6:1, 125:6</p> <p>Topius [1] - 213:5</p> <p>total [1] - 134:6</p> <p>totally [3] - 93:16, 155:12, 157:7</p> <p>tough [2] - 53:18, 181:11</p> <p>towards [4] - 25:6, 45:6, 67:5, 93:4</p> <p>tower [1] - 217:4</p> <p>Town [4] - 4:14, 7:3, 183:14, 209:3</p> <p>town [3] - 53:3, 105:11, 106:9</p> <p>towns [1] - 49:13</p> <p>Trading [1] - 183:5</p> <p>traffic [1] - 143:14</p> <p>trafficked [1] - 151:10</p> <p>training [1] - 164:4</p> <p>transcribed [3] - 9:9, 9:14, 10:12</p> <p>transcript [4] - 221:2, 221:6, 221:15, 221:16</p> <p>TRANSCRIPT [1] - 222:14</p> <p>Transcript(s) [1] - 2:5</p> <p>transcripts [1] - 6:8</p> <p>transformation [1] - 128:9</p> <p>transformer [1] - 31:1</p> <p>transit [2] - 128:13, 173:17</p> <p>transition [2] - 118:8, 130:17</p> <p>transmitted [3] - 21:6, 65:11, 65:16</p> <p>transparency [3] - 101:15, 102:12, 104:1</p> <p>transportation [1] - 151:12</p> <p>tremendously [1] - 59:2</p> <p>trench [1] - 30:17</p> <p>trial [1] - 70:1</p> <p>tried [1] - 113:12</p> <p>trigger [2] - 31:6, 85:11</p> <p>trivial [1] - 50:9</p> <p>troubling [1] - 25:14</p> <p>true [5] - 24:18, 28:16, 84:3, 193:8, 222:6</p> <p>truly [2] - 133:15, 208:18</p> <p>Trust [1] - 210:1</p> <p>trust [1] - 145:14</p> <p>trustee [1] - 145:13</p> <p>try [19] - 22:1, 22:11, 23:5, 23:13, 29:1, 54:10, 61:11, 64:8,</p>	<p>82:11, 89:7, 115:1, 125:18, 130:11, 138:10, 140:6, 171:17, 180:7, 219:6</p> <p>trying [15] - 14:4, 29:14, 32:7, 32:12, 34:9, 73:16, 104:13, 112:5, 131:15, 132:14, 135:11, 144:14, 162:4, 208:5</p> <p>tucked [1] - 194:3</p> <p>Tuesday [2] - 1:3, 142:16</p> <p>Tuesdays [1] - 21:17</p> <p>tune [1] - 115:11</p> <p>turn [3] - 40:18, 50:7, 178:12</p> <p>turned [1] - 119:7</p> <p>turning [1] - 111:3</p> <p>turnover [1] - 133:7</p> <p>turns [2] - 20:11, 20:12</p> <p>tweak [1] - 165:6</p> <p>twice [1] - 10:5</p> <p>twinkly [1] - 89:18</p> <p>two [20] - 15:9, 15:13, 19:16, 31:3, 50:5, 51:15, 58:4, 61:5, 86:7, 86:10, 87:7, 111:3, 140:4, 169:16, 172:5, 186:9, 189:6, 206:14, 211:7, 212:11</p> <p>two-dimensional [1] - 86:10</p> <p>two-family [1] - 111:3</p> <p>two-week [1] - 15:13</p> <p>type [7] - 40:16, 93:7, 138:14, 153:13, 162:2, 178:16, 195:16</p> <p>types [2] - 147:7, 161:5</p> <p>typical [1] - 166:15</p> <p>typically [4] - 43:10, 186:2, 217:1, 217:4</p>	<p>160:14</p> <p>unappealing [1] - 174:3</p> <p>unavailable [1] - 150:12</p> <p>unclear [1] - 17:5</p> <p>uncomfortable [1] - 70:8</p> <p>UNDER [1] - 222:15</p> <p>under [11] - 9:15, 54:3, 57:18, 76:2, 172:1, 175:9, 183:3, 186:11, 195:13, 206:15</p> <p>undersigned [1] - 222:4</p> <p>unduly [1] - 194:7</p> <p>unfair [1] - 57:3</p> <p>unfairly [1] - 24:17</p> <p>unfortunately [1] - 203:15</p> <p>UNIDENTIFIED [5] - 38:2, 154:10, 215:4, 215:11, 216:6</p> <p>uniformity [2] - 106:12, 106:13</p> <p>unimportant [1] - 85:2</p> <p>unintended [1] - 144:16</p> <p>unit [3] - 192:17, 192:18, 193:12</p> <p>units [2] - 151:2, 214:16</p> <p>University [1] - 204:13</p> <p>unless [4] - 15:10, 93:14, 94:8, 186:3</p> <p>UNLESS [1] - 222:15</p> <p>unnecessary [1] - 79:14</p> <p>unreasonable [2] - 63:12, 204:8</p> <p>unviable [1] - 151:5</p> <p>up [70] - 4:15, 6:11, 7:12, 17:14, 20:12, 23:6, 23:13, 23:15, 29:6, 31:9, 33:4, 43:7, 48:15, 49:5, 56:1, 56:12, 57:7, 59:9, 60:8, 61:3, 65:1, 68:7, 75:3, 79:10, 83:15, 89:17, 92:7, 93:7, 95:12, 95:14, 96:17, 106:15, 112:17, 116:18, 118:11, 120:10, 121:7, 123:15, 124:2, 125:7, 131:6, 131:16, 135:16,</p>	<p>137:17, 140:10, 140:13, 142:1, 142:8, 144:11, 151:14, 152:12, 153:14, 154:11, 156:15, 158:9, 160:18, 161:14, 173:7, 176:18, 178:3, 182:16, 189:15, 196:5, 201:15, 207:6, 209:3, 212:10, 216:4, 216:5, 216:13</p> <p>upcoming [1] - 4:13</p> <p>Update [1] - 2:3</p> <p>update [2] - 4:9, 119:16</p> <p>updated [2] - 46:13, 119:5</p> <p>updating [2] - 6:12, 171:4</p> <p>upgrade [4] - 3:5, 3:7, 3:9, 220:1</p> <p>uploaded [1] - 54:10</p> <p>urban [4] - 62:5, 142:3, 171:4, 171:8</p> <p>useful [3] - 48:16, 59:4, 84:6</p> <p>uses [9] - 20:8, 131:12, 131:13, 133:8, 133:16, 136:11, 161:5, 193:11, 196:8</p>
			<p>V</p> <p>valuable [6] - 36:6, 39:15, 40:1, 60:15, 60:16, 66:2</p> <p>value [3] - 66:9, 161:11, 161:14</p> <p>Variance [2] - 158:13, 187:13</p> <p>variations [3] - 72:15, 73:1, 137:15</p> <p>Variety [1] - 133:8</p> <p>Variety [1] - 183:14</p> <p>various [5] - 5:12, 5:18, 6:1, 6:15, 7:3</p> <p>vary [1] - 195:3</p> <p>vast [2] - 56:13, 88:6</p> <p>Vellucci [2] - 163:6, 163:14</p> <p>verbiage [1] - 15:5</p> <p>verify [1] - 103:3</p> <p>version [1] - 29:15</p> <p>versions [1] - 72:13</p> <p>versus [4] - 111:17, 131:12, 175:11, 210:8</p>	
		<p>U</p> <p>U.S [1] - 210:1</p> <p>ugly [4] - 76:11, 76:15, 154:1, 215:1</p> <p>ultimate [1] - 164:13</p> <p>ultimately [3] - 38:15, 62:13, 163:13</p> <p>unanimous [1] - 197:17</p> <p>unanimously [1] -</p>		

<p>viable [2] - 133:10, 133:16</p> <p>vibrant [2] - 130:12, 133:6</p> <p>Vice [2] - 1:7, 105:8</p> <p>Victorian [1] - 155:15</p> <p>video [2] - 79:10, 118:7</p> <p>videotape [1] - 117:9</p> <p>view [10] - 44:7, 69:5, 83:18, 84:15, 84:18, 88:14, 104:9, 123:12, 191:11, 207:17</p> <p>viewing [1] - 88:18</p> <p>views [5] - 83:7, 84:15, 88:10, 88:12, 139:16</p> <p>village [1] - 161:2</p> <p>virtual [1] - 97:9</p> <p>virtually [2] - 115:18, 150:8</p> <p>virtue [2] - 87:4, 194:18</p> <p>vision [4] - 40:8, 83:14, 130:9, 134:8</p> <p>visit [1] - 154:5</p> <p>visited [1] - 155:4</p> <p>visual [1] - 101:14</p> <p>visualizing [1] - 92:18</p> <p>visually [1] - 212:16</p> <p>visuals [1] - 117:17</p> <p>vital [1] - 157:16</p> <p>vividly [1] - 157:12</p> <p>voice [2] - 187:17</p> <p>voices [2] - 71:11, 106:8</p> <p>volume [1] - 221:6</p> <p>volumes [1] - 84:2</p> <p>volunteers [1] - 21:14</p> <p>vote [5] - 121:5, 155:5, 182:9, 190:7, 190:8</p> <p>voted [2] - 198:5, 202:17</p> <p>voting [1] - 191:4</p> <p>W</p> <p>wait [1] - 26:13</p> <p>waiting [1] - 57:2</p> <p>waive [2] - 80:5, 195:15</p> <p>waived [2] - 193:6, 193:8</p> <p>waivers [1] - 195:18</p> <p>walk [6] - 87:8, 92:9, 97:13, 125:18, 176:2, 205:12</p> <p>walkability [1] -</p>	<p>130:13</p> <p>wants [9] - 30:16, 51:1, 57:10, 77:12, 110:14, 115:16, 157:10, 190:13, 199:1</p> <p>ward [1] - 184:17</p> <p>Ward [1] - 185:1</p> <p>warning [2] - 20:7, 23:17</p> <p>warrant [1] - 80:6</p> <p>Washington [1] - 51:15</p> <p>watching [1] - 98:5</p> <p>ways [3] - 40:14, 56:17, 107:17</p> <p>wear [1] - 97:10</p> <p>weather [1] - 7:2</p> <p>weathered [2] - 217:7, 217:11</p> <p>website [12] - 4:15, 21:13, 26:7, 26:12, 27:5, 35:18, 47:4, 47:12, 47:18, 114:11, 118:4, 186:11</p> <p>Wednesday [1] - 43:11</p> <p>week [12] - 15:13, 24:16, 35:12, 54:11, 58:5, 58:17, 61:16, 66:5, 74:8, 105:17, 207:18, 220:7</p> <p>weekdays [1] - 55:9</p> <p>weekend [4] - 22:3, 55:7, 55:10, 64:8</p> <p>weeks [5] - 15:9, 16:6, 54:15, 61:5, 103:13</p> <p>weeks' [1] - 58:4</p> <p>welcome [2] - 4:4, 122:5</p> <p>well-advised [1] - 121:12</p> <p>well-informed [1] - 63:15</p> <p>WELLER [2] - 159:4, 159:7</p> <p>Weller. [1] - 159:7</p> <p>Wendell [3] - 155:2, 155:11, 156:1</p> <p>whatsoever [1] - 94:3</p> <p>whereas [1] - 87:18</p> <p>whereby [1] - 180:15</p> <p>WHEREOF [1] - 222:7</p> <p>whipping [1] - 90:8</p> <p>white [2] - 211:11, 216:18</p> <p>whole [13] - 8:6, 33:12, 38:12, 39:18, 49:11, 69:10, 109:4, 109:18, 110:18,</p>	<p>111:10, 112:3, 113:3, 196:3</p> <p>wide [3] - 133:16, 177:3, 215:6</p> <p>wider [1] - 212:2</p> <p>wild [1] - 178:2</p> <p>willing [3] - 13:9, 21:1, 160:3</p> <p>wind [2] - 90:7, 90:8</p> <p>wired [1] - 49:11</p> <p>Wireless [1] - 205:11</p> <p>wish [4] - 13:1, 18:14, 40:12, 172:9</p> <p>wishes [7] - 51:12, 53:10, 79:8, 159:3, 160:5, 163:2, 166:8</p> <p>WITNESS [1] - 222:7</p> <p>women [1] - 157:12</p> <p>wonder [5] - 84:5, 90:4, 98:12, 106:1, 106:7</p> <p>wonderful [1] - 107:1</p> <p>wondering [3] - 62:3, 198:6, 198:9</p> <p>wood [1] - 130:4</p> <p>word [3] - 6:3, 33:8, 219:4</p> <p>words [3] - 64:16, 171:15, 174:7</p> <p>workable [1] - 55:5</p> <p>workflow [2] - 61:15, 66:15</p> <p>works [9] - 111:13, 113:8, 113:9, 117:10, 117:12, 185:18, 195:12, 216:2, 217:5</p> <p>Works [1] - 117:6</p> <p>World [1] - 178:12</p> <p>worried [1] - 71:12</p> <p>worries [1] - 159:5</p> <p>worse [1] - 209:1</p> <p>worst [1] - 208:18</p> <p>wrap [2] - 31:9, 158:9</p> <p>write [1] - 63:9</p> <p>writing [1] - 35:14</p> <p>written [5] - 21:2, 21:4, 56:4, 145:4, 188:12</p> <p>wrote [1] - 139:1</p> <p>www.cambridgema.gov/cdd/zoninganddevelopment [1] - 2:14</p> <p>www.reportersinc.com [1] - 1:18</p> <p>Y</p> <p>year [6] - 7:1, 142:13,</p>	<p>149:2, 149:5, 149:11, 157:1</p> <p>years [18] - 10:4, 60:9, 70:2, 72:6, 82:8, 82:18, 97:16, 143:8, 156:5, 163:7, 164:7, 166:2, 172:6, 176:2, 176:7, 178:4, 216:4</p> <p>yellow [1] - 20:11</p> <p>young [2] - 27:12, 52:17</p> <p>YOUNG [2] - 27:13, 31:10</p> <p>Young [2] - 27:13, 50:13</p> <p>Z</p> <p>ZBA [2] - 204:8, 209:15</p> <p>Zelinski [2] - 222:4, 222:10</p> <p>zinc [1] - 216:1</p> <p>zone [1] - 138:4</p> <p>Zoning [33] - 2:10, 3:3, 8:3, 8:4, 62:4, 62:5, 75:18, 123:7, 123:8, 123:10, 125:8, 127:2, 129:1, 129:2, 131:9, 131:14, 134:12, 135:5, 135:8, 138:12, 142:7, 146:14, 149:12, 154:14, 155:5, 158:2, 164:12, 166:16, 171:2, 197:6, 199:18, 200:1, 200:2</p> <p>zoning [28] - 2:12, 2:13, 4:6, 8:6, 62:11, 125:13, 126:8, 132:3, 132:13, 136:16, 137:6, 137:10, 137:15, 138:1, 138:2, 138:3, 138:8, 146:3, 146:10, 165:12, 168:9, 168:10, 171:5, 173:15, 195:8, 196:9, 199:15, 203:8</p> <p>zoning/ amendments [1] - 2:14</p> <p>zoom [1] - 128:2</p> <p>zoom-out [1] - 128:2</p>
--	--	--	---