PLANNING BOARD
FOR THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

GENERAL HEARING

Tuesday, April 2, 2013
7:10 p.m.
in
Second Floor Meeting Room, 344 Broadway
City Hall Annex -- McCusker Building
Cambridge, Massachusetts

Hugh Russell, Chair
H. Theodore Cohen, Vice Chair
William Tibbs, Member
Pamela Winters, Member
Steven Winter, Member
Tom Sieniewicz, Member
Catherine Preston Connolly, Member
Ahmed Nur, Associate Member
Steven Cohen, Associate Member

Brian Murphy, Assistant City Manager for Community Development

Community Development Staff:
Liza Paden
Roger Boothe
Jeff Roberts
Stuart Dash
Iram Farooq

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

I N D E X

GENERAL BUSINESS

1. Board of Zoning Appeal Cases X

2. Update, Brian Murphy, Assistant City Manager of Community Development X

3. Adoption of Meeting Transcript (s) X

4. K2C2 Planning Board meeting with the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority 4

Cambridge Redevelopment Authority Members:
Barry Zevin
Conrad Crawford
Margaret Drury
Kathy Born
Christopher Bator

KeyWord Index

P R O C E E D I N G S

HUGH RUSSELL: Good evening. This is a meeting of the Cambridge Planning Board. And tonight we have some special guests, members of the Board of the Cambridge Redevelopment Authority.

So I think we might start just by introducing ourselves to each other because I don't know all of you. I know almost all of you, but not all of you.

Steve, why don't you start and then we'll go around.

STEVEN COHEN: I'm Steve Cohen.

PAMELA WINTERS: Pam Winters.

HUGH RUSSELL: Hugh Russell.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Ted Cohen.

STEVEN WINTER: Steve Winter.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Tom Sieniewicz.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY:

Catherine Preston Connolly.

CHRISTOPHER BATOR: I'm Chris Bator.

MARGARET DRURY: Margaret Drury.

KATHY BORN: Kathy Born.

CONRAD CRAWFORD: I'm Conrad Crawford.

BARRY ZEVIN: Barry Zevin.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, welcome. And coming in is Ahmed Nur.

(Ahmed Nur seated.)

HUGH RUSSELL: Actually I'll start with a little background and then Roger will give it the hard sell. I'm going to start about six months or seven months ago, last summer when the Planning Board started getting reports of the Kendall Square Committee and started looking at guidelines and recommendations for Zoning changes in Kendall Square. And at that time we -- this

was a huge package of great importance to the city, and we decided we would try to bite it off in pieces. So the two pieces that have been worked on are the MIT Sector Rezoning, which one hopes the Council will enact next week at their meeting. Guidelines, design guidelines for the entire district which sort of govern sort of how you do things as opposed to what you do, have been prepared and have not been quite enacted but they're real close.

And the pieces that are not done are three sectors: You know, one sector owned by Boston Properties, one sector owned by the Department of Transportation, and then some miscellaneous additional sites. It seems -- it's always seemed to be that when there are boards with responsibilities that for the same term, it's good city policy that we work

together, and so the purpose of this meeting is first to sort of discuss Kendall Square and how we see our roles, and the second part is to see if we can figure out a rough process or time schedule for dealing with the Zoning for the sectors that we have not yet done. And I don't know whether this is something that you're in a position to address. And that's really the purpose of the meeting because I know you've been meeting as a Board for relatively few months, and you've got a lot of powers you could exercise that might help the process. So it's wanting to put our heads together, anybody want to -- oh, there's Bill.

So, Roger, do you want to, do you want to make any opening remarks?

KATHY BORN: Mr. Chair, I'd just like to thank you for hosting us this

evening. And we'd just like to on behalf of the Board I'd like to thank you for hosting us and we're looking forward. This is our first glimpse at this particular presentation and so we're looking forward to savoring it and discussing it with you.

HUGH RUSSELL: Excellent.

(William Tibbs Seated.)

HUGH RUSSELL: Roger.

ROGER BOOTHE: Bill Tibbs has just walked in for those of you who don't know Bill is a member of the Planning Board.

Bill, everyone has introduced themselves around just to start off with, and I'm going to give a status report that tries to talk about how we got where we are and where we might be going.

I don't know, can everyone see around the projector here? It's awkward setting up

the room here. Am I speaking loud enough? I'm a little ways from the microphone. Hearing okay?

So here's an aerial fairly recently -- maybe we can turn down the lights some -- that shows a lot of development that's happened in Kendall Square and the proximity to the river. And I'd like to talk a little bit about the, especially since Bill is here, the context, talk about the context of where we are right now, and spend just a little bit of time talking about the evolution of Eastern Cambridge in the last 20, 25 years. A lot of this some of you know very intimately, some of you don't know it as much. I think we're coming a little bit from different places. So I see my role as giving us a little bit of a common understanding of that fairly recent history so that you can

have your conversation about where we go from here on a shared basis. And then fairly quickly talk about projects that are current, ongoing in the Kendall Square area, and end up with the remaining Zoning elements that Hugh referred to. And Jeff Roberts is prepared to take you through where we are with that depending on how much detail you want to get into this evening.

So, this map shows the Central Square portion of the K2-C2, as we affectionately refer to the plan, and the Kendall Square portion. And I'm not going through the details of it right now, that's what we'll get around to towards the end. But it's also a handy map to be able to think about the redevelopment authority's literally central role really in this area over the last few decades. The MIT piece that's going ahead

right now. And also thinking back to the East Cambridge riverfront over here on the -- alongside the river and how that was really a formative time for the city in terms of trying to reclaim rust belt areas, structured areas around good, urban design open space and design review. And also the University Park area sort of abutting parts of Central Square and that's sort of a different history, different sort of development structure, but similar process of very major transformation. And then maybe looking a little bit at the area around Broad Canal that sort of brings together the riverfront with more recent Kendall Square works.

STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, may I?

I simply want to say that what the discussion that we're having is very rich and I'm very happy and I like that and I don't

want you to hurry on any account. This is our single item, and any conjecture, perspective, other wisdom that you want to put in as we move on, please do so.

ROGER BOOTHE: Well, thank you for that comment. I never know how fast to go because I don't want to bore people. And I like when people but in, and if I make a mistake or ask a question. I could go on way too long. I'll certainly try not to do that. But I can feel Dennis Carlone's eyes on my neck here as I have this picture of the East Cambridge riverfront up here.

DENNIS CARLONE: I'm not going to but in.

ROGER BOOTHE: As Dennis and a lot of us do remember it was a wasteland, people didn't even know it was there. It took Dennis's plan and the City's work in the

early 80's to get going on what transformed the 60 acres from a literal sort of wasteland with parking lots and nothing much going on, to a really solid part of the community. Now we can all talk about what we learned and didn't learn. I know Steve Cohen, when we were having our preparatory session wanted me talk to about mistakes. And we certainly did make some mistakes. I hope I don't sound too much like a booster in all this, but overall I do feel very positive about the direction that we're going in. And I think we're poised right now with the work of the rejuvenated CRA Board and what's happening in Kendall Square to learn from all those things. But it's certainly true in the early 80's when the Sonesta Hotel wanted to expand, the bank said, are you crazy? This is place is a wasteland. Why would we give you money

to do anything in this area. It took a little while, but this area became kind of a calling card for the fact that we in Cambridge are -- were able to come up with visions and try to work on achieving multipurpose plans always based around a sense of connectiveness and the open -- and the urban space system with Lechmere Canal here, connecting through to new parks and opening up the riverfront, having a whole circuit of open space. And we were very excited in the late 80's that we got national recognition. We had a great plan. And that was when we were just getting started. Fortunately we were able to use that when all those projects came to the Planning Board and say people are expecting something really good here. And we did have a dozen Special Permits or so complementing the city

redevelopment efforts and especially Lechmere Canal Park. And the very first PUD Special Permit was the building here along the Broad Canal. And that project we worked with the Planning Board and commenced the developer to put up a walkway along that building and they thought we were crazy. So some things take a while. It took us probably 25 years to get the walkway on the other side.

University Park similarly was quite a wasteland in the late 70's, early 80's with the clearing of the what used to be known as the Simplex site. Simplex was a company that left Cambridge, and MIT bought up a good bit of land. It took quite a while to come up with a plan that satisfied community concerns. In fact, we had some 10 failed rezoning petitions at the Planning Board in the 80's before finally coming to a

resolution in 1988 with the Blue Ribbon Committee plan that was really one of our first big committees. Now we're used to having them, and they really have helped us a lot in places like Kendall Square. And then that led to the plan that got implemented. And interestingly in University Park it was largely through a master plan process, it's the only time we've done this in Cambridge. And I bring that up because as we go into the next phases of what's happening in Kendall Square, there might be new structures here as well. But certainly the Special Permit process is served as well, and the PUD Special Permit being for larger projects with multi-year time frames, several buildings, and lots of goals in it I think is clearly a model here. But in the case of University Park, because there had been so much

dissension. The idea was to have a master plan as long as the developer adhered to that master plan and brought every building to the Planning Board and got design review on every project and every piece of open space, they could go forward. And I say largely in that, towards the end of that process we had the citywide rezoning process and a new mandate to have design review for every large project in the city which is what we have now.

And another thing that was somewhat initiated in University Park was having a series of really strong developer agreements that were referred to in the Zoning and really part of the operative way of implementing the project. So we had design review agreement, a housing plan, traffic mitigation, infrastructure agreement, all of those were extremely important to getting a

good project that had really led the way in terms of the affordable housing before we had the requirement for affordable housing that we have now for every housing project. And had a lot of the traffic mitigation measures that we now require on every project. And I have a picture here of Jill Brown Rhone Park off of Lafayette Square which was part of the infrastructure agreement that the city, MIT, and Forest City came together, we actually had quite a bit of help from the state and created a really important urban plaza where there had just been a gas station and lots of asphalt and, again, sort of important and all of these areas where we tried to create an open space system that's urban connected and multipurpose. And we've heard in the recent Zoning worries about the University Park project from Millennium that we shouldn't be

taking these open spaces for granted, that they're really important.

Moving now closer to our era, in 1999 the Planning Board approved a plan for Cambridge Research Park. This is a 10-acre site. It's a nice handy metric when you try to figure out what's 10 acres? Well, it's just this whole area that includes from Broad Canal up to the power plant up to where the ice skating rink is now over to Third Street and back down to the so-called Badger Building has Innovation Center in it now. That's 10 acres everywhere you see the colored models.

And what we liked a lot about this plan, unlike an earlier plan that was approved, which would have been a terrible thing to have here, which is office buildings and old systems. It was broken down into a

series of blocks. It was meaningful open spaces. The ice skating rink is extremely successful in the winter and is a place where music takes place in the summer and cafes going up. Mix of uses and the beautiful Genzyme platinum building here, housing, and the Twinings' Watermark building that's expanding on down here. And so a mix of uses throughout this area which is sort of one of the hallmarks. And by now, of course, we're getting 15 percent affordable component in this.

This image we recently got from Twining that shows the original Watermark building that's a part of that PUD. It shows a second phase of housing that's almost done now, again, with affordable component with excellent ground floor retail. And one of the last couple of buildings is a little

building that hadn't been thought of as housing and now is the office building right down by the Broad Canal and next to the power plant. And right across the way is Special Permit No. 1. So here is Special Permit No. 141 next to No. 1. Sort of the message, continuity, vision trying to stick with the kinds of goals we have while we have some flexibility. I mean, this site was going to be a hotel, then the hotel was going to move here, now it became housing, that was going to be housing, it became office, but it was all within a mix of uses that the PUD had permitted and the Board was able at each stage of these changes to weigh in and I think come up with in the end something that I think is quite a good project.

Now, just to look forward a little bit, MIT hopes to do the other side of Broad Canal

Way. We refer to this as Broad Canal Way. Third Street is off the map this way. There's the Canal. Broad Canal Way is to have ground floor retail with housing above it adhere to the 60's Badger Building that now has the Cambridge Innovation Center in it. So this street can become incredibly wonderful and already having the only place on the T system where you can go and rent a kayak, right here in the heart of the city, is just fabulous. This area is really coming around.

So getting closer to 2013 we had a plan in 2000 for citywide rezoning, and this was fulfilling some of the goals that had come out in the 1993 master plan that we called tortus sustainable future, and that was after the 2000 plan was over. We kind of revisited again in 2007. Building on these themes that

came out from the very first Special Permit in terms of importance of housing, the importance of thinking about how to revitalize the older industrial districts. One thing that frustrated me personally was that we had project review down to the doorknob on a particular project and across the street nothing. It was because of the way that plans had evolved, there had been, I don't know, Hugh, 36 rezonings in the last 20 years? I don't know how many. Lots. And they've all been kind of towards the same end, I think, of a liveable city. And that's certainly underlying a lot of the K2-C2 work that we're looking at now. So that was in 2000. And that was shortly followed by the Eastern Cambridge area planning study. Affectionately known as ECaPs. We need these little acronyms. K2-C2 was shorter. ECaPs

was shorter. But this plan, again, was one of these great committees that spent a lot of time and really had the notion that a lot was happening, but we wanted to see more housing, we needed to see more retail, we needed to have the activity at the ground level, and ideally more open space, and so that really was something that led to a project like the 303 Third Street project which was pretty much envisioned in the ECaPs plan and came to life shortly thereafter right across the street from the Watermark building. Again, this is one in the earlier PUD 141 that we sometimes refer to as Cambridge Research Park that has the ground floor retail. 303 Third Street as Abigail's and all sorts of great retail. So we're now looking at Third Street as a huge success story. I know the East Cambridge neighbors have spent a lot of time

thinking about that, working with those developers, and it's something that the Kendall Square Committee was very aware of. And it's something that I think that is part of why now Kendall Square is something that people are excited and pleased about. It was only 10 years ago people kept saying Kendall Square, oh, what a failure, who wants it? In fact, Mayor Menino said, we want high tech biotech, but not like Kendall Square. And now it's there if anybody wants it. And so, how do we get there?

And so kind of zooming out to 1950 here but zooming back to where we are here in Kendall Square itself, you can see in 1950 that we had the modernist era of tall, blocky buildings; the Courthouse building, the Badger Building that now has the Innovation Center, the loan tower at Volpe, the Draper

Labs building, and the Tech Square project sort of attempts to get something going here. All intended to be kind of scary buildings because they're out there by themselves, without a sense of the context, streets, open spaces, but it was what, you know, I mean, it's easy to forget that in 1950, 1960 we had high unemployment. We had junk bond ratings, we had rent control. We had all acres and acres of unbuilt space. So it's kind of understandable this is what was happening in this era in the country. But now we've kind of started knitting that together and said oh, that's the, that's the Badger Building there, and there's the DOT Building there, and Draper is getting surrounded by other interesting stuff. So we started knitting that all together. And so now that's kind of coming to the second part of talking about

really current projects.

Does anybody have questions about how we got to 2010 or so? If not, I'll go ahead with that and then I'll leave it.

WILLIAM TIBBS: I don't have any questions.

HUGH RUSSELL: You sort of skipped.

ROGER BOOTHE: Bill.

WILLIAM TIBBS: I didn't have any questions, but it's not quite 1950's that picture because the Draper Labs were built in the 70's.

ROGER BOOTHE: Thank you. It should have been 1960 to 2000. Typing error.

WILLIAM TIBBS: That's right.

HUGH RUSSELL: The one story you haven't told is the redevelopment of 30 and the Boston Properties development. Part of that's because we weren't involved in that,

and so we don't have the graphics.

KATHY BORN: Oh.

ROGER BOOTHE: Well, I'm going to show the little plan for the CRA era here which is, again, originally the CRA had the DOT site as a part of it. I understand from a previous director that this was sold off to the Federal Government for DOT had been originally in the master plan for Kendall Square. I don't know if everybody knows that the in the 50's the urban renewal movement was such that all downtowns were buying up big parts of downtown, scraping them clean, selling to developer for a dollar because they were desperate for development. We ended up with a lot of really bad urban development as a result of that. And City Council back in the 60's, I think it was, said, okay, we're just going to do this area

here. We're not going to let you do Harvard Square, Central Square, but the redevelopment authority had actually done plans of Harvard Square and Central Square planning to declare them blighted and tear them down. So thanks to the City Council the Redevelopment Authority was given a management charge. And everybody knows the story, that NASA was supposed to come here and they didn't come here. And we ended up with Volpe DOT tower here. And a lot of development did happen in this area, and now the new board is trying to figure out what to do with the pieces that are still on the table as well as now and potentially in the K2 Zoning to have other development happening. And, Kathy, please correct me if I'm misstating any of these, but No. 1 as shown on here is the Google project.

No. 2 is the Biogen project.

No. 3 is the Broad and its expansion.

And No. 4 is housing project and we know the new board is very keen on seeing that housing happen as we've all been wanting for a long time.

So the Boston Properties project for Google. --

WILLIAM TIBBS: Excuse me, can I say something?

ROGER BOOTHE: Sure.

WILLIAM TIBBS: Can you in a brief way talk about how we got the Redevelopment Authority and when that happened? Just political, what were the political kind of ramifications?

ROGER BOOTHE: I would say because federal funds were available for urban renewal. That's why every community created

urban renewal authorities. What's sort of fascinating is we have both the planning department here and the redevelopment authority. If you look at Boston, it's all Boston Redevelopment Authority. And what they did was take that function and they're actually landlords for a lot of the projects. They fund themselves partly through land deals and rents and so forth, which has also been a little bit the model for the Redevelopment Authority in Cambridge having its funding through development agreements for the land that it used to control. So it was a very enticing way of saying let's do something about the city. And, of course, in the 50's the city welcomed what it is today. I mean, now we're all loving the city and people are coming back to it. In the 50's it was the flight to the suburbs because of the

building of the interstate highways. So we got one of those because everybody had one, but Cambridge also had a very strong historic pattern.

HUGH RUSSELL: I've heard that we actually got the first.

ROGER BOOTHE: I don't know about that.

HUGH RUSSELL: That the legislation was enacted in the federal level I think in 1958 and Cambridge, like we are today, we're quick to respond, we had a problem --

ROGER BOOTHE: I don't know.

KATHY BORN: I don't know if that's true, but to kind of envision it, you've got the federal legislation and then that was followed by state legislation and that's in the Massachusetts Laws 121-b we call it. And then the Cambridge City Council voted to

adopt 1-b along with other communities. I don't know the order. I mean, there's Boston Redevelopment Authority. There's Worcester Redevelopment Authority, I'm not sure, I think there is or was the Springfield Redevelopment Authority.

CHRISTOPHER BATOR: Lowell.

STEVEN COHEN: Watertown.

KATHY BORN: That's right, Somerville has one that they're rejuvenating now.

ROGER BOOTHE: Most major cities have redevelopment authority. And some of them are way stronger than others. San Francisco I think has quite a strong one. Obviously Boston.

KATHY BORN: I should take this minute to recognize our -- I think I've been calling him our redevelopment officer select.

It's not elect yet because we have voted to appoint Tom Evans who is here with us this evening. We finished contract negotiations. We don't have any reason to think that they're going to be unsuccessful. And Tom was with the San Francisco Redevelopment Authority for a number of years. As I understand it, San Francisco as a state has decided to do away with redevelopment authorities. So they've become, at least -- I mean, excuse me, the State of California. The San Francisco Redevelopment Authority has become a brother entity.

TOM EVANS: Successor entity to finish the projects.

KATHY BORN: What is interesting about it is that when I'm outside of Cambridge and outside of the Boston area, I tell people that I've got involved with the

Cambridge Redevelopment Authority, you know, people of a certain age all say, oh, really? And somebody this weekend just started talking to me on and on about the New Haven urban renewal project and Ed Loag (phonetic). And all of these names come kind of come out of the past. You may remember some of them, Hugh.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, because I was in school at Harvard and the design school in the late sixties and this was really hot. My first project in the design school was to redevelop Cambridgeport which meant demolishing it. And I went to my professor and I said, you know, there are some nice buildings down there. And he said, oh, there probably are, but for school purposes.

ROGER BOOTHE: So, yes, I certainly think that the money incentive was a big part

of it, because the redevelopment authority in Cambridge, I don't know what the amount of money was that they got from the Federal Government in total but it was $100 million or something like that.

BARRY ZEVIN: MIT was instrumental. Bob Symbot (phonetic) can tell you. It was federal legislation that made it possible for universities to help, so Cambridge could not have done it without from MIT.

ROGER BOOTHE: I believe that's true for Tech Square that MIT was involved in building that.

KATHY BORN: As collateral essentially.

ROGER BOOTHE: So, Bill, that's an excellent question and I'm sorry I don't have a lot more information on, but it's clear that in our history that the Cambridge

Redevelopment Authority was given this focus and some of their projects went beyond that into doing housing and so forth and Wellington-Harrington and because of there are powers that the authority has beyond just the master plan area, they've had some other influence, but certainly mostly focussed in Kendall Square.

KATHY BORN: And, Roger, I should mention that one rather notable redevelopment authority project that wasn't in Kendall Square was the Riverview Apartment Complex.

ROGER BOOTHE: Oh, right.

KATHY BORN: Along Memorial Drive. Not too far from Mount Auburn Hospital. And then a series of small or I'm trying to think, in-fill housing developments in the Wellington-Harrington area as well as partnering with an enabling some non-profit

housing developers like Just a Start.

BARRY ZEVIN: And just in-fill they placed an ice cream cone factory.

KATHY BORN: That's right.

HUGH RUSSELL: There was a woman who lives literally next-door, there was an architect for the redevelopment authority, and she spent years helping people fix up their houses, getting low interest loans, you know, drawing plans, doing the paperwork, and there were hundreds and hundreds. It was in Wellington-Harrington.

KATHY BORN: What was her name?

HUGH RUSSELL: Meg Hickey.

ROGER BOOTHE: That's right.

HUGH RUSSELL: Down on West Street.

ROGER BOOTHE: So, projects that are going on right now through the redevelopment authority include the work that Boston

Properties did for Google through the redevelopment authority auspices to connect two existing buildings across this glassy in-fill which had been an opening or a walkway to the parking garage, a top which sits an important piece of open space in Kendall Square. So this project really is trying very hard to make a very nice shopping arcade at ground level fulfilling needs of Google to have big floor plates which is something the Planning Board has talked about on other projects. It's definitely a phenomenon that we're dealing with, and then trying to preserve as much of the rooftop garden as much as possible. Like two thirds of it.

So that's well underway.

One of the largest remaining buildings in the redevelopment authority plan is an

expansion for Biogen. This is at the corner of Binney where it curves. This is Amgen down at the end of the vista, East Cambridge neighborhood off to this side. And so the Biogen building is turning that corner and continuing the restructuring and relocation of Biogen back in Cambridge which I think everyone feels is a great thing.

A third thing is the expansion of the Broad Institute. This is existing Broad Institute. This is looking from the Sixth Street pedestrian walkway down towards Ames Street. And this portion is the currently constructed Broad expansion. And so that project was one of the last ones in the current plans for redevelopment authority, and also a part of a rather complicated deal that was worked out with the City Council. Originally this site had been, I believe, a

200-unit housing project?

STUART DASH: Yes.

ROGER BOOTHE: That the redevelopment authority had sponsored and had gone --

HUGH RUSSELL: We as the Planning Board added square footage to the district for the purpose of housing.

ROGER BOOTHE: Exactly. So the Planning Board wanted to see the housing, but in order to build Broad here there had to be another deal through the City Council. They gave another 300,000 square feet I believe for this project. And so the expectation is that the housing will happen across the street. So this is -- I have to look the other way now. This is Main Street. So we were just looking this other direction from up the pedestrian walkways up here. This is

the Broad expansion. It's under construction. That's the original Broad Building. This is the Marriott Hotel. This is where Legal Sea Food is. And so the housing tower is intended to be very carefully placed in a very tight little spot here along Ames Street. And when that happens, Ames Street will be one of -- probably a most urban street. I mean but right now Ames Street has a pretty hideous aspect to it in that it has this, these gaping malls of the loading docks, it has a parking garage entry. And so the building would come down here, the garage entries would get reconfigured, the loading get reconfigured. There would actually be a nice lobby to the residential tower here with ground floor retail. But it has yet to go through quite a bit of process. And I tried

to find out today where that stands in terms of -- I know Boston Properties had put together and requested to City Council for land acquisition because they need 7500 feet of extra floor area?

MARGARET DRURY: One lane of Ames Street.

ROGER BOOTHE: One lane of Ames Street.

KATHY BORN: I think the city assessors, evaluators or surveyors.

ROGER BOOTHE: That has to go through the process. Do you know what happened to it? I know it was written up. I don't know what happened to it.

KATHY BORN: It's, it is slowly moving. There may be some alternate --

STUART DASH: I think in the next few months we expect it to startup.

KATHY BORN: One way. There's a couple ways it can go. It will go if everybody can agree on value. Is that accurate, Stuart?

STUART DASH: Yes.

ROGER BOOTHE: The point is that it can't quite sit in there without a little extra room and even then it's like a very slender tower which we all like --

KATHY BORN: We like.

ROGER BOOTHE: We love slender towers, that's one of our themes. But it's really slender, and it does have to fit in with all this kind of utilitarian stuff. And it has to deal with the structure.

KATHY BORN: And it has a lot of odd angles which is great.

STEVEN WINTER: It's stealth.

KATHY BORN: Yes.

HUGH RUSSELL: Does it need Zoning action through the Council?

ROGER BOOTHE: I beg your pardon?

HUGH RUSSELL: So does --

STUART DASH: It has to go through the land disposition process.

HUGH RUSSELL: But beyond that is the Zoning compliant or does the Zoning have to be changed?

ROGER BOOTHE: Oh, I think -- why don't you take that one, Jeff. It needs some tweaking.

JEFF ROBERTS: Yes, it does. There are certain and, you know, we haven't -- this is all very conceptual at this point. So we, you know, don't know exactly until we see what the actual plan is, but we believe there will be some issues that need to be resolved, some of them minor.

HUGH RUSSELL: So that would be one of the things that's pushing us to act sooner rather than later.

ROGER BOOTHE: Yes.

And I think certainly for the K2 Committee more housing in Kendall Square is just a bedrock concern from the neighborhood, all the way through, so I think it's a very important part, and quite a complicated one at the same time.

KATHY BORN: Roger, can I ask you a historical question? I just can't remember.

You mentioned that at some point the Planning Board added square footage to the Broad site to accommodate a future housing development.

ROGER BOOTHE: Right.

KATHY BORN: When was that? When was that part of?

ROGER BOOTHE: Can you do this? There's a couple of steps in the process.

KATHY BORN: This was the ECaPs Zoning? No, something different later.

HUGH RUSSELL: It was part of that whole process.

IRAM FAROOQ: Do you want to answer?

HUGH RUSSELL: You may, your memory may be better than me.

IRAM FAROOQ: So we adopted the change during the ECaPs Zoning in 2001, October.

KATHY BORN: The change being?

IRAM FAROOQ: The change being that we gave an additional 100,000 square feet? 200,000 square feet, sorry to be utilized only for housing on the garage next to -- well, actually --

ROGER BOOTHE: On the site that

Broad is on.

KATHY BORN: It's on Broad.

IRAM FAROOQ: And then they looked, well, they asked for Zoning relief from the City Council and got a rezoning in order to move that commitment to the garage.

ROGER BOOTHE: The difficult zone.

KATHY BORN: The 200,000 square feet?

IRAM FAROOQ: 200,000. So they got the same commercial capacity to build Broad and then moved that residential commitment. It's rezoning.

STUART DASH: And there are some qualifiers, too, in that commitment.

KATHY BORN: Escalating penalties, yes.

HUGH RUSSELL: I mean there were parts of the Boston Properties site that had

not been built out at that time and so we said well, we'll just change it so that you can -- so build housing in instead of lab buildings. And we were told, no, you can't do that. We have agreements. Boston Property wants to proceed with those agreements. So we said okay, we'll just give you some more square footage. Will you do that. And well, it's 12 years later, but it's gonna happen.

ROGER BOOTHE: Well, I think in fairness, while I wasn't a part of the rerouting authority process itself, I did review very detailed drawings for the housing to go on the site the Broad is now on.

HUGH RUSSELL: Oh, yes.

ROGER BOOTHE: And they actually did some foundation work. They were serious of building housing on that site. They spent a

lot of money to get ready to do the housing. But Broad needed to expand and they -- we, the City wanted to keep Broad here. They were making threats about moving someplace else, and so there was a -- the will of the City was to make room for Broad and give some more impetus to get the housing. So I think the housing is very much on everybody's mind at this point.

HUGH RUSSELL: And I guess in my mind one question that we want to think about in the rezoning is can we do it again with Boston Properties? Can we give them another 200 -- another 200 units of entitlement on land they control? Is there any other place?

ROGER BOOTHE: Well, that's a part of the proposal. The thought was that we would get to that, just let me do a little bit more stage setting and we can get through

those kinds of details.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

ROGER BOOTHE: So a very important part of the context also is of course Alexandria master plan. This is Binney Street here. This is a site where the CRA expansion for Biogen is happening at present, just about to finish up in the next few months. Right now Alexandria's building for Biogen is diagonally across the street here and it's well underway. These two buildings here on Binney Street are pretty much ready to go. And in order for them to go ahead, they've had to fulfill their commitment to provide a two-acre park to the city and how many millions of dollars, Stuart, to build?

STUART DASH: To build it, $8 million to build it.

ROGER BOOTHE: $8 million to build

it. And we're about to build up a process for designing that and some of the other open spaces in the Kendall Square area that need attention. So there's a lot happening in the Alexandria project. The Planning Board has actually seen designs for a lot of these projects, so that's a very important part of the context.

And while we have this map up, it shows the 303 Third Street project, the Genzyme building we were looking at earlier with the ice skating rink. So you see how these things start knitting together.

So you have the Genzyme building, the ice skating rink, then you have the south side of Binney Street, you have the Alexandria project, the passageways through to Binney Street, passageways through this building to the open space and to the

neighborhood. So things start connecting up, and that's kind of what I think is exciting about our whole process in Cambridge is that we have -- continue to keep an eye on how these things all fit together.

HUGH RUSSELL: And there's a hole in the middle.

ROGER BOOTHE: Hole in the middle is I think you're referring to the Volpe Center.

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

ROGER BOOTHE: Which has acres of parking on it and one tall building. And Brian has really worked hard on getting Volpe's attention. I think they finally noticed that they have a site there.

BRIAN MURPHY: I'm more hopeful than I've ever been in terms of Volpe actually being open to exploring alternative uses for the site. It's a fortunate time in that with

the continuation of the Obama administration, I think there's a perception within Volpe and within DOT that there's a long enough window that they can actually reasonably explore this. The timings's also fortuitus in that their current main building on the Volpe site is in need of significant capital improvement probably in the tune of 75 plus million dollars which is for them to consider does this work for them operationally and are they going to try to explore alternatives? So I hope there will be movement on that in a shorter time frame than I think many of us expected.

ROGER BOOTHE: So here's the Biogen building, the Alexandria's building. And one of the, I think, great successes of the design and review process was convincing them to save the wonderful little Dutch-ended

historical buildings on either end. And this is on the eastern most part of it. This glassy building with these beautifully restored historic buildings that are each going to have training centers in them. This one for Biogen employees and the one at the other end is for high school students. So it really helps it fit into the neighborhood.

STEVEN WINTER: Is that Cambridge Boiler?

ROGER BOOTHE: No, Cambridge boiler is down at the end of the street. It's down at Third and Binney. And this is -- is it Fifth and Binney?

Anyway, so here's the -- there were a lot of old buildings on this open space. This is a two-acre site with the neighborhood on this side, the two new buildings along Binney Street for Alexandria here with Binney

Street kind of off over here. East Cambridge riverfront over that way. You can see it's a significant space. And I think this was a pretty amazing deal that the neighbors worked out with Alexandria, with a lot of input from the City Council. I think Brian was very involved with that when he was on the City Council. So it was quite -- it was a diversion from the ECaPs plan because this was seen as sort of a transition zone. But no one was bold enough at that point to come up with a two-acre park. So I think it was a good tradeoff and that's well underway now.

So now we get to the K2-C2 study, and I love this aerial because it shows Prospect Street and Central Square, Massachusetts Avenue, MIT going down Main Street to Kendall, and the University Park project, the river, downtown, the harbor. Don't we have a

great city? It's a great city.

But really the proximity as we've -- all of us have been working on this project, well, all the time now between Central and Kendall. It's not that long of a walk, you know? And yet in people's mental maps it's not there. And I think a lot of what we're talking about doing here with intensifying the housing, getting better ground floor uses, better retail, it's going to fit together better. And obviously a lot of what the two separate committees have thought about is how does Kendall keep its character? How does Central benefit from the some of the energy that's going on in Kendall? And again this map kind of shows that proximity.

And so as we started up the K2-C2 process, you touched on it a little bit at the start. Novartis, desperately needed to

expand. So the Planning Board recommended to the City Council to rezone. It's rezoned and now under construction. This is an intriguing site that has this lower scale element right along Massachusetts Avenue. And the taller scale element in the back, and the very large courtyard design by Michael van Valkenburgh. And this center right here.

And Maya Lin's building is over here. I'm sorry?

PAMELA WINTERS: I was going to say Maya Lin's design.

ROGER BOOTHE: Maya Lin designed this building right here. And her metaphor is that this is a New England stone wall that floats. There's something a little bit contradictory about a floating stone, but it somehow seems to work and it has clearly a lot of character. So that will be fun how it

goes along.

STUART DASH: And this was a review as part of actually our planning the K2-C2 process we had anticipated that this was going to come forward and had the consultants, Goody Clancy review this in light of the K2-C2 goals for the Council and for the Board.

ROGER BOOTHE: Yes, it's been such a dynamic process because, you know, a lot of times you just sit there, you do the plan and you say can we get somebody to do something? We've been trying to do the plan and people doing things all along here. And so as we're getting towards the end of the K2-C2 study, Forest City succeeded in getting the rezoning for the block, All-Asia block here. This is the University Park project, Massachusetts Avenue, the fire station. And so these

buildings are going to be the site of expansion for Millennium Pharmaceuticals. And they had a lot of trouble convincing people about this until Millennium signed on the line and said we really do want this space. So we see that as a theme. That Broad managed to get its expansion because there was a company that was here. And they convinced the plans to accommodate them. And this is a place where Millennium is seen as part of what's going on here. And these things do take a lot of thought and review and every one's of them's been at the process at the Planning Board and the Council and the neighborhoods.

Now we come to the meeting that a lot of you were not too long ago where the City Council is considering rezoning for MIT, and they have until next Monday to vote it up or

down. So that's going to be a major step, one way or the other. And then to the plan that talks a lot about these circles are thinking about knitted together, things like Broad Canal Way. We talked about this earlier, Broad Canal, our very first Special Permit here. The PUD 141 over here. The walkway. The MIT project. Making that work better, tying over to Volpe and then Main Street. Trying to really make something out of Main Street. Tying it to the T station, Infinite Corridor of MIT. And thinking about how close all of this is to the river. And this is something that we talked a lot about in K2. It's so close to the river and yet you have almost no sense of it. So my hope is that as we get those connections around MIT Press Building and we start getting more of a sense of the river. That can be an

exciting part of it.

So now we've just now gotten to the Kendall Square plan and recommendations. I'm not going to spend a lot of time on this, but just refresh everybody about the pieces about it. The key pieces are these four ideas about creating great places, promoting environmental sustainability, innovation culture, mix of living, working, and playing. And this is a vision that shows that large open space on the Volpe site. And this is the old ECaPs configuration. It made a big square of open space out along Binney. Maybe that open space should go more like that, connect Broadway to Binney or somehow through this site. That still has to be worked out. And that's part of what typically gets worked out when we get into the PUD review and design review.

So the components really of the area-wide Zoning are active ground floors, middle income housing, innovation open space, community, sustainability, and issues about parking and loading. So just to say active ground floor is one of the keystones of everything we've been talking about.

Housing, trying to increase affordable housing. We heard some good news maybe in the MIT petition that that might get some increase there.

Thinking about middle income housing, which is a tough thing to work out because of the prices and what middle income is not what you think of as low income.

Innovation space so important to the character of the area now, and again something that the K2 committee was very keen about trying to encourage more innovation

space, trying to define what it is which no one's really done that role before.

Community investments. There's a tremendous amount of energy to be gotten out of all this new development and to go into really community benefits.

Of course, pushing on sustainability as we have been trying every time to do a rezoning or a design review.

Looking at shared parking, trying to keep parking to a minimum. And trying to think carefully about historic preservation. And everyone knows that the, the MIT Press Building is a bit of a controversy in here, but something that can be worked out as we go through the process and that doesn't have to be decided by the Zoning.

So that gets us to Jeff and Zoning but maybe you want to talk first before we get

Jeff through where we are with those pieces.

HUGH RUSSELL: I don't see anyone clamoring to be heard.

KATHY BORN: I have a question.

HUGH RUSSELL: Sure.

KATHY BORN: You refer to the MIT Press Building.

ROGER BOOTHE: Yes.

KATHY BORN: Two older concrete buildings and then the clock tower building.

ROGER BOOTHE: Yes. This is the --

KATHY BORN: I happened to be sitting next to Charlie Sullivan at the last hearing and I assume one of the reasons that he was there amongst others --

ROGER BOOTHE: Yes.

KATHY BORN: -- was to hear what was being said with those buildings.

ROGER BOOTHE: He goes to every

meeting bearing witness to those historic buildings.

KATHY BORN: Maybe you could -- yeah.

ROGER BOOTHE: Probably not without getting into trouble.

STEVEN WINTER: Kathy, where are you going?

KATHY BORN: I'm not going any place.

STEVEN WINTER: Okay.

KATHY BORN: I'm just asking the question which probably is leading to the slide that you have up there now. One way of preserving them without a landmarking status seems to be what you've got on the board; is that correct?

ROGER BOOTHE: Well, can I give some of my perspective on it?

KATHY BORN: Oh, I'd love it.

ROGER BOOTHE: Everybody has a different perspective. So, these three buildings are the last three little sisters in this whole area. Because back when we had the urban removal process, most everything was scraped away. No one would say that this building here isn't important. That's the clock tower building that has the wonderful tower on it. And Charlie has told us all about the story when it was built. It was seen from Boston, and it's like signalling here's Kendall Square. The other two, no one will say they're as powerful structures historically, but they do form an ensemble. And Charlie and I are actually joined at the hip on this one, we both feel like it's really important to keep them all. But there are others like Councillor Reeves that feel

that only the tower should stay and those others are just useless. So we have quite a spread of opinion on it. And you'll find shades of grey in there.

Elkus Manfredi for MIT has done hundred studies of how to keep the MIT Press Building. How to -- what happens if we take it down. There's an MIT faculty committee that's also looking into the whole thing. They, from what I've heard so far, were tending towards don't tie us to these historic buildings. There's some being created. There's a whole range of opinion. People get very emotional about it. But they are definitely in the spotlight. So if they get torn down, whatever goes in their place is going to have to be really good. I personally feel it's a lot richer to take out the ground floor, make a tall space at the

face of the building. This has been done all over the world. Keep the character of that building, but really change how it fits into its context, and have the most important thing, whether it's kept or not, is programming, space, flow, connection, and that's something that MIT seems to get. That when you get out of the T station, you don't know where Kendall Square is. You don't know where MIT is. Nobody's helping you with that. So that spot being where the T comes out is a spot where that ought to be happening. And that could be happening through really exciting open space. Whether the building stays or not, you're deciding interior spaces flow in the exterior, whether the building stays or not. I think the program elements are there. The guidelines don't suggest there has to be one way or the

other. The Zoning doesn't have to, but at some point it will come to the Planning Board and to the Historical Commission for determinations about whether what's new really is that much better or whether it's a shame that we're losing that historic character. That's my little speech.

STEVEN WINTER: Mr. Chair, may I make a comment?

I think that there's a lot of concurrence on the Board with those wanting to care and preserve those buildings. It's the last old brick on that strip. But even beyond that, help me out with this, Roger, if you go up a little bit higher on this issue, there's a confluence of streets there. There's Point Park, which is -- needs a brilliant designer to work it into the urban fabric.

ROGER BOOTHE: Yes.

STEVEN WINTER: And those three buildings and that confluence of streets and Point Park all, I think, can work together in a really wonderful way and keep it.

ROGER BOOTHE: Yes. I think it's a big challenge for us. Because unless it's done really with big thinking, powerful thinking, great designers, and some money, it could be a flop. I remember Ahmed when we were out there on one of our walking tours, it was the head of the snake. Remember that, Ahmed? It's the head of the snake where Main Street and Broadway come together. So it is so powerful in this whole area. And it's going to be changed by the innovation district building and MIT's building over here. It's going to have presumably a tower, housing tower on it. We hope Volpe is going

to do something strong on this side. So it gets even more of a centroidal character as those upper pieces go up around it. And I certainly feel that we're talking about millions of square feet of new development and we've got three little old buildings here. It's great, you know? We need to keep that.

BRIAN MURPHY: The other thing that's neat about Point Park, Steve, is that as we are about to enter into the East Cambridge open space planning effort is to think about how all those open spaces work together as a network. I think we have a tremendous opportunity to rethink Point Park and to think about what we do, and as Roger said, really think about doing some bold thinking about how we make this area work. Thinking about the open spaces, thinking

about the historic buildings, and thinking about wayfinding it and how all those pieces work together is important once we get the Zoning and get those buildings built and think about how this works as a place.

KATHY BORN: I have one technical question. Which of the buildings is the MIT Press Building? And is the other one of the pair does that have a name?

ROGER BOOTHE: We refer to it as the Rectus building because that's --

KATHY BORN: Okay. We've got the Cosi building.

ROGER BOOTHE: It has more of an arch.

BRIAN MURPHY: Is that Hammett?

ROGER BOOTHE: I guess that was the J.L. Hammett building.

BRIAN MURPHY: Yes. Remember you

had the little desks that people had in school? They were made there.

KATHY BORN: Yes.

The one that's closest to the clock tower building is the --

ROGER BOOTHE: That's the Rebecca's building.

KATHY BORN: Right, and that's the MIT Press building.

ROGER BOOTHE: The T station is right here, and this is a major -- one of the MIT new buildings sites.

KATHY BORN: And generally speaking those two buildings are considered as a pair; is that correct?

ROGER BOOTHE: The three of them are considered as a triligion.

KATHY BORN: Three of them?

STUART DASH: And I think many

people don't realize that it's not an enormous deal to have the floor ground level of the building like that. When you're putting a lot of money into some designs like that, that you could have the foreground level and have it flow through to a new building and have it be seamless and have the whole experience be a seamless experience at the ground level. I some people are confused thinking you're going to have step up three steps to the MIT Press building in the future. Elkus Manfredi did a drawing showing you don't have to.

KATHY BORN: And one thing that I might add I think Conrad has something, too. We have the bicycle rental. In line you've got this really dead side of One Cambridge Center that really is a wall there that is, you know, really a nasty wall in between the

entrance to One Kendall Center and the Cambridge Center and the T.

ROGER BOOTHE: Yes.

KATHY BORN: And we've got that bicycle rental place there now.

CONRAD CRAWFORD: Hubway.

KATHY BORN: Hubway, yes.

And BP has been talking about putting kiosks there. And we hope that they will work with the bicycles. But it would add something on the other side of the street from the historic buildings which might be nice.

ROGER BOOTHE: Yes.

CONRAD CRAWFORD: I think there was also the plans to redo the sidewalk and have a Hubway innovate more seamlessly. Because right now the Hubway is just backed up against the One Cambridge building.

ROGER BOOTHE: Public Works has been working on that for sometime now and we've kind of slowed down on that a little bit because of our whole K2-C2 process. But that's definitely an interim situation what's out there now. And so I think that's much more handsome and reinvigorating.

PAMELA WINTERS: Roger, so I was just wondering is it your sense that the Council is more inclined to preserve these buildings at this point in time?

ROGER BOOTHE: They're a little divided about it.

PAMELA WINTERS: Really?

ROGER BOOTHE: Yes. A couple Councillors don't see the point at all. Some of them see the point about saving it. Some are undecided.

PAMELA WINTERS: Oh.

ROGER BOOTHE: I want to be fair about it. I mean when MIT first came along, they showed the building knocked down and they had a big plaza. And they said, okay, do we really want a big plaza here? And we have a plaza that hasn't worked in 30 years. Do we want another one. And that's kind of where I came out. And some people feel having a plaza there, that's more dramatic open space, and it's new and exciting is something. So I mean they're legitimate differences of opinion.

PAMELA WINTERS: And so who's educating the Council on these issues? In other words, does Community Development go and have a certain amount of time to present these different issues? How has this been --

HUGH RUSSELL: At some sense at this point it's not necessary to educate the

Council because the Zoning before them doesn't say -- it encourages you to keep historic resources. It doesn't demand that you do or it doesn't --

PAMELA WINTERS: Right.

HUGH RUSSELL: -- so in voting for the MIT rezoning, they don't resolve the issue.

ROGER BOOTHE: That's right. I mean, I think it took them a little while to get over the emotion that we all feel that we want this thing to be the best thing possible, and that emotion is there whether you think get rid of those old buildings or keep those buildings. Where we are right now is the Zoning setting the parameters and it's like a big spiral in the design process and we're still way out here. We're not getting down to --

HUGH RUSSELL: It's spiralling up.

ROGER BOOTHE: It goes up? I go down. At any rate, we're still at the big picture level and there's going to be a lot of process here and Commission and then perhaps at the Council. And then even before getting to there, MIT has its own set of differences about this. So they've got to work all that out.

MARGARET DRURY: And, Roger, there is a landmark process that's protecting them now and will continue to protect them until a later date.

ROGER BOOTHE: Which does require City Council approval.

MARGARET DRURY: Ultimately.

ROGER BOOTHE: Yes. It's definitely -- that story will take some more time to unfold.

PAMELA WINTERS: Okay, thank you, Roger.

HUGH RUSSELL: I mean, I'm very hopeful that when we really look at it they can discover, yes, we can do a wonderful job keeping all three buildings. Or even though -- or maybe they'll say, you know, we can leave two-thirds of the building, but we really need that last 30 feet. And looking at the floor plan, that might be a reasonable deal.

ROGER BOOTHE: Again, Elkus Manfredi has done enormous studies on just what we're talking about from one end to the other. I am convinced that it can be wonderful. Any one of them can take a fair amount of money.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right.

JEFF ROBERTS: Ready? We'll just go back a few slides maybe to the map. Thanks.

Not everyone has met me. I'm Jeff Roberts. I'm in Community Development. I do a lot of work in the sort of nuts and bolts of the Zoning. And so I'm just going to try to, you know, walk through some of the ideas. I don't have a slide show, but I do have a memo that I just was reviewing with the Planning Board last month, and I think everybody has a copy of that hopefully. Or has a copy of that.

They're coming around. And we can do an intro and look at the map. Kendall Square recommendations, as Roger pointed out, cover a broad set of topics and outline a set of principles. And as we've started to look at the Zoning recommendations, it's really a matter of taking those principles and then coming up with a strategic approach to how you would apply those principles to the

different parts of Kendall Square. And the map gives a good bit of a sense of how things break down. Most of it comes down to land ownership, but there's also important characteristics about what's there now. You have the MIT area which Roger mentioned is the -- is really the first part that MIT stepped forward with and is under consideration by the Council.

In Cambridge Center and CRA area, and then over where it's red within that area, those are some areas that have already been built out according to a master plan or a set of master plans. And so then the question that we try to look for in the new Zoning is what's the next phase and how do we accommodate what happens in the next phase. And then in the orange as Hugh pointed out, is the Volpe area is kind of a hole where you

still have a pretty undeveloped site. And so the strategy there is how do you kind of start from the beginning.

So --

HUGH RUSSELL: And I think it's really key for us, in the city they have a very clearest vision we can with the DOT site so that we can communicate effectively with DOT and say this is what we want. And, you know, we don't have to be rigid, but we have to be clear.

JEFF ROBERTS: So, on that, on that note, so if everybody has the -- did you find it? So, we did talk about this last month at the Planning Board and we strategically skipped page 4 when we went through it at the time, and I think now is the opportunity to go back to that. And just to start by reflecting on what the Zoning is now for that

area without going into too much detail, the Zoning for the MXD District, the Cambridge center mixed use development district, was set up when -- subsequent to the Kendall Square urban renewal plan being created and it's written fairly tightly in certain ways in terms of what it prescribes. And the way it's written is meant to follow that original plan. And so as Roger pointed out and as we discussed a little bit, as projects have come along in recent years and have kind of broke -- started to break that mold a little bit, it's required, you know, a couple different rezonings on a building-by-building basis to where the City Council action has been required to allow these new things to happen. And so one of the issues to think about is how to think about it moving forward, whether it's a matter of whether we

want to continue to do things, keep that Zoning sort of tight, and just make adjustments on an area-by-area basis, or do what we're really sort of proposing here which is to create a new PUD, a planned unit development district. And as Roger went through the history of it, that's a tool that the city's used many times in areas where there's a lot of land under a single ownership and there's some benefits to relaxing some Zoning requirements in exchange for having more Planning Board review at the large scale and approval of a sort of more of a master plan. And it's not always called a master plan, but a multisite phase development that would then play out over time.

So, the way that a PUD would work in this area would be as an overlay which says

that the Base Zoning stays the same. So anything that's done -- anything that's been done so far that's been authorized by the Base Zoning would be okay, would be conforming, but then as you start to break beyond that envelope to do more development then is authorized under the Base Zoning, then you would go under some PUD process that would require review. And one of the questions that's come up for us and that I'm sure will be an interesting point of discussion is how the CRA and the review and planning process on -- for that authority aligns with the review authority of the Planning Board.

So, that's the, that's the overall concept. And in terms of the memo I'll just walk through what some of the, what some of the features of a district like that would

be.

We would establish a purpose and an applicability which I just explained. In terms of parcel size, we would consider what is a -- typical in a PUD to say what's the minimum amount of development that we should have to look at at the same time. Look at in order to approve what's being proposed might not want to be looking at everything on a small site-by-site basis. You might want to be looking more holistically in an area when approving a plan.

The uses permitted would not -- oh, I'm sorry.

STEVEN WINTER: Can you tell our friends that we're on page 4 of 7?

JEFF ROBERTS: Yes. So now that everybody has a copy, page 4.

ROGER BOOTHE: Who else needs one?

JEFF ROBERTS: So now I'm just walking through the list and touching on these points. And, again, it's really -- these are really just a kind of a listing out and enumeration of the specific points that relate to the recommendations of the K2 study that Roger went through.

So I was at No. 4 which is allowed uses. That wouldn't necessarily change. But, again, in the Base Zoning there are some specific things having to do with fast order food that we might want to reconsider again to allow some more flexibility in knowing that, you know, sort of that lunchtime business is one of those critical, critical things.

Floor area, the approach that's recommended was to expand the amount, the total amount of development to about four

million square feet, which goes above the current allowance which is about three million square feet, but that there would be a cap of 3.6 million on commercial. So that's similar to what was being discussed before where we would want to reserve some additional potential that could only be for housing. So that if they were going through their full build out, they would get to a certain point and then what's beyond that, they could only do housing.

Retail incentives are recommended throughout the Kendall Square area, would basically exempt the sort of the smaller scale retail establishments that help to create that activity. And dynamic feel on the street, would be exempted from FAR calculation, from gross floor area calculation. So essentially that would be

from a Zoning standpoint, that would be like free space. And that's an approach that we've used, and Roger pointed out along Third Street. That's an approach that was incorporated in the Zoning there and we've seen that it's had some success and encouraging that type of ground floor retail that we've seen. And also has, I think has had some role in encouraging getting some of the more community enriching, local, establishments because the developers will feel more like there's a -- they're not -- it's not counting against space that could be used for more profit making, commercial office, and lab uses.

So and No. 7 goes along right with No. 6 which is really to require that active uses, that ground floor areas that have frontage along the major streets which are

Main Street and Broadway and Third Street and Ames Street are all required for a certain minimum percentage of that frontage to have those active retail uses.

No. 8 has to do with height. And this has been -- this was a discussion that maybe Roger can -- if there's questions about it could, and Iram could lend some insight into. But the approach recommended by the committee is to retain the height of 250 feet but to allow residential uses to extend up to 300 feet. And the tradeoff for that would be that a certain percentage of that space would be middle income housing. And it wouldn't -- that space wouldn't necessarily need to be at that top part of the building. It's just the amount of space would be 25 percent and that could be distributed throughout.

No. 9 is the unit density, and there's

been a lot of discussion about how you decide, and we talked about microunits and incorporating different styles of units. And this was an area where we felt that there was a rationale for relaxing the requirements that sometimes impose limits on the size and number of units that you could have. And, again, the goal was to try to maximize housing as much as we could.

In terms of open space, the -- it's an interesting topic. The current Zoning has a requirement for 100,000 square feet. And that the Planning Board -- oh, I'm sorry. If the current has 100,000 square feet, and also has specific requirements for each lot within that area, and so the approach to provide a little bit more flexibility would be to keep the amount of open space, but to allow the Planning Board some flexibility to approve

variations in those lot-by-lot requirements in order to create and better configure open space. And that would go along a little with what Roger said about having a little bit more of a comprehensive plan and thinking about open space throughout the area.

Parking and loading, the approach that we've taken in other areas and we've recommended in Kendall Square is to impose maximum parking ratios and to allow some reduction -- basically it's -- I think of it almost as challenging developers to see, you know, how, how low can they go in terms of how much parking that they -- how much parking do they really need? And to encourage shared use of parking between different types of uses that are active at different types of day. Again, it goes along with the mitigation of the traffic impacts of

new development.

HUGH RUSSELL: Isn't one of the visions of the study that is, that there's perhaps too much parking already in existence and that we might want to try to nibble away at some more of the garages? And you do that and then you've got to have a mechanism to make it legal.

JEFF ROBERTS: Right. And you need to -- and one of the things that we're always reminded of by our Traffic Department is that where you have that excess parking, really the best strategy is to use the parking that you've got before you start building a lot more. So coming up with ways that where the Zoning is more flexible to allow existing parking spaces that are underutilized to be used by new uses.

No. 12 is a key one. Again, I mention

that there's a -- I mentioned that there's a sort of incentive for allowing additional capacity for housing for what's allowed for commercial. This would be requiring that there's a minimum amount of housing that would need to be built, and we would anticipate that that would be the Ames Street housing. And effectively the proposal would be to not allow any future development until a commercial development, until that minimum square footage of housing is provided.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Can I just, the conceptual Ames Street housing, is that 200,000 square feet?

JEFF ROBERTS: I believe it's minimum, yeah. At least 200,000 square feet.

ROGER BOOTHE: That's what's been studied so far. The Zoning would change it could be somewhat more.

KATHY BORN: Or taller.

ROGER BOOTHE: Or taller.

KATHY BORN: Could be.

JEFF ROBERTS: Right. I guess I could go back into the question of what could be, what Zoning might be needed. And one of the questions is height. It's probably one of the major questions. There's also the open space piece that I mentioned before, something that could affect this. The lot area per dwelling unit requirements could affect the project. And also I think there's a, there's a little bit of a minimum/maximum issue where the current Zoning allows them to go up to 200,000 square feet. And what's being proposed now is that 200,000 square feet is the minimum. And if they could do a little bit more than that, that would be great.

H. THEODORE COHEN: But conceptually that one tower would meet that requirement.

JEFF ROBERTS: Meets that requirement, exactly.

No. 13 is sustainability. And there are a number of additional requirements. We currently have a LEED rating system and a design requirement that applies to that. We would be notching that up for new development and putting some other requirements for energy monitoring which would just be basic reporting, getting buildings to report to the city what their energy use is, incorporating our best practices in terms of storm water management. Employing either green groups or white groups. Studying the feasibility of using the districts theme system. I've been talking to some members of the Planning Board who were surprised that there's a district

steam system, and there is. And also allowing some opportunity for innovative energy sharing systems or systems that minimize waste heat which may need some Zoning relief if they were to be implemented.

So noise is a piece that's been an issue for sometime, and we have some language that incorporates best practices for noise attenuation from buildings.

Innovation space is a piece that Roger went through quickly. Having some off -- requiring some amount of the new office space that gets developed to create spaces that are more, that can be shared, that are for small entrepreneurial companies that may not be able to operate on a long-term lease. They may not be able to rent a lot of space all at once. So we worked with, closely with folks that run some of the innovation centers in

Kendall Square in forming a set of requirements that would be appropriate to make that happen.

No. 16 is a community fund. And I won't go into that in too much detail, but in the Kendall Square process there was discussion about some aspects of, some aspects of development that an improvements that were best shared among property owners in the district rather than being the responsibility of any individual property owner. So the idea would be to establish a fund for doing things like open space, programming, and management which could be coordinated among different private and public open spaces in the area to improve transit connections which could be the transit services to connect to places like Sullivan Square and extend the reach of the

transit system that feeds into Kendall Square. And workforce development, which you know, really help to connect people in the community to the jobs that are available through this and made available through this.

And No. 17, really that point has to do with requirements that are currently applied around the city, but some of them don't specifically -- don't apply in the Cambridge Center area, and that includes the inclusionary housing requirement which has been -- it's one of the more successful inclusionary housing programs, I believe anywhere, that Cambridge has implemented for sometime. And the project review requirements, which the last couple of projects that have come or some of the projects in the Cambridge Center have come before the Planning Board for review.

So that's the full set. It sketches out a set of -- really a set of items and issues to tackle and we'll be working through these to develop actual Zoning language and working with everyone throughout the next couple of months.

MARGARET DRURY: Can I ask a question? The KS -- the KS1 PUD, the area, is that, that's strictly the -- like the Boston Properties area now?

JEFF ROBERTS: Yes. It's coterminous with what's now the MXD.

MARGARET DRURY: Okay.

JEFF ROBERTS: So it would be the same boundaries but a new, sort of a new set of requirements and act as an overlay over what the current --

ROGER BOOTHE: It's shown up in the screen here in yellow.

JEFF ROBERTS: Right. So you can see it says MXD right above where it says PUD S1.

MARGARET DRURY: So I think one thing that it's not unrealistic to expect -- can everyone hear me? Expect to be happening in the next few years, I mean both may change it somewhat, if there are going to be proposals for in-fill development and redevelopment, and this housing requirement seems very specific to what is there now in that one building. I mean what happens if buildings are going to be knocked down to build other buildings? There is still no requirement in Zone for additional housing?

ROGER BOOTHE: One of the things that Goody Clancy study was in-fill. I don't know, Iram, if you want to talk about it. That was certainly an issue for the committee

was trying to get as much housing as possible.

IRAM FAROOQ: Right. And clearly the opportunities in this district are all in-fill or redevelopment. But the way to get to the housing piece is having the 400,000 square feet that is only available for residential. So instead of --

MARGARET DRURY: It's 200,000, isn't it?

IRAM FAROOQ: In the proposal, the existing proposal is 200,000. And the proposal essentially adds approximately a million square feet of which a maximum of 600,000 can be commercial. The remaining 400 has to be residential.

ROGER BOOTHE: That's 600.

IRAM FAROOQ: Yes, that's true. So a total of 600,000 possible with 200,000

required before anything else can get accomplished.

MARGARET DRURY: Okay, thank you.

WILLIAM TIBBS: Can I comment on that? Because I think this -- I mean, the whole philosophy here which is to make the PUDs kind of basically around owner's parcels. You know, the MIT parcel, we spent a lot of time on that because it needs a lot of vision because it has the most development potential and can make the most positive change here. This particular parcel is, I still feel that we're not coming to grips with the fact that this particular parcel is built, and that it really is a built to envision what's developed in the past. And I'm still not convinced of what are the opportunities or what's the vision beyond the big new tower. And granted, we can get some

more height. And just what the strategies are? We don't have to get into this now, but I think this is a very unique parcel because if you read these Zoning things, it kind of implies that you have a site that has a lot more potential development, potential. And when I look at things like how the Google piece was developed, which was kind of taking this kind of interspace between two buildings and making something of it, I just want to get a -- I'll feel more comfortable when I see what are the opportunities that can make a difference that this parcel has.

BRIAN MURPHY: I'll throw one out for you, Bill, is that you've got two of the older Boston Property Biogen buildings in that area they're somewhat lower.

WILLIAM TIBBS: Which ones are those?

IRAM FAROOQ: So right, this is Broadway. So the Biogen -- these are the Biogen buildings right here.

BRIAN MURPHY: Is that to scale?

ROGER BOOTHE: Why don't you point out the color scheme here?

IRAM FAROOQ: So, the white is buildings that exist. The grey-blue are future commercial opportunities, and the yellows are future residential opportunities. It's -- it gets a little messier, not as clean if you look at the MXD. This particular PUD says just some of it is redevelopment. So right now the Biogen parcels that Brian mentioned are right here. They are existing buildings there. But it is anticipated that those could go taller. That's one of the proposals. This is -- sorry, this here and I think this one here.

This is the existing parking garage. We anticipate that you could -- well, in Goody Clancy's analysis, they thought you could flank the garage with two residential towers, have a green roof in the middle as an amenity for residents, possibly even for others. So that would be a transformation of that section.

And then move --

KATHY BORN: Can you say that again? Explain that again. That's the first I've heard that one.

IRAM FAROOQ: The existing parking garage just north of Broadway where there's only something parked in front of that. If you flank that, if you essentially build on that garage on either side, two residential slender towers that Roger was talking about --

KATHY BORN: And that's what we're looking at there now in the yellow?

IRAM FAROOQ: Yes, that's what you see now.

ROGER BOOTHE: The color coding here again is yellow is housing. White is existing.

KATHY BORN: And it's in front of the -- well, on that map, northern but it's actually southern. The one you have your little laser on.

IRAM FAROOQ: Yes.

KATHY BORN: In front of that one is the little park plaza right there?

IRAM FAROOQ: Yes, the park plaza is right there. This is the existing garage. The bright green you see here is future parks --

KATHY BORN: Wow.

IRAM FAROOQ: -- I mean future green roof. And then these are the two residential towers.

KATHY BORN: Got that.

IRAM FAROOQ: And then one final opportunity here is you go back to Main Street and here's the Coop Building. And then on top of the Coop Building is another opportunity. BP has talked about that for commercial, but it could easily, you know, that was one of the sites that was also studied for residential, so it could be either way.

MARGARET DRURY: But so if all the only, the only requirement is to build the housing that's existing, that's going to be built now and then how many commercial feet can be built after that? Is there any space left after that?

IRAM FAROOQ: So, you could actually have between the -- if this were to be, if on top of Coop was to be commercial and then the expansion of the Biogen buildings was to be commercial, then that would capture all 600 and you would have these two towers be residential.

BRIAN MURPHY: But the basic idea of this is to sort of look, you're right, Bill, this is not a blank slate by any stretch but to do it in any way that says the first housing project must be done before you can look at any commercial expansion.

WILLIAM TIBBS: Sure. But from a planning and broader conceptual point of view, I think that -- I just look at this and think it would be a fantastic architectural school design studio project as to beyond taking the low building and building the new

one or squeezing in a very tall building in a narrow site, what are those kinds of opportunities like the Google thing that the existing framework has put there. And I think some of that is, I think, until we understand that we may be losing opportunity in that. And some of it is really like as tenants change within the building can different things begin to happen? I think a lot of these buildings started out with either old buildings or large pieces of the building kind of with the same tenants and, you know, where those opportunities -- particularly as you look at some of the things that we're talking about, retail incentives and the innovation space and those kind of things. Because I understand those what I call the few big pieces that are still there. But I think the unique thing about

this is that it has an opportunity which I think we haven't got a full understanding of as to how to take something that's really solidly built. And I think of -- boy, I remember -- I keep talking about the Upper West Side which we've talked about this, because of New York City, where they have a lot of tall buildings and kind of broad streets, but they've -- talking about retail and repurposing buildings and kind of doing major things. In some cases it's tearing down a building. But in some cases it's doing exactly what we were talking about for the historical buildings on the MIT site, that there are other things that you can do which I think as we kind of push out 20 years from now, we can begin to think about that to make this a more vibrant area. I'm not saying we haven't done that, but I think I

don't want to lose that opportunity as we begin to think about this, because the Cambridge Research site is -- has a vision and we see those opportunities. And this is very unique in that it's a very unique site that you all have the most control of and interest in.

HUGH RUSSELL: Actually the Boston Property owns all the development. They own the land. So --

KATHY BORN: Well --

HUGH RUSSELL: Sort of?

KATHY BORN: They don't own every square foot of the land.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. But they own --

KATHY BORN: A lot of it.

HUGH RUSSELL: -- a lot of land.

KATHY BORN: Most of it.

HUGH RUSSELL: And so it's somehow in this process we have to get Boston Properties to think, oh, we could actually do something here and then with them, they could say, you know, this is what we really think we want to do, and you say no, you've got to do some housing, and you develop the Zoning package that ultimately arrives on the City Council floor with Boston Properties saying we're really proud to show you what our plan is. And the authorities saying this works for us. And, you know, the plan, the Community Development Department's saying this is really what's come out of this K2 process.

ROGER BOOTHE: Well, could I ask the question? My understanding is that even though Boston Properties owns a lot of this land, the Board would have to approve changes

because it's all based on the plan. So you have trouble if you don't own the land.

CHRISTOPHER BATOR: It might be useful for you to hear, I think, I'm trying to say this gently. That since this new Board has been in place, I think it's fair to say that Boston Properties has undergone -- begun to undergo a kind of education process understanding that, I think I can fairly speak for the Board that we are very focussed on housing. And they realize they're going to have to come to us for many things, and our first question will be about the housing potentials. They've heard this about Ames every time they've come, and I think they're learning about it. I think they're showing the capacity now and learn that very fast. I don't think there's any doubt in their mind about how focussed the new Board is on

housing goals.

WILLIAM TIBBS: I think for me, I mean you mentioned it as you were talking about this, it's, it would be great if they can begin to develop a contextual hold or vision, a whole vision that we can all kind of appreciate and take part in, but appreciate and back because quite frankly the history has been that we are -- that we typically have a one shot, one shot decisions which you've described earlier, where, okay, we want to do Broad, so we're going to shift the housing over on this site. Nope, we've got to put this sliver in and we're going to do that. And it's just solving these little pinpoint problems, and it would be great to have the visionary thinking that MIT has on its site and we sort of shepherded on the Cambridge Research site that they can

participate in that, too, and I think that's what Hugh was just saying, too.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Could somebody discuss what the Redevelopment Authority's jurisdiction is and how it overlaps or doesn't overlap with the Planning Boards and the rest of the Planning Department?

KATHY BORN: I told our attorney he didn't have to come tonight. And he could do it more eloquently than I could and maybe Brian could, too.

I think you need to look at the, and it's sort of understand that you need to look at the history of the development code a little bit and not be -- and it relates to the proposed rezoning as well.

You know, when Boston Properties was selected as the master developer, it was my understanding that at the time we were the

only people to step up to the plate. And Boston Properties was a very, very young organization. And we took a really big risk. And I think although it's fair to say that there have been moments when -- and these are moments when the CRA Board has had frustrations and even longer historical moments when other departments in the city have had their frustrations with Boston Properties, it's essentially been a successful partnership. There are probably few other developers who would have signed on in the -- was it the early 80's or late 70's? Late 70's. Who even exist as the same entity. Most of the development has been bough from others or they've transformed them on business. And even though it's a reed now instead of a closely held business, you look down most of the people who hold stock in

that reed, many of them were names that you recognize as being from family members of the original founders. So there are -- I needed to say that.

The second thing is that the master development is ongoing. And then incrementally as each site was developed there were development contracts that were put in place. And my understanding is that X number of years after the building is built for the development contract the kind of review powers of the CRA for that particular parcel somewhat diminish. But then when the redevelopment -- what we're seeing now their in my opinion is I think you'll all agree with me for the most part, in exempting something like the new Biogen building but in that new arcade building and the Google connector building, I think this is really

kind of more in-fill development. Places that weren't intended, it's second generation urban growth. And when those things happen, they involve changes to the original development agreement for the site. Google connector is a good example of that, which this Board kind of inherited, you know, when it was, you know, kind of on the -- beyond the starting block I guess I would say. And that means, anyone, any of my Board members can feel free to correct me, it means that we've got a certain type of design review. And in some cases those design reviews have drilled down in to the very specific, maybe even more specific than the Planning Board would have done. At the moment Boston Properties is proposing the addition of an outdoor deck on a roof space that is accessed by -- out of the Microsoft Offices at One

Kendall -- I mean, One Cambridge Center. And even though the roof deck doesn't have any technical square footage because it is, you know, the actual deck on it is little enough to exempt it, even though it has an occupancy of 45 somewhere in the Zoning, and the Zoning experts, it means that it's technically not an addition, and yet we find ourselves having discussions with them about exactly what those can be, and the skirt material on that roof deck looks like because it's incredibly visible from the plaza. So is that -- that's kind of an answer.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right, I think that --

MARGARET DRURY: Now, the only thing I would add to that is that in light of the public purpose of this CRA, all of the public, the spaces that are dedicated as open

space, the CRA has --

KATHY BORN: Yes.

MARGARET DRURY: -- we've reviewed for the indefinite future.

KATHY BORN: And whenever there's a change to what was originally built, then you have -- there are some -- I have some questions actually here.

The underlying Zoning Board, the two PUDs that we're looking, at KS-1 and -- in particular KS-1 is MXD Zoning which isn't -- is a different animal than elsewhere in the city. And it treats a couple of things specially that have caused quite a bit of activity and on our Board. And those are signs, because it's exempt from the Sign Ordinance. And it treats, I guess I'll put it in the category of sort of an open space requirements differently. And it interprets

square footage, in some cases, differently than the rest of the Zoning Ordinance. For instance, covered -- public arcade spaces are exempt from -- they don't count for the square footage. Whereas, I think they do in most other parts of Zoning Laws; is that right?

JEFF ROBERTS: Yes.

STUART DASH: And this Zoning was created especially for the MXD District in light of the CRA Redevelopment Authority, and I'm not sure of what the question was that Ted, but it seemed like and over the past many years those the projects have gone forward, reviewed by this, within the CRA auspices. And one of the key things that we're looking at with the new Zoning is given the GFA over and above what exists now is to bring new buildings under the umbrella of the

Article 19 process.

BRIAN MURPHY: And that was the Broad would be an example of that.

STUART DASH: Yes.

BRIAN MURPHY: But that's one of the areas that there's more of a movement to do that as the series has evolved over time.

HUGH RUSSELL: And one of the features of that process is that there is a staff in the Community Development Department that has many meetings with proponents before things get to us.

KATHY BORN: And I must point out that Roger Boothe, for instance, has been incredibly useful to us on the design review committee and will be at a Microsoft meeting on Thursday, I hope, looking at that very piece of skirting, siding that we were just talking about. Correct?

ROGER BOOTHE: Yes.

HUGH RUSSELL: Roger, by the time it gets to us, skirting has already been dealt with and that's -- I mean, that's the advantage of having a staff and having a particular staff that we have that's so able.

KATHY BORN: Well, we rely on the Community Development Department, and that CRA also has on consultants' contracts a design review staff. And at the moment -- well, we have two people, one is new, but Larry Bluestone has been the design review advisor for the CRA for many, many years. And he's invaluable because A, he's been good, and -- at least since we've been there. And he has an institutional history with Boston Properties. And we've also just voted to award a second design review contract to Chuck Redman whom many of you know. So, I

think we're -- we have some good advisors.

HUGH RUSSELL: I think the important question is how does that -- basically who does the work on the staff level? It's probably clear that your Board has to sign off. Do you want to have us also be involved in that process? That's, I mean --

KATHY BORN: How has it worked in the past before we were here?

PAMELA WINTERS: It didn't.

WILLIAM TIBBS: It didn't.

ROGER BOOTHE: Well, I think there was one case that we talked about that was maybe analogous to where we might be going, and that was the housing that didn't get built on the Broad site.

WILLIAM TIBBS: Oh, yes.

ROGER BOOTHE: Because the aspect of the rezoning for that project was that -- am

I right about this? That the housing had to be reviewed by the Planning Board?

IRAM FAROOQ: Even Broad, the Broad Building --

ROGER BOOTHE: And then the Broad Building later on had to be reviewed. So both of those had gone through the previous CRA board's review process which has design advisory group, and then they came to the Planning Board for -- were those Special Permits?

IRAM FAROOQ: No, those are --

ROGER BOOTHE: Those were --

H. THEODORE COHEN: That's what I'm trying to remember. Did we project review the new Broad Building or did we just review it for the Zoning Amendment?

JEFF ROBERTS: The Planning Board did conduct design review, but I feel like I

also would be remiss if we didn't mention the other elements of the review that are instrumental with the Planning Board in terms of traffic and parking, the Traffic Parking and Transportation Department, provides a lot in much the way CDD does, provides a lot of insight into the traffic impacts of development that comes in under Article 19.

In the case of the Broad project that was, it was in the Zoning that the Planning Board conduct design review, but it didn't require the TIS and the -- ultimately they did have that analysis. It didn't require that level of review.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And that we would review it was in the amendment to the Zoning that allowed them to build it there rather than the housing?

JEFF ROBERTS: Right. Let me try to

answer the last part of your question in terms of jurisdiction.

So the Planning Board's jurisdiction is dictated by the Zoning. So it's where the Planning Board reviews a project where it says in the Zoning that any project has to undergo review and you get a Special Permit with the Planning Board. And the reason why the projects haven't come before the Planning Board is because the Zoning doesn't require it. It carves out an exemption from the normal requirements from the district.

H. THEODORE COHEN: That's in the MXS District?

STUART DASH: And the fashion the rezoning for the Forest City brought the new building under the umbrella of the Article 19 process, whereas the CRDD had not been previously been subject to that as well. And

I think trying to sort of have the consistency across the city and consistency in the quality and the scope and the review across the city.

BRIAN MURPHY: And there was word that you weren't having enough meetings.

HUGH RUSSELL: The problem is that we as a Board are familiar with working with other Boards. So if there's a historic aspect to a project, you know, to an urban design review, we'll rely upon the Historic Commission to advise us. In say Central Square for the permit there was a Central Square Committee in the Zoning Ordinance that we've used. And so one possible relationship is that, you know, your input it's in the Article 19 review through that kid of process although of course you retain your own jurisdiction. It's, you know, does that mean

when the developer comes in, they get informal review? Well, then you have to ask Larry Bluestone to come and sit next to Roger together? I don't know.

MARGARET DRURY: That's what happens now.

WILLIAM TIBBS: Basically.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: I wanted to get back to something that Bill was talking about which was the division and the power of division. And in particular with this image up here I find it to be very useful because it's a vision of the perspective drawing that we have up here. So what I wanted to understand is just a factual question for staff, does this vision, this particular version of this vision represent 400,000 square feet of housing and four million square feet of overall development? Was that

measured? If, for instance, the tower that we described, the needle tower, the slender tower, represents slightly more than 200,000 square feet of housing the other box just visually would appear to be about that size in bulk as well? So it's very hard to tell from here, but I know that's outside -- that just falls slightly outside the district, right? Oh, no, it's across the street. There's maybe 600 or 800 square feet of housing detailed within the district that we described, the PUD KS-1 district in this image. I don't know, just a factual question.

HUGH RUSSELL: We have three towers that are within the KS-1 District and you could argue each one of those could be a thousand. And it seems to be possible that that amount of development on each of those

sites if you go tall enough.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: So the division shows 600,000 square feet of housing. And then in terms of the blue blocks or the commercial blocks is that equivalent to the other -- yes, okay.

IRAM FAROOQ: Yes, in all cases we tried to make sure that this was consistent with the Zoning that is being recommended and then was a true reflection of what would be permitted. But recognizing that in the end things may be arranged differently and shaped differently.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Great, thank you. That shows the relative density.

The other thing I wanted to drill down into was the question about jurisdiction and maybe it goes back to the history of how redevelopment authority came about and why it

came about. And my understanding was that we have this special district inside our city because of the history of how that property was put together and then there was public funds available for the encouragement of that redevelopment. And so Redevelopment Board has a very specific mandate which relates to that very peculiar and particular amalgamation of public funding and the taking of private property in order to make a special district to try to revitalize a downtown. And so given that it's 19 -- the late fifties or early sixties or even the seventies and the development climate here is dramatically different, I mean it's not polar opposite to the conditions that existed when the Redevelopment Authority was put into place, it's a very interesting question for me in my mind, I don't know what the answer

is, you know, if people are now clamoring for development rather than we're trying to encourage development, you know, just the perspective of that Redevelopment Authority change to, you know -- I don't know what the exact answer is, but it's really interesting to me that those planning imperatives, those motivations, what one might expect of a development partner might be very different today than it would have been at the Redevelopment Authority's inception.

BRIAN MURPHY: I think that's spot on, Tom. And I think that's why you see the CRA Board going through a process to sort of try to decide what is CRA 2.0? And that it is very different. Yet it still remains an authority with interesting set of toolkit. Its tools in its toolkit and so I think it's relevant both for thinking what happened here

in terms of how do you try to sort of evolve and encourage BP to evolve to think about the different needs and opportunities, and at the same time think are there other areas or other missions that make sense for the authorities as you look at things going forward. And, you know, some of that is going to -- would require much more of an intense public conversation, but the City Council has at least foreshadowed a willingness to have that conversation at one of the C2 meetings. They threw out the idea of considering the role of the CRA for possible redevelopment of city parking lots in Central Square. You know, if that were a particular use, there was a public purpose that wanted to be driven for that. Well, that's a public market or affordable housing or minimal housing or the like. And I mean

there would be a lot of process that would have to go with that. And there's a major plan for that significant area. It obviously involves hearings and conversation with the state. But I think that's exactly the kind of conversation that the CRA's engaging in and thinking about internally now about what is the appropriate current role given the dramatic change that has taken place and other variations.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: But it just seems to me just quickly, you know, it was put in place to get public good out of that land, to use it, to revitalize the city. It seems that now the city's such a desirable place to be that it doesn't seem inappropriate that they might ask for exceptional public good in exchange for the right to develop or on the parcels or, you know, as you say, I'd love

the idea that we might be able to use them to redevelop those parking lots and other areas.

Thank you.

CHRISTOPHER BATOR: If I could make one brief comment.

FROM THE AUDIENCE: Chris, can you speak into the mic?

CHRISTOPHER BATOR: As one CRA member, I agree with that entirely. And I think one way to think about the CRA is that it's an entity with, at least within as I understand the Cambridge development, the menu of the worries that exist. It's an unusual one and unique one with unique -- some unique attributes, including the ability to issue bonds and do things. And I think one of the things this Board is thinking about is how we can perhaps be a place where appropriate. Obviously with consultation to

do some very imaginative, unusual things and perhaps do them faster and without the kind of constraints on funding that other development entities in the city have. And I think that's part of what we're trying to figure out, and there may be great opportunity there.

HUGH RUSSELL: So along with the Goody Clancy work, additional Goody Clancy work, there was study done by the CBT that was commissioned by the East Cambridge Planning Team and -- very housing focussed. And they came to the conclusion that you had to look a little bit beyond the borders of the study area to get the housing goals. Like Met Pipe isn't inside the district, but it might be something that's considered for housing. Again, they have the ability to have other tools to do that. It might be

very useful. You know, you take the gas company by eminent domain, they've got the site (inaudible).

H. THEODORE COHEN: What has been Boston Property's involvement in the Goody Clancy or the other study?

BRIAN MURPHY: They were part of the K2 study group. Very active members. I mean, certainly had some robust exchanges about why the city requires an Inclusionary Zoning and those units on-site and you can't buy your way out of them and can't put the units elsewhere but they were a very engaged participant.

WILLIAM TIBBS: Hugh, I just wanted to -- in that line, I'm always interested in the -- even as we look at our PUD parcels, the edges of those of when they -- particularly when they -- the edges link

together and you have two different jurisdictions. I know we spent -- at least I spent a lot of time talking to MIT talking about Main Street and what it can do on its side of Main Street to enliven it. But I think those opportunities when you, particularly when you look at the Volpe site and stuff, the edge piece is there. And then again relative going back to the things you can do, I guess. I think one of the unique things about this parcel, and not to use your comment about mistakes, but there are lessons learned because of just the vision that we have, and we should look for those opportunities where we can begin to, as we have this new development potential and new height and all this other stuff, to look and see if there's ways to improve upon what's there based on the lessons learned in a way

that just isn't in-fill of a spot or building over something that's already there. So it's just a conceptually, but I think that's kind of important.

And also the one thing we know just from the planning is that as much as you can look at those visions, and they have the buildings and the towers, it's the inner weaving of how you get to one and how that's linking which makes it work, and we just need to focus on that, too.

HUGH RUSSELL: So it's getting close to our bedtime and we've been here for a couple of hours, and what shall we do to sort of wrap up this conversation? I feel like the first goal of the night is set out for us to talk to each other and starting to share our thoughts has been successful because I think we're discovering that we're actually

quite close to -- each Board has quite a similar vision of what they want to see in that part of the city. I'm still concerned about with how we deal with the juggernaut that says we've got to get this rezoning done for, you know, KS-2, KS-1, and KS-3 and I don't know if we're ready to do that. I mean the committee's ready, but I think what's the process we use to get from committee being ready to everybody being ready? And how do we work together to achieve that?

MARGARET DRURY: I think one thing that we need to do is to do as two Boards, I look at the points where the Zoning would require changes in the way that we operate now and look at those and sort of make -- kind of come up with a comprehensive list of those and sort of work through maybe first as individual boards how, what our thoughts are.

Or maybe it's another process like this, I'm not sure. But I think a list is a start.

HUGH RUSSELL: Well, your new Executive Director may have the title wrong. He's a tremendous asset now because you have staff that can start talking. I say this all the time, it's like if you look at the planning hours spent in this building, 99 percent of them are spent by the staff, one percent is spent by this Board. Who do you think does the work?

MARGARET DRURY: Exactly.

IRAM FAROOQ: Hugh, can I suggest something? I might be the person who pushes the most on moving things along because I feel -- I think -- we feel the responsibility to all the work that the committee did. But I think that Margaret's suggestion might be a really great way to move forward, because one

thing we worry about is also that not every property owner will necessarily be willing to engage at the level that MIT did. So we may not -- Volpe may want to have that conversation, but they may just be waiting to see where the Board ends up before they determine what their next steps are for instance. But we could certainly reach out to everybody and pose the same question that you asked and see what we hear back as feedback from each one of them; the issues that they seem -- and the good news is that most of them, not Volpe, but most of the rest were on the committee and so are very familiar with what was being proposed, but that -- Margaret may have offered us a path forward.

BRIAN MURPHY: And following up on that in terms of Volpe, even though they

weren't on the committee, we certainly kept them apprized of what's been going on and having ongoing discussions. I think the way to phrase it is noteworthy. In as much as I think from Volpe's standpoint, they're in the transportation business, they're not developers. What they're really trying to do is solve a math problem which is if I want a new building that instead of looking like this, looks like this, because like everybody else in the knowledge business I want horizontal integration. I think about what's a modern version that will work for me, and figure out what that costs and then look at the other development potential on the site and essentially say can they get a partner? Can they find a way that they take a plan out of the MIT book and say to a developer, you know, how much building can I buy for this

much land with the following restrictions upon it? And that's really going to be the key to unlock it for them because they're not going to have a vision in terms of what they do with it. It's really going to come to who the next iteration is for the partner. And I think it's important for us as a city and a community to really say we want to make sure we pull up with something that's economically viable because I think it's in everybody's interest thinking about a healthy Kendall Square, to not have open air parking lots at some of the most precious land for innovation and for place making in the area, but to sort of really -- but having said that, once technically viable to say as Bill would say, but what is the vision for this area because this is closest thing that we have to a blank slate in Kendall Square and it's tremendously

exciting. So to the extent to which we can say it involves these pieces, about open space and innovation office space and about housing, that's sort of the key to really put in place a plan for them to understand and follow. So I think that's sort of what's been driving us to push on that as we think about the Volpe piece.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Brian, when you talk about Volpe, are the people here that you're dealing with --

BRIAN MURPHY: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: -- or in the community? So it's not some bureaucracy in DC --

BRIAN MURPHY: It's both actually. And it's a very interesting set of issues that they have. They're still trying to sort of figure out the different ways that they

address it because, you know, they have to be careful about how they structure something because if it's viewed as -- if they were to ever declare it as surplus land, then suddenly it would be open for any other government agency to swoop in and use it for some purpose, they may not make a heck of a lot of sense. They have challenges in terms of how they deal with the federal bureaucracy on things like how they can hire an appraiser. They've got issues of dealing with the federal bureaucracy in terms of both the relationship between U.S. DOT and GSA in terms of how you can do this. So it's a complicated problem and a very interesting one. In some ways one of the critical pieces is having an administration re-elected so they come up and say all right, we have a four year time table to advance this thing.

But it's dealing with people both locally and nationally. It's on the radar of U.S. DOT, the U.S. Deputy of -- it's either Deputy or under Secretary spoke to all the employees of at Volpe to give them a sense of what's going on. It's under discussion.

KATHY BORN: Brian, could you explain in background information for some people why Volpe isn't a typical kind of a government office?

BRIAN MURPHY: Yes. They're an unusual model. They are really almost more like a fee-for-service enterprise where, you know, within Volpe you've got a large number of employees, which you've also got a very significant number of contractors. They end up sort of doing a lot of consulting work for different arms of the Federal Government in the transportation area and doing a lot of

transportation research. And so it's an unusual piece. I mean, they weren't, for example, impacted by sequestration. So they're sort of a little bit off. They're not a traditional bureaucracy in that way. They also, as I understand it, although there are some, you know, debate about this, depending upon how it's structured, it does seem that the Volpe and DOT would be able to retain the assets of this parcel and the site. It wouldn't go to GSA and the Federal Government. Which is relevant, because it does suggest if they figure out a way to do it, it's maintaining the fee and doing it as a, you know, build to suit and partner with the developer. It allows them to come up with an income stream which again comes very attractive for them to look at doing this. And again it is a window where the Federal

Government is more open to this kind of a creative approach because of the challenges that they face.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: Brian, do they fit within our vision of this district with innovation --

BRIAN MURPHY: Very much so.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: -- coming out of MIT --

BRIAN MURPHY: Very much so. A lot of their work is with MIT.

TOM SIENIEWICZ: -- so they belong here.

BRIAN MURPHY: They're drawing on the same pool of knowledge professionals. And when you look at it, it's really is very much part of who they are and it is related to some of the work that we're doing as we think about, you know, energy research and

how important that is to the next iterations for Kendall Square. And it's -- it causes them to be risk givers. Because as much as their current building may not be exactly as they want to see, they're terrified that a Congressman from Oklahoma says that we've got a place for you and tries to move Volpe's research lock, stock, and barrel to a different community. That's a big deal for the workers. It's very strong union presence which gets the attention of Congress. But it is very much in the, as part of a Kendall Square infrastructure. They're becoming more involved in Kendall Square. They're engaged with KSA Community over the summer, and I like the fact that they were willing to have movies such as Airplane. I think, you know, and we went through all the transportation disasters.

ROGER BOOTHE: I know time is running out, but I want to get back to your juggernaut role which I don't want to but heads with anybody, but we have spent a lot of time with the K2 Committee and what Jeff's described really reflects that. I would like to suggest that there's an analogy between what MIT did and what the CRA might do, which is that while you all haven't gotten your feet on the ground enough to be hiring Elkus Manfredi in doing all that study, you could take what K2 has done and critique it and say we think this is good. We maybe want this change or something. So in a sense, Margaret, Jeff read you the list. And the question is what do you think of that list? And could we get to a point where you're coming to the Planning Board saying, we really want to see the 600,000 square feet of

housing, but we're not sure about the 400,000 feet of office, or something like that. It's getting your kind of input because that's kind of what happened with MIT in that if you look at -- I know you were at the hearing tonight at Council, they're saying well, we're doing the K2 benefits package and we're doing the K2 vision for this, that, and the other thing. They had to come along because they got out ahead of us. We had the incredible committee process and they had to pull back in. They started off with 150,000 square feet of housing and now they're up to 300,000. So they got pushed in the process. Different here where we have you guys this time, but it would be great to have your take on what the K2 Committee has said about your, it's not your property, but your jurisdiction and your turf as you might still -- your turf

even though it's not your property.

CONRAD CRAWFORD: I think there's -- might be, there's one of the joint members of both the K2 Committee and now a member of CRA to serve the role of sort of reminding my fellow members of sort of that conversation. Also bringing some of that process forward. So the housing piece, as you've heard, has been picked up pretty strongly. The open space piece is going to be another conversation, that and public realm. So I don't think that we're as afraid of the juggernaut and our feeling is rushed from my position as it might seem.

STUART DASH: It's sort of the old school reasons for planning to stay ahead of the demand as much as we can and to create the vision for folks to look at and say, yeah, I think that would be a good outcome

for my property. And we sort of look at things like 303 Third Street and we look back sometimes and say, oh, God, that almost exact image was drawn in our planning. And some developer says well, that looks good, we'll do that. So it could help in a few ways.

BARRY ZEVIN: I would be happy to fulfill the same role that Conrad has as far as ECaPs. Still come up with a very reasonable set of proposals, and in particular for the Volpe parcels.

KATHY BORN: How much do we have?

BARRY ZEVIN: I was on the committee.

KATHY BORN: I was on Council.

BARRY ZEVIN: And you were on Council.

KATHY BORN: We work together.

ROGER BOOTHE: You don't think of

that, Kathy, of maybe have some type of feedback of where we are now. We hate to lose the momentum. We don't want to pressure our Board because they work so hard. The pressuring stuff on what's not ready, but we also do feel the commitment to the process. I mean, we spent many hours of our lives on trying to get this K2-C2 thing right, and I think we're in good position, but it's critiquable. You know, we could work with you at that, that would help.

KATHY BORN: I think that's a perfectly fair request. One question that I have for you is -- maybe you said this and I just didn't hear it, and what we have here is the list for K1 -- PUD KS1. Is it your intention to take up each of these PUDs separately or is it going to be altogether?

WILLIAM TIBBS: That's the $25,000

question.

HUGH RUSSELL: That's a good question. If they were already together, it might be a reasonable strategy. Now, I noticed that Margaret has been on your Board and she's it attended probably more City Council meetings than any other human being. So trying to make things that it's feasible for them to enact is part of what we have to think about. And if you're going to do them with something that's too big and is going to be adjustable.

COUNCILLOR van BEUZEKOM: Here, here.

KATHY BORN: If you come to something that's too small, it becomes too peakable.

HUGH RUSSELL: Right. So in this discussion and I've come To sort of think

about the DOT parcel is actually easier because it's our job to put out what our goals are, and we're -- and there's a lot of consensus around what the goals are for that site. And when it actually gets done, we'll probably have to redo it to fit with what DOT's going to do. But then so it gets tweaked some more. That's not, that's not a bad thing.

KATHY BORN: Well, let me ask another question of Brian.

The DOT site, is rezoning, which is essentially an upzoning going to be added impetus to that?

BRIAN MURPHY: Yes.

KATHY BORN: Okay. So let's go with that one.

And the second thing that I would add is that -- is there anybody from Boston

Properties here? No.

I know somebody's taping the meeting. Everybody's taping the meeting. Everybody knows everything.

Not having been a part of the K2 study and participating with BP on that study, from our point of view as a Board they don't seem terribly invested in this rezoning process. Would you all agree with me? I mean, for instance, we -- and they presented to us the Ames Street housing project. And we said well -- and it was the height that's allowed now, which is 200 -- 250. And I said well, you know, if you just wait, it's going to be 300. And they said we don't want to do that. And I couldn't really tell if it was because they didn't want the middle income component or if it's because it just didn't make any difference to their economic paradigm. But

the response was we want to get going on this. So, I think that, you know, moving ahead with the PUD K -- that's in 1, right? PUD KS-1, this is a good time to do that.

ROGER BOOTHE: I was going to say something similar in that, you know, this is going to be going through the disposition process in some form or another, so it's part of the context for making that decision would be what do you think you're looking at in the rest of KS-1? And that would be where you could have gotten this critique of, well, the K-2 Committee has come up with so far or at least having something that's given some sort of vision or parameters for what comes after if anything. So then it's a good, it's a reasonable question to be asking once we're looking at the revisions which I guess are going to be necessary to make that 200,000

square feet of housing work. Which by the way, we thought was ready to go.

BRIAN MURPHY: You're talking KS-2, Roger.

ROGER BOOTHE: I beg your pardon?

BRIAN MURPHY: KS-2. No, KS-1. I'm sorry.

ROGER BOOTHE: KS-1.

KATHY BORN: All right. And then that leaves the KS-3. So you do all three of them at the same time or you leave one out?

STUART DASH: KS-3 is a very modest change so to some extent it would be leaving the tiniest little piece at the end which I don't think we think -- if you're that far down the line, that's a very small change.

BRIAN MURPHY: I think we'll have a better sense of where the Council is looking to go after Monday. And, you know, at

tonight's hearing we got a general sense of some of the places where they're going. And, you know, you already had some Councillors sort of giving some feedback saying, well, I'm not sure we necessarily agree with a third, a third, a third for open space, workforce development, and transportation. You know, or they may say we may not want to call the question on that yet. So I think in some cases we may be able to sort of tease out and almost reverse engineer what direction they want to go in at least in terms of the other PUDs. And that obviously doesn't preclude the Planning Board from coming up what they think is its best recommendations are. But I think we'll have a better sense of where the Council wanted to go, and presumably as well a greater familiarity for the Council when the other

PUDs make their way there. Would you all agree?

ROGER BOOTHE: And if I could have a final thought about it. I think this is going to take sometime. Again, I'm very sensitive about not wanting to pressure the Board. And you guys work so hard and we have a lot of things coming up here. It will take some time, keeping things alive, sort of keeping the flame going here while we think about it, while we give the CRA Board a chance to do their thinking, come in. They may unfold over a few several months. I mean we had an ambitious schedule that said we'd get it done a few months. Let's say it takes longer, but I think whenever it is we come around to the disposition process on Ames Street, we're going to want to have that contextual thinking. That's my last word.

KATHY BORN: What's that mean for when? I don't understand.

ROGER BOOTHE: Next six months instead of the next three months. Try that out.

HUGH RUSSELL: But if we -- let's just say six months from now is October 1st. It's a five weeks before the municipal election and nine weeks before the Council turns over.

ROGER BOOTHE: At least having some clarity in our thinking not that we're going to file a petition and beat our heads against the election. But that -- we don't let it -- I'm worried we're going to let it drift and then we'll have lost a lot of good thinking.

BRIAN MURPHY: The other thing that we're also trying to balance is that we keep hearing from the City Council, where is it?

You know, where's K2? Where's C2? What's going on? And that's sort of the other thing that's pushing along in terms of that. You know, just to make it a little bit more complicated and more Planning Board and (inaudible) C2 will be relevant given we've had change in ownership with parcels with the group of Twining and Normandy purchasing the site. So that certainly makes it less of a -- that makes that change less theoretical and more probable.

WILLIAM TIBBS: But I think it gets to the core of it, which is that we seem to act on those things that are doable. And the MIT is doable because MIT has a vision and they could do it, and they can start doing it. And I think in this case, I think getting Boston Properties hopefully interested enough to start to think about

what they could do with some of this extra, you know, development potential and stuff we're giving them would be helpful. And C2 is so different. It's like a patchwork quilt of different owners, and that's a very different process because the city has to provide the vision that all these small properties can work within which is very different than these where we have large parcels under either control or influence by fairly large entities and they can go there. So it's a different -- but and even in Central, it literally is MIT and Novartis and those folks who are kind of pushing the envelope for us to move because they want to move on stuff. So it's kind of a different -- it's a real question about this kind of Zoning thing as to how do you make it -- you can do all the writing you want,

but how do you make it work? And clearly there are different mechanisms by which each of these parcels happen.

IRAM FAROOQ: If you think back to -- I mean, you've done it both ways. Because if you think back a little further to North Point, for instance, that vision came from a planning process from ECaPs and you all -- I mean, again, we had a parallel --

WILLIAM TIBBS: But it was one huge developer there, too. I guess what I'm saying is getting the developers to be a part of that process of trying to do the vision --

IRAM FAROOQ: But that vision came from the planning study, not from the developer, and you all adopted it.

WILLIAM TIBBS: But the planning study also came from Citywide Zoning which was broadly across the city. I mean, it was

all a process.

IRAM FAROOQ: It was from ECaPs.

WILLIAM TIBBS: So I'm not disagreeing with you.

HUGH RUSSELL: The first North Point Zoning ways 25 years ago it was the first thing I looked at when I hit the Board.

PAMELA WINTERS: ECaPs was part --

KATHY BORN: Following up on what Bill said, I'm sort of optimistic because I think that the MIT was, I hope, hardest one to kind of crack. Because you had a major institution who was proposing a major change in the campus. And you know how people feel about major institutions in Cambridge. And, you know, it was one property owner. This one, if it follows, is going to have still a very small number of property owners, but it's not one property owner. I don't think

anybody hates the redevelopment authority. I think some people have some strong feelings about Boston Properties, but you know, it's different from MIT and nobody knows anything about Volpe. Volpe is definitely a blank slate. Wouldn't you say? And I mean --

STUART DASH: Either a black box or a blank slate.

KATHY BORN: Right, right, right.

So I think that, you know, that the time is really good for this and it's really good to take them all together. And as Bill had said, once you get into Central Square, you get into something, you know, more like the Citywide Zoning was which I remember there were literally hundreds of property owners who were -- and to a lesser extent the East Cambridge Zoning which got split up. And there were literally hundreds of property

owners who wanted to me with the Council Members, who wanted to meet with the Ordinance Committee members because they were concerned about the rezoning of their property and they didn't even understand. Here you have on these two PUD parcels a very educated group of property owners, and I think we should just go for it.

HUGH RUSSELL: Gee, that sounds like a great time to say thank you very much for coming. I think it was a great discussion, and we can think about whether we want to do this again at some point in time.

So thanks very much.

(Whereupon, at 9:40 p.m., the Planning Board Adjourned.)

ERRATA SHEET AND SIGNATURE INSTRUCTIONS

The original of the Errata Sheet has been delivered to Community Development Department.

When the Errata Sheet has been completed and signed, a copy thereof should be delivered to each party of record and the **ORIGINAL** delivered to Community Development Department, to whom the original transcript was delivered.

INSTRUCTIONS

After reading this volume of the transcript, indicate any corrections or changes to testimony and the reasons therefor on the Errata Sheet supplied to you and sign it. **DO NOT** make marks or notations on the transcript volume itself.

REPLACE THIS PAGE OF THE TRANSCRIPT WITH THE COMPLETED AND SIGNED ERRATA SHEET WHEN RECEIVED.

ATTACH TO PLANNING BOARD
DATE: 04/02/13
REP: CAZ

ERRATA SHEET

INSTRUCTIONS: After reading the transcript of the Planning Board, note any change or correction to testimony and the reason therefor on this sheet. **DO NOT** make any marks or notations on the transcript volume itself. Sign and date this errata sheet (before a Notary Public, if required). Refer to Page 174 of the transcript for Errata Sheet distribution instructions.

PAGE	**LINE**		
_____	_____	CHANGE:	_____
		REASON:	_____
_____	_____	CHANGE:	_____
		REASON:	_____
_____	_____	CHANGE:	_____
		REASON:	_____
_____	_____	CHANGE:	_____
		REASON:	_____
_____	_____	CHANGE:	_____
		REASON:	_____
_____	_____	CHANGE:	_____
		REASON:	_____

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

_____

C E R T I F I C A T E

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
BRISTOL, SS.

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

I am not related to any of the parties in this matter by blood or marriage and that I am in no way interested in the outcome of this matter.

I further certify that the testimony hereinbefore set forth is a true and accurate transcription of my stenographic notes to the best of my knowledge, skill and ability.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 24th day of June, 2013.

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

My Commission Expires:
April 23, 2015

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

$

$100 [1] - 36:4
$25,000 [1] - 159:19

0

04/02/13 [1] - 175:1

1

1 [5] - 3:3, 21:5, 21:6, 29:18, 163:3
1-b [1] - 33:1
10 [4] - 15:17, 19:7, 19:13, 25:7
10-acre [1] - 19:5
100,000 [3] - 47:15, 93:12, 93:14
12 [2] - 49:9, 95:19
121-b [1] - 32:18
13 [1] - 98:5
141 [3] - 21:6, 24:13, 61:7
147703 [1] - 176:14
15 [1] - 20:11
150,000 [1] - 156:12
16 [1] - 100:4
17 [1] - 101:6
174 [1] - 175:7
19 [5] - 125:1, 129:8, 130:17, 131:17, 135:12
1950 [3] - 25:13, 25:15, 26:7
1950's [1] - 27:10
1958 [1] - 32:11
1960 [2] - 26:7, 27:14
1988 [1] - 16:1
1993 [1] - 22:16
1999 [1] - 19:3
1st [1] - 167:7

2

2 [3] - 1:3, 3:4, 30:1
2.0 [1] - 136:15
20 [3] - 9:13, 23:10, 113:16
200 [3] - 50:14, 162:13
200,000 [12] - 47:16, 48:8, 48:10, 96:14, 96:16, 97:15, 97:16, 104:9, 104:12, 104:19, 133:3, 163:19
200-unit [1] - 41:1
2000 [4] - 22:14, 22:18, 23:16, 27:14
2001 [1] - 47:11
2007 [1] - 22:19
2010 [1] - 27:3
2013 [3] - 1:3, 22:13, 176:11
2015 [1] - 176:16
23 [1] - 176:16
24th [1] - 176:11
25 [4] - 9:13, 15:8, 92:17, 171:6
250 [2] - 92:10, 162:13

3

3 [2] - 3:6, 30:2
3.6 [1] - 90:4
30 [3] - 27:17, 78:6, 81:9
300 [2] - 92:11, 162:15
300,000 [2] - 41:13, 156:14
303 [4] - 24:9, 24:15, 52:10, 158:2
344 [1] - 1:5
36 [1] - 23:10

4

4 [7] - 3:7, 3:7, 30:3, 84:16, 88:16, 88:18, 89:8
400 [1] - 104:15
400,000 [3] - 104:6, 132:17, 156:1
45 [1] - 122:6

5

50's [3] - 28:11, 31:16, 31:18

6

6 [1] - 91:17
60 [1] - 13:2
60's [2] - 22:5, 28:18
600 [3] - 104:17, 111:5, 133:10
600,000 [4] - 104:15, 104:19, 134:3, 155:19
617.786.7783/617.639.0396 [1] - 1:18

7

7 [2] - 88:16, 91:16
70's [4] - 15:11, 27:12, 119:13, 119:14
75 [1] - 54:8
7500 [1] - 43:4
7:10 [1] - 1:4

8

8 [3] - 51:17, 51:19, 92:5
80's [6] - 13:1, 13:17, 14:12, 15:11, 15:19, 119:13
800 [1] - 133:10

9

9 [1] - 92:19
99 [1] - 145:8
9:40 [1] - 173:15

A

Abigail's [1] - 24:16
ability [3] - 139:15, 140:18, 176:10
able [10] - 10:16, 14:4, 14:15, 21:14, 99:16, 99:17, 126:6, 139:1, 152:9, 165:10
abutting [1] - 11:8
accessed [1] - 121:18
accommodate [3] - 46:15, 60:9, 83:17
accomplished [1] - 105:2
according [1] - 83:13
account [1] - 12:1
accurate [3] - 44:4, 175:17, 176:9
achieve [1] - 144:11
achieving [1] - 14:5
acquisition [1] - 43:4
acre [3] - 51:15, 55:17, 56:12
acres [6] - 13:2, 19:7, 19:13, 26:9, 26:10, 53:11
acronyms [1] - 23:19
act [3] - 46:2, 102:16, 168:14
action [2] - 45:2, 85:15
active [6] - 63:2, 63:5, 91:17, 92:4, 94:17, 141:8
activity [3] - 24:6, 90:16, 123:15
actual [3] - 45:17, 102:4, 122:4
add [4] - 75:15, 76:10, 122:17, 161:18
added [3] - 41:7, 46:14, 161:13
addition [2] - 121:17, 122:8
additional [7] - 6:16, 47:15, 90:7, 96:2, 98:6, 103:15, 140:9
address [2] - 7:9, 150:1
adds [1] - 104:13
adhere [1] - 22:5
adhered [1] - 17:2
Adjourned [1] - 173:16
adjustable [1] - 160:12
adjustments [1] - 86:3
administration [2] - 54:1, 150:17
adopt [1] - 33:1
adopted [2] - 47:10, 170:16
Adoption [1] - 3:6
advance [1] - 150:19
advantage [1] - 126:5
advise [1] - 131:12
advisor [1] - 126:13
advisors [1] - 127:1
advisory [1] - 128:9
aerial [2] - 9:4, 56:15
affect [2] - 97:10, 97:12
affectionately [2] - 10:11, 23:18
affordable [6] - 18:2, 18:3, 20:11, 20:17, 63:8, 137:18
afraid [1] - 157:12
age [1] - 35:2
agency [1] - 150:6
ago [4] - 5:14, 25:7, 60:17, 171:6
agree [6] - 44:3, 120:15, 139:9, 162:9, 165:5, 166:2
agreement [4] - 17:17, 17:18, 18:9, 121:5
agreements [4] - 17:13, 31:12, 49:5, 49:7
ahead [6] - 10:19, 27:3, 51:13, 156:10, 157:16, 163:3
Ahmed [5] - 1:10, 5:9, 5:10, 71:10, 71:13
air [1] - 148:12
Airplane [1] - 154:17
Alexandria [5] - 51:5, 52:5, 52:17, 55:19, 56:5
Alexandria's [2] - 51:9, 54:16
aligns [1] - 87:14
alive [1] - 166:9
All-Asia [1] - 59:17
allow [7] - 85:16, 89:13, 92:11, 93:18, 94:10, 95:16, 96:9
allowance [1] - 90:2
allowed [4] - 89:8, 96:3, 129:17, 162:12
allowing [2] - 96:2, 99:2
allows [2] - 97:14, 152:16
almost [7] - 4:9, 20:16, 61:16, 94:12, 151:12, 158:3, 165:11
alongside [1] - 11:3
alternate [1] - 43:17
alternative [1] - 53:18
alternatives [1] - 54:11
altogether [1] - 159:18
amalgamation [1] - 135:9
amazing [1] - 56:4
ambitious [1] - 166:14
Amendment [1] - 128:17
amendment [1] - 129:16
amenity [1] - 108:5
Ames [12] - 40:12, 42:7, 42:8, 42:10, 43:6, 43:8, 92:2, 96:7, 96:13, 116:14, 162:11, 166:17
Amgen [1] - 40:2
amount [12] - 36:2, 64:4, 78:16, 81:16, 88:6, 89:18, 89:19, 92:17, 93:18, 96:5, 99:12, 133:19
analogous [1] - 127:14
analogy [1] - 155:7
analysis [2] - 108:3, 129:13

AND [2] - 174:1, 174:17
AND/OR [1] - 176:18
angles [1] - 44:17
animal [1] - 123:12
Annex [1] - 1:5
answer [5] - 47:7, 122:13, 130:1, 135:19, 136:6
anticipate [2] - 96:7, 108:2
anticipated [2] - 59:4, 107:17
ANY [2] - 176:17, 176:18
anyway [1] - 55:15
Apartment [1] - 37:12
Appeal [1] - 3:3
appear [1] - 133:5
applicability [1] - 88:3
applied [1] - 101:7
applies [1] - 98:8
APPLY [1] - 176:17
apply [2] - 82:19, 101:9
appoint [1] - 34:2
appraiser [1] - 150:11
appreciate [2] - 117:7, 117:8
apprized [1] - 147:2
approach [8] - 82:18, 89:17, 91:2, 91:4, 92:9, 93:16, 94:7, 153:2
appropriate [3] - 100:2, 138:8, 139:19
approval [2] - 80:15, 86:13
approve [3] - 88:8, 93:19, 115:19
approved [2] - 19:4, 19:17
approving [1] - 88:12
April [1] - 1:3
april [1] - 176:16
arcade [3] - 39:9, 120:18, 124:3
arch [1] - 73:15
architect [1] - 38:7
architectural [1] - 111:17
area [49] - 10:4, 10:18, 11:8, 11:13, 14:1, 14:2, 19:8, 20:9, 22:11, 23:17, 28:19, 29:12, 34:18, 37:6, 37:18, 43:5, 52:3, 63:2, 63:17, 67:5, 71:15, 72:18, 83:6, 83:10, 83:11, 83:19, 85:1, 86:3, 86:19, 88:11, 89:17, 90:13, 90:18, 93:4, 93:16, 94:6, 97:11, 100:16, 101:10, 102:8, 102:10, 106:17, 113:18, 138:3, 140:15, 148:14, 148:17, 151:19
area-by-area [1] - 86:3
area-wide [1] - 63:2
areas [10] - 11:5, 11:6, 18:15, 83:12, 86:8, 91:18, 94:8, 125:6, 137:4, 139:2
argue [1] - 133:17
arms [1] - 151:18
arranged [1] - 134:12
arrives [1] - 115:8
Article [4] - 125:1, 129:8, 130:17, 131:17
Asia [1] - 59:17
aspect [3] - 42:11, 127:18, 131:10
aspects [2] - 100:7, 100:8
asphalt [1] - 18:14
assessors [1] - 43:11
asset [1] - 145:5
assets [1] - 152:10
Assistant [2] - 1:12, 3:4
Associate [2] - 1:10, 1:11
assume [1] - 65:14
ATTACH [1] - 175:1
attempts [1] - 26:2
attended [1] - 160:6
attention [3] - 52:4, 53:14, 154:11
attenuation [1] - 99:9
attorney [1] - 118:8
attractive [1] - 152:18
attributes [1] - 139:15
Auburn [1] - 37:15
AUDIENCE [1] - 139:6
auspices [2] - 39:2, 124:16
authorities [4] - 31:1, 34:10, 115:11, 137:6
authority [18] - 29:3, 31:4, 33:13, 36:1, 37:5, 37:11, 38:7, 38:19, 39:2, 39:19, 40:16, 41:4, 49:13, 87:13, 87:14, 134:19, 136:17, 172:1
Authority [17] - 3:7, 3:8, 4:6, 29:7, 30:14, 31:5, 31:11, 33:3, 33:4, 33:6, 34:7, 34:12, 35:1, 37:1, 124:11, 135:17, 136:4
authority's [1] - 10:17
Authority's [2] - 118:4, 136:11
authorized [2] - 87:3, 87:7
available [5] - 30:18, 101:4, 101:5, 104:7, 135:5
Avenue [3] - 56:17, 58:5, 59:19
award [1] - 126:18
aware [1] - 25:3
awkward [1] - 8:19

B

backed [1] - 76:18
background [2] - 5:12, 151:8
bad [2] - 28:16, 161:9
Badger [4] - 19:11, 22:5, 25:18, 26:14
balance [1] - 167:18
bank [1] - 13:18
barrel [1] - 154:8
BARRY [6] - 5:7, 36:6, 38:2, 158:7, 158:13, 158:16
Barry [2] - 3:9, 5:7
Base [4] - 87:1, 87:4, 87:7, 89:10
based [3] - 14:6, 116:1, 142:19
basic [2] - 98:11, 111:8
basis [4] - 10:2, 85:15, 86:3, 88:10
Bator [2] - 3:11, 5:2
BATOR [5] - 5:2, 33:7, 116:3, 139:4, 139:8
bearing [1] - 66:1
beat [1] - 167:13
beautiful [1] - 20:5
beautifully [1] - 55:3
became [3] - 14:2, 21:11, 21:12
become [3] - 22:7, 34:10, 34:13
becomes [1] - 160:16
becoming [1] - 154:13
bedrock [1] - 46:7
bedtime [1] - 143:13
beg [2] - 45:3, 164:5
begin [5] - 112:9, 113:17, 114:2, 117:5, 142:15
beginning [1] - 84:3
begun [1] - 116:8
behalf [1] - 8:1
belong [1] - 153:12
belt [1] - 11:5
benefit [1] - 57:14
benefits [3] - 64:6, 86:10, 156:7
best [7] - 79:12, 95:13, 98:14, 99:8, 100:9, 165:15, 176:10
better [9] - 47:9, 57:9, 57:10, 57:11, 61:9, 70:5, 94:2, 164:18, 165:17
between [7] - 57:4, 75:19, 94:16, 106:9, 111:2, 150:13, 155:7
BEUZEKOM [1] - 160:13
beyond [10] - 37:2, 37:5, 45:7, 70:14, 87:6, 90:10, 105:18, 111:18, 121:8, 140:14
bicycle [2] - 75:16, 76:5
bicycles [1] - 76:10
big [16] - 16:3, 28:13, 35:19, 39:10, 62:12, 71:7, 71:8, 78:4, 78:5, 79:17, 80:3, 105:19, 112:18, 119:3, 154:9, 160:11
bill [1] - 27:8
Bill [12] - 7:15, 8:10, 8:12, 8:13, 9:9, 36:16, 106:15, 111:9, 132:9, 148:16, 171:10, 172:12
Binney [11] - 40:2, 51:5, 51:12, 52:16, 52:18, 55:13, 55:14, 55:19, 62:13, 62:15
Biogen [14] - 30:1, 40:1, 40:5, 40:7, 51:7, 51:10, 54:15, 55:6, 106:16, 107:2, 107:3, 107:14, 111:4, 120:17
biotech [1] - 25:10
bit [28] - 9:9, 9:11, 9:16, 9:18, 11:13, 15:14, 18:11, 21:18, 31:10, 42:19, 50:19, 57:18, 58:16, 64:14, 70:15, 77:3, 83:2, 85:10, 85:13, 93:17, 94:4, 97:13, 97:18, 118:15, 123:14, 140:14, 152:4, 168:4
bite [1] - 6:2
black [1] - 172:7
blank [4] - 111:10, 148:18, 172:5, 172:8
blighted [1] - 29:5
block [3] - 59:17, 121:9
blocks [3] - 20:1, 134:4, 134:5
blocky [1] - 25:16
blood [1] - 176:6
Blue [1] - 16:1
blue [2] - 107:8, 134:4
Bluestone [2] - 126:12, 132:3
BOARD [2] - 1:1, 175:1
board [3] - 29:12, 30:4, 66:16
Board [71] - 3:3, 3:7, 4:3, 4:5, 5:15, 7:11, 8:2, 8:12, 13:14, 14:16, 15:5, 15:18, 17:4, 19:4, 21:14, 39:11, 41:7, 41:10, 46:14, 52:5, 58:1, 59:8, 60:14, 70:2, 70:11, 82:8, 84:15, 86:12, 87:15, 93:13, 93:19, 98:18, 101:19, 115:19, 116:6, 116:10, 116:19, 119:6, 121:7, 121:10, 121:15, 123:9, 123:15, 127:5, 128:2, 128:10, 128:18, 129:3, 129:11, 130:5, 130:8, 130:10, 131:8, 135:6, 136:14, 139:17, 144:1, 145:10, 146:6, 155:18, 159:4, 160:5, 162:7, 165:14, 166:7, 166:11, 168:5, 171:7, 173:16, 175:4, 175:16
board's [1] - 128:8
Board's [1] - 130:3
boards [2] - 6:18,

144:19
Boards [3] - 118:6, 131:9, 144:13
Bob [1] - 36:7
Boiler [1] - 55:10
boiler [1] - 55:11
bold [2] - 56:11, 72:17
bolts [1] - 82:3
bond [1] - 26:8
bonds [1] - 139:16
book [1] - 147:18
booster [1] - 13:10
BOOTHE [89] - 8:10, 12:5, 12:16, 27:8, 27:13, 28:3, 30:11, 30:17, 32:7, 32:13, 33:12, 35:18, 36:11, 36:16, 37:13, 38:15, 38:17, 41:3, 41:9, 43:8, 43:12, 44:6, 44:11, 45:3, 45:10, 46:4, 46:17, 47:1, 47:19, 48:7, 49:11, 49:17, 50:16, 51:3, 51:19, 53:8, 53:11, 54:15, 55:11, 58:13, 59:9, 65:8, 65:11, 65:16, 65:19, 66:5, 66:18, 67:2, 71:1, 71:6, 73:10, 73:14, 73:17, 74:6, 74:10, 74:16, 76:3, 76:14, 77:1, 77:12, 77:15, 78:1, 79:9, 80:2, 80:14, 80:17, 81:12, 88:19, 96:17, 97:2, 102:18, 103:16, 104:17, 107:5, 109:5, 115:16, 126:1, 127:12, 127:18, 128:5, 128:13, 155:1, 158:19, 163:5, 164:5, 164:8, 166:3, 167:3, 167:11
Boothe [2] - 1:14, 125:14
borders [1] - 140:14
bore [1] - 12:7
Born [2] - 3:10, 5:4
BORN [73] - 5:4, 7:18, 28:2, 32:14, 33:9, 33:17, 34:16, 36:14, 37:9, 37:14, 38:4, 38:13, 43:10, 43:16, 44:1, 44:10, 44:16, 44:19, 46:11, 46:18, 47:3, 47:13, 48:2, 48:8, 48:16, 65:4, 65:6, 65:9, 65:12, 65:17, 66:3, 66:9, 66:12, 67:1, 73:6, 73:12, 74:3, 74:8, 74:13, 74:18, 75:14, 76:4, 76:7, 97:1, 97:3, 108:10, 109:1, 109:8, 109:13, 109:19, 110:4, 114:11, 114:13, 114:17, 114:19, 118:8, 123:2, 123:5, 125:13, 126:7, 127:8, 151:7, 158:12, 158:15, 158:18, 159:12, 160:15, 161:10, 161:16, 164:9, 167:1, 171:9, 172:9
Boston [30] - 6:14, 27:18, 30:7, 31:4, 31:5, 33:2, 33:16, 34:18, 38:19, 43:2, 48:19, 49:5, 50:13, 67:12, 102:10, 106:16, 114:8, 115:2, 115:9, 115:18, 116:7, 118:17, 119:2, 119:9, 121:16, 126:17, 141:5, 161:19, 168:18, 172:3
bough [1] - 119:16
bought [1] - 15:14
boundaries [1] - 102:15
box [2] - 133:4, 172:7
boy [1] - 113:4
BP [4] - 76:8, 110:9, 137:2, 162:6
break [3] - 83:3, 85:12, 87:5
BRIAN [24] - 53:16, 72:9, 73:16, 73:19, 106:14, 107:4, 111:8, 125:2, 125:5, 131:5, 136:12, 141:7, 146:18, 149:12, 149:16, 151:11, 153:7, 153:10, 153:14, 161:15, 164:3, 164:6, 164:17, 167:17
Brian [10] - 1:12, 3:4, 53:13, 56:6, 107:15, 118:11, 149:9, 151:7, 153:4, 161:11
brick [1] - 70:13
brief [2] - 30:12, 139:5
bright [1] - 109:17
brilliant [1] - 70:18
bring [2] - 16:10, 124:19
bringing [1] - 157:7
brings [1] - 11:14
BRISTOL [1] - 176:3
Broad [32] - 11:13, 15:3, 19:8, 21:3, 21:19, 22:1, 30:2, 40:10, 40:14, 41:11, 42:1, 42:2, 46:15, 48:1, 48:2, 48:11, 49:15, 50:2, 50:3, 50:6, 60:7, 61:5, 61:6, 117:12, 125:3, 127:16, 128:3, 128:5, 128:16, 129:9
broad [3] - 22:3, 82:14, 113:8
broader [1] - 111:15
broadly [1] - 170:19
Broadway [6] - 1:5, 62:15, 71:14, 92:1, 107:2, 108:14
broke [1] - 85:12
broken [1] - 19:19
brother [1] - 34:13
brought [2] - 17:3, 130:16
Brown [1] - 18:7
build [14] - 41:11, 48:11, 49:3, 51:16, 51:17, 51:18, 51:19, 52:1, 90:9, 103:14, 108:16, 110:15, 129:17, 152:15
building [70] - 15:3, 15:6, 17:3, 20:6, 20:7, 20:14, 21:1, 21:2, 22:19, 24:12, 25:17, 26:1, 32:1, 36:13, 40:5, 42:13, 49:19, 51:9, 52:11, 52:14, 52:19, 53:12, 54:6, 54:16, 55:3, 58:9, 58:14, 65:10, 67:8, 67:9, 69:1, 69:3, 69:15, 69:17, 71:17, 73:11, 73:13, 73:18, 74:5, 74:7, 74:9, 75:3, 75:7, 75:11, 76:19, 78:3, 81:8, 85:14, 92:16, 95:14, 103:12, 111:19, 112:1, 112:8, 112:12, 113:12, 120:10, 120:17, 120:18, 120:19, 130:17, 143:1, 145:8, 147:9, 147:19, 154:4
Building [17] - 1:5, 19:12, 22:5, 25:18, 26:14, 26:15, 42:3, 61:18, 64:14, 65:7, 68:7, 73:8, 110:7, 110:8, 128:4, 128:6, 128:16
building-by-building [1] - 85:14
buildings [50] - 16:16, 19:18, 20:19, 25:17, 26:3, 35:16, 39:3, 39:18, 49:4, 51:11, 55:1, 55:4, 55:16, 55:18, 60:1, 65:10, 65:18, 66:2, 67:4, 68:12, 70:12, 71:3, 72:6, 73:1, 73:4, 73:7, 74:12, 74:14, 76:12, 77:11, 79:14, 79:15, 81:6, 98:12, 99:9, 103:13, 103:14, 106:9, 106:16, 107:3, 107:8, 107:16, 111:4, 112:10, 112:11, 113:8, 113:10, 113:14, 124:19, 143:8
built [14] - 27:11, 49:1, 67:11, 73:4, 83:13, 96:6, 105:15, 110:17, 110:18, 113:4, 120:10, 123:6, 127:16
bulk [1] - 133:6
bureaucracy [4] - 149:14, 150:9, 150:12, 152:5
BUSINESS [1] - 3:2
business [5] - 89:15, 119:17, 119:18, 147:6, 147:11
buy [2] - 141:12, 147:19
buying [1] - 28:12
BY [1] - 176:18

C

C2 [4] - 137:12, 168:1, 168:6, 169:3
cafes [1] - 20:4
calculation [2] - 90:18, 90:19
California [1] - 34:11
CAMBRIDGE [1] - 1:1
Cambridge [47] - 1:6, 3:7, 3:8, 4:3, 4:5, 9:13, 11:2, 12:13, 14:4, 15:14, 16:9, 19:5, 22:6, 23:17, 24:14, 24:19, 31:11, 32:3, 32:11, 32:19, 34:18, 35:1, 36:2, 36:9, 36:19, 40:3, 40:7, 53:3, 55:9, 55:11, 56:1, 72:12, 75:17, 76:2, 76:19, 83:10, 85:2, 101:9, 101:14, 101:18, 114:3, 117:19, 122:1, 139:12, 140:11, 171:15, 172:18
Cambridgeport [1] - 35:13
campus [1] - 171:14
Canal [12] - 11:13, 14:8, 15:2, 15:4, 19:9, 21:3, 21:19, 22:1, 22:3, 61:5, 61:6
cap [1] - 90:4
capacity [3] - 48:11, 96:3, 116:17
capital [1] - 54:7
capture [1] - 111:5
CAPTURING [1] - 1:18
card [1] - 14:3
care [1] - 70:12
careful [1] - 150:2
carefully [2] - 42:6, 64:12
CARLONE [1] - 12:14
Carlone's [1] - 12:11
carves [1] - 130:11
case [4] - 16:18, 127:13, 129:9, 168:17
cases [6] - 113:11, 113:12, 121:13, 124:1, 134:7, 165:10
Cases [1] - 3:3
category [1] - 123:18
Catherine [4] - 1:10, 5:1, 176:4, 176:13
CATHERINE [1] - 4:19
caused [1] - 123:14
causes [1] - 154:2
CAZ [1] - 175:2
CBT [1] - 140:10
CDD [1] - 129:6
center [2] - 58:8, 85:3
Center [11] - 19:12, 22:6, 25:19, 53:9, 75:18, 76:1, 76:2, 83:10, 101:10, 101:18, 122:1
centers [2] - 55:5, 99:19
Central [12] - 10:10,

11:8, 29:2, 29:4, 56:16, 57:4, 57:14, 131:12, 131:13, 137:15, 169:13, 172:13
central [1] - 10:17
centroidal [1] - 72:2
certain [8] - 35:2, 45:14, 78:16, 85:6, 90:10, 92:2, 92:13, 121:12
certainly [14] - 12:10, 13:8, 13:16, 16:13, 23:14, 35:18, 37:7, 46:5, 72:4, 103:19, 141:9, 146:8, 147:1, 168:9
CERTIFICATION [1] - 176:17
Certified [2] - 176:4, 176:14
certify [2] - 176:5, 176:8
CERTIFYING [1] - 176:19
chair [3] - 7:18, 11:16, 70:8
Chair [2] - 1:7, 1:7
challenge [1] - 71:7
challenges [2] - 150:8, 153:2
challenging [1] - 94:12
chance [1] - 166:12
change [20] - 47:11, 47:13, 47:14, 49:2, 69:3, 89:9, 96:18, 103:7, 105:12, 112:8, 123:6, 136:5, 138:9, 155:14, 164:13, 164:16, 168:7, 168:10, 171:13, 175:4
CHANGE [6] - 175:9, 175:10, 175:11, 175:12, 175:13, 175:14
changed [2] - 45:9, 71:16
changes [7] - 5:18, 21:15, 115:19, 121:4, 144:15, 174:13, 175:17
character [6] - 57:13, 58:19, 63:17, 69:2, 70:7, 72:2
characteristics [1] - 83:5
charge [1] - 29:7
Charlie [3] - 65:13, 67:10, 67:16
Chris [2] - 5:2, 139:6
Christopher [1] - 3:11
CHRISTOPHER [5] - 5:2, 33:7, 116:3, 139:4, 139:8
Chuck [1] - 126:19
circles [1] - 61:3
circuit [1] - 14:11
cities [1] - 33:12
city [31] - 6:2, 6:19, 11:4, 14:19, 17:10, 18:9, 22:10, 23:13, 31:15, 31:16, 31:17, 43:10, 51:15, 57:1, 84:6, 98:13, 101:8, 119:8, 123:13, 131:2, 131:4, 135:2, 137:14, 138:14, 140:4, 141:10, 144:3, 148:7, 169:6, 170:19
CITY [1] - 1:1
City [26] - 1:5, 1:12, 3:4, 18:10, 28:17, 29:6, 32:19, 40:18, 41:12, 43:3, 48:5, 50:3, 50:6, 56:6, 56:7, 58:2, 59:16, 60:17, 80:15, 85:15, 113:7, 115:8, 130:16, 137:9, 160:6, 167:19
city's [2] - 86:8, 138:15
City's [1] - 12:19
citywide [2] - 17:8, 22:14
Citywide [2] - 170:18, 172:15
clamoring [2] - 65:3, 136:1
Clancy [5] - 59:6, 103:17, 140:9, 141:6
Clancy's [1] - 108:3
clarity [1] - 167:12
clean [2] - 28:13, 107:12
clear [3] - 36:18, 84:11, 127:5
clearest [1] - 84:7
clearing [1] - 15:12
clearly [4] - 16:17, 58:18, 104:3, 170:1
climate [1] - 135:14
clock [3] - 65:10, 67:9, 74:4
close [5] - 6:11, 61:13, 61:15, 143:12, 144:1
closely [2] - 99:18, 119:18
closer [2] - 19:3, 22:13
closest [2] - 74:4, 148:18
code [1] - 118:14
coding [1] - 109:5
Cohen [5] - 1:7, 1:11, 4:13, 4:16, 13:6
COHEN [12] - 4:13, 4:16, 33:8, 96:12, 98:1, 118:3, 128:14, 129:15, 130:13, 141:4, 149:9, 149:13
collateral [1] - 36:14
color [2] - 107:6, 109:5
colored [1] - 19:14
comfortable [1] - 106:11
coming [15] - 5:9, 9:16, 15:19, 22:11, 26:19, 31:18, 82:11, 82:18, 95:15, 105:13, 153:8, 155:18, 165:15, 166:8, 173:11
commenced [1] - 15:5
comment [5] - 12:6, 70:9, 105:4, 139:5, 142:12
commercial [13] - 48:11, 90:4, 91:14, 96:4, 96:10, 104:15, 107:9, 110:10, 110:17, 111:3, 111:5, 111:13, 134:5
Commission [4] - 70:3, 80:5, 131:12, 176:15
commissioned [1] - 140:11
commitment [5] - 48:6, 48:12, 48:15, 51:14, 159:6
committee [11] - 63:18, 68:8, 92:9, 103:19, 125:16, 144:9, 145:17, 146:14, 147:1, 156:11, 158:14
Committee [10] - 5:17, 16:2, 25:3, 46:6, 131:14, 155:5, 156:17, 157:4, 163:13, 173:3
committee's [1] - 144:8
committees [3] - 16:3, 24:2, 57:12
common [1] - 9:18
COMMONWEALTH [1] - 176:2
communicate [1] - 84:8
communities [1] - 33:1
community [12] - 13:4, 15:16, 30:19, 63:4, 64:3, 64:6, 91:10, 100:4, 101:4, 148:8, 149:14, 154:9
Community [11] - 1:12, 1:13, 3:5, 78:15, 82:2, 115:13, 125:10, 126:8, 154:15, 174:3, 174:8
companies [1] - 99:15
company [3] - 15:13, 60:8, 141:2
complementing [1] - 14:19
completed [1] - 174:6
COMPLETED [1] - 174:17
Complex [1] - 37:12
compliant [1] - 45:8
complicated [4] - 40:17, 46:9, 150:15, 168:5
component [3] - 20:11, 20:17, 162:17
components [1] - 63:1
comprehensive [2] - 94:5, 144:17
concept [1] - 87:17
conceptual [3] - 45:15, 96:13, 111:15
conceptually [2] - 98:1, 143:3
concern [1] - 46:7
concerned [2] - 144:3, 173:4
concerns [1] - 15:17
conclusion [1] - 140:13
concrete [1] - 65:9
concurrence [1] - 70:11
conditions [1] - 135:16
conduct [2] - 128:19, 129:11
cone [1] - 38:3
configuration [1] - 62:12
configure [1] - 94:2
confluence [2] - 70:16, 71:3
conforming [1] - 87:5
confused [1] - 75:9
Congress [1] - 154:11
Congressman [1] - 154:6
conjecture [1] - 12:2
connect [4] - 39:2, 62:15, 100:18, 101:3
connected [1] - 18:16
connecting [2] - 14:9, 53:1
connection [1] - 69:6
connections [2] - 61:17, 100:17
connectiveness [1] - 14:7
connector [2] - 120:19, 121:6
CONNOLLY [1] - 4:19
Connolly [2] - 1:10, 5:1
CONRAD [4] - 5:5, 76:6, 76:15, 157:2
Conrad [4] - 3:9, 5:5, 75:15, 158:8
consensus [1] - 161:4
consider [2] - 54:9, 88:4
consideration [1] - 83:9
considered [3] - 74:14, 74:17, 140:17
considering [2] - 60:18, 137:13
consistency [2] - 131:2
consistent [1] - 134:8
constraints [1] - 140:3
constructed [1] - 40:14
construction [2] - 42:2, 58:3
consultants [1] - 59:6
consultants' [1] - 126:9
consultation [1] - 139:19
consulting [1] - 151:17
context [7] - 9:10, 26:5, 51:4, 52:8, 69:4, 163:9
contextual [2] -

117:5, 166:19
continuation [1] - 54:1
continue [3] - 53:4, 80:12, 86:1
continuing [1] - 40:6
continuity [1] - 21:7
contract [3] - 34:3, 120:11, 126:18
contractors [1] - 151:16
contracts [2] - 120:8, 126:9
contradictory [1] - 58:17
CONTROL [1] - 176:18
control [5] - 26:9, 31:13, 50:15, 114:6, 169:10
controversy [1] - 64:14
conversation [9] - 10:1, 137:9, 137:11, 138:4, 138:6, 143:15, 146:5, 157:6, 157:11
convinced [3] - 60:9, 81:15, 105:17
convincing [2] - 54:18, 60:3
Coop [3] - 110:7, 110:8, 111:3
coordinated [1] - 100:15
copy [4] - 82:9, 82:10, 88:18, 174:6
core [1] - 168:13
corner [2] - 40:1, 40:5
correct [5] - 29:17, 66:17, 74:15, 121:11, 125:19
correction [1] - 175:5
corrections [2] - 174:12, 175:17
Corridor [1] - 61:12
Cosi [1] - 73:13
costs [1] - 147:14
coterminous [1] - 102:12
Council [34] - 6:5, 28:18, 29:6, 32:19, 40:18, 41:12, 43:3, 45:2, 48:5, 56:6, 56:8, 58:2, 59:7, 60:14, 60:18, 77:10, 78:14, 79:1, 80:6, 80:15, 83:9, 85:15, 115:9, 137:10, 156:6, 158:15, 158:17, 160:7, 164:18, 165:17, 165:19, 167:9, 167:19, 173:1
Councillor [1] - 67:19
COUNCILLOR [1] - 160:13
Councillors [2] - 77:16, 165:3
count [1] - 124:4
counting [1] - 91:13
country [1] - 26:12
couple [9] - 20:19, 44:2, 47:2, 77:15, 85:13, 101:16, 102:6, 123:13, 143:14
course [5] - 20:10, 31:15, 51:4, 64:7, 131:18
Courthouse [1] - 25:17
courtyard [1] - 58:7
cover [1] - 82:13
covered [1] - 124:3
CRA [23] - 13:14, 28:4, 28:5, 51:6, 83:10, 87:12, 119:6, 120:12, 122:18, 123:1, 124:11, 124:15, 126:9, 126:13, 128:8, 136:14, 136:15, 137:13, 139:8, 139:10, 155:8, 157:4, 166:11
CRA's [1] - 138:6
crack [1] - 171:12
CRAWFORD [4] - 5:5, 76:6, 76:15, 157:2
Crawford [2] - 3:9, 5:6
crazy [2] - 13:18, 15:7
CRDD [1] - 130:18
cream [1] - 38:3
create [6] - 18:15, 86:5, 90:16, 94:2, 99:13, 157:17
created [5] - 18:12, 30:19, 68:13, 85:5, 124:10
creating [1] - 62:7
creative [1] - 153:2
critical [3] - 89:15, 150:16
critiquable [1] - 159:10
critique [2] - 155:12, 163:12
culture [1] - 62:9
current [11] - 10:3, 27:1, 40:16, 54:6, 90:2, 93:11, 93:14, 97:14, 102:17, 138:8, 154:4
curves [1] - 40:2

D

Dash [1] - 1:15
DASH [14] - 41:2, 43:18, 44:5, 45:5, 48:14, 51:17, 59:2, 74:19, 124:9, 125:4, 130:15, 157:15, 164:12, 172:7
DATE [1] - 175:1
date [2] - 80:13, 175:6
DC [1] - 149:15
dead [1] - 75:17
deal [9] - 40:17, 41:12, 44:15, 56:4, 75:2, 81:11, 144:4, 150:9, 154:9
dealing [5] - 7:5, 39:13, 149:11, 150:11, 151:1
deals [1] - 31:9
dealt [1] - 126:3
debate [1] - 152:7
decades [1] - 10:19
decide [2] - 93:2, 136:15
decided [3] - 6:2, 34:9, 64:17
deciding [1] - 69:15
decision [1] - 163:9
decisions [1] - 117:10
deck [4] - 121:18, 122:2, 122:4, 122:11
declare [2] - 29:4, 150:4
dedicated [1] - 122:19
define [1] - 64:1
definitely [5] - 39:12, 68:15, 77:5, 80:17, 172:5
delivered [4] - 174:3, 174:7, 174:8, 174:10
demand [2] - 79:3, 157:17
demolishing [1] - 35:14
Dennis [2] - 12:11, 12:16
DENNIS [1] - 12:14
Dennis's [1] - 12:19
density [2] - 92:19, 134:15
Department [8] - 6:15, 95:11, 118:7, 125:10, 126:8, 129:5, 174:4, 174:9
department [1] - 31:3
Department's [1] - 115:13
departments [1] - 119:8
Deputy [2] - 151:3
described [4] - 117:11, 133:2, 133:12, 155:6
design [26] - 6:6, 11:6, 11:7, 17:4, 17:9, 17:16, 35:10, 35:12, 54:18, 58:7, 58:12, 62:19, 64:9, 79:17, 98:8, 111:18, 121:12, 121:13, 125:15, 126:10, 126:12, 126:18, 128:8, 128:19, 129:11, 131:11
designed [1] - 58:13
designer [1] - 70:18
designers [1] - 71:9
designing [1] - 52:2
designs [2] - 52:6, 75:4
desirable [1] - 138:15
desks [1] - 74:1
desperate [1] - 28:15
desperately [1] - 57:19
detail [3] - 10:8, 85:1, 100:5
detailed [2] - 49:14, 133:11
details [2] - 10:14, 51:1
determinations [1] - 70:4
determine [1] - 146:7
develop [4] - 102:4, 115:7, 117:5, 138:18
developed [4] - 99:13, 105:16, 106:8, 120:7
developer [11] - 15:5, 17:2, 17:13, 28:14, 118:18, 132:1, 147:18, 152:16, 158:5, 170:11, 170:16
developers [7] - 25:2, 38:1, 91:11, 94:12, 119:12, 147:7, 170:12
Development [10] - 1:12, 1:13, 3:5, 78:15, 82:2, 115:13, 125:10, 126:8, 174:3, 174:8
development [47] - 9:6, 11:10, 27:18, 28:15, 28:17, 29:11, 29:16, 31:12, 46:16, 64:5, 72:5, 85:3, 86:6, 86:16, 87:6, 88:6, 89:19, 95:1, 96:9, 96:10, 98:9, 100:8, 101:2, 103:9, 105:10, 106:6, 114:9, 118:14, 119:15, 120:6, 120:8, 120:11, 121:1, 121:5, 129:8, 132:19, 133:19, 135:14, 136:2, 136:3, 136:9, 139:12, 140:4, 142:16, 147:15, 165:7, 169:2
developments [1] - 37:17
diagonally [1] - 51:10
dictated [1] - 130:4
difference [2] - 106:13, 162:19
differences [2] - 78:12, 80:8
different [31] - 9:17, 11:9, 11:10, 47:4, 67:3, 78:17, 83:1, 85:14, 93:3, 94:17, 94:18, 100:15, 112:9, 123:12, 135:15, 136:9, 136:16, 137:3, 142:1, 149:19, 151:18, 154:9, 156:15, 169:4, 169:5, 169:6, 169:9, 169:12, 169:17, 170:2, 172:4
differently [4] - 123:19, 124:1, 134:12, 134:13
difficult [1] - 48:7
diminish [1] - 120:13
DIRECT [1] - 176:18
direction [3] - 13:11, 41:18, 165:12
DIRECTION [1] - 176:18
director [1] - 28:7
Director [1] - 145:4
disagreeing [1] - 171:4
disasters [1] - 154:19
discover [1] - 81:5
discovering [1] -

143:19
discuss [2] - 7:2, 118:4
discussed [2] - 85:10, 90:5
discussing [1] - 8:6
discussion [8] - 11:18, 87:12, 92:6, 93:1, 100:7, 151:6, 160:19, 173:11
discussions [2] - 122:9, 147:3
disposition [3] - 45:6, 163:7, 166:17
dissension [1] - 17:1
distributed [1] - 92:18
distribution [1] - 175:8
district [17] - 6:7, 41:7, 71:17, 85:3, 86:6, 87:19, 98:19, 100:10, 104:4, 130:12, 133:8, 133:11, 133:12, 135:2, 135:11, 140:16, 153:5
District [4] - 85:2, 124:10, 130:14, 133:16
districts [2] - 23:4, 98:17
diversion [1] - 56:9
divided [1] - 77:13
division [3] - 132:10, 132:11, 134:2
DO [1] - 175:5
doable [2] - 168:14, 168:15
docks [1] - 42:12
DOES [1] - 176:17
dollar [1] - 28:14
dollars [2] - 51:16, 54:9
domain [1] - 141:2
done [22] - 6:12, 7:7, 16:9, 20:16, 29:3, 36:10, 64:2, 68:5, 69:1, 71:8, 81:13, 87:2, 87:3, 111:12, 113:19, 121:16, 140:10, 144:5, 155:12, 161:5, 166:15, 170:5
door [1] - 38:6
doorknob [1] - 23:7
DOT [12] - 26:15, 28:6, 28:8, 29:10, 54:3, 84:7, 84:9, 150:13, 151:2, 152:9, 161:1, 161:12
DOT's [1] - 161:7
doubt [1] - 116:18
down [30] - 9:5, 19:11, 19:19, 20:8, 21:3, 23:6, 29:5, 35:16, 38:16, 40:3, 40:12, 42:14, 55:12, 56:17, 61:1, 68:8, 68:16, 77:3, 78:3, 79:19, 80:3, 83:3, 103:13, 113:12, 119:19, 121:14, 134:16, 164:16
downtown [3] - 28:13, 56:19, 135:12
downtowns [1] - 28:12
dozen [1] - 14:18
dramatic [2] - 78:9, 138:9
dramatically [1] - 135:15
Draper [3] - 25:19, 26:16, 27:11
drawing [4] - 38:10, 75:12, 132:13, 153:14
drawings [1] - 49:14
drawn [1] - 158:4
drift [1] - 167:15
drill [1] - 134:16
drilled [1] - 121:14
Drive [1] - 37:14
driven [1] - 137:17
driving [1] - 149:7
DRURY [15] - 5:3, 43:6, 80:10, 80:16, 102:7, 102:13, 103:4, 104:9, 105:3, 110:14, 122:16, 123:3, 132:5, 144:12, 145:12
Drury [2] - 3:10, 5:3
during [1] - 47:11
Dutch [1] - 54:19
Dutch-ended [1] - 54:19
dwelling [1] - 97:11
dynamic [2] - 59:10, 90:16

E

early [5] - 13:1, 13:16, 15:11, 119:13, 135:13
easier [1] - 161:1
easily [1] - 110:10
east [1] - 56:1
East [7] - 11:2, 12:12, 24:18, 40:3, 72:11, 140:11, 172:18
Eastern [2] - 9:13, 23:17
eastern [1] - 55:2
easy [1] - 26:7
ECaPs [11] - 23:18, 23:19, 24:10, 47:3, 47:11, 56:9, 62:12, 158:9, 170:8, 171:2, 171:8
economic [1] - 162:19
economically [1] - 148:9
Ed [1] - 35:5
edge [1] - 142:8
edges [2] - 141:18, 141:19
educate [1] - 78:19
educated [1] - 173:7
educating [1] - 78:14
education [1] - 116:8
effectively [2] - 84:8, 96:8
effort [1] - 72:12
efforts [1] - 15:1
either [8] - 55:1, 98:15, 108:17, 110:13, 112:11, 151:3, 169:10, 172:7
elect [1] - 34:1
elected [1] - 150:17
election [2] - 167:9, 167:14
element [2] - 58:5, 58:6
elements [3] - 10:5, 69:18, 129:2
Elkus [4] - 68:5, 75:12, 81:12, 155:10
eloquently [1] - 118:10
elsewhere [2] - 123:12, 141:13
eminent [1] - 141:2
emotion [2] - 79:11, 79:13
emotional [1] - 68:14
employees [3] - 55:6, 151:4, 151:15
employing [1] - 98:15
enabling [1] - 37:19
enact [2] - 6:5, 160:9
enacted [2] - 6:10, 32:10
encourage [4] - 63:19, 94:16, 136:3, 137:2
encouragement [1] - 135:5
encourages [1] - 79:2
encouraging [2] - 91:7, 91:9
end [14] - 10:4, 10:15, 17:7, 21:16, 23:13, 40:3, 55:1, 55:7, 55:12, 59:15, 81:14, 134:11, 151:16, 164:14
ended [3] - 28:16, 29:10, 54:19
ends [1] - 146:6
energy [6] - 57:15, 64:4, 98:11, 98:13, 99:3, 153:19
engage [1] - 146:3
engaged [2] - 141:13, 154:14
engaging [1] - 138:6
engineer [1] - 165:11
England [1] - 58:15
enliven [1] - 142:5
enormous [2] - 75:2, 81:13
enriching [1] - 91:10
ensemble [1] - 67:15
enter [1] - 72:11
enterprise [1] - 151:13
enticing [1] - 31:14
entire [1] - 6:7
entirely [1] - 139:9
entities [2] - 140:4, 169:11
entitlement [1] - 50:14
entity [4] - 34:13, 34:14, 119:15, 139:11
entrance [1] - 76:1
entrepreneurial [1] - 99:15
entries [1] - 42:14
entry [1] - 42:13
enumeration [1] - 89:5
envelope [2] - 87:6, 169:15
environmental [1] - 62:8
envision [2] - 32:15, 105:16
envisioned [1] - 24:10
equivalent [1] - 134:5
era [4] - 19:3, 25:16, 26:12, 28:4
ERRATA [3] - 174:1, 174:17, 175:3
Errata [4] - 174:2, 174:5, 174:13, 175:7
errata [1] - 175:6
error [1] - 27:14
escalating [1] - 48:16
especially [3] - 9:9, 15:1, 124:10
essentially [7] - 36:15, 90:19, 104:13, 108:16, 119:10, 147:16, 161:13
establish [2] - 88:2, 100:12
establishments [2] - 90:15, 91:11
evaluators [1] - 43:11
Evans [1] - 34:2
EVANS [1] - 34:14
evening [4] - 4:2, 8:1, 10:9, 34:3
everywhere [1] - 19:13
evolution [1] - 9:12
evolve [2] - 137:1, 137:2
evolved [2] - 23:9, 125:7
exact [2] - 136:6, 158:3
exactly [8] - 41:9, 45:16, 98:4, 113:13, 122:9, 138:5, 145:12, 154:4
example [3] - 121:6, 125:3, 152:3
excellent [3] - 8:7, 20:18, 36:17
except [1] - 175:16
exceptional [1] - 138:17
excess [1] - 95:12
exchange [2] - 86:11, 138:18
exchanges [1] - 141:9
excited [2] - 14:12, 25:6
exciting [5] - 53:2, 62:1, 69:14, 78:10, 149:1
excuse [2] - 30:9, 34:11
Executive [1] - 145:4
exempt [4] - 90:14, 122:5, 123:16, 124:4
exempted [1] - 90:17
exempting [1] - 120:16
exemption [1] - 130:11

exercise [1] - 7:13
exist [3] - 107:8, 119:14, 139:13
existed [1] - 135:16
existence [1] - 95:4
existing [11] - 39:3, 40:10, 95:16, 104:12, 107:16, 108:1, 108:13, 109:7, 109:16, 110:16, 112:4
exists [1] - 124:18
expand [4] - 13:17, 50:2, 58:1, 89:18
expanding [1] - 20:8
expansion [10] - 30:2, 40:1, 40:9, 40:14, 42:1, 51:7, 60:2, 60:7, 111:4, 111:13
expect [4] - 43:19, 103:5, 103:6, 136:8
expectation [1] - 41:14
expected [1] - 54:14
expecting [1] - 14:17
experience [2] - 75:8
experts [1] - 122:7
Expires [1] - 176:15
explain [2] - 108:11, 151:8
explained [1] - 88:3
explore [2] - 54:4, 54:11
exploring [1] - 53:18
extend [2] - 92:11, 100:19
extent [3] - 149:1, 164:13, 172:17
exterior [1] - 69:16
extra [3] - 43:5, 44:8, 169:1
extremely [2] - 17:19, 20:2
eye [1] - 53:4
eyes [1] - 12:11

F

fabric [1] - 70:19
fabulous [1] - 22:11
face [2] - 69:1, 153:3
fact [5] - 14:3, 15:17, 25:9, 105:14, 154:16
factory [1] - 38:3
factual [2] - 132:15, 133:13
faculty [1] - 68:8
failed [1] - 15:17
failure [1] - 25:8
fair [5] - 78:1, 81:16, 116:6, 119:4, 159:13
fairly [6] - 9:4, 9:19, 10:2, 85:6, 116:9, 169:11
fairness [1] - 49:12
falls [1] - 133:8
familiar [2] - 131:8, 146:15
familiarity [1] - 165:19
family [1] - 120:2
fantastic [1] - 111:17
FAR [1] - 90:17
far [7] - 37:15, 68:10, 87:3, 96:18, 158:8, 163:13, 164:15
FAROOQ [24] - 47:7, 47:10, 47:14, 48:3, 48:10, 104:3, 104:11, 104:18, 107:1, 107:7, 108:13, 109:3, 109:12, 109:15, 110:1, 110:5, 111:1, 128:3, 128:12, 134:7, 145:13, 170:4, 170:14, 171:2
Farooq [1] - 1:16
fascinating [1] - 31:2
fashion [1] - 130:15
fast [3] - 12:6, 89:11, 116:17
faster [1] - 140:2
feasibility [1] - 98:16
feasible [1] - 160:8
features [2] - 87:19, 125:9
Federal [5] - 28:8, 36:3, 151:18, 152:11, 152:19
federal [6] - 30:18, 32:10, 32:16, 36:8, 150:9, 150:12
fee [2] - 151:13, 152:14
fee-for-service [1] - 151:13
feedback [3] - 146:11, 159:2, 165:4
feeds [1] - 101:1
feelings [1] - 172:2
feet [30] - 41:13, 43:4, 47:15, 47:16, 48:9, 72:5, 81:9, 90:1, 90:3, 92:10, 92:12, 93:12, 93:14, 96:14, 96:16, 97:15, 97:17, 104:7, 104:14, 110:17, 132:18, 132:19, 133:4, 133:10, 134:3, 155:10, 155:19, 156:2, 156:13, 164:1
fellow [1] - 157:6
felt [1] - 93:4
few [11] - 7:11, 10:18, 43:19, 51:8, 81:19, 103:7, 112:18, 119:12, 158:6, 166:13, 166:15
Fifth [1] - 55:14
fifties [1] - 135:13
figure [7] - 7:4, 19:7, 29:13, 140:6, 147:14, 149:19, 152:13
file [1] - 167:13
fill [8] - 37:17, 38:2, 39:4, 103:9, 103:17, 104:5, 121:1, 143:1
final [2] - 110:5, 166:4
finally [2] - 15:19, 53:14
finish [2] - 34:15, 51:8
finished [1] - 34:3
fire [1] - 59:19
first [18] - 7:2, 8:4, 15:2, 16:3, 23:1, 32:6, 35:12, 61:6, 64:19, 78:2, 83:7, 108:11, 111:11, 116:13, 143:16, 144:18, 171:5, 171:6
fit [6] - 44:13, 53:5, 55:8, 57:10, 153:4, 161:6
fits [1] - 69:3
five [1] - 167:8
fix [1] - 38:8
flame [1] - 166:10
flank [2] - 108:4, 108:16
flexibility [4] - 21:9, 89:13, 93:17, 93:19
flexible [1] - 95:16
flight [1] - 31:19
floating [1] - 58:17
floats [1] - 58:16
Floor [1] - 1:5
floor [16] - 20:18, 22:4, 24:15, 39:10, 42:18, 43:5, 57:9, 63:6, 68:19, 75:2, 81:10, 89:17, 90:18, 91:7, 91:18, 115:9
floors [1] - 63:2
flop [1] - 71:10
flow [3] - 69:6, 69:16, 75:6
focus [2] - 37:1, 143:11
focussed [4] - 37:7, 116:10, 116:19, 140:12
folks [3] - 99:18, 157:18, 169:14
follow [2] - 85:8, 149:6
followed [2] - 23:16, 32:17
following [3] - 146:18, 148:1, 171:9
follows [1] - 171:17
food [1] - 89:12
Food [1] - 42:4
foot [1] - 114:14
footage [7] - 41:7, 46:14, 49:8, 96:11, 122:3, 124:1, 124:5
FOR [1] - 1:1
foregoing [1] - 175:16
FOREGOING [1] - 176:17
foreground [1] - 75:5
foreshadowed [1] - 137:10
Forest [3] - 18:10, 59:16, 130:16
forget [1] - 26:7
form [2] - 67:15, 163:8
formative [1] - 11:4
forming [1] - 100:1
forth [3] - 31:9, 37:3, 176:9
fortuitus [1] - 54:5
fortunate [1] - 53:19
fortunately [1] - 14:15
forward [12] - 8:3, 8:5, 17:6, 21:18, 59:5, 83:8, 85:19, 124:15, 137:7, 145:19, 146:17, 157:7
foundation [1] - 49:18
founders [1] - 120:3
four [4] - 62:6, 89:19, 132:18, 150:19
frame [1] - 54:13
frames [1] - 16:16
framework [1] - 112:4
Francisco [4] - 33:15, 34:6, 34:8, 34:12
frankly [1] - 117:8
free [2] - 91:2, 121:11
friends [1] - 88:16
FROM [1] - 139:6
front [3] - 108:15, 109:8, 109:13
frontage [2] - 91:19, 92:3
frustrated [1] - 23:5
frustrations [2] - 119:7, 119:9
fulfill [2] - 51:14, 158:8
fulfilling [2] - 22:15, 39:9
full [3] - 90:9, 102:1, 113:2
fun [1] - 58:19
function [1] - 31:6
fund [3] - 31:8, 100:4, 100:13
funding [3] - 31:12, 135:9, 140:3
funds [2] - 30:18, 135:5
future [9] - 22:17, 46:15, 75:12, 96:9, 107:9, 107:10, 109:17, 110:1, 123:4

G

gaping [1] - 42:12
garage [10] - 39:5, 42:13, 42:14, 47:17, 48:6, 108:1, 108:4, 108:14, 108:17, 109:16
garages [1] - 95:6
garden [1] - 39:15
gas [2] - 18:13, 141:1
gee [1] - 173:9
GENERAL [2] - 1:2, 3:2
general [1] - 165:1
generally [1] - 74:13
generation [1] - 121:2
gently [1] - 116:5
Genzyme [3] - 20:6, 52:10, 52:14
GFA [1] - 124:18
given [7] - 29:7, 37:1, 124:17, 135:12, 138:8, 163:14, 168:6
givers [1] - 154:3
glassy [2] - 39:3, 55:3
glimpse [1] - 8:4
goal [2] - 93:8, 143:16
goals [8] - 16:17, 21:8, 22:15, 59:7, 117:1, 140:15, 161:3, 161:4
God [1] - 158:3

gonna [1] - 49:10
Goody [6] - 59:6, 103:17, 108:2, 140:9, 141:5
Google [8] - 29:18, 30:8, 39:1, 39:10, 106:7, 112:3, 120:18, 121:5
govern [1] - 6:8
Government [5] - 28:8, 36:4, 151:18, 152:12, 153:1
government [2] - 150:6, 151:10
granted [2] - 19:1, 105:19
graphics [1] - 28:1
great [21] - 6:1, 14:13, 24:2, 24:16, 40:8, 44:17, 54:17, 57:1, 62:7, 71:9, 72:7, 97:19, 117:4, 117:16, 134:14, 140:6, 145:19, 156:16, 173:10, 173:11
greater [1] - 165:18
green [4] - 98:15, 108:5, 109:17, 110:1
grey [2] - 68:4, 107:8
grey-blue [1] - 107:8
grips [1] - 105:13
gross [1] - 90:18
ground [15] - 20:18, 22:4, 24:6, 24:15, 39:9, 42:18, 57:9, 63:2, 63:6, 68:19, 75:2, 75:9, 91:7, 91:18, 155:10
group [4] - 128:9, 141:8, 168:8, 173:7
groups [2] - 98:15, 98:16
growth [1] - 121:3
GSA [2] - 150:13, 152:11
guess [8] - 50:10, 73:17, 97:4, 121:9, 123:17, 142:10, 163:18, 170:11
guests [1] - 4:4
guidelines [4] - 5:17, 6:6, 6:7, 69:18
guys [2] - 156:15, 166:7

H

Hall [1] - 1:5
hallmarks [1] - 20:10
Hammett [2] - 73:16, 73:18
hand [1] - 176:11
handsome [1] - 77:7
handy [2] - 10:16, 19:6
happy [2] - 11:19, 158:7
harbor [1] - 56:19
hard [6] - 5:13, 39:8, 53:13, 133:6, 159:4, 166:7
hardest [1] - 171:11
Harrington [3] - 37:4, 37:18, 38:12
Harvard [3] - 29:1, 29:3, 35:10
hate [1] - 159:2
hates [1] - 172:1
Haven [1] - 35:4
head [2] - 71:12, 71:13
heads [3] - 7:14, 155:4, 167:13
healthy [1] - 148:11
hear [5] - 65:17, 103:6, 116:4, 146:10, 159:15
heard [8] - 18:17, 32:5, 63:9, 65:3, 68:10, 108:12, 116:14, 157:8
HEARING [1] - 1:2
hearing [5] - 9:3, 65:14, 156:5, 165:1, 167:19
hearings [1] - 138:4
heart [1] - 22:10
heat [1] - 99:4
heck [1] - 150:7
height [6] - 92:5, 92:10, 97:7, 106:1, 142:17, 162:12
held [1] - 119:18
help [8] - 7:13, 18:11, 36:9, 70:14, 90:15, 101:3, 158:6, 159:11
helped [1] - 16:4
helpful [1] - 169:3
helping [2] - 38:8, 69:10
helps [1] - 55:8
hereby [1] - 175:17
hereinbefore [1] - 176:9
hereunto [1] - 176:11
Hickey [1] - 38:14
hideous [1] - 42:10
high [3] - 25:9, 26:8, 55:7
higher [1] - 70:15
highways [1] - 32:1
hip [1] - 67:17
hire [1] - 150:10
hiring [1] - 155:10
Historic [1] - 131:11
historic [10] - 32:3, 55:4, 64:12, 66:1, 68:12, 70:6, 73:1, 76:12, 79:3, 131:9
Historical [1] - 70:3
historical [4] - 46:12, 55:1, 113:14, 119:7
historically [1] - 67:15
history [9] - 9:19, 11:10, 36:19, 86:7, 117:9, 118:14, 126:16, 134:18, 135:3
hit [1] - 171:7
hold [2] - 117:5, 119:19
hole [3] - 53:6, 53:8, 83:19
holistically [1] - 88:11
hope [7] - 13:9, 54:12, 61:16, 71:19, 76:9, 125:17, 171:11
hopeful [2] - 53:16, 81:4
hopefully [2] - 82:9, 168:18
hopes [2] - 6:5, 21:19
horizontal [1] - 147:12
Hospital [1] - 37:15
hosting [2] - 7:19, 8:2
hot [1] - 35:11
hotel [2] - 21:10
Hotel [2] - 13:17, 42:3
hours [3] - 143:14, 145:8, 159:7
houses [1] - 38:9
housing [78] - 17:17, 18:2, 18:3, 18:4, 20:6, 20:16, 21:2, 21:11, 21:12, 22:4, 23:2, 24:4, 30:3, 30:5, 37:3, 37:17, 38:1, 41:1, 41:8, 41:10, 41:15, 42:5, 46:6, 46:15, 47:17, 49:3, 49:14, 49:19, 50:1, 50:7, 50:8, 57:9, 63:3, 63:8, 63:9, 63:12, 71:19, 90:8, 90:11, 92:14, 93:9, 96:3, 96:5, 96:8, 96:11, 96:13, 101:11, 101:13, 103:10, 103:15, 104:1, 104:6, 109:6, 110:16, 111:12, 115:7, 116:11, 116:13, 117:1, 117:13, 127:15, 128:1, 129:18, 132:18, 133:4, 133:11, 134:3, 137:18, 137:19, 140:12, 140:15, 140:18, 149:4, 156:1, 156:13, 157:8, 162:11, 164:1
hubway [2] - 76:6, 76:7
Hubway [2] - 76:17, 76:18
huge [3] - 6:1, 24:18, 170:10
HUGH [55] - 4:2, 4:15, 5:8, 5:11, 8:7, 8:9, 27:7, 27:16, 32:5, 32:9, 35:9, 38:5, 38:14, 38:16, 41:6, 45:1, 45:4, 45:7, 46:1, 47:5, 47:8, 48:18, 49:16, 50:10, 51:2, 53:6, 53:10, 65:2, 65:5, 78:18, 79:6, 80:1, 81:3, 81:17, 84:5, 95:2, 114:8, 114:12, 114:15, 114:18, 115:1, 122:14, 125:8, 126:2, 127:2, 131:7, 133:15, 140:8, 143:12, 145:3, 160:2, 160:18, 167:6, 171:5, 173:9
Hugh [9] - 1:7, 4:15, 10:6, 23:10, 35:8, 83:18, 118:2, 141:15, 145:13
human [1] - 160:7
hundred [1] - 68:5
hundreds [4] - 38:11, 172:16, 172:19
hurry [1] - 12:1

I

ice [5] - 19:10, 20:2, 38:3, 52:12, 52:15
idea [5] - 17:1, 100:12, 111:8, 137:12, 139:1
ideally [1] - 24:7
ideas [2] - 62:6, 82:5
image [4] - 20:13, 132:11, 133:13, 158:4
imaginative [1] - 140:1
impacted [1] - 152:3
impacts [2] - 94:19, 129:7
imperatives [1] - 136:7
impetus [2] - 50:7, 161:14
implemented [3] - 16:6, 99:5, 101:14
implementing [1] - 17:16
implies [1] - 106:5
importance [3] - 6:1, 23:2, 23:3
important [18] - 17:19, 18:12, 18:14, 19:2, 39:6, 46:9, 51:3, 52:7, 63:16, 67:8, 67:18, 69:4, 73:3, 83:4, 127:2, 143:4, 148:7, 154:1
impose [2] - 93:6, 94:9
improve [2] - 100:16, 142:18
improvement [1] - 54:7
improvements [1] - 100:8
IN [1] - 176:11
in-fill [8] - 37:17, 38:2, 39:4, 103:9, 103:17, 104:5, 121:1, 143:1
inappropriate [1] - 138:16
inaudible [1] - 168:6
inaudible) [1] - 141:3
INC [1] - 1:17
incentive [2] - 35:19, 96:2
incentives [2] - 90:12, 112:16
inception [1] - 136:11
inclined [1] - 77:10
include [1] - 38:19
includes [2] - 19:8, 101:10
including [1] - 139:15
Inclusionary [1] - 141:10
inclusionary [2] - 101:11, 101:13
income [7] - 63:3, 63:12, 63:14, 63:15, 92:14, 152:17, 162:17

incorporated [1] - 91:5
incorporates [1] - 99:8
incorporating [2] - 93:3, 98:13
increase [2] - 63:8, 63:11
incredible [1] - 156:11
incredibly [3] - 22:7, 122:11, 125:15
incrementally [1] - 120:7
indefinite [1] - 123:4
Index [1] - 3:12
indicate [1] - 174:12
individual [2] - 100:11, 144:19
industrial [1] - 23:4
Infinite [1] - 61:12
influence [2] - 37:7, 169:10
informal [1] - 132:2
information [2] - 36:18, 151:8
infrastructure [3] - 17:18, 18:9, 154:13
inherited [1] - 121:7
initiated [1] - 17:12
inner [1] - 143:8
innovate [1] - 76:17
innovation [11] - 62:8, 63:3, 63:16, 63:19, 71:16, 99:10, 99:19, 112:16, 148:13, 149:3, 153:6
Innovation [3] - 19:12, 22:6, 25:18
innovative [1] - 99:2
input [3] - 56:5, 131:16, 156:3
inside [2] - 135:2, 140:16
insight [2] - 92:8, 129:7
instance [6] - 124:3, 125:14, 133:1, 146:8, 162:10, 170:7
instead [5] - 49:3, 104:8, 119:18, 147:9, 167:4
Institute [2] - 40:10, 40:11
institution [1] - 171:13
institutional [1] - 126:16
institutions [1] - 171:15
instructions [1] - 175:8
INSTRUCTIONS [3] - 174:1, 174:11, 175:4
instrumental [2] - 36:6, 129:3
integration [1] - 147:12
intended [3] - 26:3, 42:5, 121:2
intense [1] - 137:9
intensifying [1] - 57:8
intention [1] - 159:17
interest [3] - 38:9, 114:7, 148:11
interested [3] - 141:16, 168:19, 176:7
interesting [9] - 26:17, 34:16, 87:11, 93:11, 135:18, 136:6, 136:17, 149:17, 150:15
interestingly [1] - 16:7
interim [1] - 77:5
interior [1] - 69:16
internally [1] - 138:7
interprets [1] - 123:19
interspace [1] - 106:9
interstate [1] - 32:1
intimately [1] - 9:15
intriguing [1] - 58:4
intro [1] - 82:12
introduced [1] - 8:13
introducing [1] - 4:8
invaluable [1] - 126:14
invested [1] - 162:8
investments [1] - 64:3
involve [1] - 121:4
involved [6] - 27:19, 34:19, 36:12, 56:7, 127:6, 154:14
involvement [1] - 141:5
involves [2] - 138:4, 149:2
IRAM [24] - 47:7, 47:10, 47:14, 48:3, 48:10, 104:3, 104:11, 104:18, 107:1, 107:7, 108:13, 109:3, 109:12, 109:15, 110:1, 110:5, 111:1, 128:3, 128:12, 134:7, 145:13, 170:4, 170:14, 171:2
Iram [3] - 1:16, 92:8, 103:18
issue [6] - 70:15, 79:8, 97:14, 99:7, 103:19, 139:16
issues [9] - 45:18, 63:4, 78:14, 78:17, 85:17, 102:3, 146:11, 149:17, 150:11
item [1] - 12:2
items [1] - 102:2
iteration [1] - 148:6
iterations [1] - 154:1
itself [4] - 25:15, 49:13, 174:14, 175:6

J

J.L [1] - 73:18
JEFF [15] - 45:13, 81:18, 84:12, 88:17, 89:1, 95:9, 96:15, 97:4, 98:3, 102:11, 102:14, 103:1, 124:8, 128:18, 129:19
Jeff [7] - 1:15, 10:6, 45:11, 64:18, 65:1, 82:1, 155:15
Jeff's [1] - 155:5
Jill [1] - 18:7
job [2] - 81:5, 161:2
jobs [1] - 101:4
joined [1] - 67:16
joint [1] - 157:3
juggernaut [3] - 144:4, 155:3, 157:13
June [1] - 176:11
junk [1] - 26:8
jurisdiction [6] - 118:5, 130:2, 130:3, 131:19, 134:17, 156:18
jurisdictions [1] - 142:2

K

K-2 [1] - 163:13
K1 [1] - 159:16
K2 [15] - 29:15, 46:5, 61:15, 63:18, 89:6, 115:14, 141:8, 155:5, 155:12, 156:7, 156:8, 156:17, 157:4, 162:5, 168:1
K2-C2 [10] - 10:11, 23:14, 23:19, 56:14, 57:17, 59:3, 59:7, 59:15, 77:4, 159:8
K2C2 [1] - 3:7
KATHY [73] - 5:4, 7:18, 28:2, 32:14, 33:9, 33:17, 34:16, 36:14, 37:9, 37:14, 38:4, 38:13, 43:10, 43:16, 44:1, 44:10, 44:16, 44:19, 46:11, 46:18, 47:3, 47:13, 48:2, 48:8, 48:16, 65:4, 65:6, 65:9, 65:12, 65:17, 66:3, 66:9, 66:12, 67:1, 73:6, 73:12, 74:3, 74:8, 74:13, 74:18, 75:14, 76:4, 76:7, 97:1, 97:3, 108:10, 109:1, 109:8, 109:13, 109:19, 110:4, 114:11, 114:13, 114:17, 114:19, 118:8, 123:2, 123:5, 125:13, 126:7, 127:8, 151:7, 158:12, 158:15, 158:18, 159:12, 160:15, 161:10, 161:16, 164:9, 167:1, 171:9, 172:9
Kathy [5] - 3:10, 5:4, 29:16, 66:7, 159:1
kayak [1] - 22:10
keen [2] - 30:4, 63:18
keep [15] - 50:3, 53:4, 57:13, 64:11, 67:18, 68:6, 69:2, 71:5, 72:7, 79:2, 79:15, 86:1, 93:17, 113:5, 167:18
keeping [3] - 81:6, 166:9, 166:10
Kendall [43] - 5:16, 5:19, 7:2, 9:7, 10:4, 10:12, 11:15, 13:15, 16:5, 16:11, 25:3, 25:5, 25:7, 25:10, 25:15, 28:9, 37:8, 37:11, 39:7, 46:6, 52:3, 56:18, 57:5, 57:13, 57:15, 62:3, 67:13, 69:9, 76:1, 82:12, 83:1, 85:4, 90:13, 94:9, 100:1, 100:6, 101:1, 122:1, 148:11, 148:19, 154:2, 154:12, 154:14
kept [3] - 25:7, 69:5, 147:1
key [6] - 62:6, 84:6, 95:19, 124:16, 148:3, 149:4
keystones [1] - 63:6
KeyWord [1] - 3:12
kid [1] - 131:17
kind [49] - 14:2, 22:18, 23:12, 25:13, 26:3, 26:10, 26:12, 26:18, 30:15, 32:15, 35:6, 44:14, 53:2, 56:1, 57:16, 77:3, 78:7, 83:19, 84:2, 85:11, 89:4, 105:7, 106:4, 106:8, 106:9, 112:12, 112:17, 113:8, 113:10, 113:16, 116:8, 117:6, 120:11, 121:1, 121:7, 121:8, 122:13, 138:5, 140:2, 143:3, 144:17, 151:9, 153:1, 156:3, 156:4, 169:14, 169:16, 169:18, 171:12
kinds [3] - 21:8, 51:1, 112:2
kiosks [1] - 76:9
knitted [1] - 61:4
knitting [3] - 26:13, 26:17, 52:13
knocked [2] - 78:3, 103:13
knowing [1] - 89:13
knowledge [3] - 147:11, 153:15, 176:10
known [2] - 15:12, 23:18
knows [5] - 28:10, 29:8, 64:13, 162:4, 172:4
KS [1] - 102:8
KS-1 [9] - 123:10, 123:11, 133:12, 133:16, 144:6, 163:4, 163:11, 164:6, 164:8
KS-2 [3] - 144:6, 164:3, 164:6
KS-3 [3] - 144:6, 164:10, 164:12
KS1 [2] - 102:8, 159:16
KSA [1] - 154:15

L

lab [2] - 49:3, 91:15
Labs [2] - 26:1, 27:11
Lafayette [1] - 18:8
land [17] - 15:15, 31:8, 31:13, 43:4, 45:6, 50:15, 83:3, 86:9, 114:10, 114:14, 114:18, 115:19, 116:2, 138:13, 148:1, 148:13, 150:4
landlords [1] - 31:7
landmark [1] - 80:11
landmarking [1] - 66:15
lane [2] - 43:6, 43:8
language [2] - 99:7, 102:4
large [8] - 17:9, 58:7, 62:10, 86:13, 112:11, 151:14, 169:9, 169:11
largely [2] - 16:8, 17:6
larger [1] - 16:15
largest [1] - 39:18
Larry [2] - 126:12, 132:3
laser [1] - 109:11
last [15] - 5:14, 9:13, 10:18, 20:19, 23:10, 40:15, 65:13, 67:4, 70:13, 81:9, 82:8, 84:14, 101:16, 130:1, 166:19
late [6] - 14:12, 15:11, 35:11, 119:13, 119:14, 135:13
Laws [2] - 32:18, 124:6
Lawson [1] - 176:4
leading [1] - 66:13
learn [3] - 13:6, 13:15, 116:17
learned [3] - 13:5, 142:13, 142:19
learning [1] - 116:16
lease [1] - 99:16
least [9] - 34:10, 96:16, 126:15, 137:10, 139:11, 142:2, 163:14, 165:12, 167:11
leave [3] - 27:4, 81:8, 164:11
leaves [1] - 164:10
leaving [1] - 164:13
Lechmere [2] - 14:8, 15:1
led [3] - 16:6, 18:1, 24:8
LEED [1] - 98:7
left [2] - 15:14, 110:19
Legal [1] - 42:4
legal [1] - 95:8
legislation [4] - 32:9, 32:16, 32:17, 36:8
legitimate [1] - 78:11
lend [1] - 92:8
less [2] - 168:9, 168:10
lesser [1] - 172:17
lessons [2] - 142:12, 142:19
level [10] - 24:6, 32:10, 39:9, 75:2, 75:6, 75:9, 80:4, 127:4, 129:14, 146:3
License [1] - 176:14
life [1] - 24:11
light [3] - 59:7, 122:17, 124:11
lights [1] - 9:5
limits [1] - 93:6
Lin [1] - 58:13
Lin's [2] - 58:9, 58:12
LINE [1] - 175:9
line [4] - 60:5, 75:16, 141:16, 164:16
link [1] - 141:19
linking [1] - 143:10
list [6] - 89:2, 144:17, 145:2, 155:15, 155:16, 159:16
listing [1] - 89:4
literal [1] - 13:2
literally [5] - 10:17, 38:6, 169:13, 172:16, 172:19
liveable [1] - 23:13
lives [2] - 38:6, 159:7
living [1] - 62:9
Liza [1] - 1:14
loading [4] - 42:12, 42:15, 63:5, 94:7
Loag [1] - 35:5
loan [1] - 25:19
loans [1] - 38:9
lobby [1] - 42:17
local [1] - 91:10
locally [1] - 151:1
lock [1] - 154:8
long-term [1] - 99:16
look [35] - 21:18, 31:4, 41:16, 81:4, 82:12, 82:15, 83:15, 88:7, 106:7, 107:12, 111:9, 111:13, 111:16, 112:14, 118:12, 118:13, 119:18, 137:6, 140:14, 141:17, 142:7, 142:14, 142:17, 143:7, 144:14, 144:16, 145:7, 147:14, 152:18, 153:16, 156:5, 157:18, 158:1, 158:2
looked [2] - 48:3, 171:7
looking [22] - 5:17, 8:3, 8:5, 11:12, 23:15, 24:17, 40:11, 41:18, 52:11, 64:10, 68:9, 81:9, 88:9, 88:11, 109:2, 123:10, 124:17, 125:17, 147:9, 163:10, 163:18, 164:18
looks [3] - 122:11, 147:10, 158:5
lose [2] - 114:1, 159:3
losing [2] - 70:6, 112:6
lost [1] - 167:16
lot-by-lot [1] - 94:1
loud [1] - 9:1
love [4] - 44:11, 56:15, 67:1, 138:19
loving [1] - 31:17
low [4] - 38:9, 63:15, 94:13, 111:19
Lowell [1] - 33:7
lower [2] - 58:4, 106:17
lunchtime [1] - 89:14

M

Main [9] - 41:17, 56:17, 61:9, 61:11, 71:13, 92:1, 110:6, 142:4, 142:5
main [1] - 54:6
maintaining [1] - 152:14
major [11] - 11:11, 33:12, 61:1, 74:11, 91:19, 97:8, 113:11, 138:2, 171:12, 171:13, 171:15
malls [1] - 42:12
managed [1] - 60:7
management [3] - 29:7, 98:15, 100:14
Manager [2] - 1:12, 3:5
mandate [2] - 17:8, 135:7
Manfredi [4] - 68:5, 75:12, 81:12, 155:11
map [9] - 10:10, 10:16, 22:2, 52:9, 57:16, 81:19, 82:12, 83:2, 109:9
maps [1] - 57:6
MARGARET [15] - 5:3, 43:6, 80:10, 80:16, 102:7, 102:13, 103:4, 104:9, 105:3, 110:14, 122:16, 123:3, 132:5, 144:12, 145:12
Margaret [5] - 3:10, 5:3, 146:16, 155:15, 160:5
Margaret's [1] - 145:18
market [1] - 137:18
marks [2] - 174:14, 175:6
marriage [1] - 176:6
Marriott [1] - 42:3
MASSACHUSETTS [1] - 176:2
Massachusetts [5] - 1:6, 32:18, 56:16, 58:5, 59:18
master [13] - 16:8, 17:1, 17:3, 22:16, 28:9, 37:6, 51:5, 83:13, 83:14, 86:14, 86:15, 118:18, 120:5
material [1] - 122:10
math [1] - 147:8
matter [4] - 82:17, 85:19, 176:6, 176:7
maximize [1] - 93:8
maximum [2] - 94:10, 104:14
Maya [3] - 58:9, 58:12, 58:13
Mayor [1] - 25:9
McCusker [1] - 1:5
mean [33] - 21:9, 26:6, 31:17, 33:2, 34:11, 42:9, 48:18, 78:2, 78:11, 79:10, 81:3, 103:7, 103:12, 105:5, 110:1, 117:3, 122:1, 126:4, 127:7, 131:19, 135:15, 137:19, 141:9, 144:7, 152:2, 159:7, 162:9, 166:13, 167:1, 170:5, 170:9, 170:19, 172:6
meaningful [1] - 20:1
means [3] - 121:10, 121:11, 122:7
MEANS [1] - 176:18
meant [2] - 35:13, 85:8
measured [1] - 133:1
measures [1] - 18:5
mechanism [1] - 95:7
mechanisms [1] - 170:2
meet [2] - 98:2, 173:2
meeting [11] - 3:7, 4:3, 6:6, 7:1, 7:10, 7:11, 60:16, 66:1, 125:16, 162:2, 162:3
Meeting [2] - 1:5, 3:6
meetings [4] - 125:11, 131:6, 137:12, 160:7
meets [1] - 98:3
Meg [1] - 38:14
member [3] - 8:12, 139:9, 157:4
Member [7] - 1:8, 1:8, 1:9, 1:9, 1:10, 1:10, 1:11
Members [2] - 3:8, 173:2
members [8] - 4:5, 98:18, 120:2, 121:10, 141:8, 157:3, 157:6, 173:3
memo [2] - 82:7, 87:17
Memorial [1] - 37:14
memory [1] - 47:8
Menino [1] - 25:9
mental [1] - 57:6
mention [3] - 37:10, 95:19, 129:1
mentioned [6] - 46:13, 83:6, 96:1, 97:9, 107:15, 117:3
menu [1] - 139:13
message [1] - 21:6
messier [1] - 107:11
Met [1] - 140:16
met [1] - 82:1
metaphor [1] - 58:14
metric [1] - 19:6
mic [1] - 139:7
Michael [1] - 58:7
microphone [1] - 9:2
Microsoft [2] - 121:19, 125:16
microunits [1] - 93:2
middle [8] - 53:7, 53:8, 63:3, 63:12,

63:14, 92:14, 108:5, 162:17
might [28] - 4:7, 7:13, 8:17, 16:12, 63:10, 75:15, 76:12, 81:10, 88:8, 88:10, 89:12, 95:5, 97:6, 116:3, 127:14, 136:8, 136:9, 138:17, 139:1, 140:17, 140:19, 145:14, 145:18, 155:8, 156:19, 157:3, 157:14, 160:4
Millennium [4] - 18:19, 60:2, 60:4, 60:10
million [9] - 36:4, 51:18, 51:19, 54:8, 90:1, 90:3, 90:4, 104:14, 132:18
millions [2] - 51:16, 72:5
mind [4] - 50:8, 50:11, 116:18, 135:19
minimal [1] - 137:19
minimize [1] - 99:4
minimum [7] - 64:11, 88:6, 92:3, 96:5, 96:10, 96:16, 97:17
minimum/maximum [1] - 97:13
minor [1] - 45:19
minute [1] - 33:18
miscellaneous [1] - 6:16
missions [1] - 137:5
misstating [1] - 29:17
mistake [1] - 12:9
mistakes [3] - 13:8, 13:9, 142:12
MIT [45] - 6:4, 10:19, 15:14, 18:9, 21:19, 36:6, 36:10, 36:12, 56:17, 60:18, 61:8, 61:12, 61:18, 63:10, 64:13, 65:6, 68:5, 68:6, 68:8, 69:7, 69:10, 73:7, 74:9, 74:12, 75:11, 78:2, 79:7, 80:7, 83:6, 83:7, 105:8, 113:14, 117:17, 142:3, 146:3, 147:18, 153:9, 153:11, 155:8, 156:4, 168:15, 169:13, 171:11, 172:4
MIT's [1] - 71:17
mitigation [3] - 17:18, 18:5, 94:19
mix [4] - 20:5, 20:8, 21:13, 62:9
mixed [1] - 85:3
model [3] - 16:18, 31:10, 151:12
models [1] - 19:14
modern [1] - 147:13
modernist [1] - 25:16
modest [1] - 164:12
mold [1] - 85:12
moment [2] - 121:16, 126:10
moments [3] - 119:5, 119:6, 119:8
momentum [1] - 159:3
Monday [2] - 60:19, 164:19
money [7] - 13:19, 35:19, 36:3, 50:1, 71:9, 75:4, 81:16
monitoring [1] - 98:11
month [2] - 82:8, 84:14
months [11] - 5:14, 7:11, 43:19, 51:9, 102:6, 166:13, 166:15, 167:3, 167:4, 167:7
most [18] - 33:12, 42:9, 55:2, 67:6, 69:4, 83:3, 105:10, 105:11, 114:6, 114:19, 119:15, 119:19, 120:16, 124:6, 145:15, 146:13, 148:13
mostly [1] - 37:7
motivations [1] - 136:8
Mount [1] - 37:15
move [8] - 12:4, 21:10, 48:6, 108:9, 145:19, 154:7, 169:15, 169:16
moved [1] - 48:12
movement [3] - 28:11, 54:12, 125:6
movies [1] - 154:17
moving [6] - 19:3, 43:17, 50:4, 85:18, 145:15, 163:2
multi [1] - 16:16
multi-year [1] - 16:16
multipurpose [2] - 14:6, 18:17
multisite [1] - 86:15
municipal [1] - 167:8
MURPHY [24] - 53:16, 72:9, 73:16, 73:19, 106:14, 107:4, 111:8, 125:2, 125:5, 131:5, 136:12, 141:7, 146:18, 149:12, 149:16, 151:11, 153:7, 153:10, 153:14, 161:15, 164:3, 164:6, 164:17, 167:17
Murphy [2] - 1:12, 3:4
music [1] - 20:4
must [2] - 111:12, 125:13
MXD [6] - 85:2, 102:12, 103:2, 107:12, 123:11, 124:10
MXS [1] - 130:14

N

name [2] - 38:13, 73:9
names [2] - 35:6, 120:1
narrow [1] - 112:2
NASA [1] - 29:8
nasty [1] - 75:19
national [1] - 14:12
nationally [1] - 151:2
neat [1] - 72:10
necessarily [4] - 89:9, 92:15, 146:2, 165:5
necessary [2] - 78:19, 163:19
neck [1] - 12:12
need [17] - 23:18, 43:4, 45:1, 45:18, 52:3, 54:7, 72:7, 81:9, 92:15, 94:15, 95:9, 96:6, 99:4, 118:12, 118:13, 143:10, 144:13
needed [6] - 24:5, 50:2, 57:19, 97:6, 120:3
needle [1] - 133:2
needs [6] - 39:9, 45:11, 70:17, 88:19, 105:9, 137:3
negotiations [1] - 34:3
neighborhood [5] - 40:4, 46:7, 53:1, 55:8, 55:17
neighborhoods [1] - 60:15
neighbors [2] - 24:19, 56:4
network [1] - 72:14
never [1] - 12:6
new [36] - 14:9, 16:12, 17:8, 29:12, 30:4, 55:18, 64:5, 70:4, 72:5, 74:12, 75:6, 78:10, 83:15, 85:16, 86:5, 95:1, 95:18, 98:9, 99:12, 102:15, 105:19, 111:19, 116:5, 116:19, 120:17, 120:18, 124:17, 124:19, 126:11, 128:16, 130:16, 142:16, 145:3, 147:9
New [3] - 35:4, 58:15, 113:7
news [2] - 63:9, 146:12
next [20] - 6:5, 16:11, 21:3, 21:6, 38:6, 43:18, 47:17, 51:8, 60:19, 65:13, 83:16, 83:17, 102:5, 103:7, 132:3, 146:7, 148:6, 154:1, 167:3, 167:4
next-door [1] - 38:6
nibble [1] - 95:5
nice [5] - 19:6, 35:15, 39:8, 42:16, 76:13
night [1] - 143:16
nine [1] - 167:9
nobody [1] - 172:4
nobody's [1] - 69:10
noise [2] - 99:6, 99:8
non [1] - 37:19
non-profit [1] - 37:19
normal [1] - 130:12
Normandy [1] - 168:8
north [1] - 108:14
North [2] - 170:6, 171:5
northern [1] - 109:9
NOT [3] - 174:14, 175:5, 176:17
notable [1] - 37:10
Notary [3] - 175:7, 176:5, 176:13
notations [2] - 174:14, 175:6
notching [1] - 98:9
note [2] - 84:13, 175:4
noted [1] - 175:17
notes [1] - 176:9
noteworthy [1] - 147:4
nothing [2] - 13:3, 23:8
noticed [2] - 53:15, 160:5
notion [1] - 24:3
Novartis [2] - 57:19, 169:13
number [7] - 34:7, 93:7, 98:6, 120:10, 151:14, 151:16, 171:18
Nur [3] - 1:10, 5:9, 5:10
nuts [1] - 82:3

O

Obama [1] - 54:1
obviously [5] - 33:16, 57:11, 138:3, 139:19, 165:13
occupancy [1] - 122:5
October [2] - 47:12, 167:7
odd [1] - 44:16
OF [6] - 1:1, 174:16, 176:2, 176:17, 176:18, 176:18
offered [1] - 146:16
office [8] - 19:18, 21:2, 21:12, 91:15, 99:12, 149:3, 151:10, 156:2
officer [1] - 33:19
Offices [1] - 121:19
OFFICIAL [1] - 1:18
Oklahoma [1] - 154:6
old [8] - 19:19, 55:16, 62:12, 70:13, 72:6, 79:14, 112:11, 157:15
older [3] - 23:4, 65:9, 106:16
on-site [1] - 141:11
once [5] - 73:3, 99:18, 148:15, 163:17, 172:13
one [106] - 6:5, 6:13, 6:14, 16:2, 20:9, 20:18, 23:5, 24:1, 24:13, 27:16, 32:2, 33:10, 33:15, 37:10, 39:18, 40:15, 42:8, 43:6, 43:8, 44:1, 44:12, 45:11, 46:1, 46:9, 50:11, 53:12, 54:16, 55:6, 56:11, 61:2, 63:6, 65:14, 66:14, 67:7, 67:13, 67:17, 69:19, 71:11, 73:6, 73:8, 74:4, 74:11, 75:14, 78:7, 81:14, 81:16, 85:17, 87:9, 88:19, 89:15, 95:2, 95:10, 95:19, 97:6, 97:7, 98:2, 101:12, 103:4, 103:12, 103:16,

106:14, 107:18, 107:19, 108:12, 109:10, 109:13, 110:5, 110:11, 112:1, 117:10, 124:16, 125:5, 125:8, 126:11, 127:13, 131:15, 133:17, 136:8, 137:11, 139:5, 139:8, 139:10, 139:14, 139:17, 142:10, 143:5, 143:9, 144:12, 145:9, 145:19, 146:11, 150:16, 157:3, 159:13, 161:17, 164:11, 170:10, 171:11, 171:16, 171:17, 171:19
One [5] - 75:17, 76:1, 76:19, 121:19, 122:1
one's [2] - 60:13, 64:2
ones [2] - 40:15, 106:18
ongoing [3] - 10:4, 120:6, 147:3
open [38] - 11:6, 14:7, 14:11, 17:5, 18:16, 19:1, 20:1, 24:7, 26:5, 39:6, 52:2, 52:19, 53:18, 55:16, 62:11, 62:13, 62:14, 63:3, 69:14, 72:12, 72:13, 72:19, 78:10, 93:10, 93:18, 94:2, 94:6, 97:9, 100:13, 100:16, 122:19, 123:18, 148:12, 149:2, 150:5, 153:1, 157:9, 165:6
opening [3] - 7:17, 14:10, 39:4
operate [2] - 99:16, 144:15
operationally [1] - 54:10
operative [1] - 17:15
opinion [4] - 68:3, 68:13, 78:12, 120:15
opportunities [11] - 104:4, 105:18, 106:12, 107:9, 107:10, 112:3, 112:13, 114:4, 137:3, 142:6, 142:15
opportunity [9] - 72:15, 84:17, 99:2, 110:6, 110:9, 112:6, 113:1, 114:1, 140:7
opposed [1] - 6:9
opposite [1] - 135:16
optimistic [1] - 171:10
orange [1] - 83:18
order [8] - 33:2, 41:11, 48:5, 51:13, 88:8, 89:11, 94:2, 135:10
Ordinance [4] - 123:17, 124:2, 131:14, 173:3
organization [1] - 119:3
original [7] - 20:14, 42:2, 85:8, 120:3, 121:4, 174:2, 174:9
ORIGINAL [1] - 174:8
originally [4] - 28:5, 28:9, 40:19, 123:6
ought [1] - 69:12
ourselves [2] - 4:8, 122:8
outcome [2] - 157:19, 176:7
outdoor [1] - 121:18
outline [1] - 82:14
outside [4] - 34:17, 34:18, 133:7, 133:8
overall [3] - 13:10, 87:16, 132:19
overlap [1] - 118:6
overlaps [1] - 118:5
overlay [2] - 86:19, 102:16
own [6] - 80:7, 114:9, 114:13, 114:16, 116:2, 131:18
owned [2] - 6:13, 6:14
owner [4] - 100:12, 146:2, 171:16, 171:19
owner's [1] - 105:7
owners [6] - 100:9, 169:5, 171:18, 172:17, 173:1, 173:7
ownership [3] - 83:4, 86:10, 168:7
owns [2] - 114:9, 115:18

P

p.m [2] - 1:4, 173:15
package [3] - 6:1, 115:8, 156:7
Paden [1] - 1:14
Page [1] - 175:7
page [3] - 84:16, 88:16, 88:18
PAGE [2] - 174:16, 175:9
pair [2] - 73:9, 74:14
Pam [1] - 4:14
Pamela [1] - 1:8
PAMELA [10] - 4:14, 58:11, 77:8, 77:14, 77:19, 78:13, 79:5, 81:1, 127:10, 171:8
paperwork [1] - 38:10
paradigm [1] - 162:19
parallel [1] - 170:9
parameters [2] - 79:16, 163:15
parcel [10] - 88:4, 105:8, 105:12, 105:14, 106:3, 106:13, 120:13, 142:11, 152:10, 161:1
parcels [9] - 105:8, 107:15, 138:19, 141:17, 158:11, 168:7, 169:10, 170:3, 173:6
pardon [2] - 45:3, 164:5
Park [16] - 11:8, 15:2, 15:10, 16:7, 16:19, 17:12, 18:7, 18:18, 19:5, 24:14, 56:18, 59:18, 70:17, 71:4, 72:10, 72:15
park [4] - 51:15, 56:12, 109:14, 109:15
parked [1] - 108:15
parking [22] - 13:3, 39:5, 42:13, 53:12, 63:5, 64:10, 64:11, 94:7, 94:10, 94:14, 94:15, 94:16, 95:4, 95:12, 95:13, 95:17, 108:1, 108:13, 129:4, 137:14, 139:2, 148:12
Parking [1] - 129:4
parks [2] - 14:9, 109:18
part [38] - 7:3, 13:4, 17:15, 18:8, 20:15, 25:4, 26:19, 27:18, 28:6, 35:19, 40:17, 46:9, 46:19, 47:5, 49:12, 50:16, 51:4, 52:7, 55:2, 59:3, 60:11, 62:1, 62:17, 83:7, 92:16, 117:7, 120:16, 130:1, 140:5, 141:7, 144:3, 153:17, 154:12, 160:9, 162:5, 163:8, 170:12, 171:8
participant [1] - 141:14
participate [1] - 118:1
participating [1] - 162:6
particular [13] - 8:4, 23:7, 105:12, 105:14, 107:13, 120:12, 123:11, 126:6, 132:11, 132:16, 135:8, 137:16, 158:11
particularly [3] - 112:14, 141:19, 142:7
parties [1] - 176:6
partly [1] - 31:8
partner [4] - 136:9, 147:16, 148:6, 152:15
partnering [1] - 37:19
partnership [1] - 119:11
parts [5] - 11:8, 28:13, 48:19, 83:1, 124:6
party [1] - 174:7
passageways [2] - 52:17, 52:18
past [4] - 35:7, 105:16, 124:13, 127:9
patchwork [1] - 169:4
path [1] - 146:16
pattern [1] - 32:4
peakable [1] - 160:17
peculiar [1] - 135:8
pedestrian [2] - 40:12, 41:19
penalties [1] - 48:16
people [27] - 12:7, 12:8, 12:17, 14:17, 25:6, 25:7, 31:18, 34:19, 35:2, 38:8, 59:13, 60:4, 68:14, 74:1, 75:1, 75:9, 78:8, 101:3, 119:1, 119:19, 126:11, 136:1, 149:10, 151:1, 151:9, 171:14, 172:2
people's [1] - 57:6
per [1] - 97:11
percent [4] - 20:11, 92:17, 145:9, 145:10
percentage [2] - 92:3, 92:13
perception [1] - 54:2
perfectly [1] - 159:13
perhaps [4] - 80:6, 95:4, 139:18, 140:2
permit [1] - 131:13
Permit [8] - 15:3, 16:13, 16:15, 21:5, 23:1, 61:7, 130:7
Permits [2] - 14:19, 128:11
permitted [3] - 21:14, 88:13, 134:11
person [1] - 145:14
personally [2] - 23:5, 68:18
perspective [5] - 12:3, 66:19, 67:3, 132:13, 136:4
petition [2] - 63:10, 167:13
petitions [1] - 15:18
Pharmaceuticals [1] - 60:2
phase [4] - 20:16, 83:16, 83:17, 86:15
phases [1] - 16:11
phenomenon [1] - 39:13
philosophy [1] - 105:6
phonetic [1] - 36:7
phonetic) [1] - 35:5
phrase [1] - 147:4
picked [1] - 157:9
picture [4] - 12:12, 18:7, 27:11, 80:4
piece [15] - 10:19, 17:5, 39:6, 97:9, 99:6, 99:10, 104:6, 106:8, 125:18, 142:8, 149:8, 152:2, 157:8, 157:10, 164:14
pieces [13] - 6:3, 6:12, 29:13, 62:5, 62:6, 65:1, 72:3, 73:2, 112:11, 112:18, 149:2, 150:16
pinpoint [1] - 117:16
Pipe [1] - 140:16
place [20] - 13:18, 20:3, 20:4, 22:8, 50:15, 60:10, 66:10, 68:16, 73:5, 76:5, 116:6, 120:9, 135:18, 138:9, 138:13, 138:15, 139:18, 148:14, 149:5, 154:7
placed [2] - 38:3, 42:6

places [6] - 9:17, 16:5, 62:7, 100:18, 121:1, 165:2
plan [43] - 10:12, 12:19, 14:13, 15:16, 16:2, 16:6, 16:8, 17:2, 17:3, 17:17, 19:4, 19:16, 22:13, 22:16, 22:18, 24:1, 24:10, 28:4, 28:9, 37:6, 39:19, 45:17, 51:5, 56:9, 59:11, 59:13, 61:2, 62:3, 81:10, 83:13, 85:5, 85:9, 86:14, 86:15, 88:12, 94:5, 115:10, 115:12, 116:1, 138:3, 147:17, 149:5
planned [1] - 86:5
planning [16] - 1:1, 23:17, 29:4, 31:2, 59:3, 72:12, 87:13, 111:15, 136:7, 143:6, 145:8, 157:16, 158:4, 170:8, 170:15, 170:17
PLANNING [1] - 175:1
Planning [44] - 3:7, 4:3, 5:15, 8:12, 14:16, 15:5, 15:18, 17:4, 19:4, 39:11, 41:6, 41:10, 46:14, 52:5, 58:1, 60:14, 70:2, 82:8, 84:15, 86:12, 87:15, 93:13, 93:19, 98:18, 101:19, 118:6, 118:7, 121:15, 128:2, 128:10, 128:18, 129:3, 129:10, 130:3, 130:5, 130:8, 130:9, 140:12, 155:18, 165:14, 168:5, 173:16, 175:4, 175:16
plans [8] - 14:6, 23:9, 29:3, 38:10, 40:16, 60:9, 76:16, 83:14
plant [2] - 19:9, 21:4
plate [1] - 119:1
plates [1] - 39:10
platinum [1] - 20:6
play [1] - 86:16
playing [1] - 62:9
plaza [8] - 18:12, 78:4, 78:5, 78:6, 78:9, 109:14, 109:15, 122:12
pleased [1] - 25:6
plus [1] - 54:8
Point [6] - 70:17, 71:4, 72:10, 72:15, 170:7, 171:5
point [19] - 44:6, 45:15, 46:13, 50:9, 56:11, 70:2, 77:11, 77:16, 77:17, 78:19, 87:11, 90:10, 101:6, 107:5, 111:15, 125:13, 155:17, 162:7, 173:13
pointed [4] - 82:13, 83:18, 85:9, 91:3
points [3] - 89:3, 89:5, 144:14
poised [1] - 13:13
polar [1] - 135:15
policy [1] - 6:19
political [2] - 30:15
pool [1] - 153:15
portion [3] - 10:11, 10:13, 40:13
pose [1] - 146:9
position [3] - 7:8, 157:14, 159:9
positive [2] - 13:11, 105:11
possible [8] - 36:8, 39:15, 79:13, 104:2, 104:19, 131:15, 133:18, 137:14
possibly [1] - 108:6
potential [7] - 90:7, 105:11, 106:6, 142:16, 147:15, 169:2
potentially [1] - 29:15
potentials [1] - 116:14
power [3] - 19:9, 21:3, 132:10
powerful [3] - 67:14, 71:8, 71:15
powers [3] - 7:12, 37:5, 120:12
practices [2] - 98:14, 99:8
precious [1] - 148:13
preclude [1] - 165:14
preparatory [1] - 13:7
prepared [2] - 6:9, 10:7
prescribes [1] - 85:7
presence [1] - 154:10
present [2] - 51:7, 78:16
presentation [1] - 8:4
presented [1] - 162:10
preservation [1] - 64:12
preserve [3] - 39:14, 70:12, 77:10
preserving [1] - 66:15
Press [7] - 61:18, 64:13, 65:7, 68:6, 73:8, 74:9, 75:11
pressure [2] - 159:3, 166:6
pressuring [1] - 159:5
PRESTON [1] - 4:19
Preston [2] - 1:10, 5:1
presumably [2] - 71:18, 165:18
pretty [6] - 24:9, 42:10, 51:12, 56:4, 84:1, 157:9
previous [2] - 28:7, 128:7
previously [1] - 130:19
prices [1] - 63:14
principles [3] - 82:15, 82:17, 82:19
private [2] - 100:15, 135:10
probable [1] - 168:11
problem [4] - 32:12, 131:7, 147:8, 150:15
problems [1] - 117:16
proceed [1] - 49:6
process [53] - 7:5, 7:13, 11:11, 16:8, 16:14, 17:7, 17:8, 42:19, 43:13, 45:6, 47:2, 47:6, 49:13, 52:1, 53:3, 54:18, 57:18, 59:4, 59:10, 60:13, 64:16, 67:6, 77:4, 79:17, 80:5, 80:11, 87:8, 87:13, 100:6, 115:2, 115:15, 116:8, 125:1, 125:9, 127:7, 128:8, 130:18, 131:17, 136:14, 138:1, 144:9, 145:1, 156:11, 156:14, 157:7, 159:6, 162:8, 163:8, 166:17, 169:6, 170:8, 170:13, 171:1
professionals [1] - 153:15
professor [1] - 35:14
profit [2] - 37:19, 91:14
program [1] - 69:18
programming [2] - 69:6, 100:14
programs [1] - 101:13
project [43] - 15:4, 17:5, 17:9, 17:16, 18:1, 18:4, 18:6, 18:19, 21:17, 23:6, 23:7, 24:8, 24:9, 26:1, 29:19, 30:1, 30:3, 30:7, 35:5, 35:12, 37:11, 39:7, 40:15, 41:1, 41:14, 52:5, 52:10, 52:17, 56:18, 57:3, 59:18, 61:8, 97:12, 101:15, 111:12, 111:18, 127:19, 128:15, 129:9, 130:5, 130:6, 131:10, 162:11
projector [1] - 8:19
projects [15] - 10:3, 14:16, 16:15, 27:1, 31:7, 34:15, 37:2, 38:17, 39:12, 52:7, 85:10, 101:17, 101:18, 124:14, 130:9
promoting [1] - 62:7
properties [1] - 169:8
Properties [20] - 6:14, 27:18, 30:7, 39:1, 43:2, 48:19, 50:13, 102:10, 115:3, 115:9, 115:18, 116:7, 118:17, 119:2, 119:10, 121:17, 126:17, 162:1, 168:18, 172:3
Property [3] - 49:6, 106:16, 114:9
property [15] - 100:9, 100:11, 135:3, 135:10, 146:2, 156:18, 157:1, 158:1, 171:16, 171:18, 171:19, 172:16, 172:19, 173:5, 173:7
Property's [1] - 141:5
proponents [1] - 125:11
proposal [5] - 50:17, 96:8, 104:11, 104:12, 104:13
proposals [3] - 103:9, 107:18, 158:10
proposed [4] - 88:8, 97:16, 118:16, 146:15
proposing [3] - 86:4, 121:17, 171:13
Prospect [1] - 56:15
protect [1] - 80:12
protecting [1] - 80:11
proud [1] - 115:10
provide [3] - 51:15, 93:16, 169:7
provided [1] - 96:11
provides [2] - 129:5, 129:6
proximity [3] - 9:7, 57:2, 57:16
public [13] - 77:1, 100:16, 122:18, 122:19, 124:3, 135:4, 135:9, 137:9, 137:16, 137:18, 138:13, 138:17, 157:11
Public [3] - 175:7, 176:5, 176:13
PUD [20] - 15:2, 16:14, 20:15, 21:13, 24:13, 61:7, 62:18, 86:5, 86:18, 87:8, 88:5, 102:8, 103:2, 107:13, 133:12, 141:17, 159:16, 163:3, 163:4, 173:6
PUDs [5] - 105:7, 123:10, 159:17, 165:13, 166:1
pull [2] - 148:9, 156:12
purchasing [1] - 168:8
purpose [7] - 7:1, 7:9, 41:8, 88:2, 122:18, 137:16, 150:7
purposes [1] - 35:17
push [2] - 113:16, 149:7
pushed [1] - 156:14
pushes [1] - 145:14
pushing [4] - 46:2, 64:7, 168:3, 169:14
put [14] - 7:14, 12:4, 15:6, 43:2, 112:4, 117:14, 120:9, 123:17, 135:4, 135:17, 138:12, 141:12, 149:4, 161:2
putting [3] - 75:4, 76:8, 98:10

Q

qualifiers [1] - 48:15
quality [1] - 131:3
questions [8] - 27:2, 27:6, 27:10, 87:10, 92:7, 97:7, 97:8, 123:8

quick [1] - 32:12
quickly [3] - 10:3, 99:11, 138:12
quilt [1] - 169:4
quite [16] - 6:10, 15:10, 15:15, 18:11, 21:17, 27:10, 33:15, 42:19, 44:7, 46:9, 56:8, 68:2, 117:8, 123:14, 144:1

R

radar [1] - 151:2
ramifications [1] - 30:16
range [1] - 68:13
rate [1] - 80:3
rather [6] - 37:10, 40:17, 46:3, 100:10, 129:18, 136:2
rating [1] - 98:7
ratings [1] - 26:8
rationale [1] - 93:5
ratios [1] - 94:10
re [1] - 150:17
re-elected [1] - 150:17
reach [2] - 100:19, 146:8
read [3] - 106:4, 155:15, 175:16
reading [2] - 174:12, 175:4
ready [9] - 50:1, 51:12, 81:18, 144:7, 144:8, 144:10, 159:5, 164:2
real [2] - 6:11, 169:17
realize [2] - 75:1, 116:11
really [79] - 7:9, 10:18, 11:3, 13:4, 14:17, 16:2, 16:4, 17:13, 17:15, 18:1, 18:12, 19:2, 22:11, 24:3, 24:7, 27:1, 28:16, 35:2, 35:11, 39:7, 44:13, 53:13, 55:8, 57:2, 60:5, 61:10, 63:1, 64:2, 64:6, 67:18, 68:17, 69:3, 69:14, 70:5, 71:5, 71:8, 72:17, 75:17, 75:18, 75:19, 77:14, 78:5, 81:4, 81:9, 82:16, 83:7, 84:6, 86:4, 89:3, 89:4, 91:17, 94:15, 95:12, 101:3, 101:6, 102:2, 105:15, 112:7, 113:3, 115:5, 115:10, 115:14, 119:3, 120:19, 136:6, 145:19, 147:7, 148:2, 148:5, 148:8, 148:15, 149:4, 151:12, 153:16, 155:6, 155:19, 162:16, 172:11
realm [1] - 157:11
REASON [6] - 175:10, 175:11, 175:12, 175:13, 175:14, 175:15
reason [3] - 34:4, 130:8, 175:5
reasonable [4] - 81:10, 158:10, 160:4, 163:17
reasonably [1] - 54:4
reasons [3] - 65:14, 157:16, 174:13
Rebecca's [1] - 74:6
RECEIVED [1] - 174:18
recent [4] - 9:19, 11:15, 18:17, 85:11
recently [2] - 9:4, 20:13
reclaim [1] - 11:5
recognition [1] - 14:13
recognize [2] - 33:18, 120:2
recognizing [1] - 134:11
recommendations [6] - 5:18, 62:3, 82:13, 82:16, 89:6, 165:16
recommended [6] - 58:1, 89:18, 90:12, 92:9, 94:9, 134:9
reconfigured [2] - 42:15, 42:16
reconsider [1] - 89:12
record [2] - 174:7, 175:18
RECORD [1] - 1:18
Rectus [1] - 73:11
red [1] - 83:11
redevelop [2] - 35:13, 139:2
redevelopment [24] - 10:17, 15:1, 27:17, 29:2, 31:3, 33:13, 33:19, 34:9, 36:1, 37:10, 38:7, 38:18, 39:2, 39:19, 40:16, 41:4, 103:10, 104:5, 107:14, 120:14, 134:19, 135:6, 137:14, 172:1
Redevelopment [20] - 3:7, 3:8, 4:6, 29:6, 30:13, 31:5, 31:11, 33:3, 33:4, 33:6, 34:6, 34:12, 35:1, 37:1, 118:4, 124:11, 135:6, 135:17, 136:4, 136:11
Redman [1] - 126:19
redo [2] - 76:16, 161:6
reduction [1] - 94:11
reed [2] - 119:17, 120:1
Reeves [1] - 67:19
Refer [1] - 175:7
refer [5] - 10:12, 22:1, 24:14, 65:6, 73:10
referred [2] - 10:6, 17:14
referring [1] - 53:9
reflecting [1] - 84:19
reflection [1] - 134:10
reflects [1] - 155:6
refresh [1] - 62:5
reinvigorating [1] - 77:7
rejuvenated [1] - 13:14
rejuvenating [1] - 33:10
relate [1] - 89:6
related [2] - 153:17, 176:6
relates [2] - 118:15, 135:7
relationship [2] - 131:15, 150:13
relative [2] - 134:15, 142:9
relatively [1] - 7:11
relaxing [2] - 86:11, 93:5
relevant [3] - 136:19, 152:12, 168:6
relief [2] - 48:4, 99:5
relocation [1] - 40:6
rely [2] - 126:7, 131:11
remaining [3] - 10:5, 39:18, 104:15
remains [1] - 136:16
remarks [1] - 7:17
remember [8] - 12:17, 35:7, 46:12, 71:10, 71:12, 113:5, 128:15, 172:15
Remember [1] - 73:19
reminded [1] - 95:11
reminding [1] - 157:5
remiss [1] - 129:1
removal [1] - 67:6
renewal [5] - 28:11, 30:19, 31:1, 35:5, 85:5
rent [3] - 22:9, 26:9, 99:17
rental [2] - 75:16, 76:5
rents [1] - 31:9
REP [1] - 175:2
REPLACE [1] - 174:16
report [2] - 8:15, 98:12
Reporter [2] - 176:4, 176:14
REPORTER [1] - 176:19
REPORTERS [1] - 1:17
reporting [1] - 98:12
reports [1] - 5:16
represent [1] - 132:17
represents [1] - 133:3
REPRODUCTION [1] - 176:17
repurposing [1] - 113:10
request [1] - 159:13
requested [1] - 43:3
require [9] - 18:6, 80:14, 87:9, 91:17, 129:12, 129:13, 130:10, 137:8, 144:15
required [4] - 85:13, 85:16, 92:2, 105:1
required) [1] - 175:7
requirement [9] - 18:3, 93:12, 98:2, 98:4, 98:8, 101:11, 103:10, 103:15, 110:15
requirements [13] - 86:11, 93:5, 93:15, 94:1, 97:11, 98:6, 98:10, 100:2, 101:7, 101:16, 102:16, 123:19, 130:12
requires [1] - 141:10
requiring [2] - 96:4, 99:12
rerouting [1] - 49:13
research [3] - 152:1, 153:19, 154:8
Research [4] - 19:5, 24:14, 114:3, 117:19
reserve [1] - 90:6
residential [11] - 42:17, 48:12, 92:11, 104:8, 104:16, 107:10, 108:4, 108:17, 110:2, 110:12, 111:7
residents [1] - 108:6
resolution [1] - 16:1
resolve [1] - 79:7
resolved [1] - 45:18
resources [1] - 79:3
respond [1] - 32:12
response [1] - 163:1
responsibilities [1] - 6:18
responsibility [2] - 100:11, 145:16
rest [4] - 118:7, 124:2, 146:13, 163:11
restored [1] - 55:4
restrictions [1] - 148:1
restructuring [1] - 40:6
result [1] - 28:17
retail [13] - 20:18, 22:4, 24:5, 24:15, 24:17, 42:18, 57:10, 90:12, 90:15, 91:7, 92:4, 112:15, 113:9
retain [3] - 92:10, 131:18, 152:10
rethink [1] - 72:15
reverse [1] - 165:11
review [38] - 11:7, 17:4, 17:9, 17:17, 23:6, 49:14, 54:18, 59:2, 59:6, 60:12, 62:18, 62:19, 64:9, 86:12, 87:9, 87:12, 87:14, 101:15, 101:19, 120:12, 121:12, 125:15, 126:10, 126:12, 126:18, 128:8, 128:15, 128:16, 128:19, 129:2, 129:11, 129:14, 129:16, 130:7, 131:3, 131:11, 131:17, 132:2
reviewed [4] - 123:3, 124:15, 128:2, 128:6
reviewing [1] - 82:7
reviews [2] - 121:13, 130:5
revisions [1] - 163:18
revisited [1] - 22:18
revitalize [3] - 23:4, 135:11, 138:14
rezone [1] - 58:2
rezoned [1] - 58:2

Rezoning [1] - 6:4
rezoning [17] - 15:18, 17:8, 22:14, 48:5, 48:13, 50:12, 59:16, 60:18, 64:9, 79:7, 118:16, 127:19, 130:16, 144:5, 161:12, 162:8, 173:4
rezonings [2] - 23:10, 85:14
Rhone [1] - 18:7
Ribbon [1] - 16:1
rich [1] - 11:18
richer [1] - 68:18
rid [1] - 79:14
rigid [1] - 84:10
rink [4] - 19:10, 20:2, 52:12, 52:15
risk [2] - 119:3, 154:3
river [6] - 9:8, 11:3, 56:19, 61:13, 61:15, 61:19
riverfront [5] - 11:2, 11:14, 12:13, 14:10, 56:2
Riverview [1] - 37:12
ROBERTS [15] - 45:13, 81:18, 84:12, 88:17, 89:1, 95:9, 96:15, 97:4, 98:3, 102:11, 102:14, 103:1, 124:8, 128:18, 129:19
Roberts [3] - 1:15, 10:6, 82:2
robust [1] - 141:9
ROGER [87] - 8:10, 12:5, 12:16, 27:8, 27:13, 28:3, 30:11, 30:17, 32:7, 32:13, 33:12, 35:18, 36:11, 36:16, 37:13, 38:15, 38:17, 41:3, 41:9, 43:8, 43:12, 44:6, 44:11, 45:3, 45:10, 46:4, 46:17, 47:1, 47:19, 48:7, 49:11, 49:17, 50:16, 51:3, 51:19, 53:8, 53:11, 54:15, 55:11, 58:13, 59:9, 65:8, 65:11, 65:16, 65:19, 66:5, 66:18, 67:2, 71:1, 71:6, 73:10, 73:14, 73:17, 74:6, 74:10, 74:16, 76:3, 76:14, 77:1, 77:12, 77:15, 78:1, 79:9, 80:2, 80:14, 80:17, 81:12, 88:19, 96:17, 97:2, 102:18, 103:16, 104:17, 107:5, 109:5, 115:16, 126:1, 127:12, 127:18, 128:5, 155:1, 158:19, 163:5, 164:5, 164:8, 166:3, 167:11
rOGER [2] - 128:13, 167:3
Roger [25] - 1:14, 5:12, 7:16, 8:9, 37:9, 46:11, 70:14, 72:16, 77:8, 80:10, 81:2, 82:13, 83:6, 85:9, 86:6, 89:7, 91:3, 92:7, 94:4, 99:10, 108:18, 125:14, 126:2, 132:3, 164:4
role [9] - 9:17, 10:18, 64:2, 91:9, 137:13, 138:8, 155:3, 157:5, 158:8
roles [1] - 7:3
roof [5] - 108:5, 110:2, 121:18, 122:2, 122:11
rooftop [1] - 39:14
Room [1] - 1:5
room [3] - 9:1, 44:8, 50:6
rough [1] - 7:4
run [1] - 99:19
running [1] - 155:2
rushed [1] - 157:13
RUSSELL [55] - 4:2, 4:15, 5:8, 5:11, 8:7, 8:9, 27:7, 27:16, 32:5, 32:9, 35:9, 38:5, 38:14, 38:16, 41:6, 45:1, 45:4, 45:7, 46:1, 47:5, 47:8, 48:18, 49:16, 50:10, 51:2, 53:6, 53:10, 65:2, 65:5, 78:18, 79:6, 80:1, 81:3, 81:17, 84:5, 95:2, 114:8, 114:12, 114:15, 114:18, 115:1, 122:14, 125:8, 126:2, 127:2, 131:7, 133:15, 140:8, 143:12, 145:3, 160:2, 160:18, 167:6, 171:5, 173:9
Russell [2] - 1:7, 4:15
rust [1] - 11:5

S

S1 [1] - 103:3
SAME [1] - 176:18
San [4] - 33:14, 34:6, 34:8, 34:12
satisfied [1] - 15:16
save [1] - 54:19
saving [1] - 77:17
savoring [1] - 8:5
scale [5] - 58:4, 58:6, 86:13, 90:15, 107:4
scary [1] - 26:3
schedule [2] - 7:5, 166:14
scheme [1] - 107:6
school [8] - 35:10, 35:12, 35:17, 55:7, 74:2, 111:18, 157:16
scope [1] - 131:3
scraped [1] - 67:7
scraping [1] - 28:13
screen [1] - 102:19
Sea [1] - 42:4
seamless [2] - 75:7, 75:8
seamlessly [1] - 76:17
Seated [1] - 8:8
seated [1] - 5:10
Second [1] - 1:5
second [7] - 7:3, 20:15, 26:19, 120:5, 121:2, 126:18, 161:18
Secretary [1] - 151:4
section [1] - 108:8
Sector [1] - 6:4
sector [2] - 6:13, 6:14
sectors [2] - 6:13, 7:6
see [29] - 7:3, 7:4, 8:18, 9:17, 19:13, 24:4, 24:5, 25:15, 41:10, 45:16, 52:12, 56:2, 60:6, 65:2, 77:16, 77:17, 94:12, 103:2, 106:12, 109:4, 109:17, 114:4, 136:13, 142:18, 144:2, 146:6, 146:10, 154:5, 155:19
seeing [2] - 30:4, 120:14
seem [6] - 138:16, 146:12, 152:9, 157:14, 162:7, 168:13
select [1] - 33:19
selected [1] - 118:18
sell [1] - 5:13
selling [1] - 28:14
sense [14] - 14:7, 26:5, 61:16, 61:19, 77:9, 78:18, 83:2, 137:5, 150:8, 151:5, 155:14, 164:18, 165:1, 165:17
sensitive [1] - 166:6
separate [1] - 57:12
separately [1] - 159:18
sequestration [1] - 152:3
series [4] - 17:13, 20:1, 37:16, 125:7
serious [1] - 49:18
serve [1] - 157:5
served [1] - 16:14
service [1] - 151:13
services [1] - 100:18
session [1] - 13:7
set [16] - 80:7, 82:14, 83:13, 85:4, 100:1, 102:1, 102:2, 102:15, 136:17, 143:16, 149:17, 158:10, 176:9, 176:11
setting [3] - 8:19, 50:19, 79:16
seven [1] - 5:14
seventies [1] - 135:14
several [2] - 16:16, 166:13
shades [1] - 68:4
shall [1] - 143:14
shame [1] - 70:6
shaped [1] - 134:12
share [1] - 143:17
shared [5] - 10:2, 64:10, 94:16, 99:14, 100:9
sharing [1] - 99:3
SHEET [3] - 174:1, 174:17, 175:3
Sheet [4] - 174:2, 174:5, 174:13, 175:8
sheet [2] - 175:5, 175:6
shepherded [1] - 117:18
shift [1] - 117:12
shopping [1] - 39:8
shorter [3] - 23:19, 24:1, 54:13
Shorthand [2] - 176:4, 176:14
shortly [2] - 23:16, 24:11
shot [2] - 117:10
show [3] - 28:4, 82:6, 115:10
showed [1] - 78:3
showing [2] - 75:12, 116:16
shown [2] - 29:18, 102:18
shows [10] - 9:6, 10:10, 20:14, 20:15, 52:9, 56:15, 57:16, 62:10, 134:3, 134:15
side [10] - 15:9, 21:19, 40:4, 52:16, 55:18, 72:1, 75:17, 76:11, 108:17, 142:5
Side [1] - 113:6
sidewalk [1] - 76:16
siding [1] - 125:18
Sieniewicz [2] - 1:9, 4:18
SIENIEWICZ [8] - 4:18, 132:8, 134:2, 134:14, 138:11, 153:4, 153:8, 153:12
Sign [2] - 123:16, 175:6
sign [2] - 127:5, 174:13
signalling [1] - 67:12
SIGNATURE [1] - 174:1
signed [3] - 60:4, 119:12, 174:6
SIGNED [1] - 174:17
significant [4] - 54:7, 56:3, 138:3, 151:16
signs [1] - 123:16
similar [4] - 11:11, 90:5, 144:2, 163:6
similarly [1] - 15:10
Simplex [1] - 15:13
simplex [1] - 15:13
simply [1] - 11:17
single [2] - 12:2, 86:9
sisters [1] - 67:4
sit [3] - 44:7, 59:11, 132:3
site [42] - 15:13, 19:6, 21:9, 28:6, 40:19, 46:15, 47:19, 48:19, 49:15, 49:19, 51:6, 53:15, 53:19, 54:6, 55:17, 58:4, 60:1, 62:11, 62:16, 84:1, 84:7, 88:10, 106:5, 112:2, 113:14, 114:3, 114:5,

117:13, 117:18, 117:19, 120:7, 121:5, 127:16, 141:3, 141:11, 142:7, 147:15, 152:11, 161:5, 161:12, 168:9
site-by-site [1] - 88:10
sites [4] - 6:16, 74:12, 110:11, 134:1
sits [1] - 39:6
sitting [1] - 65:13
situation [1] - 77:5
six [3] - 5:14, 167:3, 167:7
Sixth [1] - 40:11
sixties [2] - 35:11, 135:13
size [3] - 88:4, 93:6, 133:5
skating [4] - 19:10, 20:2, 52:12, 52:15
sketches [1] - 102:1
skill [1] - 176:10
skipped [2] - 27:7, 84:16
skirt [1] - 122:10
skirting [2] - 125:18, 126:3
slate [4] - 111:10, 148:19, 172:6, 172:8
slender [5] - 44:9, 44:11, 44:13, 108:18, 133:2
slide [2] - 66:14, 82:6
slides [1] - 81:19
slightly [2] - 133:3, 133:8
sliver [1] - 117:14
slowed [1] - 77:3
slowly [1] - 43:16
small [7] - 37:16, 88:10, 99:14, 160:16, 164:16, 169:7, 171:18
smaller [1] - 90:14
snake [2] - 71:12, 71:13
so-called [1] - 19:11
sold [1] - 28:7
solid [1] - 13:4
solidly [1] - 113:4
solve [1] - 147:8
solving [1] - 117:15
someplace [1] - 50:4
Somerville [1] - 33:10
sometime [4] - 77:2, 99:7, 101:15, 166:5
sometimes [3] - 24:14, 93:6, 158:3
somewhat [5] - 17:11, 96:19, 103:8, 106:17, 120:13
somewhere [1] - 122:6
Sonesta [1] - 13:17
sooner [1] - 46:2
sorry [7] - 36:17, 47:16, 58:10, 88:14, 93:13, 107:19, 164:7
sort [51] - 6:7, 6:8, 7:2, 11:8, 11:9, 11:10, 11:14, 13:2, 18:14, 20:9, 21:6, 26:2, 27:7, 31:1, 56:10, 82:3, 86:2, 86:4, 86:13, 89:14, 90:14, 96:2, 102:15, 111:9, 114:12, 117:18, 118:13, 123:18, 131:1, 136:14, 137:1, 143:14, 144:16, 144:18, 148:14, 149:4, 149:6, 149:18, 151:17, 152:4, 157:5, 157:6, 157:15, 158:1, 160:19, 163:14, 165:4, 165:10, 166:9, 168:2, 171:10
sorts [1] - 24:16
sound [1] - 13:9
sounds [1] - 173:9
south [1] - 52:15
southern [1] - 109:10
space [46] - 11:6, 14:8, 14:11, 17:5, 18:16, 24:7, 26:10, 39:6, 52:19, 55:16, 56:3, 60:6, 62:11, 62:13, 62:14, 63:3, 63:16, 64:1, 68:19, 69:6, 69:14, 72:12, 78:10, 91:2, 91:13, 92:13, 92:15, 92:17, 93:10, 93:18, 94:3, 94:6, 97:9, 99:10, 99:12, 99:17, 100:13, 110:18, 112:16, 121:18, 123:1, 123:18, 149:3, 157:10, 165:6
spaces [12] - 19:1, 20:2, 26:6, 52:3, 69:16, 72:13, 72:19, 95:17, 99:13, 100:16, 122:19, 124:3
speaking [2] - 9:1, 74:13
special [3] - 4:4, 135:2, 135:11
Special [10] - 14:18, 15:2, 16:13, 16:15, 21:4, 21:5, 23:1, 61:6, 128:10, 130:7
specially [1] - 123:14
specific [7] - 89:5, 89:11, 93:15, 103:11, 121:14, 121:15, 135:7
specifically [1] - 101:9
speech [1] - 70:7
spend [2] - 9:11, 62:4
spent [12] - 24:2, 24:19, 38:8, 49:19, 105:8, 142:2, 142:3, 145:8, 145:9, 145:10, 155:4, 159:7
spiral [1] - 79:17
spiralling [1] - 80:1
split [1] - 172:18
sponsored [1] - 41:4
spot [5] - 42:6, 69:11, 69:12, 136:12, 143:1
spotlight [1] - 68:15
spread [1] - 68:3
Springfield [1] - 33:5
Square [52] - 5:16, 5:19, 7:2, 9:7, 10:4, 10:10, 10:12, 11:9, 11:15, 13:15, 16:5, 16:12, 18:8, 25:3, 25:5, 25:8, 25:10, 25:15, 26:1, 28:10, 29:2, 29:4, 36:12, 37:8, 37:12, 39:7, 46:6, 52:3, 56:16, 62:3, 67:13, 69:9, 82:12, 83:1, 85:5, 90:13, 94:9, 100:1, 100:6, 100:19, 101:2, 131:13, 131:14, 137:15, 148:12, 148:19, 154:2, 154:13, 154:14, 172:13
square [32] - 41:7, 41:13, 46:14, 47:15, 47:16, 48:8, 49:8, 62:13, 72:5, 90:1, 90:3, 93:12, 93:14, 96:11, 96:14, 96:16, 97:15, 97:16, 104:7, 104:14, 114:14, 122:3, 124:1, 124:5, 132:18, 132:19, 133:4, 133:10, 134:3, 155:19, 156:13, 164:1
squeezing [1] - 112:1
SS [1] - 176:3
staff [8] - 125:10, 126:5, 126:6, 126:10, 127:4, 132:16, 145:6, 145:9
Staff [1] - 1:13
stage [2] - 21:15, 50:19
standpoint [2] - 91:1, 147:5
stands [1] - 43:1
Start [1] - 38:1
start [17] - 4:7, 4:11, 5:11, 5:13, 8:14, 52:13, 53:1, 57:19, 61:18, 84:3, 84:18, 87:5, 95:14, 145:2, 145:6, 168:16, 168:19
started [11] - 5:15, 5:17, 14:14, 26:13, 26:17, 35:3, 57:17, 82:15, 85:12, 112:10, 156:12
starting [2] - 121:9, 143:17
startup [1] - 43:19
state [4] - 18:11, 32:17, 34:8, 138:5
State [1] - 34:11
statements [1] - 175:18
station [5] - 18:13, 59:19, 61:11, 69:8, 74:10
status [2] - 8:15, 66:15
stay [2] - 68:1, 157:16
stays [3] - 69:15, 69:17, 87:1
stealth [1] - 44:18
steam [1] - 99:1
stenographic [1] - 176:9
step [3] - 61:1, 75:10, 119:1
stepped [1] - 83:8
steps [3] - 47:2, 75:11, 146:7
Steve [5] - 4:11, 4:13, 4:17, 13:6, 72:10
Steven [2] - 1:9, 1:11
STEVEN [11] - 4:13, 4:17, 11:16, 33:8, 44:18, 55:9, 66:7, 66:11, 70:8, 71:2, 88:15
stick [1] - 21:7
still [15] - 29:14, 62:16, 79:18, 80:3, 84:1, 103:14, 105:13, 105:17, 112:18, 136:16, 144:3, 149:18, 156:19, 158:9, 171:17
stock [2] - 119:19, 154:8
stone [2] - 58:15, 58:17
storm [1] - 98:14
story [5] - 24:18, 27:16, 29:8, 67:11, 80:18
strategic [1] - 82:18
strategically [1] - 84:15
strategies [1] - 106:1
strategy [3] - 84:2, 95:13, 160:4
stream [1] - 152:17
street [10] - 22:7, 23:8, 24:12, 41:16, 42:9, 51:10, 55:12, 76:11, 90:17, 133:9
Street [38] - 19:10, 22:2, 24:9, 24:16, 24:17, 38:16, 40:12, 40:13, 41:17, 42:7, 42:8, 42:10, 43:7, 43:9, 51:6, 51:12, 52:10, 52:16, 52:18, 55:19, 56:1, 56:16, 56:17, 61:10, 61:11, 71:14, 91:4, 92:1, 92:2, 96:7, 96:13, 110:7, 142:4, 142:5, 158:2, 162:11, 166:18
streets [5] - 26:5, 70:16, 71:3, 91:19, 113:9
stretch [1] - 111:10
strictly [1] - 102:9
strip [1] - 70:13
strong [6] - 17:13, 32:3, 33:15, 72:1, 154:10, 172:2
stronger [1] - 33:14
strongly [1] - 157:9
structure [3] - 11:11, 44:15, 150:2
structured [2] - 11:5, 152:8
structures [2] - 16:12,

67:14
Stuart [3] - 1:15, 44:4, 51:16
STUART [14] - 41:2, 43:18, 44:5, 45:5, 48:14, 51:17, 59:2, 74:19, 124:9, 125:4, 130:15, 157:15, 164:12, 172:7
students [1] - 55:7
studied [2] - 96:18, 110:12
studies [2] - 68:6, 81:13
studio [1] - 111:18
study [15] - 23:17, 56:14, 59:15, 89:6, 95:3, 103:17, 140:10, 140:15, 141:6, 141:8, 155:11, 162:5, 162:6, 170:15, 170:18
studying [1] - 98:16
stuff [7] - 26:17, 44:14, 142:8, 142:17, 159:5, 169:2, 169:16
styles [1] - 93:3
subject [1] - 130:19
subscribe [1] - 175:17
subsequent [1] - 85:4
suburbs [1] - 31:19
succeeded [1] - 59:16
success [2] - 24:18, 91:6
successes [1] - 54:17
successful [4] - 20:3, 101:12, 119:11, 143:18
successor [1] - 34:14
suddenly [1] - 150:5
suggest [4] - 69:19, 145:13, 152:13, 155:7
suggestion [1] - 145:18
suit [1] - 152:15
Sullivan [2] - 65:13, 100:19
summer [3] - 5:15, 20:4, 154:15
supplied [1] - 174:13
supposed [1] - 29:9
surplus [1] - 150:4
surprised [1] - 98:19
surrounded [1] - 26:16
surveyors [1] - 43:11
sustainability [4] - 62:8, 63:4, 64:7, 98:5
sustainable [1] - 22:17
swoop [1] - 150:6
Symbot [1] - 36:7
system [7] - 14:8, 18:16, 22:9, 98:7, 98:17, 99:1, 101:1
systems [3] - 19:19, 99:3

T

table [2] - 29:14, 150:19
tackle [1] - 102:3
talks [1] - 61:3
tall [6] - 25:16, 53:12, 68:19, 112:1, 113:8, 134:1
taller [4] - 58:6, 97:1, 97:2, 107:17
taping [2] - 162:2, 162:3
Team [1] - 140:12
tear [1] - 29:5
tearing [1] - 113:11
tease [1] - 165:10
tech [1] - 25:9
Tech [2] - 26:1, 36:12
technical [2] - 73:6, 122:3
technically [2] - 122:7, 148:16
Ted [2] - 4:16, 124:13
tenants [2] - 112:8, 112:12
tending [1] - 68:11
term [2] - 6:19, 99:16
terms [22] - 11:4, 18:2, 23:2, 43:1, 53:17, 85:7, 87:17, 88:4, 93:10, 94:13, 98:14, 129:3, 130:2, 134:4, 137:1, 146:19, 148:4, 150:8, 150:12, 150:14, 165:13, 168:3
terrible [1] - 19:17
terribly [1] - 162:8
terrified [1] - 154:5
testimony [3] - 174:13, 175:5, 176:8
THE [9] - 1:1, 1:18, 139:6, 174:16, 176:17, 176:18, 176:18
them's [1] - 60:13
theme [2] - 60:6, 98:17
themes [2] - 22:19, 44:12
themselves [3] - 8:14, 26:4, 31:8
theodore [1] - 1:7
THEODORE [10] - 4:16, 96:12, 98:1, 118:3, 128:14, 129:15, 130:13, 141:4, 149:9, 149:13
theoretical [1] - 168:10
thereafter [1] - 24:11
therefor [2] - 174:13, 175:5
thereof [1] - 174:6
they've [11] - 23:12, 34:10, 37:6, 51:14, 80:8, 113:9, 116:14, 116:15, 119:16, 141:2, 150:11
thinking [23] - 11:1, 23:3, 25:1, 61:4, 61:12, 63:12, 71:8, 71:9, 72:18, 72:19, 73:1, 75:10, 94:5, 117:17, 136:19, 138:7, 139:17, 148:11, 166:12, 166:19, 167:12, 167:16
Third [10] - 19:10, 22:2, 24:9, 24:15, 24:17, 52:10, 55:13, 91:3, 92:1, 158:2
third [4] - 40:9, 165:6
thirds [2] - 39:15, 81:8
THIS [2] - 174:16, 176:17
thoughts [2] - 143:18, 144:19
thousand [1] - 133:18
threats [1] - 50:4
three [13] - 6:13, 67:3, 67:4, 71:2, 72:6, 74:16, 74:18, 75:10, 81:6, 90:2, 133:15, 164:10, 167:4
threw [1] - 137:12
throughout [5] - 20:9, 90:13, 92:18, 94:6, 102:5
throw [1] - 106:14
Thursday [1] - 125:17
TIBBS [18] - 27:5, 27:9, 27:15, 30:9, 30:12, 105:4, 106:18, 111:14, 117:2, 127:11, 127:17, 132:7, 141:15, 159:19, 168:12, 170:10, 170:17, 171:3
Tibbs [3] - 1:8, 8:8, 8:10
tie [1] - 68:11
tight [2] - 42:6, 86:2
tightly [1] - 85:6
timings's [1] - 54:5
tiniest [1] - 164:14
TIS [1] - 129:12
title [1] - 145:4
TO [2] - 175:1, 176:17
today [4] - 31:16, 32:11, 43:1, 136:10
together [22] - 7:1, 7:14, 11:14, 18:10, 26:13, 26:18, 43:3, 52:13, 53:5, 57:11, 61:4, 71:4, 71:14, 72:14, 73:3, 132:4, 135:4, 142:1, 144:11, 158:18, 160:3, 172:12
TOM [9] - 4:18, 34:14, 132:8, 134:2, 134:14, 138:11, 153:4, 153:8, 153:12
Tom [5] - 1:9, 4:18, 34:2, 34:5, 136:13
tonight [3] - 4:4, 118:9, 156:6
tonight's [1] - 165:1
took [6] - 12:18, 14:1, 15:8, 15:15, 79:10, 119:3
tool [1] - 86:7
toolkit [2] - 136:17, 136:18
tools [2] - 136:18, 140:19
top [4] - 39:5, 92:16, 110:8, 111:3
topic [1] - 93:11
topics [1] - 82:14
torn [1] - 68:16
tortus [1] - 22:17
total [3] - 36:4, 89:19, 104:19
touched [1] - 57:18
touching [1] - 89:2
tough [1] - 63:13
tours [1] - 71:11
towards [6] - 10:15, 17:7, 23:12, 40:12, 59:15, 68:11
tower [17] - 25:19, 29:10, 42:5, 42:17, 44:9, 65:10, 67:9, 67:10, 68:1, 71:18, 71:19, 74:5, 98:2, 105:19, 133:1, 133:2, 133:3
towers [7] - 44:12, 108:4, 108:18, 110:3, 111:6, 133:15, 143:8
tradeoff [2] - 56:13, 92:12
traditional [1] - 152:5
traffic [5] - 17:17, 18:5, 94:19, 129:4, 129:7
Traffic [2] - 95:11, 129:4
training [1] - 55:5
Transcript [1] - 3:6
transcript [8] - 174:9, 174:12, 174:14, 175:4, 175:6, 175:7, 175:16, 175:17
TRANSCRIPT [2] - 174:16, 176:17
transcription [1] - 176:9
transformation [2] - 11:12, 108:7
transformed [2] - 13:1, 119:16
transit [3] - 100:17, 100:18, 101:1
transition [1] - 56:10
Transportation [2] - 6:15, 129:5
transportation [5] - 147:6, 151:19, 152:1, 154:18, 165:7
treats [2] - 123:13, 123:17
tremendous [3] - 64:4, 72:15, 145:5
tremendously [1] - 148:19
tried [3] - 18:15, 42:19, 134:8
tries [2] - 8:15, 154:7
triligion [1] - 74:17
trouble [3] - 60:3, 66:6, 116:2
true [6] - 13:16, 32:15, 36:11, 104:18, 134:10, 176:9
try [14] - 6:2, 12:10, 14:5, 19:6, 54:11, 82:4, 83:15, 93:8, 95:5, 129:19,

135:11, 136:15, 137:1, 167:4
trying [26] - 11:5, 21:7, 29:12, 37:16, 39:8, 39:14, 59:13, 61:10, 63:8, 63:19, 64:1, 64:8, 64:10, 64:11, 104:1, 116:4, 128:15, 131:1, 136:2, 140:5, 147:7, 149:18, 159:8, 160:8, 167:18, 170:13
Tuesday [1] - 1:3
tune [1] - 54:8
turf [2] - 156:19
turn [1] - 9:5
turning [1] - 40:5
turns [1] - 167:10
tweaked [1] - 161:8
tweaking [1] - 45:12
Twining [2] - 20:13, 168:8
Twinings' [1] - 20:7
two [24] - 6:3, 39:3, 39:15, 51:11, 51:15, 55:17, 55:18, 56:12, 57:12, 65:9, 67:13, 74:14, 81:8, 106:9, 106:15, 108:4, 108:17, 110:2, 111:6, 123:9, 126:11, 142:1, 144:13, 173:6
two-acre [3] - 51:15, 55:17, 56:12
two-thirds [1] - 81:8
tying [2] - 61:9, 61:11
type [3] - 91:7, 121:12, 159:1
types [2] - 94:17, 94:18
typical [2] - 88:5, 151:9
typically [2] - 62:17, 117:10
typing [1] - 27:14

U

U.S [3] - 150:13, 151:2, 151:3
ultimately [3] - 80:16, 115:8, 129:12
umbrella [2] - 124:19, 130:17
unbuilt [1] - 26:10
undecided [1] - 77:18
under [12] - 42:1, 58:3, 83:8, 86:9, 87:7, 87:8, 124:19, 129:8, 130:17, 151:4, 151:6, 169:10
UNDER [1] - 176:18
undergo [2] - 116:8, 130:7
undergone [1] - 116:7
underlying [2] - 23:14, 123:9
undersigned [1] - 176:4
understandable [1] - 26:11
underutilized [1] - 95:17
underway [3] - 39:17, 51:11, 56:13
undeveloped [1] - 84:1
unemployment [1] - 26:8
unfold [2] - 80:19, 166:13
union [1] - 154:10
unique [8] - 106:3, 112:19, 114:5, 139:14, 139:15, 142:10
unit [3] - 86:5, 92:19, 97:11
units [5] - 50:14, 93:3, 93:7, 141:11, 141:13
universities [1] - 36:9
University [8] - 11:7, 15:10, 16:7, 16:18, 17:12, 18:18, 56:18, 59:18
unless [1] - 71:7
UNLESS [1] - 176:18
unlike [1] - 19:16
unlock [1] - 148:3
unrealistic [1] - 103:5
unsuccessful [1] - 34:5
unusual [4] - 139:14, 140:1, 151:12, 152:2
up [62] - 8:19, 10:5, 12:13, 14:4, 14:10, 15:6, 15:14, 15:15, 16:10, 19:9, 20:5, 21:16, 28:12, 28:16, 29:10, 38:8, 41:19, 43:14, 51:8, 52:1, 52:9, 53:1, 56:12, 57:17, 60:19, 66:14, 70:15, 72:3, 75:10, 76:18, 80:1, 80:2, 82:18, 85:4, 87:10, 92:11, 95:15, 97:15, 98:9, 102:18, 119:1, 132:12, 132:14, 143:15, 144:17, 146:6, 146:18, 148:9, 150:18, 151:17, 152:16, 156:13, 157:9, 158:9, 159:17, 163:13, 165:15, 166:8, 171:9, 172:18
Update [1] - 3:4
Upper [1] - 113:5
upper [1] - 72:3
upzoning [1] - 161:13
urban [15] - 11:6, 14:8, 18:12, 18:16, 28:11, 28:16, 30:18, 31:1, 35:5, 42:9, 67:6, 70:18, 85:5, 121:3, 131:10
useful [4] - 116:4, 125:15, 132:12, 141:1
useless [1] - 68:2
uses [13] - 20:5, 20:8, 21:13, 53:18, 57:10, 88:13, 89:9, 91:15, 91:18, 92:4, 92:11, 94:17, 95:18
utilitarian [1] - 44:14
utilized [1] - 47:16

V

Valkenburgh [1] - 58:8
value [1] - 44:3
van [2] - 58:8, 160:13
variations [2] - 94:1, 138:10
version [2] - 132:17, 147:13
viable [2] - 148:10, 148:16
vibrant [1] - 113:18
Vice [1] - 1:7
view [2] - 111:16, 162:7
viewed [1] - 150:3
visible [1] - 122:12
vision [24] - 21:7, 62:10, 84:7, 105:10, 105:18, 114:3, 117:6, 132:13, 132:16, 132:17, 142:13, 144:2, 148:4, 148:17, 153:5, 156:8, 157:18, 163:15, 168:15, 169:7, 170:7, 170:13, 170:14
visionary [1] - 117:17
visions [3] - 14:5, 95:3, 143:7
vista [1] - 40:3
visually [1] - 133:5
Volpe [23] - 25:19, 29:10, 53:9, 53:17, 54:2, 54:6, 61:9, 62:11, 71:19, 83:19, 142:7, 146:4, 146:13, 146:19, 149:8, 149:10, 151:5, 151:9, 151:14, 152:9, 158:11, 172:5
Volpe's [3] - 53:14, 147:5, 154:7
volume [3] - 174:12, 174:14, 175:6
vote [1] - 60:19
voted [3] - 32:19, 34:1, 126:17
voting [1] - 79:6

W

wait [1] - 162:14
waiting [1] - 146:5
walk [3] - 57:5, 82:5, 87:18
walked [1] - 8:11
walking [2] - 71:11, 89:2
walkway [5] - 15:6, 15:9, 39:5, 40:12, 61:8
walkways [1] - 41:19
wall [3] - 58:15, 75:18, 75:19
wants [3] - 25:8, 25:11, 49:6
waste [1] - 99:4
wasteland [4] - 12:17, 13:2, 13:19, 15:11
water [1] - 98:14
Watermark [3] - 20:7, 20:14, 24:12
Watertown [1] - 33:8
wayfinding [1] - 73:2
ways [10] - 9:2, 44:2, 85:6, 95:15, 142:18, 149:19, 150:16, 158:6, 170:5, 171:6
weaving [1] - 143:9
week [1] - 6:6
weekend [1] - 35:3
weeks [2] - 167:8, 167:9
weigh [1] - 21:15
welcome [1] - 5:8
welcomed [1] - 31:16
Wellington [3] - 37:4, 37:18, 38:12
Wellington-Harrington [3] - 37:4, 37:18, 38:12
West [2] - 38:16, 113:6
WHEN [1] - 174:17
whereas [2] - 124:5, 130:18
WHEREOF [1] - 176:11
white [3] - 98:16, 107:7, 109:6
whole [12] - 14:10, 19:8, 47:6, 53:3, 67:5, 68:9, 68:13, 71:15, 75:8, 77:4, 105:6, 117:6
wide [1] - 63:2
WILLIAM [18] - 27:5, 27:9, 27:15, 30:9, 30:12, 105:4, 106:18, 111:14, 117:2, 127:11, 127:17, 132:7, 141:15, 159:19, 168:12, 170:10, 170:17, 171:3
William [2] - 1:8, 8:8
willing [2] - 146:2, 154:16
willingness [1] - 137:11
window [2] - 54:3, 152:19
WINTER [9] - 4:17, 11:16, 44:18, 55:9, 66:7, 66:11, 70:8, 71:2, 88:15
winter [1] - 20:3
Winter [2] - 1:9, 4:17
WINTERS [10] - 4:14, 58:11, 77:8, 77:14, 77:19, 78:13, 79:5, 81:1, 127:10, 171:8
Winters [2] - 1:8, 4:14
wisdom [1] - 12:3
WITH [1] - 174:16
WITNESS [1] - 176:11
witness [1] - 66:1
woman [1] - 38:5
wonderful [6] - 22:8, 54:19, 67:9, 71:5, 81:5, 81:15
wondering [1] - 77:9
Worcester [1] - 33:3
word [2] - 131:5,

166:19
words [1] - 78:15
workers [1] - 154:10
workforce [2] - 101:2, 165:7
works [3] - 11:15, 73:5, 115:11
Works [1] - 77:1
world [1] - 69:2
worried [1] - 167:15
worries [2] - 18:18, 139:13
worry [1] - 146:1
wow [1] - 109:19
wrap [1] - 143:15
writing [1] - 169:19
written [3] - 43:14, 85:6, 85:8
www.reportersinc.com [1] - 1:19

Y

year [2] - 16:16, 150:19
years [15] - 9:13, 15:8, 23:11, 25:7, 34:7, 38:8, 49:9, 78:6, 85:11, 103:7, 113:16, 120:10, 124:14, 126:13, 171:6
yellow [3] - 102:19, 109:2, 109:6
yellows [1] - 107:10
York [1] - 113:7
young [1] - 119:2

Z

Zelinski [2] - 176:4, 176:13
Zevin [2] - 3:9, 5:7
ZEVIN [6] - 5:7, 36:6, 38:2, 158:7, 158:13, 158:16
zone [2] - 48:7, 56:10
Zone [1] - 103:15
Zoning [65] - 3:3, 5:18, 7:6, 10:5, 17:14, 18:18, 29:15, 45:1, 45:8, 47:4, 47:11, 48:4, 63:2, 64:17, 64:18, 70:1, 73:4, 79:1, 79:16, 82:4, 82:16, 83:15, 84:19, 85:2, 86:2, 86:11, 87:1, 87:4, 87:7, 89:10, 91:1, 91:5, 93:11, 95:16, 96:18, 97:6, 97:14, 99:5, 102:4, 106:4, 115:7, 122:6, 123:9, 123:11, 124:2, 124:6, 124:9, 124:17, 128:17, 129:10, 129:17, 130:4, 130:6, 130:10, 131:14, 134:9, 141:11, 144:14, 169:18, 170:18, 171:6, 172:15, 172:18
zooming [2] - 25:13, 25:14