1	
2	PLANNING BOARD FOR THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE
3	GENERAL HEARING
4	Tuesday, February 12, 2013
5	7:05 p.m. in
6	Second Floor Meeting Room, 344 Broadway
7	City Hall Annex McCusker Building Cambridge, Massachusetts
8	Hugh Duggell Chair
9	Hugh Russell, Chair H. Theodore Cohen, Vice Chair Thomas Appinger, Member
10	Thomas Anninger, Member Pamela Winters, Member William Tibbs, Member
11	Steven Winter, Member Ahmed Nur, Associate Member
12	
13	Brian Murphy, Assistant City Manager for Community Development
14	O
15	Community Development Staff: Susan Glazer
16	Liza Paden Roger Boothe
17	Stuart Dash Jeff Roberts
18	Iram Farooq
19	DEDODTEDS INC
20	REPORTERS, INC. CAPTURING THE OFFICIAL RECORD 617.786.7783/617.639.0396
21	www.reportersinc.com

1	TNDEV	
2	INDEX	
3	<u>CASE</u> <u>PAGE</u>	
4	GENERAL BUSINESS	
5	1. Board of Zoning Appeal Cases 3	
6	2. Update, Brian Murphy, Assistant City Manager of Community Development 3	
7	3. Adoption of Meeting Transcript (s) 3	
8	4. Kendall Square & Central Square	
9	(K2C2) Discussion 5	
10	KeyWord Index 174	
11	Transfer a Triage	
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
= •		

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	(Sitting Members: Hugh Russell, H. Theodore
3	Cohen, Thomas Anninger, Pamela Winters,
4	Steven Winter.)
5	HUGH RUSSELL: Good evening. This
6	is a meeting of the Cambridge Planning Board
7	and I believe we have no Zoning Board of
8	Appeal cases to discuss; is that correct?
9	LIZA PADEN: No, we don't.
10	HUGH RUSSELL: And do we have any
11	meeting transcripts?
12	LIZA PADEN: No.
13	HUGH RUSSELL: So, Brian, would you
14	like to give us your update?
15	BRIAN MURPHY: Sure. Just to give
16	an update, the Planning Board is meeting
17	again next week on the 19th, and that will be
18	another sort of action-packed meeting. We've
19	got one BZA case on antenna replacement on
20	300 Mount Auburn Street for Mount Auburn
21	Hospital. Then we have a public hearing on

54R Cedar Street, and I believe that's scheduled for 7:20. And depending on what happens with that, we are therefore scheduling MIT for I believe 7:30 so that if -- we don't know whether Cedar Street will be going forward or not. But that way there shouldn't be too much of a gap. The MIT discussion will be a continuation of the discussion on the MIT Zoning that, you know, with the Board is a continuation of that hearing.

HUGH RUSSELL: We have two or three meetings in March?

BRIAN MURPHY: I believe we'll have three in March. And the events, just so the Board knows, the City Council on Monday night, will be Forest City Petition to a second reading as amended. And so the earliest they could then discuss it and ordain it shows will be the 25th. In addition, the City Council has scheduled two

Am

I'll

1 Ordinance Committee hearings to go into the 2 MIT Petition. The first one is at the end of 3 February, I believe it's the 26th. 4 confirm that. And that's at 4:30. 5 that's going to be focused on built forum 6 primarily. Yes, it's on February 26th, 7 specifically to discuss built forum including 8 FAR heights, floor plates, open space, and 9 parking. And that's on Tuesday, the 26th at 10 4:30. And then again on Thursday, March 7th 11 at 4:30 another public meeting to continue 12 MIT, the discussion on the MIT Petition to 13 discuss uses, incentive zoning, community 14 funds, housing, and sustainability. 15 that's sort of a parallel process that's 16 going on to the Planning Boards next week. 17 HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you. 18 So we have a series of items for 19 discussion on Kendall and Central Square. 20 I correct that the first piece is the 21 housing?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

BRIAN MURPHY: Yes, that's correct.

We thought we would start with housing, followed by transportation. We then assume that the Board might want a short break and then go into design guidelines. Our general best guess was that perhaps 30 minutes or so on housing, 30 minutes or so on transportation, and then probably want to go around, you know, 90 minutes for design guidelines. Obviously if the Board wants to get deeper into any of these issues, if people are prepared to do that, we've got Chris Cotter and his team from the housing staff and Stuart, Roger, and Iram from the planning side to talk about the design guidelines and Susanne Rasmussen is here to talk about transportation and housing.

HUGH RUSSELL: So one member of the Board asked me three minutes ago well, what's the goal for us to achieve this evening? And I said, the ultimate goal for design

19 20

21

guidelines is to have a final document that the Board adopts as design guidelines. And that this is one -- the guidelines discussions is one step along the way. I think we all hope it's a step near the end of the way, but we will see. And I'm not quite sure how the housing and transportation discussions fit into that and fit into the MIT Zoning Petition.

Can you give us some --

BRIAN MURPHY: Sure, I'll start and then members can jump in if they like. The general goal is to really to just provide the Board with a little bit more context in terms of analyzing some of these pieces. Obviously housing in general has been a very hot topic in the City for understandable reasons. You can't look anywhere without seeing stories of properties that are going for significantly more than they're assessed. We are a (inaudible) residential real estate market.

And that's one issue.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

In addition, we've got the tensions that go on between competing uses in a city that's 6.2 square miles. I noted that I think it was a week ago Sunday, the piece on the boom on North Dakota. Slightly different I believe that their density circumstances. is something like 10 per square mile. So, you know, maybe roughly, you know, 62 people for the size of Cambridge. So it's a slightly different approach to density, but that's certainly not the case here in Cambridge. There are competing demands for uses, and so it's come up a lot in the Kendall Square and Central Square context. And we thought it would helpful to give the Board a little bit of a take the lens back a little bit and provide kind of an overview and introduction to some of the work that our housing division does and talk about affordable housing primarily, but I'll touch

2

a little bit on some of the housing challenges in general.

3

4 again, this has been an issue that's been

5

6 the discussions in Kendall Square and Central

7

Square. There was an article in the Globe

very, very pronounced in terms of a lot of

8

last summer talking about the effectiveness

On the transportation side of things,

9

of PTDM which was in Kendall Square and how

10

we've actually had less of a traffic impact

11

as had been anticipated from some of the

12

13

early planning studies. But thought it would sort of be helpful to go a little deeper for

14

the Board in terms of some the work that was

15

done by Susanne Rasmussen and her team and

16

Sue Clippinger and her team in terms of some

17

of the preparations on traffic for K2 and C2.

18

Again, to give the Board a better sense and

better context.

19

20

So I would say that while those are not

21

directly related to the discussion the Board

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

1011

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

will have next week with MIT, the hope is that it provides you with a little bit of background information going forward.

HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.

STUART DASH: Stuart Dash, Community Development.

What we felt just briefly talk about, and for members of the Board of looking back, we sort of often in our planning work we look forward 20 years and we sort of look back a little bit, and the question came up at the last meeting concerning MIT, is what is the city looking -- how does the city look at housing and think about housing over time? And the question from the Board was could we sort of respond to it a little bit, to the questions of does the city try to do an overall planning look at housing. And certainly Hugh was there back in '92 when we worked on the original growth policy document, which was not the first place the

city thinks about housing. Anyone who was here during the rent control certainly can attest that's not the only time the city has talked about housing and thought about it very deeply. And that was a good sort of demarcation point for us where we very explicitly brought together members of the public and the Planning Board to talk about housing. And the clear goal and vision for the city at that time was that a strong housing supply and also a strong housing to support the diversity that people value so much in the city.

And in the citywide zoning that we then added a number of the Planning Board members to that. I think Tom was here and Pam was also here and I think Bill part of that, where we explicitly said that we really wanted to encourage the housing supply. And if the tune of the -- what is the first of many places where we may rebalance the FAR's

for housing and for commercial to put an incentive into place, a very strong incentive to increase the supply of housing. And what we've seen over the last dozen years is a very strong housing to supply increase and a shift of -- a positive shift in the jobs housing balance which was one of the things we talked about a lot through citywide which was if we're going to have this many jobs, we have a responsibility to have a reasonable amount of housing to serve the percentage of jobs that we have.

And then as we went through ECaPs, the Eastern Cambridge Planning Study and the Concord/Alewife Planning Study, we took that same approach of encouraging housing and putting in place incentives for housing and in the context of those specific planning areas for Eastern Cambridge and for the Concord/Alewife area.

At the same time the universities got

3

2

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

into the -- into playing with -- there was a 1991 university study where the universities committed to work very hard to sort of do better on housing their graduate students. And they increased their housing supply for graduate students by quite a bit over the last decade. What's often seen as, I think you've heard is a moving target which is how many graduate students they actually have from that period of time. So they peaked up to sort of 50 percent, which was their goal, and then fell back down as the supply of housing -- the graduate students increased. And I think that's something that certainly we realize is something that has to be, along with the housing supply in general, sort of talked about on a continuous basis.

The change in the workforce ratio, I
think we think of is very important when we
talk about the citywide in terms of also
traffic and giving the opportunity for people

who work here to live here. And it's not to say that when you build housing near jobs, everyone's going to live near their job, but just that you give that opportunity, something that's important for traffic. And we've seen an increase in the number of percentage of people who work in Cambridge, living in Cambridge, and increase in the percentage of people who live in Cambridge walking to work and not taking cars to work, and all those things sort of add up to a positive influence for us.

What I'd like to ask is Chris Cotter to come up and talk briefly about the specifics of the housing policy, the day-to-day policy that he oversees and that we'd tried to give you some sense of in that document for the planning of housing in Cambridge.

CHRIS COTTER: Thanks, Stuart. Good evening. I'm Chris Cotter, Director of Housing for the City of -- Community

Development. So you have in your packet a document that we prepared, just to give you a little background on the City's housing goals, objectives, and housing programs that are -- that we offer. So I oversee the housing division, so we administer the City's housing programs. I know many of you are aware of many of those programs. The one supplementary piece, I did hand out was an income, a chart of income limits which we'll talk about going through. I just wanted to give you a picture of the housing market because I know some of the questions came up in light of the discussions that we've had with the Kendall and Central Committee, so just to give you a sense as to, you know, what the housing needs are now as we see them given the housing market. But just a little overview for all of you. So I would say that the housing division, we oversee the City's

programs to preserve and create affordable

20

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

21

3

2

4

5 6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

housing primarily for low and modern income residents we have. We do have programs that are available for middle income residents as well. We'll talk about those a little bit. And some of the accomplishments and some of the current needs that we see on issues that we're dealing with. As I think, most of you know, we work very closely with the Affordable Housing Trust and staff that We're fortunate to have Bill as a Board. member of the trust, and so we see him on a regular basis talking about the housing needs and what the trust can do to preserve some of the socioeconomic diversity and the low and moderate income assist the housing to low to moderate income residents.

(William Tibbs seated.)

CHRIS COTTER: So just starting off to give folks a picture, because I know that we're talking about the Kendall/Central Study Committees. And we talked a lot about

3

4

5

6 7

8

9

1011

12

13

. •

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

housing affordability there. We talked a lot about a growing need or a growing gap between what the housing market costs are and what's affordable to certainly low and moderate income households, but also now increasingly middle income households. So in your write-up you'll see that our most recent analysis of the rental market looking at asking rents in the city, saw some dramatic increases. And frankly, we've been seeing some pretty significant increases over the last couple of years after several years in which rents were flat, maybe even went down a little bit, but depending on the timing of the survey, but we've seen a dramatic rebound and are now seeing rents approaching all time highs. So you'll note there that the rent that we have in our survey for a three-bedroom unit, which is where we think would be some of the greatest affordability gaps are particularly for families and those

18

19

20

21

looking for larger units. We recently eclipsed \$3,000 a month for a three-bedroom That's almost 3200. unit. That's the first time we've seen anything that high for a three-bedroom unit, and that's up just over 20 percent in the last two years. So, you know, it's a pretty significant jump. And similar to jumps that we've seen in other unit sizes. Two bedrooms are now up as well, over 20 percent. We're seeing rents there approximately 2800. And to give you an idea of income needed to afford those rents, when you're talking about a three-bedroom unit at almost \$3200 a month, you need an income that's roughly 135 percent of the median income in order to be able to afford that paying 30 percent of your income. And I did hand out the income chart. These are figures that are set by HUD and become kind of the eligibility limits for housing programs. Generally speaking most housing programs are

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

-- limits are 80 percent of median. You see that there. And as I said, we do have some programs that stretch up beyond that. You see for HUD 80 percent of median which is the federal limit for a family of four, 67,000. We, and for the inclusionary program raise that to an actual number for this MSA, this statistical area as defined by HUD. To get to a slightly higher number, try to make that program serve a broader range of households, getting up, you know, into the middle income range. And then as I've said, we've got home buyer programs that are available for middle income households at this point earning up to 100 percent median. So right now we're able, through our current programs, to assist households earning -- four-person households earning up to \$94,000. And we do have units in the hard stock of restricted units that serve families earning up to 120 percent. You know, generally speaking, though, they

2

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

tend to be restricted to lower levels, 100 or 80, but we do have programs that will reach out to say 113 or so for a family of four.

So as I said, rents are going up. We're now seeing -- beginning to see a rebound or an increase in sales prices for condominiums. We just took a look at the -all the data now that's in for 2012, and saw about a five percent increase in the median price of a condominium. And, again, this is a measure that we use that has been flat for the last few years. It's now up to about \$445,000 after being in the 420 range for, you know, at least the last three or four years. So, again, it's to us signalling a time where we're entering a period where we're seeing housing costs beginning to increase rather dramatically. And I said, with the rental you're seeing that for a couple of years and increasingly becoming an issue for higher income households than are

typically served through affordable housing programs. The programs that we work with as I said, generally capture 80 percent. It comes with the funding that's used for those programs up through the state or Federal Government, and for programs that have got, that don't have that type of a assistance but receive funding from a trust or support from the city. We have raised those limits where we can.

But as I said, we're seeing incomes in the, you know, certainly dramatic reduction in the amount of housing that's affordable to families at 100 percent median now. Same thing, a reduction in housing even at 120 and, you know, not surprisingly we remain a city of impossible opportunities for folks at 80 percent of the realm. Which is not new, that's always been the case, but what we are seeing new is that the gap is now stretching into the middle income range.

2

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So, we talked with the Central Square Committee a lot about what we're seeing and what we're hearing. We heard a lot from them about their concerns about housing, particularly about middle income housing, family housing. Heard a lot of stories of folks who know people in the community who are leaving, who are forced out because they weren't able to find, you know, affordable larger units. So they're looking at opportunities in other cities and towns. It's consistent with what we see. As you know, we oversee the city stock of affordable ownership units. So we are seeing an increasing number of folks now moving out of the city, out of that program. Success stories really, but folks who would love to stay in Cambridge but don't have the options given, given what's available in the private market. I mentioned the rents for the three-bedroom units. We're seeing similar

19

20

21

things on the sales side. The median price for a condo at 45 is what we looked at for our most recent analysis, that is reflective of a stock that is predominantly one and two-bedroom units, smaller units. aren't as many threes in that number. when you look at adjusting that number for larger units, it becomes even more affordable. I just took a look this afternoon just to see, you know, for a family looking for a three-bedroom unit, what was on the market. I found 65 units of listings of units of three bedrooms or larger, two of which were under \$600,000. So, you know, well beyond what's affordable, for certainly low mod and getting into the middle income range.

So I wanted to give you that backdrop, because I know that questions came as to how this is related to the Kendall/Central recommendations, and where we talked about

public benefits and that context of the housing, that came from the discussion was seen as a having the potential for one of those benefits, along with many other worthy things of course. The one difference is when we talked about middle income affordability, that they're not other avenues to produce that other than, you know, really city -- sponsored city initiatives.

The funding that we use to develop and preserve affordable housing is generally capped out at 80 percent. You know, you might be able to fund a couple sources that will go a little higher than that, but not public funding that's available to subsidize folks in that income range. So, you know, we saw it as an opportunity really just to see could there be something that could be done through Zoning that might produce a small supply of units that might assist some of the these families looking for affordable

opportunities, albeit they earn more than the traditional programs would allow, to see what might work. So in some sense it is trying to see if we can leverage some of the benefits that might come through the Kendall/Central recommendations to try to expand up the programs to folks who are really caught between what the affordable programs serve and where the market is.

You've got a lot more information here.

I'm happy to answer questions about it. I
can briefly run through some of the City's
programs. I mentioned the trust. That's the
I think the biggest thing we do, is work with
the trust where the city allocates, has
allocated the majority of the Community
Preservation Act funds to support the
preservation and creation of affordable
housing. We spend a lot of time doing that
working with local non-profit housing
agencies, private developers, and the

Cambridge Housing Authority to do that. I know you're all familiar with the Inclusionary Ordinance which has been around now coming up on 15 years, and it's been a fabulously successful in producing more than 466 units during that time and really it's been, you know, cited within a number of studies as a national model where we are able to serve such a diverse range of incomes through that program.

You know, the City's commitment to housing really is second to none that I'm aware of. The City Manager right on down to the City Council, you know, for many years has had housing as a top priority. We've been fortunate to have very good folks in the affordable housing trust administering and helping us make the decision that the housing policies, and the needs continue. The needs have changed and will continue to evolve, you know, as I said, the low and moderate income

21

families that we see as the primary mission remain priced out of the market. Restoring, preserving some of that economic diversity in the city remains a goal. And you know, the growing need for middle income housing is something that we want to continue to have conversations with you all, with the City Council, and with the Affordable Housing Trust to understand what the benefits of that type of program might be and what some of the policy considerations, tradeoffs might be. should mention that we're looking at this at a time when we're seeing unprecedented cuts in funding for housing programs at the federal level which are filtering down. We're feeling them here in federal funds the city administers. I think we have seen more than 20 percent cut in CDBG funds in the last two or three years. Those are funds that fund programs that we administer for low and moderate income families around the city.

Funds a lot of our staff time. We've seen approximately a 40 percent cut, I believe, in the Home Program the Federal Home Program that used for housing production. So, you know, we would be severely limited. We're obviously very fortunate to have the CPA funds in Cambridge, and are able to continue doing the preservation and creation of housing with those funds allow.

Going forward, you know, so the declining resources will remain a challenge. We also are faced with the impacts of that and the end of restrictions on a lot of units that have been long-term affordable resources. There are more than 800 units, affordable rental units, that are facing expiring restrictions before 2020. And so that has been our top priority for the last couple of years. We're fortunate in preserving more than 270 in the last couple of years, but those 800 remain out there.

How to preserve those homes for 800 families in a time when we're seeing funds dwindle is a pressing challenge and one that we're working to prepare for. That said, we expect that we'll see similar issues for the CHA, Cambridge Housing Authority, also facing federal cuts. We, the trust was involved in and we assisted the CHA with CPA funds that were used to revitalize the Lincoln Way Development which I believe you saw through the permitting process and also the Jackson Gardens Development. The Public Housing Act, while they weren't facing expiring affordability restrictions really were facing the end of their useful life. And CHA has other assets in similar states of capital needs that got a pretty long list of developments that need capital reinvestments and they're relying on funding that they get from HUD and the Federal Government to deal with a lot of that inventory. And as those

2

3

5

4

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

resources continue to dwindle, I expect that we'll both be working with them to help them strategize and access resources to try to deal with some of the larger developments that they have out there.

Another thing that we've been talking about a lot recently is the needs of an aging population and the Silverware Commission that met for about a year to talk about the needs of the baby boomers as they enter retirement and with the, you know, how do you best support them with a variety of choices as they look at that housing options, aging in place, and retirement communities. We have been working obviously on other senior housing developments. We've preserved some of those developments that have been facing expiring use restrictions, so it's something that we're also spending a little time. could go on but I don't know if you want to focus more on that.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

HUGH RUSSELL: I think maybe it's time for us to ask questions if there are questions. I certainly have some questions.

Iram.

IRAM FAROOQ: If I could add one tiny thing. So Stuart and Chris have painted this picture, and I just wanted to connect it to your early question from the last time we met about this, which is how does this connect to the recommendations for Kendall Square and Central Square? And the two big problems, really, if you think about it in the housing sense, one is the pool of parking -- the pool of housing. The overall pool of housing and the supply side and how much the need is and how does that match with the demand? And then the second piece of it is affordability. And so both the Kendall Square and Central Square Committees have tried in slightly different ways to address those two. Both committees had talked about

one, creating incentives for housing in a similar manner as Stuart described with an FAR differential, and also using height which is something that we've only done in a few instances in the city. But, you know, Alex Twining who is in the audience, tells us oftentimes how much more valuable housing is as you go higher up in the building. And so that becomes a big incentive when you think about housing. So both Kendall and Central Committees have talked about that as a significant incentive to increase the amount of housing.

And then the second related piece that both groups have talked about is a middle income affordability component which Chris has mentioned very limited funding sources that we can tap, so how can we leverage private development to give us some of those middle income in a -- units in a method that parallels maybe the affordable housing, I

mean the inclusionary housing program? It would be a much more modest component than inclusionary than the low mod component, but both committees have recommended that.

And then the second piece, the piece where it's different is that in Kendall Square we've also proposed minimum housing amounts in some of the PUD districts. Now I think the Board is having a discussion on what that number ought to be in each one, and you'll get to discussion that when we get to the specific PUDs. But that is a principle that's laid out here, review settings PUD that in North Point.

And then finally -- well, I think with the middle income units there is also the emphasis on family units, family size units particularly in Central Square. And then the final component I would say is the workforce or innovation housing. So, on the opposite side of the family size units is the small

3

2

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

units for people who may not need a lot of space but are much more willing to sacrifice space for the privilege of being able to afford something close to work or, you know, in a desirable location where they need to And so particularly in Kendall Square, be. the committee has recommended making sure that we eliminate any barriers to building microunits or innovation units to target that So just wanted to make that need. connection.

Thanks.

HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, I'd like to start by asking, you've given us sort of a narrative of -- and I'm, I'm very curious to know if you were to do it on a more sort of numerical grounds, what would it look like? And here's what I'm thinking:

There are 100,000 people in the city and there's a bunch of people who have enough assets so that they can move in the free

1 market without any trouble. And I don't know 2 what proportion of the city that might be. 3 And then there are a bunch of people who live 4 in housing from the -- with the Housing 5 Authority and the private buildings that have agreements to make them affordable. 6 And so 7 my question about sort of that, and that's a 8 number, and there probably aren't too many 9 other people in the city who are in the same 10 economic situations for families because 11 there aren't resources available. So in some 12 sense that number of housing units kind of 13 determines the number of people in that 14 income bracket in the city. Although income 15 is sort of if somebody's retired, they may 16 not have enormous income but they may have 17 other resources. So, you know, we've got a 18 bunch of students, some of which come from 19 enormously wealthy backgrounds in this 20 country and in other countries. Many of them 21 from other countries. That's -- I mean you

21

can't get here from many places unless you have those kinds of resources behind you. And so in a way sort of a characterization of the student population, because it's a part -- a significant part of the city, which ones, which part of our city that were students aren't able to deal with the market as it is? And then there's sort of the grounds between the people who have -- who market the serves and/or the ones that the subsidized housing serves, those are the people in the middle. And you've painted a picture of increasing stress. What sort of numerically is that, and how many of those people are sort of families and how many of those are, you know, one and two person living groups? I mean, I think in my neighborhood the average size of a family are a group living in a dwelling unit is 1.2. So we have 50,000 dwelling units in the city, 100,000 residents. So it's, you know, that's

an unusual distribution.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

very interesting comparison, how does the city's income distribution look against the state's income distribution? Because -- and I would guess it's more polarized in some That we have fewer low income people wavs. in the city because we have only a finite resource of housing for them. And we probably have more wealthy people than many parts of the -- than in the average of the state because we've got people who are, you know, living here, working here. There are many really successful businesses. And even though we're not, you know, like a suburb that is full of horse farms and estates, still there are many people who are very well balanced out.

And then, to sort of give us just a

So if something that's more numerical but isn't, you know, isn't, you know, 30 categories or 100 categories, it's just a few

1 categories, that would help me understand 2 I don't know how it -better what it is. 3 whether it would make any difference to what 4 I could do about it, but it would help me to 5 understand it. And that's something you 6 might bring back to us at some point in time. 7 WILLIAM TIBBS: Hugh, can I --8 HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, go ahead, Bill. 9 I just want to add WILLIAM TIBBS: 10 to that. One of the things we hear an awful 11 lot is the BPA Committee, the public 12 hearings, people come up, in addition to that 13 list of people, it's those people who don't 14 live in Cambridge but would have liked to 15 live in Cambridge but had to move out of 16 Cambridge because they can't afford to stay 17 Maybe they're lifelong Cambridge here. 18 residents. That's a hard number to kind of 19 estimate. 20 That's what I was HUGH RUSSELL: 21 trying to get at with the statewide

comparison. But I think it's more, you're 1 2 putting that -- that's a better focus to ask 3 that question. 4 H. THEODORE COHEN: Could I add one 5 -- and when you're looking at these numbers, 6 I also would be interested if you could get 7 some information about the number of 8 school-aged children, public -- K through 12 9 aged children and how they fit within the 10 different categories that you would be 11 looking at. 12 **HUGH RUSSELL:** Steve. 13 STEVEN WINTER: I just wanted to ask 14 Chris briefly how do we -- in fact, how do we 15 preserve expiring use? What's the way that 16 we do that? And positing the question so that we can all understand it, is there 17 18 anything that any others of us can do to help 19 the process? I honestly don't know how we do 20 that. 21 That's a very good CHRIS COTTER:

21

question, and there are a variety of ways we do it, really it involves a lot of different partnerships. You know, we have been fortunate to work with committed tenants who've wanted to keep their buildings affordable for future generations, owners who have been willing to work with us rather than letting their buildings expire and take into market and realize the profits that they made in taking to market. And we've had resources available through the trust and other public funders and private partners to do that. There's a strong housing advocacy community in Cambridge which informs and is informed by a lot of the tenants in these units. Really what it comes down to in every case, though, is looking at the particular needs of each building where the tenants are, what the needs of the owners might be. A lot of times we may find an owner approaching retirement, looking to sell. Can we work with them

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

around the timing and try to take advantage of an opportunity that might present today, that might not be there six or eight years So I think it's trying to be from now. proactive. Being aware of the inventory of the expiring units. Understanding that in a certain sense everything's expiring because everything's got some amount of a time limited commitment. But when you get into, say, the final ten years or so, that becomes really much more of appropriate to look for that opportunity, make sure that others are prime to do that working with other public partners and other state and government agencies. I think the other thing that has been very helpful to us is the recently passed state statute called Chapter 40T which has allowed for notices to be sent and alarms to go off when owners are within two years of an expiring restriction, and/or they consider selling. The state then has a right to

21

appoint a designee who has a right to make an offer, first offer on the building, in an attempt to make a preservation sale. And in the back end that designee has a right to match the offer. We have successfully used The Chapman Arms Building in the that. middle of Harvard Square was one, that we thought when that time comes, that's going to be very difficult to preserve. It's half market, half affordable building in the middle of Harvard Square. Certainly not one that you can look to buy at a market, a price with a lot of strong competition, but given the 40T statute homeowners rehab was designated, we were able to work with them. They made an offer to the owner. As I said, it's been a long-term affordable housing so there was an interest on the part of the owner to, if it was in the same range, to keep it affordable as opposed to taking it to market. We're able to make that work without

20

21

them needing to go explore the market, which I think is good, because we certainly seen now in the couple of years where that essence, where that building has been preserved some incredible sales prices for multi-family buildings in Harvard Square really beyond our wildest expectations. So I think it's a combined commitment starting, you know, from the City Council, the manager down through the different city departments and agencies. Certainly the funding comes up through the commitments of the Affordable Housing Trust, partners like the CHA and the non-profits and then the advocacy and the interest of the tenants and the advocates and knowing, you know, in a city like Cambridge if there's a need to discuss or a need for something, the general support we want to preserve these homes for residents.

HUGH RUSSELL: All right, thank you very much.

2

4

3

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

BRIAN MURPHY: And just what we can do is one thing I'll direct your attention to and we'll send on to you is this on the CDD website there's a 2011 statistical profile that actually has some pretty nice summary of some of the data that you've been seeking. Ι mean, just to highlight some of those things and, Chris, jump in if I'm misspeaking here. From '07 to '09 medium family income in Cambridge was 88,574. For the U.S. it was 62,367 to just put it a little bit in perspective. You do have also household and family income distribution, 2007 to 2009, you've got less than \$20,000 all households 19.2 percent. 200,000 or more 9.3 percent. So clearly there is a range and it goes from 20 to 39,000, 14 percent. 40 to 60,000, 13.1. And it goes from there. But I mean, there's, you know, without going into too great detail, there's some information on that that I think may provide you with a

1 little bit broader context for some of the 2 questions that you were driving at, Hugh, in 3 terms of who are these -- who is our city? 4 In that respect I STUART DASH: 5 don't know that Cliff Cook our planning 6 information manager who put together all 7 those numbers for us has over the many years. 8 We can get some CLIFF COOK: 9 information that's again more up to date and 10 probably directly more to the point as well 11 for the questions that you've asked. I'll be 12 getting that I'm sure. 13 WILLIAM TIBBS: Hugh. 14 HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, Bill. 15 WILLIAM TIBBS: I just want to say, 16 and Iram, you talked about the idea of the 17 pool and then the affordability as being key 18 issues, but I wanted to see for me a key 19 issue is an opportunity, because Central 20 Square has the opportunity to produce 21 housing. Because I think that's an issue

21

that hits us every time we have a Zoning change or a project comes before us, particularly if it's housing could be there and for whatever reason somebody decides not to do that. And I think Central Square has a very different, as I remember from the stuff that you gave us about the ownership patterns and the opportunity, just very different in Central Square than they are say in Kendall Square where you have MIT as a large owner and then there's some banked interests there. So and I think for me that really is a big driver on this whole residential issue. Where is the opportunity and what can we do to encourage it? Not just in an incentive way, but really looking at where the opportunities are and seeing where they are happening. And I think we want to make sure that we don't miss the opportunity, because we allow non-residential things to happen in those areas. At least make sure that the

1 Zoning allows for that opportunity to happen. 2 H. THEODORE COHEN: Could someone 3 just explain to me on this map what is the 4 grey so-called non-residential process? 5 STUART DASH: We debated what color 6 to do that non-residential are commercial 7 buildings around the city, and we actually 8 have a different map where they're colored 9 but we're trying to highlight the housing. 10 So in the different colors on that map are 11 just the housing project in the colors, and 12 in grey are all the commercial projects, 13 whether it's Amgen or Biogen all around the 14 city. And we showed the --15 H. THEODORE COHEN: And are those 16 things that have been permitted, under 17 construction or just in any status? 18 grey. 19 CLIFF COOK: At least just the ones 20 that are built or under construction. I 21 don't think we have permitted in there.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

10

1112

13

14

1516

17

18

19

20

21

STUART DASH: That's right, I think those are built or under construction as opposed to the housing ones which actually include permitted.

HUGH RUSSELL: Sometimes it's hard to determine exactly what the status of some of these projects are. And I don't mean that as a joke or a criticism, that's just, you know, MIT moved forward, permitted the building which is coming to Pfizer before Pfizer came along so they would be ready if somebody like Pfizer came here. So where is that in the process, you know? And -- but I think what's -- I think what your point was to show where the colored circles are and where the grey circles are. And is there a relationship? And the answer is, not, you know, some relationship but it's not, it's not one to one.

STUART DASH: Right. And I think, too, to show and many people mentioned this,

substantial amount of housing, new housing
that's come along and there's in fact in
construction and permitted and probably

4 likely to be constructed --

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

WILLIAM TIBBS:

STUART DASH: -- at this point.

But for me it shows

that, again, it gets to that opportunity area, you know, East Cambridge and North Point and North Cambridge are the areas where the opportunity is. And, if anything, if you look at the sheer number of grey circles there, it shows that there could have been housing opportunities there that for what various reasons may not have happened on that -- I'm not saying they are -- but for me this was a very good map to kind of illustrate the grey areas are the opportunity areas because those are the ones that are just there. And

as we look at these two areas, Kendall and

Central, we need to really focus on that.

1 STUART DASH: Okay. 2 HUGH RUSSELL: All right. 3 Transportation. 4 I'll try in 10 SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: 5 minutes to do transportation analysis that 6 was done for the K2-C2 project and in brief, 7 what we did was calculate daily and peak 8 trips resulting from proposed build out by 9 2030. And for the K2-C2 entire area we 10 looked at analysis of future impacts at 12 11 different intersections near or close to the 12 study area, and we conducted an analysis of 13 future capacity of the transit system to 14 absorb the projected transit trips in 2030. 15 And then I'm not going to discuss this, but 16 we also looked at parking and infrastructure 17 recommendations for the entire area. 18 HUGH RUSSELL: And so I'm going to 19 jump in and I would encourage other people to 20 jump in because we tend to save questions for

the end, we won't, it will be confusing

21

1 because there's a very wide -- so my question 2 is in how much of Kendall Square gets 3 developed by 2030? Is it 30 percent, 50 4 percent, 100 percent? SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Iram will answer 5 6 that question. 7 IRAM FAROOQ: We assumed 80 percent 8 for the MIT area, 33 percent for Volpe, and 9 about -- oh, and also 80 percent for the Boston properties CRA area. And I think 100 10 11 percent for things that are already permitted 12 like Alexandria. 13 SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Right. 14 So, after Iram suggested those 15 percentages, we figured out what does that 16 mean in terms of person trips? And, of 17 course, it's all different whether it's 18 retail, residential or commercial 19 development. And what you can see on the 20 chart here is the comparison of 2030 if the 21 area was built out under existing zoning

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

compared to the K2-C2 proposal. And the big difference is the additional housing and retail trip generation.

Once we knew how many person trips were likely to occur, then we looked at what could we assume about how those people were getting to either to and from their homes or businesses or retail. And this is just the -- we used different assumptions for Central Square and Kendall Square. What I'm showing here is Central Square, and just giving you an illustration of how we're thinking of the future. We believe that there's good reason at the office of RND we'll see -- we can see and affect a shift from people driving to -more people taking transit, and we think bicycling will assume a greater importance and a little bit greater increase in walking. If you look on the residential side, we think the transit will actually drop in favor of people walking or biking because we're adding

more housing and creating more -- both job and residential and retail destinations closer to each other.

And in terms of retail, we see it being pretty much the same. We're not, we didn't feel like we had reasons to believe that we could create a big difference in how people traveled to and from retail.

And this is just a chart showing -- on your left you see all the predicted p.m. trips, person trips. And we look at the p.m. peak hour because that is when you experience mostly congestion so we're not really that focussed on daily trips, because they're sort of spread out very unevenly over the course of a 24-hour period. But in this peak, in the evening peak in particular is where you tend to see the most congestion. So that's what our analysis really is focussed on.

And the initial screen we did, which is the top right-hand box with car trips was

20

21

just with car and assumptions with what modes of transportation people use. We would expect to see 42 -- about 4200 trips distributed across the area in the p.m. peak hour, but under a scenario where we've reduced driving by 10 percent which we believe is very realistic both because of general trends that are happening. We see across the city that driving as a mode is decreasing slowly but steadily over the past many decades, but also because of tougher requirements about transportation demand, management programs that would be imposed under the new Zoning Regulations. We could assume conservatively that we could drop driving by another 10 percent. So the number of trips we have been distributing is the 3477 over the p.m. peak hour.

And the tool we've used to look at intersection impact is called Critical Sums Analysis or it has other similar names, but

1 often it's called Critical Sums Analysis. 2 It's a planning tool. It's not an 3 engineering tool. And it's, it's used to evaluate build out scenarios. And in 4 5 particular, it's good for comparing different 6 levels of build out, and that's what we're 7 doing. We're looking in 2030 what would, 8 what would the impacts be under current 9 Zoning and how would it look different if we 10 changed the Zoning to the K2-C2 proposal. 11 it's really a comparative tool. And as I 12 said, we're focusing on the p.m. peak hour, 13 not on daily trips. And this is the same 14 methodology that we've been using for over a 15 decade now. So it was, what we did under 16 ECaPs as well, which gives us an opportunity 17 to look back and see how do the numbers look 18 compared to ECaPs. And I'll just say we, we 19 thought the world was gonna be worse in terms 20 of traffic than it actually is. And that's 21 been interesting to look back and see.

So these --

2

HUGH RUSSELL: Yet it's not great.

3

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: It's not great.

4

These are the intersections we

5

circles so the 10 intersections, and we chose

analyzed. And originally we did the white

7

6

them because they were in and near -- they

8

were in the study area and we have -- these

9

were the same ones we looked at at ECaPs so

10

we had the ability to compare. As part of

11

the Central Square process we added two more

12

intersections; the Bishop Alan and Prospect

13

and Putnam and Western to get a better sense

14

of Central Square. It seemed

15

underrepresented and so we added those two.

16

Notably and as has been discussed, these --

17

this analysis does not include some of the

18

big intersections along the main arterials as

19

Memorial Drive and O'Brien Highway in

20

particular, and we, we didn't include them

21

because those are intersections that are so

3

2

4

5

6

7

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

heavily dominated by regional traffic that this particular traffic that we'll be adding is such a small fraction for one thing of the traffic that happens at those intersections and they're also already very highly congested. So it's not terribly meaningful that we can say qualitatively that yes, if you add more traffic, they will get worse than they are right now. But we're not talking about adding 20 percent more or anything in that order of magnitude. And we certainly -- there's no difficulty in looking at them. We just felt that it wasn't as meaningful to include them.

Very quickly, and I apologize to those people who have heard this before, but very quickly the methodology that we use is as we add up all conflicting movements in cars per hour and with conflicting movements, so an example is if I'm coming down Prospect Street and somebody comes on Bishop Allen and wants

1 to turn left, that's a conflicting movement. 2 Whereas if I'm coming down Prospect Street 3 northbound and somebody's going down Prospect 4 Street southbound, those are not conflicting 5 movements because we can pass each other 6 without causing any delay. And then the 7 benchmark we used is 1500 conflicting 8 movements per hour. You start seeing -- you 9 start being concerned about the 10 intersection's operation. And so that's a 11 cutoff we use. You can use another number. 12 It's in and it has been suggested that 1400 13 is a better number. It's -- if you use a 14 newer technical manual, it would, it could --15 you would be using 1400. We used 1500 16 because that's the number we've used before, 17 and also it happens that in practically the 18 analysis we did as you'll see in a moment, it 19 doesn't actually make any difference. 20 should have no more intersections passing the 21 threshold whether you use 14 or 1500.

So this chart shows basically the outcome of the analysis. The far left column is existing conditions. So today these are the number of conflicting movements per intersection. You look at the one that says critical sum. Then we compared that with 2030 build out under existing Zoning, and then under the original K2-C2 and then finally with a 10 percent reduction in auto mode. And Iram wants me to do two things at once.

Okay, so this is existing conditions. This is the conflicting movements you're seeing today. This is what would be in 2030 under existing Zoning. This is K2-C2 without extra TDM. And finally, this is with a 10 percent additional reduction in the percent of people driving, also called the preferred scenario. And as you can see, there was one intersection, Broadway and Third, that slightly exceeded the threshold with the

1	reduced auto mode share and none of them are
2	exceeding a threshold. And of course it's
3	all built off of existing conditions. And
4	there has been a decline in traffic in the
5	area since ten years ago. So if you compare
6	these with ten years ago, these would have
7	been higher.
8	HUGH RUSSELL: So, at that
9	intersection you can't do a lot of things.
10	WILLIAM TIBBS: Correct.
11	HUGH RUSSELL: So what are the
12	conflicting moves? It is the left turn from
13	Broadway to Third Street. That obviously
14	conflicts with traffic going across.
15	SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Yes. Third
16	turning left to Longfellow Bridge conflicts
17	with through.
18	HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
19	SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: And left from
20	Broadway onto Third Street.
21	HUGH RUSSELL: So the

1	SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: And it just
2	there are a lot of people turning there. So
3	it could have been like if nobody wanted
4	to go on Third Street, then the conflicting
5	moves would have been a lot lower. But it's
6	a high desire for people coming Broadway
7	going up Third and down Third and over the
8	Longfellow Bridge.
9	HUGH RUSSELL: Right, because you
10	can't turn on First and you should have
11	turned on Binney.
12	SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Right.
13	SUSAN CLIPPINGER: It's not
14	conflicting based on the signal operation.
15	HUGH RUSSELL: Right. Because
16	they're controlled.
17	SUSAN CLIPPINGER: It's conflicting
18	based on the numbers.
19	HUGH RUSSELL: The desires.
20	SUSAN CLIPPINGER: It's not a
21	conflict, like, you know, you didn't manage

1 the signal. So it -- the planning tool 2 ignores what you're doing with your signal. 3 HUGH RUSSELL: But in the sense what 4 it means is that you've got to provide a lot 5 of green for those left turn movements and you run out of time on the clock. Is that a 6 7 way to think about it? 8 SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Well. that's 9 sort of, that comes down to the -- if we're 10 talking engineering. 11 HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. 12 SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: But practically 13 speaking, yes. 14 This is, you know, I WILLIAM TIBBS: 15 must have been from a standpoint of all 16 traffic studies, I just find that -- I always 17 try to correlate whatever you're saying with 18 the reality of what I experience. So can you 19 talk about the Putnam and Western 20 intersection? Because that's another one 21 where the conflicting movements, as you

1 described them, are somewhat limited. 2 you have a lot of one way streets kind of 3 going so you can only move in a certain way, 4 but what little conflicting movement you have 5 backs up the traffic. Like on Putnam Avenue 6 from blocks on in and backs up the traffic on 7 Western Ave. for blocks on in. So how does that -- queueing always -- may be queueing is 8 9 not the issue here, but queueing is a big 10 But it's one that I feel -- the issue. 11 studies seem to not grasp for me at least. 12 SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: In that 13 situation it's not Putnam and Western. 14 Memorial Drive and Western. That's where --15 and the Memorial Drive is given an advantage. 16 that's why it backs up because you -- that 17 box is. the box between Memorial Drive and 18 Putnam is full. 19 WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes. 20 SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: If that was not 21 full of cars, then there would not be a

1 problem with Putnam and Western. And it sort 2 of --3 WILLIAM TIBBS: Any way you look at 4 it, though, that still becomes -- the Putnam 5 and Western intersection is one that's very 6 hard to manage. And your number kind of 7 implies that it's not too bad because it 8 hasn't hit 1500 yet. And so that's where 9 the, that's where it doesn't, it doesn't 10 correlate to me the reality of when you put 11 all this stuff together and what the numbers 12 I just don't want to paint such a rosy 13 picture of some of these intersections which 14 I know aren't rosy. But if you're saying 15 that the effect of the Zoning that we're 16 anticipating is not going to change it too 17 much more than the way it is or might improve 18 it slightly from where we're projecting --19 SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Right. 20 WILLIAM TIBBS: -- that's one thing. 21 But when it gets to what you said earlier

1 about the -- I remember when we were doing 2 the citywide zoning, you know, you have an F. 3 You can't keep adding to an F, it's just gets 4 a worse F, but it's still an F. 5 SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: That's right, 6 exactly what you're saying, which is this is 7 not judging whether we can accept the way 8 Putnam and Western is today. This tells you 9 how the K2-C2 compare to what is, what is 10 allowed today. And I mean we can have a long 11 discussion about so Putnam and Western, the 12 problem is actually created over at River and 13 Soldiers Field. 14 WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes. 15 SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: That's where all 16 the problems stem from. 17 And so one of the things that I wanted 18 to mention is when we did this analysis, we 19 added traffic from future development to 20 existing traffic. We did not try to factor 21 in that the positive trend that has been

1 going on in Cambridge at least, which is 2 insist that the travel patterns of existing 3 development has improved. So we have added 4 4.6 million square feet of development in 5 Kendall Square without noticeable changes in 6 traffic impacts. And that sounds 7 nonsensical. But the way that it's possible 8 is that the building that has been, that was 9 there already, people who come to that 10 building have now drive less than they used 11 And you probably saw the article's front 12 page story in the Globe and the subsequent 13 editorial showing people saying oh, yeah, I 14 used to drive but now I take my bike because 15 my employer gives me a benefit to ride my 16 bike, etcetera. So there's been a change in 17 how people travel to existing development. 18 And that is why we're seeing these downward 19 trends on some of the streets. And in 20 Kendall Square and the same -- these are some 21 graphs from the Cambridgeport area that we,

we have not taken that into account. So we haven't tried to, if you will, benefit from a positive trend that is measurable and we know that has occurred. We just said, okay, this is the way things are today and we're not going to add to it. We're not going to try to think that things are going to improve generally. So I just wanted to note that.

WILLIAM TIBBS: Because that basically is saying that the TDM measures that we're doing are effective?

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Yes. And there is frankly a general trend as well, like, people have -- even if they don't work in a place where there's TDM, the percentage of people who have started to change the travel behavior for other reasons, environmental or health or whatever their justification is.

So in conclusion, this analysis, as I said, is a planning tool, that is a comparative tool between existing and

proposed Zoning. Six intersections are predicted to experience more or the same number of conflicting movements. Six of them are -- will experience fewer, and that has to do with how development has been moving around. We are adding housing in places where under current Zoning there was commercial development. And the Broadway and Third is the one intersection where we're close to the threshold.

And then as you may have heard, we did an extra analysis of Mass., Prospect, River, Western intersection in the heart of Central Square because it's very unusual in that there are vastly more pedestrians than cars in that intersection. And Critical Sums does not take pedestrians into account. So people raised that issue correctly and we did, we used, we tried to do -- or we did a level of service analysis instead, and that as anyone who goes to Central Square knows, the

congested intersection, and that's something as development is proposed in Central Square, it has to be looked at very closely because that is, like some of the other intersections, has a lot of traffic and very, very many pedestrians.

And as I just mentioned, analysis assumes that existing travel patterns remain the same -- unchanged even though we know that's not what's been occurring. It's actually has been decreasing.

And then of course any -- once the Zoning's adopted as you know better than anyone, traffic studies and traffic mitigation is required even though, even if the Zoning says this project can go forward, it can't go forward if it hasn't complied with Article 19. So there is an extra screen on any project that is proposed even under the new Zoning. And of course most projects if they create parking, are subject to PTDM

1 and the Zoning has reduced parking ratios 2 compared to what is under current Zoning. 3 So that is sort of the auto analysis. 4 Then we did a lot of work on looking at Red 5 Line transit capacity because the --6 H. THEODORE COHEN: Before you go 7 there, I was just wondering you said that 8 traffic didn't get as bad as you had 9 anticipated as it would. Do you have an 10 explanation or hypothesis as to why that's 11 the case? 12 SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: It was what we 13 were just discussing which is a lot of 14 existing development, the travel behavior to 15 and from existing developments changed in 16 favor of sustainable modes over driving. So, 17 generally there is, and you can see it in the 18 census data as well, that people are driving 19 less and using other modes more. 20 WILLIAM TIBBS: And can I ask you 21 another question before you go there? And

again, going back to the ownership patterns, the TDM stuff can work when you have large projects and large developers who can offer all of those things and it affects a lot of people. And then in the Central Square area, other than the kind of, if we don't have a lot of opportunity for those, is there a smaller scale or TDM things that you can do or things that can you can do with existing -- people who are already there to help that trend go down?

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: So, we try to scale the requirements under PTDM in accordance with what the project is. Of course, if less than 20 parking spaces are created, they're subject only to a small PTDM, which is really a checklist that you just have to pick three measures from. So that's much less intense, and there's no annual monitoring or -- but once you get to 20 spaces or more, you're into a full PTDM

plan. And the reason why PTDM is not like a prescribed sort of measures is exactly so that you can fit the kind of non-residential development that it is. And there is great variety in what PTDM plans encompass in terms of measures.

Right. Sue was just saying that the Zoning that's proposed is highly residential. So of course residential is not subject to PTDM. Typically TDM measures are included in residential projects, but it's quite on a quite different scale.

All right?

So the transit analysis, we focussed on the Red Line because the Red Line is by far the most important transit measure or opportunity there is. And just some -- very quickly just to give you a sense of what we did. So we looked at both trend lines over time and how has transit ridership grown? So we had a sense of apart from what we're doing

1 in Cambridge. How does transit grow over 2 time? And as you can see, most of our 3 transit lines have been increasing in terms 4 of ridership compared to five years ago. 5 also took a look at Kendall and Central, how 6 much pressure there is in the peak hour and 7 you can see that Central is both a 8 residential and commercial area because you 9 have almost the same a.m. and p.m. So people 10 are leaving in the morning to go to work and 11 some people are coming to work and vice 12 versa, whereas Kendall still exhibits very 13 clearly a job-dominated area and hopefully 14 that is -- we will be changing that, but it 15 still is very clear that -- and most people 16 are -- not a lot of people get on at Kendall. 17 A lot of people get off. 18 Can you go back H. THEODORE COHEN: 19 to that? 20 SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Yes. 21 I find very H. THEODORE COHEN:

interesting, I would be happy if anybody had an explanation, for the Kendall the fact that it increases, continues to increase from like 10 to 2. Is there any explanation for that?

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: So these are people leaving, these are entries. So people getting on at Kendall and going somewhere either towards Boston or the other direction. So, it -- the lowest number -- well, of course, like nighttime, but 10 is like not that many. And then some people start leaving and then it just builds and between four and seven, that's when you really see the huge departure. So who are these people that are leaving Kendall Square at eleven a.m., I'm not sure.

WILLIAM TIBBS: I would speculate that people who are just going to other places and meetings and appointments. You know, they're just using the transportation to move around the city. They're already in

1	their office and now they're going somewhere
2	but they're not going home.
3	H. THEODORE COHEN: So people who
4	arrive between six and eight, then leave
5	during the day to go elsewhere?
6	WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes.
7	H. THEODORE COHEN: I find that very
8	curious.
9	SUSAN CLIPPINGER: There are also
10	students, and their schedules tend not to be
11	traditional work schedules.
12	SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: They're heading
13	to the Kennedy School for a class.
14	H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.
15	SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: And we looked at
16	busses and just to see, and this is Central
17	Square on and off. And just to give a sense
18	of how important the Red Line is compared to
19	busses, and it's obviously more than
20	two-thirds of the transit ridership is on the
21	Red Line versus all those different busses.

1	HUGH RUSSELL: And so on and off
2	means for the No. 1 bus when you enter the
3	edge of the study area on one end and then
4	leave it at the other end?
5	SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: No, these are
6	getting on and off busses.
7	HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
8	SUSAN CLIPPINGER: In Central.
9	HUGH RUSSELL: Right. But like does
10	Bigelow Street count as Central Square in
11	your analysis?
12	SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: For this purpose
13	right here, this is really like just Central
14	Square. It's not like Landsdowne Street
15	or
16	WILLIAM TIBBS: Is that right at the
17	station?
18	SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: It's only right
19	around the Red Line entry.
20	WILLIAM TIBBS: Okay.
21	SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: All the busses

1	that have a main stop either on River Street
2	Extension, Mass. Ave. or Green Street.
3	WILLIAM TIBBS: So it's within that
4	block?
5	SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Right.
6	HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
7	But the boundaries of the Central
8	Square district and the commercial district
9	encompass maybe four stops on a No. 1 bus.
10	SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Right.
11	HUGH RUSSELL: And there are I
12	mean, from my not particularly happy
13	experience with the No. 1 bus, I would take
14	from my observation is, yes, the bulk of the
15	people that get on or off the bus do it, do
16	so at the station.
17	SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Right.
18	HUGH RUSSELL: But, you know, there
19	are a few of us who get off at Bigelow
20	Street.
21	SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: I mean, another

1 reason why we did this was because we're very 2 interested in can we get people who are 3 riding a bus to Central Square and who really 4 want to go to Kendall Square to stay on that 5 bus if we convince the T to extend it to 6 Kendall Square? So that was another reason 7 why we focussed on that bus. WILLIAM TIBBS: Also there's some of 8 9 some of those busses like the 47 that's the 10 end of the line, so people are going on and 11 off to an empty bus. 12 SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Right. 13 WILLIAM TIBBS: Whereas the No. 1, 14 my unhappy experience is that it's coming 15 from Harvard Square and it's already full. 16 So you have all those 3900 people running to 17 get on full busses, partially full busses. 18 HUGH RUSSELL: But there are two 19 empty ones right behind it. I mean, it's a 20 classic study of a bus route that's too long. 21 And the characteristics of a long bus route

1 in a congested area are is that vehicles tend 2 to clump and cluster. 3 SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Yeah, the 4 bunching, it's a huge issue. 5 HUGH RUSSELL: And I mean they 6 could, I mean in some ways solve the problem 7 by forcing the bus to get ahead, to just stop 8 and wait at a sign, that would not be popular 9 with anybody on the bus or anybody at the 10 next stop waiting, but that would space, it 11 would force them to leave space periodically. 12 They do that with WILLIAM TIBBS: 13 trains periodically. They just stop them and 14 have them wait for a few minutes. 15 HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. 16 SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: There's a lot of 17 bus efficiency measures that don't happen 18 because they're unpopular. For example, get 19 on in the front and get off in the back. 20 That would really help a lot. But it took 21 the MBTA three weeks to try it and abandon it

again.

2

3

HUGH RUSSELL: We'll have to go back

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

to street cars in that line.

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Yes, so the real point of this is so what does it, what does the K2-C2 transit trips mean then to how the Red Line operates? And so we did an analysis of the additional trips that would be added from the K2-C2 build out, and basically the way it breaks down is we would be adding 680 new transit riders coming and going in Central Square in the a.m., and we used Central Square and we used a.m. because that is the worst in Cambridge in terms of transit on the Red Line. So getting on at Central, travelling towards Boston, that is the highest level of congestion of any place on the Red Line. So we used the worst case scenario.

So there are already 680 new, 680 new transit riders. Then we figured out how many

of those would be getting on Central, travelling in the inbound direction, which is the worst. And you can see we had some assumptions about how many on and off and how many Red Line were expressed and inbound and outbound. So that analysis concluded that on average we're adding 16 new riders to each inbound Red Line train to Central Square in the peak hour. And right now there are 112 boarding per train. So we would be adding 16 more people to that.

And here's the highly controversial chart of what that means. So what you're seeing in this chart is, as I mentioned, is that Central is the most congested. And the little orange on top of the blue bars at Kendall and Central, these are the new trips that would be added. And this is the seated capacity of the Red Line. So if everybody sits down, this is how many people you can fit on in the peak hour. And obviously we're

20

21

way, as everybody has experienced, we're way passed seating capacity, but we're not passed standing capacity. And this doesn't, this is per peak hour. So this, of course, you can still go down the Red Line at 8:30 in Central Square and the train comes and there's absolutely not one single spot for you to be So I'm not proposing or the analysis in. does not suggest that every single train has capacity. Some of them won't. And there is also bunching on the Red Line, there shouldn't be but there is. So you may have to wait for the next train. But what this chart illustrates is the K2-C2 is not going to significantly alter the situation. What is going to alter the situation and why we're all concerned about Red Line capacity is overall growth in the metro area which is going to overwhelm the Red Line in the long run. And one of the reasons that we've been working on -- well, unfortunately

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

unsuccessfully on the urban ring in the last 15 years is something needs -- transit capacity needs to be enhanced for the long term because you cannot have the level of economic growth that we're all expecting and anticipating and desiring without more transit capacity.

So we, as part of the study we did look at so what can you do about it? Because we know that by 2030 there's going to be a problem because of overall growth, and there's four different strategies that we're -- have looked at. And the first strategy is to shift riders to other modes. And I mentioned that if we can get people to -- you can get busses extended to Kendall, we can get some people to stay on the bus and not go into Central which is the highest congestion point. And we also think that there will be people that can switch to bicycling, and of course, the introduction of Hubway really

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

helps with that. And then new and/or improved subway and bus lines in the urban ring is the prime example in Cambridge of what could really significantly help the Red Line.

The Red Line also needs to run at what is it's theoretical existing capacity and there's all kinds of problems. I won't go into a lot of the details, but we're running cars from 1969 that actually are not ready to operate every single day. The switching systems are old. A lot of things could be done to just maintain what is supposed to be current capacity. And you could improve it by upgrading power systems and potentially introduce the cars that have fewer seats, although that has, was not very popular. the T actually has removed most of them because it was unpopular, but among the riders.

And then finally a TDM measure is you

can shift people off the peak. This is what happens with driving. Many people say, okay, I'm not going to drive between eight and nine, I'm going to arrive at seven because I won't encounter the level of congestion that I will at 8:30. And of course we have a role in that through TDM pushing people to have flexible work hours so people can actually travel outside of the peak hour. And of course a more dramatic strategy is peak hour pricing on transit, and that's done in many other locales.

WILLIAM TIBBS: Washington, D.C.

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: It's cheaper at seven and nine-thirty then eight-thirty. And these are all things that can be looked at, and funding is a huge issue. And the Governor actually has proposed a very aggressive proposal to raise funds for transit and with some luck, some of that or all of that will happen, so we can get

1 increased transit capacity because absolutely 2 it needs to happen in the long run. 3 HUGH RUSSELL: Didn't the Red Line 4 have a higher capacity 60 or 70 years ago? 5 SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Did the Green 6 Line have --7 The Red Line. HUGH RUSSELL: 8 SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: The Red Line? 9 HUGH RUSSELL: With those old olive 10 cars running at much shorter head ways? 11 Of course they had shorter trains. Ι 12 thought the head ways between trains were 13 much shorter and it was a function of a 14 control system because if it wasn't an 15 automated control, it was a block system and 16 there were -- you can -- I seem to remember 17 in a report that I read somewhere that said 18 more people travelled on the Red Line in 19 World War II then are travelling on it now. 20 SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: I do know the 21 commuter rail was a lot faster in 1815 than

And as

1 it is now. And I mean, just to look forward, 2 if a different signal system and switching 3 systems were put in place, you could 4 definitely increase the capacity because you 5 could space the trains more closely. You 6 can't add more trains because the platforms 7 are -- the trains are already as long as the 8 platforms, but if you could space them more 9 closely and still meet safety standards, you 10 could definitely move more people. 11 HUGH RUSSELL: There's always room 12 for technology. 13 SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Yes. 14 long as somebody pays for it. 15 HUGH RUSSELL: So I also had this 16 vision which comes out of my reading of 17 science fiction where you convert the Green 18 Line so that it's just all moving sidewalks. 19 And, you know, the first 200 feet are running at two miles an hour, and then there's a two 20 21 mile hour bump so that when you're in between

1	the station, you're going at like 15 or 20
2	miles an hour vis-a-vis the walls. And I
3	mean it doesn't serve certain patrons,
4	particularly people who are not as able as
5	others, but there's a different completely
6	different way to use that volume of space
7	then is presently, you know, don't have
8	trains, have continuous system.
9	SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Right.
10	HUGH RUSSELL: So
11	SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: We're extremely
12	focussed on the urban ring because it takes
13	people out of the central subway system where
14	they don't actually want to be. So the
15	Sullivan Square, Lechmere, Kendall Square,
16	Longwood is such the desire for the travel in
17	that corridor is huge.
18	WILLIAM TIBBS: Right.
19	HUGH RUSSELL: Right.
20	SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: But we can't get
21	any traction with that project, at least not

1	at the moment.
2	HUGH RUSSELL: Unless there's
3	enormous population south of that in Boston
4	that could get to Cambridge or get to
5	Longwood or get to the other areas. It's too
6	expensive to build new systems, right?
7	SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: And other
8	projects have gotten ahead in the priority
9	line.
10	HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, is that it?
11	SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: That's it.
12	HUGH RUSSELL: Shall we then take a
13	break for about ten minutes?
14	STEVEN WINTER: I'd like to
15	compliment Susanne for the presentation.
16	Terrific.
17	SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Thank you.
18	HUGH RUSSELL: And I guess behind
19	Susanne is a team of people that have to
20	share in that.
21	SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: I will let them

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

know.

2 (A short recess was taken.)

HUGH RUSSELL: Let's get going again. We're going to be discussing the Kendall Square and Central Square guidelines and Roger is going to key that up for us.

Thank you, Hugh. ROGER BOOTHE: It's really kind of exciting to get to this point after a couple of years of so many processes with the K2-C2 groups, and some of those folks are here tonight. guidelines really have been shaped by that process, by a lot of the input we had from Goody Clancy who we went through the process, and staff has been trying to be faithful to those plans as we've been these guidelines. And brought to mind that we've been doing Special Permits for quite a while here at the In my case 33 years. And one of the Board. -- I think Special Permit No. 2 had the walkway and the Broad Canal on the side that

20

21

19

20

21

got built first, and it took 25 years to get the other side, and that was Special Permit No. 141 with a lot of input from the Cambridge Planning Team and others trying to make sure that canal walk happened. So good things can happen through Special Permits and that's what the guidelines are here for is to help the Board and the public understand what the goals are and how to get there. And as Hugh and I were just discussing, certain things are rules in the Zoning. guidelines aren't rules, but they're setting really strong goals that we care a lot about and they offer some more flexibility. So one of the things we talked about in the MIT Zoning was whether some of the things that have been in their Zoning should be in the guidelines. We've been meeting with MIT, and I think we're getting closer on how to work those things out.

I'd also point out that the Harleston

3

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

1011

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Parker Award is the Arts Society Architect's Award for the most beautiful building in Boston. And over the last five years four of them have been in Cambridge. They were all Special Permits. And it's really cool that one of them was by MIT. The Media Lab is the one that just got the award. There was the Kyu Sung Woo Dormitory at Harvard. There was the Genzyme building, and of course our own public library. So neat that different sectors of our community have done such good work and they've all gone through the Special Permit process. So I think part of what we're looking for in the guidelines is to get some more Harleston Parker Awards, especially we need one in Central Square because we have a building there that's not so popular. we need to work on that.

So the Kendall Square guidelines really are again building on so much of the work that we went through with the committee, and

20

21

I'm not going to do much PowerPoint here but up on the screen is the image that I hope everybody has a copy of the paper guidelines. I'm going to refer to page 5 here which shows the overall plan and the dark streets, Broadway, Binney Street, and Main are the main public ways. And then we have secondary public ways. And you'll see what those refer to as you go through the plan. And also call out here are important existing open spaces such as Point Park, the Canal Way that I was just mentioning, the skating rink near the Genzyme building, and some of the Cambridge research -- the Cambridge redevelopment authority open spaces. And not shown on here will be the new open space over here on Binney Street, the two acre park in the neighborhood. And we're going to have a whole process looking at those open spaces as we go through the next couple of years, and that will be even more information to come

into the Board's review process.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

So clearly how the buildings relate to the open spaces is an important part of this; walkability, university access, how the streets work. Again, these are things that we've been working on trying to get better and better at in the last 30 years. And certainly in Article 19, we set forth a lot of guidelines that these are really built on. So this is in a sense trying to get more depth into the way we're thinking about these things, building on the work that we've been doing. We've made mistakes over the years. We're trying to see if we can do better on all of these things. And I feel like we're doing better with all of this.

Architectural identity on Kendall Square on page 9 is important. We're not trying to dictate modernist buildings or historicist buildings, but we are wanting to say it's really important in trying to have

20

21

plans that have architectural quality in what comes out of the work that leads to scale and In the middle of the document, massing. around page 15 or so, we're talking about how to start making sure that we have visual interest, that the massing, if you look on page 16 and 17, that there aren't just big chunks of buildings, but they had broken down and we went through a lot with Goody Clancy and the committee and looking at what were kind of proper distance as you might go before you have a break in the building, the relationship between buildings and setbacks and so forth. So we tried to put that in the guidelines. And we got to page 19, you see examples of tall, slender buildings. And certainly the Zoning encourages housing for the taller buildings and trying to think about how those can be gracefully done. And then on pages 20 and 21 are a series of images looking around Kendall Square that

talk about how these buildings become landmarks. And I have to say that I've been surprised sometimes, for example, about how far off you can see the museum towers now called residents, you can see them all the way from Inman Square, and I hadn't thought about that at the time. So we're trying to get better at thinking about how these tall buildings are going to be influencing our environment especially for starting to get taller buildings.

Towards the end of the document we spent a lot of time on the committee on how that's -- how the building meets the ground and how we get the activity that comes from the ground floor retail, how important that is. And so I think we've had a lot of experience in trying to make those ground floors work.

And in the end we have a little bit of a section on academic buildings because some

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

of the Kendall Square area gets out of the traditional mixed use area and into the campus, but we still want to have a lot of the goals being met even though the different kinds of building. That's just a really quick overview.

HUGH RUSSELL: Well, I was kind of dreading opening my packet. I put it off for a long time, because things weren't really very clear six months ago. And so I was just delighted when I actually looked at the proposed guidelines, because it will seemed they reached a level of clarity that really exceeds any guidelines that I think we've ever done. And I think one aspect of that is the goals and measures structure. The goals are in a sense the real meat. These are the things that we're really trying to accomplish. And the measures are ways of thinking about how you would meet those goals, say suggestions of how you can do this

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

would say that you've met this. And I think, and then a large measure, the distinctions between the goals and the measures is clear and correct at one place I would ask you to think about. The thing that is to me the most, in some ways the most important thing is to make it clear to the reader of the document that the goals and the measures are They're fundamentally different different. things. And so, if you look at the measures and you say, I've got to do all those things, then you'll quickly get panicked because -and then if you look at some of the illustrations, you say, but that's ugly, but the diagram's illustrating how, how a principle works, and, yes, you really wouldn't want to do a building that was just a photograph of that and change the materials but then they illustrate principles.

in way Safe Harbors, if you do this, then we

So my first suggestion is actually a

1	very tiny editorial change in the third
2	paragraph of the introduction.
3	ROGER BOOTHE: Page 3?
4	HUGH RUSSELL: Page 3, yes.
5	The second sentence I think might be
6	better to say: Other design measures not
7	described here may also be utilized which
8	heed the same goals at the discretion of the
9	Planning Board.
10	ROGER BOOTHE: That's a great
11	suggestion.
12	HUGH RUSSELL: I think it just makes
13	it a little clearer of what the ownership is.
14	And in the and I think, I don't know
15	how we're going to do this. I mean, I have
16	about a dozen marks on here. I could just go
17	through and other people can do that and skip
18	around or we can try to do it section by
19	section.
20	STEVEN WINTER: I'd like to hear
21	what you have to say about the whole thing.

1	That works for me.
2	HUGH RUSSELL: Okay.
3	Because I mean I think the whole thing
4	is great. And it's just bits and pieces.
5	So, for example, in the first paragraph
6	of the introduction maybe where we refer to
7	PUD, we should actually refer to PUDs. And
8	Special Permit we should refer to Special
9	Permits so that it's clear to everybody that
10	these applied are going to apply to multiple
11	things, not just the one.
12	ROGER BOOTHE: Yes.
13	HUGH RUSSELL: On the public
14	streets.
15	ROGER BOOTHE: What page are you on
16	to?
17	HUGH RUSSELL: I'm sort of starting
18	from that diagram and then it leads back to
19	page 4. The secondary streets are kind of
20	different south of Main and north of Main and
21	east of Third and west of Third. And maybe

1 we need a paragraph that distinguishes what 2 campus streets are like. And the things that 3 are different, the conditions that are 4 different, I know are that one person owns 5 the whole district. So that means -- whereas 6 you're writing the guidelines as if they're 7 individual parties just dealing with parcels. 8 And so another thing is there if you look at 9 the grey smudges there, those are buildings. 10 And most of those buildings are pretty fixed 11 in terms of their long-term lives. They're not -- they may be upgraded and changed. But 12 13 maybe like the corner of the Media Lab, MIT's 14 not going to touch the urban design of that 15 building for probably a very long time. And 16 they probably will have to pay for it 17 eventually. It's one of our longest Special 18 Permits because of the funding. 19 PAMELA WINTERS: It was ten years. 20 HUGH RUSSELL: It's an example of 21 how you have to have faith and just keep

2

going, and they had the faith and we kept the faith.

21

So there isn't any retail down there now, and there's a lot of buildings that wouldn't be sensible to think there would be retail in. So there would have to be a different way of thinking about animating those streets. And the -- and I mean like, for example, when you're looking at the dimensional guidelines about diversity, you may want to think about whole blocks, you know? And consider, you know, the existing buildings as well as the new in-filled building, and that I think you have to -- you have to think in a bigger scale. And there might be buildings that aren't in a PUD, say that gets established. I don't know how, you know, MIT is going to -- how many PUDs they're going to establish in that district. I would assume because of the different time tables for the academic growth, they're

1	probably not going to come, you know, next
2	year and say we're going to, you know,
3	sometime in the next 20 years we're going to
4	build a building in this place and we don't
5	know what's going in it and we don't know how
6	big it is. That's not a very productive way
7	to have a PUD.
8	ROGER BOOTHE: Yes, I think we're
9	hoping the PUDs will have some kind of logic
10	to them.
11	HUGH RUSSELL: And then be a master
12	plan.
13	ROGER BOOTHE: Yes, like a master
14	plan. Use a ten acre Genzyme site where we
15	have a lot of uses going on and open space
16	systems. So you have, whole context relate
17	to, so I think that's going to be important.
18	HUGH RUSSELL: Right. So how that
19	impacts the goals for the street, I think,
20	are different. If you look at the third,
21	it's called Third Square. If you were to

1	look carefully at the street goals, it would
2	say all the street frontages, there should be
3	retail or 70 percent retail. Well, I'm not
4	sure that's it depends on the use. So
5	I'll get to that in a later comment.
6	I think in a way that's the biggest
7	comment I have in this whole thing is this
8	notion of trying to differentiate the campus
9	streets from the other streets.
10	WILLIAM TIBBS: Hugh, do you mind if
11	I comment on your comment?
12	HUGH RUSSELL: Sure.
13	WILLIAM TIBBS: I agree with you
14	because I think I mentioned earlier at one
15	point that if you look at the development
16	potential of those MIT blocks, particularly
17	if you look at Ames Street and Carlton
18	Street, there's only so if you look at the
19	streets and even the massing, it, it can be a
20	little bit more yes, I think there should
21	be a differential. And then there's this

1 issue of what's an institutional. We have 2 academic buildings, but there's clearly going 3 to be some blend of academic and what we 4 would call traditionally, you know, 5 commercial I guess or at least biotech kind 6 of blends there. And so those are your 7 academic buildings suggestions fall into them 8 or so -- just understanding that. And I 9 think just by creating zones more 10 institutional in nature with some specific 11 things around it would be helpful. So I'm 12 not quite sure what's the best way to do it, 13 but I think you hit it --14 ROGER BOOTHE: That could be an 15 issue on the DOT site. You know, how DOT 16 stays there. 17 Iram, did you want to say something? 18 IRAM FAROOQ: Yes. The one thing 19 that I wanted to say is that, you know, just 20 to the point that Bill just made about 21 academic buildings and then there may be a

1	mix somehow in some along some of the
2	streets, and we were actually trying to get
3	to that by on page 30 have actually a
4	section that deals with academic buildings.
5	So if you had along, I don't know, along
6	Hayward Street for instance, if there were a
7	commercial building, it may be dealt with
8	thought of differently than if there were an
9	academic building.
10	HUGH RUSSELL: Right.
11	IRAM FAROOQ: So we were just trying
12	to distinguish based on use rather than
13	street, but certainly we could think about it
14	either way.
15	WILLIAM TIBBS: It's almost like you
16	need to define it. Is it a certain
17	percentage of academic use before it's and
18	academic building, or it's a commercial
19	building and to get there, you know, it's
20	like
21	IRAM FAROOQ: Right.

1 HUGH RUSSELL: One thing I've heard 2 somewhere is that -- this is now on page 7. 3 There's a section on loading and servicing. 4 And maybe we should add a measure in there to 5 encourage consolidated off street loading 6 facilities, because I think MIT wants to do 7 that. And that would be a measure that would certainly increase the walkability. 8 9 Page 9, this is built --10 Hugh, if I could add ROGER BOOTHE: 11 to that one. 12 HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. 13 ROGER BOOTHE: I think the potential 14 housing site, Ames Street, that redevelopment 15 authority is thinking about because right now 16 there's a great maze of --17 HUGH RUSSELL: Right. 18 -- parking and ROGER BOOTHE: 19 loading and so forth that we could probably 20 get probably better disguised and make that 21 street that much better. Some are time

1 issues. 2 HUGH RUSSELL: And on page 9 there's 3 a built forum page. And that I'm wondering 4 to some extent if maybe measures B and C are 5 actually more goals than measures. 6 ROGER BOOTHE: Yes. 7 HUGH RUSSELL: I think this is a --8 this is a difficult section to try to 9 quantify. And it's just a suggestion of 10 maybe a different way of thinking about it. 11 There's a lot of stuff on scale and 12 massing, and anybody who wants to look at it 13 and develop it would say oh, my God. But if 14 the -- if you look at the goals, you know, I 15 don't think anybody has any problem here with 16 the goals. And I don't think actually people 17 who are sitting facing us don't have a 18 problem with the goals either. 19 ROGER BOOTHE: They're very much 20 like the Article 19 goals. 21 **HUGH RUSSELL:** Yes.

1 ROGER BOOTHE: But what follows 2 is --3 Right. What follows HUGH RUSSELL: 4 are, and if by making the difference between 5 goals and measures clear, some of the anxiety 6 over what the measures are may go away. 7 That's not to say that if somebody comes with 8 a building that is monolithic with 9 satellites, we won't use the goal language 10 and say, no, that's not really what we want. 11 Here's the time for the Genzyme story 12 which is the first building to be proposed 13 and that development was the Genzyme 14 building, and I think it broke half of the 15 design guidelines that had been established. 16 WILLIAM TIBBS: Oh, yes, that's 17 true. 18 HUGH RUSSELL: And I remember Roger 19 coming to us when we first discussed it and 20 saying that, you know, here's a building that 21 breaks half the design guidelines, but it's a

1 great building and it achieves the goals. 2 And so, you know, you can get extraordinary 3 buildings that with somebody with, you know, 4 infinite money and tremendous in terms of the 5 architect, tremendous understanding and 6 commitment to some very high principles and 7 end up with wonderful things that you never 8 expected when you were writing this. 9 we've shown not only in that building but in 10 other buildings, that we can handle that. 11 ROGER BOOTHE: The Stata Center was 12 another one that broke almost every rule. 13 HUGH RUSSELL: There were fewer 14 rules there, but I do remember. And I 15 remember at the same time MIT brought two 16 buildings, one of which I thought was 17 wonderful, the Stata Center, which I still 18 think is bearable, which is the dormitory on 19 Vassar Street. Which --20 Which building? PAMELA WINTERS: 21 Stephen Hall ROGER BOOTHE:

1 building. 2 HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. Simmons Hall. 3 WILLIAM TIBBS: Simmons Hall. 4 HUGH RUSSELL: And maybe I don't 5 think it's as horrible as I thought it was 6 And it is in a place where nobody ever then. 7 really has to see it much unless you're at 8 MIT. 9 ROGER BOOTHE: Apparently the 10 students love it. 11 I don't think JOHN HAWKINSON: 12 that's accurate. 13 HUGH RUSSELL: That, what I was most 14 concerned about that building is that it was 15 an enormous effort to create an image and the 16 quality of life inside was compromised as a 17 result. And also a stark comparison between 18 that building and the Pacific Street House 19 which was being done at exactly the same time 20 for two-thirds of the budget with better 21 results. So just annoyed me that they

1 couldn't see that.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

H. THEODORE COHEN: Can I pop in here?

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I think I have a different design aesthetic -- architectural aesthetic than a number of people here. And I'm really glad Hugh started because I think, you know, you said the things that I wanted to say, which is that some buildings are great just because they're great, and some are ugly just because they're ugly. And it doesn't matter what guidelines they followed, and I really don't want us to eliminate the great buildings or the beautiful buildings because people are following guidelines too much. And I don't think, you know, there's anything wrong. I don't think they're dirty words to say tall or big or shiny or sleek. I think they all have a place and can fit in. And so I agree that a lot of things have to

1 be more goals rather than the methods 2 because, you know, I do love the Hancock 3 Building. And I actually do love the Stata 4 Center and I do like the Hope Building. And 5 a lot of the building, you know, the warehouse on Mass. Ave., I can't think, the 6 7 storage building. You know, it's huge but 8 it's gorgeous. 9 HUGH RUSSELL: Metropolitan. 10 H. THEODORE COHEN: 11 Metropolitan Storage. And I don't want to 12 allow those buildings to happen --13 ROGER BOOTHE: Yes. 14 H. THEODORE COHEN: -- because we're 15 too worried about the guidelines and 16 following exactly, you know, some of the 17 proposals. And so, you know, I'm really 18 concerned about that. I mean, I think these 19 are great. I think, you know, they're -- a 20 great outline for people to follow, but I 21 don't want to lose --

1 ROGER BOOTHE: Now, certainly over 2 the years we have never treated the 3 guidelines like rules, and we certainly heard 4 that from both committees in different ways. 5 They wanted us to think outside the box, 6 trying to be imaginative. So I think the 7 guidelines are there partly to say that we 8 really care about getting something of 9 quality, and this is how we see it going, but 10 it's kind of what Hugh was saying, you know, 11 these are measures we come up with that there might be others and the Board can take those 12 13 into account, but we are trying to make it 14 clear that we're expecting really good 15 things. 16 HUGH RUSSELL: I think also the 17 Stata Center might do quite well under these. ROGER BOOTHE: It might do better on 18 19 these than the old ones. 20 Roger, I was just PAMELA WINTERS: 21 wondering, it reminds me of the Koolhaas, Rem

1	Koolhaas dorm at MIT.
2	HUGH RUSSELL: Steven Holl.
3	ROGER BOOTHE: Steven Holl.
4	PAMELA WINTERS: But Koolhaas was
5	the architect, right?
6	ROGER BOOTHE: No.
7	HUGH RUSSELL: No.
8	ROGER BOOTHE: No, H-o-1-1.
9	PAMELA WINTERS: Okay, what am I
10	thinking of then?
11	ROGER BOOTHE: It does have a cool
12	house feeling to it.
13	HUGH RUSSELL: I don't think we've
14	been actually so lucky to have a Koolhaas
15	building.
16	PAMELA WINTERS: Okay. I don't know
17	why I'm
18	ROGER BOOTHE: He was involved a
19	little bit in the Harvard initiative early
20	on.
21	PAMELA WINTERS: Okay.

1 ROGER BOOTHE: And they were going 2 across, but that's all he's been involved in. 3 HUGH RUSSELL: Anyway, that 4 building. 5 PAMELA WINTERS: That building, 6 whatever it is. That building, I know that, 7 like, half the Board loved it, half the Board 8 hated it, and, you know, it was just -- it's 9 really -- I found it very interesting 10 architecturally. But do the students, have 11 you had any feedback? Do the students like 12 living there? Because that was one of our 13 concerns. ROGER BOOTHE: Well, Jeff Roberts 14 15 was a student when they were developing the 16 I don't know if you want to say program. 17 anything about that, Jeff. 18 JEFF ROBERTS: I'll say, I'll say 19 I can say a lot. We can talk about it 20 later, but it's a good example of where 21 things can become problematic when the design

1 isn't keeping in mind the larger set of goals 2 that it's meant to accomplish. I think it's 3 a -- I was involved in that project beginning 4 to end as a student, and it's one where the 5 design really got -- you know, it started 6 with a set of community goals, and the design 7 kind of ran away from that set of goals to a 8 point where it became, it became an issue. 9 But, yes, as mentioned, it is still a place 10 and people like it. The community kind of 11 tends to bond together somewhat in spite of 12 the architecture. One of the challenges of 13 living there helped in a funny way helped to 14 build some community in the dorm that might 15 not have otherwise have formed. 16 STUART DASH: Like a blizzard. 17 JEFF ROBERTS: There's certainly 18 unintended consequences. But it's a -- yes, 19 I don't want to get too far off. 20 PAMELA WINTERS: No, that's fine. 21 ROGER BOOTHE: I personally hate the

1 building, but I think it's a really good 2 thing it's there. 3 PAMELA WINTERS: Okav. Verv 4 diplomatic. 5 WILLIAM TIBBS: Getting back to what 6 Hugh said, thought, one of the concerns I 7 always had with the North Cambridge ones, and 8 I think the way you've done it, I agree, is 9 the good thing. The big fear is that we get 10 a building that's made just like these 11 blocks. And then they'd say, wait a minute, 12 we're complying with everything you said we should do. 13 14 ROGER BOOTHE: Well, we won't let 15 them do that. 16 WILLIAM TIBBS: And I think the word 17 measures is good and I think I agree with 18 Hugh that if you describe a definition of 19 what the goal and measures are so that they 20 -- because I think a lot of people weren't 21 used to dealing with us or these things,

might just liberally say we're going to check off, here's a hundred feet here, and here's or whatever. And we just want to make sure that we do, we do get the quality. And just because they comply with everything that we -- the measures say, that that doesn't necessarily mean a good building. As I've said we've got, we have guidelines that and sometimes we get great buildings and sometime we get not so great buildings that comply with the buildings. I think North Mass Ave. falls into that category.

ROGER BOOTHE: Most really good architects have really strong egos and are not going to take guidelines for an answer.

HUGH RUSSELL: Well, we have actually three very good architects sitting in the room, or at least three that I recognize, and I'm not worried about them dealing with this. And I understand guidelines and the previous buildings have

1	merit.
2	ROGER BOOTHE: Right.
3	IRAM FAROOQ: Just one thing.
4	HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, I wanted to
5	move on to the ground floor design
6	guidelines.
7	IRAM FAROOQ: The only thing I
8	wanted to say was that this section, one of
9	the things you asked us when you were talking
10	about MIT was are there any pieces that are
11	proposed in the Zoning language that actually
12	would fit better as design guidelines? And I
13	think when you look at the floor plate
14	limitations as you go over different heights,
15	that's right now in the MIT Zoning, and
16	that's one of the things we would recommend
17	might belong better in a place like this.
18	HUGH RUSSELL: I think I would agree
19	with that.
20	So now I've spent the substance of the
21	a lot of the setback and the heights and all

20

21

of those regimes in part because I wish no buildings were over 150 feet and it's just not going to work. And a lot of what's in here is dealing with the fact that there are buildings that are over 150 feet tall that will be built, not too many, but some. how to shape those buildings so that they are good neighbors in the city. And in part because I think a tremendous amount of effort has been done by consultants and staff to come up with specific numbers. So I feel that I'm not sure that I want to substitute my suggestions. But when I get to the retail page, there are a couple of places I do want to do that. And I'd like to move to that.

PAMELA WINTERS: What page, Hugh? HUGH RUSSELL: I'm on page 23.

And I was thinking as I said before about secondary streets, and I think you should probably add residential entry and stoops to the list of measures that are part

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

1011

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

of, you know, the measures that we'd expect on secondary streets because I think, you know, that was done at Third Square and is the right thing to do there. And to line it with the -- try to line it with retail would not be a good idea.

ROGER BOOTHE: No.

HUGH RUSSELL: And then I -- this is a question about the depth of the ground floor retail at the height. And the thing I look at is well, the 40-foot depth and 18 to 20 foot floor-to-floor height is what the national retailers are looking for. But our goal is to have small locally-owned businesses. So if you make the space -- if you require people to make space that the national people want, it's more likely that they'll come. Now, and then I thought about how many stores in Harvard Square are in 18 to 20 foot high floor? And it -- the Harvard Coop and what used to be the old coop where

12 13

9

10

11

15

14

16

17 18

19

20

21

the bank is now, I can't even remember which bank is now and I can't even remember what bank it is it changes so often, but those have big high ceilings. And when the Coop was there, it was a double height space. I think there might -- it's possible that it appears, and it might be that that one building. But I don't think there's a single other storefront in Harvard Square that has that kind of height. And I would also note that your illustration on page 27 of storefronts shows, as far as I can calculate based on the height of seven foot doors, 13 feet, 18 feet, 16 feet, 13 feet, and 12 foot high. So I think the 18 to 20 is not the right guideline.

ROGER BOOTHE: We actually had quite a bit of discussion about this with Goody Clancy. They were urging us to have the higher heights. I wouldn't add Crate and Barrel, the old DR building, and that faces

1	pretty soaring some of that, you know. So,
2	and that's a different scale that we're
3	talking about in Kendall Square. So I don't
4	know.
5	IRAM FAROOQ: One of the other
6	things that 18 to 20 was also trying to make
7	sure that we could accommodate restaurants
8	and all of the equipment that might need to
9	go with that because this is fifth floor to
10	floor-to-floor?
11	HUGH RUSSELL: So I would be curious
12	to know the
13	ROGER BOOTHE: Floor-to-floor
14	height.
15	IRAM FAROOQ: Yes.
16	HUGH RUSSELL: in the Twining
17	Building which has now three great
18	restaurants in it, is there two feet between
19	the first floor and the
20	UNIDENTIFIED MALE: It might be 16.
21	HUGH RUSSELL: Which is generous but

17

18

19

20

21

I'm not saying make it 12 or 10, but maybe it should be cranked down because I think in terms of the depth we've had this discussion again and again and again, and I guess I'm willing to -- well, right now the language says: Should average about 40 feet. That doesn't say every space has to be 40 foot minimum. And that's based on retail wisdom of what many retailers want to see. They're clearly --you know, the Novartis new building has retail at half that depth which in some ways is good because it stretches it out and it's not a fabulous retail location. So by having a 20-foot deep space and getting good people and stretching them enhances the experience rather than have two empty storefronts and two busy ones.

ROGER BOOTHE: Maybe we should get a little more of that kind of language in there rather than the numbers. I'm always nervous about numbers in a guideline.

2

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes, I was going to suggest you had a little bit more flexibility in that -- part of what they're doing when they come to us and telling us what they think that should be based on what their they're trying to accomplish and then we can judge what's appropriate or not.

ROGER BOOTHE: And in a lot of places we are talking about food trying some uses, so we want them to be showing us that they can actually provide food. I think back to some of the failures that we've had on the East Cambridge riverfront where we weren't able to get food in because there wasn't enough -- in some cases height floor-to-ceiling but also not putting in the black steel to ventilate the restaurants so it was more like we want to, we want these spaces to work for restaurants in a lot of cases, but not everywhere necessarily. we'll work on that.

1 HUGH RUSSELL: And another very 2 small point on page 26, measure a -- I think 3 we should also say that the percentage of 4 transparency we're interested in is 5 somewhere, it's in the zone that is maybe two 6 feet above the sidewalk and maybe ten feet 7 above the sidewalk. It doesn't do any good 8 to have a lot of high windows and, you know, 9 the Walgreens preferred mode which is to have 10 no -- you can't see into the place, but they 11 might have 50 percent glass, it's all up 12 where you can't see in. I'm using the 13 Brattleboro Walgreens as an example, but 14 thank God it's not downtown. So I think 15 that's just my editorial there. I think that's what you needed. 16 17 ROGER BOOTHE: Yes, good point. 18 I'm actually HUGH RUSSELL: Tom. 19 done with my remarks. 20 THOMAS ANNINGER: Are you done with 21 your list?

HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

THOMAS ANNINGER: Others have said what I was thinking when I read this, but I'll say it in my own words. I think my approach to this is a little similar to what we did with the Bicycle Zoning just a few weeks ago. So the point about the Bicycle Zoning is that what I was worried about there was balance between something that was very controlling and something that allowed for some flexibility. And for the Bicycle Zoning, I was convinced in the end that something very prescriptive actually was exactly the right way to go because it actually freed you up from getting caught up in all sorts of details on a fight over bicycle parking and gave you a chance to really think about the architecture and the urban planning of the building.

Here I think the balance is different. Here I think that there is a, there is a lot

of thinking here that -- and learning, but it does to me at certain points have an overly prescriptive tone to it. And it's what Ted was getting at. I think it was what some of my other colleagues -- some of these measures really read like rules. Like you got to do this.

I'll give you two examples that caught my eye and there may be many others, but I have to read through this rather quickly.

On page 12, buildings should have a clearly-expressed base, middle, and top.

Yes, I understand what that means, but it almost sounds a little bit like you're telling kids in kindergarten how to build their blocks. It's a little bit much in the way it's perhaps worded, and I'm just afraid that people might over read that sentence.

The other example is which goes to that is on page 17, and this -- here the tone is different. It's not quite so strong. Used

variations in height to create varied roof
lines.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

ROGER BOOTHE: I'm sorry, Tom, you're on page 17?

Page 17, measure THOMAS ANNINGER: Use variations in height. Α. To me variations in height as a way of creating interest is somewhat controversial. You and I have both have talked many times about the continental European cities. They do not consider variations in height a virtue. If anything, quite the opposite. Paris is not Many of the cities in Europe are not that. They like a uniform line at the top of that. their buildings to create a certain calm and peace. And I think one of the things that Cambridge sometimes makes me uncomfortable is some of the variations in height that make for a very jagged edge and create an unpeaceful kind of feeling. So I think we have to be careful when we say things like

2

4

3

5

7

6

8

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

that. I see what you're saying, and I think it can be used tastefully and well, but I think we have to be careful not to overstate that one either.

ROGER BOOTHE: Yes. This is certainly an issue that came up in the Central Square Committee even more strongly where the committee was really pushing us not to have so much uniformity. Our old guidelines were pretty much saying very much the traditional cornus line, the setbacks, and so forth and they really wanted to see It wasn't as strong I think the variation. the Kendall Square Committee, but they -- I think we and Goody Clancy were worried about the bulky buildings, particularly if they get to being too bulky and they're monolithic. But I hear what you're saying. I think the language in any case should be we do want to read like a measure and not like a rule. we'll work on it.

1	HUGH RUSSELL: The again,
2	thinking of the Twining Building probably
3	because the people are staring at me, but if
4	you look at the, think of the tower, the
5	housing tower on Third Street, it shows you
6	that it's quite a tall building, and I think
7	the variation in height is in some ways more
8	important when you get up to the taller
9	buildings. And think about the what they
10	did with that building. There's, you know
11	there's one mass that's a few stories taller.
12	ROGER BOOTHE: It's on page 9.
13	HUGH RUSSELL: Page 9, right. And
14	then there was the screen that introduced
15	another kind of
16	ROGER BOOTHE: The glass screen?
17	HUGH RUSSELL: Yes.
18	ROGER BOOTHE: It doesn't show on
19	this picture very well, but you see a little
20	tip of it there.
21	HUGH RUSSELL: And the other so

we're seeing it from a different side. It's more monolithic than it does from Third Street. But in some, you know, I think that articulation is it meets the sky has to be done in a bold scale. It can't be done in a weak scale. I'm just suggesting as a way to maybe explain the logic behind the requirements.

WILLIAM TIBBS: I think a more flexible way of doing it saying something where appropriate using the variation. That way we always have the, we have the conversation about is it appropriate or not.

ROGER BOOTHE: Right.

HUGH RUSSELL: But what's also kind of a revelation when Forest City came in with their massive model, and showed how like, you know, breaking the mass up into the three different volumes, you could, you could address the street in a much better way. So it's a measure that can be used to achieve

1 the scaling goals. 2 H. THEODORE COHEN: I agree with Tom 3 about all those things, and especially in the 4 section on tall buildings because I'm 5 personally not a big fan of, you know, the 6 changes in materials or fenestrations or 7 colors or I think arbitrary changes in 8 facades. But I think actually on page 18 9 where you're talking about tall buildings, 10 while I don't necessarily like a lot of those 11 things, you phrased it in consider doing 12 this. 13 ROGER BOOTHE: Yes. 14 WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes. 15 H. THEODORE COHEN: So it's much 16 more, you know, a measured response. You know, we've got this goal in mind and, you 17 18 know, doing this may be what a lot of us will 19 like, but you don't, you know, just think 20 about it. 21 ROGER BOOTHE: I mean --

1 H. THEODORE COHEN: I think language 2 like that throughout would be helpful. 3 I think in my mind ROGER BOOTHE: 4 I've been very worried about the very large 5 massive biotech buildings and feeling like 6 something has to happen to those buildings to 7 humanize them. And maybe residential almost 8 inherently has more gracefulness to it than 9 some of these really bulky biotech buildings. 10 So we should think more about that language. 11 WILLIAM TIBBS: I do want to say 12 that, Tom, I really agree with you. I mean, 13 I've only been to Paris once, and I was 14 amazed at the uniformity of the line of 15 buildings and the effect it had as you walked down the street. Because it's something that 16 17 we don't experience that much here, but --18 THOMAS ANNINGER: Right. 19 H. THEODORE COHEN: On the contrary, 20 I was just with a number of friends in 21 Kendall Square going to some of the great new restaurants there, and the number of people said why are all the buildings the same

3 height?

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes. Well, I'm not necessarily -- I'm agreeing with everybody saying we should have the flexibility. But I was impressed with that.

THOMAS ANNINGER: Can I say something that I heard Hugh say about residential entrances on side streets? In a way that's all to the good. I think we do have to ask ourself the question as to how successful our push for residential entrances is at those early buildings at North Point. I'm not convinced was it Tango and Sierra that we really got what we wanted with those wooden doors? And they look a little bit contrive to me, and I think we have to be careful just how much we push for residential, broken down residential entrances. That too has to be done right.

1	I'm getting a look from somebody who
2	designed it.
3	HUGH RUSSELL: Right.
4	I think, you know, if right now those
5	buildings are like point blocks in a park.
6	WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes.
7	HUGH RUSSELL: And when it becomes a
8	neighborhood of streets, it's different. And
9	I mean, I thought the ingenuity behind the
10	David's building. I've forgotten which one
11	it is. But the way he really thought about
12	it and came up with some completely unusual
13	and new ideas, but when you actually get
14	there on the sidewalk, it's pretty
15	interesting, you know.
16	THOMAS ANNINGER: I think you're
17	absolutely right, that it is too early to
18	judge. I think you're right.
19	STUART DASH: We're just getting
20	people in them.
21	THOMAS ANNINGER: That's right. I

1 think that's a fair point. 2 STEVEN WINTER: Hugh, I wanted to 3 add that as I recall the Central Square 4 discussion about height was that we want to 5 honor the old buildings and we want to honor 6 that setting. But the height is okay where it goes as long as it's, as long as it plays 7 8 and orchestrates with the rest of the 9 streetscape, high is okay. I believe that's 10 what they were saying. 11 ROGER BOOTHE: Yes, that's 12 definitely what they were saying. And it's 13 definitely departure from where we've been 14 for quite a while and those guidelines. 15 That's what was STEVEN WINTER: 16 exciting about it. 17 ROGER BOOTHE: And really pretty 18 much were right on the Central Square 19 guidelines based on the Committee's input. 20 STEVEN WINTER: Based on the 21 standard heights I do think Paris is a

1	wonderful example. You know, they've also
2	had a thousand years to get to the point
3	where it works for them well. It could be
4	our height is going to be 180 feet, and if
5	you come back here in 900 years, we're all
6	going to be the same height but it's going to
7	be 180 feet.
8	ROGER BOOTHE: We don't have our
9	houseman to help us out.
10	STUART DASH: We just changed the
11	regulations.
12	WILLIAM TIBBS: Hugh, can I add? I
13	had another area I wanted to
14	HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, sure.
15	WILLIAM TIBBS: Can you talk a
16	little bit about the connectors? I remember
17	when I first saw that
18	ROGER BOOTHE: Yes.
19	WILLIAM TIBBS: it was
20	interesting. And the only reason why, and I
21	may be going back, way too back in time, but

1	I remember a time when trying to get a
2	connector in the city was very, very
3	difficult. And I just want to make sure if
4	we're saying I'm not saying whether I
5	don't feel that there's a problem myself, but
6	I just want to say are there other political
7	issues that we need to or are we trying to
8	avoid a political issue and it's going to hit
9	us in the face.
10	ROGER BOOTHE: I'm not sure it's a
11	political issue. The thing that we're trying
12	to deal with is the desire for huge floor
13	plates.
14	WILLIAM TIBBS: No, I understand
15	that, but I'm trying to understand what was
16	the resistance to connectors
17	HUGH RUSSELL: I think these
18	connectors would not be going across public
19	ways.
20	ROGER BOOTHE: Exactly. We don't
21	want them across public ways. The Draper

Labs Connector, that one was so hugely 1 2 controversial. 3 Yes, yes. WILLIAM TIBBS: 4 I still regret that ROGER BOOTHE: 5 Some of the ones like the Broad 6 Institute, you know, there's the existing 7 Broad and the one that's been built now. And 8 they have connectors right around the corner 9 that don't go over public ways and those 10 really read like two different buildings 11 completely, and on several floors they're 12 totally connected. 13 WILLIAM TIBBS: So the controversy 14 is over public ways? 15 ROGER BOOTHE: Yes, that's for sure, 16 and I think we're all -- we all have 17 longstanding policies in trying to avoid that 18 because it blocks the sky and so forth and so 19 on. 20 STUART DASH: We want people flat on 21 the street.

1	WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes. I want to
2	reread it then just in that context.
3	HUGH RUSSELL: There's a very small
4	point, maybe we could just say they should be
5	two stories above the ground and not the
6	heights.
7	ROGER BOOTHE: Okay, do we have a
8	number there?
9	HUGH RUSSELL: We have 35 feet or
10	two stories.
11	ROGER BOOTHE: Yeah, no I feel
12	better with stories. I'd like to remove a
13	lot of the numbers to get to sound like
14	we're being too descriptive.
15	WILLIAM TIBBS: Exactly.
16	IRAM FAROOQ: If I could just say
17	one thing. Just to be fair to MIT, I will
18	say that they have expressed an interest in
19	having some of this format exist over some of
20	the streets within the campus, and I think it
21	would be useful to get the Board's guidance

on what you all think about that.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

I brought it up WILLIAM TIBBS: specifically for that reason because I know from personal experience that even when MIT tried to do that on streets that were relatively within its domain, there was still a lot of controversy with the city about doing it. So I think we need to face that issue very straight on. If MIT's trying to basically say that -- MIT likes connectors. I mean their main group buildings are all connected, and I think it's a great idea as a person who's had to walk in the winter there. But I think that's an issue that we don't want to skirt passed. If they want to -- if they wanted to be over public streets but not major public streets, then I think that's something that we just need to talk about and see if that makes sense to us, and then get a sense as to what the issue is with the city.

ROGER BOOTHE:

Yes, I guess I

1	would
2	HUGH RUSSELL: I think it's really
3	simple.
4	ROGER BOOTHE: different than on
5	a campus and a mixed use center.
6	WILLIAM TIBBS: But, again, the East
7	Campus is not the campus that we are thinking
8	about. I mean, this whole conversation has
9	been about the fact that we're changing the
10	mode from the campus that's the Central
11	Campus and the West Campus, and this is going
12	to be something different with streets and
13	people and commercial and institutional all
14	mixed together.
15	ROGER BOOTHE: Yes.
16	HUGH RUSSELL: I would have no
17	problem with considering connectors over
18	Carlton and Hayward. I would have huge
19	problems considering connectors over Amherst
20	and what's the one that isn't labelled there?
21	I guess down the river?

1	ROGER BOOTHE: It's making a
2	passageway to the river
3	WILLIAM TIBBS: Wadsworth.
4	ROGER BOOTHE: so that makes it
5	more or less hospitable the less it's going
6	to work.
7	HUGH RUSSELL: And writing up with
8	the difference between the campus streets, we
9	might want a place to put something like
10	this.
11	WILLIAM TIBBS: That might be how
12	you define a secondary street.
13	H. THEODORE COHEN: Isn't a
14	connector over a public way ultimately up to
15	the City Council?
16	ROGER BOOTHE: It is.
17	H. THEODORE COHEN: Because I mean,
18	I longed for the connector between the Fogg
19	and the Sterling Museum which was so
20	spectacularly beautiful.
21	ROGER BOOTHE: That was certainly

1	not a universally held opinion.
2	H. THEODORE COHEN: No, it was not.
3	It's not there.
4	HUGH RUSSELL: They managed to
5	convince half of the neighborhood association
6	in the largest meeting ever held in
7	Cambridge, but they didn't realize the rules
8	required two-thirds. So that we didn't do
9	things by close majorities. Of course they
10	now hate that building and so they're
11	probably just as happy not to have a
12	connector.
13	H. THEODORE COHEN: Right.
14	ROGER BOOTHE: Okay.
15	HUGH RUSSELL: Okay. More?
16	H. THEODORE COHEN: Just a couple of
17	small points. Should we, can we talk about
18	cell towers and whether there's going to be
19	any provision for them? And sort of the
20	related matter is, you know, these are all
21	great but do we talk at all about penthouses

1 and what goes on these beautiful roofs that 2 we're talking about with the guidelines 3 should be? 4 ROGER BOOTHE: That sounds like 5 probably a good idea. That's always a hard 6 one to get your arms around but we could take 7 a crack at that. 8 HUGH RUSSELL: But in the sense the 9 mechanical penthouse on a building becomes 10 the top of the building, and we want it to be 11 considered as the top of the building and not 12 considered as --13 Something on H. THEODORE COHEN: 14 top. 15 Mechanical things on WILLIAM TIBBS: 16 top of the building. 17 ROGER BOOTHE: We certainly have 18 that in our project review guidelines, and I 19 think we've made pretty good progress on that 20 in the last several years but we could 21 address that more directly.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay.

And I think my last point was about interior signs. And we were talking about page 10 maybe it is, about transparency and obeying the spirit of innovation. I mean, do we really want a lot more Microsoft, you know, bearing weight as you come over the Longfellow Bridge staring you in the face? I realize it's in the interior and through the glass wall. And I know we don't necessarily get to control the interior, but are we really trying to promote something like that?

ROGER BOOTHE: Yes, that's a tough discussion. I mean, I think there is certainly something about the digital age that we're in now that you probably don't want to be ignoring it and totally covering it up. But the Microsoft thing is really a disappointment because it reads like advertisements and nothing else. So maybe I don't know. But it's a tough subject.

1 H. THEODORE COHEN: I mean it reads 2 like a billboard that we probably wouldn't 3 allow on top of the building. 4 ROGER BOOTHE: Yes. 5 WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes. 6 HUGH RUSSELL: Is it better than a 7 subway power substation which is right behind 8 it? 9 ROGER BOOTHE: Yes. I mean, certainly the Broad Institute tried to do 10 11 something with their museum there, which 12 maybe not everybody would like to see, but 13 it's certainly a step above what Microsoft 14 has done. But they're both in sort of the 15 same, if you're -- you can talk about 16 guidelines, they're both using electronics to 17 try to make it -- the building more appealing 18 from the outside. And I would think that not 19 being overly descriptive, we probably would 20 want to prevent that completely, but it would

be nice that we had more assurances that it

21

1	was going to be successful. But I don't
2	think we have easy answers on that.
3	IRAM FAROOQ: Could there just be
4	some language that it shouldn't be
5	advertising?
6	ROGER BOOTHE: Yes, yes, that would
7	be
8	IRAM FAROOQ: That may be
9	ROGER BOOTHE: Not advertising
10	something that is really interesting, but one
11	person's interesting is another person's
12	advertisement. But let us think about that.
13	H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay.
14	STUART DASH: Which we're
15	actually, we have some language. The guy
16	that back in the ill-fated sign ordinance
17	that talked to that a little bit or talked
18	about big areas that just, you know, lit up
19	color or signage that basically weren't
20	adding anything to the overall urban district
21	and just a matter of advertising.
	1

1 HUGH RUSSELL: So I want to draw 2 your memories back to the Manfredi 3 renderings, the first renderings for the 4 center of the Gateway to MIT. And while I 5 wasn't -- I mean, I think if MIT really 6 wanted to do that and they did it well and it 7 was loud and splashy and colorful, I don't 8 think we might, we might look at that and 9 say, well, that's probably okay. You know? 10 Like, like there's a dotted line there. And 11 sort of on your land, and this is what, this 12 is the message you want to send, then we're 13 maybe a little puzzled by that, but.... 14 Well, yes, I mean, ROGER BOOTHE: 15 again, in the spirit of not wanting to choke 16 out all creativity --17 HUGH RUSSELL: Yes, sure. 18 ROGER BOOTHE: -- we want to think 19 about those things. You may remember 20 probably Cliff Solbert's (phonetic) little 21 electronic thing that went up in Holyoke

1	Center Plaza that lasted about two weeks
2	before it was ripped out because everybody
3	it was animated, you know, electronic
4	animation right there in Harvard Square. So
5	these things are they're risky and, you
6	know, MIT is a risky kind of place. And I
7	guess we probably wanted to see some of that,
8	and maybe we just have to try to make sure
9	that we're understanding what the thing is
10	really going to be like.
11	HUGH RUSSELL: Right. I mean 77
12	Mass. Avenue doesn't really communicate
13	architecturally what's really going on at
14	MIT. You know, a bunch of
15	WILLIAM TIBBS: Sure it does.
16	You've got a dome, you've got the stairs, and
17	you've got the new sculptures opposite.
18	STUART DASH: People have to find
19	their way there.
20	HUGH RUSSELL: I guess. It is more
21	I mean, 77, you know, looks like it's an

1 old academic building. And there's some 2 probably very brilliant professors sitting 3 behind that window, you know, with a slide 4 rule and it's, that's not I think the modern 5 story of everything at MIT. 6 Do we want to address ROGER BOOTHE: 7 Central Square or are we getting late now? 8 I'm going to have to WILLIAM TIBBS: 9 leave at 10:00. If you all want to --10 HUGH RUSSELL: I guess Central 11 Square, I find is the guidelines, the 12 problem's different. It's like Central 13 Square, we're trying to guide in-fill rather 14 than develop into other areas. 15 WILLIAM TIBBS: Yes. 16 HUGH RUSSELL: And it's all about 17 in-fill and it's about opportunities and 18 trying to push people to do things 19 differently. So I mean I had a single mark 20 on the Central Square guidelines, probably 21 only because I didn't study them enough, but

1 I thought -- the only mark I have was 5,000 2 square feet big enough for a public market 3 building in Central Square? And it says 4 minimum of 5,000. I thought downtown 5 Brattleboro ended up with a public market 6 space kind of by default that's probably four 7 times that size. And that's kind of an interesting, usable space. The things go on 8 9 down there, and mostly it's kind of empty and 10 forlorn but every once in a while it's going 11 to be fun. So that was my --12 ROGER BOOTHE: Well, if I could just 13 say one thing about the committee process. 14 HUGH RUSSELL: Yes. 15 ROGER BOOTHE: Again, they really 16 pushed hard to get away from the old 17 guidelines that seemed too stayed. And I 18 read them over and even though I probably 19 wrote them, they were probably a little too 20 stayed. So they're wanting us to think about 21 great new architecture that doesn't have to

be historicist, but also we had the desire to keep thinking about the historical pattern there because it is very important. We don't want Central Square to disappear because people love Central Square. We had the Red Ribbon Commission right before the K2-C2 process, and that big theme there was saying let's benefit from some of all of this economic activity that's happening in Kendall Square and how we bring that to Central Square. So I mean, this image up on the screen here, which I forget what page it's on in the guidelines, but it's got --

IRAM FAROOQ: 6.

ROGER BOOTHE: -- on the left side, the upper portion of the Holmes Building and its plaza which really doesn't have a popular following. And we've got on the right Lafayette Square which is amazingly popular, but it doesn't have architectural framing. That's kind of at the two ends of the square,

1 and I think those were really emblematic 2 concerns of the committee is how to make 3 something more at this square and then really 4 respect what's happened at Lafayette Square. 5 And, of course, we heard a lot about that and 6 the discussion about the Forest City 7 rezoning. And we still have some folks right 8 here in the room who have taken on the 9 request site, and so that's maybe a little 10 bit more than in-fill because it's a big 11 site. You got the city parking lot here. 12 That's two big city parking lots were also 13 big discussion in committee as to how those 14 could be built with to still respect the 15 neighborhood edges and so forth but have 16 something more positive going on in it. So, 17 I think that these guidelines really do try 18 to respect a lot of the -- those -- that kind 19 of thinking that came out of the committee. 20 And it does once again allow for more height 21 than we're used to been thinking about in

3

4

5 6

7

8

9

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Central Square, but it's not really going to be wall to wall heights, you know? It's just too difficult to assemble sites and so forth. But certainly in the case of Quest, you know, I think we're going to be seeing something more visible at Lafayette Square. The good thing about this site is that we won't have to worry so much about the shading of the park since it's on the north side of the park, but then you do get back into the neighborhood issues and the needs to be sure to protect the neighborhood. So these guidelines do try to address these things, and probably don't have a lot of -- you don't want to get into a lot of detail perhaps or should I try to get through it?

HUGH RUSSELL: I mean, I think part of my reaction to this is that I think we really were impressed with the committee process, with the presentation that was made, the thoughtfulness that process came out

1	with. This is simply putting into guideline
2	form what we've already heard, so in some
3	ways I don't want to tamper. If it's not
4	broken, don't fix it.
5	ROGER BOOTHE: Yes. Well, I think
6	that's kind of the way we felt. At least
7	we're trying to respect the spirit of that
8	extraordinary process.
9	THOMAS ANNINGER: Did you say you
10	had a five-minute run through of this that
11	you wanted to give us?
12	ROGER BOOTHE: Well, I was asking
13	whether you want to try to go through that?
14	THOMAS ANNINGER: I think we should
15	go through that. We're not going to have
16	another chance if it's Roger does things
17	really fast so I think we can do it.
18	HUGH RUSSELL: Great. I would love
19	to have us at the end of tonight to sort of
20	say, okay, we've had the major discussions on
21	both of these and time to wrap them up.

1 STEVEN WINTER: Yes. 2 HUGH RUSSELL: And I think, you 3 know. 4 PAMELA WINTERS: That's fine. 5 ROGER BOOTHE: Shall I do a run 6 through? 7 Once again I think all these guidelines 8 were trying to build on experiences we've 9 had, especially the project review. And so 10 much of what the Board looks at is where the 11 building meets the street, trying to make 12 sure that we have active sidewalks that would 13 animate public squares where there are 14 buildings next to it. That's a big thing 15 that runs all through these guidelines. 16 Streets and sidewalks is all about that. And 17 on page 5 you see the Tavern on the Square 18 that we've seen as a successful model of 19 trying to have zones in sidewalk where you 20 have walking going on and cafe space and 21 really animation. Seeing more and more of

that throughout the square. Again, that's a big theme of Red Ribbon, something the committee really wants to see.

So on page 6, which is what's up on the screen there, again, the Carl Barren Plaza in my mind has really benefitted from getting active uses on that ground floor. There apparently is some change in the management. And we've heard indirectly that they might be getting something in there. I think that's essential. It's very hard to redo that process as much as everybody would like to, but that would be a critical thing to make it work.

The idea of this public room was something that, again, I think has its roots, this is on page 7. And the Red Ribbon Commission had resonance with the C2 Committee, the need for some kind of gathering space. And as we see these developments happen, try to think about

something that's not just internalized but something that has a place for people.

The ground floor design guidelines, again, similar to discussion we were having about the Kendall Square ground floors, how do we make sure those ground floors work, and I don't remember if we had as many numbers in here. I'd rather stay away from the numbers about the heights and the amount of space as we were discussing before, but certainly trying to make sure that we don't wind up with spaces that are not really workable for these kinds of uses as everybody I think agrees are so important.

The built forum section has on page 11 there's an error actually that Section 3 is actually the same as Section 4. There's another section that -- Iram, can you pull that up on the screen? That's really just showing the area of Main Street near Newtown Court and it shows basically no change on the

3

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

Newtown Court side and maintaining the kind of setback regime that we have on the side where there's 650 Main Street building further on down. So you can see up here the proper Section 3. That's a real detail. I think as you have time to look at these and see if these make sense to you, and we can certainly still tweak the clarity and numbers and so forth. But it's really all about trying to keep the heights near Mass. Ave, have protection for the neighborhood areas and Newtown Court. And, again, the height is really allow for housing. So that's something that the committee felt very strongly about trying to allow, that would break through the traditional plane. So if you look at page 13 on the guidelines and you see the traditional plane is the 55-foot height. And then right now in our regime we have 80 feet by Special Permit. You could go up to 140 feet on a few sites. Again, I do

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

not think it's going to be more than a very few over the next decade or two just because of the ownership, but the committee felt strongly they wanted that kind of height possibility for residential.

On pages 14 and 15 we get into building facade, and this is where we had a really interesting discussion with the committee where they reacted against our old guidelines which all sounded very stuffy and conservative, and so I really like the juxtaposition on page 15 of having the historic building. We talk about what's really great about that, but then we have an example from Harvard Square of a really modern glassy building that has its own kind of character and interest. So we're thinking about Central Square as benefitting from having those kinds of juxtapositions. again trying hard not to be too prescriptive in a lot of what was and that carries on page

1	16.
2	So, I think those are the main points
3	and Central Square guidelines. Again, a lot
4	of similarities in terms of thinking about
5	the importance of the street and sidewalk and
6	respect with public spaces.
7	THOMAS ANNINGER: Good job.
8	HUGH RUSSELL: So, I think what
9	we're saying in a nutshell is we're endorsing
10	the design guidelines as with no suggestions
11	or reservations, and that we have a few areas
12	to think about in Kendall Square so we're at
13	95 percent instead of 100.
14	ROGER BOOTHE: Well, I think the
15	discussion was very helpful. I think we
16	understand what you're saying. We'll work on
17	those things.
18	HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, great.
19	Excellent work.
20	Iram will of course have the last word.
21	IRAM FAROOQ: I just want to say

1 next steps with what we're going to do from 2 here on K2 and C2, and we'd like to -- our 3 in-house Zoning team has started to write the 4 language now especially for Central Square 5 based on the Committee's recommendations of 6 the Zoning language, and we'd like to start 7 having those discussions with you, maybe come 8 in once a month is what we're thinking, so 9 that we can advance Central Square and then 10 on Kendall Square. As you had earlier 11 expressed that we use MIT as kind of the test 12 case, and we wait for the MIT piece to wrap 13 up before we bring you the language for the rest of the area. We feel like once we do 14 15 that, we'll be pretty set with the principles 16 for the rest of Kendall Square. 17 **HUGH RUSSELL:** Does the -- do we 18 have any sense of the redevelopment 19 authority's process and the timeline? 20 SUSAN GLAZER: In terms of what? 21 Processing timeline. ROGER BOOTHE:

1 HUGH RUSSELL: The processing 2 timeline for the redevelopment authority to 3 sort of get up to speed to become, you know, 4 sort of --5 IRAM FAROOQ: As an organization. 6 They -- the SUSAN GLAZER: 0h. 7 redevelopment authority is continuing on with 8 its work. They have advertised for a 9 redevelopment officer redevelopment director, 10 I'm not quite sure of the exact title. And 11 we're receiving resumes until the 25th of 12 this month, and then we'll be reviewing them 13 pretty quickly after that and hope to have 14 someone on board, you know, fairly soon. But 15 they definitely are continuing on. 16 HUGH RUSSELL: So maybe next year 17 we'll be in position to do the DOT Zoning or 18 maybe earlier? 19 SUSAN GLAZER: It's hard to say. 20 One of the things that we'll be doing in the 21 next year is a strategic plan to, you know,

1	give a little more focus to their work.
2	HUGH RUSSELL: Thank you.
3	0kay.
4	THOMAS ANNINGER: Hugh, before we
5	break, if I'm not mistaken next week we
6	tackle our second look at the MIT Zoning
7	Petition?
8	ROGER BOOTHE: Yes.
9	THOMAS ANNINGER: Just what we do
10	with that is something we might spend 30
11	seconds on, but there are parts of that
12	Zoning Petition that we'd like guidelines,
13	and there are parts that don't. And it isn't
14	entirely clear to me just where Zoning stops
15	and guidelines begin and how we navigate
16	between those two as to what it is that we
17	expect, but I any help you can give us in
18	comments on it
19	HUGH RUSSELL: Sounds like they're
20	trying to address that issue directly with
21	MIT.

1	ROGER BOOTHE: Yes, I think we're
2	making progress on that. And we're going to
3	have a meeting with MIT before the next board
4	meeting to kind of try to move that one step
5	further along. But I think we heard your
6	concerns, and we're hoping that we're getting
7	MIT to where they feel comfortable with the
8	Kendall Square guidelines and they can make
9	that reference and the Zoning to move some of
10	those things out of Zoning and into
11	guidelines.
12	THOMAS ANNINGER: I don't know where
13	the right place is.
14	ROGER BOOTHE: Yes. We're still
15	working on that but we're getting close.
16	THOMAS ANNINGER: But there is a
17	line that I don't remember that I remember
18	being somewhat confused about.
19	ROGER BOOTHE: Yes, we'll try to
20	clarify.
21	HUGH RUSSELL: What do you expect to

put in our packages about that in the next week?

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

We have a Zoning memo IRAM FAROOQ: -- we're going to have a memo for you that Jeff and the rest of the team are putting together that speaks about response to some of the questions that you had raised last It's our thinking that MIT will have time. some modifications to talk to you about, because we've had conversations with them, and I think we're getting much closer on some of those areas where there was disparity even though overall there was a lot of consistency from the very start. And I think dealing with this question of what goes into guidelines, what goes into Zoning and we're, I think our hope is that what we come up with as guidelines will be embraced by MIT as their set of guidelines and gets attached to their Zoning as a collective piece.

THOMAS ANNINGER: I think what Hugh

1	might have been asking is are you intending
2	to send us perhaps a memo on some of these
3	issues that might help us go deeper into our
4	analysis of the Zoning than we were able to
5	do the first time?
6	ROGER BOOTHE: Yes.
7	THOMAS ANNINGER: I think that would
8	be helpful.
9	HUGH RUSSELL: Okay, thank you very
10	much.
11	
12	(Whereupon, at 10:15 p.m., the
13	Planning Board Adjourned.)
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	

1	ERRATA SHEET AND INSTRUCTIONS
2	The original of the Errata Sheet
3	has been delivered to Community Development.
4	When the Errata Sheet has been
5	completed and signed, a copy thereof should
6	be delivered to each party of record and the
7	ORIGINAL delivered to Community Development,
8	to whom the original transcript was
9	delivered.
10	
11	INSTRUCTIONS
12	After reading this volume of the
	transcript, indicate any corrections or changes and the reasons therefor on the
13	transcript, indicate any corrections or changes and the reasons therefor on the Errata Sheet supplied to you and sign it. DO NOT make marks or notations on the transcript
13 14	transcript, indicate any corrections or changes and the reasons therefor on the Errata Sheet supplied to you and sign it. DO
13 14 15	transcript, indicate any corrections or changes and the reasons therefor on the Errata Sheet supplied to you and sign it. DO NOT make marks or notations on the transcript
13 14 15 16	transcript, indicate any corrections or changes and the reasons therefor on the Errata Sheet supplied to you and sign it. DO NOT make marks or notations on the transcript
13 14 15 16	transcript, indicate any corrections or changes 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.
12 13 14 15 16 17 18	transcript, indicate any corrections or changes 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
13 14 15 16 17	transcript, indicate any corrections or changes 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
13 14 15 16 17 18	transcript, indicate any corrections or changes 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

1	ATTACH TO PLANNING BOARD DATE: 02/12/13
2	REP: CAZ
3	ERRATA SHEET
4	INSTRUCTIONS: After reading the transcript
5	of the Planning Board, note any change or correction and the reason therefor on this
6	sheet. DO NOT make any marks or notations on the transcript volume itself. Sign and date
7	this errata sheet (before a Notary Public, if required). Refer to Page 171 of the
8	transcript for Errata Sheet distribution instructions.
9	PAGE LINE
10	CHANGE: REASON:
11	CHANGE : REASON :
12	CHANGE : REASON :
13	
14	CHANGE : REASON :
15	CHANGE : REASON :
16	CHANGE : REASON :
17	
18	I have read the foregoing transcript of the Planning Board, and except for any
19	corrections or changes noted above, I hereby
20	subscribe to the transcript as an accurate record of the statements made.
21	

1	CERTIFICATE
2	COMMON IEAL THE OF MACCACHILICETTS
3	COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS BRISTOL, SS.
4	I, Catherine Lawson Zelinski, a
5	Certified Shorthand Reporter, the undersigned Notary Public, certify that:
6	I am not related to any of the parties
7	in this matter by blood or marriage and that I am in no way interested in the outcome of this matter.
8	
9	I further certify that the testimony hereinbefore set forth is a true and accurate transcription of my stenographic notes to the
10	best of my knowledge, skill and ability.
11	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 1st day of March 2013.
12	my hand cirro roc day or haron 2010.
13	
14	Catherine L. Zelinski Notary Public Contified Shorthand Paparter
15	Certified Shorthand Reporter License No. 147703
16	My Commission Expires:
17	April 23, 2015
18	THE EODEOLING OFFITTION OF THE
19	THE FOREGOING CERTIFICATION OF THIS TRANSCRIPT DOES NOT APPLY TO ANY REPRODUCTION OF THE SAME BY ANY MEANS UNLESS UNDER THE
20	DIRECT CONTROL AND/OR DIRECTION OF THE
21	CERTIFYING REPORTER.

\$	58:21, 64:8	162:5	7	accomplish [3] -
•	16 [6] - 81:7, 81:10,	30 [8] - 6:6, 6:7,	•	97:19, 117:2, 126:6
	95:7, 123:14,	18:17, 37:20, 51:3,		accomplishments [1]
\$20,000 [1] - 44:14	124:20, 164:1	94:7, 106:3, 167:10	7 [2] - 107:2, 160:17	- 16:5
\$3,000 [1] - 18:2	17 [4] - 95:7, 129:20,	300 [1] - 3:20	70 [2] - 86:4, 104:3	accordance [1] -
\$3200 [1] - 18:14	130:4, 130:5	3200 [1] - 18:3	77 [2] - 152:11,	71:14
\$445,000 [1] - 20:13	171 [1] - 172:7	33 [2] - 51:8, 90:19	152:21	account [3] - 67:1,
\$600,000 [1] - 23:14	174 [1] - 2:10	344 [1] - 1:6	7:05 [1] - 1:5	68:17, 114:13
\$94,000 [1] - 19:18	18 [6] - 122:11,	3477 [1] - 54:18	7:20 [1] - 4:2	accurate [3] - 111:12,
	122:19, 123:14,	35 [1] - 142:9	7:30 [1] - 4:4	172:19, 173:9
•	123:15, 124:6,	39,000 [1] - 44:17	7th [1] - 5:10	achieve [2] - 6:20,
	134:8	3900 [1] - 78:16		133:21
	180 [2] - 139:4, 139:7	3900 [1] - 78.10	8	achieves [1] - 110:1
'07 [1] - 44:9	1815 [1] - 86:21	4		acre [2] - 93:17,
'09 [1] - 44:9	19 [4] - 69:18, 94:8,	4		103:14
'92 [1] - 10:19	95:15, 108:20		80 [9] - 19:1, 19:4,	
	· ·	4 [3] - 2:8, 100:19,	20:2, 21:3, 21:18,	Act [2] - 25:17, 29:12
0	19.2 [1] - 44:15	161:17	24:12, 51:7, 51:9,	action [1] - 3:18
	1969 [1] - 84:10	4.6 [1] - 66:4	162:20	action-packed [1] -
	1991 [1] - 13:2	40 [4] - 28:2, 44:17,	800 [3] - 28:15, 28:21,	3:18
02/12/13 [1] - 172:1	19th [1] - 3:17	125:6, 125:7	29:1	active [2] - 159:12,
	1st [1] - 173:11	40-foot [1] - 122:11	88,574 [1] - 44:10	160:7
1	_	40T [2] - 41:17, 42:14	8:30 [2] - 82:5, 85:6	activity [2] - 96:15,
	2	40 [2] - 41.17, 42.14 42 [1] - 54:3	,	155:9
4 m 2.5 76.2 77.0		420 [1] - 20:13	9	actual [1] - 19:7
1 [5] - 2:5, 76:2, 77:9, 77:13, 78:13	2 [3] - 2:6, 74:4, 90:20	4200 [1] - 54:3		add [14] - 14:11, 31:5,
1.2 [1] - 36:19	20 [15] - 10:10, 18:6,	45 [1] - 23:2		38:9, 39:4, 57:8,
1.2 [1] - 30.19 10 [11] - 8:8, 50:4,	18:10, 27:18, 44:17,	466 [1] - 26:6	9 [5] - 94:18, 107:9,	57:18, 67:6, 87:6,
• • •	57:10, 71:15, 71:21,		108:2, 132:12,	107:4, 107:10,
54:6, 54:16, 56:6,	88:1, 95:20, 103:3,	47 [1] - 78:9	132:13	121:20, 123:20,
59:9, 59:16, 74:4, 74:10, 125:1, 148:4	122:12, 122:20,	4:30 [3] - 5:4, 5:10,	9.3 [1] - 44:15	138:3, 139:12
100 [7] - 19:15, 20:1,	123:15, 124:6	5:11	90 [1] - 6:9	added [7] - 11:15,
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	20-foot [1] - 125:14		900 [1] - 139:5	56:11, 56:15, 65:19,
21:14, 37:21, 51:4,	200 [1] - 87:19	5	95 [1] - 164:13	66:3, 80:8, 81:18
51:10, 164:13	200,000 [1] - 44:15			adding [9] - 52:21,
100,000 [2] - 34:19,	200,000 [1] - 44:13	5 [3] - 2:9, 93:4,	A	57:2, 57:10, 65:3,
36:21		159:17		68:6, 80:10, 81:7,
10:00 [1] - 153:9	2009 [1] - 44:13	5,000 [2] - 154:1,	70.0.74.40	81:10, 150:20
10:15 [1] - 170:12	2011 [1] - 44:4	154:4	a.m [4] - 73:9, 74:16,	addition [3] - 4:21,
11 [1] - 161:15	2012 [1] - 20:8	50 [3] - 13:11, 51:3,	80:12, 80:13	8:2, 38:12
112 [1] - 81:9	2013 [2] - 1:4, 173:11	127:11	abandon [1] - 79:21	additional [3] - 52:2,
113 [1] - 20:3	2015 [1] - 173:16	50,000 [1] - 36:20	ability [2] - 56:10,	59:17, 80:8
12 [6] - 1:4, 39:8,	2020 [1] - 28:17	54R [1] - 4:1	173:10	address [6] - 31:20,
50:10, 123:14,	2030 [8] - 50:9, 50:14,	55-foot [1] - 162:18	able [13] - 18:16,	133:20, 147:21,
125:1, 129:11	51:3, 51:20, 55:7,	33-1001 [1] - 102.10	19:15, 22:9, 24:13,	153:6, 157:13,
120 [2] - 19:20, 21:15	59:7, 59:14, 83:10	6	26:8, 28:7, 34:3,	167:20
13 [3] - 123:13,	21 [1] - 95:20		36:7, 42:15, 42:21,	Adjourned [1] -
123:14, 162:17	23 [2] - 121:17,		88:4, 126:14, 170:4	170:13
13.1 [1] - 44:18	173:16	6 [2] - 155:14, 160:4	absolutely [3] - 82:7,	adjusting [1] - 23:7
135 [1] - 18:15	24-hour [1] - 53:16	6.2 [1] - 8:4	86:1, 137:17	administer [2] - 15:6,
14 [3] - 44:17, 58:21,	25 [1] - 91:1	60 [1] - 86:4	absorb [1] - 50:14	27:20
163:6	25th [2] - 4:20, 166:11	60,000 [1] - 44:17	academic [11] - 96:21,	administering [1] -
140 [1] - 162:21	26 [1] - 127:2	617.786.7783/617.	102:21, 105:2,	26:17
1400 [2] - 58:12,	26th [3] - 5:3, 5:6, 5:9	639.0396 [1] - 1:20	105:3, 105:7,	administers [1] -
58:15	27 [1] - 123:11	62 [1] - 8:9	105:21, 106:4,	27:17
141 [1] - 91:3	270 [1] - 28:20	62,367 [1] - 44:11	106:9, 106:17,	adopted [1] - 69:13
147703 [1] - 173:15	2800 [1] - 18:11		106:18, 153:1	Adoption [1] - 2:7
15 [6] - 26:4, 83:2,		65 [1] - 23:12	accept [1] - 65:7	adopts [1] - 7:2
88:1, 95:4, 163:6,	3	650 [1] - 162:3	access [2] - 30:3,	advance [1] - 165:9
163:12		67,000 [1] - 19:5	94:4	advantage [2] - 41:1,
150 [2] - 121:2, 121:5		680 [3] - 80:10, 80:20	accommodate [1] -	63:15
1500 [4] - 58:7, 58:15,	3 [8] - 2:5, 2:6, 2:7,		124:7	advertised [1] - 166:8
	99:3, 99:4, 161:16,			uavoi iisou [i] - 100.0

advertisement [1] -150:12 advertisements [1] -148:20 advertising [3] -150:5, 150:9, 150:21 advocacy [2] - 40:13, 43:14 advocates [1] - 43:15 aesthetic [2] - 112:6, 112:7 affect [1] - 52:15 affects [1] - 71:4 afford [4] - 18:12, 18:16, 34:4, 38:16 affordability [7] -17:1, 17:20, 24:6, 29:14, 31:18, 32:16, 45:17 affordable [22] - 8:21, 15:21, 17:4, 21:1, 21:13, 22:9, 22:13, 23:9, 23:15, 24:11, 24:21, 25:8, 25:18, 26:17, 28:14, 28:16, 32:21, 35:6, 40:6, 42:10, 42:17, 42:20 Affordable [3] - 16:9, 27:8, 43:12 afraid [1] - 129:17 afternoon [1] - 23:10 age [1] - 148:15 aged [2] - 39:8, 39:9 agencies [3] - 25:21, 41:15, 43:11 aggressive [1] - 85:19 aging [2] - 30:7, 30:13 ago [8] - 6:19, 8:5, 60:5, 60:6, 73:4, 86:4, 97:10, 128:7 agree [7] - 104:13, 112:21, 118:8, 118:17, 120:18, 134:2, 135:12 agreeing [1] - 136:5 agreements [1] - 35:6 agrees [1] - 161:14 ahead [3] - 38:8, 79:7, 89:8 Ahmed [1] - 1:11 Alan [1] - 56:12 alarms [1] - 41:18 albeit [1] - 25:1 Alex [1] - 32:5 Alexandria [1] - 51:12 Allen [1] - 57:21 allocated [1] - 25:16 allocates [1] - 25:15 allow [8] - 25:2, 28:9, 46:20, 113:12,

149:3, 156:20, 162:13, 162:15 allowed [3] - 41:18, 65:10, 128:10 allows [1] - 47:1 almost [7] - 18:3, 18:14, 73:9, 106:15, 110:12, 129:14, 135:7 alter [2] - 82:15, 82:16 amazed [1] - 135:14 amazingly [1] -155:19 amended [1] - 4:18 Ames [2] - 104:17, 107:14 Amgen [1] - 47:13 Amherst [1] - 144:19 amount [7] - 12:11, 21:13, 32:12, 41:8, 49:1, 121:9, 161:9 amounts [1] - 33:8 analysis [21] - 17:8, 23:3, 50:5, 50:10, 50:12, 53:19, 56:17, 58:18, 59:2, 65:18, 67:19, 68:12, 68:20, 69:7, 70:3, 72:14, 76:11, 80:7, 81:6, 82:8, 170:4 Analysis [2] - 54:21, 55:1 analyzed [1] - 56:5 analyzing [1] - 7:15 **AND** [2] - 171:1, 171.18 AND/OR [1] - 173:20 animate [1] - 159:13 animated [1] - 152:3 animating [1] - 102:7 animation [2] - 152:4, 159:21 Annex [1] - 1:6 ANNINGER [16] -127:20, 128:2, 130:5, 135:18, 136:8, 137:16, 137:21, 158:9, 158:14, 164:7, 167:4, 167:9, 168:12, 168:16, 169:21, 170:7 Anninger [2] - 1:9, 3:3 annoyed [1] - 111:21 annual [1] - 71:20 answer [4] - 25:11, 48:17, 51:5, 119:15 answers [1] - 150:2 antenna [1] - 3:19 anticipated [2] - 9:11,

70:9

anticipating [2] -64:16, 83:6 anxiety [1] - 109:5 **ANY** [2] - 173:19, 173:19 anyway [1] - 116:3 apart [1] - 72:21 apologize [1] - 57:15 Appeal [2] - 2:5, 3:8 appealing [1] - 149:17 applied [1] - 100:10 **APPLY** [1] - 173:19 **apply** [1] - 100:10 appoint [1] - 42:1 appointments [1] -74.19 approach [3] - 8:11, 12:16, 128:5 approaching [2] -17:16, 40:20 appropriate [4] -41:11, 126:7, 133:11, 133:13 april [1] - 173:16 arbitrary [1] - 134:7 architect [2] - 110:5, 115:5 Architect's [1] - 92:1 architects [2] -119:14, 119:17 architectural [4] -94:17, 95:1, 112:6, 155:20 architecturally [2] -116:10, 152:13 architecture 131 -117:12. 128:18. 154:21 area [24] - 12:20, 19:8. 49:9. 50:9. 50:12. 50:17, 51:8, 51:10, 51:21, 54:4, 56:8, 60:5, 66:21, 71:5, 73:8, 73:13, 76:3, 79:1, 82:18, 97:1, 97:2, 139:13, 161:20, 165:14 areas [12] - 12:19, 46:21, 49:10, 49:18, 49:20, 89:5, 150:18, 153:14, 162:11, 164:11, 169:12 arms [1] - 147:6 Arms [1] - 42:6 arrive [2] - 75:4, 85:4 arterials [1] - 56:18 Article [3] - 69:18, 94:8. 108:20 article [1] - 9:7 article's [1] - 66:11

articulation [1] -

133:4 Arts [1] - 92:1 aspect [1] - 97:15 assemble [1] - 157:3 assessed [1] - 7:20 assets [2] - 29:16, 34:21 assist [3] - 16:15, 19:16, 24:20 assistance [1] - 21:7 Assistant [2] - 1:12, assisted [1] - 29:8 Associate [1] - 1:11 association [1] -146.5 assume [5] - 6:3, 52:6, 52:17, 54:15, 102:20 assumed [1] - 51:7 assumes [1] - 69:8 assumptions [3] -52:9, 54:1, 81:4 assurances [1] -149:21 ATTACH [1] - 172:1 attached [1] - 169:19 attempt [1] - 42:3 attention [1] - 44:2 attest [1] - 11:3 Auburn [2] - 3:20 audience [1] - 32:6 authority [4] - 93:15, 107:15, 166:2, 166:7 Authority [3] - 26:1, 29:6, 35:5 authority's [1] -165:19 auto [3] - 59:9, 60:1, 70:3 automated [1] - 86:15 available [6] - 16:3, 19:13, 22:19, 24:15, 35:11, 40:11 Ave [5] - 63:7, 77:2, 113:6, 119:11, 162:10 Avenue [2] - 63:5, 152:12 avenues [1] - 24:7 average [4] - 36:18, 37:11, 81:7, 125:6 avoid [2] - 140:8, 141:17 Award [2] - 92:1, 92:2 award [1] - 92:7 Awards [1] - 92:15 aware [3] - 15:8, 26:13. 41:5 awful [1] - 38:10

В

baby [1] - 30:10 backdrop [1] - 23:18 background [2] -10:3, 15:3 backgrounds [1] -35:19 backs [3] - 63:5, 63:6, 63:16 bad [2] - 64:7, 70:8 balance [3] - 12:7, 128:9, 128:20 balanced [1] - 37:18 bank [3] - 123:1, 123:2, 123:3 banked [1] - 46:11 Barrel [1] - 123:21 Barren [1] - 160:5 barriers [1] - 34:8 bars [1] - 81:16 base [1] - 129:12 based [9] - 61:14, 61:18, 106:12, 123:13, 125:8, 126:5, 138:19, 138:20, 165:5 basis [2] - 13:17, 16:12 bearable [1] - 110:18 bearing [1] - 148:7 beautiful [4] - 92:2, 112:15, 145:20, 147:1 became [2] - 117:8 become [4] - 18:19, 96:1, 116:21, 166:3 becomes [6] - 23:8, 32:9, 41:10, 64:4, 137:7, 147:9 becoming [1] - 20:20 bedroom [7] - 17:19, 18:2, 18:5, 18:13, 22:21, 23:5, 23:11 bedrooms [2] - 18:9, 23:13 begin [1] - 167:15 beginning [3] - 20:5, 20:17, 117:3 behavior [2] - 67:17, 70:14 behind [7] - 36:2, 78:19, 89:18, 133:7, 137:9, 149:7, 153:3 belong [1] - 120:17 benchmark [1] - 58:7 benefit [3] - 66:15, 67:2, 155:8 benefits [4] - 24:1, 24:4, 25:4, 27:9

benefitted [1] - 160:6 benefitting [1] -163:18 best [4] - 6:6, 30:11, 105:12, 173:10 better [23] - 9:18, 9:19, 13:4, 38:2, 39:2, 56:13, 58:13, 69:13, 94:6, 94:7, 94:14, 94:16, 96:8, 99:6, 107:20, 107:21, 111:20, 114:18, 120:12, 120:17, 133:20, 142:12, 149:6 between [20] - 8:3, 17:2, 25:8, 36:9, 63:17, 67:21, 74:12, 75:4, 85:3, 86:12, 87:21, 95:13, 98:4, 109:4, 111:17, 124:18, 128:9, 145:8, 145:18, 167:16 beyond [3] - 19:3, 23:15, 43:7 Bicycle [3] - 128:6, 128:7, 128:11 bicycle [1] - 128:17 bicycling [2] - 52:17, 83:20 big [21] - 31:11, 32:9, 46:12, 52:1, 53:7, 56:18, 63:9, 95:7, 103:6, 112:19, 118:9, 123:4, 134:5, 150:18, 154:2, 155:7, 156:10, 156:12, 156:13, 159:14, 160:2 Bigelow [2] - 76:10, 77:19 bigger [1] - 102:15 biggest [2] - 25:14, 104:6 bike [2] - 66:14, 66:16 biking [1] - 52:21 **Bill** [5] - 11:17, 16:10, 38:8, 45:14, 105:20 **billboard** [1] - 149:2 Binney [3] - 61:11, 93:6, 93:17 Biogen [1] - 47:13 biotech [3] - 105:5, 135:5, 135:9 Bishop [2] - 56:12, 57:21 **bit** [24] - 7:14, 8:17, 8:18, 9:1, 10:2, 10:11, 10:16, 13:6,

16:4, 17:14, 44:11,

45:1, 52:18, 96:20, 104:20, 115:19, 123:18, 126:2, 129:14, 129:16, 136:17, 139:16, 150:17, 156:10 bits [1] - 100:4 black [1] - 126:17 blend [1] - 105:3 blends [1] - 105:6 blizzard [1] - 117:16 block [2] - 77:4, 86:15 blocks [8] - 63:6, 63:7, 102:11, 104:16, 118:11, 129:16, 137:5, 141:18 blood [1] - 173:6 blue [1] - 81:16 board [2] - 166:14, 168:3 BOARD [2] - 1:2, 172:1 Board [31] - 2:5, 3:6, 3:7, 3:16, 4:10, 4:16, 6:4, 6:10, 6:19, 7:2, 7:14, 8:17, 9:14, 9:18, 9:21, 10:8, 10:15, 11:8, 11:15, 16:10, 33:9, 90:19, 91:8, 99:9, 114:12, 116:7, 159:10, 170:13, 172:4, 172:18 Board's [2] - 94:1, 142:21 boarding [1] - 81:10 Boards [1] - 5:16 **bold** [1] - 133:5 bond [1] - 117:11 boom [1] - 8:6 boomers [1] - 30:10 **BOOTHE** [87] - 90:7, 99:3, 99:10, 100:12, 100:15, 103:8, 103:13, 105:14, 107:10, 107:13, 107:18, 108:6, 108:19, 109:1, 110:11, 110:21, 111:9, 113:13, 114:1, 114:18, 115:3, 115:6, 115:8, 115:11, 115:18, 116:1, 116:14, 117:21, 118:14, 119:13, 120:2, 122:7, 123:17, 124:13, 125:18, 126:8, 127:17,

130:3, 131:5,

132:12, 132:16, 132:18, 133:14, 134:13, 134:21, 135:3, 138:11, 138:17, 139:8, 139:18, 140:10, 140:20, 141:4, 141:15, 142:7, 142:11, 143:21, 144:4, 144:15, 145:1, 145:4, 145:16, 145:21, 146:14, 147:4, 147:17, 148:13, 149:4, 149:9, 150:6, 150:9. 151:14. 151:18, 153:6, 154:12, 154:15, 155:15, 158:5, 158:12, 159:5, 164:14, 165:21, 167:8, 168:1, 168:14, 168:19, 170.6 **Boothe** [1] - 1:16 Boston [5] - 51:10, 74:8, 80:16, 89:3, 92.3 boundaries [1] - 77:7 box [4] - 53:21, 63:17, 114:5 **BPA**[1] - 38:11 bracket [1] - 35:14 Brattleboro [2] -127:13, 154:5 break [5] - 6:4, 89:13, 95:12, 162:16, 167.5 breaking [1] - 133:18 breaks [2] - 80:10, 109.21 Brian [3] - 1:12, 2:6, 3:13 BRIAN [5] - 3:15, 4:14, 6:1, 7:11, 44:1 Bridge [3] - 60:16, 61:8, 148:8 brief [1] - 50:6 briefly [4] - 10:7, 14:14, 25:12, 39:14 brilliant [1] - 153:2 bring [3] - 38:6, 155:10, 165:13 BRISTOL [1] - 173:3 Broad [4] - 90:21, 141:5, 141:7, 149:10 broader [2] - 19:10, 45:1

Broadway [7] - 1:6,

59:20, 60:13, 60:20,

110:12 broken [3] - 95:8, 136:20, 158:4 brought [4] - 11:7, 90:17, 110:15, 143.2 budget [1] - 111:20 **build** [11] - 14:2, 50:8, 55:4, 55:6, 59:7, 80:9, 89:6, 103:4, 117:14, 129:15, 159:8 building [66] - 32:8, 34:8, 40:18, 42:2, 42:10, 43:4, 48:10, 66:8, 66:10, 92:2, 92:9, 92:17, 92:20, 93:13, 94:12, 95:12, 96:14, 97:5, 98:18, 101:15, 102:14, 103:4, 106:7, 106:9, 106:18, 106:19, 109:8, 109:12, 109:14, 109:20, 110:1, 110:9, 110:20, 111:1, 111:14, 111:18, 113:5, 113:7, 115:15, 116:4, 116:5, 116:6, 118:1, 118:10, 119:7, 123:8, 123:21, 125:11, 128:19, 132:6, 132:10, 137:10, 146:10, 147:9, 147:10, 147:11, 147:16, 149:3, 149:17, 153:1, 154:3, 159:11, 162:3, 163:6, 163:13, 163:16 Building [7] - 1:6, 42:6, 113:3, 113:4, 124:17, 132:2, 155:16 buildings [56] - 35:5, 40:5, 40:8, 43:6, 47:7, 94:2, 94:19, 94:20, 95:8, 95:13, 95:16, 95:18, 96:1, 96:9, 96:11, 96:21, 101:9, 101:10, 102:4, 102:13, 102:16, 105:2, 105:7, 105:21, 106:4, 110:3,

110:10, 110:16,

112:10, 112:15,

113:12, 119:9,

61:6, 68:8, 93:6

broke [2] - 109:14,

119:10, 119:11, 119:21, 121:2, 121:5, 121:7, 129:11, 130:15, 131:16, 132:9, 134:4, 134:9, 135:5, 135:6, 135:9, 135:15. 136:2. 136:14, 137:5, 138:5, 141:10, 143:11, 159:14 builds [1] - 74:12 **built** [14] - 5:5, 5:7, 47:20, 48:2, 51:21, 60:3, 91:1, 94:9, 107:9, 108:3, 121:6, 141:7, 156:14, 161:15 bulk [1] - 77:14 bulky [3] - 131:16, 131:17, 135:9 bump [1] - 87:21 bunch [4] - 34:20, 35:3, 35:18, 152:14 bunching [2] - 79:4, 82:11 bus [15] - 76:2, 77:9, 77:13, 77:15, 78:3, 78:5, 78:7, 78:11, 78:20, 78:21, 79:7, 79:9, 79:17, 83:17, 84.2 **BUSINESS**[1] - 2:4 businesses [3] -37:14, 52:8, 122:15 busses [9] - 75:16, 75:19, 75:21, 76:6, 76:21, 78:9, 78:17, 83:16 busy [1] - 125:17 but... [1] - 151:13 buy [1] - 42:12 buyer [1] - 19:13 **BY** [1] - 173:19 **BZA**[1] - 3:19

C

C2 [3] - 9:17, 160:18, 165:2 cafe [1] - 159:20 calculate [2] - 50:7, 123:12 calm [1] - 130:15 CAMBRIDGE [1] - 1:2 Cambridge [36] - 1:7, 3:6, 8:10, 8:13, 12:14, 12:19, 14:7, 14:8, 14:9, 14:18, 22:18, 26:1, 28:7, 29:6, 38:14, 38:15,

38:16, 38:17, 40:14, 43:16, 44:10, 49:9, 49:10, 66:1, 73:1, 80:14, 84:3, 89:4, 91:4, 92:4, 93:13, 93:14, 118:7, 126:13, 130:17, 146:7 Cambridgeport [1] -66:21 campus [8] - 97:3, 101:2, 104:8, 142:20, 144:5, 144:7, 144:10, 145:8 Campus [3] - 144:7, 144:11 Canal [2] - 90:21, 93:11 canal [1] - 91:5 cannot [1] - 83:4 capacity [14] - 50:13, 70:5, 81:19, 82:2, 82:3, 82:10, 82:17, 83:3, 83:7, 84:7, 84:14, 86:1, 86:4, 87:4 capital [2] - 29:16, 29:18 capped [1] - 24:12 capture [1] - 21:3 CAPTURING [1] -1:20 car [2] - 53:21, 54:1 care [2] - 91:13, 114:8 careful [3] - 130:21, 131:3, 136:19 carefully [1] - 104:1 Carl [1] - 160:5 Carlton [2] - 104:17, 144:18 carries [1] - 163:21 cars [8] - 14:10, 57:18, 63:21, 68:15, 80:3, 84:10, 84:16, 86:10 CASE [1] - 2:3 case [10] - 3:19, 8:12, 21:19, 40:16, 70:11, 80:18, 90:19, 131:19. 157:4. 165:12 Cases [1] - 2:5 cases [3] - 3:8, 126:15, 126:20 categories [4] -37:21, 38:1, 39:10 category [1] - 119:12 Catherine [2] - 173:4, 173:13 caught [3] - 25:7,

128:15, 129:8 causing [1] - 58:6 CAZ [1] - 172:2 CDBG [1] - 27:18 CDD [1] - 44:3 Cedar [2] - 4:1, 4:5 ceiling [1] - 126:16 ceilings [1] - 123:4 cell [1] - 146:18 census [1] - 70:18 Center [5] - 110:11, 110:17, 113:4, 114:17, 152:1 center [2] - 144:5, 151:4 Central [58] - 2:8, 5:19, 8:15, 9:6, 15:15, 22:1, 31:11, 31:19, 32:10, 33:18, 45:19, 46:5, 46:9, 49:21, 52:9, 52:11, 56:11, 56:14, 68:13, 68:21, 69:2, 71:5, 73:5, 73:7, 75:16, 76:8, 76:10, 76:13, 77:7, 78:3, 80:12, 80:13, 80:15, 81:1, 81:8, 81:15, 81:17, 82:5, 83:18, 90:5, 92:16, 131:7, 138:3, 138:18, 144:10, 153:7, 153:10, 153:12, 153:20, 154:3, 155:4, 155:5, 155:10, 157:1, 163:18, 164:3, 165:4, 165:9 central [1] - 88:13 certain [7] - 41:7, 63:3, 88:3, 91:10, 106:16, 129:2. 130:15 certainly [28] - 8:12, 10:19, 11:2, 13:14, 17:4, 21:12, 23:15, 31:3, 42:11, 43:2, 43:11, 57:12, 94:8, 95:17, 106:13, 107:8, 114:1, 114:3, 117:17, 131:6, 145:21, 147:17, 148:15, 149:10, 149:13, 157:4, 161:10, 162:8 **CERTIFICATION** [1] -173:18 Certified [2] - 173:4, 173:14 certify [2] - 173:5, 173.8

CERTIFYING [1] -

173:20 CHA [4] - 29:5, 29:8, 29:15, 43:13 Chair [2] - 1:8, 1:9 challenge [2] - 28:11, 29:3 challenges [2] - 9:2, 117:12 chance [2] - 128:17, 158:16 **CHANGE** [8] - 172:9, 172:10, 172:11, 172:12, 172:13, 172:14, 172:15, 172:16 change [10] - 13:18, 46:2, 64:16, 66:16, 67:16, 98:19, 99:1, 160:8, 161:21, 172:4 changed [5] - 26:20, 55:10. 70:15. 101:12, 139:10 changes [6] - 66:5, 123:3, 134:6, 134:7, 171:13, 172:19 changing [2] - 73:14, 144:9 Chapman [1] - 42:6 Chapter [1] - 41:17 character [1] - 163:17 characteristics [1] -78:21 characterization [1] -36:3 chart [8] - 15:10, 18:18, 51:20, 53:9, 59:1, 81:13, 81:14, 82:14 cheaper [1] - 85:14 check [1] - 119:1 checklist [1] - 71:17 children [2] - 39:8, 39:9 choices [1] - 30:12 choke [1] - 151:15 chose [1] - 56:6 Chris [7] - 6:13, 14:13, 14:20, 31:6, 32:16, 39:14, 44:8 CHRIS [3] - 14:19, 16:18, 39:21 **chunks** [1] - 95:8 circles [4] - 48:15, 48:16, 49:12, 56:6 circumstances [1] -8:7 cited [1] - 26:7 cities [3] - 22:11,

130:10, 130:13

CITY [1] - 1:2

city [41] - 8:3, 10:13, 10:17, 11:1, 11:3, 11:10, 11:13, 17:9, 21:9, 21:17, 22:13, 22:16, 24:8, 24:9, 25:15. 27:4. 27:17. 27:21. 32:5. 34:19. 35:2. 35:9. 35:14. 36:5, 36:6, 36:20, 37:8, 43:10, 43:16, 45:3, 47:7, 47:14, 54:9, 74:21, 121:8, 140:2, 143:7, 143:20, 156:11, 156:12 City [15] - 1:6, 1:12, 2:6, 4:16, 4:17, 4:21, 7:17, 14:21, 26:13, 26:14, 27:7, 43:9, 133:16, 145:15, 156:6 city's [1] - 37:4 **City's** [5] - 15:3, 15:6, 15:20, 25:12, 26:11 citywide [4] - 11:14, 12:8, 13:20, 65:2 Clancy [4] - 90:14, 95:9, 123:19, 131:15 clarify [1] - 168:20 clarity [2] - 97:13, 162:8 **class** [1] - 75:13 classic [1] - 78:20 clear [9] - 11:9, 73:15, 97:10, 98:4, 98:8, 100:9, 109:5, 114:14, 167:14 clearer [1] - 99:13 clearly [6] - 44:16, 73:13, 94:2, 105:2, 125:10, 129:12 clearly-expressed [1] - 129:12 Cliff [2] - 45:5, 151:20 CLIFF [2] - 45:8, 47:19 **Clippinger** [1] - 9:16 CLIPPINGER [5] -61:13, 61:17, 61:20, 75:9, 76:8 clock [1] - 62:6 close [5] - 34:4, 50:11, 68:10, 146:9, 168:15 closely [4] - 16:8, 69:3, 87:5, 87:9 closer [3] - 53:3, 91:19, 169:11 clump [1] - 79:2

cluster [1] - 79:2

Cohen [2] - 1:9, 3:3 **COHEN** [26] - 39:4, 47:2. 47:15. 70:6. 73:18. 73:21. 75:3. 75:7, 75:14, 112:2, 112:5, 113:10, 113:14, 134:2, 134:15, 135:1, 135:19, 145:13, 145:17, 146:2. 146:13, 146:16, 147:13, 148:1, 149:1, 150:13 colleagues [1] - 129:5 collective [1] - 169:20 color [2] - 47:5, 150:19 colored [2] - 47:8, 48:15 colorful [1] - 151:7 colors [3] - 47:10, 47:11, 134:7 column [1] - 59:2 combined [1] - 43:8 comfortable [1] -168:7 coming [9] - 26:4, 48:10, 57:20, 58:2, 61:6, 73:11, 78:14, 80:11, 109:19 comment [4] - 104:5, 104:7, 104:11 comments [1] -167:18 commercial [11] -12:1, 47:6, 47:12, 51:18, 68:8, 73:8, 77:8, 105:5, 106:7, 106:18, 144:13 Commission [4] -30:8, 155:6, 160:18, 173:16 commitment [4] -26:11, 41:9, 43:8, 110:6 commitments [1] -43:12 committed [2] - 13:3, Committee [7] - 5:1, 15:15, 22:2, 38:11, 131:7, 131:14, 160:19 committee [14] - 34:7, 92:21, 95:10, 96:13, 131:8, 154:13, 156:2, 156:13, 156:19, 157:19, 160:3, 162:14, 163:3, 163:8 Committee's [2] -

138:19, 165:5 committees [3] -31:21, 33:4, 114:4 Committees 131 -16:21, 31:19, 32:11 **COMMONWEALTH** [1] - 173:2 communicate [1] -152:12 communities [1] -30:14 community [7] - 5:13, 22:7, 40:13, 92:11, 117:6, 117:10, 117:14 Community [8] - 1:13, 1:14, 2:6, 10:5, 14:21, 25:16, 171:3, 171:7 commuter [1] - 86:21 comparative [2] -55:11, 67:21 compare [3] - 56:10, 60:5, 65:9 compared [6] - 52:1, 55:18, 59:6, 70:2, 73:4, 75:18 comparing [1] - 55:5 comparison [4] -37:3, 39:1, 51:20, 111:17 competing [2] - 8:3, 8:13 competition [1] -42:13 completed [1] - 171:5 COMPLETED [1] -171:18 completely [4] - 88:5, 137:12, 141:11, 149:20 complied [1] - 69:17 compliment [1] -89:15 comply [2] - 119:5, 119:10 complying [1] -118.12 component [4] -32:16, 33:2, 33:3, 33:19 compromised [1] -111:16 concerned [4] - 58:9, 82:17, 111:14, 113:18 concerning [1] -10:12 concerns [5] - 22:4, 116:13, 118:6,

156:2, 168:6

concluded [1] - 81:6 conclusion [1] -67:19 Concord/Alewife [2] -12:15, 12:20 conditions [4] - 59:3, 59:12, 60:3, 101:3 condo [1] - 23:2 condominium [1] -20:10 condominiums [1] -20:7 conducted [1] - 50:12 confirm [1] - 5:4 conflict [1] - 61:21 conflicting [14] -57:18, 57:19, 58:1, 58:4, 58:7, 59:4, 59:13, 60:12, 61:4, 61:14, 61:17, 62:21, 63:4, 68:3 conflicts [2] - 60:14, 60:16 confused [1] - 168:18 confusing [1] - 50:21 congested [4] - 57:6, 69:1, 79:1, 81:15 congestion [5] -53:13, 53:18, 80:17, 83:18. 85:5 connect [2] - 31:7, 31:10 connected [2] -141:12, 143:12 connection [1] -34:11 connector [4] - 140:2, 145:14, 145:18, 146:12 Connector [1] - 141:1 connectors [7] -139:16, 140:16, 140:18, 141:8, 143:10, 144:17, 144:19 consequences [1] -117:18 conservative [1] -163:11 conservatively [1] -54:15 consider [4] - 41:20, 102:12, 130:11, 134:11 considerations [1] -27:11 considered [2] -147:11, 147:12

considering [2] -

144:17, 144:19

consistency [1] -

169:13 consistent [1] - 22:12 consolidated [1] -107:5 constructed [1] - 49:4 construction [4] -47:17, 47:20, 48:2, 49.3 consultants [1] -121.10 context [8] - 7:14, 8:15, 9:19, 12:18, 24:1, 45:1, 103:16, 142:2 continental [1] -130:10 continuation [2] - 4:8, 4:10 continue [6] - 5:11, 26:19, 26:20, 27:6, 28:7, 30:1 continues [1] - 74:3 continuing [2] -166:7, 166:15 continuous [2] -13:17, 88:8 contrary [1] - 135:19 contrive [1] - 136:18 control [4] - 11:2, 86:14, 86:15, 148:11 CONTROL [1] -173:20 controlled [1] - 61:16 controlling [1] -128:10 controversial [3] -81:12, 130:8, 141:2 controversy [2] -141:13, 143:7 conversation [2] -133:13, 144:8 conversations [2] -27:7, 169:10 convert [1] - 87:17 convince [2] - 78:5, 146:5 convinced [2] -128:12, 136:15 Cook [1] - 45:5 COOK [2] - 45:8, 47:19 cool [2] - 92:5, 115:11 Coop [2] - 122:21, 123:4 coop [1] - 122:21 **copy** [2] - 93:3, 171:5

corner [2] - 101:13,

cornus [1] - 131:11

correct [5] - 3:8, 5:20,

141:8

correction [1] - 172:5 corrections [2] -171:12. 172:19 correctly [1] - 68:18 correlate [2] - 62:17, 64:10 corridor [1] - 88:17 costs [2] - 17:3, 20:17 **COTTER** [3] - 14:19, 16:18, 39:21 Cotter [3] - 6:13, 14:13, 14:20 Council (6) - 4:16. 4:21, 26:14, 27:8, 43:9, 145:15 count [1] - 76:10 countries [2] - 35:20, 35:21 country [1] - 35:20 couple [10] - 17:12, 20:20, 24:13, 28:19, 28:20, 43:3, 90:9, 93:20, 121:14, 146:16 course [18] - 24:5, 51:17, 53:15, 60:2, 69:12, 69:20, 71:15, 72:9, 74:10, 82:4, 83:21, 85:6, 85:10, 86:11, 92:9, 146:9, 156:5, 164:20 Court 131 - 161:21. 162:1, 162:12 covering [1] - 148:17 **CPA** [2] - 28:6, 29:8 CRA[1] - 51:10 crack [1] - 147:7 cranked [1] - 125:2 Crate [1] - 123:20 create [7] - 15:21, 53:7, 69:21, 111:15, 130:1, 130:15, 130:19 created [2] - 65:12, 71.16 creating [4] - 32:1, 53:1, 105:9, 130:7 creation [2] - 25:18, 28:8 creativity [1] - 151:16 Critical [3] - 54:20, 55:1, 68:16 critical [2] - 59:6, 160:13 criticism [1] - 48:8 curious 131 - 34:15. 75:8, 124:11 current [6] - 16:6, 19:16, 55:8, 68:7, 70:2, 84:14

6:1, 60:10, 98:5

cut [2] - 27:18, 28:2 cutoff [1] - 58:11 cuts [2] - 27:13, 29:7

D

D.C [1] - 85:13 daily [3] - 50:7, 53:14, 55:13 Dakota [1] - 8:6 dark [1] - 93:5 Dash [2] - 1:16, 10:5 DASH [13] - 10:5, 45:4, 47:5, 48:1, 48:20, 49:6, 50:1, 117:16, 137:19, 139:10, 141:20, 150:14, 152:18 data [3] - 20:8, 44:6, 70:18 **DATE** [1] - 172:1 date [2] - 45:9, 172:6 **David's** [1] - 137:10 day-to-day [1] - 14:15 deal [4] - 29:20, 30:4, 36:7, 140:12 dealing [6] - 16:7, 101:7, 118:21, 119:20, 121:4, 169:14 deals [1] - 106:4 dealt [1] - 106:7 debated [1] - 47:5 decade [3] - 13:7, 55:15, 163:2 decades [1] - 54:11 decides [1] - 46:4 decision [1] - 26:18 decline [1] - 60:4 declining [1] - 28:11 decreasing [2] -54:10, 69:11 deep [1] - 125:14 **deeper** [3] - 6:11, 9:13, 170:3 deeply [1] - 11:5 default [1] - 154:6 define [2] - 106:16, 145:12 defined [1] - 19:8 definitely [5] - 87:4, 87:10, 138:12, 138:13, 166:15 **definition** [1] - 118:18 delay [1] - 58:6 delighted [1] - 97:11 delivered [4] - 171:3, 171:6, 171:7, 171:9 demand [2] - 31:17, 54:12

demands [1] - 8:13 demarcation [1] -11:6 density [2] - 8:7, 8:11 departments [1] -43:10 departure [2] - 74:14, 138:13 depth [5] - 94:11, 122:9, 122:11, 125:3, 125:11 describe [1] - 118:18 described [3] - 32:2, 63:1. 99:7 descriptive [2] -142:14, 149:19 design [17] - 6:5, 6:9, 6:15, 6:21, 7:2, 99:6, 101:14, 109:15, 109:21, 112:6, 116:21, 117:5, 117:6, 120:5, 120:12, 161:3, 164:10 designated [1] -42:15 designed [1] - 137:2 designee [2] - 42:1, 42:4 desirable [1] - 34:5 desire [4] - 61:6, 88:16. 140:12. 155.1 desires [1] - 61:19 desiring [1] - 83:6 destinations [1] -53.2 detail [3] - 44:20, 157:15, 162:5 details [2] - 84:9, 128:16 determine [1] - 48:6 determines [1] -35:13 develop [3] - 24:10, 108:13, 153:14 developed [1] - 51:3 developers [2] -25:21, 71:3 developing [1] -116:15 development [13] -32:19, 51:19, 65:19, 66:3, 66:4, 66:17, 68:5, 68:8, 69:2, 70:14, 72:4, 104:15, 109:13 Development [9] -1:13, 1:14, 2:6, 10:6, 15:1, 29:10,

29:12, 171:3, 171:7

developments [6] -29:18, 30:4, 30:16, 30:17, 70:15, 160:21 diagram [1] - 100:18 diagram's [1] - 98:16 dictate [1] - 94:19 difference [7] - 24:5, 38:3, 52:2, 53:7, 58:19, 109:4, 145:8 different [46] - 8:6, 8:11, 31:20, 33:6, 39:10, 40:2, 43:10, 46:6, 46:8, 47:8, 47:10, 50:11, 51:17, 52:9, 55:5, 55:9, 72:12, 75:21, 83:12, 87:2, 88:5, 88:6, 92:10, 97:4, 98:10, 100:20, 101:3, 101:4, 102:7, 102:20, 103:20, 108:10, 112:6, 114:4, 120:14, 124:2, 128:20, 129:21, 133:1, 133:19, 137:8, 141:10, 144:4, 144:12, 153:12 differential [2] - 32:3, 104:21 differentiate [1] -104:8 differently [2] - 106:8, 153:19 difficult [4] - 42:9, 108:8, 140:3, 157:3 difficulty [1] - 57:12 digital [1] - 148:15 dimensional [1] -102:10 diplomatic [1] - 118:4 direct [1] - 44:2 **DIRECT**[1] - 173:20 direction [2] - 74:8, 81:2 DIRECTION [1] -173:20 directly [4] - 9:21, 45:10, 147:21, 167:20 Director [1] - 14:20 director [1] - 166:9 dirty [1] - 112:18 disappear [1] - 155:4 disappointment [1] -148:19 discretion [1] - 99:8 discuss [6] - 3:8,

4:19, 5:7, 5:13,

43:17, 50:15

discussed [2] - 56:16, 109:19 discussing [4] -70:13, 90:4, 91:10, 161:10 Discussion [1] - 2:9 discussion [18] - 4:8, 4:9, 5:12, 5:19, 9:21, 24:2, 33:9, 33:11, 65:11, 123:18, 125:3, 138:4, 148:14, 156:6, 156:13, 161:4, 163:8, 164:15 discussions [6] - 7:4, 7:8, 9:6, 15:14, 158:20, 165:7 disguised [1] - 107:20 disparity [1] - 169:12 distance [1] - 95:11 distinctions [1] - 98:3 distinguish [1] -106:12 distinguishes [1] -101:1 distributed [1] - 54:4 distributing [1] -54:17 distribution [5] -37:1, 37:4, 37:5, 44:13, 172:7 district [5] - 77:8. 101:5, 102:19, 150:20 districts [1] - 33:8 diverse [1] - 26:9 diversity [4] - 11:12, 16:14, 27:3, 102:10 division [3] - 8:20, 15:6, 15:20 DO [1] - 172:5 document [7] - 7:1, 10:21, 14:17, 15:2, 95:3, 96:12, 98:9 **DOES** [1] - 173:19 domain [1] - 143:6 dome [1] - 152:16 dominated [2] - 57:1, 73:13 done [19] - 9:15, 24:18, 32:4, 50:6, 84:13, 85:11, 92:11, 95:19, 97:15, 111:19, 118:8, 121:10, 122:3, 127:19, 127:20, 133:5, 136:21, 149:14 doors [2] - 123:13,

136:17

dorm [2] - 115:1, 117:14 dormitory [1] - 110:18 **Dormitory** [1] - 92:8 **DOT** [3] - 105:15, 166:17 dotted [1] - 151:10 double [1] - 123:5 down [23] - 13:12, 17:13, 26:13, 27:15, 40:16, 43:10, 57:20, 58:2, 58:3, 61:7, 62:9, 71:11, 80:10, 81:20, 82:5, 95:8, 102:3, 125:2, 135:16, 136:20, 144:21, 154:9, 162.4 downtown [2] -127:14, 154:4 downward [1] - 66:18 dozen [2] - 12:4, 99.16 DR [1] - 123:21 dramatic [4] - 17:9, 17:15, 21:12, 85:10 dramatically [1] -20:18 Draper [1] - 140:21 draw [1] - 151:1 dreading [1] - 97:8 drive [3] - 66:10, 66:14. 85:3 **Drive** [4] - 56:19, 63:14, 63:15, 63:17 driver [1] - 46:13 driving [9] - 45:2, 52:15, 54:6, 54:9, 54:16, 59:18, 70:16, 70:18, 85:2 drop [2] - 52:20, 54:15 during [3] - 11:2, 26:6, 75:5 dwelling [2] - 36:19, 36:20 dwindle [2] - 29:2, 30:1

Ε

earliest [1] - 4:19 early [5] - 9:12, 31:8, 115:19, 136:14, 137:17 earn [1] - 25:1 earning [4] - 19:14, 19:17, 19:18, 19:20 East [3] - 49:9, 126:13, 144:6

12:16

end [15] - 5:2, 7:5,

110:7, 117:4,

28:13, 29:15, 42:4,

78:10, 96:12, 96:20,

50:21, 76:3, 76:4,

east [1] - 100:21 Eastern [2] - 12:14, 12:19 easy [1] - 150:2 ECaPs [4] - 12:13, 55:16, 55:18, 56:9 eclipsed [1] - 18:2 economic [4] - 27:3, 35:10, 83:5, 155:9 edge [2] - 76:3, 130:19 edges [1] - 156:15 editorial 131 - 66:13. 99:1. 127:15 effect [2] - 64:15, 135:15 effective [1] - 67:11 effectiveness [1] - 9:8 efficiency [1] - 79:17 effort [2] - 111:15, 121:9 egos [1] - 119:14 eight [4] - 41:3, 75:4, 85:3, 85:15 eight-thirty [1] - 85:15 either [6] - 52:7, 74:8, 77:1, 106:14, 108:18, 131:4 electronic [2] -151:21, 152:3 electronics [1] -149:16 eleven [1] - 74:15 eligibility [1] - 18:20 eliminate [2] - 34:8, 112:14 **elsewhere** [1] - 75:5 emblematic [1] -156:1 embraced [1] -169:18 emphasis [1] - 33:17 **employer** [1] - 66:15 empty [4] - 78:11, 78:19, 125:16, 154:9 encompass [2] - 72:5, 77:9 encounter [1] - 85:5 encourage [4] -11:19, 46:15, 50:19, 107:5 encourages [1] -95.17 encouraging [1] -

128:12, 158:19 ended [1] - 154:5 endorsing [1] - 164:9 ends [1] - 155:21 engineering [2] -55:3, 62:10 enhanced [1] - 83:3 enhances [1] - 125:15 enormous [3] - 35:16, 89:3, 111:15 enormously [1] -35:19 enter [2] - 30:10, 76:2 entering [1] - 20:16 entire [2] - 50:9, 50:17 entirely [1] - 167:14 entrances [3] -136:10, 136:13, 136:21 entries [1] - 74:6 entry [2] - 76:19, 121:20 environment [1] -96:10 environmental [1] -67:17 equipment [1] - 124:8 errata [1] - 172:6 ERRATA [3] - 171:1, 171:18, 172:3 Errata [4] - 171:2, 171:4, 171:13, 172:7 error [1] - 161:16 especially [5] - 92:15, 96:10, 134:3, 159:9, 165:4 essence [1] - 43:4 essential [1] - 160:11 establish [1] - 102:19 established [2] -102:17, 109:15 estate [1] - 7:21 estates [1] - 37:16 estimate [1] - 38:19 etcetera [1] - 66:16 Europe [1] - 130:13 European [1] - 130:10 evaluate [1] - 55:4 evening [4] - 3:5, 6:20, 14:20, 53:17 events [1] - 4:15 eventually [1] -101:17 everywhere [1] -126:20 evolve [1] - 26:20 exact [1] - 166:10 exactly [8] - 48:6, 65:6, 72:2, 111:19,

113:16, 128:14,

140:20, 142:15 example [12] - 57:20, 79:18, 84:3, 96:3, 100:5, 101:20, 102:9, 116:20, 127:13. 129:19. 139:1, 163:15 examples [2] - 95:16, 129:8 exceeded [1] - 59:21 exceeding [1] - 60:2 exceeds [1] - 97:14 excellent [1] - 164:19 except [1] - 172:18 exciting [2] - 90:8, 138:16 exhibits [1] - 73:12 exist [1] - 142:19 existing [18] - 51:21, 59:3, 59:7, 59:12, 59:15, 60:3, 65:20, 66:2, 66:17, 67:21, 69:8, 70:14, 70:15, 71:9, 84:7, 93:10, 102:12, 141:6 expand [1] - 25:6 expect [6] - 29:4, 30:1, 54:3, 122:1, 167:17, 168:21 expectations [1] -43:7 expected [1] - 110:8 expecting [2] - 83:5, 114:14 **expensive** [1] - 89:6 experience [10] -53:12, 62:18, 68:2, 68:4, 77:13, 78:14, 96:18, 125:16, 135:17, 143:4 experienced [1] -82:1 experiences [1] -159:8 expire [1] - 40:8 Expires [1] - 173:16 expiring [7] - 28:17, 29:13, 30:18, 39:15, 41:6, 41:7, 41:20 explain [2] - 47:3, 133.7 explanation [3] -70:10, 74:2, 74:4 explicitly [2] - 11:7, 11:18 explore [1] - 43:1 expressed [4] - 81:5, 129:12, 142:18, 165:11 extend [1] - 78:5

extended [1] - 83:16

Extension [1] - 77:2 extent [1] - 108:4 extra [3] - 59:16, 68:12, 69:18 extraordinary [2] -110:2, 158:8 extremely [1] - 88:11 eye [1] - 129:9

federal [4] - 19:5, 27:15, 27:16, 29:7 feedback [1] - 116:11 fabulous [1] - 125:13 feet [19] - 66:4, 87:19, fabulously [1] - 26:5 facade [1] - 163:7 123:14, 124:18, facades [1] - 134:8 face [3] - 140:9, 143:8. 148:8 162:20, 162:21 faced [1] - 28:12 fell [1] - 13:12 faces [1] - 123:21 felt [5] - 10:7, 57:13, facilities [1] - 107:6 158:6, 162:14, facing [6] - 28:16, 163:3 29:6, 29:13, 29:14, fenestrations [1] -30:17, 108:17 134:6 fact [5] - 39:14, 49:2, few [10] - 20:12, 32:4, 74:2, 121:4, 144:9 factor [1] - 65:20 128:6, 132:11, failures [1] - 126:12 162:21, 163:2, fair [2] - 138:1, 142:17 164:11 fairly [1] - 166:14 fewer [4] - 37:7, 68:4, faith [3] - 101:21, 84:16, 110:13 102:1, 102:2 fiction [1] - 87:17 faithful [1] - 90:15 Field [1] - 65:13 fall [1] - 105:7 fifth [1] - 124:9 falls [1] - 119:12 fight [1] - 128:16 familiar [1] - 26:2 figured [2] - 51:15, families [9] - 17:21, 80:21 19:20, 21:14, 24:21, figures [1] - 18:18 27:1, 27:21, 29:1, fill [3] - 153:13, 35:10, 36:15 153:17, 156:10 family [11] - 19:5, filled [1] - 102:13 20:3, 22:6, 23:10, filtering [1] - 27:15 33:17, 33:21, 36:18, final [3] - 7:1, 33:19, 43:6, 44:9, 44:13 41:10 fan [1] - 134:5 finally [4] - 33:15, FAR [2] - 5:8, 32:3 59:9, 59:16, 84:21 far [5] - 59:2, 72:15, fine [2] - 117:20, 96:4, 117:19, 159:4 123:12 finite [1] - 37:8 FAR's [1] - 11:21 first [17] - 5:2, 5:20, farms [1] - 37:16 10:21, 11:20, 18:3, Farooq [1] - 1:17 42:2, 83:13, 87:19, FAROOQ [16] - 31:5, 91:1, 98:21, 100:5, 51:7, 105:18, 109:12, 109:19, 106:11, 106:21, 124:19, 139:17, 120:3, 120:7, 124:5, 151:3, 170:5 124:15, 142:16, First [1] - 61:10 150:3, 150:8, fit [7] - 7:8, 39:9, 72:3, 155:14, 164:21,

166:5, 169:3

fast [1] - 158:17

faster [1] - 86:21 92:3, 158:10 fated [1] - 150:16 five-minute [1] favor [2] - 52:20, 158:10 fix [1] - 158:4 70:16 fixed [1] - 101:10 fear [1] - 118:9 flat [3] - 17:13, 20:11, February [3] - 1:4, 5:3, 5:6 141.20 Federal [3] - 21:5, flexibility [4] - 91:14, 28:3, 29:20 126:2, 128:11, 136.6 flexible [2] - 85:8, 133:10 Floor [1] - 1:6 119:2, 121:2, 121:5, floor [18] - 5:8, 96:16, 120:5, 120:13, 125:6, 127:6, 139:4, 122:10, 122:12, 122:20, 124:9, 139:7, 142:9, 154:2, 124:10, 124:13, 124:19, 126:16, 140:12, 160:7, 161:3 floor-to-ceiling [1] -126:16 floor-to-floor[3] -122:12, 124:10, 124.13 37:21, 77:19, 79:14, floors [4] - 96:19, 141:11, 161:5, 161:6 focus [4] - 30:21, 39:2, 49:21, 167:1 focused [1] - 5:5 focusing [1] - 55:12 focussed [5] - 53:14, 53:19, 72:14, 78:7, 88:12 Fogg [1] - 145:18 folks [10] - 16:19, 21:17, 22:7, 22:15, 22:17, 24:16, 25:7, 26:16, 90:11, 156:7 follow [1] - 113:20 followed [2] - 6:3, 112:13 following [3] -112:16, 113:16, 155:18 follows [2] - 109:1, 109:3 food [3] - 126:9, 126:11, 126:14 foot [5] - 122:12, 122:20, 123:13, 123:14, 125:8 FOR [1] - 1:2 force [1] - 79:11 forced [1] - 22:8 forcing [1] - 79:7 81:21, 112:20, foregoing [1] - 172:18 FOREGOING [1] -120:12

173:18

five [4] - 20:9, 73:4,

Forest [3] - 4:17, 133:16, 156:6 forget [1] - 155:12 forgotten [1] - 137:10 forlorn [1] - 154:10 form [1] - 158:2 format [1] - 142:19 formed [1] - 117:15 forth [9] - 94:8, 95:14, 107:19, 131:12, 141:18, 156:15, 157:3, 162:9, 173:9 fortunate [5] - 16:10, 26:16, 28:6, 28:19, forum [4] - 5:5, 5:7, 108:3, 161:15 forward [8] - 4:6, 10:3, 10:10, 28:10, 48:9, 69:16, 69:17, 87:1 four [9] - 19:5, 19:17, 20:3, 20:14, 74:13, 77:9, 83:12, 92:3, 154:6 four-person[1] -19:17 fraction [1] - 57:3 framing [1] - 155:20 frankly [2] - 17:10, 67:13 free [1] - 34:21 freed [1] - 128:15 friends [1] - 135:20 front [2] - 66:11, 79:19 frontages [1] - 104:2 full [7] - 37:16, 63:18, 63:21, 71:21, 78:15, 78:17 fun [1] - 154:11 function [1] - 86:13 fund [2] - 24:13, 27:20 fundamentally [1] -98:10 funders [1] - 40:12 funding [10] - 21:4, 21:8, 24:10, 24:15, 27:14, 29:19, 32:17, 43:11, 85:17, 101:18 funds [11] - 5:14, 25:17, 27:16, 27:18, 27:19, 28:1, 28:7, 28:9, 29:2, 29:8, 85:19 funny [1] - 117:13 future [5] - 40:6, 50:10, 50:13, 52:13, 65:19

G

gap [3] - 4:7, 17:2, 21:20 gaps [1] - 17:21 Gardens [1] - 29:12 Gateway [1] - 151:4 gathering [1] - 160:20 **GENERAL** [2] - 1:3, general [8] - 6:5, 7:13, 7:16, 9:2, 13:16, 43:18, 54:8, 67:13 generally [6] - 18:21, 19:21, 21:3, 24:11, 67:8, 70:17 generation [1] - 52:3 generations [1] - 40:6 generous [1] - 124:21 Genzyme [5] - 92:9, 93:13, 103:14, 109:11, 109:13 given [6] - 15:18, 22:19, 34:14, 42:13, 63:15 glad [1] - 112:8 glass [3] - 127:11, 132:16, 148:10 glassy [1] - 163:16 Glazer [1] - 1:15 GLAZER [3] - 165:20, 166:6, 166:19 Globe [2] - 9:7, 66:12 goal [10] - 6:20, 6:21, 7:13, 11:9, 13:11, 27:4, 109:9, 118:19, 122:14, 134:17 goals [24] - 15:4, 91:9, 91:13, 97:4, 97:16, 97:21, 98:4, 98:9, 99:8, 103:19, 104:1, 108:5, 108:14, 108:16, 108:18, 108:20, 109:5, 110:1, 113:1, 117:1, 117:6, 117:7, 134:1 God [2] - 108:13, 127:14 gonna [1] - 55:19 Goody [4] - 90:14, 95:9, 123:18, 131:15 gorgeous [1] - 113:8 government [1] -41:14 Government [2] -21:6. 29:20

Governor [1] - 85:18

gracefully [1] - 95:19

gracefulness [1] -135:8 graduate [4] - 13:4, 13:6, 13:9, 13:13 graphs [1] - 66:21 grasp [1] - 63:11 great [23] - 44:20, 56:2, 56:3, 72:4, 99:10, 100:4, 107:16, 110:1, 112:11, 112:15, 113:19, 113:20, 119:9, 119:10, 124:17, 135:21, 143:12, 146:21, 154:21, 158:18, 163:14, 164:18 greater [2] - 52:17, 52:18 greatest [1] - 17:20 green [1] - 62:5 Green [3] - 77:2, 86:5, 87:17 grey [7] - 47:4, 47:12, 47:18, 48:16, 49:12, 49:18, 101:9 ground [10] - 96:14, 96:16, 96:18, 120:5, 122:9, 142:5, 160:7, 161:3, 161:5, 161:6 grounds [2] - 34:17, 36:9 group [2] - 36:19, 143:11 groups [3] - 32:15, 36:17, 90:10 grow [1] - 73:1 growing [3] - 17:2, 27:5 grown [1] - 72:20 growth [5] - 10:20, 82:18, 83:5, 83:11, 102:21 guess [10] - 6:6, 37:6, 89:18, 105:5, 125:5, 143:21, 144:21, 152:7, 152:20, 153:10 guidance [1] - 142:21 quide [1] - 153:13 guideline [3] - 123:16, 125:21, 158:1 guidelines [59] - 6:5, 6:10, 6:16, 7:1, 7:2, 7:3, 90:5, 90:12, 90:16, 91:7, 91:12, 91:18, 92:14, 92:19, 93:3, 94:9, 95:15, 97:12, 97:14, 101:6, 102:10, 109:15,

109:21, 112:13,

112:16, 113:15, 114:3, 114:7, 119:8, 119:15, 119:21, 120:6, 120:12, 131:10, 138:14, 138:19, 147:2, 147:18, 149:16, 153:11. 153:20. 154:17, 155:13, 156:17, 157:13, 159:7, 159:15, 161:3, 162:17, 163:9, 164:3, 164:10, 167:12, 167:15, 168:8, 168:11, 169:16, 169:18, 169:19 guy [1] - 150:15

Н

H-o-I-I [1] - 115:8 half [8] - 42:9, 42:10, 109:14, 109:21, 116:7, 125:11, 146:5 Hall [4] - 1:6, 110:21, 111:2, 111:3 Hancock [1] - 113:2 hand [4] - 15:9, 18:18, 53:21, 173:11 handle [1] - 110:10 happy [4] - 25:11, 74:1, 77:12, 146:11 Harbors [1] - 98:1 hard [10] - 13:3, 19:19, 38:18, 48:5, 64:6, 147:5, 154:16, 160:11, 163:20, 166:19 Harleston [2] - 91:21, 92.15 Harvard [11] - 42:7, 42:11, 43:6, 78:15, 92:8, 115:19, 122:19, 122:20, 123:9, 152:4, 163:15 hate [2] - 117:21, 146:10 hated [1] - 116:8 HAWKINSON [1] -111:11 Hayward [2] - 106:6, 144:18 head [2] - 86:10, 86:12 heading [1] - 75:12 health [1] - 67:18 hear [3] - 38:10, 99:20, 131:18

heard [12] - 13:8, 22:3, 22:6, 57:16, 68:11, 107:1, 114:3, 136:9, 156:5, 158:2, 160:9, 168:5 hearing [3] - 3:21, 4:11, 22:3 **HEARING** [1] - 1:3 hearings [2] - 5:1, 38:12 heart [1] - 68:13 heavily [1] - 57:1 heed [1] - 99:8 height [23] - 32:3, 122:10, 122:12, 123:5, 123:10, 123:13, 124:14, 126:15, 130:1, 130:6, 130:7, 130:11, 130:18, 132:7, 136:3, 138:4, 138:6, 139:4, 139:6, 156:20, 162:12, 162:19. 163:4 heights [9] - 5:8, 120:14, 120:21, 123:20, 138:21, 142:6, 157:2, 161:9, 162:10 **held** [2] - 146:1, 146:6 help [11] - 30:2, 38:1, 38:4, 39:18, 71:10, 79:20, 84:4, 91:8, 139:9, 167:17, 170:3 helped [2] - 117:13 helpful [7] - 8:16, 9:13, 41:16, 105:11, 135:2, 164:15, 170:8 helping [1] - 26:18 helps [1] - 84:1 hereby [1] - 172:19 hereinbefore [1] -173:9 hereunto [1] - 173:11 high [8] - 18:4, 61:6, 110:6, 122:20, 123:4, 123:15, 127:8, 138:9 higher [7] - 19:9, 20:21, 24:14, 32:8, 60:7, 86:4, 123:20 highest [2] - 80:17, 83:18 highlight [2] - 44:7, 47.9 $\textbf{highly} \ [3] \ \textbf{--} \ 57{:}5, \ 72{:}8,$ 81:12

highs [1] - 17:17

Highway [1] - 56:19

12:5, 14:6, 14:8, 20:6, 20:9, 20:18,

historic [1] - 163:13 historical [1] - 155:2 historicist [2] - 94:20, 155:1 hit [3] - 64:8, 105:13, 140:8 hits [1] - 46:1 Holl [2] - 115:2, 115:3 Holmes [1] - 155:16 Holyoke [1] - 151:21 Home [2] - 28:3 home [2] - 19:12, 75:2 homeowners [1] -42:14 homes [3] - 29:1, 43:19, 52:7 honestly [1] - 39:19 honor [2] - 138:5 hope [5] - 7:5, 10:1, 93:2, 166:13, 169:17 Hope [1] - 113:4 hopefully [1] - 73:13 hoping [2] - 103:9, 168.6 horrible [1] - 111:5 horse [1] - 37:16 **hospitable** [1] - 145:5 Hospital [1] - 3:21 hot [1] - 7:16 hour [15] - 53:12, 54:5, 54:18, 55:12, 57:19, 58:8, 73:6, 81:9, 81:21, 82:4, 85:9, 85:10, 87:20, 87:21, 88:2 hours [1] - 85:8 house [2] - 115:12, 165:3 House [1] - 111:18 household [1] - 44:12 households [8] -17:5, 17:6, 19:10, 19:14, 19:17, 20:21, 44:14 houseman [1] - 139:9 housing [102] - 5:14, 5:21, 6:2, 6:7, 6:13, 6:17, 7:7, 7:16, 8:20, 8:21, 9:1, 10:14, 10:18, 11:1, 11:4, 11:9, 11:11, 11:19, 12:1, 12:3, 12:5, 12:7, 12:11, 12:16, 12:17, 13:4, 13:5, 13:13, 13:16, 14:2, 14:15, 14:18, 15:3, 15:4, 15:6, 15:7, 15:12, 15:17, 15:18, 15:20, 16:1, 16:12, 16:15, 17:1,

17:3, 18:20, 18:21, 20:17, 21:1, 21:13, 21:15, 22:4, 22:5, 22:6, 24:2, 24:11, 25:19, 25:20, 26:12, 26:15, 26:17, 26:18, 27:5, 27:14, 28:4, 28:9. 30:13. 30:16. 31:13, 31:14, 31:15, 32:1, 32:7, 32:10, 32:13, 32:21, 33:1, 33:7, 33:20, 35:4, 35:12, 36:11, 37:9, 40:13, 42:17, 45:21, 46:3, 47:9, 47:11, 48:3, 49:1, 49:14, 52:2, 53:1, 68:6, 95:17. 107:14. 132:5, 162:13 Housing [8] - 14:21, 16:9, 26:1, 27:8, 29:6, 29:12, 35:4, 43:13 Hubway [1] - 83:21 HUD [4] - 18:19, 19:4, 19:8, 29:20 huge [7] - 74:14, 79:4, 85:17, 88:17, 113:7, 140:12, 144:18 hugely [1] - 141:1 HUGH [128] - 3:5, 3:10, 3:13, 4:12, 5:17, 6:18, 10:4, 31:1, 34:13, 38:8, 38:20, 39:12, 43:20, 45:14, 48:5, 49:5, 50:2. 50:18. 56:2. 60:8, 60:11, 60:18, 60:21, 61:9, 61:15, 61:19, 62:3, 62:11, 76:1, 76:7, 76:9, 77:6, 77:11, 77:18, 78:18, 79:5, 79:15, 80:2, 86:3, 86:7, 86:9, 87:11, 87:15, 88:10, 88:19, 89:2, 89:10, 89:12, 89:18, 90:3, 97:7, 99:4, 99:12, 100:2, 100:13, 100:17, 101:20, 103:11, 103:18, 104:12, 106:10, 107:1, 107:12, 107:17, 108:2, 108:7, 108:21, 109:3, 109:18, 110:13, 111:2, 111:4, 111:13, 112:4, 113:9, 114:16,

115:2, 115:7,

115:13, 116:3,

119:16, 120:4, 120:18, 121:17, 122:8, 124:11, 124:16, 124:21, 127:1, 127:18, 128:1, 132:1, 132:13, 132:17, 132:21. 133:15. 137:3, 137:7, 139:14, 140:17, 142:3, 142:9, 144:2, 144:16, 145:7, 146:4, 146:15, 147:8, 149:6, 151:1, 151:17, 152:11, 152:20, 153:10, 153:16, 154:14, 157:17, 158:18, 159:2, 164:8, 164:18, 165:17, 166:1, 166:16, 167:2, 167:19, 168:21, 170:9 Hugh [20] - 1:8, 3:2, 10:19, 38:7, 45:2, 45:13, 90:7, 91:10, 104:10, 107:10, 112:8, 114:10, 118:6, 118:18, 121:16, 136:9, 138:2, 139:12, 167:4, 169:21 humanize [1] - 135:7 hundred [1] - 119:2 hypothesis [1] -70:10

-

idea [6] - 18:11, 45:16, 122:6, 143:12, 147:5, 160:15 ideas [1] - 137:13 identity [1] - 94:17 ignores [1] - 62:2 ignoring [1] - 148:17 **II** [1] - 86:19 ill [1] - 150:16 ill-fated [1] - 150:16 illustrate [2] - 49:17, illustrates [1] - 82:14 illustrating [1] - 98:16 illustration [2] -52:12, 123:11 illustrations [1] -98:15 image [3] - 93:2, 111:15, 155:11 images [1] - 95:21

imaginative [1] -114:6 impact [2] - 9:10, 54:20 impacts [5] - 28:12, 50:10, 55:8, 66:6, 103.19 **implies** [1] - 64:7 importance [2] -52:17, 164:5 important [14] -13:19, 14:5, 72:16, 75:18, 93:10, 94:3, 94:18, 94:21, 96:16, 98:7, 103:17, 132:8, 155:3, 161:14 imposed [1] - 54:13 impossible [1] - 21:17 impressed [2] -136:7, 157:19 improve [3] - 64:17, 67:7, 84:14 improved [2] - 66:3, 84:2 IN [1] - 173:11 in-fill [3] - 153:13, 153:17, 156:10 in-filled [1] - 102:13 in-house [1] - 165:3 inaudible [1] - 7:21 inbound [3] - 81:2, 81:5, 81:8 INC [1] - 1:19 incentive [6] - 5:13, 12:2, 32:9, 32:12, 46:15 incentives [2] - 12:17, 32:1 include [4] - 48:4, 56:17, 56:20, 57:14 included [1] - 72:10 including [1] - 5:7 Inclusionary [1] -26:3 inclusionary [3] -19:6, 33:1, 33:3 income [35] - 15:10, 16:1, 16:3, 16:15, 16:16, 17:5, 17:6, 18:12, 18:14, 18:16,

18:17, 18:18, 19:11,

19:14, 20:21, 21:21,

22:5, 23:16, 24:6,

24:16, 26:21, 27:5,

27:21, 32:16, 32:20,

33:16, 35:14, 35:16,

37:4, 37:5, 37:7,

incomes [2] - 21:11,

increase [12] - 12:3,

44:9, 44:13

26:9

32:12, 52:18, 74:3, 87:4, 107:8 increased [3] - 13:5, 13:13. 86:1 increases [3] - 17:10, 17:11, 74:3 increasing [3] -22:15, 36:13, 73:3 increasingly [2] -17:5, 20:20 incredible [1] - 43:5 Index [1] - 2:10 indicate [1] - 171:12 indirectly [1] - 160:9 individual [1] - 101:7 infinite [1] - 110:4 influence [1] - 14:12 influencing [1] - 96:9 **information** [7] - 10:3, 25:10, 39:7, 44:20, 45:6, 45:9, 93:21 informed [1] - 40:14 informs [1] - 40:14 infrastructure [1] -50:16 ingenuity [1] - 137:9 inherently [1] - 135:8 initial [1] - 53:20 initiative [1] - 115:19 **initiatives** [1] - 24:9 Inman [1] - 96:6 innovation [3] -33:20, 34:9, 148:5 input [3] - 90:13, 91:3, 138:19 inside [1] - 111:16 insist [1] - 66:2 instance [1] - 106:6 instances [1] - 32:5 instead [2] - 68:20, 164:13 Institute [2] - 141:6, 149:10 institutional [3] -105:1, 105:10, 144:13 INSTRUCTIONS [3] -171:1, 171:11, 172:4 instructions [1] -172:8 intending [1] - 170:1 intense [1] - 71:19 interest [6] - 42:18, 43:15, 95:6, 130:8, 142:18, 163:17 interested [4] - 39:6, 78:2, 127:4, 173:7 interesting [10] -

37:3, 55:21, 74:1, 116:9, 137:15, 139:20, 150:10, 150:11, 154:8, 163:8 interests [1] - 46:11 interior [3] - 148:3, 148:9, 148:11 internalized [1] -161.1 intersection [10] -54:20, 59:5, 59:20, 60:9, 62:20, 64:5, 68:9, 68:13, 68:16, 69:1 intersection's [1] -58:10 intersections [11] -50:11, 56:4, 56:6, 56:12, 56:18, 56:21, 57:4, 58:20, 64:13, 68:1, 69:5 introduce [1] - 84:16 introduced [1] -132:14 introduction [4] -8:19, 83:21, 99:2, 100.6 inventory [2] - 29:21, 41:5 involved [4] - 29:7, 115:18, 116:2, 117:3 involves [1] - 40:2 Iram [10] - 1:17, 6:14, 31:4, 45:16, 51:5, 51:14, 59:10, 105:17, 161:18, 164:20 IRAM [16] - 31:5, 51:7, 105:18. 106:11. 106:21. 120:3. 120:7, 124:5, 124:15, 142:16, 150:3, 150:8, 155:14, 164:21, 166:5, 169:3 issue [21] - 8:1, 9:4, 20:21, 45:19, 45:21, 46:13, 63:9, 63:10, 68:18, 79:4, 85:17, 105:1, 105:15, 117:8, 131:6, 140:8, 140:11, 143:9, 143:14, 143:20, 167:20 issues [8] - 6:11, 16:6, 29:5, 45:18,

108:1, 140:7,

157:11, 170:3

items [1] - 5:18

itself [2] - 171:14, 172:6 **J**Jackson [1] - 29:11 jagged [1] - 130:19 Jeff [4] - 1:17, 116:14,

jagged [1] - 130:19 116:17, 169:5 JEFF [2] - 116:18, 117:17 job [4] - 14:3, 53:1, 73:13, 164:7 job-dominated [1] -73:13 jobs [4] - 12:6, 12:9, 12:12, 14:2 JOHN [1] - 111:11 joke [1] - 48:8 judge [2] - 126:7, 137:18 judging [1] - 65:7 jump [5] - 7:12, 18:7, 44:8, 50:19, 50:20 jumps [1] - 18:8 justification [1] -

67:18

163:12

163:19

juxtaposition [1] -

juxtapositions [1] -

K

K2 [2] - 9:17, 165:2 **K2-C2** [12] - 50:6, 50:9, 52:1, 55:10, 59:8, 59:15, 65:9, 80:6, 80:9, 82:14, 90:10, 155:6 K2C2 [1] - 2:9 keep [6] - 40:5, 42:20, 65:3, 101:21, 155:2, 162:10 keeping [1] - 117:1 Kendall [42] - 2:8, 5:19, 8:15, 9:6, 9:9, 15:15, 31:10, 31:18, 32:10, 33:6, 34:6, 46:9, 49:20, 51:2, 52:10, 66:5, 66:20, 73:5, 73:12, 73:16, 74:2, 74:7, 74:15, 78:4, 78:6, 81:17, 83:16, 88:15, 90:5, 92:19, 94:17, 95:21, 97:1, 124:3, 131:14, 135:21, 155:9, 161:5, 164:12, 165:10, 165:16,

168:8 Kendall/Central [3] -16:20, 23:20, 25:5 Kennedy [1] - 75:13 kept [1] - 102:1 key [3] - 45:17, 45:18, 90.6 KeyWord [1] - 2:10 kids [1] - 129:15 kind [36] - 8:18, 18:19, 35:12, 38:18, 49:17, 63:2, 64:6, 71:6, 72:3, 90:8, 95:11, 97:7, 100:19, 103:9, 105:5, 114:10, 117:7, 117:10, 123:10, 125:19, 130:20, 132:15, 133:15, 152:6, 154:6, 154:7, 154:9, 155:21, 156:18, 158:6, 160:19, 162:1, 163:4, 163:16, 165:11. 168:4 kindergarten [1] -129:15 kinds [5] - 36:2, 84:8, 97:5, 161:13, 163:19 knowing [1] - 43:16 knowledge [1] -173:10 knows [2] - 4:16, 68:21 Koolhaas [4] -114:21, 115:1,

L

115:4, 115:14

Kyu [1] - 92:8

Lab [2] - 92:6, 101:13 labelled [1] - 144:20 Labs [1] - 141:1 Lafayette [3] - 155:19, 156:4, 157:6 laid [1] - 33:13 land [1] - 151:11 landmarks [1] - 96:2 Landsdowne [1] -76:14 language [12] - 109:9, 120:11, 125:6, 125:19, 131:19, 135:1. 135:10. 150:4. 150:15. 165:4, 165:6, 165:13 large [5] - 46:10, 71:2, 71:3, 98:3, 135:4

larger [6] - 18:1, 22:10, 23:8, 23:13, 30:4, 117:1 largest [1] - 146:6 last [19] - 9:8, 10:12, 12:4, 13:7, 17:12, 18:6, 20:12, 20:14, 27:18, 28:18, 28:20, 31:8, 83:1, 92:3, 94:7, 147:20, 148:2, 164:20, 169:7 lasted [1] - 152:1 late [1] - 153:7 **Lawson** [1] - 173:4 leads [2] - 95:2, 100:18 learning [1] - 129:1 least [9] - 20:14, 46:21, 47:19, 63:11, 66:1, 88:21, 105:5, 119:18, 158:6 leave [4] - 75:4, 76:4, 79:11, 153:9 leaving [5] - 22:8, 73:10, 74:6, 74:12, 74:15 **Lechmere** [1] - 88:15 left [8] - 53:10, 58:1, 59:2, 60:12, 60:16, 60:19, 62:5, 155:15 lens [1] - 8:17 less [8] - 9:10, 44:14. 66:10. 70:19. 71:15. 71:19, 145:5 letting [1] - 40:8 level [6] - 27:15, 68:19, 80:17, 83:4, 85:5, 97:13 levels [2] - 20:1, 55:6 leverage [2] - 25:4, 32:18 liberally [1] - 119:1 library [1] - 92:10 License [1] - 173:15 life [2] - 29:15, 111:16 lifelong [1] - 38:17 light [1] - 15:14 likely [3] - 49:4, 52:5, 122:17 limit [1] - 19:5 limitations [1] -120.14 limited [4] - 28:5,

32:17, 41:9, 63:1

18:20, 19:1, 21:9

72:15, 75:18, 75:21,

76:19, 80:7, 80:15,

80:18, 81:5, 81:8,

limits [4] - 15:10.

Lincoln [1] - 29:9

Line [24] - 70:5,

81:19, 82:5, 82:11, 82:17, 82:19, 84:5, 84:6, 86:3, 86:6, 86:7, 86:8, 86:18, 87:18 LINE [1] - 172:9 line [10] - 78:10, 80:3, 89:9, 122:4, 122:5, 130:14, 131:11, 135:14, 151:10, 168:17 lines [4] - 72:19, 73:3, 84:2, 130:2 list [4] - 29:17, 38:13, 121:21, 127:21 listings [1] - 23:12 lit [1] - 150:18 live [6] - 14:1, 14:3, 14:9, 35:3, 38:14, 38.15 lives [1] - 101:11 living [6] - 14:8, 36:17, 36:19, 37:13, 116:12, 117:13 **LIZA** [2] - 3:9, 3:12 Liza [1] - 1:15 loading [3] - 107:3, 107:5, 107:19 local [1] - 25:20 locales [1] - 85:12 locally [1] - 122:14 locally-owned [1] -122:14 location [2] - 34:5, 125:13 logic [2] - 103:9, 133:7 long-term [3] - 28:14, 42:17, 101:11 longed [1] - 145:18 longest [1] - 101:17 Longfellow [3] -60:16, 61:8, 148:8 longstanding [1] -141:17 Longwood [2] -88:16, 89:5 look [47] - 7:18, 10:9, 10:10, 10:13, 10:18, 20:7, 23:7, 23:9, 30:13, 34:17, 37:4, 41:11, 42:12, 49:12, 49:20, 52:19, 53:11, 54:19, 55:9, 55:17, 55:21, 59:5, 64:3, 73:5, 83:8, 87:1, 95:6, 98:11, 98:14, 101:8, 103:20, 104:1, 104:15, 104:17, 104:18, 108:12, 108:14,

120:13, 122:11, 132:4, 136:17, 137:1, 151:8, 162:6, 162:17, 167:6 looked [11] - 23:2, 50:10. 50:16. 52:5. 56:9. 69:3. 72:19. 75:15, 83:13, 85:16, 97:11 looking [22] - 10:8, 10:13, 17:8, 18:1, 22:10, 23:11, 24:21, 27:12, 39:5, 39:11, 40:17, 40:21, 46:16, 55:7, 57:12, 70:4, 92:14, 93:19, 95:10, 95:21, 102:9, 122:13 looks [2] - 152:21, 159:10 lose [1] - 113:21 loud [1] - 151:7 love [6] - 22:17, 111:10, 113:2, 113:3, 155:5, 158:18 loved [1] - 116:7 low [9] - 16:1, 16:14, 16:15, 17:4, 23:16, 26:21, 27:20, 33:3, 37.7 lower [2] - 20:1, 61:5 lowest [1] - 74:9 luck [1] - 85:20 lucky [1] - 115:14

M

magnitude [1] - 57:11 Main [5] - 93:6, 100:20, 161:20, main [5] - 56:18, 77:1, 93:7, 143:11, 164:2 maintain [1] - 84:13 maintaining [1] -162.1 major [2] - 143:17, 158:20 majorities [1] - 146:9 majority [1] - 25:16 **MALE** [1] - 124:20 manage [2] - 61:21, managed [1] - 146:4 management [2] -54:13, 160:8 manager [2] - 43:9, 45.6 Manager [3] - 1:12, 2:6, 26:13

Manfredi [1] - 151:2 manner [1] - 32:2 manual [1] - 58:14 map [4] - 47:3, 47:8, 47:10, 49:17 March [4] - 4:13, 4:15, 5:10, 173:11 mark [2] - 153:19, 154:1 market [20] - 7:21, 15:12, 15:18, 17:3, 17:8, 22:20, 23:12, 25:9, 27:2, 35:1, 36:7, 36:10, 40:9, 40:10, 42:10, 42:12, 42:21, 43:1, 154:2, 154:5 marks [3] - 99:16, 171:14, 172:5 marriage [1] - 173:6 Mass [6] - 68:12, 77:2, 113:6, 119:11, 152:12, 162:10 mass [2] - 132:11, 133:18 Massachusetts [1] -1:7 MASSACHUSETTS 111 - 173:2 massing [4] - 95:3, 95:6, 104:19, 108:12 massive [2] - 133:17, 135:5 master [2] - 103:11, 103:13 match [2] - 31:16, 42:5 materials [2] - 98:19, 134:6 matter [5] - 112:13, 146:20, 150:21, 173:6, 173:7 maze [1] - 107:16 MBTA [1] - 79:21 McCusker [1] - 1:6 mean [38] - 33:1, 35:21, 36:17, 44:7, 44:18, 48:7, 51:16, 65:10, 77:12, 77:21, 78:19, 79:5, 79:6, 80:6. 87:1. 88:3. 99:15. 100:3. 102:8.

113:18, 119:7,

134:21, 135:12,

137:9, 143:11,

144:8, 145:17,

148:5, 148:14,

151:14, 152:11,

152:21, 153:19,

149:1, 149:9, 151:5,

155:11, 157:17 meaningful [2] - 57:6, 57:14 MEANS [1] - 173:19 means [5] - 62:4, 76:2, 81:13, 101:5, 129.13 meant [1] - 117:2 measurable [1] - 67:3 measure [10] - 20:11, 72:16, 84:21, 98:3, 107:4, 107:7, 127:2, 130:5, 131:20, 133:21 measured [1] -134:16 measures [23] -67:10, 71:18, 72:2, 72:6, 72:10, 79:17, 97:16, 97:19, 98:4, 98:9, 98:11, 99:6, 108:4, 108:5, 109:5, 109.6 114.11 118:17, 118:19, 119:6, 121:21, 122:1, 129:5 meat [1] - 97:17 mechanical [2] -147:9, 147:15 Media [2] - 92:6, 101:13 median [7] - 18:15, 19:1, 19:4, 19:15, 20:9, 21:14, 23:1 medium [1] - 44:9 meet [2] - 87:9, 97:20 Meeting [2] - 1:6, 2:7 meeting [10] - 3:6, 3:11, 3:16, 3:18, 5:11, 10:12, 91:18, 146:6, 168:3, 168:4 meetings [2] - 4:13, 74:19 meets [3] - 96:14, 133:4, 159:11 member [2] - 6:18, 16:11 Member [5] - 1:9, 1:10, 1:10, 1:11, Members [1] - 3:2 members [4] - 7:12, 10:8, 11:7, 11:15 memo [3] - 169:3, 169:4, 170:2 Memorial [4] - 56:19, 63:14, 63:15, 63:17 memories [1] - 151:2 mention [2] - 27:12, 65:18

mentioned [9] -

22:20, 25:13, 32:17, 48:21, 69:7, 81:14, 83:15, 104:14, 117:9 mentioning [1] -93:12 merit [1] - 120:1 message [1] - 151:12 met [4] - 30:9, 31:9, 97:4, 98:2 method [1] - 32:20 methodology [2] -55:14, 57:17 methods [1] - 113:1 metro [1] - 82:18 Metropolitan [2] -113:9, 113:11 Microsoft [3] - 148:6, 148:18, 149:13 microunits [1] - 34:9 middle [17] - 16:3, 17:6, 19:11, 19:13, 21:21, 22:5, 23:16, 24:6, 27:5, 32:15, 32:20, 33:16, 36:12, 42:7, 42:11, 95:3, 129:12 might [37] - 6:4, 24:13, 24:19, 24:20, 25:3, 25:5, 27:10, 27:11, 35:2, 38:6, 40:19, 41:2, 41:3, 64:17, 95:11, 99:5, 102:16, 114:12, 114:17, 114:18, 117:14, 119:1, 120:17, 123:6, 123:7, 124:8, 124:20, 127:11, 129:18, 145:9, 145:11, 151:8, 160:9, 167:10, 170:1, 170:3 mile [2] - 8:8, 87:21 miles [3] - 8:4, 87:20, 88.2 million [1] - 66:4 mind [6] - 90:17, 104:10, 117:1, 134:17, 135:3, 160:6 minimum [3] - 33:7, 125:8, 154:4 minute [2] - 118:11, 158:10 minutes [7] - 6:6, 6:7, 6:9, 6:19, 50:5, 79:14, 89:13 miss [1] - 46:19 mission [1] - 27:1

misspeaking [1] -

44:8 mistaken [1] - 167:5 mistakes [1] - 94:13 MIT [39] - 4:4, 4:7, 4:9, 5:2, 5:12, 7:9, 10:1, 10:12, 46:10, 48:9, 51:8, 91:15, 91:18, 92:6, 102:18, 104:16, 107:6, 110:15, 111:8, 115:1, 120:10, 120:15, 142:17, 143:4, 143:10, 151:4, 151:5, 152:6, 152:14, 153:5, 165:11, 165:12, 167:6, 167:21, 168:3, 168:7, 169:8, 169:18 MIT's [2] - 101:13, 143:9 **mitigation** [1] - 69:15 mix [1] - 106:1 mixed [3] - 97:2, 144:5. 144:14 mod [2] - 23:16, 33:3 mode [5] - 54:9, 59:10, 60:1, 127:9, 144.10 model [3] - 26:8, 133:17, 159:18 moderate [5] - 16:15, 16:16, 17:4, 26:21, 27:21 modern [3] - 16:1, 153:4, 163:16 modernist [1] - 94:19 modes [4] - 54:1, 70:16, 70:19, 83:14 modest [1] - 33:2 modifications [1] -169:9 moment [2] - 58:18, 89:1 Monday [1] - 4:16 money [1] - 110:4 monitoring [1] - 71:20 monolithic [3] -109:8, 131:17, 133:2 month [4] - 18:2, 18:14, 165:8, 166:12 months [1] - 97:10 morning [1] - 73:10 most [17] - 16:7, 17:7, 18:21, 23:3, 53:18, 69:20, 72:16, 73:2, 73:15, 81:15, 84:18, 92:2, 98:7, 101:10, 111:13, 119:13

mostly [2] - 53:13, 154:9 Mount [2] - 3:20 move [9] - 34:21, 38:15, 63:3, 74:21, 87:10, 120:5, 121:15, 168:4, 168.9 moved [1] - 48:9 movement [2] - 58:1, 63:4 movements [9] -57:18, 57:19, 58:5, 58:8, 59:4, 59:13, 62:5, 62:21, 68:3 moves [2] - 60:12, moving [4] - 13:8, 22:15, 68:5, 87:18 MSA [1] - 19:7 multi [1] - 43:6 multi-family [1] - 43:6 **multiple** [1] - 100:10 Murphy [2] - 1:12, 2:6 MURPHY [5] - 3:15, 4:14, 6:1, 7:11, 44:1 museum [2] - 96:4, 149:11 Museum [1] - 145:19 must [1] - 62:15

Ν

names [1] - 54:21 narrative [1] - 34:15 national [3] - 26:8, 122:13, 122:17 nature [1] - 105:10 navigate [1] - 167:15 near [8] - 7:5, 14:2, 14:3, 50:11, 56:7, 93:12. 161:20. 162:10 neat [1] - 92:10 necessarily [5] -119:7, 126:20, 134:10, 136:5, 148:10 need [20] - 17:2, 18:14, 27:5, 29:18, 31:16, 34:1, 34:5, 34:10, 43:17, 49:21, 92:16, 92:18, 101:1, 106:16, 124:8, 140:7, 143:8, 143:18, 160:19 needed [2] - 18:12, 127:16 needing [1] - 43:1

needs [15] - 15:17,

16:6, 16:12, 26:19, 29:17, 30:7, 30:9, 40:17, 40:19, 83:2, 83:3, 84:6, 86:2, 157:11 neiahborhood 181 -36:18. 93:18. 137:8. 146:5. 156:15. 157:11, 157:12, 162:11 neighbors [1] - 121:8 nervous [1] - 125:20 never [2] - 110:7, 114:2 new [19] - 21:18, 21:20, 49:1, 54:14, 69:20, 80:11, 80:20, 81:7, 81:17, 84:1, 89:6, 93:16, 102:13, 125:10, 135:21, 137:13, 152:17, 154:21 newer [1] - 58:14 Newtown [3] -161:20, 162:1. 162:12 next [16] - 3:17, 5:16, 10:1, 79:10, 82:13, 93:20. 103:1. 103:3. 159:14, 163:2, 165:1, 166:16, 166:21, 167:5, 168:3, 169:1 nice [2] - 44:5, 149:21 night [1] - 4:17 nighttime [1] - 74:10 nine [2] - 85:4, 85:15 nine-thirty [1] - 85:15 nobody [2] - 61:3, 111:6 non [6] - 25:20, 43:14, 46:20, 47:4, 47:6, 72:3

non-profit [1] - 25:20

non-residential [4] -

46:20, 47:4, 47:6,

none [2] - 26:12, 60:1

nonsensical [1] - 66:7

North [7] - 8:6, 33:14,

49:9, 49:10, 118:7,

northbound [1] - 58:3

north [2] - 100:20,

119:11, 136:14

NOT [3] - 171:14,

172:5, 173:19

notably [1] - 56:16

Notary [3] - 172:6,

non-profits [1] -

43:14

72:3

157:9

0

nutshell [1] - 164:9

173:5, 173:14

171:14, 172:5

123:10, 172:4

notes [1] - 173:9

nothing [1] - 148:20

noticeable [1] - 66:5

Novartis [1] - 125:10

number [27] - 11:15,

14:6, 19:7, 19:9,

22:15, 23:6, 23:7,

26:7. 33:10. 35:8.

35:12, 35:13, 38:18,

39:7, 49:12, 54:16,

58:11, 58:13, 58:16,

74:9, 112:7, 135:20,

59:4, 64:6, 68:3,

numbers [12] - 39:5,

64:11, 121:11,

125:20, 125:21,

142:13, 161:7,

161:8, 162:8

numerically [1] -

37:19

36:14

Nur [1] - 1:11

45:7, 55:17, 61:18,

numerical [2] - 34:17,

136:1, 142:8

notices [1] - 41:18

notion [1] - 104:8

note [4] - 17:17. 67:8.

noted [2] - 8:4, 172:19

notations [2] -

O'Brien [1] - 56:19 obeying [1] - 148:5 objectives [1] - 15:4 observation [1] -77:14 obviously [7] - 6:10, 7:15, 28:6, 30:15, 60:13, 75:19, 81:21 occur[1] - 52:5 occurred [1] - 67:4 occurring [1] - 69:10 **OF** [6] - 1:2, 171:17, 173:2, 173:18, 173:19, 173:20 offer [7] - 15:5, 42:2, 42:5, 42:16, 71:3, 91:14 office [2] - 52:14, 75:1 officer[1] - 166:9 OFFICIAL [1] - 1:20 often [4] - 10:9, 13:7, 55:1, 123:3 oftentimes [1] - 32:7

old [10] - 84:12, 86:9, 114:19, 122:21, 123:21, 131:9, 138:5, 153:1, 154:16, 163:9 olive [1] - 86:9 once [10] - 52:4, 59:11, 69:12, 71:20, 135:13, 154:10, 156:20, 159:7, 165:8, 165:14 one [77] - 3:19, 5:2, 6:18, 7:3, 7:4, 8:1, 12:7, 15:8, 23:4, 24:3, 24:5, 29:3, 31:5, 31:13, 32:1, 33:10, 36:16, 38:10, 39:4, 42:7, 42:11, 44:2, 48:19, 57:3, 59:5, 59:19, 62:20, 63:1, 63:2, 63:10, 64:5, 64:20, 65:17, 68:9, 76:3, 82:7, 82:20, 90:19, 91:14, 92:6, 92:7, 92:16, 97:15, 98:5, 100:11, 101:4, 101:17, 104:14, 105:18, 107:1, 107:11, 110:12, 110:16, 116:12, 117:4, 117:12, 118:6, 120:3, 120:8, 120:16, 123:7, 124:5, 130:16, 131:4, 132:11, 137:10, 141:1, 141:5, 141:7, 142:17, 144:20, 147:6, 150:10, 154:13, 166:20, 168:4 ones [11] - 36:6, 36:10, 47:19, 48:3, 49:19, 56:9, 78:19, 114:19, 118:7, 125:17, 141:5 open [7] - 5:8, 93:10, 93:15, 93:16, 93:19, 94:3, 103:15

opening [1] - 97:8

operate [1] - 84:11

operates [1] - 80:7

opinion [1] - 146:1

opportunities [6] -

46:17, 49:14,

opportunity [17] -

153:17

21:17, 22:11, 25:1,

13:21, 14:4, 24:17,

61:14

operation [2] - 58:10,

41:2, 41:12, 45:19, 45:20, 46:8, 46:14, 46:19, 47:1, 49:8, 49:11, 49:18, 55:16, 71:7, 72:17 opposed [2] - 42:20, 48:3 opposite [3] - 33:20, 130:12, 152:17 options [2] - 22:18, 30:13 orange [1] - 81:16 orchestrates [1] -138:8 ordain [1] - 4:20 order [2] - 18:16, 57:11 Ordinance [2] - 5:1, 26:3 ordinance [1] -150:16 organization [1] -166:5 original [4] - 10:20, 59:8, 171:2, 171:8 **ORIGINAL** [1] - 171:7 originally [1] - 56:5 otherwise [1] - 117:15 ought [1] - 33:10 ourself [1] - 136:12 outbound [1] - 81:6 outcome [2] - 59:2, 173:7 **outline** [1] - 113:20 outside [3] - 85:9, 114:5, 149:18 overall [7] - 10:18, 31:14, 82:18, 83:11, 93:5, 150:20, 169:13 overly [2] - 129:2, 149:19 oversee [3] - 15:5, 15:20, 22:13 oversees [1] - 14:16 overstate [1] - 131:3 overview [3] - 8:18, 15:19, 97:6 overwhelm [1] - 82:19 own [3] - 92:9, 128:4, 163:16 owned [1] - 122:14 owner [4] - 40:20, 42:16, 42:19, 46:10 owners [3] - 40:6, 40:19, 41:19 ownership [5] -22:14, 46:7, 71:1, 99:13, 163:3 owns [1] - 101:4

P
p.m [8] - 1:5, 53:10,
53:11, 54:4, 54:18,
55:12, 73:9, 170:12
Pacific [1] - 111:18
packages [1] - 169:1
packed [1] - 3:18
packet [2] - 15:1, 97:8
Paden [1] - 1:15
PADEN [2] - 3:9, 3:12
page [36] - 66:12,
93:4, 94:18, 95:4,
95:7, 95:15, 99:3,
99:4, 100:15,
100:19, 106:3,
107.2 107.9 108.2
108:3, 121:14,
121:16, 121:17,
123:11, 127:2,
129:11, 129:20,
130:4, 130:5,
132:12, 132:13,
134:8, 148:4,
155:12, 159:17,
160:4, 160:17,
161:15, 162:17,
163:12, 163:21
PAGE [3] - 2:3,
171:17, 172:9
Page [1] - 172:7
pages [2] - 95:20,
163:6
paint [1] - 64:12
painted [2] - 31:6,
36:12
Pam [1] - 11:16
PAMELA [12] -
101:19, 110:20,
114:20, 115:4,
115:9, 115:16,
115:21, 116:5,
117:20, 118:3,
121:16, 159:4
Pamela [2] - 1:10, 3:3
panicked [1] - 98:13
paper [1] - 93:3
paragraph [3] - 99:2,
100:5, 101:1
parallel [1] - 5:15
parallels [1] - 32:21
parcels [1] - 101:7
Paris [3] - 130:12,
135:13, 138:21
Park [1] - 93:11
park [4] - 93:17,
137:5, 157:9,
157:10
Parker [2] - 92:1,

92:15

Ρ

parking [10] - 5:9,
31:13, 50:16, 69:21, 70:1, 71:15, 107:18,
128:17, 156:11,
156:12
part [14] - 11:17, 36:4,
36:5, 36:6, 42:18,
56:10, 83:8, 92:13,
94:3, 121:1, 121:8,
121:21, 126:3,
157:17
partially [1] - 78:17
particular [5] - 40:17,
53:17, 55:5, 56:20,
57:2
particularly [9] -
17:21, 22:5, 33:18,
34:6, 46:3, 77:12,
88:4, 104:16,
131:16
parties [2] - 101:7,
173:6
partly [1] - 114:7
partners [3] - 40:12,
41:14, 43:13
partnerships [1] -
40:3
parts [3] - 37:11, 167:11, 167:13
167:11, 167:13
party [1] - 171:6
pass [1] - 58:5
passageway [1] -
145:2
passed [4] - 41:17,
82:2, 143:15
passing [1] - 58:20
past [1] - 54:10
past [1] - 54:10 patrons [1] - 88:3
past [1] - 54:10 patrons [1] - 88:3 pattern [1] - 155:2
past [1] - 54:10 patrons [1] - 88:3
past [1] - 54:10 patrons [1] - 88:3 pattern [1] - 155:2
past [1] - 54:10 patrons [1] - 88:3 pattern [1] - 155:2 patterns [4] - 46:7, 66:2, 69:8, 71:1
past [1] - 54:10 patrons [1] - 88:3 pattern [1] - 155:2 patterns [4] - 46:7, 66:2, 69:8, 71:1 pay [1] - 101:16
past [1] - 54:10 patrons [1] - 88:3 pattern [1] - 155:2 patterns [4] - 46:7, 66:2, 69:8, 71:1 pay [1] - 101:16 paying [1] - 18:17
past [1] - 54:10 patrons [1] - 88:3 pattern [1] - 155:2 patterns [4] - 46:7, 66:2, 69:8, 71:1 pay [1] - 101:16 paying [1] - 18:17 pays [1] - 87:14
past [1] - 54:10 patrons [1] - 88:3 pattern [1] - 155:2 patterns [4] - 46:7, 66:2, 69:8, 71:1 pay [1] - 101:16 paying [1] - 18:17 pays [1] - 87:14 peace [1] - 130:16
past [1] - 54:10 patrons [1] - 88:3 pattern [1] - 155:2 patterns [4] - 46:7, 66:2, 69:8, 71:1 pay [1] - 101:16 paying [1] - 18:17 pays [1] - 87:14 peace [1] - 130:16 peak [14] - 50:7,
past [1] - 54:10 patrons [1] - 88:3 pattern [1] - 155:2 patterns [4] - 46:7, 66:2, 69:8, 71:1 pay [1] - 101:16 paying [1] - 18:17 pays [1] - 87:14 peace [1] - 130:16 peak [14] - 50:7, 53:12, 53:16, 53:17,
past [1] - 54:10 patrons [1] - 88:3 pattern [1] - 155:2 patterns [4] - 46:7, 66:2, 69:8, 71:1 pay [1] - 101:16 paying [1] - 18:17 pays [1] - 87:14 peace [1] - 130:16 peak [14] - 50:7, 53:12, 53:16, 53:17,
past [1] - 54:10 patrons [1] - 88:3 pattern [1] - 155:2 patterns [4] - 46:7, 66:2, 69:8, 71:1 pay [1] - 101:16 paying [1] - 18:17 pays [1] - 87:14 peace [1] - 130:16 peak [14] - 50:7,
past [1] - 54:10 patrons [1] - 88:3 pattern [1] - 155:2 patterns [4] - 46:7, 66:2, 69:8, 71:1 pay [1] - 101:16 paying [1] - 18:17 pays [1] - 87:14 peace [1] - 130:16 peak [14] - 50:7, 53:12, 53:16, 53:17, 54:4, 54:18, 55:12, 73:6, 81:9, 81:21,
past [1] - 54:10 patrons [1] - 88:3 pattern [1] - 155:2 patterns [4] - 46:7, 66:2, 69:8, 71:1 pay [1] - 101:16 paying [1] - 18:17 pays [1] - 87:14 peace [1] - 130:16 peak [14] - 50:7, 53:12, 53:16, 53:17, 54:4, 54:18, 55:12, 73:6, 81:9, 81:21, 82:4, 85:1, 85:9,
past [1] - 54:10 patrons [1] - 88:3 pattern [1] - 155:2 patterns [4] - 46:7, 66:2, 69:8, 71:1 pay [1] - 101:16 paying [1] - 18:17 pays [1] - 87:14 peace [1] - 130:16 peak [14] - 50:7, 53:12, 53:16, 53:17, 54:4, 54:18, 55:12, 73:6, 81:9, 81:21, 82:4, 85:1, 85:9, 85:10
past [1] - 54:10 patrons [1] - 88:3 pattern [1] - 155:2 patterns [4] - 46:7, 66:2, 69:8, 71:1 pay [1] - 101:16 paying [1] - 18:17 pays [1] - 87:14 peace [1] - 130:16 peak [14] - 50:7, 53:12, 53:16, 53:17, 54:4, 54:18, 55:12, 73:6, 81:9, 81:21, 82:4, 85:1, 85:9, 85:10 peaked [1] - 13:10
past [1] - 54:10 patrons [1] - 88:3 pattern [1] - 155:2 patterns [4] - 46:7, 66:2, 69:8, 71:1 pay [1] - 101:16 paying [1] - 18:17 pays [1] - 87:14 peace [1] - 130:16 peak [14] - 50:7, 53:12, 53:16, 53:17, 54:4, 54:18, 55:12, 73:6, 81:9, 81:21, 82:4, 85:1, 85:9, 85:10 peaked [1] - 13:10 pedestrians [3] -
past [1] - 54:10 patrons [1] - 88:3 pattern [1] - 155:2 patterns [4] - 46:7, 66:2, 69:8, 71:1 pay [1] - 101:16 paying [1] - 18:17 pays [1] - 87:14 peace [1] - 130:16 peak [14] - 50:7, 53:12, 53:16, 53:17, 54:4, 54:18, 55:12, 73:6, 81:9, 81:21, 82:4, 85:1, 85:9, 85:10 peaked [1] - 13:10 pedestrians [3] - 68:15, 68:17, 69:6
past [1] - 54:10 patrons [1] - 88:3 pattern [1] - 155:2 patterns [4] - 46:7, 66:2, 69:8, 71:1 pay [1] - 101:16 paying [1] - 18:17 pays [1] - 87:14 peace [1] - 130:16 peak [14] - 50:7, 53:12, 53:16, 53:17, 54:4, 54:18, 55:12, 73:6, 81:9, 81:21, 82:4, 85:1, 85:9, 85:10 peaked [1] - 13:10 pedestrians [3] - 68:15, 68:17, 69:6 penthouse [1] - 147:9
past [1] - 54:10 patrons [1] - 88:3 pattern [1] - 155:2 patterns [4] - 46:7, 66:2, 69:8, 71:1 pay [1] - 101:16 paying [1] - 18:17 pays [1] - 87:14 peace [1] - 130:16 peak [14] - 50:7, 53:12, 53:16, 53:17, 54:4, 54:18, 55:12, 73:6, 81:9, 81:21, 82:4, 85:1, 85:9, 85:10 peaked [1] - 13:10 pedestrians [3] - 68:15, 68:17, 69:6
past [1] - 54:10 patrons [1] - 88:3 pattern [1] - 155:2 patterns [4] - 46:7, 66:2, 69:8, 71:1 pay [1] - 101:16 paying [1] - 18:17 pays [1] - 87:14 peace [1] - 130:16 peak [14] - 50:7, 53:12, 53:16, 53:17, 54:4, 54:18, 55:12, 73:6, 81:9, 81:21, 82:4, 85:1, 85:9, 85:10 peaked [1] - 13:10 pedestrians [3] - 68:15, 68:17, 69:6 penthouse [1] - 147:9
past [1] - 54:10 patrons [1] - 88:3 pattern [1] - 155:2 patterns [4] - 46:7, 66:2, 69:8, 71:1 pay [1] - 101:16 paying [1] - 18:17 pays [1] - 87:14 peace [1] - 130:16 peak [14] - 50:7, 53:12, 53:16, 53:17, 54:4, 54:18, 55:12, 73:6, 81:9, 81:21, 82:4, 85:1, 85:9, 85:10 peaked [1] - 13:10 pedestrians [3] - 68:15, 68:17, 69:6 penthouses [1] - 147:9 penthouses [1] -
past [1] - 54:10 patrons [1] - 88:3 pattern [1] - 155:2 patterns [4] - 46:7, 66:2, 69:8, 71:1 pay [1] - 101:16 paying [1] - 18:17 pays [1] - 87:14 peace [1] - 130:16 peak [14] - 50:7, 53:12, 53:16, 53:17, 54:4, 54:18, 55:12, 73:6, 81:9, 81:21, 82:4, 85:1, 85:9, 85:10 peaked [1] - 13:10 pedestrians [3] - 68:15, 68:17, 69:6 penthouses [1] - 147:9 penthouses [1] -

14:7, 14:9, 22:7,

34:1, 34:19, 34:20,

162:20

```
35:3, 35:9, 35:13,
 36:9, 36:12, 36:15,
 37:7, 37:10, 37:12,
 37:17, 38:12, 38:13,
 48:21, 50:19, 52:6,
 52:15, 52:16, 52:21,
 53:7, 54:2, 57:16,
 59:18. 61:2. 61:6.
 66:9, 66:13, 66:17,
 67:14, 67:16, 68:17,
 70:18, 71:5, 71:10,
 73:9, 73:11, 73:15,
 73:16, 73:17, 74:6,
 74:11, 74:14, 74:18,
 75:3, 77:15, 78:2,
 78:10. 78:16. 81:11.
 81:20, 83:15, 83:17,
 83:20, 85:1, 85:2,
 85:7, 85:8, 86:18,
 87:10, 88:4, 88:13,
 89:19, 99:17,
 108:16, 112:7,
 112:16, 113:20,
 117:10, 118:20,
 122:16, 122:17.
 125:15, 129:18,
 132:3, 136:1,
 137:20, 141:20,
 144:13, 152:18,
 153:18, 155:5,
 161.2
per [6] - 8:8, 57:18,
 58:8, 59:4, 81:10,
 82:4
percent [35] - 13:11,
 18:6, 18:10, 18:15,
 18:17, 19:1, 19:4,
 19:15, 19:20, 20:9,
 21:3, 21:14, 21:18,
 24:12, 27:18, 28:2,
 44:15, 44:17, 51:3,
 51:4, 51:7, 51:8,
 51:9, 51:11, 54:6,
 54:16, 57:10, 59:9,
 59:17, 104:3,
 127:11, 164:13
percentage [6] -
 12:11, 14:7, 14:9,
 67:15, 106:17,
 127:3
percentages [1] -
 51:15
perhaps [4] - 6:6,
 129:17, 157:15,
 170:2
period [3] - 13:10,
 20:16, 53:16
periodically [2] -
 79:11, 79:13
Permit [5] - 90:20,
 91:2, 92:13, 100:8,
```

```
Permits [5] - 90:18,
 91:6, 92:5, 100:9,
 101:18
permitted [6] - 47:16,
 47:21, 48:4, 48:9,
 49:3, 51:11
permitting [1] - 29:11
person [7] - 19:17,
 36:16, 51:16, 52:4,
 53:11, 101:4,
 143:13
person's [2] - 150:11
personal [1] - 143:4
personally [2] -
 117:21, 134:5
perspective [1] -
 44:12
Petition [6] - 4:17,
 5:2, 5:12, 7:9,
 167:7, 167:12
Pfizer [3] - 48:10,
 48:11, 48:12
phonetic [1] - 151:20
photograph [1] -
 98:19
phrased [1] - 134:11
pick [1] - 71:18
picture [6] - 15:12,
 16:19, 31:7, 36:13,
 64:13, 132:19
piece [9] - 5:20, 8:5,
 15:9, 31:17, 32:14,
 33:5, 165:12,
 169:20
pieces [3] - 7:15,
 100:4, 120:10
place [18] - 10:21,
 12:2, 12:17, 30:14,
 67:15, 80:17, 87:3,
 98:5, 103:4, 111:6,
 112:20, 117:9,
 120:17, 127:10,
 145:9, 152:6, 161:2,
 168:13
places [6] - 11:21,
 36:1, 68:6, 74:19,
 121:14, 126:9
plan [6] - 72:1, 93:5,
 93:9, 103:12,
 103:14, 166:21
plane [2] - 162:16,
 162:18
planning [11] - 6:15,
 9:12, 10:9, 10:18,
 12:18, 14:18, 45:5,
 55:2, 62:1, 67:20,
 128:19
PLANNING [2] - 1:2,
 172:1
Planning [12] - 3:6,
 3:16, 5:16, 11:8,
```

```
11:15, 12:14, 12:15,
 91:4, 99:9, 170:13,
 172:4, 172:18
plans [3] - 72:5,
 90:16, 95:1
plate [1] - 120:13
plates [2] - 5:8,
 140:13
platforms [2] - 87:6,
 87:8
playing [1] - 13:1
plays [1] - 138:7
Plaza [2] - 152:1,
 160:5
plaza [1] - 155:17
point [21] - 11:6,
 19:14, 38:6, 45:10,
 48:14, 49:6, 80:5,
 83:19, 90:9, 91:21,
 104:15, 105:20,
 117:8, 127:2,
 127:17, 128:7,
 137:5, 138:1, 139:2,
 142:4, 148:2
Point [4] - 33:14,
 49:10, 93:11,
 136:14
points [3] - 129:2,
 146:17, 164:2
polarized [1] - 37:6
policies [2] - 26:19,
 141:17
policy [4] - 10:20,
 14:15, 27:11
political [3] - 140:6,
 140:8, 140:11
pool [4] - 31:13,
 31:14, 45:17
pop [1] - 112:2
popular [5] - 79:8,
 84:17, 92:17,
 155:17, 155:19
population [3] - 30:8,
 36:4, 89:3
portion [1] - 155:16
positing [1] - 39:16
position [1] - 166:17
positive [5] - 12:6,
 14:12, 65:21, 67:3,
 156:16
possibility [1] - 163:5
possible [2] - 66:7,
 123:6
potential [3] - 24:3,
 104:16, 107:13
potentially [1] - 84:15
power [2] - 84:15,
 149:7
PowerPoint [1] - 93:1
practically [2] - 58:17,
 62:12
```

predicted [2] - 53:10, 68:2 predominantly [1] -23:4 preferred [2] - 59:18, 127.9 preparations [1] -9:17 prepare [1] - 29:4 prepared [2] - 6:12, prescribed [1] - 72:2 prescriptive [3] -128:13. 129:3. 163:20 present [1] - 41:2 presentation [2] -89:15, 157:20 presently [1] - 88:7 Preservation [1] -25:17 preservation [3] -25:18, 28:8, 42:3 preserve [7] - 15:21, 16:13, 24:11, 29:1, 39:15, 42:9, 43:19 preserved [2] - 30:16, 43:5 preserving~[2]~-~27:3,28:20 pressing [1] - 29:3 pressure [1] - 73:6 pretty [13] - 17:11, 18:7, 29:17, 44:5, 53:5, 101:10, 124:1, 131:10, 137:14, 138:17, 147:19, 165:15, 166:13 prevent [1] - 149:20 previous [1] - 119:21 price [3] - 20:10, 23:1, 42:12 priced [1] - 27:2 prices [2] - 20:6, 43:5 pricing [1] - 85:11 primarily [3] - 5:6, 8:21, 16:1 primary [1] - 27:1 prime [2] - 41:13, 84:3 principle [2] - 33:12, 98:17 principles [3] - 98:20, 110:6, 165:15 priority [3] - 26:15, 28:18, 89:8 private [5] - 22:19, 25:21, 32:19, 35:5, 40:12 **privilege** [1] - 34:3 **proactive** [1] - 41:5

problem [8] - 64:1,

65:12, 79:6, 83:11, 108:15, 108:18, 140:5, 144:17 problem's [1] -153:12 problematic [1] -116.21 problems [4] - 31:12, 65:16, 84:8, 144:19 process [18] - 5:15, 29:11, 39:19, 47:4, 48:13, 56:11, 90:13, 90:14, 92:13, 93:19, 94:1, 154:13, 155:7, 157:20, 157:21, 158:8, 160:12, 165:19 processes [1] - 90:10 processing [2] -165:21, 166:1 produce [3] - 24:7, 24:19, 45:20 producing [1] - 26:5 production [1] - 28:4 productive [1] - 103:6 professors [1] - 153:2 profile [1] - 44:4 profit [1] - 25:20 profits [2] - 40:9, 43:14 Program [2] - 28:3 program [7] - 19:6. 19:10, 22:16, 26:10, 27:10, 33:1, 116:16 programs [22] - 15:4, 15:7, 15:8, 15:21, 16:2, 18:20, 18:21, 19:3, 19:13, 19:16, 20:2, 21:2, 21:5, 21:6, 25:2, 25:7, 25:8, 25:13, 27:14, 27:20, 54:13 progress [2] - 147:19, 168:2 project [10] - 46:2, 47:11, 50:6, 69:16, 69:19, 71:14, 88:21, 117:3, 147:18, 159:9 projected [1] - 50:14 projecting [1] - 64:18 projects [6] - 47:12, 48:7, 69:20, 71:3, 72:11, 89:8 **promote** [1] - 148:12 pronounced [1] - 9:5 proper [2] - 95:11, 162:5 properties [2] - 7:19, 51:10

proportion [1] - 35:2

proposals [1] -113:17 proposed [10] - 33:7, 50:8, 68:1, 69:2, 69:19, 72:8, 85:18, 97:12, 109:12. 120:11 **proposing** [1] - 82:8 Prospect [5] - 56:12, 57:20, 58:2, 58:3, 68:12 protect [1] - 157:12 protection [1] -162:11 provide [5] - 7:13, 8:18, 44:21, 62:4, 126:11 provides [1] - 10:2 provision [1] - 146:19 **PTDM** [8] - 9:9, 69:21, 71:13, 71:17, 71:21, 72:1, 72:5, 72:10 public [26] - 3:21, 5:11, 11:8, 24:1, 24:15, 38:11, 39:8, 40:11, 41:13, 91:8, 92:10, 93:7, 93:8, 100:13, 140:18, 140:21, 141:9, 141:14, 143:16, 143:17, 145:14, 154:2, 154:5, 159:13, 160:15, 164:6 Public [4] - 29:12, 172:6, 173:5, 173:14 **PUD** [5] - 33:8, 33:13, 100:7, 102:16, 103:7 PUDs [4] - 33:12, 100:7, 102:18, 103:9 **pull** [1] - 161:18 **purpose** [1] - 76:12 push [3] - 136:13, 136:19, 153:18 pushed [1] - 154:16 pushing [2] - 85:7, 131:8 put [9] - 12:1, 44:11, 45:6, 64:10, 87:3, 95:14, 97:8, 145:9, 169:1 Putnam [9] - 56:13,

62:19, 63:5, 63:13,

63:18, 64:1, 64:4,

putting [5] - 12:17,

65:8, 65:11

proposal [3] - 52:1,

55:10, 85:19

39:2, 126:16, 158:1, 169:5 puzzled [1] - 151:13

Q

qualitatively [1] - 57:7 quality [4] - 95:1, 111:16, 114:9, 119:4 quantify [1] - 108:9 Quest [1] - 157:4 questions [11] -10:17, 15:13, 23:19, 25:11, 31:2, 31:3, 45:2, 45:11, 50:20, 169:7 queueing [3] - 63:8, 63:9 quick [1] - 97:6 quickly [6] - 57:15, 57:17, 72:18, 98:13, 129:10, 166:13 quite [13] - 7:6, 13:6, 72:11, 72:12, 90:18, 105:12, 114:17, 123:17, 129:21, 130:12. 132:6. 138:14, 166:10

R

rail [1] - 86:21 raise [2] - 19:6, 85:19 raised [3] - 21:9, 68:18, 169:7 ran [1] - 117:7 range [9] - 19:10, 19:12, 20:13, 21:21, 23:17, 24:16, 26:9, 42:19, 44:16 Rasmussen [2] -6:16, 9:15 RASMUSSEN [46] -50:4, 51:5, 51:13, 56:3, 60:15, 60:19, 61:1, 61:12, 62:8, 62:12, 63:12, 63:20, 64:19, 65:5, 65:15, 67:12, 70:12, 71:12, 73:20, 74:5, 75:12, 75:15, 76:5, 76:12, 76:18, 76:21, 77:5, 77:10, 77:17, 77:21, 78:12, 79:3, 79:16, 80:4. 85:14. 86:5. 86:8. 86:20. 87:13. 88:9, 88:11, 88:20, 89:7, 89:11, 89:17, 89:21

rather [9] - 20:18, 40:7, 106:12, 113:1, 125:16, 125:20, 129:10, 153:13, 161:8 ratio [1] - 13:18 ratios [1] - 70:1 reach [1] - 20:2 reached [1] - 97:13 reacted [1] - 163:9 reaction [1] - 157:18 read [9] - 86:17, 128:3, 129:6, 129:10. 129:18. 131:20, 141:10, 154:18, 172:18 reader [1] - 98:8 reading [4] - 4:18, 87:16, 171:12, 172:4 reads [2] - 148:19, 149:1 ready [2] - 48:11, 84:10 real [4] - 7:21, 80:4, 97:17, 162:5 realistic [1] - 54:7 reality [2] - 62:18, 64:10 realize [4] - 13:15, 40:9, 146:7, 148:9 really [90] - 7:13, 11:18, 22:17, 24:8, 24:17, 25:7, 26:6, 26:12, 29:14, 31:12, 37:14, 40:2, 40:15, 41:11, 43:7, 46:12, 46:16, 49:21, 53:13, 53:19, 55:11, 71:17, 74:13, 76:13, 78:3, 79:20, 83:21, 84:4, 90:8, 90:12, 91:13, 92:5, 92:19, 94:9, 94:21, 97:5, 97:9, 97:13, 97:18, 98:17, 109:10, 111:7, 112:8, 112:14, 113:17, 114:8, 114:14, 116:9, 117:5, 118:1, 119:13, 119:14, 128:18, 129:6, 131:8, 131:12, 135:9, 135:12, 136:16, 137:11, 138:17, 141:10, 144:2, 148:6, 148:12, 148:18, 150:10, 151:5, 152:10, 152:12,

152:13, 154:15,

155:17, 156:1,

156:3, 156:17, 157:1, 157:19, 158:17, 159:21, 160:3, 160:6, 161:12, 161:19, 162:9, 162:13, 163:7, 163:11, 163:14. 163:15 realm [1] - 21:18 **REASON** [8] - 172:10, 172:11, 172:12, 172:13, 172:14, 172:15, 172:16, 172:17 reason [8] - 46:4, 52:13, 72:1, 78:1, 78:6, 139:20, 143:3, 172:5 reasonable [1] -12:10 reasons [6] - 7:17, 49:15, 53:6, 67:17, 82:20, 171:13 rebalance [1] - 11:21 rebound [2] - 17:15, 20:6 receive [1] - 21:8 RECEIVED [1] -171:19 receiving [1] - 166:11 recent [2] - 17:7, 23:3 recently [3] - 18:1, 30:7, 41:16 recess [1] - 90:2 recognize [1] - 119:19 recommend [1] -120:16 recommendations [5] - 23:21, 25:6, 31:10, 50:17, 165:5 recommended [2] -33:4, 34:7 **RECORD** [1] - 1:20 record [2] - 171:6, 172:20 Red [25] - 70:4, 72:15, 75:18, 75:21, 76:19, 80:7, 80:15, 80:18, 81:5, 81:8, 81:19, 82:5, 82:11, 82:17, 82:19, 84:4, 84:6, 86:3, 86:7, 86:8, 86:18, 155:5, 160:2, 160:17 redevelopment [7] -93:14, 107:14, 165:18, 166:2, 166:7, 166:9 redo [1] - 160:11 reduced [3] - 54:6, 60:1, 70:1

reduction [4] - 21:12, 21:15, 59:9, 59:17 refer [5] - 93:4, 93:8, 100:6, 100:7, 100:8 Refer [1] - 172:7 reference [1] - 168:9 **reflective** [1] - 23:3 regime [2] - 162:2, 162:19 regimes [1] - 121:1 regional [1] - 57:1 regret [1] - 141:4 regular [1] - 16:12 Regulations [1] -54:14 regulations [1] -139:11 rehab [1] - 42:14 reinvestments [1] -29:18 relate [2] - 94:2, 103:16 related [5] - 9:21, 23:20, 32:14, 146:20, 173:6 relationship [3] -48:17, 48:18, 95:13 relatively [1] - 143:6 relying [1] - 29:19 Rem [1] - 114:21 remain [5] - 21:16, 27:2, 28:11, 28:21, 69:8 remains [1] - 27:4 remarks [1] - 127:19 remember [14] - 46:6. 65:1, 86:16, 109:18, 110:14, 110:15, 123:1, 123:2, 139:16, 140:1, 151:19, 161:7, 168:17 reminds [1] - 114:21 remove [1] - 142:12 removed [1] - 84:18 renderings [2] - 151:3 rent [2] - 11:2, 17:17 rental [3] - 17:8, 20:19, 28:16 rents [7] - 17:9, 17:13, 17:16, 18:10, 18:12, 20:4, 22:20 **REP** [1] - 172:2 REPLACE [1] -171:17 replacement [1] -3:19 report [1] - 86:17 REPORTER [1] -

Reporter [2] - 173:4,

173:14 REPORTERS [1] -1:19 REPRODUCTION [1] - 173:19 request [1] - 156:9 require [1] - 122:16 required [2] - 69:15, 146:8 required) [1] - 172:7 requirements [3] -54:12, 71:13, 133:8 reread [1] - 142:2 research [1] - 93:14 reservations [1] -164:11 residential [20] - 7:21, 46:13, 46:20, 47:4, 47:6, 51:18, 52:19, 53:2, 72:3, 72:8, 72:9, 72:11, 73:8, 121:20, 135:7, 136:10, 136:13, 136:20, 163:5 residents [7] - 16:2, 16:3, 16:16, 36:21, 38:18, 43:19, 96:5 resistance [1] -140:16 resonance [1] -160:18 resource [1] - 37:9 resources [8] - 28:11, 28:15, 30:1, 30:3, 35:11, 35:17, 36:2, 40.10 respect [6] - 45:4, 156:4, 156:14, 156:18, 158:7, 164.6 respond [1] - 10:16 response [2] -134:16, 169:6 responsibility [1] -12:10 rest [4] - 138:8, 165:14, 165:16, 169:5 restaurants [5] -124:7, 124:18, 126:17, 126:19, 136:1 restoring [1] - 27:2 restricted [2] - 19:19, 20:1 restriction [1] - 41:20 restrictions [4] -28:13, 28:17, 29:14, 30:18

result [1] - 111:17

resulting [1] - 50:8

results [1] - 111:21 resumes [1] - 166:11 retail [17] - 51:18, 52:3, 52:8, 53:2, 53:4, 53:8, 96:16, 102:3, 102:6, 104:3, 121:13, 122:5, 122:10, 125:8, 125:11, 125:13 retailers [2] - 122:13, 125:9 retired [1] - 35:15 retirement [3] - 30:10, 30:14, 40:20 revelation [1] -133:16 review [4] - 33:13, 94:1, 147:18, 159:9 reviewing [1] - 166:12 revitalize [1] - 29:9 rezoning [1] - 156:7 **Ribbon** [3] - 155:6, 160:2, 160:17 ride [1] - 66:15 riders [5] - 80:11, 80:21, 81:7, 83:14, 84.20 ridership [3] - 72:20, 73:4, 75:20 riding [1] - 78:3 right-hand [1] - 53:21 ring [3] - 83:1, 84:3, 88.12 rink [1] - 93:12 ripped [1] - 152:2 risky [2] - 152:5, 152:6 river [2] - 144:21, 145:2 River [3] - 65:12, 68:12, 77:1 riverfront [1] - 126:13 **RND** [1] - 52:14 Roberts [2] - 1:17, 116:14 ROBERTS [2] -116:18, 117:17 **ROGER** [87] - 90:7, 99:3, 99:10, 100:12, 100:15, 103:8, 103:13, 105:14, 107:10, 107:13, 107:18, 108:6, 108:19, 109:1, 110:11, 110:21, 111:9, 113:13, 114:1, 114:18, 115:3, 115:6, 115:8, 115:11, 115:18, 116:1, 116:14, 117:21, 118:14,

119:13, 120:2, 122:7, 123:17, 124:13, 125:18, 126:8, 127:17, 130:3, 131:5, 132:12, 132:16, 132:18, 133:14, 134:13. 134:21. 135:3, 138:11, 138:17, 139:8, 139:18, 140:10, 140:20, 141:4, 141:15, 142:7, 142:11, 143:21, 144:4, 144:15, 145:1. 145:4. 145:16, 145:21, 146:14, 147:4. 147:17. 148:13. 149:4, 149:9, 150:6, 150:9, 151:14, 151:18, 153:6, 154:12, 154:15, 155:15, 158:5, 158:12, 159:5, 164:14, 165:21, 167:8, 168:1, 168:14, 168:19, 170:6 Roger [6] - 1:16, 6:14, 90:6, 109:18, 114:20, 158:16 role [1] - 85:6 roof [1] - 130:1 roofs [1] - 147:1 room [4] - 87:11, 119:18, 156:8, 160:15 Room [1] - 1:6 roots [1] - 160:16 rosy [2] - 64:12, 64:14 roughly [2] - 8:9, 18:15 route [2] - 78:20, 78:21 rule [3] - 110:12, 131:20, 153:4 rules [6] - 91:11, 91:12, 110:14, 114:3, 129:6, 146:7 run [7] - 25:12, 62:6, 82:20, 84:6, 86:2, 158:10, 159:5 running [4] - 78:16, 84:9, 86:10, 87:19 runs [1] - 159:15 **RUSSELL** [128] - 3:5, 3:10, 3:13, 4:12, 5:17, 6:18, 10:4, 31:1, 34:13, 38:8, 38:20, 39:12, 43:20,

45:14, 48:5, 49:5,

50:2, 50:18, 56:2, 60:8, 60:11, 60:18, 60:21, 61:9, 61:15, 61:19, 62:3, 62:11, 76:1, 76:7, 76:9, 77:6, 77:11, 77:18, 78:18, 79:5, 79:15, 80:2. 86:3. 86:7. 86:9, 87:11, 87:15, 88:10, 88:19, 89:2, 89:10, 89:12, 89:18, 90:3, 97:7, 99:4, 99:12, 100:2, 100:13, 100:17, 101:20, 103:11, 103:18, 104:12, 106:10, 107:1, 107:12, 107:17, 108:2, 108:7, 108:21, 109:3, 109:18, 110:13, 111:2, 111:4, 111:13, 112:4, 113:9, 114:16, 115:2, 115:7, 115:13, 116:3, 119:16, 120:4, 120:18, 121:17, 122:8, 124:11, 124:16, 124:21, 127:1, 127:18, 128:1, 132:1, 132:13, 132:17, 132:21, 133:15, 137:3, 137:7, 139:14, 140:17, 142:3, 142:9, 144:2, 144:16, 145:7, 146:4, 146:15, 147:8, 149:6, 151:1, 151:17, 152:11, 152:20, 153:10, 153:16, 154:14, 157:17, 158:18, 159:2, 164:8, 164:18, 165:17, 166:1, 166:16, 167:2, 167:19, 168:21, 170:9 Russell [2] - 1:8, 3:2

S

sacrifice [1] - 34:2 Safe [1] - 98:1 safety [1] - 87:9 sale [1] - 42:3 sales [3] - 20:6, 23:1, 43:5 SAME [1] - 173:19 satellites [1] - 109:9 save [1] - 50:20 saw [6] - 17:9, 20:8, 24:17, 29:10, 66:11, 139.17 scale [9] - 71:8, 71:13, 72:12, 95:2, 102:15, 108:11, 124:2, 133:5, 133:6 scaling [1] - 134:1 scenario [3] - 54:5, 59:19, 80:19 scenarios [1] - 55:4 scheduled [2] - 4:2, 4:21 schedules [2] - 75:10, 75:11 scheduling [1] - 4:4 school [1] - 39:8 School [1] - 75:13 school-aged [1] -39:8 science [1] - 87:17 screen [8] - 53:20, 69:18, 93:2, 132:14, 132:16, 155:12, 160:5, 161:19 sculptures [1] -152:17 seated [2] - 16:17, 81:18 seating [1] - 82:2 seats [1] - 84:16 Second [1] - 1:6 second [7] - 4:18, 26:12, 31:17, 32:14, 33:5, 99:5, 167:6 secondary [5] - 93:7, 100:19, 121:19, 122:2, 145:12 seconds [1] - 167:11 section [10] - 96:21, 99:18, 99:19, 106:4, 107:3, 108:8, 120:8, 134:4, 161:15, 161.18 Section [3] - 161:16, 161:17, 162:5 sectors [1] - 92:11 see [57] - 7:6, 15:17, 16:6, 16:11, 17:7, 19:1, 19:4, 20:5, 22:12, 23:10, 24:17, 25:2, 25:4, 27:1, 29:5, 45:18, 51:19, 52:14, 53:4, 53:10, 53:18, 54:3, 54:8, 55:17, 55:21, 58:18, 59:19, 70:17, 73:2, 73:7, 74:13, 75:16, 81:3, 93:8, 94:14,

95:15, 96:4, 96:5,

111:7, 112:1, 114:9, 125:9, 127:10, 127:12, 131:1, 131:12, 132:19, 143:19, 149:12, 152:7, 159:17, 160:3, 160:20, 162:4. 162:7. 162:18 seeing [22] - 7:18, 17:10, 17:16, 18:10, 20:5, 20:17, 20:19, 21:11, 21:20, 22:2, 22:14, 22:21, 27:13, 29:2, 46:17, 58:8, 59:14, 66:18, 81:14, 133:1, 157:5, 159:21 seeking [1] - 44:6 seem [2] - 63:11, 86:16 sell [1] - 40:21 selling [1] - 41:21 send [3] - 44:3, 151:12, 170:2 senior [1] - 30:15 sense [19] - 9:18, 14:17, 15:16, 25:3, 31:13, 35:12, 41:7, 56:13, 62:3, 72:18, 72:21, 75:17, 94:10, 97:17, 143:19, 143:20, 147:8, 162:7, 165:18 sensible [1] - 102:5 sent [1] - 41:18 sentence [2] - 99:5, 129:18 series [2] - 5:18, 95:20 serve [6] - 12:11, 19:10, 19:20, 25:8, 26:9, 88:3 served [1] - 21:1 serves [2] - 36:10, 36:11 **service** [1] - 68:20 servicing [1] - 107:3 **set** [9] - 18:19, 94:8, 117:1, 117:6, 117:7, 165:15, 169:19, 173:9, 173:11 setback [2] - 120:21, 162:2 setbacks [2] - 95:13, 131:11 setting [2] - 91:12, 138:6 settings [1] - 33:13

seven [4] - 74:13,

85:4, 85:15, 123:13

several [3] - 17:12, 141:11, 147:20 severely [1] - 28:5 shading [1] - 157:8 **shall** [2] - 89:12, 159:5 shape [1] - 121:7 shaped [1] - 90:12 share [2] - 60:1, 89:20 sheer [1] - 49:12 sheet [2] - 172:5, 172:6 SHEET [3] - 171:1, 171:18, 172:3 Sheet [4] - 171:2, 171:4, 171:13, 172:7 **shift** [5] - 12:6, 52:15, 83:14, 85:1 **shiny** [1] - 112:19 **short** [2] - 6:4, 90:2 **shorter** [3] - 86:10, 86:11, 86:13 Shorthand [2] -173:4, 173:14 show [3] - 48:15, 48:21, 132:18 showed [2] - 47:14, 133:17 **showing** [5] - 52:10, 53:9, 66:13, 126:10, 161:20 shown [2] - 93:15, 110:9 shows [8] - 4:20, 49:7, 49:13, 59:1, 93:4, 123:12, 132:5, 161:21 side [14] - 6:15, 9:3, 23:1, 31:15, 33:21, 52:19, 90:21, 91:2, 133:1, 136:10, 155:15, 157:9, 162:1, 162:2 sidewalk [5] - 127:6, 127:7, 137:14, 159:19. 164:5 sidewalks [3] - 87:18, 159:12, 159:16 Sierra [1] - 136:15 Sign [1] - 172:6 sign [3] - 79:8, 150:16, 171:13 signage [1] - 150:19 signal [4] - 61:14, 62:1, 62:2, 87:2 **signalling** [1] - 20:15 **SIGNED** [1] - 171:18 signed [1] - 171:5 significant [4] -17:11, 18:7, 32:12,

36.5 significantly [3] -7:19, 82:15, 84:4 signs [1] - 148:3 Silverware [1] - 30:8 similar [8] - 18:8, 22:21, 29:5, 29:16, 32:2, 54:21, 128:5, 161:4 similarities [1] - 164:4 **Simmons** [2] - 111:2, 111:3 simple [1] - 144:3 simply [1] - 158:1 single [5] - 82:7, 82:9, 84:11, 123:8, 153:19 site [6] - 103:14, 105:15, 107:14, 156:9, 156:11, 157:7 sites [2] - 157:3, 162:21 sits [1] - 81:20 sitting [3] - 108:17, 119:17, 153:2 Sitting [1] - 3:2 situation [3] - 63:13, 82:15, 82:16 **situations** [1] - 35:10 six [5] - 41:3, 68:1, 68:3, 75:4, 97:10 size [5] - 8:10, 33:17, 33:21, 36:18, 154:7 sizes [1] - 18:9 skating [1] - 93:12 skill [1] - 173:10 skip [1] - 99:17 skirt [1] - 143:15 **sky** [2] - 133:4, 141:18 sleek [1] - 112:19 slender [1] - 95:16 slide [1] - 153:3 slightly [6] - 8:6, 8:11, 19:9, 31:20, 59:21, 64:18 slowly [1] - 54:10 small [8] - 24:19, 33:21, 57:3, 71:16, 122:14, 127:2, 142:3, 146:17 smaller [2] - 23:5, 71:8 smudges [1] - 101:9 so-called [1] - 47:4 so...[1] - 88:10 soaring [1] - 124:1 Society [1] - 92:1 socioeconomic [1] -16:14 Solbert's [1] - 151:20

Soldiers [1] - 65:13 solve [1] - 79:6 someone [2] - 47:2, 166:14 sometime [2] - 103:3, 119.9 sometimes [4] - 48:5, 96:3, 119:9, 130:17 somewhat [4] - 63:1, 117:11, 130:8, 168:18 somewhere [5] - 74:7, 75:1, 86:17, 107:2, 127:5 soon [1] - 166:14 sorry [1] - 130:3 sort [32] - 3:18, 5:15, 9:13, 10:9, 10:10, 10:16, 11:5, 13:3, 13:11, 13:16, 14:11, 34:14, 34:16, 35:7, 35:15, 36:3, 36:8, 36:13, 36:15, 37:2, 53:14, 62:9, 64:1, 70:3, 72:2, 100:17, 146:19, 149:14, 151:11, 158:19, 166:3, 166:4 sorts [1] - 128:16 sound [1] - 142:13 sounded [1] - 163:10 sounds [4] - 66:6, 129:14, 147:4, 167:19 sources [2] - 24:13, 32:17 south [2] - 89:3, 100:20 southbound [1] -58.4 **space** [20] - 5:8, 34:2, 34:3, 79:10, 79:11, 87:5, 87:8, 88:6, 93:16, 103:15, 122:15, 122:16, 123:5, 125:7, 125:14, 154:6, 154:8, 159:20, 160:20, 161:9 spaces [9] - 71:15, 71:21, 93:10, 93:15, 93:19, 94:3, 126:19, 161:12, 164:6 speaking [3] - 18:21, 19:21, 62:13 speaks [1] - 169:6 Special [10] - 90:18, 90:20, 91:2, 91:6, 92:5, 92:12, 100:8, 101:17, 162:20

specific [4] - 12:18,

33:12, 105:10, 121:11 specifically [2] - 5:7, 143:3 specifics [1] - 14:14 spectacularly [1] -145.20 speculate [1] - 74:17 speed [1] - 166:3 spend [2] - 25:19, 167:10 spending [1] - 30:19 spent [2] - 96:13, 120:20 spirit [3] - 148:5, 151:15, 158:7 spite [1] - 117:11 splashy [1] - 151:7 **sponsored** [1] - 24:9 spot [1] - 82:7 spread [1] - 53:15 square [7] - 8:4, 8:8, 66:4, 154:2, 155:21, 156:3, 160:1 Square [93] - 2:8, 5:19, 8:15, 9:6, 9:7, 9:9, 22:1, 31:11, 31:19, 33:7, 33:18. 34:6, 42:7, 42:11, 43:6, 45:20, 46:5, 46:9. 46:10. 51:2. 52:10, 52:11, 56:11, 56:14, 66:5, 66:20, 68:14, 68:21, 69:2, 71:5, 74:15, 75:17, 76:10, 76:14, 77:8. 78:3, 78:4, 78:6, 78:15, 80:12, 80:13, 81:8, 82:6, 88:15, 90:5, 92:16, 92:19, 94:18, 95:21, 96:6, 97:1, 103:21, 122:3, 122:19, 123:9, 124:3, 131:7, 131:14, 135:21, 138:3, 138:18, 152:4, 153:7, 153:11, 153:13, 153:20, 154:3, 155:4, 155:5, 155:10, 155:11, 155:19, 156:4, 157:1, 157:6, 159:17, 161:5, 163:15, 163:18, 164:3, 164:12, 165:4, 165:9, 165:10, 165:16, 168.8 squares [1] - 159:13

SS [1] - 173:3

Staff [1] - 1:14 staff [5] - 6:14, 16:9, 28:1, 90:15, 121:10 stairs [1] - 152:16 standard [1] - 138:21 standards [1] - 87:9 standing [1] - 82:3 standpoint [1] - 62:15 staring [2] - 132:3, 148:8 stark [1] - 111:17 start [9] - 6:2, 7:11, 34:14, 58:8, 58:9, 74:11, 95:5, 165:6, 169:14 started [4] - 67:16, 112:8, 117:5, 165:3 starting [4] - 16:18, 43:8, 96:10, 100:17 Stata [4] - 110:11, 110:17, 113:3, 114:17 state [5] - 21:5, 37:12, 41:14, 41:17, 41:21 state's [1] - 37:5 statements [1] -172:20 states [1] - 29:16 statewide [1] - 38:21 station [3] - 76:17, 77:16, 88:1 statistical [2] - 19:8, 44:4 status [2] - 47:17, 48:6 statute [2] - 41:17, 42:14 stay [5] - 22:18, 38:16. 78:4. 83:17. 161:8 stayed [2] - 154:17, 154:20 stays [1] - 105:16 steadily [1] - 54:10 steel [1] - 126:17 stem [1] - 65:16 stenographic [1] -173:9 step [4] - 7:4, 7:5, 149:13, 168:4 Stephen [1] - 110:21 steps [1] - 165:1 Sterling [1] - 145:19 Steve [1] - 39:12 steven [1] - 115:2 Steven [3] - 1:11, 3:4, 115:3 STEVEN [7] - 39:13, 89:14, 99:20, 138:2, 138:15, 138:20,

159:1

still [16] - 37:17, 64:4, 65:4, 73:12, 73:15, 82:5, 87:9, 97:3, 110:17, 117:9, 141:4, 143:6, 156:7, 156:14. 162:8. 168:14 stock [3] - 19:19, 22:13, 23:4 stoops [1] - 121:21 **stop** [4] - 77:1, 79:7, 79:10, 79:13 stops [2] - 77:9, 167:14 storage [1] - 113:7 Storage [1] - 113:11 **storefront** [1] - 123:9 storefronts [2] -123:12, 125:17 stores [1] - 122:19 stories [7] - 7:18, 22:6, 22:17, 132:11, 142:5, 142:10, 142:12 story [3] - 66:12, 109:11, 153:5 straight [1] - 143:9 strategic [1] - 166:21 strategies [1] - 83:12 **strategize** [1] - 30:3 strategy [2] - 83:13, 85:10 street [13] - 80:3, 103:19, 104:1, 104:2, 106:13, 107:5, 107:21, 133:20, 135:16, 141:21, 145:12, 159:11, 164:5 Street [26] - 3:20, 4:1, 4:5, 57:20, 58:2, 58:4, 60:13, 60:20, 61:4, 76:10, 76:14, 77:1, 77:2, 77:20, 93:6, 93:17, 104:17, 104:18, 106:6, 107:14, 110:19, 111:18, 132:5, 133:3, 161:20, 162:3 streets [23] - 63:2, 66:19, 93:5, 94:5, 100:14, 100:19, 101:2, 102:8, 104:9, 104:19, 106:2, 121:19, 122:2, 136:10, 137:8, 142:20, 143:5, 143:16, 143:17, 144:12, 145:8, 159:16

streetscape [1] -138:9 stress [1] - 36:13 stretch [1] - 19:3 stretches [1] - 125:12 stretching [2] - 21:20, 125:15 strong [10] - 11:10, 11:11, 12:2, 12:5, 40:13, 42:13, 91:13, 119:14, 129:21, 131:13 strongly [3] - 131:7, 162:15, 163:4 **structure** [1] - 97:16 Stuart [6] - 1:16, 6:14, 10:5, 14:19, 31:6, 32:2 **STUART** [13] - 10:5, 45:4, 47:5, 48:1, 48:20, 49:6, 50:1, 117:16, 137:19, 139:10, 141:20, 150:14, 152:18 student [3] - 36:4, 116:15, 117:4 students [10] - 13:4, 13:6, 13:9, 13:13, 35:18, 36:7, 75:10, 111:10, 116:10, 116:11 studies [5] - 9:12, 26:8, 62:16, 63:11, 69:14 Study [3] - 12:14, 12:15, 16:20 study [7] - 13:2, 50:12, 56:8, 76:3, 78:20, 83:8, 153:21 stuff [4] - 46:6, 64:11, 71:2, 108:11 stuffy [1] - 163:10 subject [4] - 69:21, 71:16, 72:9, 148:21 subscribe [1] -172:19 subsequent [1] -66:12 subsidize [1] - 24:15 **subsidized** [1] - 36:11 substance [1] -120:20 substantial [1] - 49:1 **substation** [1] - 149:7 substitute [1] -121:12 **suburb** [1] - 37:15 **subway** [3] - 84:2, 88:13, 149:7 success [1] - 22:16

successful [5] - 26:5,

37:14, 136:13, 150:1, 159:18 successfully [1] -42:5 Sue [2] - 9:16, 72:7 suggest [2] - 82:9, 126.2 suggested [2] -51:14, 58:12 suggesting [1] -133:6 suggestion [3] -98:21, 99:11, 108:9 suggestions [4] -97:21, 105:7, 121:13, 164:10 **Sullivan** [1] - 88:15 **sum** [1] - 59:6 **summary** [1] - 44:5 summer [1] - 9:8 Sums [3] - 54:20, 55:1, 68:16 Sunday [1] - 8:5 Sung [1] - 92:8 supplementary [1] -15:9 supplied [1] - 171:13 **supply** [9] - 11:11, 11:19, 12:3, 12:5, 13:5, 13:12, 13:16, 24:20, 31:15 support [5] - 11:12, 21:8, 25:17, 30:12, 43:18 **supposed** [1] - 84:13 surprised [1] - 96:3 surprisingly [1] -21:16 survey [2] - 17:15, 17:18 SUSAN [8] - 61:13, 61:17, 61:20, 75:9, 76:8, 165:20, 166:6, 166:19 Susan [1] - 1:15 **SUSANNE** [46] - 50:4, 51:5, 51:13, 56:3, 60:15, 60:19, 61:1, 61:12, 62:8, 62:12, 63:12, 63:20, 64:19, 65:5, 65:15, 67:12, 70:12, 71:12, 73:20, 74:5, 75:12, 75:15, 76:5, 76:12, 76:18, 76:21, 77:5, 77:10, 77:17, 77:21, 78:12, 79:3, 79:16, 80:4, 85:14, 86:5, 86:8, 86:20, 87:13, 88:9, 88:11, 88:20, 89:7, 89:11, 89:17, 89:21

Susanne [4] - 6:16, 9:15, 89:15, 89:19 sustainability [1] -5:14 sustainable [1] -70:16 switch [1] - 83:20 switching [2] - 84:11, 87:2 system [6] - 50:13, 86:14, 86:15, 87:2, 88:8, 88:13 systems [5] - 84:12, 84:15, 87:3, 89:6, 103:16

Т

tables [1] - 102:21 tackle [1] - 167:6 tall [7] - 95:16, 96:8, 112:19, 121:5, 132:6, 134:4, 134:9 taller [4] - 95:18, 96:11, 132:8, 132:11 tamper [1] - 158:3 Tango [1] - 136:15 tap [1] - 32:18 target [2] - 13:8, 34:9 tastefully [1] - 131:2 Tavern [1] - 159:17 TDM [8] - 59:16, 67:10, 67:15, 71:2, 71:8, 72:10, 84:21, 85.7 team [6] - 6:13, 9:15, 9:16, 89:19, 165:3, 169:5 **Team** [1] - 91:4 technical [1] - 58:14 technology [1] -87:12 Ted [1] - 129:3 ten [7] - 41:10, 60:5, 60:6, 89:13, 101:19, 103:14, 127:6 tenants [4] - 40:4, 40:15, 40:18, 43:15 tend [5] - 20:1, 50:20, 53:18, 75:10, 79:1 tends [1] - 117:11 tensions [1] - 8:2 term [4] - 28:14, 42:17, 83:4, 101:11 terms [17] - 7:14, 9:5, 9:14, 9:16, 13:20, 45:3, 51:16, 53:4, 55:19, 72:5, 73:3,

80:14, 101:11,

110:4, 125:3, 164:4, 165:20 terribly [1] - 57:6 terrific [1] - 89:16 test [1] - 165:11 testimony [1] - 173:8 THE [8] - 1:2, 1:20, 171:17, 173:18, 173:19, 173:20 theme [2] - 155:7, 160:2 THEODORE [26] -39:4, 47:2, 47:15, 70:6, 73:18, 73:21, 75:3, 75:7, 75:14, 112:2, 112:5, 113:10, 113:14, 134:2, 134:15, 135:1, 135:19, 145:13, 145:17, 146:2, 146:13, 146:16, 147:13, 148:1, 149:1, 150:13 theodore [2] - 1:9, 3:2 theoretical [1] - 84:7 therefor [2] - 171:13, 172:5 therefore [1] - 4:3 thereof [1] - 171:5 they've [2] - 92:12, 139:1 thinking [21] - 34:18, 52:12, 94:11, 96:8, 97:20, 102:7, 107:15, 108:10, 115:10, 121:18, 128:3, 129:1, 132:2, 144:7, 155:2, 156:19, 156:21, 163:17. 164:4. 165:8. 169:8 thinks [1] - 11:1 Third [13] - 59:20, 60:13, 60:20, 61:4,

156:19, 156:21, 163:17, 164:4, 165:8, 169:8 thinks [1] - 11:1 Third [13] - 59:20, 60:13, 60:20, 61:4, 61:7, 68:9, 100:21, 103:21, 122:3, 132:5, 133:2 third [3] - 60:15, 99:1, 103:20 thirds [3] - 75:20, 111:20, 146:8 thirty [2] - 85:15 THIS [2] - 171:17,

173:18 **Thomas** [2] - 1:9, 3:3 **THOMAS** [16] 127:20, 128:2,
130:5, 135:18,

136:8, 137:16,

137:21, 158:9,

104:13, 106:15, 109:16, 111:3, 118:5, 118:16, 126:1, 133:9, 134:14, 135:11, 136:4, 137:6, 139:12, 139:15, 139:19, 140:14, 141:3, 141:13, 142:1, 142:15, 143:2, 144:6, 145:3, 145:11, 147:15, 149:5, 152:15, 153:8, 153:15 timeline [3] - 165:19, 165:21, 166:2 timing [2] - 17:14, 41:1 tiny [2] - 31:6, 99:1 tip [1] - 132:20 title [1] - 166:10 **TO** [2] - 172:1, 173:19 today [6] - 41:2, 59:3, 59:14, 65:8, 65:10, 67:5 together [6] - 11:7, 45:6, 64:11, 117:11, 144:14, 169:6

158:14, 164:7,

168:12, 168:16,

thoughtfulness [1] -

thousand [1] - 139:2

6:19, 17:19, 18:2,

three [18] - 4:12, 4:15,

18:5, 18:13, 20:14,

22:21, 23:11, 23:13,

27:19, 71:18, 79:21,

119:17, 119:18,

124:17, 133:18

threes [1] - 23:6

throughout [2] -

135:2, 160:1

Thursday [1] - 5:10

TIBBS [53] - 38:7,

Tibbs [2] - 1:10, 16:17

38:9, 45:13, 45:15,

49:7, 60:10, 62:14,

63:19, 64:3, 64:20,

65:14, 67:9, 70:20,

74:17, 75:6, 76:16,

78:13, 79:12, 85:13,

76:20, 77:3, 78:8,

88:18, 104:10,

three-bedroom [6] -

17:19, 18:2, 18:5,

18:13, 22:21, 23:11

threshold [4] - 58:21,

59:21, 60:2, 68:10

167:4, 167:9,

169:21, 170:7

157:21

Tom [5] - 11:16, 127:18, 130:3, 134:2, 135:12 tone [2] - 129:3, 129:20 tonight [2] - 90:11, 158:19 took [6] - 12:15, 20:7, 23:9, 73:5, 79:20, 91:1 tool [7] - 54:19, 55:2, 55:3, 55:11, 62:1, 67:20, 67:21 top [11] - 26:15, 28:18, 53:21, 81:16, 129:12, 130:14, 147:10, 147:11, 147:14, 147:16, 149:3 topic [1] - 7:16 totally [2] - 141:12, 148:17 touch [2] - 8:21, 101:14 tough [2] - 148:13, 148:21 tougher [1] - 54:11 towards [3] - 74:8, 80:16, 96:12 tower [2] - 132:4, 132:5 towers [2] - 96:4, 146:18 towns [1] - 22:11 traction [1] - 88:21 tradeoffs [1] - 27:11 traditional [6] - 25:2, 75:11, 97:2, 131:11, 162:16, 162:18 traditionally [1] -105:4 traffic [21] - 9:10, 9:17, 13:21, 14:5, 55:20, 57:1, 57:2, 57:4, 57:8, 60:4, 60:14, 62:16, 63:5, 63:6, 65:19, 65:20, 66:6, 69:5, 69:14, train [5] - 81:8, 81:10, 82:6. 82:9. 82:13 trains [7] - 79:13, 86:11, 86:12, 87:5, 87:6, 87:7, 88:8 transcript [8] - 171:8, 171:12, 171:14, 172:4, 172:6, 172:7, 172:18, 172:19

Transcript [1] - 2:7

TRANSCRIPT [2] -

171:17, 173:19

transcription [1] -173:9 transcripts [1] - 3:11 transit [20] - 50:13, 50:14, 52:16, 52:20, 70:5, 72:14, 72:16, 72:20, 73:1, 73:3, 75:20, 80:6, 80:11, 80:14, 80:21, 83:2, 83:7, 85:11, 85:20, transparency [2] -127:4, 148:4 transportation [10] -6:3, 6:8, 6:17, 7:7, 9:3, 50:3, 50:5, 54:2, 54:12, 74:20 travel [7] - 66:2, 66:17, 67:16, 69:8, 70:14, 85:9, 88:16 traveled [1] - 53:8 travelled [1] - 86:18 travelling [3] - 80:16, 81:2, 86:19 treated [1] - 114:2 tremendous [3] -110:4, 110:5, 121:9 trend [5] - 65:21, 67:3, 67:13, 71:11, 72:19 trends [2] - 54:8, 66:19 tried [7] - 14:16, 31:20, 67:2, 68:19, 95:14, 143:5, 149:10 trip [1] - 52:3 trips [14] - 50:8, 50:14, 51:16, 52:4, 53:11, 53:14, 53:21, 54:3, 54:17, 55:13, 80:6, 80:8, 81:17 trouble [1] - 35:1 true [2] - 109:17, 173:9 Trust [3] - 16:9, 27:9, 43:13 trust [8] - 16:11, 16:13, 21:8, 25:13, 25:15, 26:17, 29:7, 40:11 try [23] - 10:17, 19:9, 25:6, 30:3, 41:1, 50:4, 62:17, 65:20, 67:6, 71:12, 79:21, 99:18, 108:8, 122:5, 149:17, 152:8, 156:17, 157:13, 157:16, 158:13, 160:21, 168:4, 168:19

trying [41] - 25:3, 38:21, 41:4, 47:9, 90:15, 91:4, 94:6, 94:10, 94:14, 94:19, 94:21, 95:18, 96:7, 96:18. 97:18. 104:8. 106:2. 106:11. 114:6. 114:13. 124:6, 126:6, 126:9, 140:1, 140:7, 140:11, 140:15, 141:17, 143:9, 148:12, 153:13, 153:18, 158:7, 159:8, 159:11, 159:19, 161:11, 162:10, 162:15, 163:20, 167:20 Tuesday [2] - 1:4, 5:9 tune [1] - 11:20 turn [4] - 58:1, 60:12, 61:10, 62:5 turned [1] - 61:11 turning [2] - 60:16, 61:2 tweak [1] - 162:8 Twining [3] - 32:6, 124:16, 132:2 two [36] - 4:12, 4:21, 18:6, 18:9, 23:5, 23:13, 27:19, 31:11, 31:21, 36:16, 41:19, 49:20, 56:11, 56:15, 59:10, 75:20, 78:18, 87:20, 93:17, 110:15, 111:20, 124:18, 125:16, 125:17, 127:5, 129:8, 141:10, 142:5, 142:10, 146:8, 152:1, 155:21, 156:12, 163:2, 167:16 two-bedroom [1] -23:5 two-thirds [3] - 75:20, 111:20, 146:8 type [2] - 21:7, 27:10 typically [2] - 21:1, 72:10

U

U.S [1] - 44:10 ugly [3] - 98:15, 112:12 ultimate [1] - 6:21 ultimately [1] - 145:14 unchanged [1] - 69:9 uncomfortable [1] -130:17 **UNDER** [1] - 173:19 under [17] - 23:14, 47:16, 47:20, 48:2, 51:21, 54:5, 54:14, 55:8, 55:15, 59:7, 59:8, 59:15, 68:7, 69:19, 70:2, 71:13, 114:17 underrepresented [1] - 56:15 undersigned [1] -173:4 understandable [1] -7:17 unevenly [1] - 53:15 unfortunately [1] -82:21 unhappy [1] - 78:14 UNIDENTIFIED [1] -124:20 uniform [1] - 130:14 uniformity [2] - 131:9, 135:14 unintended [1] -117:18 unit [7] - 17:19, 18:3, 18:5, 18:9, 18:13, 23:11, 36:19 units [27] - 18:1, 19:18, 19:19, 22:10, 22:14, 22:21, 23:5, 23:8, 23:12, 23:13, 24:20, 26:6, 28:13, 28:15, 28:16, 32:20, 33:16, 33:17, 33:21, 34:1, 34:9, 35:12, 36:20, 40:15, 41:6 universally [1] - 146:1 universities [2] -12:21, 13:2 university [2] - 13:2, 94.4 unless [3] - 36:1, 89:2, 111:7 **UNLESS** [1] - 173:19 unpeaceful [1] -130:20 unpopular [2] - 79:18, 84:19 unprecedented [1] -27:13 unsuccessfully [1] -83.1 unusual [3] - 37:1, 68:14, 137:12

up [57] - 8:14, 10:11,

15:13, 17:7, 18:5,

18:9, 19:3, 19:11,

20:4, 20:12, 21:5,

13:10, 14:11, 14:14,

19:14, 19:18, 19:20,

38:12, 43:11, 45:9, 57:18, 61:7, 63:5, 63:6, 63:16, 90:6, 93:2, 110:7, 114:11, 121:11, 127:11, 128:15, 131:6, 132:8. 133:18. 137:12, 143:2, 145:7, 145:14, 148:18, 150:18, 151:21, 154:5, 155:11, 158:21, 160:4, 161:11, 161:19, 162:4, 162:21, 165:13. 166:3, 169:17 **Update** [1] - 2:6 update [2] - 3:14, 3:16 upgraded [1] - 101:12 upgrading [1] - 84:15 upper [1] - 155:16 urban [6] - 83:1, 84:2, 88:12, 101:14, 128:19, 150:20 urging [1] - 123:19 usable [1] - 154:8 useful [2] - 29:15, 142:21 uses [7] - 5:13, 8:3, 8:14, 103:15, 126:10, 160:7, 161:13 utilized [1] - 99:7

25:6, 26:4, 32:8,

٧

valuable [1] - 32:7 value [1] - 11:12 variation [3] - 131:13, 132:7, 133:11 variations [5] - 130:1, 130:6, 130:7, 130:11, 130:18 varied [1] - 130:1 variety [3] - 30:12, 40:1, 72:5 various [1] - 49:15 Vassar [1] - 110:19 vastly [1] - 68:15 vehicles [1] - 79:1 ventilate [1] - 126:17 versa [1] - 73:12 versus [1] - 75:21 Vice [1] - 1:9 vice [1] - 73:11 virtue [1] - 130:11 vis [2] - 88:2 vis-a-vis [1] - 88:2 visible [1] - 157:6

vision [2] - 11:9, 87:16 visual [1] - 95:5 Volpe [1] - 51:8 volume [4] - 88:6, 171:12, 171:14, 172:6 volumes [1] - 133:19

W

Wadsworth [1] -

82:13, 118:11,

wait [5] - 79:8, 79:14,

145:3

165:12 waiting [1] - 79:10 Walgreens [2] -127:9, 127:13 walk [2] - 91:5, 143:13 walkability [2] - 94:4, 107:8 walked [1] - 135:15 walking [4] - 14:10, 52:18, 52:21, 159:20 walkway [1] - 90:21 wall [3] - 148:10, 157:2 walls [1] - 88:2 wants [6] - 6:10, 57:21, 59:10, 107:6, 108:12, 160:3 War [1] - 86:19 warehouse [1] - 113:6 Washington [1] -85:13 ways [18] - 31:20, 37:7, 40:1, 79:6, 86:10, 86:12, 93:7, 93:8, 97:19, 98:7, 114:4, 125:12, 132:7, 140:19, 140:21, 141:9, 141:14, 158:3 weak [1] - 133:6 wealthy [2] - 35:19, 37:10 website [1] - 44:4 week [6] - 3:17, 5:16, 8:5, 10:1, 167:5, 169:2 weeks [3] - 79:21, 128:7, 152:1 weight [1] - 148:7 west [1] - 100:21 West [1] - 144:11 Western [10] - 56:13, 62:19, 63:7, 63:13,

63:14, 64:1, 64:5,

65:8, 65:11, 68:13 WHEN [1] - 171:18 whereas [4] - 58:2, 73:12, 78:13, 101:5 WHEREOF [1] -173:11 white [1] - 56:5 who've [1] - 40:5 whole [9] - 46:13, 93:19, 99:21, 100:3, 101:5, 102:11, 103:16, 104:7, 144:8 wide [1] - 51:1 wildest [1] - 43:7 WILLIAM [53] - 38:7, 38:9, 45:13, 45:15, 49:7, 60:10, 62:14, 63:19, 64:3, 64:20, 65:14, 67:9, 70:20, 74:17, 75:6, 76:16, 76:20, 77:3, 78:8, 78:13, 79:12, 85:13, 88:18, 104:10, 104:13, 106:15, 109:16, 111:3, 118:5, 118:16, 126:1, 133:9, 134:14, 135:11, 136:4, 137:6, 139:12, 139:15, 139:19, 140:14, 141:3, 141:13, 142:1, 142:15, 143:2, 144:6, 145:3, 145:11, 147:15, 149:5, 152:15, 153:8, 153:15 William [2] - 1:10, 16:17 willing [3] - 34:2, 40:7, 125:5 wind [1] - 161:11 window [1] - 153:3 windows [1] - 127:8 winter [1] - 143:13 WINTER [7] - 39:13, 89:14, 99:20, 138:2, 138:15, 138:20, 159:1 Winter [2] - 1:11, 3:4 **WINTERS** [12] -101:19, 110:20, 114:20, 115:4, 115:9, 115:16, 115:21, 116:5, 117:20, 118:3, 121:16, 159:4 Winters [2] - 1:10, 3:3 wisdom [1] - 125:9 wish [1] - 121:1

WITH [1] - 171:17 WITNESS [1] - 173:11 wonderful [3] - 110:7, 110:17, 139:1 wondering [3] - 70:7, 108:3, 114:21 **Woo** [1] - 92:8 wooden [1] - 136:17 word [2] - 118:16, 164:20 worded [1] - 129:17 words [2] - 112:19, 128:4 workable [1] - 161:12 workforce [2] - 13:18, 33:19 works [3] - 98:17, 100:1, 139:3 world [1] - 55:19 World [1] - 86:19 worried [5] - 113:15, 119:19, 128:8, 131:15, 135:4 worry [1] - 157:8 worse [3] - 55:19, 57:8, 65:4 worst [3] - 80:14, 80:18, 81:3 worthy [1] - 24:4 wrap [2] - 158:21, 165:12 write [2] - 17:7, 165:3 write-up [1] - 17:7 writing [3] - 101:6, 110:8, 145:7 wrote [1] - 154:19

173:13 zone [1] - 127:5 zones [2] - 105:9, 159:19 **Zoning** [41] - 2:5, 3:7, 4:9, 7:9, 24:19, 46:1, 47:1, 54:14, 55:9, 55:10, 59:7, 59:15, 64:15, 68:1, 68:7, 69:16, 69:20, 70:1, 70:2, 72:8, 91:11, 91:16, 91:17, 95:17, 120:11, 120:15, 128:6, 128:8, 128:12, 165:3, 165:6, 166:17, 167:6, 167:12, 167:14, 168:9, 168:10, 169:3, 169:16, 169:20, 170:4 zoning [4] - 5:13, 11:14, 51:21, 65:2 Zoning's [1] - 69:13

Υ

www.reportersinc.

com [1] - 1:21

year [4] - 30:9, 103:2, 166:16, 166:21 years [36] - 10:10, 12:4, 17:12, 18:6, 20:12, 20:15, 20:20, 26:4, 26:14, 27:19, 28:19, 28:21, 41:3, 41:10, 41:19, 43:3, 45:7, 60:5, 60:6, 73:4, 83:2, 86:4, 90:9, 90:19, 91:1, 92:3, 93:20, 94:7, 94:13, 101:19, 103:3, 114:2, 139:2, 139:5, 147:20

Ζ

Zelinski [2] - 173:4,