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EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT: Good
morning.

If anyone has a cell phone on, we would
appreciate it if you would put it on silent.

This is License Commission. It's the

Decision Making Hearing, Thursday, May 28, 2015.

It's 10:09 a.m. We are in the Michael J.

Lombardi Building, 832 Mass. Ave, Basement

Conference Room.
Before you are the Commissioners: Chair

Andrea Jackson, Fire Chief Gerald Reardon and

Police Commissioner Robert Haas.

## APPLICATION:

ABBEY CAMBRIDGE, LLC D/B/A THE ABBEY

## EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT: First

matter is the application of The Abbey, LLC,
doing business as The Abbey, Jean-Claude

Barrault, Manager, holder of an All Alcoholic

Beverages Restaurant License at 1755

Massachusetts Avenue has applied for an

Alteration of Premise to include an outdoor
seasonal patio on the public sidewalk for six seats.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: I don't believe
they are here this morning, which is fine,
because $I$ think we told them they didn't have to be here.
As it relates to The Abbey, I know
that there's been some back and forth between the City and the ABCC as it relates to the location of outdoor patios because our preference is to put them curbside versus the ABCC's preference and guidelines to be contiguous to the building. And until we're able to work matters out,

I'm going to make a motion that we continue this

```
application. My fear is that if we were to
approve it as currently designed curbside that
```

the ABCC would subsequently deny it.
So I would like to make a motion that we
continue the application for The Abbey for the
outdoor seasonal patio.
FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: Second.
CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: All those in favor
signify by --
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT: May I
suggest that you approve the CV only for them?
CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Okay. So I
retract my motion.
I would like to make a motion first that
we approve their outdoor seasonal patio for the
CV portion only.
Is there a second?
FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: Second.
CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: All those in favor

```
signify by saying aye.
```

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: Aye.

FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: Aye.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: I would like to
make a motion that we continue the matter as it relates to serving alcohol on the outdoor seasonal patio.

Is there a second?

FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: Second.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: All those in favor
signify by saying aye.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: Aye.

FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: Aye.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Thank you.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: So I
just have one question. So you're going to allow
them temporarily to put it curbside, right, until we get this resolved?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT: Well,

```
because for food, it just doesn't matter.
    POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: Okay.
```

No, no, I get that. I just want to make sure
that -- I'm just trying to figure out where --
okay.
CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Yep.

## APPLICATION:

BAILEY AND SAGE, LLC

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT:

Application: Bailey and Sage, LLC, holder of a Wine and Malt Beverages Restaurant License, Michael Kaplan, Manager, at 5 Cambridge Center, has applied for an alteration of premise to expand the approved patio inside the atrium and include two additional patios outside in a private courtyard.

ATTY KEVIN CRANE: Good morning, Madam

Chair and Members of the Commission. My name is

Kevin Crane. I'm the attorney that represents
the petitioner in this matter.

First of all, Madam Chair, we do have a
letter from the landlord approving the plan. (Forwarding documents.)

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: So, counsel, I
guess, let me start by saying this: I know we
continued this from the last hearing, and
yesterday, $I$ went by Bailey and Sage and was
upset to see that even though we had not approved
the current alteration of premise, it had already
been done. So, the 36 seats that you're
requesting in the lobby and the patio seating is
already there. So people were sitting in the
lobby, all 36 seats, they were already eating -people were already eating in the patio area that we hadn't even approved.

So, I guess from my standpoint, I guess
my first inclination when $I$ was there yesterday
was: Why did you bother to come here because you
were gonna do it anyway?

ATTY KEVIN CRANE: Madam Chair, I want to acknowledge that a mistake was made there.

I think I will let my client speak to it,
but I believe that he was under the misimpression
that because the landlord would let him use the seats that he could do it so long as he hadn't served any beer and wine out there, so long as he kept it under the capacity of 60 -- I mean, 61, which was the approved capacity.

So, the reason we're here is to get it
squared away. And $I$ will just go back and say
that the problem has been that the seating plan
initially was much more skewed towards the
inside, and as a result of the construction, it
was discovered that the seating in the inside
would be that much less, but they would have
available seats in the lobby area.

So I just want to apologize for that, and

```
I'll let my client speak further to it.
    CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: I would like to
```

hear from him. Let me ask this: What
construction was done differently in the inside
from the time we initially approved it to today?
Because $I$ know when $I$ was inside
yesterday, I didn't see any difference. So it
just looked as though, maybe inside seating was
removed to allow more seats in the lobby, but $I$
didn't see any difference on the inside. I could
be wrong and that's fine, but I didn't see
anything different.
ATTY KEVIN CRANE: On the inside, the
initial plan if you came into the premises on the
right-hand side, there were additional seating in
there. And the setup of the service was such
that those seats were removed.
CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Was it to help the
flow of traffic on the inside more so than actual

```
construction?
```

ATTY KEVIN CRANE: That's right.

MICHAEL KAPLAN: If I can speak?

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Sure.

If you could please identify yourself for
the record.

MICHAEL KAPLAN: Yes, sure. Michael

Kaplan, owner of Bailey and Sage.

When we opened up Bailey and Sage in

Cambridge, we weren't exactly sure on how, you know, the lunch rush was gonna go, which is our main source of business right now. And, you know, thankfully, you know, people started coming to the restaurant and that, you know, 12:00 to 1:00, it's very busy in there. We do a lot of people in that hour and a half, and we had to
remove some of those seating just to get -- so it
wasn't so congested that people could move a
little freer, and wasn't such a, you know -- it
just made it easier.

And just to speak on the seating that's in the lobby. Once again, I do apologize. When the landlord -- because we needed more seating, you know, part of opening a business in your first years, you're trying to make everyone happy and a lot of people were coming, they wanted a seat and we had less than -- you know, far less than what we were approved for seating-wise, and

I wasn't -- I guess I'm at fault, but I didn't know that it mattered inside or in that atrium. The landlord said, "Yeah, sure you can put seats out there. So I don't -- I didn't know as long as we were under that 61-seat capacity, I thought that would be okay, so I guess it was just a misunderstanding. I do apologize for that.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: So, the decrease
of the seating in the inside is to ease really your traffic flow, it's not related to

```
construction?
```

MICHAEL KAPLAN: Well, it was because,
you know, the way the construction was originally
we laid it out, you know, it took up more of the area than we thought, you know, visually thought it would be able to, you know, handle.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: But there was no physical construction to the space is what $I^{\prime} m$ asking.

MICHAEL KAPLAN: After?

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: After you opened. MICHAEL KAPLAN: No.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: So, again, moving
the seating from the inside to the outside was to ease your traffic flow, not related to any physical construction within the space?

MICHAEL KAPLAN: No.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: Did you
see evidence of that when you visited yesterday

```
or no?
```

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: I didn't see anything different in the inside space as it related to physical construction of the space. MICHAEL KAPLAN: Excuse me. I'm sorry. I actually misspoke a little bit. If you look on the plan.

ATTY KEVIN CRANE: This is the old one?

MICHAEL KAPLAN: Yeah, the old one.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Mm—hmm.

MICHAEL KAPLAN: Against the wall here,
we did have room -- I'm sorry. We put our beverage cooler in there and we did have to remove those seatings.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: So where the beverage cooler is currently now, you had seats there?

MICHAEL KAPLAN: Correct.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: How many seats did

```
you have there?
```

ATTY KEVIN CRANE: I would say six seats,

Madam Chair, and the other side where the traffic flow was, there were probably eight seats, plus those other two, probably 12 seats on that side. CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Where was the beverage cooler prior?

MICHAEL KAPLAN: This comes all the way down here, so these seats were all gone. Okay. ATTY KEVIN CRANE: Where is the beverage cooler now?

MICHAEL KAPLAN: The beverage cooler
is --

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: I know where it is
now, where was it before?

MICHAEL KAPLAN: We didn't have it.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: You didn't have it before.

MICHAEL KAPLAN: No. And it's in here

```
I'd also point out that --
```

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: And I also noticed
in the lobby that there were no -- and although not required because you were only serving food there -- there was no alcohol out there because, obviously, it hasn't been approved yet by the ABCC, but there was no stanchions, no perimeter around your seating.

So I know we discussed that at great
length at the original hearing. What are you going to do in terms of outlining a perimeter?

MICHAEL KAPLAN: We're designing
something a little more -- we would like
something more tasteful than just the rope, so
that's the process. We will, a hundred percent,
before beer and wine starts to be served have
that, you know, sectioned off in both areas.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: When do you
anticipate this design being done? I guess from
my standpoint, the concern is that you've already went ahead and put the seating out there without having approval, and then to still not have the perimeter outlined, my concern is whether or not a perimeter actually would go back there because if $I$ have to go back again and don't see a perimeter, we're going to end up bringing you back in for a disciplinary hearing and you will possibly be having your beer and wine revoked. MICHAEL KAPLAN: And $I$ would be --
there's no way I'm starting beer and wine out there without the perimeter. So I would completely understand being brought back in here in for a disciplinary hearing. Because it means a lot to us as well to be able to control that area.

Like I said, this is just -- this is just
in addition, you know, for our clients, our
customers that -- if they wanted an extra
beverage, you know, after work with a meal.

Right now, like I said, our lunch rush is doing very well. We're dying off dramatically
after that lunch rush, which is really hurting
us. We don't have -- our nighttime business
isn't there. You know, we trickle in a few people.
Some of the surrounding areas with
restaurants like Clover, the Ames Street that
just opened who do serve beer and wine, I believe that is an advantage. So we're surrounded -we're actually the only one of our neighbors right there that isn't serving beer and wine. So after that lunch rush, it's just -- our drop off is so dramatic that it's hurting business.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: SO
you're anticipating that your business will pick up again once the application has been approved?

MICHAEL KAPLAN: I believe so. I believe
it's a draw, especially for after work. That outdoor patio area, you know, after work, to sit outside and have a beer or a glass of wine with maybe a snack after work will definitely help the business.

I think it's just another option. CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: I haven't even
touched on the outside piece of it.

I know from my view, $I$ don't support
serving the beer and wine on the outdoor patio.

And I don't know about my fellow Commissioners,
what their thought is. But the fact that you have to leave your establishment, go out into the lobby, go out double doors and then turn the corner to get to the patio -- I'm fine with serving food out there -- but in terms of the
alcohol service, $I$ just -- I can't support it. I
mean, it's just -- again, it was a nice little
area for food, but it just seemed rather --

```
there's no direct access from the restaurant to
outside to the patio. You literally have got to
leave your establishment, go outside through
the lobby, out the doors and then over to the
patio.
```

    MICHAEL KAPLAN: From our door to the
    lobby door to exit out there, it's not a great
    distance. I mean, you're essentially touching
where the lobby seating would be.
And like I said, we would have a waiter
or waitress, the only one carrying the alcohol
from that area to the outside area, which would
also be, you know, partitioned off.
Like I said, it's nice to have outdoor
seating. It's really a seasonal thing.
Obviously, we're not going to be doing it 12
months of the year.
We do have full view from the restaurant.
And even my neighbors, you know, you have to

```
cross the public sidewalk to get, you know, to
their seating where they're serving beer and
wine.
```

This is a private alleyway, where there's no public area, you know, that we're crossing.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: If you can see, this is the lobby and outside.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: SO I
know we had a lot of conversation relative to the assignment of waitstaff, and where it's going to be, I mean, so I'm just wondering if that, to some degree, will allay the concerns of myself and the Chair with respect to making sure this is adequately monitored.
You know, it's one thing to be able to
have a clear view, but if your waitstaff is all
tied up given the volume of your lunch business,

I'm sure they're going to be preoccupied.

Who is actually monitoring this area?

MICHAEL KAPLAN: There will be a set
person. So that person will --

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: Doing
what, though?

MICHAEL KAPLAN: For that out -- for that
outside --

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: For
service, or to monitor the activity of your
patrons outside?

MICHAEL KAPLAN: That area right now is
six tables. There will be one person that
doesn't deal with anything but that outdoor area.

We would set someone aside for that, so they'd
monitoring it, they'd be, you know, serving it.

So they wouldn't have to deal with the, you know,
other -- the restaurant. That would be their set area.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: This
waitstaff person, they still have to come into
the restaurant to get the food and things like
that, right? So they're going to be leaving this area?

MICHAEL KAPLAN: That's just going to be just for beer and wine, the waitstaff.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: That's all they're going to be doing is just serving beer and wine in that area?

MICHAEL KAPLAN: Yeah, because people can go up and grab food.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: SO
you're going to have a station outside where you can serve beer and wine?

MICHAEL KAPLAN: No, they'll be coming
into the --

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: SO,
again, you lose some continuity with respect to
monitoring this area, and you're going to have
waitstaff leaving to go inside the restaurant. I
think that's part of the concern that we all have with respect to it not being contiguous to the restaurant itself whereas traffic going back and forth. They actually have to go into that lobby and go outside and around the building to get to that area. So who's monitoring -- now, granted it's six tables, but who's monitoring what's going on in that area?

MICHAEL KAPLAN: I completely understand
where your concerns come in. But is that any different than the, you know, other places that have -- you know, are across the sidewalk or, you know, outdoor seating where they have a lot more tables, who's monitoring is that? You know, I
think it falls into that same thing. You know, we're gonna have to obviously keep an eye on it.
I don't think -- like I said, I don't
think that the area in the building where we are

```
trying to get this -- we're not trying to have
like, you know, people coming in and drinking 20
beers. It's just, you know, a beer after work.
It's just like an addition.
    We're not promoting it as any, you know,
crazy, come with all your friends, sit here all
day, lounge out. It's more like, have a beer or
have a glass of wine and have your meal and, you
know, it's time to go.
    POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: But you
have been privy now to the conversation we have
had with The Abbey, the ABCC rules, and things
like that and we're trying to reconcile that.
                    So, in this instance, I think what you're
asking to do is try to continue to stretch that
envelope when we're not really clear where ABCC
is going to pull out on this thing. So I think
what we're trying to do is figure out what
makes -- how do we make sure that we're
```

```
consistent with the ABCC rules. And so I get
your argument that there are patio areas that
```

have that separation, but $I$ think right now, it's
almost a moratorium until we get that resolved.
So I'm just trying to figure out is there
a way that we can reconcile this issue and not
continue to find ourselves possibly being outside
of the scope of ABCC regulations.
MICHAEL KAPLAN: Now, the restaurant that
opened up across the street from me, they just
opened, I think, a couple months ago. They're
crossing, you know, the public sidewalk to get to
their outdoor seating.
CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: What restaurant is
that?

MICHAEL KAPLAN: Ames Street Deli, I
think.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Right. And
they're serving food out there, no alcohol.

MICHAEL KAPLAN: Okay, that's food.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT:

Uh-huh.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: They're on the agenda as well this morning.

MICHAEL KAPLAN: Oh, okay.

ATTY KEVIN CRANE: Just to speak to your point, Commissioner, $I$ think arguably this space could be labeled contiguous.

If you're going out a door and you're not going across, and $I$ hear what -- about that difference with The Abbey. And this might be one, if the Board is inclined to approve it, that we see what the ABCC says.
And, also, I want to point out just on
this particular door to the lobby, it's not the main lobby door. My client tells me, who is there all the time, there's a minimal comings and goings through that door because the only people

```
going through it really would be people that are
going to the garage.
            POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: Uh-huh.
            ATTY KEVIN CRANE: It's not like it's the
```

main. I just want to point that out. The main
lobby door is on Main Street.
FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: Counsel,
since the other night, are we still going with
the plan you have here, or have you been changing
anything?
MICHAEL KAPLAN: If it made -- and I
spoke with -- if it makes it more comfortable, we
would be willing to forego serving alcohol in the
two -- the tables on the side.
FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: You're
talking about limiting it to the six tables?
MICHAEL KAPLAN: Exactly, if that makes
it more comfortable for you guys.
FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: You would
turn around and continue this -- your waitstaff has to walk around here, but this would be blocked off you're saying?

MICHAEL KAPLAN: Correct.

FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: And you would
have the one entrance that continues to the door?

MICHAEL KAPLAN: Uh-huh.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: So you're saying
that you would serve on what's marked as Patio

No. 2 on the drawing and not Patio No. 1?

ATTY KEVIN CRANE: That's correct.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: So if I'm a
patron, I've ordered my food, I have my glass of
wine, $I$ go outside, and $I$ decide $I$ want to -- are
there still going to be tables and chairs on

Patio No. 1?

ATTY KEVIN CRANE: Yes, but you're not
going to have a glass of wine because they --

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Why?

ATTY KEVIN CRANE: They can't get a glass
of wine unless they're already seated with their
food, and then the waitstaff will come over and
ask them if they want beer or wine.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: So what you're
saying is, when people order -- come in and they
place their order, they can't just take their
food and go outside?

ATTY KEVIN CRANE: They can take the
food, but they can't take the beer and wine.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: So, I'm not trying
to be difficult, and I've had no coffee this
morning, so, excuse me.

ATTY KEVIN CRANE: You can have your wine, Madam Chair.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: I can have my
wine, but no coffee. I get it.

So I order my food and, say, I order a
glass of wine, and I'm sitting inside, that's
okay?

ATTY KEVIN CRANE: Sitting inside?

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Inside.

ATTY KEVIN CRANE: I believe on the
inside, correct me if I'm wrong, it would still
be a case that you take your food to the seat and the waitstaff person is going to come over and address any beer or wine choice that you want. CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Okay. So the beer
and wine, you have to order through waitstaff?

ATTY KEVIN CRANE: That's correct.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Any questions?

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: No
other questions.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Any questions?

FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: No further
questions.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: SO nOw,

Chair, while you're contemplating this, I wonder
if it makes sense to -- I get the argument being somewhat contiguous. I get that. Our problem is direct access. If, in fact, we were willing to grant it on an experimental basis for three months and monitor it knowing this License

Commission is pretty active about going out in the field, as you can see from the photographs from yesterday --

MICHAEL KAPLAN: Of course.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: -- then
it puts the burden on you to make sure that you
can adequately control and demonstrate to us that you can adequately control, that you can maintain strict use of alcohol within that particular area.

So I just offer that as something to consider in addition to any motion you may be considering.

MICHAEL KAPLAN: I would accept that

```
responsibility.
    FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: So on this
vote, we need the external seating in the public
arcade and the --
    CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: So it's the
alteration of premise to -- it's the decrease of
seating on the inside, the increase of seating in
the inside atrium, and then the patio seating,
which is modified from what was originally
submitted if we're going with what's on the
schematic of Patio No. 2. It could be this
(indicating).
```

    Is that correct, counsel? So you will
    still do away with Patio No. 1?
ATTY KEVIN CRANE: As far as alcohol.
But food, yes.
CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Let's do it in
separate motions, just so it's kind've clean.
So, I make a motion that we approve the

```
alteration of premise for the reduction of
interior seating and increase of exterior seating
in the inside atrium which expands to 36 seats.
```

    Is there a second?
    FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: Second.
    CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: All those in favor
    signify by saying aye.
POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: Aye.
FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: Aye.
CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: I make a motion
that we approve the patio seating as is shown on
the schematic for Patio No. 2 which shows six
tables to serve beer and wine at those six tables
only, again, as noted, as Patio No. 2.
So that's six tables, 24 seats, is that
correct?
MICHAEL KAPLAN: Uh-huh.
CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: And to make sure
that there are, as required, the barriers that

```
need to be outside as well as the interior,
separating that space. Is there a second?
    FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: Second.
    CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: All those in favor
signify by saying --
    POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: Chair,
can I just put an additional stipulation?
    I think what we want to try to do is to
make sure the barrier is satisfactory to the
License Commission before you go ahead and serve
the alcohol, which would mean you would have to
notify the License Commission and an inspector
will have to go out to make sure it does
establish the kinds of controls we're looking
for.
```

    CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: And can \(I\) amend my
    motion further? Sorry, Jill and sorry,
Elizabeth. Let me try to do this in writing.
So the beer and wine would be served on

Patio No. 2, Patio No. 1 will be allowed, but there will be no alcohol, and $I$ want to be clear, no alcohol to be served on Patio No. 1, which shows two tables, eight seats.

ATTY KEVIN CRANE: Ten seats.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: I forget these
little two here over here. Okay. Ten seats.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT: HOw
many tables?

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Is that a table in the middle, counsel?

ATTY KEVIN CRANE: Yes, it is.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Three tables, ten
seats.

Is there a second?

FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: Second.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: All those in favor signify by saying aye.

FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: Aye.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Aye.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: Aye.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT: Do
you want to add in the three-month review?

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Yes.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: You
haven't gotten to that yet, though, right?

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: I can do it as a separate motion and still throw it in the one letter.

I would like to make a motion that we
also include a three-month review once approved by the ABCC. I also -- go ahead. I'll let someone second before $I$ continue.

FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: Second.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: All those in favor
signify by saying aye.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: Aye.

FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: Aye.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: I do want to make
it clear that if one of our investigators go out and they happen to see stanchions not there, people drinking beer and wine on Patio No. 1, you will be brought in immediately for a disciplinary hearing. I want to make that very, very clear. MICHAEL KAPLAN: (Nods head.)

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: YOU have to say "yes" to acknowledge. She can't hear your nod.

MICHAEL KAPLAN: I'm sorry. Of course.

We take it very serious, we will.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Okay. All set.

ATTY KEVIN CRANE: Thank you.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Thank you.

MICHAEL KAPLAN: Thank you very much.

## REVOCATION:

FI-HI PIZZA, INC D/B/A HI-FI-PIZZA

Revocation: Continued from February 3, 2015,

February 18, 2015, and May 19, 2015, Hi-Fi Pizza,

Inc doing business as Hi-Fi Pizza, Francis

Holland, Manager, holder of a Wine and Malt

Beverages Restaurant License at 496 Massachusetts

Avenue pursuant to Mass. General Laws Chapter

138, Section 77. The licensing authorities may,
after hearing or reasonable opportunity, cancel
any license issued under this chapter if the
licensee ceases to conduct the licensed business.

ATTY KEVIN CRANE: Madam Chair and

Members of the Board, Attorney Kevin Crane for
the licensee, and $I$ have with me --

FRANK HOLLAND: Frank Holland.

ATTY KEVIN CRANE: And also, why don't
you identify yourself?

DANIEL NEWCOMB: Dan Newcomb, Atlantic

License Brokers.

THE REPORTER: Dan, because you haven't

```
been before the Board, can you state and spell
your name fully?
```

    DANIEL NEWCOMB? First name is Daniel,
    D-A-N-I-E-L, last name Newcomb, $N-E-W-C-O-M-B$.
THE REPORTER: Thank you very much.
ATTY KEVIN CRANE: Madam Chair, and
Members of the Commission, since the last
hearing, we continued to market the property.
I'm going to let Mr. Newcomb, because he's the
one with the personal knowledge, testify as to
where they stand on a particular offer.
I also did receive a phone call yesterday
from Mr. Muir regarding the license, and he made
another offer, which was, again, in the fire sale
area.
I don't need to get into it too much now,
but I question his methodology of how he gets to
these figures.
But, in any event, if it's all right, if

```
you want, I will let Mr. Newcomb say where we
stand on selling the license.
    CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Yes, please.
    DANIEL NEWCOMB: Good morning, Madam
Chair and Members of the Board.
    CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Good morning.
    DANIEL NEWCOMB: I'm Daniel Newcomb with
the Atlantic License Brokers. I have a
consulting permit specialized in selling public
people market and selling licenses.
    I was engaged by a Hi-Fi Pizza March 24,
2 0 1 5 ~ t o ~ m a r k e t ~ t h e ~ w i n e ~ a n d ~ m a l t ~ l i c e n s e . ~
    Very shortly thereafter, we had an
accepted offer with a business in Harvard Square
called Takemura, who was a holder of an all
alcohol license. They had interest in selling
the all alcohol license which we have under
agreement. You will see an application for that
shortly for that transfer.
```

They're selling off the all alcohol
license bringing in the wine and malt license. A purchase and sale was created by Attorney Crane and distributed.

The buyer, at that point, decided that
they no longer wanted to be in business and put the business up for sale. So they terminated that agreement in late April.

Post that, we addressed a number of
different buyers, interested parties, one of
which is Wagamama over in Harvard Square.

They're the holder of an all alcohol license.

They've indicated an interest in selling
the all alcohol license and downgrading to a wine and malt license.

The attorney that was representing

Wagamama when we started the transaction was Attorney Dennis Quilty from Boston. The vice president of operations for Wagamama, which is a

```
UK-based company was terminated, that connection
```

between Attorney Quilty and Wagamama disappeared,
so we had to get back in and reconnect with
Wagamama which we have done with the new vice
president of ops. His first name is Kamal
(phonetic), his last name I would murder it if I
tried to say it, but $I$ will spell it for the
Board's interest.
I don't know if $I$ can say it.
CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: That's all right.
You can spell.
DANIEL NEWCOMB: One second here.
I'll have to dig it up out of my thing.
I have an email with his first name and his last
name and then the corporate entity is Wagamama
USA.
So they -- we reconnected with him and
asked him if they were interested in revisiting
that transaction. They said that they were.

```
Asked us to draft an offer. They would get it
over to their attorney who is now not Attorney
Quilty. I'm not sure who there attorney is
there. But I received an email last night from
Kamal that they had forwarded the offer to their
attorney, and if they're interested in doing the
transaction, they would get back to me very
shortly.
```

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Do you know what
"the very shortly "is defined of?
DANIEL NEWCOMB: Well, we've asked. You
know, I don't. I pressed him. I let him know
that we were coming before the Board, and I
prefer to show up with an offer in hand versus
talking about something. Because I know you
received a lot of talk about the license.
I can assure you that they have a high
level of interest, we have interest in their all
alcohol license, $I$ have two parties that are

```
interested. It would be a simultaneous
transaction. Their all alc would go out, the
wine and malt would come in, and we'd create a
new business in Cambridge. That's the best -- my
best guess estimate is, you know, I don't know
who his attorney is. If I knew who it was, I
could reach out to the attorney and nudge them a
little bit.
```

    POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: So you
    have no appreciation of how long this could take
in terms of getting a final answer on this
license?
DANIEL NEWCOMB: Now that we've
connected, this started back in December -- they
first reached out to us in December, to indicate
that they had interest in selling the all alcohol
license and downgrading. Attorney Quilty and I
were working together on that, and then when
their VP of OPs got terminated, we lost that

```
connection. So it sat by the wayside.
    Attorney Quilty is a great guy. He's not
the kind of guy to reach out and reconnect. I
had to take advantage of that and do that, but we
had this license under agreement with Takemura
that looked like it was going to close. So it
kinda paused, it kinda sat on the shelf while we
were facilitating that.
```

    When it died, we jumped right back in and
    then we had to reconnect with Wagamama. They're
a big company based on the UK. Just trying to
get that engagement, get the connection, get the
offers, starting to get things moving. It's just
been a -- $I$ can't say out of the ordinary, but
where I've known that we've had a, you know, some
interest by the Board to get this moved along
quickly, we put some extra effort to try and
nudge them along there.
ideally from my perspective, and this is really addressing more towards the applicant or the holder of the license, is that $I$ think you fully appreciate the fact that you've got an existing business that's in the space that's prohibited from getting a liquor license, right, regardless of what they're willing to offer. I mean, ideally it would have been nice if they bought the license, but that's not going to happen it looks like. And I'm not encouraging you to pursue something you don't think is fair market value, but I'm really concerned about just how long this thing's going to linger with respect to trying to get some finality to it and at the same time recognizing the fact that you have a business that's being denied the opportunity to get a license.

So those are my concerns at this point in
time, so I don't know where that takes us.

ATTY KEVIN CRANE: Well, let me -- on
that point, Commissioner, my client would be very happy to sell the license to Mr. Muir.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: I get that.

ATTY KEVIN CRANE: It would be a much easier transaction. I understand -- and now, he's prohibited from evidently applying for a license.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: That's correct.

ATTY KEVIN CRANE: But -- and that's not
to say that even if he applies that he would get it.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS:

Correct.

ATTY KEVIN CRANE: We don't know. I do understand that he has other no value licenses that might affect how a new application for a new license would be received by the Commission.

I think at the end of the day -- the sad part of this would be -- the sad ending really would be if Mr. Holland's license was revoked and then Mr. Muir didn't get a new license.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: Uh-huh.

ATTY KEVIN CRANE: Which, you know, that
could happen, but as far as timing of it goes, I hear you, and you know the process. We're trying to -- as a matter of fact, I spoke to Mr. Newcomb the last time about a new transaction and shot out dates as far as signing purchase and sale agreements, and there's a number of people that will be involved, and how fast they operate is somewhat out of my control anyway.
I can ask another lawyer, you know,
"where is the agreement," "where are your
comments" only so many times.
POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: I
understand the complexity. I understand you're

```
dealing with a very large corporation that
doesn't make decisions. I get all that.
    So our frustration is, I think we're
trying to give your client an opportunity to
recover his value of that license to some degree,
but with the same respect, there's a pressing
issue that we just can't deny. I think that's
Our dilemma.
```

    DANIEL NEWCOMB: Commissioner, I would
    anticipate with the -- now that we've connected,
that $I$ made the connection with Wagamama and
moving things in that direction, I'm anticipating
-- I was surprised that $I$ didn't have something
on my desk this morning, but $I$ think within the
next two weeks, next 14 days, I would expect to
have -- you know, could be a week, could be three
days, but I am not the type of guy that sits
around and let's something linger waiting for
someone to sign, either they're going to sign it
or they're not.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: And from my
standpoint, $I$ agree with what the Commissioner
said. I think the challenge is that the business closed back in March of 2014. And we're here now
in May of 2015 , and $I$ don't want it to be the case that sets the precedent saying, "Well, you
let this license linger for over a year," and I know people have compared it, rightly or wrongly,
to your brother's license, which, I think, is a very different scenario where his license he was able to hold for years, but there was no business being impacted. There was nobody there. So I think it's a very different case.

So I don't think you can compare the two.

So, again, $I$ think our challenge is that,
you know, there is another business in that
location that's prohibited from applying for a
license, and being able to hold -- for you to
continue to hold this license is our challenge.

And how much longer do we give you knowing that the business has been closed.

FRANK HOLLAND: If $I$ had Dan from day
one, it would've been long gone.

The problem was $I$ had a real estate guy
that wasn't marketing it properly. Like as soon
as Dan started, it's unbelievable how much he has
done, and $I$ wished -- like I said, if I had him
from day one, this would've been long gone. I
thought the realtor -- the guy I had was
marketing it, obviously, he was doing nothing --

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Right.

FRANK HOLLAND: -- at all which I had no
idea. I have no idea how the process worked, et
cetera, et cetera, et cetera and I'm paying a
price for it now.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: And it puts the

Board in a real dilemma. If we were to revoke

Mr. Holland's license, he does have appeal rights to the $A B C C$, is that correct?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT:

Absolutely.

FRANK HOLLAND: Which $I$ would use and it would tie him up for awhile, because I definitely would use it, and he would have to wait longer.

FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: That was the
point $I$ was going to make as well. Obviously,
it's within your right to do so, and that could linger on even worse, $I$ guess.

FRANK HOLLAND: I wish it would --

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT: It
could.

FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: In my mind

I'm trying to find a way.

FRANK HOLLAND: I wish $I$ wasn't even in
this position. Like I said, I wish had

Mr. Newcomb from day one and it would've been
sold.

FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: At the end of
the day, as counsel said, we don't know what the present location is, but at the same time taking interfaces out of the fact that anyone is prohibited from applying, whether they get something or not, is a problem that this license is holding up potential down there. How do we reconcile that in a reasonable fashion? DANIEL NEWCOMB: Madam Chair, I think to take into account that he had engaged us, that we do this, this is my sole business, this is what I do is find buyers and sellers for liquor licenses.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: That's a whole different conversation.

DANIEL NEWCOMB: You know --

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: We don't have to
get into that.

DANIEL NEWCOMB: I sold restaurants for
years, and there was a need that people didn't see, they couldn't figure out the process and we jumped in and were able to help them find a niche that we could help service, you know, like

Mr. Holland, his back is against the wall. He has got to find someone, and we know who to call and who to touch and talk to to identify those buyers. We stay very close, you know, with the Elizabeth's office and with Chris O'Neil, and, you know, I'm willing to give them weekly updates on our progress if that is something that the Board requires. I have no issue with that at all.

But this is -- his license is, you know, it's top on our list. It's what I do everyday. It's how we -- it's how I put my kids through college is finding buyers for licenses.

So he's not sitting on the license, not

```
attempting to find a buyer or home for it, as I
think we can prove, you know, with the purchase
and sale agreement with Takemura, and then with
Wagamama.
```

    (Pause.) I have his last name I could
    try and spell it.
CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: That's okay.
FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: At the same
time, any of potential buyers kind've know
Mr. Holland's situation, so I'm sure they want to
receive a discounted price.
DANIEL NEWCOMB: Absolutely. The buyers
know -- he is not the type of seller that says
"This is my number, that's my number." He's
given me a very broad reach to find a buyer that
is suitable for the license and for the Board and
we can then get it transferred and closed.
We can get an offer all day long, but if
we can't get it approved and closed, what's the
point?

FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: As I said,
for the record, even if we were to turn around
and revoke this, it's not the end, and it could,
in fact, drag on longer in an appeal state than
if we were try to give a little extra time to see
if we can work this out amicable to everyone's best interest.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: I guess
my question is: What is a fair amount of time, and again, I'm not -- I don't want to be held hostage to the fact that Mr. Holland does, in fact, have a right to appeal. We acknowledge that. And it could drag it out longer. I'm not trying to rush this along. I appreciate there's some issues going on here. But in the same respect, if the Board decides and the Commission decides to move on this license, then, you know, Mr. Holland made it clear what his intentions

```
are, however long it takes, it takes.
    I mean, I don't want to get in the middle
of trying to figure out, okay, we give you X
number of months because we know it's going to
take that long to get before the ABCC. I mean, I
think we're all -- I think we made it very clear,
we're all interested in Mr. Holland getting a
fair price for his license and moving along.
    To the Chair's point, though, it has
been going on over a year and it is a pressing
issue in terms of how quickly you sell that
license.
```

    And what troubles me a little bit is the
    uncertainty because $I$ understand the size of
Wagamama and its ability to move on this issue.
I was hoping that, as from earlier
representations, that you would have a client,
you would be coming in and saying "We've got a
purchase and sale agreement in hand either by

```
today," or whatever the case may be, and some
degree of finality to this whole situation. That
doesn't seem to be the case today.
    I'm really struggling with what is the
right and fair thing to do with respect to
understanding the whole issue that's surrounding
this particular license.
    ATTY KEVIN CRANE: Like I said, I have
been onboard since March 24th we got the
assignment.
    POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: I get
that.
    ATTY KEVIN CRANE: Could we maybe
continue it to the June deliberation session, and
in the meantime, we would be giving Ms. Lint
progress reports as we go along?
    CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: One other
question -- I don't know the answer to this one
-- if we were to vote to revoke the license --
```

```
I'm not saying that's what everybody wants to
do -- but if we were to vote to revoke the
license, number one, the ABCC has to approve it,
do they?
```

                    EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT: What
    do you mean "do they have to approve it"?
CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Approve our
revocation of the license.
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT: No,
they do not. The ABCC's actions are either to
approve the local licensing authority action or
to disapprove. If they disapprove of our action,
it comes back to us for a whole new hearing.
CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: So that's Question

1. Question 2: If we revoke the license,
Mr. Holland has indicated appeals -- appeals
our revocation, are they still able to go through
and sell the license while under appeal to the
ABCC?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT: No.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: No.

DANIEL NEWCOMB: And a buyer wouldn't be
interested in getting involved in a situation
like that. They want a clean deal.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Right.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT: And
then the third problem there, if they did approve of the Board's action of revoking, he still has appeal rights to Superior Court.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: So five years from
now when he comes down --

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT: Five years from now.

FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: And the other
thing, too, I think in terms of the ABCC saying that we're not fair.
(Short recess.)

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: And the another

```
thing --
    FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: Well, the
issue also for the ABCC is what level of detail
did we give the applicant before we did a
revocation and stuff.
    I guess I'm inclined to look at this end
Of June thing. It's like 30 days, and I'm fine
that, I guess, that at that hearing I guess we
would have to turn around and set that up for --
from my side, we would have to look at revocation
at that particular point.
    But that June decision would be
approximately 30 days from now, give or take
or...?
```

            CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: But that would be
    30 days just for them to come back in with a
purchase and sale agreement, but then the time
frame that it would take to complete the deal
could be another -- $I$ know this is what you do

```
for a living -- but it could be another 60 days.
    FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: Well, it
could be, but that same situation could
happen today if they came in with a purchase and
sale.
```

DANIEL NEWCOMB: I think the key date is
the application, when an application needs to be
filed before the Cambridge Board, that's the key
date we'd shoot for, that you would want to see
an application by a certain date, then it's in
your control.
FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: Because if
they came with one today, we would still be in
the same boat that it could take three or four
months -- hopefully not, but there could be an
unknown period of time between the time they
present today if they had a purchase and sale
until the time it actually passes and goes
through and clears for the ABCC.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: The additional complication, whether it will make a difference or not, is that $I$ won't be here for that Decision Hearing, so...

DANIEL NEWCOMB: Madam Chair, we're
saying approximately six months from the time of offer to the time of closing right now with ABCC with just the way things work over there right now.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: I can't agree to six months.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT: But that's ABCC approval --

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: No, I understand.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT: --
wrapped into that. So it's really from time of purchase and sale. I think counsel can control that a little more by making short dates.

FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: Now, does the

```
ABCC take consideration of the fact that it's in
    for approval that that clears the location, or it
    doesn't until actually such time as they assign
    it?
        EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT: Until
    such time as it's approved by the ABCC, the spot
    is not clear.
```

        FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: The address
    stays.
        EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT: Yep.
    Yep. So I think really from time of purchase and
    sale until time of application is not a
    substantially long time.
    POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: So, in
    essence, where we are right now, it looks like
there's two pathways. One we can do revocation
and clear the pathway for the applicant to come
back and apply for another license, or -- and,
again, $I$ don't know how much control they have
over how quickly a deal could be completed,
saying to a potential client, "All right, this is
the purchase and sale, you've got so many days to close the deal" and they get it before the ABCC.

And then have having said that, if, in fact, they
can't do it, then bringing it back before the

Board for revocation or consideration for
revocation at that point in time.

I think time is of the essence. And,
again, $I$ think -- I'm just really getting hard
pressed to continue to have these extensions. We
have done a number of comprehensions already.

So, again, I don't know how much
influence we would have in terms of speeding up
the closure of a deal on a license.

DANIEL NEWCOMB: I think, again, now that

I'm in communication directly with them or not, you know, using an attorney as a middle man, or
the specific attorney here, $I$ have better control
here. So I think that we will be able to nudge them along and get an offer on the table.

I think that's the shorter path to getting Clover a license than revoking and dealing with appeals and things like that. FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: So what do we have about -- I guess I'm inclined do like a 30-day window here for finality, and when we come back in that 30 days, if it's not sold, it will have to be gone. I don't know how that lines up with anything in terms of -- and again, even though it would fall into the ABCC's appeal process as well, we did due diligence with them in terms of giving them enough time, but yet not extensive time because we can't keep continuing forever.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: I'm really
concerned about the precedent that it sets.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: Uh-huh.

To be honest, my inclination when $I$ was coming in here would be that either you would have a purchase and sale agreement, or $I$ was going to vote for a revocation.

So I'm really troubled by the fact that -- and again, $I$ think I'm struggling with the notion $I$ want to be fair to your client, but with the same respect, I agree with the Chair the precedent that we're setting here, given the circumstances we're finding ourselves in, is really kind of dangerous because you would come back in and say, well, you know, it's Hi-Fi, representing your client, you allowed this to go on for so long, and $I$ mean, $I$ wouldn't blame you. It's the action of the Commission.

So, you know, I'm really having a -- I'm
really trying to figure out where, in fact, is there a fair and equitable way to go.

```
                                I mean, clearly, I think, to the current
```

```
tenant, revocation would, in fact, delay it for a
period of time, you know, again, if your client
is so inclined to go ahead and appeal the actions
Of the Commission should we decide for revocation
of the license, so I think that's coming into
balance with me to some respect, but, you know,
I'm still --
```

    ATTY KEVIN CRANE: We have come this far,
    Commissioner. I don't see that 30 days is going
to, you know, break the thing. We know it's make
or break within 30 days.
POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: Uh-huh.
But having said that, then your client
still has the right to appeal after that
period of time and will get a second bite at the
apple.

ATTY KEVIN CRANE: Well, it's versus
giving him the 30 days to try to work out a deal
and we don't tie everything up, including for the

```
present occupants of the premises.
```

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: Uh-huh. FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: I guess my view of it is that the reality is Mr. Holland has rights for appeal that he can exercise. I'm trying to look at it in terms how we clear this address, and the most expedient fashion would be, even though the ABCC takes an infinite amount of time to pass a license, the expedient way would be get a buyer, transfer it and clear that, that would probably be in the reality of the present occupant be the fastest, most expedited manner of getting this adjudicated as opposed to getting an appeal. This could go on for some period of time.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: I guess, again, my
concern is that this is for a restaurant, and

Hi-Fi, has been gone over a year, and I'm not
even at this point thinking in terms of that
there's a current tenant there, you know, it's in
the back of mind there's a current tenant who wants to apply, but I'm concerned that over a year later, you still have this license out here, and we already know there are going to be countless people who will come to say, you kept this license out there for, you know, 18 months, or however many months, and I just don't want to set that precedent.

And so, I'm really, really struggling with balancing setting the precedent, holding it
out there longer, and the fact that Mr. Holland
has had this license for a long time and he's
doing his best to try to sell it.

So I'm having a real -- I will be honest,

I'm having a real struggle.

FRANK HOLLAND: Ms. Chairman, if I had
him from day one, it would have been long gone.

I had a lousy guy. Looking back now, it's the
worse mistake $I$ ever made hiring him. He didn't do nothing.

ATTY KEVIN CRANE: Also, Mr. Holland was
in the pizza business. He was unfamiliar with --

FRANK HOLLAND: The rules, oh yeah.

ATTY KEVIN CRANE: That's a fact of life.

If you had a corporation, although sometimes it's amazing what they do, too, as far as not
acknowledging that it's inactive or there's a
been a bankruptcy filing or letting the local
licensing Commission know what the status of the license is.

But I think there could be a little
deference to Mr. Holland in that regard, too.

He not only lost his license, he lost his
business, you know. He was counting on probably
selling the thing eventually, but things didn't
work out with his landlord.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Just go ahead and

```
tug on the heart strings, counsel.
    FRANCIS HOLLAND: It's the truth, though.
    ATTY KEVIN CRANE: It's the delays,
    right, Chairman?
```

    CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Any other
    comments? Questions?
POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: SO,
again, just for -- it's probably talking out
loud. But I'm just wondering, this doesn't
preclude the current tenant from coming back and
making a counteroffer?
ATTY KEVIN CRANE: Not at all.
DANIEL NEWCOMB: We'd encourage that.
His number has just been so far off.
POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: NO, I
get it.
DANIEL NEWCOMB: We encourage that.
POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: I don't
want to do your job. I don't have a broker's
license.

DANIEL NEWCOMB: I made myself available to him on multiple occasions to have a
conversation about it.

ATTY KEVIN CRANE: He was here, like I
say, Commissioners, at the last hearing and then he finally called me yesterday and we did have a conversation about it, but...

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: Uh-huh.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: And $I$ guess from my standpoint that's not the issue for me.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: Right.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: And before us.

I'm still stuck on this timeline in terms of how
long we let the license sit.

When did Hi-Fi close, was it March of

2014?

FRANCIS HOLLAND: Yeah.

I never even realized there was a time
frame. You know, obviously, because my brother
had it for so long, I just figured, oh, you
know...

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Your brother is in a whole different category.

FRANCIS HOLLAND: No, no. I wish I
didn't know, you know, because I mean, I assumed that just --

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: You could hold it forever.

FRANCIS HOLLAND: Well, not forever. But

I planned on selling it, but I didn't realize
there was a mandate for $X$ amount of months, you
know, seriously, because $I$ wouldn't have -- I
would have gotten another broker much sooner. I
had no idea about the laws. And that's why I got
a new broker. Like I said, he has done an excellent job and $I$ wish $I$ had him from day one.

We wouldn't be sitting here.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: So assuming there are no members of the public that wish to be heard on this, $I$ am struggling with this one.

FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: At this point from my -- we can't go back in time. The most expeditious way of clearing this applicant and the person who is presently there, I think is obviously to get a purchase and sale agreement.

I guess we can put a drop dead date on it after 30 days, or whatever we do for a date, it will be revoked.

$$
\text { I don't think that }-- \text { that probably would }
$$

be the best solution for all the parties involved.
If we do a revocation today, I don't
think at the end of the day, it clears up that address and that could go on a lot longer.

That's what I'm trying to juggle in my mind.

That would be the best solution to get a sale in
terms of adjudicating all the parties.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: I think we agree with you. The question is, is that it's an open-ended process and $I$ understand you can set deadlines, but...

FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: I guess my portion would be that whatever this date is, it's a drop dead date. If you come back on that date and it's not done, it's not going to be 24 hours and it's over. I think we have to have a control number on this, so it's not open-ended. POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: I want to make sure it's not a fool's errand that not setting -- we're setting these dates and they're not even realistic in terms of...

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Right. Because, I
mean, for me it wouldn't be even setting a date to see a purchase and sale. I want to set a date in which that transfer application is filed.

FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: Yes, I agree with that.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: And $I$ don't know
if it's realistic to say 30 days. I want to see a transfer application.

FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: I guess in my mind that's what $I$ was thinking of, it's not just a purchase and sale, but actually an application submitted in its entirety so we could approve it and get it forwarded to the ABCC.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: So how realistic
is it if we were to say within 30 days you would have to have a transfer application filed?

DANIEL NEWCOMB: That would be a stretch.

I think if you asked me to report back in 14 days with an accepted offer of a purchase and sale, I think that that's reasonable, and that would give the Board some vision as to how this proceeds in the future versus a blind eye.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: What
happens after the 14 days? What is the duration after that 14 days? I mean just --

DANIEL NEWCOMB: If there's no deal,
there's no deal. If there's -- if there's no
deal there, then there's no deal there.

And then you move forward doing -- I
think if we have a deal, if there's a potential
for a deal to happen, I'm not going to sit before
the Board and suggest that there is something that there's not.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: Sure.

Right.

DANIEL NEWCOMB: My integrity is on the
line. But $I$ think if we can take this to the next step and we're making progress and moving
things forward, $I$ think that would put the Board
at ease that we're making progress and not hung
up on something.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: SO, I
guess my question to you then would be: So that would be one decision point for the Commission to decide, if you can't come back in 14 days with a $P \& S$, then we can simply say we may elect to take action at that point in time, is that what you're suggesting?

DANIEL NEWCOMB: Defer it for 14 days.

See if we can push this by or into a place that we can make a deal can happen.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: Without
committing the Commission, you know, I would
propose to the Chair that could be a decision point that we could still decide. You know, you could come back and say, "Well, jeez, it's going to be six months before we close the deal on this
thing," and so there's no misunderstanding that
somehow the Commission now is bound to follow
this pathway when it could take a longer period

```
Of time to close the deal.
    DANIEL NEWCOMB: At that point we would
```

have a clear timeline so the Board could consider
that before they make the decision.
Right now, there's -- I don't have a
clear timeline.
POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: I'm not
pressuring you. I understand that you're dealing
with a large corporation that doesn't make a lot
of decisions quickly. I appreciate all that.
So the question is -- and I think that's
what we're struggling with, is, you know, how --
are their points in time we can make certain
decisions because we're deciding, (a), it's
taking too long or something that's right around
the corner that can get this thing resolved
quickly. I mean, I just -- you know, ideally, I
think we would like to see it within 30 days.
Again, ideally, within a short period of time

> that this deal could be done and have it resolved.

But $I$ appreciate the fact it's not a
realistic expectation. So where does that leave the Commission if it chooses to prolong this
longer in terms of making some decisions sooner than later?

And I've pretty much made up my mind what I was going to do, and I'm really -- that's what really is causing me a lot of consternation with respect to this.

DANIEL NEWCOMB: We're going to have
clarity with this buyer within the next 7 to 14
days, and that will establish a clear timeline and clear path on how it will get closed, and at
that point, the Board could see it and say either
it works or doesn't work.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: I am really torn
because my struggle is: Do we continue this

```
until to June 16th, which I feel is really just
postponing the inevitable, or do we revoke?
And I'm really struggling with it
because, again, you could conceivably come back
here on June 16 and say, "Yes, we have an offer,"
and then a couple months down the line the offer
falls through and we're right back to where we
are today.
```

ATtY KEVIN CRANE: Well, at least by

June 16 we would know better where we stood.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Anything you would like to add do need another minute to get your head straight to figure out what you want to do?

Anything you would like to add?

FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: Obviously, we
could revoke it right now. But $I$ think, again,
in the interest of the public good, two more
weeks is probably --

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: I think the two

```
weeks is going to turn into two more.
    FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: Well, if it's
two weeks, after two weeks, we revoke it in two
weeks. As I said previously, the best outcome is
if they can get this thing, the purchase and sale
down and transfer this to clear the property, it
takes care of Mr. Holland, not that we have to --
and also takes care of the present licensee at
that address who is being blocked from applying,
whether or not they get anything, I'm not saying
that, but that would be the most --
    CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: We're still
looking at, I mean, the best case scenario,
another six-month window then.
    FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: We are. But
at the same time, the reality is that
Mr. Holland is going to exercise his right for
appeal and that could be a two- or three-year
process.
```

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: But at least it
doesn't set the precedent in terms of how long we held the license for. That's all I'm looking at. I'm not even looking at --

FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: I guess I'm
also looking at the precedent of we've got a
licensee who is tied up with a license that goes
on. This is not a good precedent that we have. It's everyone's legal right to appeal but at the end the day, it's not really a good situation that we have a license tied to an address who could be precluded from doing anything for several years because of the legal right of the applicant to appeal.

So, I guess, I look at the realty point
of this as opposed to just the policy point.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: Well,

I'm wondering how much this body should be
concerned about what potentially is beyond our

```
control.
```

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Right.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: Again,

I appreciate your concerns, the situation, but with the same respect, I think that an issue for us is clearly trying to make sure that we're somewhat clear of expectations going forward for any applicant that wants to hold his license in inactive status and we don't find ourselves -like I said, this could drag on. I mean, you intend to come back with a purchase and sale agreement, and then we're struggling now, okay, do we allow this to continue to go on because it looks like there's some light at the end the tunnel, or at that point in time, we just pull the rug out from underneath you, and say, "That's too long, we can't wait that long, sorry." ATTY KEVIN CRANE: On the precedent issue since March of 2014 , it's been 14,15 months. I
mean, $I$ don't think there's a danger of setting a
bad precedent if it's 14,15 months versus 14,15 months plus two and a half weeks.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: The
question is: What goes on beyond that, though?

ATTY KEVIN CRANE: Well, we're back here
in two and a half weeks and we have nothing
going, it sounds to me like the license will be revoked.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: That's the easy
piece. The difficult piece is if you come back
and say, "We do have someone who wants to buy
it"; how long is that progress?

ATTY KEVIN CRANE: All we're asking for
is a chance for that.

DANIEL NEWCOMB: Wagamama was the
licensee in the City. They have already been approved by this Board to hold a license, so it's not like we're bringing a licensee in that has
never been established in the City of Cambridge
before. These are an established --
CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Wagamama holds an all alcohol license, correct?

DANIEL NEWCOMB: Correct.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: So they would
still need to sell their all alcohol license, so that's a another whole process in and of itself that can add more to the time frame.

I'm going to be the bad guy.

ATTY KEVIN CRANE: In two and a half
weeks, we could also talk to Mr. Muir again.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: I think he made you two fire sale offers, so...

ATTY KEVIN CRANE: Yeah, but it's not as big a conflagration as it was before.

FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: I'm confused
with all these fire terms.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: It's
always confusing me.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: I don't want to
set the precedent, so I'm going to be the bad gay
and I'm going to make a motion that we revoke the license.

Is there a second?

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: Second.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: All those in favor
signify by saying aye.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: Aye.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Aye.

FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: No.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: I'm sorry.

DANIEL NEWCOMB: Thank you.

ATTY KEVIN CRANE: Thank you.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT: Can
we skip Ames Street and go to Cilantro since
counsel has been waiting?

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Sure.

## APPLICATION: <br> SUNNYWOODS, INC, D/B/A CILANTRO

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT:

Application: Continued from March 17, 2015 and March 31, 2015, Sunnywoods, Inc, doing business as Cilantro, Wen Pan, Manager, holder of a Common Victualer License at 1105 Mass Ave has applied for a new All Alcoholic Beverages Restaurant License at said address. The current operating hours are 11:00 a.m. to 1:00 a.m. seven days per week with a seating capacity of 60 .

ATTY CHUNG LEE: Good morning.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Good morning.

ATTY CHUNG LEE: Good morning.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: I almost said good
evening. It feels like it.

Good morning.

ATTY CHUNG LEE: Just so you know, I
didn't have coffee either so $I$ know exactly how

```
you feel.
```

THE REPORTER: Do me a favor? Please
state and spell your full name.

ATTY CHUNG LEE: Sure. My name is Chung

Lee, $\quad C-H-U-N-G \quad L-E-E, \quad I ' m$ counsel for the
applicant, Sunnywoods Inc, d/b/a Cilantro. I
apologize for Ms. Ming Pan not being in here.

She had a personal matter she had to attend to,
and she had to leave overseas abruptly, but
didn't want to miss this meeting. So, again, my apologies.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Sure.

THE REPORTER: Could I get a spelling on
her name, please?

ATTY CHUNG LEE: Ming Pan, $M-I-N-G, P a n$,
$P-A-N$.

THE REPORTER: $P-A-N ?$

ATTY CHUNG LEE: Yes.

THE REPORTER: Thank you.

ATTY CHUNG LEE: The last time we met, I
believe we had an application for all alcohol,
there was some issues about the neighborhood.

Since that time, I did try to contact and did whatever I could to contact the neighborhoods, however, if you look at the map, this is split in between mid-Cambridge and Riverside.

I contacted the primaries for both of the neighborhood groups, and they both essentially declined, and in many words declined commenting on this, citing that it's not within their district.

The last email I got from Joan Pickett,
who is the -- in Cambridge, cited something about the Harvard Square overlay district.

I also emailed Ms. Iram Farooq, I think,
which is the Harvard Square Advisory. This is what the site had advised us to do. I have not received a returned email yet.

> I consequently -- subsequently, rather,
called up Chris over in the Zoning Department, along with George, who has been helpful when we were doing the original application, and they indicated that that was the wrong area to go to, that Joan Pickett was, in fact, the right area. So, at this moment, $I$ have done everything $I$ can
do. I did get an email last night from
Riverside, Ms. Shipley, Carolyn Shipley, and
because the last email $I$ had from her prior to
last night was that she was going to try to put
it on her contact lists.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Okay.

ATTY CHUNG LEE: And this morning -- last
night she emailed me back saying she received
nothing from -- relative to this application.

And she's looking for a glass of wine over there as well, but that's besides the point.
So, at this moment, I'm -- we're trying

```
our best. I mean, if you noticed in the original
application, when we sent out the notices, we did
the crazy of thing of notifying the neighborhood
individually, not by the condominium association
and trustees.
```

    CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Right.
    ATTY CHUNG LEE: We did that -- one of
    the reasons was, in fact, we weren't really able
to get in touch with any neighborhood groups,
quite frankly, that's why we choose -- so we
choose -- there were 295 names on that list.
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT:
They're all in there.
ATTY CHUNG LEE: We individually mailed
each one of them. I have most of the return
receipts back from them as well.
So at this moment, Madam Chairman, we're
doing the best we can.
CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: And I do note at
the last hearing the trustee from --
ATTY CHUNG LEE: Right.
CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: -- from, it says

Bedford Hall Building at 1137 Mass Ave, and he's one of the trustees, and he said that Cilantro
has been a good place, well run, folks do a good job, very responsible.

He's in favor of supporting them to
acquire the liquor license.

ATTY CHUNG LEE: I'd like to hear that
because, again, when we appeared in front of this

Board for a common vic license last year, we
specifically indicated to the Board that -- we had a chance to transfer the liquor license from Cancun previously, but we chose not to do that. CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: That wasn't a
transferrable license.

ATTY CHUNG LEE: But we chose not to do
it -- do anything at the time because we wanted
to get to know the neighborhood, and we wanted to be part of the neighborhood and contribute to the environment. That's the reason why we didn't do anything at that time.

What I'm hearing from the trustee is
really a good indicator because we have taken strides to be a good business member, and it's
nice to hear from our neighbors that it's working and we will continue to do that.

But at this moment, what I'm going to ask
this Board is in view of the efforts that we have
tried, we've really exhausted, if you will,
whatever we could have done, and in the original
application went over and beyond what the ABCC
rules call for by notifying the abutters
individually.
In view of those efforts, we're asking
the Board to approve the license for my client.

Now the last hearing we had, it's

```
understood that this will be a limited
nontransferable license. We fully accept that.
Again, we're not in it to make money on the
license -- license meaning in terms of transfer
and so forth.
```

    We are looking to add to our existing
    business as a lot of our clients -- my client's
clients rather, have indicated that having sake
and liquor and wine, and so forth, will be
helpful with the foods because this is sort of
like a fusion-type of a menu.
So I'm asking this Board to recognize the
efforts and grant this license for us so that we
can continue to be a growing member of the
business environment.
CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Any questions?
POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: So just
remind me of your efforts to satisfy the criteria
to apply for an all alcoholic license, in other
words, the demonstrated need, the acceptance and
also the lack of harm to the community. Just
remind me what those -- what your client has done
to satisfy those three criteria.

ATTY CHUNG LEE: Well, can you give me
the criteria again so $\operatorname{can}$ go in sequence?

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: I don't
know if there's any particular sequence.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT: Yes,
there is. It's proof of need, that there's a
need for another license in that location, that
there's no harm to the neighborhood and there's an overwhelming neighborhood support.

ATTY CHUNG LEE: Well, there is
definitely a need by my client.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: That's
not the criteria.

ATTY CHUNG LEE: Everybody around the
area there has liquor license and menu -- or

```
liquor service, rather, and all the clients that
come over to my client's restaurant has indicated
that if, in fact, we had the liquor, most
certainly -- in essence, the business will grow a
lot more rapidly.
```

We have been tempered in terms of our
business plans because we don't know exactly what
that limit is going to be. But the input that we
have, the data that we received indicates that it
-- we could improve our profitability by two
times, maybe even three times for that matter.
In terms of the neighborhood, like I
mentioned before, there are other restaurants
already with liquor licenses. We have tried to
contact the neighborhood individually. We
received none. In the last hearing, during the
original liquor license hearing, there were no
people, no neighbors who showed up in opposition
to this license.

In fact, I think Madam Chairman mentioned that one of the trustees showed up in favor of that.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: Uh-huh. ATTY CHUNG LEE: Actually, in my opinion, I respectfully submit that there is no harm to the neighborhoods.

And, again, we exhausted our efforts in trying to do that.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: Uh-huh.

ATTY CHUNG LEE: So, again, I
respectfully submit -- granted there's limited input here in a sense because if we had a lot of neighborhood -- I mean, I would have loved to come here with letters from the Riverside

Cambridge saying we're in full support of the
liquor license. I would like to flood this
licensing room full of people saying we really, really need this, we really, really need this.

But, unfortunately, that's not going to happen. POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS:

Because?

ATTY CHUNG LEE: Because as much as I
hate to say it, it doesn't seem like the
neighborhoods really care. I hate to say this.

I don't like to say this. Because $I$ work in Boston and we're very involved.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: You're
arguing against your third point in terms of overwhelming support. So, I mean, I just --

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: But $I$ think -- if

I can chime in, I think, in my opinion, when
we -- when he was last in front of the Board, we talked extensively about neighborhood support.

We had the one person who came in support --

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: Uh-huh. CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: -- but, I mean, by -- as evidenced by all the Green cards, $I$ feel

```
like he has done -- he was done his
responsibility to try to notify. You can't twist
people's arms and make them come.
```

    POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: But one
    approach we have taken in the past is to -- and I
think a number of applicants in the past what
they have done is actually have a petition that
their clients or customers would say that they
see this is an added benefit to their dining
experience at your client's restaurant. I mean,
absent -- I get what the Chair is saying with
respect to the Green cards, and it's interesting
that the associations -- because both of
associations are relatively active, and it's
interesting to me that neither one of them or
both of them haven't come forward and said, jeez,
you know, we welcome you --
ATTY CHUNG LEE: I did email the emails
to Ms. Lint. I do have copies for the Board.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT: I do have them.

ATTY CHUNG LEE: It's a very, very
nonchalant, "Well, you know, it's not really in my district, so we usually have no...

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT: It's
in that in-between.

ATTY CHUNG LEE: If $I$ may, can $I$ give
copies of the emails? It's only like three or
four emails.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Sure.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT: If I
could just throw my two cents in. He said
petitions. I think the Chair has gone on record
several times saying that in her opinion,
petitions don't really amount to all that because you can just have anybody walking by and ask them to sign.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Right.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: And we have had people do that.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT:

Exactly.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: What's
interesting is also seeing where the petitioners are coming from.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Exactly. I mean, prefer the personal letter.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT:

Right.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: But, I mean, in
his case, we did have at least one person come in.

ATTY CHUNG LEE: So, yes, I agree. I
might be arguing against my third point. But if you consider the overall circumstances, I really don't have much of a choice. I wish I could
have, you know, half the neighborhood come in

```
here, but it's just not going to happen,
unfortunately.
```

FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: Counsel, the
other thing that this was all -- when they came
in for the original hearing, it was talked about
that this is simply a need to accent the food
service there.
ATTY CHUNG LEE: That's correct.
FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: And the issue
came up about the seats at the bar. Has anyone
relooked at that again in terms of why we have
the bar seating?
ATTY CHUNG LEE: Well, there's six seats
on the bar right now. It's intended to --
FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: I thought you
had it listed as eight.
Right now he was telling me that it's
six. And the primary purpose of the restaurant
is to serve food with the liquor. There's no

```
intention to turn it into a bar where you just
serve liquor.
```

    I believe it was either Police
    Commissioner Haas or maybe Chief Reardon had
mentioned, "Well, what's to stop someone from
coming in and just having a drink and just
leaving?" Frankly, the answer is no, there's
nothing we can do about that. But $I$ respectfully
submit that's the same with any restaurant
business with a liquor license. Anybody can go
in and sit down at a table. We have seen that
happen. Order a drink, and say, "I'm looking at
a menu right now," and say, "I don't feel like
eating right now and I'm going to leave."
FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: I agree with
you, counsel. There's a different connotation,
you know, that the bar is set up so you can turn
around and just have a drink at the bar and
not -- versus taking a table. I agree with you.

It can happen. I don't think it's the norm as opposed to --

ATTY CHUNG LEE: It's not. I talked to
the Bill, the manager, a couple days ago, and
it's their feeling that that's going to amount
for a very minuscule amount in terms of the percentage. I cannot say it cannot happen. Of course, it can happen. I mean, if I say it will not happen, you'll know I'm lying to you and
that's not going to be right.

But all $I$ can say is the intent of the
restaurant is not to turn it into a bar per se.

We're going to lower it to six seats, and all the waiters are going to be well trained to basically
serve liquor primarily with foods only. It's a
compliment to the food not a substitute and
that's about all we can tell the Board today on that.
you.

ATTY CHUNG LEE: Thank you.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: If I
recall this hearing, there was a little bit of confusion between you and your client in terms of what you wanted to do, and I think that's part of the reason why I wanted to continue it, so it might be helpful for me to hear what is the business plan with respect to this liquor license, so we're certain, as the Fire Chief indicated, there was some confusion about how many chairs were going to be around the bar and things like that.

ATTY CHUNG LEE: Right.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: I just
want to make sure that we're clear in terms of
what we're voting for with respect to the
application for a new all beverage alcohol
license.

Atty Chung Lee: Absolutely. Yes, I apologize for the little confusion before. POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: NO problem.

ATTY CHUNG LEE: But as I told Ms. Lint, it's six seats at the bar. If it was eight before, we accepted the input of this Board and we want to lower it to six seats. And the staff is going to be trained to make sure that the primary purpose is the food, not the liquor. Those six seats will be incorporated within the overall allowed seating capacity of 60.

```
Cilantro currently serves an Asian fusion
```

Taiwanese buns type of menu, and that lends
itself very well for liquor, like sake, beer and wine. We will continue to do that.

Like I said, the liquor will only be a
supplement and compliment to the foods.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: Uh-huh, uh-huh.

ATTY CHUNG LEE: Right now we're
estimating probably around 85 percent food sales.

85, maybe a little higher than that. Time will
tell. But that's our estimate at the moment. So it's definitely not going to be, you know, a bar. That's for sure.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: Uh-huh.

ATTY CHUNG LEE: Okay? And we will
continue to expand on our fusion Asian style
restaurant as the business grows, and we
certainly expect the business to grow.

As I indicated earlier, based on what
data we have at hand right now, adding --
just simply adding sake to the menu may increase our business by 50 to 100 percent, quite frankly. POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: Uh-huh. ATTY CHUNG LEE: So we are anticipating
an increase in sales. By doing that, we will
increase and add onto the menu as well.

So we have lowered the bar to six seats.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: I think we
mentioned this at the last hearing, there's a
requirement in Cambridge, that if approved, that licensee has to attend 21 Proof training. You can't just be TIPS certified.

ATTY CHUNG LEE: I understand. You mean,
all servers or -- all the servers or just the manager?

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Is it all servers?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT: All
servers and managers.

ATTY CHUNG LEE: That should not be an
issue. Could $I$ be able to get information about
that training through Ms. Lint?

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Yes.

Do you want to see what the bar area
looks like?

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: Sure.
(Showing on phone.)

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Any additional
comments?

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: No.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Any additional
comments?

FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: No.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Any members of the
public wishing to be heard on this matter?

Seeing none, I make a motion that we
approve the all alcohol beverage restaurant
license for Sunnywoods, Inc, doing business as

Cilantro with a requirement of attendance at 21

Proof training and a review in six months for
their current operating hours.

Is there a second?

FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: Second.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: All those in favor signify by saying aye.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: Aye.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Aye.

FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: Aye.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: You're all set.

ATTY CHUNG LEE: Will the review be --
will we be required to come to a review meeting at that time?

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Yes.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT: We'll send notice.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: It will be for the time when you were finally granted the license with the ABCC, and the clock will start ticking then.

ATTY CHUNG LEE: I understand. Thank you very much.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Thank you.

ATtY CHUNG LEE: On a side note, the
hearing that was here before, I did talk to the other attorney, I might have a client who is interested in doing business with him. So I did contact him and he will contact me as well.

Hopefully that will work out well for the Board and it will make it a lot easier, so...

Thank you very much.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Thank you.

## APPLICATION: <br> UNSPEAKABLE, LLC, D/B/A AMES STREET DELI

## EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT:

Application: Unspeakable, LLC, doing business as

Ames Street Deli, Joseph Cammarata, Manager,
holder of an all alcoholic beverages restaurant
license at 73 Ames Street has applied for an
alteration of premise to include an outdoor
seasonal patio on the public sidewalk for 38 seats.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: So no one is here for that application. I think this is very similar to what we discussed at the very beginning of the hearing with The Abbey is that we'll need to continue this matter until we're able to resolve curbside seating for outside patios.

We did approve the CV portion so they're able to serve food. If we can send them something in the mail that tells them that the matter has been continued.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT: Yes.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: So I make a motion
that we continue this matter.

Is there second?

FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: Second.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: All those in favor signify by saying aye.

FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: Aye.

```
POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: Aye.
```


## RATIFICATION:

## LEGAL SEA FOODS, LLC

## EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT:

Ratification: The Board of License Commissioners will vote to rescind the approval of Legal sea Foods, LLC for their change of sunday hours as

Legal Sea Foods has withdrawn their applications.

So basically the only reason we put this
on is since you had taken action on approving the change of hours with a question in regard to one location it was Kendall.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: And whether or not they were going to serve brunch.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT: And
all of them.
CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Did they
then subsequently -- I believe they sent a letter
in saying "Never mind, we're not going to change
the hours for any of them."

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT: The restaurants will continue to operate under all three liquor licenses without change.

So it's just to approve the letter
withdrawing the requests -- withdrawing your approval.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: I make a motion that withdraw our approval.

Is there is a second?

FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: Second.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: All those in favor
signify by saying aye.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: Aye.

FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: Aye.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: No further
business?

Actually, while we're here, we do have
one further item. Can we find a date to change
the June 25 th hearing? That's the Decision Hearing that you already said you won't be here. POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS:

Correct.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: And apparently
looking at my calendar neither will I. If we can come with another date that we can schedule. POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: Right now there's no matters scheduled for that Decision Hearing, right?

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: That's correct. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT:

Because you haven't had any June hearings yet.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: I
wanted to make sure we didn't push something out. CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Right, right. No.

So we have nothing scheduled for, just the fear
is after the June 2nd and the June 16 hearing if
we have anything that we have a hearing scheduled

```
and not pushing it through to July.
POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: Would
```

that Thursday following the June 16 hearing be
too soon, you think? If -- I mean, potentially
there could be issues with respect to giving
somebody an opportunity to get something resolved
before the Decision Hearing, that's always the
risk you run, right?
CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Right. Are you
out that whole week?
POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: That
week I'm in, the 16th, but the 26 th, I'm gone the
whole week.
CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: The 25th, you're
gone that whole week.
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT: We
have hearings on the $16 t h$.
POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: I am
wondering if the 18 th would work?

## EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT:

Unless it was a situation where --

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: I can't do the 18 th.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT: I
can't either.

FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: I can't
either.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: Are you looking at the $2 n d ?$

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT:

July $2 n d ?$

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: What about June 30th, it's a Tuesday.

FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: We're up to our ears on the 4 th of July.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: I'm in
a conference that day?

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: On the 30th?

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: On the $30 t h$.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT:

Wednesday the 8 th?

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: June?

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR ELIZABETH LINT: July.

FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: I have a
conference call $I$ can push. I can do that.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: 10:00 a.m.

Please lock it in.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Make a motion
adjourn.

FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: Second.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: All those in favor
signify by saying aye.

POLICE COMMISSIONER ROBERT HAAS: Aye.

CHAIR ANDREA JACKSON: Aye.

FIRE CHIEF GERALD REARDON: Aye.
(Hearing adjourned.)
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| course [3] | 59:13, | 4:16, 5:2, | DANIEL | 63:10, |
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| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 62:7, | 80:10, | 119:7 | 2:9, | different |
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| $79: 2$ | decide [3] | $33: 6$ | Dennis [1] | $10: 4$ |
| $79: 3,$ | - 29:14, | defer [1] | $\frac{\text { - 42:18 }}{}$ | difficult |
| $\begin{aligned} & 80: 4, \\ & 80: 8, \end{aligned}$ | 69:4, | $-80: 8$ | deny [2] - | [2] - |
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| 69:18, | [1] - 1:5 | delays [1] | difference | $32: 3$ |
| 79:4, | Decision | -73:3 | [4] - | direction |
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| [1] - | 116:4, | [3] - | 61:12, | during [1] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 124:18 | 116:15, | 92:12, | 83: 6, | - 99:16 |
| directly | 117:2, | 92:15, | 84: 6, | dying [1] |
| [1] - | 118:12, | 103:5 | 106:11 | - 18:3 |
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|  | district |  | [1] - 79:2 | 58:19, |


| 60:10, | 103:12, | 73:17 | [1] - | 52:15, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
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| 82:16, | 104:10, | $\underline{\mathrm{g}}$ [1] - | errand [1] | evening |
| 90:19, | 111:13, | 47:10 | - 77:13 | [1] - |
| 106:3, | 113:11, | end [8] - | errata [1] | 90:16 |
| 120: 6, | 114:12, | 17:7, | - 123:3 | event [1] |
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| [44] - | 120:5, | ended [2] | 66:9, 99:4 | evidence |
| 1:11, 3:3, | 120:11, | -77:4, | essentiall | [1] - |
| $3: 18 \text {, }$ | 121:3, | 77:11 |  | 13:19 |
| $5: 10,$ | $121: 6$ | ending [1] | $20: 8, \quad 92: 9$ | evidenced |
| $6: 19,7: 9,$ | $\frac{\text { Elizabeth ' }}{}$ | - 49:2 | establish | [1] - |
| $27: 2,$ | S ${ }_{\text {5 }}$ [1] - | engaged | [2] - | 101:19 |
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| 53:3, | $\begin{aligned} & 44: 4, \\ & 92: 13 . \end{aligned}$ | engagement | d [2] - | [6] - |
| 53:13, | $\begin{aligned} & 92: 13, \\ & 92 \cdot 19 \end{aligned}$ | [1] - | 88:1, 88:2 | 11:10, |
| 60:5, | $\begin{aligned} & 92: 19, \\ & 93: 8 \end{aligned}$ | 46:12 | establishm | 28:17, |
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| 1:11, 3:3, | 121:3, | experience | 57:12, | 54:9, 70:8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 3:18, | 121:6 | [1] - | 57:13, | fast [1] |
| 5:10, | exercise | 102:10 | 65:1, | 49:13 |
| 6:19, 7:9, | [2] - | experiment | 66:5, | fastest |
| 27:2, | $70: 5$, | al [1] - | 68:5, | [1] - |
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| $61: 1,$ | 47:4, 97:6 | extensivel | 99:3, | $34: 6,$ |
| $61: 7,$ | exit [1] - | $\underline{\underline{y}}$ [1] - | 100:1 | 35:4, |
| 61:13, | 20:7 | $101: 15$ | fair [7] - | 36:17, |
| 64:12, | expand [2] | exterior | $47: 11 \text {, }$ | 37:16, |
| $64: 15,$ | $-7: 14$ | [1]-34:2 | $57: 10 \text {, }$ | 89:8, |
| 65:5, | $110: 11$ | external | $58: 8,$ | 91:2, |
| 65:10, | expands | $\frac{\text { external }}{[1]-33: 3}$ | $59: 5 \text {, }$ | 95:8, |
| $89: 16$, $90: 3$, | [1] - $34: 3$ | extra [3] | $\begin{aligned} & 61: 17, \\ & 68 \cdot 7 . \end{aligned}$ | 100:2, |
| $90: 3$, $94: 12$, | expect [2] | - 17:19, | 68:7, | 113:1, |
| $94: 12$, $98: 9$, | - 50:15, | 46:17, | 68:18 | 115:17, |
| $98: 9$, $103: 1$, | 110:13 | 57: 6 | $\underline{\text { fall [1] - }}$ | 117:12, |
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| 116:15, | 70:10 | - 19:12, |  | few [1] - |
| 117:2, | expedited | 32:3, | $14$ | 18: 6 |
| 118:12, | [1] - | 47: 4, |  | FI [4] - |
| 119:16, | 70:13 | 47:15, | Farooq [1] | 2:6, 38:17 |
| 120:1, | expeditiou | 49:9, | - 92:16 | Fi [6] - |
| 120:5, | s [1] - | 54: 5, | fashion | 39:2, |
| 120:11, | $\overline{76: 6}$ | 57: 5, | [2] | 39:3, |


| 41:11, | 4:9, | 84:2, | 61:13 | 116:2 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 68:12, | 10:11, | 84:15, | flood [1] | Foods [2] |
| 70:18, | 19:15, | 85:5, | - 100:17 | - 116:7, |
| 74:16 | 62:7 | 88:17, | flow [4] - | 116:8 |
| FI-HI [2] | FIRE [58] | 89:12, | 10:19, | foods [3] |
| - 2:6, | - 1:10, | 105:3, | 12:19, | - 97:10, |
| 38:17 | 5:7, 5:18, | 105: 9, | 13:15, | 107:15, |
| field [1] | 6:3, 6:9, | 105:15, | 15:4 | 109:19 |
| - 32:7 | 6:13, | 106:15, | folks [1] | fool's [1] |
| figure [7] | 28:7, | 112:9, | - 95:6 | - 77:13 |
| - 7:4, | 28:15, | 112:19, | follow [1] | forego [1] |
| 25:18, | 28:19, | 113:5, | - 80:18 | - 28:13 |
| 26:5, | 29:5, | 115:16, | following | foregoing |
| 55:3, | 31:16, | 115:19, | [1] - | [1] - |
| 58:3, | 33:2, | 117:11, | 119:3 | 123:11 |
| $68: 17$ | 34:5, | 117:15, | food [21] | FOREGOING |
| $83: 13$ | $34: 9$, $35: 3$, | $\begin{aligned} & 120: 7, \\ & 120: 15, \end{aligned}$ | -7:1, | [1] - |
| figured | 35:3, | $120: 15,$ | 16:4, | 124:16 |
| [1] - 75:2 | 36:16, | $\begin{aligned} & 121: 7, \\ & 121: 13, \end{aligned}$ | 19:16, | forever |
| figures | 36:19, | $\begin{aligned} & 121: 13, \\ & 121: 18 \end{aligned}$ | 19:19, | [3] - |
| [1] - | 37:15, | 121:18 | 23:1, | 67:16, |
| 40:18 | 37:19, | Fire [2] - | 23:10, | 75:10, |
| filed [3] | 53: 8, | 3:13, | 26:19, | 75:11 |
| $-63: 8,$ | 53:15, | 108:10 | 27:1, | forget [1] |
| $77: 19 \text {, }$ | $\begin{aligned} & 54: 2, \\ & 56: 8 \end{aligned}$ | fire [3] - | 29:13, | -36:6 |
| 78:13 | 56:8, | 40:14, | 30:3, | forth [5] |
| filing [1] | 57:2, $61: 15$ | $\begin{aligned} & 88: 14, \\ & 88: 18 \end{aligned}$ | $30: 8$, | -4:13, |
| $-72: 10$ | $\begin{aligned} & 61: 15, \\ & 62: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $88: 18$ | $30: 10 \text {, }$ | 24:4, |
| final [1] | $62: 2$, $63: 2$, | $\frac{\text { first }}{-3.18}$ | $30: 18 \text {, }$ | 97:5, |
| - 45:11 |  | $-3: 18$, $5: 14,8.2$, | $31: 6$, | 97:9, |
| finality |  | 5:14, 8:2, | 33:16, | 124:8 |
| [3] - | $64: 19$, $65: 8$, | 8:18, | 105: 6, | forward |
| 47:14, |  | 12: 6, | 105:19, | [4] - |
| $59: 2,67: 8$ | 67:6, | 40:3, | 107:16, | 79:7, |
| finally | $70: 3$, $76: 4$, | 43:5, | 109:10, | 79:17, |
| [2] - | 77: 6, | $43: 14$, $45: 15$ | 110:4, | 86:7, |
| $74: 7,$ | $78: 1,$ |  | 115:9 | 102:16 |
| 113:14 | $78: 6 \text {, }$ | $\frac{\text { five }}{61: 11,}$ | FOODS [2] | forwarded |
| fine [4] - | 83:15, |  | - 2:10, | [2] - |


| 44:5, | - 95:11, | 28:19, | 113:5, | 24: 6, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 78:10 | 101:14 | 29:5, | 115:16, | 100:12, |
| forwarding | frustratio | 31:16, | 115:19, | 113:14 |
| [1] - 8:4 | $\underline{n}$ [1] - | 33:2, | 117:11, | great [3] |
| four [2] - | 50:3 | 34:5, | 117:15, | - 16:9, |
| 63:14, | full [4] - | 34:9, | 120:7, | 20:7, 46:2 |
| 103:10 | 20:18, | 35:3, | 120:15, | Green [2] |
| frame [3] | 91:3, | 36:16, | 121:7, | - 101:19, |
| - 62:18, | 100:16, | 36:19, | 121:13, | 102:12 |
| 75:1, 88:9 | 100:18 | 37:15, | 121:18 | groups [2] |
| Francis | fully [3] | 37:19, | Gerald [1] | - 92:9, |
| [1] - 39:3 | - 40:2, | 53:8, | - 3:13 | 94:9 |
| FRANCIS | 47:3, 97:2 | 53:15, | GERARD [1] | grow [2] - |
| [4] - | fusion [3] | 54:2, | - 1:10 | 99:4, |
| 73:2, | - 97:11, | 56:8, | given [3] | 110:13 |
| 74:18, | 109:14, | 57:2, | - 21:17, | growing |
| 75: 6, | 110:11 | 61:15, | 56:15, | [1] - |
| 75:11 | fusion- | 62:2, | 68:9 | 97:14 |
| FRANK [8] | type [1] - | 63:2, | glass [7] | grows [1] |
| - 39:14, | 97:11 | 63:12, | - 19:3, | - 110:12 |
| 52:4, | future [1] | 64:19, | 25:8, | guess [22] |
| 52:14, | -78:19 | 65:8, | 29:13, | - 8:6, |
| 53:5, |  | 67: 6, | 29:18, | $8: 17,$ |
| 53:12, | $\underline{\text { G }}$ | $70: 3$, | $30: 1$, | 12:10, |
| 53:17, | garage [1] | 76:4, | 30:19, | 12:15, |
| 71:17, | 28:2 | 77: 6, | 93:17 | 16:19, |
| 72:5 | gay [1] - | 78:1, | goings [1] | 45:5, |
| frank [1] | 89:3 | 78:6, | - 27:19 | 53:11, |
| - 39:14 | General |  | gonna [3] | 57: 9, |
| frankly | [1] - 39:6 | $84: 15$ | - 9:1, | 62: 6, |
| [3] - | George [1] | $85: 5$ | 11:11, | 62:8, |
| 94:10, | - 93:3 | $\begin{aligned} & 85: 5, \\ & 88 \cdot 17 \end{aligned}$ | 24:16 | 67:7, |
| 106:7, | GERALD | 88:17, | grab [1] - | 70:3, |
| 110:17 | [57] - | 89:12, 105:3, | 23:10 | 70:16, |
| freer [1] | 5:7, 5:18, |  | grant [2] | 74:10, |
| - 11:19 | 6:3, 6:9, | 105:15, | - 32:4, | 76:9, |
| friends | 6:13, | $106: 15,$ | 97:13 | 77: 6, |
| [1] - 25:6 | 28:7, | 112:9, | granted | $78: 6$, |
| front [2] | 28:15, | 112:19, | [3] - | 80:2, |


| 85:5, | 45:9, | 104:1, | 44:14, | [6] - 3:8, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 85:15 | 46:19, | 104:5, | 58:19, | 64:4, |
| guidelines | 48:4, | 107:19, | 110:15, | 118:2, |
| [1] - 4:17 | 48:14, | 108:3, | 124:11 | 118:10, |
| guy [7] - | 49:5, | 108:15, | handle [1] | 119:7, |
| 46:2, | 49:18, | 109:3, | - 13:6 | 121:19 |
| 46:3, | 57: 9, | 110:1, | happy [2] | hearing |
| 50:17, | 59:11, | 110:9, | - 12:6, | [25] - |
| 52: 6, | 64:1, | 110:18, | 48:3 | 8:7, |
| 52:11, | 65:14, | 112:2, | hard [1] - | 16:10, |
| 71:19, | 67:19, | 112: 6, | 66:10 | 17:8, |
| 88:10 | 69:12, | 113:3, | harm [3] - | 17:14, |
| guys [1] - | 70:2, | 113:13, | 98:2, | $38: 6$, |
| 28:18 | $73: 7$, | 116:1, | 98:12, | 39:8, |
|  | 73:15, | 117:14, | 100:6 | 40:8, |
| H | 73:18, | 118:3, | Harvard | $60: 13$, |
| HAAS [91] | $74: 9$, | 118:8, | [4] - | 62:8, |
| - 1:9, | 74:12, | 118:14, | 41:14, | $74: 6$, |
| 6:2, 6:12, | 77:2, | 119:2, | 42:11, | 95:1, |
| 6:15, 7:2, | 77:12, | 119:11, | 92:15, | 96:5, |
| 13:18, | 79:1, | 119:18, | 92:17 | 96:19, |
| 18:16, | 79:12, | 120:9, | hate [2] | 99:16, |
| 21:8, | $80: 1$, | 120:17, | 101:5, | 99:17, |
| 22:3, | $80: 11$, | 121:1, | 101: 6 | 105:5, |
| 22:7, | 81:7, | 121:5, | head [2] | 108: 4, |
| 22:18, | 85:17, | 121:16 | 38:7, | 111:5, |
| 23: 6, | 86:3, | Haas [2] - | $83: 13$ | 114:2, |
| 23:11, | 87:4, | $3: 14,$ | hear [7] - | $\text { 115: } 4 \text {, }$ |
| 23:16, | $88: 19 \text {, }$ | $106: 4$ | $\frac{\text { hear }}{10: 3,}$ | 118:1, |
| 25:10, | $89: 7 \text {, }$ | half [5] - | $\begin{aligned} & 10: 3, \\ & 27: 11, \end{aligned}$ | 118:18, |
| 28:3, | 89:10, | 11:16, | $38: 9,$ | $118: 19,$ |
| $31: 13$, | 97:17, | $87: 3,$ | $49: 8 \text {, }$ | 119:3, |
| 31:18, | $98: 7,$ | $87: 7 \text {, }$ | $95: 10 \text {, }$ | $124: 8$ |
| $32: 10$, | 98:16, | $88: 11 \text {, }$ | $96: 8,$ | HEARING |
| 34:8, | $100: 4 \text {, }$ $100: 10$ | $104: 19$ | 108:8 | $[2]-1: 2,$ |
| 35: 6, | $100: 10$, $101: 2$, | Hall [1] - | heard [2] | $1: 5$ |
| 37:2, | 101:2, | 95:4 | - 76:3, | hearings |
| $37: 6$, | $\begin{aligned} & 101: 9, \\ & 101: 17, \end{aligned}$ | hand [5] - | 112:11 | [2] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 37: 18, \\ & 38: 8, \end{aligned}$ | 102: 4, | 10:15, | Hearing | 118:13, |



| 114:17 | 94:14, | 31:5, | [7] - | 86:18, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| including | 96:16, | 33:7, | 42:10, | 105:9, |
| [1] - | 99:15 | 33:8, 34:3 | 43:18, | 111:16 |
| 69:19 | inevitable | inspector | $44: 6$, | issued [1] |
| incorporat | [1] - 83:2 | [1] - | 45:1, | - 39:9 |
| ed [1] - | infinite | 35:12 | 58:7, | issues [3] |
| 109:11 | [1] - 70:9 | instance | 61: 4, | - 57:16, |
| increase | influence | [1] - | 114:4 | 92:3, |
| [5] - | [1] - | 25:14 | interestin | 119:5 |
| 33:7, | 66:14 | INSTRUCTIO | $\underline{g}$ [3] - | item [1] - |
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| - 3:14 | 42:3, | [1] - | 11:17, | 15: 4 , |
| room [2] - | 42:7, | 118:7 | 12:2, | 15:5, |
| 14:12, | 49:11, | scheduled | 12:4, | 15:9, |
| 100:18 | 56:3, | [3] - | 12:9, | 34:3, |
| Room [2] - | 58:19, | 118: 9, | 12:18, | 34:15, |
| 1:13, 3:11 | 62:17, | 118:17, | 13:14, | 36:4, |
| rope [1] - | 63:5, | 118:19 | 16:8, | 36:5, |
| 16:14 | 63:17, | schematic | 17:2, | 36:7, |
| rug [1] - | $64: 17$, | [2] - | 20:9, | 36:14, |
| 86:16 | 65:12, | 33:11, | 20:15, | 105:10, |
| rules [4] | 66:3, | 34:12 | 21:2, | 105:13, |
| - 25:12, | 68:3, | scope [1] | 24:13, | 107:13, |
| 26:1, | 76:8, | - 26:8 | 26:13, | 109: 6, |
| 72:5, | 76:19, | se [1] - | 33:3, | 109:8, |
| 96:15 | 77:18, | - | $33: 7$, | 109:11, |
| run [2] - | 78:8, | SEA [2] - | 33: 8, | 111:3, |
| $\overline{95}: 6$ | 78:16, | SEA [2] - | $34: 2$, | 114:19 |
| 119:8 | 84:5, | 116:2 | $34: 11$, | second |
| rush [5] - | 86:11, | Sea [2] | 90:11, | [24] - |
| 11:11, | 88:14 | $\frac{\text { Sea }}{116: 6,}$ | 105:12, | 5:7, 5:17, |
| $18: 2 \text {, }$ | sales [2] | $116: 6$, $116: 8$ | 109:12, | 5:18, 6:8, |
| 18:4, | - 110:4, | $116: 8$ seasona | 115:6 | 6:9, 34:4, |
| 18:14, | 111:1 |  | seating- | 34:5, |
| 57:15 | SAME [1] - |  | wise [1] - | 35:2, |
|  | 124:17 | $6 \cdot 7$ | 12:9 | 35:3, |
| S | sat [2] - | 6:7, $20: 15$, | seatings | 36:15, |
| sad [2] - | 46:1, 46:7 | 20:15, | [1] - | 36:16, |
| 49:1, 49:2 | satisfacto | seat [2] - | 14:14 | 37:14, |
| Sage [4] - | $\underline{\underline{y}}$ [1] - | $12: 8,31: 6$ | seats [28] | $\begin{aligned} & 37: 15, \\ & 43: 12, \end{aligned}$ |


| 69:15, | - 104:6, | 37:9 | 105:7, | $71: 11$, |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 89:6, | 112:12 | separating | 111:10, | 77:14, |
| 89:7, | seem [2] - | [1] - 35:2 | 111:12, | 77:17, |
| 112:18, | 59:3, | separation | 111:14 | 87:1 |
| 112:19, | 101:5 | [1] - 26:3 | serving | setup [1] |
| 115:15, | sell [5] - | sequence | [10] - | - 10:16 |
| 115:16, | 48:3, | [2] - | $6: 6,16: 4$, | seven [1] |
| 117:10, | 58:11, | 98:6, 98:8 | 18:13, | - 90:10 |
| 117:11, | 60:18, | serious | 19:10, | several |
| 121:13 | 71:14, | [1] - | 19:16, | [2] - |
| Section | 88:7 | 38:12 | 21:2, | 85:13, |
| [1] - 39:7 | seller [1] | seriously | 22:14, | 103:15 |
| sectioned | - 56:13 | [1] - | 23:7, | SHEET [1] |
| [1] - | sellers | 75:14 | 26:19, | - 123:1 |
| 16:17 | [1] - | serve [10] | 28:13 | sheet [2] |
| see [23] - | 54:13 | - 18:10, | session | - 123:3 |
| 8:9, 10:7, | selling | 23:13, | [1] - | shelf [1] |
| 10:10, | [9] - | 29:9, | 59:14 | - 46:7 |
| 10:11, | 41:2, | 34:13, | set [14] - | Shipley |
| 13:19, | 41:9, | 35:10, | 22:1, | [2]-93:9 |
| 14:2, | 41:10, | 105:19, | 22:13, | shoot [1] |
| 17: 6, | 41:16, | 106:2, | 22:16, | - 63:9 |
| $21: 6,$ | 42:1, | 107:15, | 38:13, | Short [1] |
| $27: 14,$ | 42:13, | 115:9, | 62:9, | $-61: 18$ |
| 32:7, | $45: 16,$ | 116:14 | 71:9, | short [2] |
| $38: 3,$ | $72: 17,$ | served [4] | $77: 5 \text {, }$ | - 64:18, |
| $41: 18 \text {, }$ | 75:12 | - 9:8, | $77: 18 \text {, }$ | $81: 19$ |
| 55:3, | send [2] - | 16:16, | $85: 2,$ $89: 3$ | shorter |
| $\begin{aligned} & 57: 6, \\ & 63: 9, \end{aligned}$ | 113:12, | 35:19, | $\begin{aligned} & 89: 3, \\ & 106: 17, \end{aligned}$ | $[1]-67: 3$ |
| $\begin{aligned} & 63: 9, \\ & 69: 9, \end{aligned}$ | $115: 9$ | $36: 3$ | $\begin{aligned} & 106: 17, \\ & 113: 6, \end{aligned}$ | Shorthand |
| 69:9, 77 : 18, | $\underline{\text { sense [2] }}$ | serves [1] | 113:6, | [1] - |
| $77: 18$, $78: 4$, | - 32:1, | - 109:14 | 124:8, | 124:14 |
| 80: 9, | 100:13 | service | sets [2] | shortly |
| 81:18, | sent [2] - | 10 | 51: | [4] - |
| $82: 16,$ | 94:2, 116:18 | 10:16, | 67:18 | 41:13, |
| 102:9, |  |  | setting | 41:19, |
| 111:19 | $\frac{\text { separate }}{[2]-}$ | $22: 8$, $55: 5$, | [6] - | 44:8, |
| seeing [2] | 33:18, | 99:1, | 68:9, | shot [1] - |


| $\begin{aligned} & 49: 10 \\ & \text { show [1] } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 37: 17, \\ & 89: 9, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 56: 10, \\ & 59: 2, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 64: 4, \\ & 88: 14, \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 89: 13 \\ & \text { sort [1] } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 44:14 | 113:2, | 61: 4 , | 114:7 | 97:10 |
| showed [2] | 115:18, | 63:3, | sold [3] - | sounds [1] |
| - 99:18, | 117:13, | 85:10, | 54:1, | - 87:8 |
| 100:2 | 121:15 | 86:4, | 55:1, 67:9 | source [1] |
| showing | signing | 120:2 | sole [1] | - 11:12 |
| [1] - | [1] - | six [20] - | 54:12 | space [7] |
| 112:3 | 49:11 | $4: 6, \quad 15: 2,$ | solution | - 13:8, |
| shown [1] | silent [1] | $22: 11,$ | [2] - | 3:16, |
| - 34:11 | - 3:6 | 24:7, | 76:13, | 14:3, |
| shows [2] | similar | 28:16, | 76:19 | 14:4, |
| - 34:12, | [1] - | $34: 12$ | someone | 27:8, |
| 36:4 | 115:3 | 34:13, | [6] - | 35:2, 47:5 |
| side [6] - | simply [3] | 34:15, | 22:13, | specialize |
| 10:15, | - 80:5, | 64:6, | 37:14, | d [1] - |
| 15:3, | 105: 6, | 64:11, | 50:19, | 41:9 |
| 15:5, | 110:16 | 80:16, | 55:7, | specific |
| 28:14, | simultaneo | $84: 14,$ | 87:12, | [1] - |
| 62:10, | us [1] - | $105: 13,$ | 106:5 | 66:19 |
| 114:1 | 45:1 | 105:18, | sometimes | specifical |
| sidewalk | sit [5] - | 107:13, | [1] - 72:7 | ly [1] - |
| [5] - 4:6, | 19:2, | $\begin{aligned} & 109: 6, \\ & 109: 8, \end{aligned}$ | somewhat | 95:13 |
| 21:1, | 25: 6, | 109:8, | [3] - | speeding |
| $24: 12$ | $74: 15 \text {, }$ | 111:3, | $32: 2,$ | [1] - |
| $26: 12$ | $79: 9,$ | 112:16 | $49: 14$ | 66:14 |
| 114:18 | 106:11 | six-mon | 86:7 | spell [5] |
| $\frac{\text { Sign }}{123 \cdot 3} \text { [1] - }$ | site [1] - | $\frac{\text { six-mon }}{[1]-}$ | $\frac{\text { soon }}{52: 7}$ [2] - | $-40: 1$ |
| $123: 3$ <br> sign [3] | $92: 18$ | $84: 14$ | $\begin{aligned} & 52: 7, \\ & 119: 4 \end{aligned}$ | $43: 7,$ |
| $\frac{\operatorname{sign}}{50: 19,}$ | $\frac{\text { sits }}{50: 17}$ | size [1] - | sooner [2] | 43:11, |
| 103:18 | sitting | 58:14 | - 75:15, | spelling |
| signify | [4] - | $\frac{\text { skewed [1] }}{\text { - } 9.14}$ | 82: 6 | [1] - |
| [12] - | 30:19, | - 9:14 | sorry [7] | 91:13 |
| 5:9, 6:1, | 31:2, | skip [1] | - 14:5, | split [1] |
| 6:11, | 55:19, | 89:17 | 14:12, | - 92:6 |
| 34:7, | 75:19 | snack [1] | 35:17, | spot [1] - |
| 35:5, | situation | - 19:4 | 38:11, | 65:6 |
| 36:18, | [7] - | so.. [3] - | 86:17, | Square [4] |


| - 41:14, | state [3] | stood [1] | 81:12, | Sunday [1] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 42:11, | - 40:1, | - 83:10 | 83:3, | - 116:7 |
| 92:15, | 57:5, 91:3 | stop [1] - | 86:12 | SUNNYWOODS |
| 92:17 | statement ( | 106:5 | stuck [1] | [2] - 2:7, |
| squared | s [1] - | straight | - 74:14 | 90:1 |
| [1] - 9:12 | 123:12 | [1] - | stuff [1] | Sunnywoods |
| ss [1] - | station | 83:13 | - 62:5 | [3] - |
| 124:4 | [1] - | street [1] | style [1] | 90:5, |
| staff [1] | 23:12 | - 26:10 | - 110:11 | 91: 6, |
| - 109:8 | status [2] | Street [6] | submit [3] | 112:14 |
| STAFF [1] | - 72:11, | - 18:9, | - 100:6, | Superior |
| - 1:11 | 86:9 | 26:16, | 100:12, | [1] - |
| stanchions | stay [1] - | 28: 6, | 106:9 | 61:10 |
| [2] - | 55:9 | 89:17, | submitted | supplement |
| 16:7, 38:3 | stays [1] | 114:14, | [2] - | [1] - |
| stand [2] | - 65:9 | 114:16 | 33:10, | 109:19 |
| - 40:11, | step [1] - | STREET [2] | 78:9 | support |
| 41:2 | 79:16 | - 2:9, | subscribe | [7] - |
| standpoint | still [17] | 114:10 | [1] - | 19:9, |
| [4] - | - 17:3, | stretch | 123:12 | 19:17, |
| 8:17, | 22:19, | [2] - | subsequent | 98:13, |
| 17:1, | 28:8, | 25:15, | ly [3] - | 100:16, |
| 51:3, | 29:15, | 78:14 | 5:3, 93:1, | 101:11, |
| 74:11 | 31:5, | strict [1] | 116:18 | 101:15, |
| start [2] | 33:14, | - 32:14 | substantia | 101:16 |
| - 8:6, | 37:9, | strides | lly [1] - | supporting |
| 113:15 | 60:17, | [1] - 96:7 | 65:13 | [1] - 95:8 |
| started | 61: 9, | strings | substitute | surprised |
| [4] - | 63:13, | [1] - 73:1 | [1] - | [1] - |
| 11:13, | 69:7, | struggle | 107:16 | 50:13 |
| 42:17, | 69:14, | [2] - | suggest | surrounded |
| 45:14, | 71:4, | 71:16, | [2] - | [1] - |
| 52:8 | 74:14, | 82:19 | 5:11, | 18:11 |
| starting | 80:14, | struggling | 79:10 | surroundin |
| [2] - | 84:12, | [7] - | suggesting | $\underline{\underline{g}}$ [2] - |
| 17:11, | 88:7 | 59:4, | [1] - 80:7 | 18:8, 59:6 |
| 46:13 | $\frac{\text { stipulatio }}{}$ | 68:6, | suitable | $\underline{1}$ |
| $\frac{\text { starts }}{-16: 16}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{n}{35: 7} \quad-\quad-1 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 71: 10, \\ & 76: 3, \end{aligned}$ | [1] - | table [4] |


| - 36:10, | 71:2, | 1:18, 2:3, | 50:16, | timing [1] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 67:2, | 73:10 | 3:16, | 63:14, | - 49:7 |
| 106:11, | terminated | 39:19, | 84:18, | TIPS [1] - |
| 106:19 | [3] - | 40:5, | 98:4, | 111:8 |
| tables | 42:7, | 91:2, | 99:11, | TO [1] - |
| [12] - | 43:1, | 91:13, | 103: 9, | 124:17 |
| 22:11, | 45:19 | 91:17, | 117:4 | today [9] |
| 24:7, | terms [24] | 91:19, | three- | - 10:5, |
| 24:14, | - 16:11, | 124:16, | month [2] | 59:1, |
| 28:14, | 19:16, | 124:17, | - 37:4, | 59:3, |
| 28:16, | 45:11, | 124:17, | 37:12 | 63:4, |
| 29:15, | 58:11, | 124:18 | three-year | 63:13, |
| 34:13, | 61:16, | thereafter | [1] - | $63: 17$, |
| 34:15, | 66:14, | [1] - | 84:18 | 76:15, |
| 36:4, | 67:11, | 41:13 | throw [2] | 83:8, |
| 36:9, | 67:14, | therefor | - 37:9, | 107:17 |
| 36:13 | $70: 6$, | [1] - | 103:13 | together |
| Taiwanese | 70:19, | 123:2 | Thursday | [1] - |
| [1] - | $74: 14$, | they ' ve | [3] - | $45: 18$ |
| 109:15 | $77 \text { : } 1$ | [1] - | $1: 15,3: 8,$ | took [1] - |
| Takemura | 77:15, | 42:13 | 119:3 | 13:4 |
| [3] - | $82: 6 \text {, }$ | thing's | ticking | top [1] - |
| $41: 15$ | $\begin{aligned} & 85: 2, \\ & 88: 18, \end{aligned}$ | $[1]-$ | [1] - | $55: 16$ |
| $46: 5,56: 3$ <br> tasteful | $\begin{aligned} & 88: 18, \\ & 97: 4, \end{aligned}$ | $47: 13$ | $113: 16$ | torn [1] |
| tasteful | 97:4 | thinking | tie [2] - | 82:18 |
| [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 99: 6, \\ & 99: 12, \end{aligned}$ | [2] - | 53: 6, | touch [2] |
| $\begin{aligned} & 16: 14 \\ & \text { tempers } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 99: 12, \\ & 101: 10, \end{aligned}$ | $70: 19 \text {, }$ | 69:19 | - 55:8, |
| $\frac{\text { tempered }}{[1]-99: 6}$ | 105:11, | 78:7 | tied [3] - | 94:9 |
| temporaril | 107:6, | $\frac{\text { third }}{-61: 8,}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 21: 17 \\ & 85: 7 \end{aligned}$ | touched ${ }^{\text {[1] - } 19.8}$ |
| $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{y}} \text { [1] - }}$ | $108: 5$, $108: 16$ | 101:10, | $85: 71$ $85: 11$ | touching |
| 6:17 | 108:16 testify | 104:16 | TIME [1] - | [1]-20:8 |
| $\frac{\text { ten }}{36}$ [3] 5 - | [1] - | $\frac{\text { THIS [1] }}{124: 16}$ | $1: 16$ | towards |
| $\begin{aligned} & 36: 5, \\ & 36: 7, \end{aligned}$ | $40: 10$ | 124:16 | timeline | [2] - |
| $\begin{aligned} & 36: 7, \\ & 36: 13 \end{aligned}$ | thankfully | three [11] | [4] - | 9:14, 47:2 |
| tenant [4] | [1] - |  | 74:14, | traffic |
| -69:1, | 11:13 | 37: |  | [5] - |
| 71:1, | THE [13] - | 37:12, | 82:14 | $10: 19 \text {, }$ |


| 13:15, | 95:17 | trying | two [22] - | under [8] |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 15:3, 24:3 | transferre | [21] - | 7:15, | - 9:5, |
| trained | d [1] - | 7:4, 12:6, | 15:5, | 9:9, |
| [2] - | 56:17 | 25:1, | 28:14, | 12:14, |
| 107:14, | trickle | 25:13, | 36:4, | 39:9, |
| 109:9 | [1] - 18:6 | 25:18, | 36:7, | 41:17, |
| training | tried [3] | 26:5, | 44:19, | 46:5, |
| [3] - | - 43:7, | 30:11, | 50:15, | 60:18, |
| 111:7, | 96:12, | 46:11, | $51: 15$, | 117:3 |
| 111:17, | 99:14 | 47:14, | 65:16, | UNDER [1] |
| 112:16 | troubled | 49:8, | 83:17, | - 124:17 |
| transactio | [1] - 68:5 | $50: 4$, | 83:19, | underneath |
| $\underline{n}$ [6] - | troubles | 53:16, | 84:1, | [1] - |
| 42:17, | [1] - | 57:15, | 84:3, | 86:16 |
| 43:19, | 58:13 | 58:3, | 84:18, | understood |
| 44:7, | true [1] - | 68:17, | 87:3, | [1] - 97:1 |
| 45:2, | 124:9 | 70:6, | 87:7, | unfamiliar |
| 48:7, | trustee | 76:18, | 88:11, | [1] - 72:4 |
| 49:10 | [2] - | $\begin{aligned} & 86: 6, \\ & 92 \cdot 19 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 88: 14, \\ & 99 \cdot 10 \end{aligned}$ | unfortunat |
| transcript | $95: 1, \quad 96: 5$ | $\begin{aligned} & 93: 19 \\ & 100: 9 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 99: 10, \\ & 103: 13 \end{aligned}$ | ely [2] - |
| $[3]-$ | trustees | $100: 9$ |  | $\overline{101}: 1,$ |
| $123: 2$ | [3] - | Tuesday | type [4] - | 105:2 |
| 123:11, | $94: 5,$ | $\begin{aligned} & {[1] \quad-} \\ & 120: 14 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 50: 17, \\ & 56: 13, \end{aligned}$ | unknown |
| 123:12 | $95: 5 \text {, }$ | $\begin{gathered} 120: 14 \\ \text { tuq [1] - } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 56: 13, \\ & 97: 11, \end{aligned}$ | [1] - |
| TRANSCRIPT | 100:2 | $\frac{\text { tug }}{73: 1}$ [1] - | $\begin{aligned} & 97: 11, \\ & 109: 15 \end{aligned}$ | $63: 16$ |
| [1] - | truth <br> [1] | $73: 1$ <br> tunnel [1] | 109:15 | unless [2] |
| 124:16 | -73:2 | tunnel [1] <br> - 86:15 | U | - 30:2, |
| $\frac{\text { transfer }}{[8]-}$ | try [11] - | turn [8] | UK [2] - | 120:2 |
| [8] - | 25:15, | turn [8] - | 43:1, | UNLESS [1] |
| $\begin{aligned} & 41: 19, \\ & 70: 10, \end{aligned}$ | $35: 8 \text {, }$ |  | $46: 11$ | - 124:17 |
| $\begin{aligned} & 70: 10, \\ & 77: 19, \end{aligned}$ | $35: 18,$ | $57: 3,$ | UK-based | UNSPEAKABL |
| $77: 19$, $78: 5$, | 46:17, | 62:9, | [1]-43:1 | E [2] - |
| $78: 1$ | 56:6, | 84:1, | unbelievab | 2:9, |
|  | 57: 6, | 106:1 | le [1] - | 114:10 |
| 95:14, | 69:18, | 106:17, | $\overline{52}: 8$ | Unspeakabl |
| 97:4 | 71: | 107:12 | uncertaint | e [1] - |
| transferra | : 11, | twist [1] | $\underline{\underline{\mathbf{y}}}$ [1] - | 114:13 |
| ble [1] - | 102:2 | - 102:2 | 58:14 | $\frac{\text { up }}{11: 9,}$ |


| 13: 4 , | - 4:16, | w | $31: 7$, | [1] - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 17:7, | 44:14, | Wagamama | 31:10 | 102:17 |
| 18:18, | 69:17, | [12] - | walk [1] - | Wen [1] - |
| 21:17, | 78:19, | 42:11, | 29:2 | 90:6 |
| 23:10, | 87:2, | 42:17, | walking | whereas |
| 26:10, | 106:19 | 42:19, | [1] - | [1] - 24:3 |
| 42:7, | vic [1] - | 43:2, | 103:17 | WHEREOF |
| 43:13, | 95:12 | 43: 4 , | wall [2] - | [1] - |
| 44:14, | vice [2] - | 43:15, | 14:11, | 124:10 |
| 53: 6, | 42:18, | 46:10, | 55: 6 | whole [9] |
| 54:8, | 43:4 | 50:11, | wants [4] | - 54:15, |
| 62:9, | Victualer | 56:4, | - 60:1, | 59:2, |
| 66:14, | [1]-90:7 | 58:15, | 71:3, | 59:6, |
| 67:10, | view [6] - | 87:16, | 86:8, | 60:13, |
| 69:19, | 19:9, | 88:3 | 87:12 | $75: 5$, |
| 76:16, | 20:18, | wait [2] - | wayside | 88:8, |
| 79:19, | $21: 16,$ | 53:7, | [1] - 46:1 | 119:10, |
| 82:8, | 70:4, | 86:17 | Wednesday | 119:13, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 85: 7, \\ & 0.7 \end{aligned}$ | 96:11, | waiter [1] | [1] - | 119:15 |
| 93:2, | 96:17 | - 20:10 | 121:4 | willing |
| $99: 18 \text {, }$ $100: 2$ | vision [1] | waiters | week [6] - | [3] - |
| $100: 2,$ | - 78:18 | [1] - | 50:16, | 32:3, |
| $105: 10 \text {, }$ | visited | 107:14 | 90:11, | 47:7, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 106: 17 \\ & 120: 15 \end{aligned}$ | [1] - | waiting | 119:10, | 55:11 |
| updates | 13:19 | [2] - | 119:12, | window [2] |
| $\frac{\text { [1] - }}{\text { updates }}$ | visually | 50:18, | 119:13, | - 67:8, |
| $55: 11$ | [1] - 13:5 | 89:18 | 119:15 | 84:14 |
|  | volume [1] | waitress | weekly [1] | wine [33] |
| - 8:9 | - 21:17 | [1] - | - 55:11 | - 9:8, |
| USA | vote [5] - | 20:11 | weeks [9] | 16:16, |
| $43: 16$ | 33:3, | waitstaff | - 50:15, | 17:9, |
|  | 59:19, | [9] - | 83:18, | 17:11, |
| $\underline{\mathrm{v}}$ | 60:2, | 21:10, | 84:1, | 18:10, |
| value [3] | 68:4, | 21:16, | 84:3, | $18: 13,$ |
| - 47:12, | 116:6 | 22:19, | $84: 4 \text {, }$ | $\begin{aligned} & 19: 3, \\ & 19: 10 . \end{aligned}$ |
| 48:17, | $\underline{\text { voting }}$ - 108:17 | $23: 5$, $23: 19$, | $\begin{aligned} & 87: 3, \\ & 87: 7, \end{aligned}$ | 11:3, |
| $50: 5$ | VP [1] - | 29:1, | 88:12 | 23:5, |
|  | 45:19 | 30:3, | welcome | 23: 8, |


| 23:13, | withdraw | wrongly |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25:8, | [1] - | [1] - 51:9 |
| 29:14, | 117:9 | www. |
| 29:18, | withdrawin | reportersin |
| 30:2, | $\underline{\underline{g}}$ [2] - | . com [1] - |
| $30: 4$, | 117:6 | 1:19 |
| 30:10, | withdrawn |  |
| $30: 15$, | [1] - | $\underline{\mathrm{Y}}$ |
| $30: 17$, | 116:8 | year [7] - |
| $30: 19$, | WITNESS | 20:17, |
| 31:8, | [1] - | 51:8, |
| 31:10, | 124:10 | 58:10, |
| $34: 13$, | wonder [1] | 70:18, |
| 35:19, | - 31:19 | 71: 4 , |
| 38:4, | wondering | 84:18, |
| 41:12, | [4] - | 95:12 |
| 42:2, | 21:11, | years [6] |
| $42: 14$, $45: 3$, | 73:9, | - 12:6, |
| $45: 3$, $93: 17$, | 85:18, | 51:12, |
| $\begin{aligned} & 93: 17, \\ & 97: 9, \end{aligned}$ | 119:19 | 55:2, |
| 109:17 | words [2] | 61:11, |
| Wine [2] - | - 92:10, | $61: 14$, $85: 13$ |
| 7:11, 39:4 | 98:1 works [1] | yesterday |
| $\frac{\text { wise }}{12: 9} \text { [1] - }$ | - 82:17 | $\begin{aligned} & {[7]-8: 8,} \\ & 8: 18 . \end{aligned}$ |
| wish [7] - | worse [2] | $\begin{aligned} & 8: 18, \\ & 10: 7, \end{aligned}$ |
| 53:12, | $-53: 11 \text {, }$ | 13:19, |
| 53:17, | 72:1 | 32:8, |
| 53:18, | would ve | 40:12, |
| 75:6, | [3] - | 74:7 |
| 75:18, | 52:5, | yourself |
| 76:2, | $\begin{aligned} & 52: 10, \\ & 53: 19 \end{aligned}$ | [2] - |
| 104:18 |  | 11:5, |
| wishing | 64:16 | $\underline{z}$ |
| [1] - | writing | Zoning [1] |
| 112:11 | $\begin{aligned} & {[1]} \\ & 35: 18 \end{aligned}$ | - 93:2 |

