

PLANNING BOARD
FOR THE CITY OF CAMBRIDGE

GENERAL HEARING

Tuesday, October 20, 2015

7:00 p.m.

in

Second Floor Meeting Room

344 Broadway

Cambridge, Massachusetts

H. Theodore Cohen, Chair

Catherine Preston Connolly, Vice Chair

Hugh Russell, Member

Steven Cohen, Member

Louis J. Bacci, Jr., Member

Mary Flynn, Member

Iram Farooq, Assistant City Manager

Community Development Staff:

Liza Paden

Jeff Roberts

Suzannah Bigolin

Swaathi Joseph

REPORTERS, INC.
CAPTURING THE OFFICIAL RECORD

617.786.7783/617.639.0396

www.reportersinc.com

I N D E X**PAGE****GENERAL BUSINESS**

Update from the Community
Development Department

Adoption of the Meeting Transcript(s)

PB#

229, 2551 Mass. Avenue, Request to extend the date for continuing the public hearing and filing the decision.

Public Hearing

7:00 p.m. Planning Board Zoning Petition to amend Section 13.10 of the Cambridge Zoning Ordinance so as to change the development controls applicable in the Planned Unit Development at Kendall Square (PUD-KS) Overlay Zoning District. The majority of the PUD-KS District is occupied by the Volpe Transportation Systems Research Center operated by the U.S. Department of Transportation.

Keyword Index

P R O C E E D I N G S

* * * * *

H. THEODORE COHEN: All right.

Well, welcome everyone to the October 20th meeting of the Planning Board. We will start with the usual update from the Assistant City Manager.

IRAM FAROOQ: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

So today's meeting is largely devoted to the Volpe with a couple of administrative items. And in terms of what's coming up on the Planning Board's agenda, on the 27th, which is your next meeting, will be a public -- two public hearings; one on carsharing zoning and the second is on the Barrett petition, which is -- which has to do with accessory housing units and creation thereof and throughout the city.

On November 10th we will have the --

we'll be talking about the -- we're returning to -- the CMX District will be returning so it will be the continued hearing on that topic.

On November 17th there will be a public hearing on Coolidge Place land disposition. This is really to the Mass. And Main rezoning, and Coolidge Place is the pedestrian connection from Mass. Ave. to the parking lot. And if you might remember, the desire was to have that connection be moved which would require a land disposition process. And so in fact there is a public hearing that just happened today.

JAMES WILLIAMSON: It was a community meeting. We had a fight over there.

IRAM FAROOQ: A community meeting. There will also be a meeting at City Council

on that topic.

STEVEN COHEN: Does that include the lot across the street?

IRAM FAROOQ: No, just that pedestrian connection on Mass. Ave.

STEVEN COHEN: Oh, okay. Not the property itself?

IRAM FAROOQ: No.

So in terms of other items of interest, I think I mentioned this before, but on this coming Monday, there will be -- the City Council will hold a roundtable meeting on the citywide planning process. We had sent up the appropriation request for that process for yesterday, for yesterday's agenda, and we're requesting a total of \$3.3 million for the process to be -- which is going to be a three-year process, and that yesterday it was -- the charter was exercised on that item and

so it will come up for discussion on November 2nd which is the Council's next meeting.

On -- in terms of hearings at the City Council's Ordinance Committee, the Carshare Ordinance will be up for discussion on November 18th. And on November 12th they will be talking about the Volpe zoning -- rezoning that we're discussing today.

So I think those are the key things that are coming up. And with that, if you're ready, we can transition into the next item on this.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes.

IRAM FAROOQ: All right --

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, before we get to Volpe we have a couple of housekeeping items.

Liza, are there any meeting transcripts?

LIZA PADEN: We have the September 29th transcript and it is certified.

H. THEODORE COHEN: I have a motion to adopt it?

HUGH RUSSELL: So moved.

STEVEN COHEN: Second.

H. THEODORE COHEN: All those in favor?

(Raising hands.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: Did you say September 29th?

LIZA PADEN: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And Planning Board No. 299, 2551 Mass. Avenue. I guess there was a request to extend the date for continuing the public hearing and filing the decision. And is there a proposed date for that?

LIZA PADEN: Six months from the

current expiration date. So it's six months from the 26th of October.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay. And I gather that's because the applicant and the neighbors are still in discussions about -- I think the neighbors and the applicant are still in discussions about trying to reach agreement on a design?

LIZA PADEN: Yes, they are.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay.

Motion to approve that extension?

STEVEN COHEN: So moved.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Second?

MARY FLYNN: Second.

H. THEODORE COHEN: All those in favor.

(Raising hands.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

And I think we have no ZBA matters to

discuss tonight so we will now go to the public hearing on the Planning Board Zoning Petition to amend Section 13.10 of the Zoning Ordinance to change the development controls in the area of Kendall Square known as Volpe Center.

Iram.

IRAM FAROOQ: Yes.

Thank you, Mr. Chair. So we're here again to talk about the Volpe block which is -- and the rezoning, the zoning for this area as the PUD-KS. And as we've talked before -- so this particular rezoning is an outflow of the K2 process that began in 2011. So it's actually -- there's been discussions ongoing for this parcel in this particular iteration starting back in 2011, so we've really been talking about it for the past four years. And we'll talk a little bit more

about the process discussions. Suzannah will talk about that in a little bit, but I wanted to start with just the vision for the area, because this is what sets the stage for the zoning on this parcel. So when we look at the entire Kendall Square area, that process really emphasized these particular items. The goal is to create a way to sustain Cambridge's knowledge economy, because Kendall Square really is the heart of our economic engine, but at the same time make sure that we are creating a really active and rich public realm, that we are introducing housing, we're creating a really liveable neighborhood in this area. And at the same time there was a lot of emphasis on making sure that we were creating a sustainable place as well both from an environmental perspective, from an economic perspective,

from a transportation perspective. And so all of this together, which is what brings us to the zoning proposal which tries to, to lay out all of these components together.

So, this lays out a little bit of the history of that parcel. So the current zoning on that -- in this area goes back to the ECaPs Zoning from 2001, which was, again, also a result of a public process over the community. And then the amendments that you see before you, of course, go back to K2. So we have started having discussions about this with you in January. And so to refine the petition, the zoning petition itself, which was forwarded to City Council in June, and there was a joint hearing at Planning Board and City Council at that time. And the Council, as well as Planning Board, gave us a lot of feedback which we will -- which we've

tried to summarize and will present to you in a short while. But also you asked us to go out and speak to the community some more because, you know, each of these pieces of public process had focussed on certain groups, but to have a more, more open conversation with the community to try to determine what the vision -- not just for all of Kendall Square, but specifically for this parcel was. So we've been working on that over the last few months and Suzannah will summarize that for you as well. And then we will transition into just updating everybody on -- I mean, reminding everybody on what the components of the zoning are. Jeff will do that.

The other thing you had asked us to do was to zoom out because the MIT Zoning which stemmed from K2 process as well is already

adopted and the Special Permit PUD project is before the Planning Board right now. The MXD District is looking for rezoning also which has been sponsored by the CRA. We spoke about that at the last meeting. And so what we've attempted to do here is to actually synthesize all of that material and create a picture of what all of this gets built out, what might it look like. So put all of those pieces together. And then Susanne Rasmussen is also here, she's our Director of Environmental and Transportation and she will speak to the transportation analysis that was done because the Board had asked us about that as well. So we can talk about what we all looked at, how we looked at trip generations, how we looked at transit, and that factored in all of the different build-out in all of these different areas.

So, again, I've emphasized time and again how important it is for us to be talking about -- I mean, how fortunate it is that we have all of this work that has been done by the city and by the community at a time when the Federal Government is actually looking to partner with a private developer or work with a private developer, and in order to -- in order to get a new building for the Volpe Transportation Center. And as part of that be able to have the developer redevelop the rest of the site. So we actually have a lot of work that has been done in terms of generating a vision for this site, but can inform, like, set the stage and the principles for the work that a developer might do.

So with that, I'm going to turn it over to Suzannah to speak about what we've heard.

SUZANNAH BIGOLIN: Thanks, Iram.

We thought it would be useful to recap on some of the comments that we heard at the joint hearing with the City Council earlier in June.

So the City Council, they had a lot of comments, so this is a lot of text we realize but it will be used later on as we sort of move through the process.

But they -- key interest obviously in affordable housing, so looking at the low-mod income housing and also low income housing. We are also looking at the proportion of housing in general that's provided on the site.

And another important element is also the interest in family size housing. So the three-bedroom plus units.

There's also a lot of comments about

the ground floor retail and the different uses through the active space plan that we're hoping to provide as the zoning and that's mostly looking at the affordability and diversity of retail. So there was a lot of interest in sort of family, friendly places and locally owned places, so how that can be facilitated through the zoning process.

The open space and public realm is also of interest, so there was a lot of discussion mostly about what the open space needs to be in terms of its relationship to buildings, its importance to the site, its connections, and also needing to clarify the federally owned open space and what's accessible to the public. So that's another element that was discussed.

With regard to the built form, there was discussion of building height and then

also some detail that we hope to sort of include in refine design guidelines. So looking at floor plates and the setbacks of buildings and the importance of those sort of lower ground -- lower floors of buildings in relation to open space. And also the need to provide sort of more of the details and definitions in the design guidelines.

The Planning Board had sort of similar comments. So you attended the joint hearing and then we had a deliberation meeting afterwards. So the Planning Board's asked us to look at similar elements in terms of the affordable housing. And then the ground floor retail, I think you've asked us to be more specific with regard to what types and where it will be located.

The open space, the amount of open space has been discussed. So the sort of

form of open space, whether it's a large open space or a series of smaller spaces, and the amount of open space also on the site. And then with regard to the built form, looking at how we can consider the best location for taller buildings where they might act as landmarks, where they're sort of best located on the site and then looking at a variation in height as well. So some of those important built form elements we'll need to sort of move forward as part of the design guidelines update as well.

So as part of the roundtable we were asked to sort of go out to the community and to discuss the Volpe rezoning. And it's important to notice that part of the original K2 study there was a lot of outreach and community engagement, and that took place over a number of years and through different

venues and committee meetings. So the Volpe site we were tasked with sharing information about the Volpe rezoning proposal in creating better understanding in the community. We also wanted to obtain feedback from the community in terms of how the Volpe site can be transformed into a driving mixed use neighborhood. We have gone through sort of extensive -- we've gone through an extensive notification process and communication activities and we sent out postcards to 13 -- around 13,000 properties and that advertised our community conversations and forums. And we've also used social media to advertise our different meetings and events.

We held a series of community conversations in different areas close to the Volpe site. We spoke to more than 350 people as part of that process. So we did get a lot

of diverse feedback and met with different residents and workers and it was quite well distributed through East Cambridge, in Area 4, and Wellington and Harrington as well. We also met quite a few workers at the Kendall Square farmer's market and the Central Square farmer's market. As part of the conversations, we asked people to identify the types of open spaces and ground floor uses and amenities that were missing on the site, and we've got the boards actually behind you here so that consolidates the feedback from each of the community conversations. And generally we'll speak further about the different open spaces, but there was quite a lot of interest in sort of more lively urban squares and plazas. And then also on the other hand, natural settings and more picturesque sort of green

environment. So there's sort of two opposing competing interests.

The ground floor uses, I don't think it would be a surprise to anyone that there was a lot of interest in the grocery store, pharmacy, also looking at some of the local retail and sort of diverse retail and affordable retail. And then also workforce development needs have kind of been a key item that was discussed.

Following the forum, the conversations, we actually also had an element about priorities. So we asked people to identify what the key priority for the rezoning was, and that was mostly focussed on affordable housing. So affordable housing in the proportion of housing, people wanted that increased. And also increasing the amount of open space was also what was prioritized by

community members.

The sit down forum we had just on Saturday, so we're still sort of processing the feedback we received and trying to synthesize that. The sit down forum really gave people an opportunity to delve into the details of the site, and particularly with regard to site design and layout and then also the form. So we asked people to look at the different types of open spaces that we had already discussed at the community conversations and select the open spaces they want to see on the site and also consider connections through the site and the types of connections, so if they should be pedestrian or bicycle or shared streets, and then also looking at the types of uses and activities. So some of the concepts and ideas are shown on the slide here. So we're still trying to

sort of sift through a lot of the elements that came out of Saturday's forum.

We also had this model on display at the forum and people were able to sort of take part and interact with the model and move things around. So we had a lot of sort of interesting different massing layouts and building layouts and changes. So that's all movable. And it really was really interesting to see how people were changing the massing across the site and looking at different options and different connections.

So as part of the community outreach, we're now sort of synthesizing the outcomes and looking at some key things that we want to move forward with and consider. So with the open space there were a lot of different opinions and ranging from the large, consolidated open space that would be a

central plaza or a park on the corner of the site to interesting more of illusive feel of smaller spaces and streets and open public spaces and a more intimate setting.

There was also a lot of interest in sort of uses. So if we were going to provide some active sort of sporting on the site, a basketball court was very popular with everyone. So that's something to consider. Workers in the area tended to prefer more of an urbanistic type of open space setting so there was more of an interest in the lively plaza, the sort of types of open space that can have multiple functions, so can be gathering, parties, events, different set of uses. And the -- a lot of sort of longer term residents like that natural setting of open spaces and the -- right from the city environment, so a green space that's an

escape.

There is also sort of a consistent support for the idea of extending a connection and to the Broad Canal. And there was a lot of interest in the semi-covered public space. So an indoor/outdoor public market was really popular as well.

With the ground floor uses, there was, as I mentioned, the widespread support for the grocery store and the pharmacy. And there's agreement on the need to make retail in Kendall more affordable and that's especially for families. And even there was a lot of suggestions, but a chain-type food places because they are less expensive and more accessible for families.

There was also the emphasis on connecting Cambridge residents to new jobs that will be created in new developments, so

not just be entry level biotech jobs but also sort of lower level jobs such as cleaning and maintenance. At the moment they're outsourced, and there was an interest in Cambridge residents being able to access those jobs.

Streets and connections and that was one of the key elements that we discussed at the sit down forum. And generally those kinds of consensus on the importance of the Sixth Street connector and how we can capitalize on that existing amenity either with low scale buildings or sitting buildings back from the walkway. And also the importance of north/south connections through the site. And that included extending Fifth Street through to the Marriott. And east/west connections also need to be considered as well because that enhances

permeability to and from the surrounding neighborhoods. And also the idea of establishing a framework of connected streets and spaces and how that sort of defines an urban form and create a series of brims and that's what makes the city a city and how these sort of spaces can connect through the site and not just be a public sort of park in the center.

With the built form there was a lot of different opinions about building height and massing and the arrangement of buildings and that was primarily through this sort of massing model. Generally everyone sort of had supported an urban district with a mix of uses and establishing a sort of strong urban form. So we're avoiding sort of urban type development. With the massing, though, there was different suggestions where a tall

building should be located. At the moment the Zoning focuses on the Broadway edges, the taller buildings, but there was some discussion about maybe they can be sort of tucked away in the middle of the site or maybe even closer towards Binney Street. There was also the opposite sort of point, that Binney Street should have lower scale buildings. So we're hoping to fill the work through the building massing potentially as part of the next step in the process.

There was also a lot of sort of interest in making sure that the buildings don't overwhelm open space. So that's a key issue that we hope the design guidelines can further elaborate upon.

As part of the K2 Study, the Connect Kendall competition was also recommended. So that's been a sort of parallel study that has

been happening at the same time as the Zoning and that -- the winning entry does support strong links and connections through the site. So it also recognizes the role the site plays within the existing urban fabric of Kendall Square and how the site can have this role of connecting MIT and the innovation community around Kendall Square with the neighborhoods. And that's been similar to the feedback we've received from the community as well.

The Connect Kendall competition also looks at Broad Canal as a sort of key feature along the site and we've had a lot of agreement with that as well in the community process.

And one of the other discussion points in the Connect Kendall competition was the corner of Third Street and Broadway and

setting buildings back from that corner to frame an urban square. We've heard the opposite, that that's the sort of a hundred percent corner so there should be a landmark building on that corner as well. So these are some of the key urban design issues that we want to keep working on as the process continues.

And just an update, we -- the City is currently appointing landscape architects to design for a few open space areas that were recommended in the competition.

So there's also work that's currently underway. And Iram mentioned that we're looking at how to sort of consolidate the various PUDs that have been looked at separately in Kendall Square most recently but were sort of considered as part as a whole through the K2 process. So this is our

model at the moment which includes just one of our Zoning massing studies that we originally prepared for the Volpe site.

The orange buildings are the MIT PUD proposals. So that's currently before the Planning Board.

The magenta buildings are the MXD rezoning proposals. So that was the massing that was suggested as part of the rezoning that's also currently being discussed before the Planning Board.

And the purple building is the Ames Street housing that's not under construction yet but soon will be.

So we think that's sort of helping to set the context that everyone's interested in seeing. And then the zoning study that we have varies sort of the simple zoning envelopes that were prepared area and that

will probably be refined as we are moving forward as well with the design guidelines.

The other work that's currently underway is the mobility task force for Kendall Square and the transportation analysis as well. And Susan is going to talk about that.

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Good evening. Quickly on the Kendall Square mobility task force, so that is a task force that was set up by State Department of Transportation, massDOT, and it's structured so that while they are running the process and they pay the consultant, Brian Dacey from the Cambridge Innovation Center who is President of the Cambridge Innovation Center and I are co-chairing the task force and it has representation from throughout Kendall Square and also the East Cambridge Planning Team and

a pending representative from the Area 4 area.

The purpose of the task force is over a period of approximately 12 months to develop a mobility plan for Kendall Square that focuses on all modes of transportation and reaches as far out as 2040. So the work will concentrate on walking, biking, driving, and transit. And I think it's fair to say that transit will be probably the most intense focus because that's an area where the city doesn't have a whole lot of control and hasn't been looked at as much in the past, and frankly, where there are some very significant challenges that will have to be solved over time.

So to date, we've been mainly in a sort of exploratory stage where we've been looking at current conditions and trends and getting

input from various stakeholders on what the focus of the efforts should be, but we're now starting to dig into thinking about solutions. And the idea is to end up with one or more scenarios for actions that will improve mobility over time in Kendall Square.

And of course all the task force meetings are open to the public, and we just had a public meeting last week.

On the transportation analysis let me start by saying we are in the process of redoing what we did when Kendall Square was last studied in 2011, so I'm not going to be able to tell you the impact at this meeting, but what I wanted to do was to tell you how we did the analysis in 2011 so you can understand what it is that goes into the analysis and when we give you the updated results that factor in all the changes that

were made since the K2 process took place, you'll have an understanding of how did we, how did we come up with all of that and what does it all mean. And, of course, the major changes, MIT is a significant -- significantly different proposal. It doesn't necessarily mean that it's different in terms of traffic impacts, but it is a different proposal so we need to look at what the impacts are likely to be from this project. The K-Surp is coming along and Volpe is coming along, so we're re-looking at everything in its entirety and we'll be able to present that to you in some weeks.

So I wanted to just start by reviewing what is it really that -- and I don't know if we can -- why that is hiding up there, but so the -- these are all the factors that impact traffic generation. And I should say, I

think it's -- in the case of Kendall Square it's probably equally important to talk about traffic generation, and -- as in terms of vehicles, but also transit trips because the volume is so significant that it is noticeable. So the amount of development of course is a key factor. The pace of the development is a key factor, and that is a really difficult thing to be sure about. And I think you'll hear a theme here that we are making the best estimates that we can because there are so many things here that we don't -- these are not facts that -- we don't know exactly how fast the projects will unfold. And oftentimes when there's a plan, it's not followed. Like North Point is a really excellent example because that was supposed to buildout over, and be completed over a certain period of time and it has

really stalled in many ways. So it's not at all on the pace that we expected. You go out to Alewife and you see the opposite trend. Like, it's developing faster than the pace that was expected. When we're trying to sort of zoom in on a year and talking about 2030 impacts, that is based on an assumption of ours about the base of development that can change.

Trip generation characteristics are influenced by land use type. There are huge differences in how much traffic is generated by a housing project versus laboratory building versus a retail store, and the characteristics we look at that are most important is the peak hour when the congestion is the worst because that's -- we look at daily traffic, but it's not nearly as important because that's not where you see

the worst impacts.

The travel mode choices, so what -- how are people going to get to these buildings? Are they driving? Are they biking? Are they walking? And what is their mode choice?

And then the sort of very difficult thing is the other trends that are really important. So what is happening with settlement patterns? We know that people are much more likely to live, work, and play in the city now than ten years ago, for example, and that really influences people's travel mode choices because if you live in Billerica, you pretty much have one choice, you have to drive. But if you live in North Cambridge, you could walk, you could bike or take transit or you could drive. So there's a settlement pattern, trends and settlement patterns really influence or long term

traffic planning as do travel mode choices. And, again, over time we have -- we're seeing changes in what people choose to do. Obviously in Cambridge many more people choose to bike than was the case five years ago or ten years ago. So these are very important. And if you have a big change in travel mode choice in general that can really drive down the traffic that might have been on a street a year ago, is not there now, and then we add new buildings that adds more traffic. So you -- that all has to be factored in. And that is probably the most difficult thing to factor into the planning process because we just don't -- we can see, we can look backwards. But looking forwards, we didn't, for example, assume an accelerating trend in bicycle use. So it's not science, but we do the best we can.

So this is -- these are the square foot of anticipated development that was analyzed in the Kendall Square and Central Square process. These are all referring to Kendall Square and you see we're looking at housing and office R&D and retail. Those are the four categories that we analyze separately because they have different characteristics in terms of how many trips they generate. And in that whole process we looked at 2010 which was existing and then we looked at existing Zoning and then we compared that with the Zoning that was under discussion which obviously is in the K2 plan but not adopted.

Animation. We just.... So what we do is we look at the amount of development that's predicted. We understand from national studies how many people that really

means. So if you build a ten-story office building, we expect X number of people to work there. And then we figure out based on what we know about travel mode choices in Cambridge, and we have a lot of data about that from Kendall Square through our PTDM Ordinance where we just gather -- we gather data since 1998, and we have a really good understanding of at least up to the present time what choices people make in terms of how they get to a site.

And then we figure out -- people who drive, they don't always drive alone. So how many car trips does that result in? And of course we had the same number for transit trips and walk trips and bike trips.

We -- this is of course based on, as I said, these assumptions about people's travel choices. But we also kind of push on that

because we -- when we adopt these new Zoning, we make also rules about parking, for example. So the plan was supposed to drive down driving by ten percent compared to what had been the case previously. And the number of parking spaces you were allowed to have would match, would match that ten percent downward trend. So it's not only like what people completely choose to do on their own, but we're trying to push in a direction of fewer driving trips. And this is just a representation of how -- what the choices people -- what percent of people chose which mode and then what it would look like when you drive it down by a certain amount.

So, this is just showing the person trips. We'll skip over that.

So, okay, so now we know how many people arrive by each mode, but we need to

know more than that. We need to know what streets are they going to be on in the case of people were driving to really understand the impact. So, again, through the PTDM Ordinance we have a very, very good understanding of where people who come to Kendall Square live. And then, again, because we ask people what Zip Code are you in when these annual surveys are done of all of the employees that are subject to the ordinance. So we had a very good understanding of where people are coming from. And so we sort of know now they're like driving towards Cambridge, but once they get closer, they will obviously get on to a specific street that we care about and so we have consultants do what's called trip assignments. So you take all the people that are driving to Kendall Square and you put

them on a specific street, this is how they're coming into Kendall Square. And we did a -- for this planning study and other planning studies going as far back as when Catherine worked for the City of Cambridge, we've used this methodology to understand what is the impact of these trips. And because this is layered with assumptions about how much development, what's the person trip generation, how does that translate into what mode choice people take and what route -- where they live and what route they will take, it doesn't make sense to use some of these very specific engineering techniques that you use when you're analyzing a much more known situation like a project that will be built next year that -- where you know all the exact information.

So we're using a more higher level

analysis that's called Critical Sums Analysis that was agreed on through community discussion back in 1999, 2000? A long time ago, that just has a much higher level -- of sense of trying to understand how does this feel on the ground when you put these cars out on the street? And it's really most useful to when you make comparisons with -- between two different versions of plan that you might have. But sort of as a general rule, I mean, there are some thresholds that you can use to say okay, is this, is this a tolerable impact or intolerable impact?

So what the critical sums tool does is that it looks at an intersection and it counts up all the times where there's a conflict. Because if I drive up Third Street because I'm going up to O'Brien Highway and one of you are coming the opposite direction,

we don't bother each other. So there's no conflict. It doesn't matter. But if Iram shows up and wants to go from down Binney Street to Land Boulevard, she's now creating a conflict with us and that's what causes traffic congestion. So we count all of these situations, the number of times there's a conflict at an intersection. I mean it's really just as basic as that. There's a sort of general rule of thumb if you exceed the number 1500 an hour, then you start to have a problem. And that sort of translates generally speaking you have to sit -- the light will turn red more than twice, that's how long. So now you're really feeling it. If you don't get through until the third time the light changes, that's -- now you're starting to feel a real impact and of course it creates queues.

So, yeah, that's just an illustration of what I just explained.

So these are all the intersections that we analyzed and we didn't go sort of further out because this is where you're having the biggest impact. We did -- actually, that's not true, because in a later iteration we did link in Land and O'Brien and I think also, I'm not sure, but I think Third and O'Brien but definitely Land and O'Brien. So there was some criticism why did we only look close in and so we added some intersections further out as well.

And so this is where the analysis ended up, and so we're looking here at -- we looked all the way back to 1998 when we did ECaPs and then -- so we did the same analysis for every single year under whatever buildout scenario we had agreed on at the time, and

the 2030 K2-C2 buildout was seen to have less impact than what's actually in place right now, which is the 2030 existing zoning.

So this is where we're going to now add new columns because we're looking at all the new proposals in the aggregate. And so we're creating a new buildout scenario for 2030 to compare. And we might make one that's closer in because it -- I mean, sooner than 2030 because some of the MIT is proposing that their buildout will happen within ten years and we're -- so we might try to go in a little further and look at 2025 instead of 2030. But that's in the process right now and that will allow for a comparison of all the new proposals in the aggregate over what we -- what we've been assuming when we did this four years ago.

So, that is what I had to say. And I'm

glad to take any questions.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, the one question I have for all of you is this is an enormous amount of information to digest and are these proposals either going to be on the website or available in hard copy so that we can all look at them?

IRAM FAROOQ: Absolutely, yes. They're already on the website in the K2-C2 section. We'll send you the links, but we'll also add them to our Volpe page so they're all in one consolidated location for reference. If you prefer hard copies, we can also send those out for sure.

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: And I would just add that the presentation that Iram's referring to on the website is much longer and more detailed than this, so you can really get a good impression of all the gory

details.

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

H. THEODORE COHEN: Sure, go ahead.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Why did the, on your last slide all of your intersections seemed to be east and south of Kendall Square? There's an awful lot of people coming in through Somerville and all the border streets.

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: So, only circles represents a way of getting into Kendall Square.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Wrong. There's lots more ways of getting into Kendall Square.

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: So --

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: If I was coming from Medford, I'd come down. And if

28 was backed up, I would turn off of it and go down South Street and up to Windsor and that way.

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: But eventually you would have to get through one of these intersections.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Okay, all the way to this intersection this is causing a problem, right? That's what I'm saying. There is no study on the north side of this project at all.

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: So there were in the more congested intersections up. There's Land and O'Brien and I believe O'Brien and Third.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: But nothing west of --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Lou. If I may, Susanne, I think one of the things

that is important, and Susanne said in her talk to understand about this, is that it looks not at the engineering of particular intersections so much as it does kind of determine thresholds, and because these intersections are the ones that eventually everybody has -- they're used to assess -- you can't say the intersection of Bent and Sixth is going to have a particular level of congestion from this kind of analysis, but you can tell that overall the neighborhood is going to be more or less congested because of the analysis.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: But if Bent and Sixth backs up, then that has a resounding effect on its backward streets.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Agreed. Nobody is disputing that.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: How far back

do we go? That's why I'm curious.

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Right. Every time a project comes before this Board, a similar level of choice has been made as to where do you look at the impact. So if you just see a single building being proposed at the traffic study that --

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Smaller footprint.

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: -- there's a determination made as to how many intersections will be, will be analyzed because the impact sort -- of that project are getting greater and greater the closer you get. So it's a choice that was made about how many intersections, how far away do you include? And that is not a matter of science. That's a matter of making a decision in the traffic impact study context,

the decision was -- and I'm hoping that I'm right and that was 40 trips added and then the intersection gets analyzed. Less than 40 it doesn't.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: But the distinction is important that a traffic impact study is dealing with a particular building in a very specific location in a very near future. Whereas this is doing an entire neighborhood and scaling up and is really being used to just compare the relative pane over the whole neighborhood that anyone will -- and putting those --

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: That particular --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: And putting those particular streets in there where you're talking about where it might back up further out, gives the impression of

precision that this kind of analysis does not have.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Well, not knowing the numbers or anything, you're a third off. Because this would make my numbers -- if I thought these were all relative to a certain number of problems at an intersection.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Yes.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: A third of the volume is missing.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: You think there's a third of the volume coming into Kendall Square on any given day --

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: From Somerville?

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: -- that doesn't come through one of the intersections shown?

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Yes, I think a lot of it comes from the north is what I'm trying to say. All these side streets and into --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: And it doesn't eventually hit one of those intersections?

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Eventually it will hit one of these intersections.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Okay.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: That's the point.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: But what I'm saying to you is we're going to use No. 1 intersection as the place. So if this is backing up three other or four other intersections, this has a bigger effect than is shown, correct?

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: I mean, I think

it's --

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Because if I live at intersection -- three or four intersections back, and that's queueing the cars back that far, it's still the impact. I'm just curious how to understand it.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: No one is saying these are the only intersections impacted.

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Right.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: The idea is these are the best ones to give us an idea of the relative impact over the whole area that different scenarios will have. Many, many, many, many more intersections will be impacted and that's taken into account in the analysis. But the analysis focuses on these intersections because they are the ones that you can count on the

traffic eventually hitting.

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: And I think the other thing that's very important is that the way traffic impacts are addressed through the process that we're all responsible for is like a two step rocket, because this is sort of the high level general understanding of what the impacts will be overall in terms of the number of trips and generally how they're impacting the immediate environment. But this is a zoning. When the zoning is adopted buildings will come to you. And at that time the impacts will be very clearly documented because the level of understanding and the proximity in time is now great. And just because the Zoning says that it's okay to build this building, you all will make a second judgment as to the traffic impacts, and the Zoning Code obviously states that the

project that has unacceptable impacts on city traffic will not be, cannot be permitted. So your -- when we have the various specific information, you're making another judgment whether this building is acceptable or not regardless of what the overall Zoning allows.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: But it seems to me we're using this information to base that on.

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: The Zoning? Yes.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Correct.

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: But not an individual project.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Well, they're all individual projects.

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Right. But you are making a decision as to whether the traffic impacts that an individual building

that's -- as seeking a Special Permit, whether those traffic impacts are acceptable or not in accordance with what the Zoning code defines as acceptable.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Are there acceptable levels in those nine intersections, correct? That's where we're talking about. And I may be absolutely upside down on this, but it seems like this is a -- and I know that this is the destination and you're getting the destination numbers, but everyone in back of the destination also has a part in this. You know what I mean? I mean, we all live around all of this and have to deal with it.

STEVEN COHEN: Can I follow up?

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Go ahead.

STEVEN COHEN: Susanne, let me apologize, I couldn't fully digest everything

that you presented --

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Yes.

STEVEN COHEN: -- and as you've already indicated this is just the tip of the iceberg to get deep into the study. But we do know that over the next number of years we're going to be building millions of square feet of office R&D and residential in Kendall Square, and I don't need to be a traffic engineer and I don't need ITE codes to know that that's going to probably result in more traffic and more congestion in the local streets. One of the first things that crosses my mind as I look at this, you know, as we can analyze individual intersections and neighborhoods, but I'm kind of wondering where all of those cars are going seeing as we're limiting parking and so forth. But that's the segue to what has been my

perennial question here, and I'm not sure whether this is in your bailiwick or not, so I apologize for that also. But, again, millions of square feet, but we are discouraging parking. Bicycles are really not going to be a significant part of the solution. We have limited housing that we're building that is going to be affordable to the folks who are working in these buildings. We're told that mass transit is more or less at or very near capacity. And I keep coming back to this fundamental question, what is the long term game plan here for how we are going to provide for the transportation needs of all the folks who are going to be working in or living in these millions of new square feet that we anticipate? So is this in your bailiwick and is this part of your study?

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: So what I do is

I try to help illustrate what different planning scenarios will result in and also speak to what does that mean on the transit system or on the roads, and also illustrate what are other trends that are happening. So in that sense, it is -- I mean, it's not -- I'm not deciding what makes sense. That's you all are helping to make that decision. So one of the things, and this is a highly controversial topic, but so we try to look at what are the trends in terms of trips on the streets? And because of downward trends in people's choices of mode of driving, so there are fewer people as a percentage that drive and more people that use transit and walking and biking. And because that's been happening overall, like in the city and in other -- in Boston and other places, the existing buildings are generating less

traffic than they did before. So there's some balancing that's going on where the amount of new development -- if you just assumed as we have been doing over and over again, that the new buildings are additive, strictly additive to the traffic that we're experiencing, we would have way more traffic on the streets now than we do. We would not have empty parking garages, which we do. When we go back and look at development projects where the garages were supposed to be full, they are not full. So there's a counterbalance. And I'm not here to suggest that it's even, that all the new traffic is being, is replacing other trips that were converted, that's not the case, but there hasn't been a sort of linear growth in traffic. And so that's, that's one of the challenges is to try to understand how will

these trends continue? We monitor all of these trends very closely. We look at the PTDM data for the percent of people who are driving. We look at auto ownership in Cambridge. We look at the census which is now gathering data every single year and rolling it up in three year averages. And we look at the Registry of Motor Vehicle data. All of those trends is down. It's one explanation for why we're not -- all these building trips aren't just adding to what we have.

STEVEN COHEN: If I can interrupt for a second. I understand all of that, and you know, we're building in the direction of the great urban centers of New York or something. I don't want to belabor the point. I just want to raise the question of whether there is a limit to that reasoning

and whether those limits may be imposed to some extent, you know, A, by the increasing cost and unaffordability of housing, especially the new housing being built in the area, No. 1.

And No. 2, what I am led to believe to be the existing capacity or future capacity of mass transit. You know, if mass transit were readily available here, then, then, you know, I would let it go, I wouldn't be raising the point. But I'm led to believe that, you know, a significant capacity may not be there in the future. And I, as I say, I don't want to belabor it, and I know you don't have any answers to these difficult long term regional transportation issues, but I just do think that as we constantly increase the development in this area, not marginally, but quite significantly, that

these issues of transportation remain part of the discussion and I'm certainly going to raise it regularly. You know, how are we going to get these workers here? How are we going to provide for the transportation needs? Are there plans on the board someplace that I'm not aware of to expand the capacity of public transit? And, you know, I just leave it as an open point.

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: So, I mean that is a key issue that Kendall Square Mobility Task Force is going to be talking about. And the technical answers for how to expand Red Line capacity, for example, are well understood. We know what -- that we need upgrades to the power system, the signal system, and we need more cars -- Red Line cars. And so -- we can easily envision what is required, but it needs to be paid for.

So, there's a, there's a conversation, and the city is raising that conversation at the state level as one that is directly tied to economic development. That, the transit capacity is, over the long term, is constraining economic development in the region.

STEVEN COHEN: Just one quick detailed question. Is the size of the parking garage down at Alewife and perhaps at the other end in Quincy and other places, is that a constraint on the system as well?

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: The Red Line Alewife garage is full at around eight o'clock in the morning.

STEVEN COHEN: Yes, so it's an issue as well?

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: It is an issue, yes.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: The slide you had from the -- with the compass on it.

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Compass slide.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Please.

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Which one?

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: So people who work in Cambridge, only 11 percent of the people working in that area live in Cambridge? Is that what that shows?

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Yes.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: So 89 percent of the people don't? So there's a lot of coming in here.

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: Right.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: And you see the northwest and Arlington and Somerville, there's a lot of people coming in from that direction.

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: It's spread out.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: And that's what I -- I'm kind of one of the people that cuts through one of those streets.

STEVEN COHEN: You should be ashamed of yourself.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: I live in that area.

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: There's huge differences in the -- depending on where you are, your transit access is --

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Well, there are none north of -- really. The Green Line Extension is going to be short. As far as the Red Line goes, is Alewife.

FROM THE AUDIENCE: Busses.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Commuter rail I guess.

IRAM FAROOQ: I just wanted to add one thing just in the spirit of thinking of

the trends, and these are specific to Cambridge. So we just looked at census trends in terms of how people commute to work, and so we've looked at the workforce, the people who work in Cambridge, the -- regardless of where they live. The labor force, which is the people who live in Cambridge, who are in the work age, so regardless of where they work. And then the resident labor force which is, you know, the people who live and work in Cambridge. And we looked at how they get back and forth from work. And the work piece is really critical because that's happening at peak hour typically. And so we've noted that -- and this is census information largely, that a declining portion of each of the three groups is choosing to drive alone to work, which is the biggest contributor to congestion on the

streets. And that is not just -- sometimes you think this is just the youngest people who are or the poorest people who are -- who don't have a choice or who are most strongest and able to bike to work, but that's not the trend. The trend is actually across all demographic groups. So there is, you know, some of us may not be actually participating in it, but it is actually happening in a pretty broad and universal way. And we're happy to share the report of that work with you as well just because, you know, that's the strongest data that we have to --

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Do you see that continuing to grow without hitting a stop at some point?

IRAM FAROOQ: Yes, because also we are -- well, actually one thing just in terms of commute, what also happens is that

commuters may make adjustments and businesses may make adjustments in terms of how they function. So everybody may not actually work nine to five. I think we've already started to see some of that start to happen. That trend may continue as well. We don't really have any data on that. But there are -- Susanne, as well as the Traffic, Parking Department and DPW are all working to try and make sure that our infrastructure is actually -- as supportive as possible of sustainable modes of transportation in terms of our roadway network. So how can we facilitate and encourage bicycling and walking as commute modes?

Susanne talked about the mobility task force for Kendall Square which is really focusing a lot on transit in addition to the walking and bicycling.

So everything -- and it's not just Cambridge. I think that is a regional effort that other cities are engaged in as well, and the Metropolitan area planning commission is also trying to usher, usher that direction, because I think everybody recognizes that it's really hard to sustain just an automobile-focussed lifestyle in our areas.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Absolutely.

SUSANNE RASMUSSEN: And there's a lot of -- so if you look at the Red Line, the problem is in a really, really narrow band. There's really not a problem outside like one hour in the morning and one hour in the afternoon. And so one of the -- in the PTDM plans that we require of all major developments, there's a very big focus on requiring flex time and spreading people out a little more as Iram was just talking about.

And if you spread out people just a tiny bit more on the Red Line, we would not be standing -- I wouldn't be standing here talking about problems with the Red Line because it's really only in the very narrow period of time. So peak spreading when we talk about driving, it's usually a bad thing, we don't like to hear about that. But on transit it could be very effective if you could manage your resource better and not demand that everybody had to fit in between 8:30 and 9:00 a.m. in the morning when it's the worst problem.

And I would also just add I am -- have much more confidence in the biking as a viable mode. And I say that because if you visit major cities elsewhere, you will see -- well Copenhagen just reached 50 percent, 50 percent of all trips in Copenhagen are made

by bike. If you haven't been there, it's a very vibrant, very big city that has as much commerce as we have, and that's something that's happened over time, but -- and we won't get to 50 percent any time in the near future, but we have a lot more potential for using bikes as a viable form of transportation. And the fact that Cambridge has reached seven percent which is more, it's one of the highest in the country, also tells you that when you plan, when you are taking steps to really make it a viable mode, you can achieve a lot more than if you don't. It's not going to be tomorrow, but over time I feel very confident that biking will have a much more important role.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay, I mean do you have further presentation at this point?

IRAM FAROOQ: Just because we

haven't talked about the Zoning, so Jeff will do some of the Zoning.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Oh, that?

H. THEODORE COHEN: Oh, that.

JEFF ROBERTS: I just have a little technicality that there's a Zoning Proposal.

H. THEODORE COHEN: All right, well, let me just explain where I think we are and where we're going with this.

That this is a public hearing, and after the presentation is finished we will open it up to the public for their comments. And then there will still be a lot of issues that we need to talk about just in terms of what our ideas might be and where we think we need more information, and I believe there are some areas where staff does not have the

data for us right now, but will in the near future. And so the intent is that, you know, we'll just be getting ideas out and concepts out that we need further information on and that there will then be a continuation of this hearing.

I think November 17th was the date we were tentatively talking about?

IRAM FAROOQ: Liza, is that it?

JEFF ROBERTS: That's what we have reserved if that's agreeable to the Board. So we can -- that can be announced.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay, that's where I just think we are now. We're not going to end up this evening I don't believe saying this is what we want the Zoning to ultimately look like. That there will be a lot of questions. And then there may be a redraft of the Zoning before the next session

taking into account some of our ideas and leaving open, you know, still a lot of areas that we really need to finalize before we make a recommendation to the City Council.

Okay, Jeff.

JEFF ROBERTS: Okay. So Iram already covered this, so I wanted to put things in context. The Zoning Proposal is based on this larger set of recommendations that came out of the Kendall Square Study which envisioned growth of the commercial sector in Kendall Square, but along with that growth a set of public requirements and public priorities that would be incorporated into new development. So the -- this is just -- and this is anti-climatic me presenting the petition -- the proposal the Planning Board submitted to the City Council back in May, but I try my best just to

summarize it. And I'm summarizing it in terms of what were the general elements that were incorporated into the K2 Zoning recommendations. And just quickly, housing was a key element for the reasons that Iram mentioned regarding the overall vision for Kendall Square. The strategy which has been used in Kendall -- in certain parts of Kendall Square and a couple other parts of Cambridge is to ensure that as, as the growth of commercial development proceeds in these redevelopment areas, that housing be a required proponent of that development and create truly mixed use areas.

Affordable and middle income units would be included. Some of the thinking is evolved, continue to evolve since the K2 study. And it was always the intent that incentive zoning requirements, which are

payments required for non-residential development into the Affordable Housing Trust, it was anticipated those would be included since the K2 study. In fact, very recently the City Council adopted amendments to that which require at this point \$12 per square foot within in three years that will increase to \$15 per square foot which I think we imagined it will probably take more than three years for these -- for the project that we're talking about now in Zoning to really start happening.

Moving to active ground floors, the study recommended requirements of along major streets. 75 percent of the frontage which is about as much of the frontage as you can get to be retail, reserving some space for the more utilitarian parts of the building and lobby and other areas. Really trying to

promote an active ground floor. And in particular with incentives promoting retail, smaller retail establishments as defined as 5,000 square feet or less.

Public open space is a major part of the K2 study. In particular on the, on this area on the Volpe site which has long been envisioned as an area that would accommodate, along with new development, some major public open space. But really the K2 study as Suzannah was referring to the Connect Kendall Square study introduced this notion that open space should be looked at just as standalone requirements within these areas but part of a larger system.

Innovation space, it was also a concept introduced referring to space that would be reserved for smaller companies and for individuals working generally through some

shared work space, environments, providing -- continuing to provide opportunities for the smaller scale economic development as well as some of the larger companies that have -- that we've seen making a shift into Kendall Square.

Transportation, the main zoning recommendation is the limited parking limitations on the amount of parking that can be provided for a new uses, particularly the non-residential and both minimums and maximums for residential. Sustainability requirements are -- were a major component which, again, along with a lot of other ones continue to evolve. We now have the NetZero action plan which is, which is a citywide framework for increasing attention and requirements on energy efficiency, and that will -- that will apply for development in

Kendall Square as well.

The study looked at open space programming, transit improvements, and workforce readiness as particular needs in Kendall Square that would not necessarily be satisfied just by individual developers, developing individually, but by contributions to a shared fund, and that was recommended at a rate of \$10 per square foot which would go into a city fund to be dedicated into those pursuits. And urban design was also a key component. There were a set of urban design guidelines that were created as part of the K2 study and they would be -- those guidelines would be applied as part of the development review process which would be under a PUD type of process which the Planning Board's now familiar with for a couple of projects that are going on.

So this just a refresher of the study area and the rezoning areas that were contemplated in the K2 Study and to go, just to go over them quickly and their current status, the purple area is the MIT rezoning area, that was adopted by the City Council in 2013. Currently the Planning Board is looking at a development proposal which includes not only commercial and residential development but also significant component of student housing. So that's at the project review stage.

And the yellow and orange are now both under review by the City Council at the Zoning stage. And the requirements are, as was anticipated when the Kendall Square study was completed, most of the main requirements that I covered are included in -- were included in both the MIT Zoning and are

considered for inclusion in the MXD and the PUD-KS Zoning, but there are also elements that are more tailored to the circumstances of those particular zones.

The -- this is a summary of the particular requirements in the Zoning, just what some of the key requirements are, and the Planning Board's familiar with these increasing to rather -- with the original recommendation was an FAR of four plus inclusionary housing bonus. The new, the Planning Board's petition ultimately recommended FAR of 4.5 without an inclusionary housing bonus, just a different way of making that calculation.

The other components, the 40 percent minimum housing which is carried over from the existing zoning.

The affordable housing for a total of

15 percent of combined low, moderate, and middle income units was part of the Planning Board's petition.

A minimum of 25 percent or three-and-a-half acres of -- or at least on the Volpe site translating to three-and-a-half acres of -- over three-and-a-half acres of open space. And, again, was discussed by the Planning Board. And that would be public open space.

The parking maximums, the required ground floor retail on Broadway and Third Street, the requirement of innovation space and sustainability, community funds, all of these are consistent with the, with the other K2 areas.

What I did here, and this isn't different from the last time you saw this, but I put a little box around some of the

issues as Suzannah mentioned that have been, that have come up, really come up the most in our discussions and the ones that are likely to be the focus of ongoing discussion as we, as we look at this petition here in this next round.

Oh, and I wanted to cover also the height limits as they currently exist in the area and as proposed in the area. I know it's a little bit hard to read the numbers here, but the dark purple in the center indicates the area where the Planning Board had suggested allowing a -- allowing heights for residential buildings or heights for -- I'm sorry, for a limited number of buildings to reach 350 feet, and to have the potential for one building at 500 feet as a standout landmark building. And then as the color fades to a lighter purple and then into

darker green and lighter green and yellow, that's how the height steps down.

This is just another review of if you looked at the Volpe parcel in particular, which is not the whole zoning district, but most of the zoning district, this is what would be the anticipated buildout. Again, also noting that the 40 percent minimum is a minimum. We're only assuming in this case that the, that the final development would elect to maximize the commercial space. It's not always the case. And sometimes it varies depending on just the timing of how development proceeds, whether certain projects are chosen to be commercial or residential. But this is the overall increase from what the current zoning would allow about 2.1 million square feet of private commercial or commercial and

residential and other development to about 3 million square feet.

This is just a summary. It's similar to what was before of what the -- what that development translates to under the proposed requirements that we would anticipate about a thousand units of housing with the affordable requirements and over \$20 million in incentive zoning payments, the Affordable Housing Trust, fairly continuous active uses on Third Street and Broadway, at least three-and-a-half acres of public open space. And, again, I pointed this out before, it's 25 percent is probably about on par with what the kind of open space that's been created in other development areas like North Point and Alexandria, but in all of those cases it's -- the provided open space exceeded the minimum amount and that's, it's usually a little bit

easier to find that flexibility to provide open space greater than the minimum requirement in a PUD proposal.

The innovation space was covered and the rest of these are basically covered.

The community funds, just to point out, we would about we anticipate over 16 million that would go to those open space programming and the workforce readiness programs.

So, I just wanted to try to close things off. This is bringing some of the stuff back from what Suzannah was presenting at the beginning, trying to break down what some of the key issues were that were identified and the items that I imagine we'll be taking a closest look at and talking the most about as we continue these. Probably no surprise that housing was a big issue. And looking at the amount and the affordability

levels and will certainly be looking at what can, you know, what alternatives there are and what can be done, keeping in mind that the goal isn't just to require the housing, it's to ultimately to have the housing get built and that -- and to understanding that the commercial development as was sort of the, in anticipated in the Kendall Square study, the commercial, the drive for commercial development is what drives a lot of the public benefits that we would be able to get from the -- from a future development plan.

Open space, as Suzannah was mentioning, there are some differences and varied opinions about open space and what the right approach would be. We've certainly heard a lot from the public and through the Connect Kendall Square process about what those

options are. We could continue to look at what the requirements are. The zoning requirements generally just talk about the size. We could talk about the configuration a bit more, but also keeping in mind that we may not want to be too restrictive. We may want to allow some -- continue to allow some flexibility.

On the retail note, that's something that we certainly heard a lot about, and I think the theme that I've received from the comment is not just looking at retail as a retail as if it's a uniform idea, but looking at the variety of different types of ground floor uses that might take shape in crafting the proposal so that it, so that it accommodates a real variety of spaces, not just the typical types of retail spaces, but also some larger spaces that are, that serve

the community in a different way, and maybe other types of spaces that aren't, that aren't typically retail, like child care, like indoor public spaces or indoor/outdoor spaces that serve the community in a different way.

And then on the built form and height, again, we've seen a lot of different thoughts and had a lot of different alternatives for how that, for how building, building massing could be arranged on the site that may prompt us to look at that about, and where we might want to provide more flexibility, where we might want to provide more guidance on those issues.

And the last thing is just to, just to point out that there's sort of a two, a two-pronged approach as we're looking at this proposal. We're looking at what the zoning

requirements are, which are the very, the strict constraints on what can be done, what can be allowed to be -- or rather what can be allowed to be proposed under the zoning, and there are different things that we can do, but they, it tends to be as people say, a blunt instrument, so it can be difficult to get into a lot of detail or to get into a lot of -- a lot of thinking about how, how we articulate our aspirations through zoning. A lot of that would come through the design guidelines and design framework that is being looked at in parallel of how can we create a more refined and thoughtful vision that would help to provide direction to a future developer as well as providing some guidance to the Planning Board in their review, but would still have enough flexibility. And if that could consider other options, could

consider alternative ways of meeting the objectives of the site when a development plan actually comes forward.

Did you want to say anything?

IRAM FAROOQ: No.

JEFF ROBERTS: I guess that's the sound of the presentation ending. So we're, again, happy to answer questions or to go to the Planning Board or public comment.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes, well -- and, Steve, I know you have a question, but, Jeff, for you or for anyone else, a quick question. We've been promoting innovation space in a lot of the different PUDs. Do we reach a point where we have more innovation space than there is demand or is demand so large that we'll -- at the five percent we'll never get there?

IRAM FAROOQ: So, so the innovation

space, the goal is to be able to accomm --
it's kind of like affordable housing for
business. So right now what's happening is
that the startups and the mid-tier, midsize
companies that really have historically made
Kendall Square the hot band of innovation
that it is, a lot of them are getting priced
out because of the large companies that are
moving in, we want to make sure that as we
develop this area, that we are supportive of
that tier of business. Because as much as we
talk about talent that draws the larger
companies, they're also drawn by the smaller
or startups who, who are supporting that
environment. And so we think that's a really
critical diversity that needs to be
maintained. So I don't think that we're
going to max out at some point. We're not --
that would be a problem that we would like to

have.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, just, you know, what you've been saying, just as we've been talking about the need for middle income housing in addition to low and moderate, is there, the innovation space is so specific in terms of the leases and the size and the number of employees, is there another tier of middle income, you know --

IRAM FAROOQ: Right.

H. THEODORE COHEN: R&D that needs a, you know, a subsidized lease rate?

IRAM FAROOQ: I think you're right, that we do want to be able to cater to that mid-tier company as well. So companies that grow beyond the startup stage, but aren't quite hands on. But it's really hard to be able to lay out what exactly that means, which is why we have -- we have the criteria

for what it means for the co-working space that really cater startups but then have enough flexibility in there that people can propose alternative models. So already we've seen in Kendall Square the -- I apologize I'm completely blanking on the name of the organization, but we've seen lab space.

JOHN HAWKINSON: Lab Central.

IRAM FAROOQ: Lab Central, thank you. Co-working lab space which is not something that we anticipated when we were -- well, I mean it had started and we did have Joe hand us as part of our brain trust to help us develop these criteria. Having that flexibility allows those kinds of models to also happen under this, but gives the Planning Board an opportunity to review them.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay.

Steve, you had a question?

STEVEN COHEN: I just had one question I think also for you, Iram. And that is we're hearing from the community and the public and the staff and the board members, all the things that we'd like to see in this development, and unfortunately here, as in many cases, there's the question of economic viability which to some extent is at odds with many of our preferences. And in this very unique situation economic viability is largely driven by the gentleman sitting here from GSA and --

FROM THE AUDIENCE: Volpe, not GSA.

STEVEN COHEN: Right.

But by that whole galaxy of issues of what DOT, what their program is, you know, how much land do they need? How much money will it cost for a developer, you know, to fulfill their needs? In what time frame?

And so first of all, and so just tying those together, I mean for those who aren't totally familiar with it, basically the project that we are trying to shape with our Zoning and Planning process here must be sufficiently profitable for the ultimate developer to fund the needs of new DOT facilities. And so two-part question for you, Iram, and No. 1, do we know anything more about any of those subjects than we did months ago when we first discussed this subject?

And, No. 2, have we acquired any more capability for economic analysis or modelling to better understand the nexus between those needs to provide DOT's needs on the one hand and, you know, how many square feet and what kind of uses would be necessary to generate sufficient, you know, income for the developer to meet DOT's needs?

IRAM FAROOQ: We have -- second question first. We have, yes, just acquired some consulting services to be able to do some financial development economics analysis. We don't currently have -- you know, because of that timing, we don't have any additional information to provide at this time, but that's the missing piece that Ted was referring to that we do intend to bring back to the Board when we see you in the coming weeks.

But I do think that your point is a good one. And the key is to think about it in terms of a balance, right? So how are we just balancing all of these priorities? Because in some ways the transformation of the site is to achieve all of these positives, is what if those priorities, and we just need to make sure that we strike the

right balance.

STEVEN COHEN: And, again, Iram, I don't want to belabor this or any other point, but we have to find the right balance clearly, but I fear, and have felt in the past, that we're kind of doing this in the dark. It's hard enough to find the right balance when you have a better understanding of all of the pieces and factors and influences that you're trying to balance, but what we're trying to balance is our desires and needs from a planning perspective on the one hand with the financial requirements to do what we need to do for DOT on the other hand, but we don't have a clear understanding either of what their financial requirements are, No. 1, or, No. 2, to what extent any particular zoning development plan, you know, company generate those financial

requirements. So, you know, I feel that we're really maybe unavoidably, but navigating in the dark and we need to make decisions here, and it's very uncomfortable for me anyway to make these tough decisions and priority choices doing so in the kind of murk that I find myself.

IRAM FAROOQ: Well, for sure. And we will, like I said, we will be attempting to get you as much information as we can related to that. We'll -- it will still be at the -- at a modelling level because just like with the traffic analysis, unless there is a firm program which we suddenly do not have, it's really hard to have a really crisp analysis. But the, the one thought I want to throw out is that it's also worth thinking about this in the context of what we ask anybody else to do in the City of Cambridge.

And, frankly, if you look at the proposal right now, it's asking more than we ask anybody else in any other district in the city. So I think just in terms of balance that's also worth keeping, keeping in mind.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay, does anyone else have any other questions right now?

(No Response.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: Then why don't we go to public comment. And is there a sign-up sheet?

If you haven't signed up, you will still have an opportunity to speak before we close.

FROM THE AUDIENCE: (Inaudible).

H. THEODORE COHEN: So, there are only three names on it now, so anyone else will be given an opportunity to speak.

So when you are called, please come forward and state your name and address, and if necessary, spell your name for the stenographer. In general, we ask people to limit their comments to three minutes. And we will have a timekeeper but we won't cut you off instantly.

STEVEN COHEN: Eventually.

H. THEODORE COHEN: But eventually.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: You will hear a beep which will give you a warning that you're at your three minutes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Steve Kaiser.

STEVE KAISER: My name is Steve Kaiser and I live at 191 Hamilton Street and I know the traffic analysis you saw tonight was somewhat baffling. As a traffic engineer, I think I can summarize it so that it's not so overwhelming and maybe not so

significant. The two traffic studies that I've seen, one done by the CRA and the other done by MIT, both coming to the same conclusion. They looked at traffic in the future and found that in the peak hour when they assigned it, they ended up with 30 percent more traffic on the peak hour on Third Street which is backed up today. Okay?

And what this really tells us is the traffic analysis has no solutions. There's no magic bullet out there, no magic position out there that's going to say oh, boy, we can move more cars. It's just not going to happen, and the traffic engineers agree with that.

The transit system exactly the opposite. We've got a screwed up transit system with great capacity if we can find a way to use it. It's the only option we have

to be able to handle all this growth. We should be spending five percent of our concern on traffic and 95 percent on transit. And when we had the MIT session, I saw a very good discussion on this Board about transit, and a number of different perspectives. One perspective was that the MIT, that the MBTA has screwed up and they can't do anything or they can't get money so nobody will do anything. So let's go ahead with development.

And the third was Steve Cohen's concern is it's not rational to go ahead with development if you don't have the capacity on the Red Line. Somebody has to do something about that.

I come down right in the middle, which is if you don't do anything you don't develop. But you can do something. And what

you can do will allow for a certain amount of development. So let's find out what that is. And the reason I'm doing this because I live in Cambridgeport, because I'd like to see the development at Kendall Square and not in Central Square. Okay? So it's quite rational.

Now, just today, a report came out from the CRA and Boston Properties called an EIR and they go into exactly the question that Steve Cohen asked. I have a short paragraph that I hope will answer it. It says: The expanded transit analysis and this report says there's a great need for Red Line improvements if future ridership increases creating demand higher than available capacity. If improvements were implemented and trains ran according to the posted schedule of headways providing of peak hour

capacity of over 15,000 riders, there would be enough capacity to support the future demand. With the morning peak hour inbound route demanded capacity without the project is slightly over capacity with the project. So they're right on the edge. But here's this report which is right out saying in effect that's a possible solution. So, it's a very valuable conclusion that they have contributed in the analysis.

So let me just suggest a slightly different way of getting at who does what in the transit business. CRA and Boston Properties have done this report. I think if they could give us additional information on what's the effect of adding new cars to the line and then capacity and how that will help us, this would be a useful piece. MIT is a problem with bunching of the trains, they get

staggered and screwed up and everything else like that. They should come up with a very nice complicated computer model that would explain that. And the Volpe should explain international approaches of solving problems with transit and transit irregularities. And then when it comes to zoning --

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY:

Mr. Kaiser?

STEVE KAISER: I'll finish up with one line. I'm very concerned with how it's written. Our standard for zoning is to have the same goal for excellence as we have for transit.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Lee Farris.

LEE FARRIS: Good evening. Lee Farris, L-e-e F-a-r-r-i-s, 269 Norfolk

Street.

I still stand by the letter from the Cambridge Residents' Alliance that we sent I think back in June or July as well as my own comments. So I don't know if I should just resubmit them for the record, but other thoughts that occurred to me or that I want to emphasize based on what I'm hearing tonight are the -- I would like the Planning Board to consider putting in a requirement that whatever housing is in here must be built before the commercial is built because I'm concerned that if things dwindle out like North Point did or stall I think was the word, I want to end up with housing first. So that's one thought.

I would like it if when CDD is doing analysis of the FAR and the other changes that come about, I understand why the FAR of

the new Volpe building is not included, but I think it would be helpful to have that FAR information as you're going along, because if you have that information, then it will turn out that housing is not 40 percent of a minimum in the Volpe site, it's going to be far less. To me that is to come back around to my main point from before, a strong -- as well as my point with MXD, a strong point for requiring more housing. And that gets to the development economics question that Mr. Cohen was raising, because what I've looked at, cost to build and profit for housing versus commercial, there's some difference, but it's, it's not night and day. And I don't think that if you require more housing, that it's going to break a developer's bank. So that -- we need an answer on that.

I do want to reiterate the -- on the

affordable housing, I really feel that to see a lower requirement for low and moderate income housing here than we have in the rest of the city. I do think both kinds should be higher than they are, but I understand these things cost, so, you know, I would say if you're going to keep it at 15, meet the requirement somewhere else in the city 11.5 and 3.5.

May I have a little bit more time?

Thank you.

I wanted to raise a question of whether one PUD could share with another. So I thought of this particularly like meeting requirements -- I thought of this in particular with the innovation space because MIT has those old buildings that the historical folks would kind of like to see preserved. And I was thinking oh, wouldn't

that maybe be better innovation space than building something brand new? So just a thought and maybe there could be a transfer between for other items between the PUDs. And lastly I want to -- I appreciate CDD's reaching out and I look forward to see the aggregation of that. But I do feel that one aspect of it was not accurately portrayed in terms of my experience of it. It was described as a tradeoff conversation, but it wasn't -- it was a prioritization conversation. So to me tradeoff is, like, okay, Lee you get 100 points and you can distribute them between these things, and that then shows okay, does Lee really care more about open space or does she care more about affordable housing? So I think that conversation hasn't been had with residents. And, I'll also just add that the last

community forum I wasn't able to attend because it conflicted with other things, but I know two people who went and they said there was a very small number of people in attendance and that was rescheduled twice, that might have been why. So I think it would be interesting to try to do something that is more genuine tradeoff conversation with a larger number of people.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

James Williamson.

(No Response.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: Not here? Okay.

Bethany Stevens and then next will be Rosemary Booth.

BETHANY STEVENS: Hello. Bethany Stevens, 100 Spring Street. Chairman and Board Members I'm making this comment on

behalf of the East Cambridge Planning Team whose members voted to convey this message to the Planning Board and to the city. I'm going to summarize the comments because I only have three minutes, but I do have hard copies to give out to all the members as well.

So redevelopment of the federally owned 14-acre Volpe site in the heart of Kendall Square represents a singular and perhaps the largest, the last large scale opportunity to transform Kendall Square into a balanced live, work, play community as recommended by the 2013 Kendall Square Planning Study. The East Cambridge Planning Team and many other stakeholders and their consultants invested in enumerable hours participating in the city manager appointed K2 Plan Advisory Committee from 2011 to 2013. Now two years later the

K2 plan recommendations are apparently being overridden. Neither East Cambridge Planning Team, which is the formal advisory group for the neighborhood, nor groups from other impacted neighborhoods including Area 4 and Wellington-Harrington were invited to participate on formal committees or working groups to help develop the rezoning. This goes to Lee Farris's point about the community forums not being a tradeoff discussion and not taking advantage of these formal committees to have an actual working relationship.

The CDD, the City Manager to slow down the rezoning process and appoint the committee now and make the Volpe early action zoning master wide planning process. Given that we were not meaningfully included in the Volpe rezoning process, we formed a Volpe

subcommittee, which I'm one of the members of, to spend time analyzing the proposed up-zoning and make recommendations, which are:

Before finalizing any rezoning, wait for the Kendall Square Mobility Task Force that Ms. Rasmussen had spoken of. Especially in winter traffic, congestion, parking, and public transportation challenges are already acute in East Cambridge as the eight to ten million square feet of additional building by Alexandria, Boston Properties, MIT, Volpe and others come online, the situation will clearly be exacerbated. More study and information is required to plan properly.

As I just mentioned, and as Mr. Cohen had suggested as well, we need to look at this in terms of what the entire plan is for the city. We have the master planning

process going on and we would ask that this be an early action item under the citywide planning process where the Alewife planning area is and to look at the situation through that perspective.

And we also ask that before the finalizing of the rezoning as you've already requested, require the city to articulate the economic and political rationale for granting this bonus which is essentially approximately \$125 million in bonus value up-zoned from the K2 Planning Study, which was already from the residents' point of view a lot of concession in terms of density and height and that kind of a thing. We recommend that then and the letter lays out six recommendations to the proposed zoning changes that need to be maybe made. One of them is with respect to the FAR and that the FAR calculation should be

revised because currently it's listed as a 4.5 FAR, which is the K2 is at 4.0. It doesn't sound like a significant increase, but the 4.5 includes all 14 acres but excludes the federal buildings. So it actually would be giving you a 5.5 FAR so that there should be a revised FAR calculation that's not as misleading I would suggest as the current one.

The second thing that we would request is the amount of public open space should be at least five acres.

That this should exclude the federal land which the current petition does not include for.

That it should have at least one significant park at least three acres in size that receives adequate sunlight versus being in the shadow of the new building. The

reduction of open space by about 50 percent of the K2 plan, while increasing the density by about 30 percent, is unfair trade for residents. Typically the negotiation is that we will go ahead and give up the height and the density to gain the open space, but here we reduced the open space while increasing the density and the height. I just have three more points to make I'll be quick about them. Hopefully not too quick.

Also we have enough commercial. We should be looking at adjusting the housing ratio. Everybody's been talking about how we need new housing and the housing at maximum should be increased to allow for that.

Also we need to have increased infrastructure capacity, and any of this development needs to be contingent upon an increased structure capacity. We should

stick with the planning principle;
infrastructure first and development second.

We should also be looking at having detailed guidelines, detailed design guidelines. We're talking about including a building about up to 500 feet, which is almost twice the height of the current tallest building in the city. And in this we also have to look at severe weather events and integrate climate change, resiliency in the plan and guidelines that address those.

And lastly throughout all of this, we should be seeking to extract maximum community benefits for any concession that the city gets.

So I thank you very much for considering and I hope you will adopt our requests. We are happy to be available and to go through this process with you. Thank

you very much.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Rosemary Booth.

ROSEMARY BOOTH: Rosemary Booth,
like telephone booth. 303 Third Street.

All right, well, I'm glad to be speaking to the Planning Board and to have a chance to express my points of view on this very important issue. The Planning Board actually has an incredibly important mission to be the planning entity for our city. I trained here as a planner and I'm taking this quite seriously. I read the ECaPs study that was referred to tonight. I read the study of the Kendall Square final report, and I read the rezoning petition. And although there's been a lot of discussion tonight about how these were evolved to the current situation with the rezoning, that isn't what I found when I looked and put together a little

matrix of the key points of each of the housing requirements; the FAR, the building height. I mean affordable housing, of course, public open space, and almost every dimension there's a serious difference between the ECaPs study and even the K2 Study and what we're looking at right now. So, for example, it's a 50 percent increase in the allowable square feet. That's not just trivial when you're talking millions of square feet. Okay, as a resident and as a member of the community, it seems to me that moving ahead without waiting for two things at a minimum and one is the task force, the mobility task force that Susanne spoke to tonight, which will have valuable, useful, I hope relevant information. And the second item would be actual citywide planning data, maybe some early data from the citywide plan

that Iram introduced tonight and others have referred to. This is people's vision for what our city is going to be, and it would seem as if that would be what we would want to know, in planning this, to my mind, probably the most consequential development that's going to come before this Board for the next, I don't know what, and maybe ever. It's not another project. Rushing it right now when we have -- want to have a clear understanding, Steve Cohen mentioned this tonight, too, of the requirements and needs, would seem to me to be not only wouldn't feel right but it wouldn't make sense. Take the time to do it right. This is Cambridge. We should be leading the process and not responding to the complexities of three other entities; GSA, Volpe, and a developer who we don't know and won't know for quite a while.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Before we continue, I just would like to address that last point, which is that many of us on this Board, and staff, believe that we need to have zoning in place before GSA and the Department of Transportation move on their own, they have their own timeline and many of us believe that we cannot simply wait and let them go forward without putting Zoning in place. The City Council may have a different point of view and they're the ones that ultimately will adopt or not adopt Zoning, and I think the argument about the City should simply wait before it does anything is an argument that really should be made to them because, you know, this member on the Planning Board thinks that we would be remiss not to have Zoning in place when DOT

and GSA select a developer and tell the developer what they want.

IRAM FAROOQ: Mr. Chair, I would normally not interrupt but I did want to say one thing since there's a little break. Just a connection in terms of the FAR, because the K2 study suggested -- recommended 4.0, and I think that there seems to be a perception that this petition is recommending 4.5, but the difference is actually, we -- the 4.0 would have then had the inclusionary bonus on top of that. And if you recall what the Board had discussed when formulating the petition was to, that that was confusing and to in fact take that bonus and build it into the allowable FAR. So there will not be a bonus on top of the 4.5. So the idea is that they would be equivalent.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Yes.

STEVEN COHEN: Iram, could I just ask a question? It's been suggested tonight, and actually at the last hearing also, that with the FAR of 4.5, that somehow or another it doesn't reflect the gross floor area of the Volpe building itself.

Is that correct?

JEFF ROBERTS: Yes.

IRAM FAROOQ: That is correct, yes.

HUGH RUSSELL: And that was 150,000 square feet with the FAR of 0.6. If it was 400,000 square feet, it would be more like 0.7. That's the kind of additional floor area that would -- that you should mentally add in when comparing.

JEFF ROBERTS: I'll try to clarify. So FAR is, it's -- I mean, it's a little bit of an abstract concept the way we use it in Zoning because there are certain things in

all areas. Whenever we are controlling development, there are certain things that we include and certain things we don't include and we calculate it. And this one, really the unique thing about this is that government, the government use would not be included. There are other areas where we do, for instance, will exclude things that we might want like the ground floor retail. We might exclude that from the calculation of FAR. So there is always a difference between what the zoning controlled FAR is and what the -- what the actual, if you add up all of the physical floor area actually would be. But putting the FAR aside for a bit and just looking at the Kendall Square study and what development was anticipated and modelled, that study actually -- it sort of built in the new development around the Volpe

building. It essentially assumed that that would remain, would remain there. And in this case from the discussions that have been going on with Volpe and the GSA, the anticipation would be while the building would be replaced, the size would be the same as what's existing. In this case when we're talking about new development, we're talking about private residential, commercial retail that in addition to what essentially is existing for the transportation center.

STEVEN COHEN: Thank you.

The only thing I would say is for the benefit of the public and the Members of the Board. You know, just for clarity, full disclosure, I understand it's relevant to somehow as you say add it mentally or I think it should be, you know, verbally, so to help us understand the density that, you know,

we're contemplating that's being proposed and for comparing it to the density of other areas in the city where we're familiar with what 3.0 or 4.0 looks and feels like. It's almost just a matter of disclosure, though technically I understand what you're saying.

JEFF ROBERTS: And just to -- I don't want to dwell on this too much. Just to add a point, it is very -- in terms of FAR as an abstract concept, I've tried doing this before. It's very hard to determine what something looks like based on FAR. There are certainly lots of developments in the city that are much higher than an FAR of five or six or seven or ten and it's a -- it is a much more abstract concept than something like building height and floor plate and open space and setbacks. So we'll certainly include that information, but I do want to

caution it doesn't always tell us what we imagine it will tell us.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay, thank you.

Gerald O'Leary.

GERALD O'LEARY: Hi, Gerald O'Leary, 303 Third Street.

I agree that there's a need for more economic information. I think what we're facing here is a very complicated three-sided negotiation. And three-sided negotiations in game theory are sort of unsolvable problems, but I think we have to take a way of, you know -- of expressing Cambridge's interest in this. And I think that interest can be expressed through the Zoning process, because what we're doing is we're saying this is how much we'll allow you and we have to -- you have to decide whether you can make money on it.

Now, I think we're doing it backwards. We're saying how much development is going to be required to do what somebody else wants, what one of the other parties wants to do. So I think the zoning process is the one point where Cambridge has leverage to push back on the government and the developers at the same time to make sure this property represents what Cambridge really wants. And so I think Cambridge should decide through whatever planning process what they want this land to look like when it's developed, to make it attractive and to promote the ultimate long term economic growth of the city and meet the needs of the residential and cultural things for the people of this city and then offer that up through the zoning process to the developers and to the government and see whether they can make a go

of it. And maybe they will take another round of negotiations or maybe more arguments, but I don't think we should give away everything in the first round. But so -- I'm -- my emphasis would be to start the process by saying what we want and seeing if that's acceptable to the other parties. And I'd just like to endorse some of the things that some of the other -- Bethany said and the planning team, East Cambridge Planning Team meeting. I think to me if you're going to build a dense development, you need -- one of the most important things is to have some signature open space in that development which will be the identifying feature of that development. And it's a place where people will naturally flow through in the course of the day. And if they're flowing through naturally, they will

gather there, they will meet there, and that will become the identity, the identifying feature of the space. You know, we may actually call it the Kendall Square of Kendall Square much as, you know, you could look at things like Washington Square in New York or Britain House square in Philadelphia and places like that. But I think if that part is done right and the reasonable amount of development is done around it, the development will be a success and to the long term credit of Cambridge.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you. Tom Stohlman.

TOM STOHLMAN: I'm Tom Stohlman, 19 Channing Street. Spelling of the last name, S-t-o-h-l-m-a-n.

I was listening with interest to

Mr. Steven Cohen's comments like feeling he's in the dark. If you're in the dark, the public's certainly in the dark. And I just want to verify that this hearing is going to be continued and that we will have another chance to react and comment to whatever happens to this zoning petition. Is that the case?

H. THEODORE COHEN: That's the intention as of 9:20. Whether things change between now and 10:00 or 11:00 but it is, it is the intent that there will be further hearings and there will be further proposals and further opportunity for the public to testify.

TOM STOHLMAN: Great, excellent.

I want to say that I agree wholeheartedly with the comments from the East Cambridge Planning Team. They're very

good comments. I know they were fast, but take sometime to read them because they truly do reflect the immense amount of planning that went into the K2-C2 process and the previous ECaPs process. I don't think the zoning that's before you fully reflects those two efforts on the part of lots of people in the city to come up with a vision for Kendall Square.

I think that in particular the proportion of housing on the Volpe site is too low. The FAR is too high. The open space amount is too low. I've said all this before. I said it in the spring. And I'm just a little disappointed that after a whole summer's worth we still have the same stuff before us, the same original zoning proposal before us.

I -- lastly I want to agree with the

people who have stated that they believe, as do I, that this -- the proposal before you reflects more in fact of what the Volpe concerns are and the developer -- I assume the developer concerns are. And if you're going to pass a Zoning article prior to the developer being chosen, I'm hoping that it's our City's Zoning Article and not the developer's Zoning Article to begin with you.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Hasson Rashid.

HASSON RASHID: Hello. Hello, everybody. Peace be unto you. I'm Hasson Rashid, H-a-s-s-o-n R-a-s-h-i-d and I reside at 820 Massachusetts Avenue.

Okay, I prepared a written statement so I'm just going to read this off and say okay.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Can you try to

speaking closer into the microphone?

HASSON RASHID: All right. Can you hear me?

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: That's better.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

HASSON RASHID: The city's proposed up-zoning of 14 acres of the Volpe Center has been acted as an Ordinance would be a discriminatory and desperate impact towards our homeless sector in mosaic. Under the 14th Amendment of the Fair Housing Act of 1968, the Equal Protection Clause, proposed up-zoning changes will produce discriminatory and a fair housing violation against our jurisdictions homeless sector and mosaic. Those authorities such as a regional GFA, Federal Transportation Department, Volpe Center, and of course our municipal policy

makers and authorities are also or will be in violation of Title V of the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act 42 USC 24 CFR 581. And further, a violation of individual homeless rights of the 5th and 13th Amendment. The proposed up-zoning ordinance changes exclusionary to the homeless sector and mosaic. And this seems to accommodate the homeless sector mosaic by eliminating through those up-zoning land unit policy changes in places like Kendall Square. Much of the 14 acres of designated land has been laying dormant, vacant, and idle for sometime now while the need for additional homeless housing continues to increase the need to address homelessness and poverty on vacant government owned land and these are being denied towards the utilization of building a path out of poverty and ending homelessness.

Other examples of this in Cambridge are what's happening or going on at the Foundry building and the southern courthouse. These up-zoning changes are relating to impediments to fair and low income housing for the homeless population in our jurisdiction.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Heather Hoffman.

HEATHER HOFFMAN: Hello. Heather Hoffman, 213 Hurley Street. I feel the need to disagree somewhat with the -- what just came before me. I do not consider the land that people are using and enjoying and getting relief from the green space around the current buildings to be unused, vacant, abandoned, or anything else like that. And in fact, I really hope that we will not abandon the promise that has been made for a

good 15 years of a seven-and-a-half acre park there. All of the huge buildings in Kendall Square was supposed to be offset by this park. The up-zoning for Alexandria has its own parks. You don't get to double count them. And I would also like to echo what Tom Stohlman said. It's -- I'm really unhappy that the same thing that was pretty roundly rejected was just re-filed instead of taking the time to take a look and see how we could improve it, to have actual public hearings and discussions that should have been held before it was filed the first time. So instead we're wasting the time that the clock is ticking from the time that this was re-filed because everybody's thinking oh, the time is coming up that we have to vote on it. Why -- it's a lousy use of time.

And I do not understand why we can't

have -- why we can't include the government buildings in all of our calculations. Just because the government could cover this entire site with something a thousand feet tall if it chose, they're not gonna do that. We can control the other buildings by adding in what the government gets, and I don't see any good reason to, to lose our opportunity to put what amounts to a cap on the development there by just adding it all together. I would even suggest doing this more like the MXD Zoning and having a cap of this many square feet with certain limitations on how you can use it so at least this percent has to be housing, you know, things like that, but if we're going to have what we assume to be one developer, why are we not using the opportunity that we have to really say as others have said before me,

what we want there. Because when it comes right down to it, I don't believe that any developer is going to come in and not ask for changes. I, I mean I've been here long enough to see this for project after project after project, they want new zoning. So why do we give away the store to start with? Why don't we develop our own vision and understand that yes, we will probably end up making some changes and working with people once we have something a bit clearer, but to squander our opportunity to talk about this in a way that isn't hurried, to squander our opportunity to express our own vision and all of that, it's sad. We really owe ourselves more than that. And I imagine it would make you guys happier to not feel so squeezed.

Thank you.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Is there anyone else who wishes to speak?

BJORN POONEN: Yes. Hello, I'm Bjorn Poonen. My address is 303 Third Street and I work at MIT as a math professor. Last name is P-o-o-n-e-n. First name is B-j-o-r-n.

Okay, all right, so I wanted to say something about the FAR. There are a lot of numbers thrown around and I just want -- my feeling is that there are two reasonable ways you can try to measure the FAR. You could either include all of the land and all of the buildings or you could include only the non-federal land and include only the non-federal buildings. So you could -- okay, so those two ways. If you include all of the land and all of the buildings, then according to what we saw today, there's 2,000,972

square feet in the currently zoning proposal. That's not including the federal building. And according to what the Volpe and the GSA presented at the roundtable last April, there is also going to be a 400,000 square foot building. If you total that, that comes to 3.4 million square feet. On the other hand, if you, and all the land is 14 acres, which is 600,000 -- 600,000 square feet. If you just calculate the ratio, it's 5.5. So there's nothing to argue there. That's what it is. And if you don't include -- that's -- if you include all of the land and all of the buildings.

If you exclude the federal building and you also exclude the federal land, then the ratio is even higher. So that's -- yeah, so that's one comment I want to make.

Second comment was something that

occurred to me just in response to the presentation about the discussion of open space. So there is a discussion about whether we should, whether we should have a network of pathways through the neighborhood or just -- or just one large open space. But my feeling is that we don't really need to choose one or the other. I mean, there should be enough -- I mean, there should be enough -- we should have enough open space to do both. I mean, we don't have to use all of the open space for a park, but we can still have a large public park. And as I said, I mean we need a landmark. We need some sort of landmark park to make Kendall Square a place. And I mean, I don't think anybody would -- I mean, Washington Square Park was mentioned before. And I mean, I'd also mention Union Square in San Francisco. I

mean all the great cities have some park like this. I don't think anybody would say that wasn't the right place for a park, let's put a -- let's build extra buildings there. I don't think anybody would say that. So, I -- yeah, okay, that's what I wanted to say. So thank you for listening.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Thank you.

Is there anyone else who wishes to speak?

(No Response.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: If not, then I think we'll take a five minute break and then we'll come back and the Board will raise some questions and some issues and have some discussion.

(A short recess was taken.)

H. THEODORE COHEN: Ladies and gentlemen, can we reconvene?

All right, so why don't we start raising our concerns and comments and issues that we want further discussion on and amongst ourselves and amongst the staff. I think -- well, I'm not -- let's go as long as we need to go this evening, but we are going to be picking up again in a couple of weeks and I think, you know, we just want to churn up issues that we would have further discussion on.

Who would like to start? Hugh.

HUGH RUSSELL: Everybody else has been sort of repeating what they've said four months ago so I'm going to do it, too.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: Consistency is always good.

HUGH RUSSELL: So I would like to see the Volpe site redeveloped. I would like -- because I think getting a thousand

units of housing of which 150 to 200 are affordable is a good thing. It will help the whole district and it will be good in a sort of a general sense for the city, but we really need to have three or four thousand units of housing in Kendall Square and this is an important piece.

I would like to see the open space included in a network rather than just being something you can see as you go around the perimeter. And I like, I think, to connect Kendall Square plan, particularly the one that was selected really as a model for the approach that should be taken in terms of creating, you know, reasonable sized open -- significant open spaces at several places on the site, connecting into the network of pathways and movements. And to some extent rectifying the problem with the triangle in

Kendall Square which it doesn't have any open space to speak of except the plaza in front of the police station. I mean, it's got that wonderful rooftop garden which I've seen several times in my life -- well, it has two-thirds of it left but.... So I think the most important thing is to make sure that it gets done. And I'm not optimistic about the state of national politics in this country. There seems to be a majority of both houses of Congress who don't want to do anything, and I'm very worried that if we don't follow along with the GSA timetable, which says by 20th of January in 2017 they want to have a contract with a developer, that there's a significant risk that it won't happen in our lifetime and that would not be good for the city.

I would like that the result of this

development is not causing bad -- you know, impossible transportation situations. And so to converge on to the traffic study, which I think I get, which is it's trying to show the critical sum of the close-knit intersections that have the most traffic as a result of this development. It's trying to see which of those are in trouble, but I think it would be helpful for the Board to see, as we did see, 10 or 15 years ago where all the intersections are in the city. They've been, you know, their sort of level of service are a different kind of measure, and maybe more precise than can be used in this kind of projecting out to the future, but I think we know where they are and I feel quite certain that you're going to find plenty of problems on Third Street and problems on the Broadway corridor and, you know, the city street

corridor at Central Square. That intersection's a complicated intersection as it has a lot of conflicting -- to see what the overall pattern is. And, you know, if right now there's a whole bunch of problems in one particular area, you might -- we might be forced to say well, well, we can deal with the traffic at Third and Binney although that's one of the ones that's in the critical sum analysis is a worst intersection. Why is it the worst? Because it's -- there's a lot of traffic on Third Street trying to make turns and when it gets to Main Street proper.

I was -- there's sort of the comments between Steve and Susanne about the Red Line were very interesting because, because I felt that there was capacity there, because I know there were more vehicles on the line, 16 years ago there were more people being served

by the Red Line in the 1940s, you know, by the stations were having more boardings than they have now, headways were half of what they are now and those clunky old cars which, you know, only had four speeds was, it was like control, 1, 2, 3, 4, you would give you a little jerk when you moved into the next one, you could tell it. But the -- it produced more volumes. Also, of course when I was riding it 50 years ago, Kendall Square was like a dead station. There was nobody boarding there. That's changed.

The financial feasibility is of course the critical question for the GSA and for us and it's -- I mean, there are some significant developers who are looking at the site already, they probably already have their opinions about whether it's feasible or not, but they're probably not going to tell

us in this next few months because they don't want to give away important data to their competitors when they're trying to, you know -- you could ask somebody if they could derive what they were bidding and, you know, bid a dollar more and that kind of stuff for a million dollars more, ten million more. So I'm encouraged to think that we're going to have a consultant looking at those financial feasibility to see how far we can push. But I don't want to -- I don't particularly want to risk the development. I mean, I wouldn't -- some other people have been playing with it. I played with it. Gee, I wouldn't like to do that, but that shows the consequences of what do you -- what do you have to do to the building to get a much larger open space.

I guess that's all I want to say. I

mean, I don't -- I think we already know what the imponderables are, just try to chip away at them but we should -- I think the proposal that's on the table isn't very far from the K2 plan. It's apparently, you know, I don't hear the Volpe people saying, you know, oh, God, if you pass that, we're dead in the water. So it probably is in the realm of possibility to them and we -- can we get some more public benefits without making it impossible? I don't know. That's -- but I'd rather be conservative. And, you know, the FAR's a maximum. It's a limit. And I wonder, I guess to what extent there is a market for 15, 20 story technology buildings in Kendall Square. You know, if that's the development which is if there are 15-story buildings, does that mean that there's going to be Microsoft and Google rather than people

who are actually developing technology? I'd rather see our valuable resource of land in the city being used to develop the new technology.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Mary?

MARY FLYNN: This is a -- really the first time I think I've participated in the discussion on Volpe and I agree that it is a huge amount of information to digest very, very quickly. I think over the next few weeks really a lot of thought, a lot of my thought will be devoted to a number of issues that have already been raised. I do think the financial analysis is critical. It will, I think, inform our thinking a lot about what the right balance is between commercial and housing and just how much open space is achievable here. So I'm looking forward to getting that information very much. I think

that is a very important missing piece.

On the traffic and transportation side, in previous meetings I have mentioned as Steve did tonight, that the, to me it's really important to get a better handle on when do the potential transit improvements or adjustments to the existing Red Line, you know, when, when will that sort of begin to play into all of this? And how do you pace that versus the development as it comes before the Board? It's hard to imagine that you could require, you know, a particular developer or prevent, you know, say sorry but the Red Line hasn't come through with their improvements so you can't build. It's definitely a districtwide if not a region-wide problem. But I'd be interested if there are any examples anywhere else of staging development around transit or bike

improvements or any of the other kinds of modes that task force is going to look at. And also just getting a better sense of what the task force timetable is and how that would impact the zoning timetable.

And with the open space, I do think it is important to have a significant piece of open space in the area. It is an opportunity for the city to provide that, but I do agree with Hugh's comment that, you know, the network is important as well. So I wouldn't do a large open space at the exclusion of the smaller pieces that will make the whole district much more integrated.

I do agree that the development potential in this area is significant and it is important for the city. There has been a lot of study that's already been done. Obviously there will be more discussion. I

think that's important, too. I think we should stay on the timeline that we're on. That's it.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Catherine.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Okay, so starting with the transportation piece, I really agree that the idea that the capacity for this development and a lot of the others in Kendall Square is going to come from non-car modes. So that's the transit improvements. It's increasing bike share, it's bringing more housing to the area so people can more realistically walk to work. And I think that's a very realistic way of looking at things. It's a very important way of looking at things. That's not to say that we should assume no cars will come, that would be foolish, but a lot of the capacity and the balancing that Susanne was talking

about, I think you really do see more potential and to support this, you know, non-car modes. Therefore, the idea of how are we going to get that additional capacity in the Red Line is important, but I am somewhat stuck with the problem of when you see concurrency laws with respect to infrastructure in many places, that is infrastructure that the permitting body can control. And so if I am a suburban county and I say you can't expand your subdivision unless you have a sewer, I can give you a sewer permit. I can collect your money for the sewer, and I can build the sewer and then you can get your Building Permit. So that's something I can directly control and say you can do this if you do this. Even if that were legal in Massachusetts, which is arguable, we don't have that kind of control

over the MBTA. So we could not say to a developer, you may only build this project if you give us the money needed to increase the Red Line capacity. Because even if we took all that -- even if we had a developer who was willing to provide every last cent of that and we took all that money and we gave it to the state and we said please build the Red Line to capacity, we have no guarantee that would happen.

On the other hand, so that's, that's the problem with the requiring concurrency with the infrastructure in this particular case.

On the other hand, what I like about this development plan, the MIT development plan, and the task force as a whole, is it is building the political capital to both insist on private contributions that will help and

the political well within the State House to understand that it is necessary. That's not a guarantee. It's not something we can hold up any individual exercising private property rights over in my opinion, but this is building that momentum, that case to the state that says Red Line capacity is key to our economic development as a state. And we, whether it's just Google and Microsoft or it's Google, Microsoft, and MIT, and the city and, you know, and the biotech council and whomever else, are willing to pony up, you know, more than our share from tax dollars to make sure this happens, but we need you the state to be our partner. That takes a tremendous amount of lobbying especially in an era of constrained budgets, but I think that's how this happens. And I don't think it's appropriate or really within the scope

of this Board to say you can't go forward without that.

That said, once we get to project review, which is a whole different kind of analysis, we do have to make a finding that the traffic and transportation impacts from any given project are tenable. And folks may have read Traffic and Parking's very good memos on very Special Permits, but they actually delineate almost all of the exceedances of Planning Board criteria, but what kinds of measures have to be undertaken to alleviate those exceedances. So for instance, if there's a level of service exceedance at Third and Binney or something like that, that could be attributed to that project. They say we, therefore, need you to pay X number of dollars towards signal improvements to alleviate that issue.

Similarly improving bike and pedestrian infrastructure, intersection configuration, all those things that the city actually has control over, we do very well at the project level of looking at the impacts, making sure the developers are paying their share of offsetting those impacts. And I think, you know, the task force is going to be a really critical component of making sure that extra piece that we don't control also happens. I think that's all I have to say on the transportation side for now.

On the affordable housing side someone tonight commented that it was unfortunate that the recommended zoning is below the now adopted citywide standard for the percentage of affordable housing per low and moderate income people, and I would agree with that. I don't know whether or not the whole number

needs to go up or if we need to -- or if it really is some gain, and we need to take it away from middle. But I don't think it's right to say that this project has to do less in low and moderate income housing than we did anywhere else in the city. And I do think, like Hugh, that I want to see this project happen because I think it has tremendous potential for creating not just low and moderate income housing, but housing in general, which both this neighborhood and the city desperately needs.

On the economic analysis side, I'm, I'm really looking forward to seeing that, because right now I feel like we're negotiating against ourselves and that's something in my practice as an attorney I try very hard not to do. You know, I hear that there are fears, that what we're doing --

that all these asks that we're putting on this, makes the project untenable. And that, again, I want to see this project happen. I agree with Hugh's analysis of the timeline. I think it's important. But I also think it's important that we take advantage of the opportunity to get the best development we can and right now without the economics, I feel like we're just -- have a lot of fear without much basis for that other than kind of this abstract oh, if we ask too much we won't get it at all. And that to me feels like well, I offer -- I offer you \$10 and you say that's not enough. Oh, okay, how about 20? Without having any idea of 20 or 200 or 11 is acceptable. And I -- it's -- I don't like that feeling and so I'm really hoping that there is some economic analysis, you know, short of getting full disclosure on the

pro formas that GSA is putting together and thinking of as they're getting ready to analyze the proposals. Having our own analysis of what we really think this is going to take is kind of crucial to knowing if we're in the right ballpark on the total FAR. That's it.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Steve.

STEVEN COHEN: Well, just picking up on your last point, Catherine, what I characterize as the murkiness of the financial analysis. You know, it's not even a matter of GSA disclosing their figures. At best the GSA and transportation can tell us what their program is, but what the cost of producing a program, you know, they probably don't know clearly themselves. And how profitable the commercial and residential development will be for the developer is

certainly not something that the feds know anything about. So it is murky but it is going to be difficult to find our way out of that darkness and that is going to be I think a frustrating thing for us.

And I think somehow or another we have to find an appropriate path whereby on the one hand we understand that we have to make this project financially feasible for a developer, which is to say sufficiently profitable, you know, to fund the transportation work. But on the other hand, not be so fearful that we're asking so much that we unduly compromise our own interests as the central planning body for the city.

You know, I like you all very much. Would like to see this site developed, but I would rather see it lie fallow than somehow or another find ourselves facilitating a bad

development here. And I, you know, I want to make sure that we avoid that and that we find that right balance, that right path between financial feasibility and our own goals as planners which is hard to do right now.

A few general comments, you know, I always try to look at the stuff that we do from a regional perspective as well as from the narrow parochial perspective, and I always say, I'll say it again, from a regional perspective, you know, I believe that development should try to focus in the urban center and not so much spread out in the suburbs which, you know, what is more of the mid-20th century model. And Kendall Square is that urban center and so, you know, this is the right place to be doing a development like this. And as far as this kind of development, I mean this is the sort

of biotech and high tech commercial uses and lab uses that we're talking about here are not only the economic engine of the City as we've discussed, but I mean they are the economic engine of Boston and the region. And so, you know, for all of these regionally economic and development reasons also, I mean, I like -- you guys are motivated to make this happen here, but not at all costs and I want to make sure that it's a good development.

I've been a little bit concerned that maybe out of, you know, fear that somehow or another we're going to, you know, not give enough square footage to the developer, that somehow or another we're going to undermine the economic feasibility of the project. I think perhaps we've been a little bit too fearful about that, and frankly in the first

go-round a few months ago, you know, staff put together a number of massing studies, and I didn't find any of those massing studies terribly appealing, and I was nervous that perhaps we were trying to stuff the perennial hundred pounds of manure into an 80 pound bag or maybe in a 60 pound bag. And actually, I came into the hearing tonight with that concern and fear, but thank God for breaks. During the break we were up there playing around with the Styrofoam models and Hugh taking the lead on moving them around, and actually it seemed clear to me that we could come up with a massing that I thought worked in which a density did not seem inappropriate with that sort of network of smaller open spaces that I thought worked. And Hugh actually, you know, questioning the large open space versus a smaller one, Hugh drew

the analogy to -- what's the name of the park?

HUGH RUSSELL: Winthrop Square.

STEVEN COHEN: Winthrop Square in Harvard Square. It's a tiny little pocket park in the square, but it's vibrant and dynamic and youthful and totally increases the appeal and desirability of that density neighborhood. And I think that's a great analogy and model for what can be done here, but not just one. You know, instead of one big space, you could probably do, you know, two or three or more smaller lovely spaces like that. And I think that would be actually the best way to use open space, but also facilitates a better massing design of the building and allows us to offset buildings and, you know, set back perhaps from a tall building from across the street.

And I think it gives it the sort of flexibility in the design that might work.

So, I mean the good news was that as we played around with it, I think that we can come up with a massing that works at this density. On the other hand, I'm nervous whether, you know, a developer is going to come up with it, and traditionally it seems to me that, you know, that it's the developers that come to us with their plans, and they're frequently well worked out and they put a lot of time and effort and work into it and we feel a little bit reluctant to totally upset their applecart and we end up, you know, sort of making suggestions and improvements around the edges. And, you know, I wish if we're going to go down this road with this project with this kind of density that somehow or another that we can,

you know, define a design process in which we get much more involved, much earlier in the process, and I don't want them to design the goddamn buildings. I want them to come in with Styrofoam and do exactly what we did, you know, here to come up with a massing model that works for us and we can, you know, ask for revisions and changes without feeling guilty that we're imposing tremendous costs on them to totally redo the elaborate design that they've already worked on. I would feel much more comfortable about this kind of density if we could have that kind of early input on the massing.

Transportation, I voiced great concerns about transportation earlier, but I've heard from some people today and from some others here that what I in fact characterized as insufficient capacity in the mass transit,

well, that's not an inalterable fact of life. That in fact is relatively easy to address, all it takes is money and new equipment and so forth. And the Planning Board has limited input on that, but we as a city can have more impact on that. So I would say as part of our process, that we really call upon the city manager and the city administration to make it a priority of this City's policy to upgrade the mass transit system at very least on the Red Line serving Kendall Square, if not others. And I would call upon our state representatives and senators as well as the municipal administration to make that a priority and lobby, you know, not just massDOT but the governor and ultimately massDOT would love to accommodate us, they just don't have any money. So, you know, we've got to go to the legislature which has

turned down various bills in the recent past to increase transportation budgets and really impress upon them this isn't some parochial priority that the City of Cambridge has, this is a project of regional importance, of state importance. It is -- should be a priority for the state to facilitate it, but in order for this day to happen, we have a transportation issue, problem here and it's not that difficult. We're not asking to create a whole new Green Line or anything. We're asking for more equipment, more frequency on the Red Line. It's a necessity to go forward on this site.

So, you know, I will leave it at that. In general, obviously, I support this thing. I think there are things that we can do to improve the process. I'm sorry, one last thing, affordable housing. You know, there

are several folks here who said look, we should put out there what we want and, you know, just see if it flies. And there are others on the Board who said I'm nervous about asking too much because I don't want to kill the goose that laid the golden egg. You know, I hear both sides because we don't know the economics here, I don't know where to come down on it. We should be asking for the moon but maybe we can be asking for a little bit more. Last time around I guess, Hugh, I'm repeating myself also, on affordable housing I'd be inclined to push the envelope a little bit and go to 15 and 5. You know, this is one of the most desirable real estate parcels in the country, right? This is one of the most desirable markets in the country. You know, I don't know the economics well enough to say with any certainty one way or

another, but I suspect that given the valley here, the developer could find a way to make it work.

In any event, at this moment in time I have no reason to believe otherwise. So unless and until I'm provided with information and reason to believe otherwise, I go 15 and 5 on the affordable.

I think that's it for today.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Lou?

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: I guess I won't re-cover any of the items my -- much of my eloquent colleagues have gotten over. I think it's a great project for the -- that end of the city. I think it needs to be a landmark of some sort. I'd also like to see the open space more usable, and to tell you what that means, I don't know. Some kind of an outdoor gathering spot connected to all of

the other pathways in the area, sounds like the right move.

As far as the transportation, I don't have a lot of faith in the Red Line getting too much improvements in the next decade. The DOT's got a lot of irons in the fire, so I don't know where that goes. But we really need to -- I think all the ingredients are in this. How it's going to get played out, because I guess is up to us all, but I think it's all there. The housing -- one of the things that bothers me, housing. Some of the taller buildings that are residential, I can see some of the younger crowd wanting to live in a 30-story building. I don't know if families really want to be on the 30th floor of a high rise. So maybe some thoughts on that, but I guess I'll leave that, leave it at that for now.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Okay.

Well, most everything has already been said, I just want to try and summarize and raise a couple of questions.

I too believe that January 1917 -- 2017 is a significant and important date and that it would be wrong to not be able to facilitate GSA and DOT, Volpe, whoever the body is, to be able to have a contract by the time the administration changes. And so I do think it's important that we -- the City do something.

I think the project is good.

I think that we need more development, both commercial and residential and retail in this particular location.

You know, is 40 percent residential the correct number? I'm not certain about that.

You know, maybe we could have some further

discussion about that. It's, you know, Iram was speaking last week about the CRA and the MRX, and when we were talking about what the correct proportions in Kendall Square were and that these were numbers that had been worked out, you know, through K2 and through the ECaPs plan and that, you know, they're not making any more landscape in Cambridge. So, you know, we can only have commercial in a couple of places, and maybe this is a spot where we have to have a higher percentage of commercial. And if we assume we need several thousand more units of residential housing, we have to figure out where that can be. So a thousand units here, you know, is a start. Could it be something more than a thousand? I don't know. And, again, that ties back into some of the economics. So I'd like to look at that again.

With regard to the affordable housing, I think actually what we did several months ago was misconstrued by a lot of people. There certainly was no intent to go below the 11.2 low and moderate income housing that the formula 15 percent gives, but we felt that as important as low and moderate was, middle income was also important, and sticking to a real 15 percent, we split it 10 and 5 because we felt all three levels were important. Obviously a lot of people feel to the contrary, and I think over the past several months other proponents for other projects have been giving or being required to do 20 percent, and so I think I would be happy with 15 percent low and moderate and five percent middle. And if economically we could push it even a little higher than that, great. But I think that the 20 percent is the correct

minimum at this point.

All of it ties into the issues of density and height and open space, too. I think to get what we want in terms of the amount we need in this particular location, we have to have higher density. I think every city is grappling with that now, that if you need more housing, you don't have more land, you have to go up higher. And, you know, I think this does indeed need to be a landmark spot for entering into the city and I think yes, you can have a park, you know, like Washington Square Park, that's terrific, and that can be a landmark. I think you can also have a building that's a landmark. You know, we're not going to get the Empire State Building here, but, you know, certainly the John Hancock building has become a landmark for Boston. And open space in and of itself

does not guarantee that it will be a wonderful space. Take a look at Boston City Hall Plaza which has never been successful at being a usable space for anything, and it's quite large and nobody goes there. On the other hand, Winthrop Square Park, people go to all the time. So it's, you know, it's a design issue, what is the right thing for this particular location? Maybe it's a building. Maybe it's a park. Maybe it's a combination of the two. Maybe it's some artistic point. Chicago has giant Picasso, you know, in front of one of its buildings. Chicago has lots of urban art, very large urban art. So I think we ought to be able to allow for the flexibility that a developer can come along and say, this is what I want to put here, and when we talk about the 500-foot building, it was only if it was

something that was architecturally significant. And I think that is still a rational thing to do and a good thing for us to do.

You know, with regard to transportation, I am convinced that the Red Line issue can be resolved, you know, whether it's the T or the state has the will or the money to do it, is a different issue. But I think if this gets developed and if the Red Line becomes, you know, just over subscribed at many times, there will be pressure on the T and the state to do something. Just as I think it was the Microsoft and the Googles that lobbied the governor to extend the hours of the T and because their employees didn't work nine to five, that they worked frequently through the night and were going home at two, three, four in the morning and

coming into work at that time. That if there is pressure from -- brought about by the people who are living and working in this development that the state and T will be forced to take some action. You know, that's anybody's guess how it's going to happen, but I do believe it can happen.

I think, you know, open space I am of two minds about it. And, you know, I think the idea of networking is good. I think we need to have some flexibility there to see what a developer wants to do, if you really want a three-and-a-half acre open space in the middle of things, then it's going to have to be run by taller buildings. And does that make it better than having smaller spaces between some lower buildings? I'm not sure. I think, you know, the Connect Kendall, you know, people had great ideas and they ought

to be able to play out with the development here.

I think I've covered everything that --
Steve.

STEVEN COHEN: Just a couple of quick things.

First of all, on transportation, the T does not have the money. To me, this is a legislative issue and we need to be lobbying the legislature on this thing. And forgive me if I'm repeating myself on this. The city and its representatives really need to make this a priority, and I think it's up to us since we're the ones sort of initiating this, it's really is up to us to lobby the city and our representatives to in turn lobby the state. This hasn't been high on our agenda, but I think it must be.

One other thing that I would say, you

know, I mentioned earlier that I was concerned about the massing here, and it might seem too dense, but then we played around here and I said oh, you know, this can work. But as I'm listening to your comments here, I realize that for me anyway, the only thing that was making it work was the height.

LOUIS J. BACCI, JR.: True.

STEVEN COHEN: Because without that height it would be much too boxy down on the ground and I just do not think it would work as a good urban planning.

So, if I'm right about that, I then bear in mind two comments with Lou and I think Hugh or somebody raised, Lou raised the question well, do people want to live so high? And I think it was you who says well, tech companies want to be in buildings that tall. Well, those are pretty darn good

threshold questions because if the answer to either one of those is no, then we can't provide that kind of height, and in my view, if we can't provide that kind of height and this kind of density and this kind of FAR, you know, may not work well here. And if you can't get that kind of density, well, then we may not be able to generate the economic, you know, viability with transportation. So I think that's an important threshold question and I think that you folks, staff I'm talking to, I don't think we have to hire big, you know, consultants and stuff. I think you can pick up the phone and call some of the residential developers and commercial developers in the city and get some, you know, good useful feedback on how they would react to that kind of height for the uses that they are familiar with. It's an

important marketing question and, you know, if the demand ain't there, then we really need to go back to the drawing board in my view.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Well, I think it's fine to look into it. I can't believe given the housing market that there won't be demand for any housing that we build, and if families don't want to live at a certain height, then people who do want to live there will live up there and the families will live at lower levels whether it makes sense for, you know, lab and commercial, I have no ability to comment about that.

STEVEN COHEN: I have no knowledge one way or the other either, but it's such an important threshold question that I think it would be important to get, you know, some kind of confirmation and not simply go on our

gut feelings, which every now and then turn out to be wrong.

CATHERINE PRESTON CONNOLLY: Yours?

STEVEN COHEN: Even mine.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Any other comments?

Iram.

IRAM FAROOQ: I just wanted to respond briefly to Steve's question. So one of the things that the GSA did in their current RFQ is that they asked all of the developers to come talk to the city so that they could hear about the discussions that are ongoing and give us any feedback. And so, we have spoken to most of the development teams -- well, actually, I don't know, maybe some of them didn't come to us, but I do -- because we don't have a full list. But we spoke to many teams, and mostly it was us

giving them information, but they were certainly reacting to things. And while clearly there was this issue of not wanting to show their hand or give us a lot of information, but I will say that we did not hear this push back that it was completely -- you know that the height was a problem or -- because the height only works with -- I mean, the open space percentage requires that if you are to maximize that density, you in fact have to go up. And we did not hear concern about that from folks, but we did certainly hear that in terms of a thousand-foot building because nobody -- nobody that we spoke to who responded felt that they would be able to really tenant that much square footage all at once. So that was the big -- that was the big concern that we heard. It was not so much who would want to be up

there, because if it's not -- it will change the nature, because as Hugh was saying, you're not going to have little startup on the top floor of 15 or 20 floor building, but you probably will have more of the Microsofts and Googles and other companies.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Does anyone know how tall is the millennium tower that's being built downtown Boston?

STEVE KAISER: 50 stories.

H. THEODORE COHEN: 50 stories?

STEVE KAISER: Yes.

H. THEODORE COHEN: And my understanding is that it's 99 percent sold or tenanted. So I think there is, you know, a market for it in this area.

LEE FARRIS: It's not my place, but does anyone know if there are families living there and do the families -- (inaudible)?

H. THEODORE COHEN: I don't know.

You know, there is a requirement that so many of the units will be for families, they will be three bedrooms and will be for families.

If there are no further comments, then we will continue the hearing on November 17th? Is that a definite date?

JEFF ROBERTS: Yes, November 17th and we'll have materials in advance.

H. THEODORE COHEN: Great. Thank you all for coming and look forward to continuing the discussion.

And I don't think we have anything else. We are adjourned.

(Whereupon, at 10:45 p.m., the
Planning Board Adjourned.)

* * * * *

ERRATA SHEET AND SIGNATURE INSTRUCTIONS

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

INSTRUCTIONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set
my hand this 4th day of December 2015.

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

My Commission Expires:
April 29, 2022

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

<p style="text-align: center;">\$</p> <p>\$10 [2] - 84:9, 168:13 \$12 [1] - 81:6 \$125 [1] - 120:11 \$15 [1] - 81:8 \$20 [1] - 90:8</p>	<p>1999 [1] - 45:3</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">4</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">A</p>	<p>action [4] - 83:16, 118:16, 120:2, 188:5 actions [1] - 34:5 active [6] - 10:12, 16:2, 24:7, 81:13, 82:1, 90:10 activities [2] - 19:11, 22:17 actual [4] - 118:12, 125:18, 130:13, 143:11 acute [1] - 119:10 add [11] - 39:11, 48:4, 49:11, 49:16, 70:18, 75:14, 115:19, 129:15, 130:13, 131:17, 132:9 added [2] - 47:12, 54:2 adding [4] - 65:11, 110:16, 144:6, 144:10 addition [3] - 73:18, 98:5, 131:10 additional [6] - 102:7, 110:15, 119:11, 129:13, 141:14, 162:4 additive [2] - 64:5, 64:6 address [6] - 106:2, 123:11, 127:4, 141:16, 146:4, 177:2 addressed [1] - 58:4 adds [1] - 39:11 adequate [1] - 121:18 adjourned [1] - 196:14 Adjourned [1] - 196:16 adjusting [1] - 122:12 adjustments [3] - 73:1, 73:2, 159:7 administration [3] - 177:8, 177:14, 182:10 administrative [1] - 3:10 adopt [5] - 7:4, 42:1, 123:17, 127:13 adopted [6] - 13:1, 40:15, 58:11, 81:5, 85:6, 166:16 Adoption [1] - 2:4 advance [1] - 196:9 advantage [2] - 118:11, 168:6 advertise [1] - 19:14 advertised [1] - 19:12</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">0</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">2</p>	<p>4 [4] - 20:4, 33:1, 118:5, 155:6 4.0 [4] - 121:2, 128:7, 128:10, 132:4 4.5 [6] - 86:13, 121:2, 121:4, 128:9, 128:17, 129:4 40 [6] - 54:2, 54:3, 86:16, 89:8, 113:5, 182:17 400,000 [2] - 129:12, 147:5 42 [1] - 141:3 4th [1] - 198:9</p>	<p>a.m [1] - 75:12 abandon [1] - 142:19 abandoned [1] - 142:17 ability [1] - 192:14 able [19] - 14:11, 23:4, 26:5, 34:14, 35:13, 72:5, 92:11, 97:1, 98:14, 98:18, 102:3, 108:1, 116:1, 182:7, 182:9, 186:15, 189:1, 191:8, 194:16 absolutely [3] - 49:8, 60:8, 74:9 abstract [4] - 129:18, 132:10, 132:16, 168:11 accelerating [1] - 39:18 acceptable [6] - 59:5, 60:2, 60:4, 60:6, 135:7, 168:16 access [2] - 26:5, 70:10 accessible [2] - 16:15, 25:16 accessory [1] - 3:17 accomm [1] - 97:1 accommodate [3] - 82:8, 141:8, 177:17 accommodates [1] - 93:17 accordance [1] - 60:3 according [3] - 109:18, 146:18, 147:3 account [2] - 57:17, 79:1 accurate [2] - 197:16, 198:7 accurately [1] - 115:8 achievable [1] - 158:18 achieve [2] - 76:13, 102:17 acquired [2] - 101:12, 102:2 acre [2] - 143:1, 188:13 acres [10] - 87:5, 87:7, 87:8, 90:12, 121:4, 121:12, 121:17, 140:8, 141:12, 147:8 Act [2] - 140:12, 141:3 act [1] - 18:6 acted [1] - 140:9</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">0.6 [1] - 129:11 0.7 [1] - 129:13</p>	<p>2 [4] - 66:6, 101:12, 103:17, 155:6 2,000,972 [1] - 146:19 2.1 [1] - 89:18 20 [7] - 1:4, 157:15, 168:15, 184:14, 184:19, 195:4 200 [2] - 151:1, 168:15 2000 [1] - 45:3 2001 [1] - 11:8 2010 [1] - 40:10 2011 [5] - 9:14, 9:17, 34:13, 34:16, 117:19 2013 [3] - 85:7, 117:14, 117:19 2015 [2] - 1:4, 198:9 2017 [2] - 152:14, 182:5 2022 [1] - 198:15 2025 [1] - 48:13 2030 [6] - 37:6, 48:1, 48:3, 48:7, 48:9, 48:14 2040 [1] - 33:7 20th [2] - 3:4, 152:14 213 [1] - 142:11 229 [1] - 2:6 24 [1] - 141:3 25 [2] - 87:4, 90:14 2551 [2] - 2:6, 7:14 269 [1] - 111:19 26th [1] - 8:2 27th [1] - 3:12 28 [1] - 51:1 29 [1] - 198:15 299 [1] - 7:14 29th [2] - 7:2, 7:11 2nd [1] - 6:2</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">5</p> <p>5 [3] - 179:14, 180:8, 184:9 5,000 [1] - 82:4 5.5 [2] - 121:6, 147:10 50 [8] - 75:18, 76:5, 122:1, 125:8, 155:10, 195:10, 195:11 500 [2] - 88:17, 123:6 500-foot [1] - 186:19 581 [1] - 141:3 5th [1] - 141:5</p>	<p>action [4] - 83:16, 118:16, 120:2, 188:5 actions [1] - 34:5 active [6] - 10:12, 16:2, 24:7, 81:13, 82:1, 90:10 activities [2] - 19:11, 22:17 actual [4] - 118:12, 125:18, 130:13, 143:11 acute [1] - 119:10 add [11] - 39:11, 48:4, 49:11, 49:16, 70:18, 75:14, 115:19, 129:15, 130:13, 131:17, 132:9 added [2] - 47:12, 54:2 adding [4] - 65:11, 110:16, 144:6, 144:10 addition [3] - 73:18, 98:5, 131:10 additional [6] - 102:7, 110:15, 119:11, 129:13, 141:14, 162:4 additive [2] - 64:5, 64:6 address [6] - 106:2, 123:11, 127:4, 141:16, 146:4, 177:2 addressed [1] - 58:4 adds [1] - 39:11 adequate [1] - 121:18 adjourned [1] - 196:14 Adjourned [1] - 196:16 adjusting [1] - 122:12 adjustments [3] - 73:1, 73:2, 159:7 administration [3] - 177:8, 177:14, 182:10 administrative [1] - 3:10 adopt [5] - 7:4, 42:1, 123:17, 127:13 adopted [6] - 13:1, 40:15, 58:11, 81:5, 85:6, 166:16 Adoption [1] - 2:4 advance [1] - 196:9 advantage [2] - 118:11, 168:6 advertise [1] - 19:14 advertised [1] - 19:12</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">1</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">3</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">6</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">7</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">8</p>
<p>1 [5] - 56:14, 66:5, 101:8, 103:17, 155:6 10 [2] - 153:10, 184:9 100 [2] - 115:13, 116:18 10:00 [1] - 137:11 10:45 [1] - 196:15 10th [1] - 3:19 11 [2] - 69:7, 168:16 11.2 [1] - 184:5 11.5 [1] - 114:8 11:00 [1] - 137:11 12 [1] - 33:4 12th [1] - 6:6 13 [1] - 19:11 13,000 [1] - 19:12 13.10 [2] - 2:9, 9:3 13th [1] - 141:5 14 [4] - 121:4, 140:8, 141:12, 147:8 14-acre [1] - 117:9 147703 [1] - 198:14 14th [1] - 140:12 15 [11] - 87:1, 114:7, 143:1, 153:10, 157:15, 179:14, 180:8, 184:6, 184:9, 184:16, 195:4 15,000 [1] - 110:1 15-story [1] - 157:17 150 [1] - 151:1 150,000 [1] - 129:10 1500 [1] - 46:11 16 [2] - 91:7, 154:18 17th [4] - 4:5, 78:7, 196:7, 196:8 18th [1] - 6:6 19 [1] - 136:16 191 [1] - 106:15 1917 [1] - 182:5 1940s [1] - 155:1 1968 [1] - 140:13 1998 [2] - 41:8, 47:16</p>	<p>3 [2] - 90:1, 155:6 3.0 [1] - 132:4 3.3 [1] - 5:16 3.4 [1] - 147:7 3.5 [1] - 114:9 30 [2] - 107:6, 122:3 30-story [1] - 181:15 303 [3] - 124:4, 133:6, 146:4 30th [1] - 181:16 344 [1] - 1:6 350 [2] - 19:18, 88:16</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">9</p> <p>60 [1] - 173:7 600,000 [2] - 147:9 617.786.7783/617.639.0396 [1] - 1:18</p> <p>75 [1] - 81:15 7:00 [2] - 1:5, 2:9</p> <p>80 [1] - 173:6 820 [1] - 139:16 89 [1] - 69:11 8:30 [1] - 75:12</p> <p>95 [1] - 108:3 99 [1] - 195:14 9:00 [1] - 75:12 9:20 [1] - 137:10</p>	<p>60 [1] - 173:7 600,000 [2] - 147:9 617.786.7783/617.639.0396 [1] - 1:18</p> <p style="text-align: center;">7</p> <p>75 [1] - 81:15 7:00 [2] - 1:5, 2:9</p> <p style="text-align: center;">8</p> <p>80 [1] - 173:6 820 [1] - 139:16 89 [1] - 69:11 8:30 [1] - 75:12</p> <p style="text-align: center;">9</p> <p>95 [1] - 108:3 99 [1] - 195:14 9:00 [1] - 75:12 9:20 [1] - 137:10</p>	<p>60 [1] - 173:7 600,000 [2] - 147:9 617.786.7783/617.639.0396 [1] - 1:18</p> <p style="text-align: center;">7</p> <p>75 [1] - 81:15 7:00 [2] - 1:5, 2:9</p> <p style="text-align: center;">8</p> <p>80 [1] - 173:6 820 [1] - 139:16 89 [1] - 69:11 8:30 [1] - 75:12</p> <p style="text-align: center;">9</p> <p>95 [1] - 108:3 99 [1] - 195:14 9:00 [1] - 75:12 9:20 [1] - 137:10</p>

<p>Advisory [1] - 117:18 advisory [1] - 118:3 affordability [2] - 16:4, 91:19 Affordable [2] - 81:2, 90:9 affordable [21] - 15:11, 17:14, 21:8, 21:15, 21:16, 25:12, 62:8, 80:15, 86:19, 90:7, 97:2, 114:1, 115:17, 125:3, 151:2, 166:13, 166:17, 178:19, 179:12, 180:8, 184:1 afternoon [1] - 74:15 afterwards [1] - 17:12 age [1] - 71:8 agenda [3] - 3:12, 5:15, 189:17 aggregate [2] - 48:6, 48:16 aggregation [1] - 115:7 ago [13] - 38:11, 39:6, 39:10, 45:4, 48:18, 101:10, 150:14, 153:10, 154:19, 155:10, 173:1, 184:3 agree [10] - 107:14, 133:7, 137:17, 138:19, 158:8, 160:9, 160:15, 161:7, 166:18, 168:4 agreeable [1] - 78:11 agreed [3] - 45:2, 47:19, 52:17 agreement [3] - 8:8, 25:11, 29:15 ahead [6] - 50:4, 60:17, 108:10, 108:13, 122:5, 125:13 ain't [1] - 192:2 Alewife [5] - 37:3, 68:10, 68:14, 70:14, 120:3 Alexandria [3] - 90:17, 119:12, 143:4 alleviate [2] - 165:13, 165:19 Alliance [1] - 112:3 allow [8] - 48:15, 89:18, 93:7, 109:1, 122:15, 133:17, 186:16 allowable [2] - 125:9,</p>	<p>128:16 allowed [3] - 42:6, 95:3, 95:4 allowing [2] - 88:13 allows [3] - 59:6, 99:15, 174:17 almost [4] - 123:7, 125:4, 132:5, 165:10 alone [2] - 41:13, 71:18 alternative [2] - 96:1, 99:4 alternatives [2] - 92:2, 94:9 amend [2] - 2:9, 9:3 Amendment [2] - 140:12, 141:6 amendments [2] - 11:10, 81:5 amenities [1] - 20:10 amenity [1] - 26:12 Ames [1] - 31:12 amount [19] - 17:18, 18:3, 21:18, 36:6, 40:17, 42:15, 49:4, 64:3, 83:9, 90:19, 91:19, 109:1, 121:11, 136:9, 138:3, 138:13, 158:9, 164:16, 185:5 amounts [1] - 144:9 analogy [2] - 174:1, 174:10 analysis [30] - 13:13, 32:6, 34:10, 34:16, 34:18, 45:1, 47:14, 47:17, 52:10, 52:13, 55:1, 57:17, 101:13, 102:5, 104:13, 104:16, 106:16, 107:10, 109:13, 110:10, 112:18, 154:10, 158:14, 165:5, 167:13, 168:4, 168:18, 169:4, 169:12 Analysis [1] - 45:1 analyze [3] - 40:7, 61:15, 169:3 analyzed [4] - 40:2, 47:4, 53:12, 54:3 analyzing [2] - 44:15, 119:2 AND [1] - 197:1 AND/OR [1] - 198:18 animation [1] - 40:16 announced [1] - 78:12 annual [1] - 43:9</p>	<p>answer [4] - 96:8, 109:12, 113:18, 191:1 answers [2] - 66:15, 67:13 anti [1] - 79:16 anti-climatic [1] - 79:16 anticipate [3] - 62:17, 90:6, 91:7 anticipated [7] - 40:2, 81:3, 85:16, 89:7, 92:8, 99:11, 130:17 anticipation [1] - 131:5 ANY [2] - 198:17, 198:17 anyway [2] - 104:5, 190:6 apologize [3] - 60:19, 62:3, 99:5 appeal [1] - 174:8 appealing [1] - 173:4 applecart [1] - 175:14 applicable [1] - 2:10 applicant [2] - 8:4, 8:6 applied [1] - 84:15 APPLY [1] - 198:17 apply [1] - 83:19 appoint [1] - 118:15 appointed [1] - 117:18 appointing [1] - 30:10 appreciate [1] - 115:5 approach [3] - 92:17, 94:18, 151:14 approaches [1] - 111:5 appropriate [2] - 164:19, 170:7 appropriation [1] - 5:14 approve [1] - 8:11 april [1] - 198:15 April [1] - 147:4 architects [1] - 30:10 architecturally [1] - 187:1 area [35] - 9:5, 9:12, 10:3, 10:6, 10:15, 11:7, 24:10, 31:19, 33:2, 33:11, 57:14, 66:5, 66:18, 69:8, 70:7, 74:4, 82:7, 82:8, 85:2, 85:5, 85:6, 88:9, 88:12, 97:10, 120:4, 129:5, 129:14, 130:14, 154:6, 160:8, 160:16, 161:12, 181:1, 195:16</p>	<p>Area [3] - 20:3, 33:1, 118:5 areas [16] - 13:19, 19:17, 30:11, 74:8, 77:19, 79:2, 80:12, 80:14, 81:19, 82:14, 85:2, 87:16, 90:16, 130:1, 130:7, 132:3 arguable [1] - 162:19 argue [1] - 147:11 argument [2] - 127:14, 127:16 arguments [1] - 135:3 Arlington [1] - 69:16 arranged [1] - 94:11 arrangement [1] - 27:12 arrive [1] - 42:19 art [2] - 186:14, 186:15 article [1] - 139:6 Article [2] - 139:8, 139:9 articulate [2] - 95:10, 120:8 artistic [1] - 186:12 ashamed [1] - 70:4 aside [1] - 130:15 aspect [1] - 115:8 aspirations [1] - 95:10 assess [1] - 52:7 assigned [1] - 107:6 assignments [1] - 43:18 Assistant [3] - 1:12, 3:6, 141:3 assume [5] - 39:17, 139:4, 144:17, 161:17, 183:12 assumed [2] - 64:4, 131:1 assuming [2] - 48:17, 89:9 assumption [1] - 37:7 assumptions [2] - 41:18, 44:8 attempted [1] - 13:6 attempting [1] - 104:9 attend [1] - 116:1 attendance [1] - 116:5 attended [1] - 17:10 attention [1] - 83:17 attorney [1] - 167:17 attractive [1] - 134:13 attributed [1] - 165:16 AUDIENCE [3] - 70:15, 100:13, 105:16 authorities [2] -</p>	<p>140:17, 141:1 auto [1] - 65:4 automobile [1] - 74:8 automobile- focussed [1] - 74:8 available [4] - 49:6, 66:9, 109:16, 123:18 Ave [2] - 4:9, 5:5 Avenue [3] - 2:6, 7:14, 139:16 averages [1] - 65:7 avoid [1] - 171:2 avoiding [1] - 27:17 aware [1] - 67:7 awful [1] - 50:8</p> <p style="text-align: center;">B</p> <p>B-j-o-r-n [1] - 146:7 Bacci [1] - 1:10 BACCI [37] - 50:2, 50:5, 50:14, 50:18, 51:7, 51:16, 52:14, 52:19, 53:8, 54:14, 55:3, 55:10, 55:15, 56:1, 56:10, 56:13, 57:2, 59:7, 59:12, 59:15, 60:5, 60:17, 61:2, 69:1, 69:4, 69:6, 69:11, 69:15, 70:1, 70:6, 70:11, 70:16, 72:14, 74:9, 150:15, 180:11, 190:8 backed [2] - 51:1, 107:8 backing [1] - 56:16 backs [1] - 52:15 backward [1] - 52:16 backwards [2] - 39:16, 134:1 bad [3] - 75:7, 153:1, 170:19 baffling [1] - 106:17 bag [2] - 173:6, 173:7 bailiwick [2] - 62:2, 62:18 balance [9] - 102:14, 103:1, 103:4, 103:8, 103:10, 103:11, 105:4, 158:16, 171:3 balanced [1] - 117:12 balancing [3] - 64:2, 102:15, 161:19 ballpark [1] - 169:6 band [2] - 74:12, 97:6 bank [1] - 113:17 Barrett [1] - 3:16</p>
--	---	--	--	--

base [2] - 37:8, 59:8
based [6] - 37:7, 41:3, 41:17, 79:9, 112:8, 132:12
basic [1] - 46:9
basis [1] - 168:10
basketball [1] - 24:8
bear [1] - 190:14
become [2] - 136:2, 185:18
becomes [1] - 187:11
bedroom [1] - 15:18
bedrooms [1] - 196:4
beep [1] - 106:11
began [1] - 9:14
begin [2] - 139:9, 159:8
beginning [1] - 91:13
behalf [1] - 117:1
behind [1] - 20:12
belabor [3] - 65:17, 66:14, 103:3
below [2] - 166:15, 184:4
benefit [1] - 131:14
benefits [3] - 92:11, 123:14, 157:10
Bent [2] - 52:8, 52:14
best [9] - 18:5, 18:7, 36:11, 39:19, 57:12, 79:19, 168:7, 169:14, 174:15
bethany [2] - 116:15, 116:17
Bethany [1] - 135:9
BETHANY [1] - 116:17
better [10] - 19:4, 75:10, 101:14, 103:8, 115:1, 140:5, 159:5, 160:3, 174:16, 188:16
between [13] - 45:9, 75:11, 101:14, 115:4, 115:14, 125:6, 130:11, 137:11, 154:15, 158:16, 171:3, 188:17
beyond [1] - 98:16
bicycle [2] - 22:16, 39:18
bicycles [1] - 62:5
bicycling [2] - 73:14, 73:19
bid [1] - 156:6
bidding [1] - 156:5
big [8] - 39:7, 74:17, 76:2, 91:18, 174:12, 191:12, 194:17, 194:18

bigger [1] - 56:17
biggest [2] - 47:6, 71:19
Bigolin [1] - 1:15
BIGOLIN [1] - 15:1
bike [8] - 38:16, 39:5, 41:16, 72:5, 76:1, 159:19, 161:11, 166:1
bikes [1] - 76:7
biking [5] - 33:8, 38:4, 63:16, 75:15, 76:15
BillERICA [1] - 38:14
bills [1] - 178:1
Binney [5] - 28:6, 28:8, 46:3, 154:8, 165:15
biotech [3] - 26:1, 164:11, 172:1
bit [16] - 9:19, 10:2, 11:5, 75:1, 88:10, 90:19, 93:5, 114:10, 129:17, 130:15, 145:11, 172:12, 172:18, 175:13, 179:11, 179:14
BJORN [1] - 146:3
Bjorn [1] - 146:4
blanking [1] - 99:6
block [1] - 9:10
blunt [1] - 95:7
board [3] - 67:6, 100:4, 192:3
Board [42] - 2:9, 3:5, 7:14, 9:2, 11:16, 11:18, 13:2, 13:14, 17:9, 31:6, 31:11, 53:3, 78:11, 79:18, 85:7, 87:9, 88:12, 95:17, 96:9, 99:17, 102:10, 108:5, 112:10, 116:19, 117:3, 124:6, 124:8, 126:7, 127:5, 127:18, 128:13, 131:15, 149:14, 153:9, 159:11, 165:1, 165:11, 177:4, 179:4, 196:16, 197:6, 197:15
BOARD [1] - 1:2
Board's [6] - 3:12, 17:12, 84:18, 86:8, 86:12, 87:3
boarding [1] - 155:12
boardings [1] - 155:2
boards [1] - 20:11
body [3] - 162:9, 170:15, 182:9
bonus [7] - 86:11,

86:14, 120:10, 120:11, 128:11, 128:15, 128:17
BOOTH [1] - 124:3
Booth [3] - 116:16, 124:2, 124:3
booth [1] - 124:4
border [1] - 50:10
Boston [8] - 63:18, 109:9, 110:13, 119:12, 172:5, 185:19, 186:2, 195:9
bother [1] - 46:1
bothers [1] - 181:12
Boulevard [1] - 46:4
box [1] - 87:19
boxy [1] - 190:10
boy [1] - 107:12
brain [1] - 99:13
brand [1] - 115:2
break [5] - 91:13, 113:17, 128:5, 149:13, 173:10
breaks [1] - 173:9
Brian [1] - 32:14
briefly [1] - 193:9
brims [1] - 27:5
bring [1] - 102:9
bringing [2] - 91:11, 161:12
brings [1] - 11:2
BRISTOL [1] - 198:4
Britain [1] - 136:7
broad [1] - 72:10
Broad [2] - 25:4, 29:13
Broadway [6] - 1:6, 28:2, 29:19, 87:12, 90:11, 153:18
brought [1] - 188:2
budgets [2] - 164:17, 178:2
build [12] - 13:19, 41:1, 58:17, 113:13, 128:15, 135:12, 149:4, 159:15, 162:14, 163:2, 163:8, 192:8
build-out [1] - 13:19
Building [2] - 162:15, 185:17
building [52] - 14:9, 16:19, 23:8, 27:11, 28:1, 28:10, 30:5, 31:12, 37:14, 41:2, 53:6, 54:8, 58:17, 59:5, 59:19, 61:7, 62:8, 65:11, 65:15, 81:18, 88:17, 88:18, 94:10, 113:1, 115:2,

119:11, 121:19, 123:6, 123:8, 125:2, 129:6, 131:1, 131:5, 132:17, 141:18, 142:3, 147:2, 147:6, 147:15, 156:17, 163:18, 164:6, 174:17, 174:19, 181:15, 185:15, 185:18, 186:10, 186:19, 194:14, 195:4
buildings [41] - 16:12, 17:4, 17:5, 18:6, 26:13, 27:12, 28:3, 28:9, 28:13, 30:1, 31:4, 31:7, 38:3, 39:11, 58:12, 62:9, 63:19, 64:5, 88:14, 88:15, 114:17, 121:5, 142:16, 143:2, 144:2, 144:6, 146:14, 146:16, 146:18, 147:14, 149:4, 157:15, 157:18, 174:18, 176:4, 181:13, 186:13, 188:15, 188:17, 190:18
buildout [6] - 36:18, 47:18, 48:1, 48:7, 48:11, 89:7
built [13] - 13:8, 16:18, 18:4, 18:10, 27:10, 44:17, 66:4, 92:6, 94:7, 112:12, 130:18, 195:9
bullet [1] - 107:11
bunch [1] - 154:5
bunching [1] - 110:19
business [3] - 97:3, 97:11, 110:13
BUSINESS [1] - 2:2
businesses [1] - 73:1
busses [1] - 70:15
but... [1] - 152:6

C

calculate [2] - 130:4, 147:10
calculation [4] - 86:15, 120:19, 121:8, 130:10
calculations [1] - 144:2
CAMBRIDGE [1] - 1:2
Cambridge [39] - 1:7, 2:9, 20:3, 25:18, 26:5, 32:14, 32:16, 32:19, 38:16, 39:4,

41:5, 43:14, 44:5, 65:5, 69:7, 69:9, 71:2, 71:5, 71:8, 71:11, 74:2, 76:8, 80:10, 104:19, 112:3, 117:1, 117:15, 118:2, 119:10, 126:15, 134:6, 134:9, 134:10, 135:10, 136:12, 137:19, 142:1, 178:4, 183:8
Cambridge's [2] - 10:9, 133:13
Cambridgeport [1] - 109:4
Canal [2] - 25:4, 29:13
cannot [2] - 59:2, 127:9
cap [2] - 144:9, 144:12
capability [1] - 101:13
capacity [25] - 62:11, 66:7, 66:12, 67:8, 67:14, 68:5, 107:18, 108:14, 109:17, 110:1, 110:2, 110:4, 110:5, 110:17, 122:17, 122:19, 154:17, 161:7, 161:18, 162:4, 163:4, 163:9, 164:7, 176:19
capital [1] - 163:18
capitalize [1] - 26:12
CAPTURING [1] - 1:18
car [3] - 41:14, 161:10, 162:3
care [4] - 43:16, 94:3, 115:15, 115:16
carried [1] - 86:17
cars [9] - 45:6, 57:5, 61:17, 67:17, 67:18, 107:13, 110:16, 155:4, 161:17
Carshare [1] - 6:4
carsharing [1] - 3:15
case [12] - 36:1, 39:5, 42:5, 43:2, 64:16, 89:9, 89:12, 131:3, 131:7, 137:8, 163:14, 164:6
cases [2] - 90:17, 100:7
categories [1] - 40:7
cater [2] - 98:14, 99:2
CATHERINE [17] - 51:18, 52:17, 54:5, 54:16, 55:9, 55:12, 55:17, 56:5, 56:11,

<p>57:7, 57:11, 77:4, 106:10, 111:8, 140:4, 161:5, 193:3 Catherine [6] - 1:8, 44:5, 161:4, 169:10, 198:5, 198:12 causes [1] - 46:5 causing [2] - 51:8, 153:1 caution [1] - 133:1 CDD [2] - 112:17, 118:14 CDD's [1] - 115:5 census [3] - 65:5, 71:2, 71:16 cent [1] - 163:6 center [5] - 27:9, 88:11, 131:11, 171:13, 171:16 Center [7] - 2:12, 9:6, 14:10, 32:15, 32:16, 140:8, 140:19 centers [1] - 65:16 central [2] - 24:1, 170:15 Central [6] - 20:6, 40:3, 99:8, 99:9, 109:6, 154:1 century [1] - 171:15 certain [14] - 12:5, 36:19, 42:15, 55:7, 80:8, 89:14, 109:1, 129:19, 130:2, 130:3, 144:13, 153:16, 182:18, 192:9 certainly [12] - 67:2, 92:1, 92:17, 93:10, 132:13, 132:18, 137:3, 170:1, 184:4, 185:17, 194:2, 194:12 certainty [1] - 179:19 CERTIFICATION [1] - 198:16 certified [1] - 7:2 Certified [2] - 198:5, 198:13 certify [1] - 198:6 CERTIFYING [1] - 198:18 CFR [1] - 141:3 chain [1] - 25:14 chain-type [1] - 25:14 Chair [2] - 1:8, 1:8 chair [3] - 3:8, 9:9, 128:3 chairing [1] - 32:17 Chairman [1] - 116:18 challenges [3] - 33:15, 64:19, 119:9</p>	<p>chance [2] - 124:7, 137:6 CHANGE [6] - 197:8, 197:9, 197:10, 197:11, 197:12, 197:13 change [8] - 2:10, 9:4, 37:9, 39:7, 123:10, 137:10, 195:1, 197:6 changed [1] - 155:12 changes [16] - 23:8, 34:19, 35:5, 39:3, 46:17, 112:18, 120:17, 140:14, 141:7, 141:11, 142:4, 145:4, 145:10, 176:8, 182:10, 197:16 changing [1] - 23:10 Channing [1] - 136:17 characteristics [3] - 37:10, 37:15, 40:8 characterize [1] - 169:11 characterized [1] - 176:18 charter [1] - 5:19 Chicago [2] - 186:12, 186:14 child [1] - 94:3 chip [1] - 157:2 choice [7] - 38:5, 38:14, 39:8, 44:11, 53:4, 53:15, 72:4 choices [9] - 38:2, 38:13, 39:1, 41:4, 41:10, 41:19, 42:12, 63:13, 104:6 choose [4] - 39:3, 39:5, 42:9, 148:8 choosing [1] - 71:18 chose [2] - 42:13, 144:5 chosen [2] - 89:15, 139:7 churn [1] - 150:8 circles [1] - 50:11 circumstances [1] - 86:3 cities [3] - 74:3, 75:17, 149:1 CITY [1] - 1:2 city [50] - 3:18, 14:5, 24:18, 27:6, 33:11, 38:11, 59:1, 63:17, 68:2, 76:2, 84:10, 105:4, 114:4, 114:8, 117:3, 117:17, 119:19, 120:8, 123:8, 123:15,</p>	<p>124:10, 126:3, 132:3, 132:13, 134:15, 134:17, 138:8, 151:4, 152:18, 153:11, 153:19, 158:3, 160:9, 160:17, 164:10, 166:3, 167:6, 167:12, 170:15, 177:5, 177:8, 180:15, 185:7, 185:11, 189:11, 189:15, 191:16, 193:12 City [24] - 1:12, 3:6, 4:19, 5:11, 6:3, 11:15, 11:17, 15:4, 15:6, 30:9, 44:5, 79:4, 79:18, 81:5, 85:6, 85:14, 104:19, 118:14, 127:11, 127:15, 172:3, 178:4, 182:11, 186:2 City's [2] - 139:8, 177:9 city's [1] - 140:7 citywide [6] - 5:13, 83:16, 120:2, 125:18, 125:19, 166:16 clarify [2] - 16:14, 129:16 clarity [1] - 131:15 Clause [1] - 140:13 cleaning [1] - 26:2 clear [3] - 103:15, 126:10, 173:13 clearer [1] - 145:11 clearly [5] - 58:13, 103:5, 119:14, 169:17, 194:3 climate [1] - 123:10 climatic [1] - 79:16 clock [1] - 143:14 close [5] - 19:17, 47:11, 91:10, 105:15, 153:5 close-knit [1] - 153:5 closely [1] - 65:2 closer [5] - 28:6, 43:15, 48:8, 53:14, 140:1 closest [1] - 91:16 clunky [1] - 155:4 CMX [1] - 4:2 co [3] - 32:17, 99:1, 99:10 co-chairing [1] - 32:17 co-working [2] - 99:1,</p>	<p>99:10 code [1] - 60:4 Code [2] - 43:8, 58:19 codes [1] - 61:10 Cohen [6] - 1:8, 1:9, 109:11, 113:11, 119:16, 126:11 COHEN [80] - 3:3, 5:2, 5:6, 6:13, 6:15, 7:3, 7:6, 7:7, 7:10, 7:13, 8:3, 8:10, 8:12, 8:13, 8:15, 8:18, 49:2, 50:4, 60:16, 60:18, 61:3, 65:13, 68:8, 68:16, 70:4, 76:17, 77:3, 77:6, 77:9, 78:13, 96:10, 98:2, 98:11, 99:18, 100:1, 100:14, 103:2, 105:6, 105:10, 105:17, 106:8, 106:9, 106:13, 111:16, 116:11, 116:14, 124:2, 127:2, 128:19, 129:1, 131:12, 133:3, 136:14, 137:9, 139:11, 139:19, 140:6, 142:8, 145:19, 149:8, 149:12, 149:18, 158:5, 161:4, 169:8, 169:9, 174:4, 180:10, 182:1, 189:5, 190:9, 192:5, 192:15, 193:4, 193:5, 195:7, 195:11, 195:13, 196:1, 196:10 Cohen's [2] - 108:12, 137:1 colleagues [1] - 180:13 collect [1] - 162:13 color [1] - 88:18 columns [1] - 48:5 combination [1] - 186:11 combined [1] - 87:1 comfortable [1] - 176:12 coming [19] - 3:11, 5:11, 6:10, 35:11, 35:12, 43:12, 44:2, 45:19, 50:9, 50:19, 55:13, 62:11, 69:13, 69:17, 102:11, 107:3, 143:17, 188:1, 196:11 comment [9] - 93:12, 96:9, 105:11,</p>	<p>116:19, 137:6, 147:18, 147:19, 160:10, 192:14 commented [1] - 166:14 comments [18] - 15:3, 15:7, 15:19, 17:10, 77:14, 106:5, 112:5, 117:4, 137:1, 137:18, 138:1, 150:2, 154:14, 171:6, 190:5, 190:14, 193:6, 196:5 commerce [1] - 76:3 commercial [22] - 79:11, 80:11, 85:9, 89:11, 89:15, 89:19, 92:7, 92:9, 92:10, 112:12, 113:14, 122:11, 131:9, 158:16, 169:18, 172:1, 182:15, 183:9, 183:12, 191:15, 192:13 commission [1] - 74:4 Commission [1] - 198:15 Committee [2] - 6:4, 117:18 committee [2] - 19:1, 118:16 committees [2] - 118:7, 118:12 COMMONWEALTH [1] - 198:3 communication [1] - 19:10 community [30] - 4:16, 4:18, 11:10, 12:3, 12:7, 14:5, 18:14, 18:18, 19:4, 19:6, 19:13, 19:16, 20:13, 22:1, 22:11, 23:13, 29:8, 29:11, 29:15, 45:2, 87:14, 91:6, 94:1, 94:5, 100:3, 116:1, 117:13, 118:10, 123:14, 125:12 Community [3] - 1:13, 2:3, 197:3 commute [3] - 71:3, 72:19, 73:15 commuter [1] - 70:16 commuters [1] - 73:1 companies [8] - 82:18, 83:4, 97:5, 97:8, 97:13, 98:15, 190:18, 195:6</p>
---	--	---	---	--

<p>company [2] - 98:15, 103:19</p> <p>compare [2] - 48:8, 54:11</p> <p>compared [2] - 40:12, 42:4</p> <p>comparing [2] - 129:15, 132:2</p> <p>comparison [1] - 48:15</p> <p>comparisons [1] - 45:8</p> <p>compass [2] - 69:2, 69:3</p> <p>competing [1] - 21:2</p> <p>competition [4] - 28:18, 29:12, 29:18, 30:12</p> <p>competitors [1] - 156:3</p> <p>completed [2] - 36:18, 85:17</p> <p>completely [3] - 42:9, 99:6, 194:6</p> <p>complexities [1] - 126:17</p> <p>complicated [3] - 111:3, 133:9, 154:2</p> <p>component [4] - 83:13, 84:12, 85:10, 166:9</p> <p>components [3] - 11:4, 12:15, 86:16</p> <p>compromise [1] - 170:14</p> <p>computer [1] - 111:3</p> <p>concentrate [1] - 33:8</p> <p>concept [4] - 82:16, 129:18, 132:10, 132:16</p> <p>concepts [2] - 22:18, 78:3</p> <p>concern [5] - 108:3, 108:12, 173:9, 194:11, 194:18</p> <p>concerned [4] - 111:11, 112:13, 172:12, 190:2</p> <p>concerns [4] - 139:4, 139:5, 150:2, 176:15</p> <p>concession [2] - 120:13, 123:14</p> <p>conclusion [2] - 107:4, 110:9</p> <p>concurrency [2] - 162:7, 163:12</p> <p>conditions [1] - 33:19</p> <p>confidence [1] - 75:15</p> <p>confident [1] - 76:15</p>	<p>configuration [2] - 93:4, 166:2</p> <p>confirmation [1] - 192:19</p> <p>conflict [4] - 45:17, 46:2, 46:5, 46:8</p> <p>conflicted [1] - 116:2</p> <p>conflicting [1] - 154:3</p> <p>confusing [1] - 128:14</p> <p>congested [2] - 51:13, 52:12</p> <p>congestion [6] - 37:17, 46:6, 52:10, 61:12, 71:19, 119:8</p> <p>Congress [1] - 152:11</p> <p>Connect [6] - 28:17, 29:12, 29:18, 82:11, 92:18, 188:18</p> <p>connect [2] - 27:7, 151:11</p> <p>connected [2] - 27:3, 180:19</p> <p>connecting [3] - 25:18, 29:7, 151:17</p> <p>connection [5] - 4:9, 4:11, 5:5, 25:4, 128:6</p> <p>connections [8] - 16:13, 22:14, 22:15, 23:12, 26:7, 26:15, 26:18, 29:3</p> <p>connector [1] - 26:11</p> <p>Connolly [1] - 1:8</p> <p>CONNOLLY [17] - 51:18, 52:17, 54:5, 54:16, 55:9, 55:12, 55:17, 56:5, 56:11, 57:7, 57:11, 77:4, 106:10, 111:8, 140:4, 161:5, 193:3</p> <p>consensus [1] - 26:10</p> <p>consequences [1] - 156:16</p> <p>consequential [1] - 126:6</p> <p>conservative [1] - 157:12</p> <p>consider [8] - 18:5, 22:13, 23:16, 24:9, 95:19, 96:1, 112:10, 142:13</p> <p>considered [3] - 26:19, 30:18, 86:1</p> <p>considering [1] - 123:17</p> <p>consistency [1] - 150:15</p> <p>consistent [2] - 25:2, 87:15</p> <p>consolidate [1] -</p>	<p>30:15</p> <p>consolidated [2] - 23:19, 49:12</p> <p>consolidates [1] - 20:12</p> <p>constantly [1] - 66:17</p> <p>constrained [1] - 164:17</p> <p>constraining [1] - 68:6</p> <p>constraint [1] - 68:12</p> <p>constraints [1] - 95:2</p> <p>construction [1] - 31:13</p> <p>consultant [2] - 32:14, 156:9</p> <p>consultants [3] - 43:17, 117:16, 191:13</p> <p>consulting [1] - 102:3</p> <p>contemplated [1] - 85:3</p> <p>contemplating [1] - 132:1</p> <p>context [4] - 31:16, 53:19, 79:8, 104:18</p> <p>contingent [1] - 122:18</p> <p>continuation [1] - 78:5</p> <p>continue [9] - 65:1, 73:6, 80:17, 83:15, 91:17, 93:1, 93:7, 127:3, 196:6</p> <p>continued [2] - 4:3, 137:5</p> <p>continues [2] - 30:8, 141:15</p> <p>continuing [5] - 2:6, 7:16, 72:15, 83:2, 196:12</p> <p>continuous [1] - 90:10</p> <p>contract [2] - 152:15, 182:9</p> <p>contrary [1] - 184:12</p> <p>contributed [1] - 110:10</p> <p>contributions [2] - 84:7, 163:19</p> <p>contributor [1] - 71:19</p> <p>CONTROL [1] - 198:18</p> <p>control [8] - 33:12, 144:6, 155:6, 162:10, 162:16, 162:19, 166:4, 166:10</p> <p>controlled [1] - 130:12</p>	<p>controlling [1] - 130:1</p> <p>controls [2] - 2:10, 9:4</p> <p>controversial [1] - 63:10</p> <p>converge [1] - 153:3</p> <p>conversation [7] - 12:7, 68:1, 68:2, 115:10, 115:12, 115:18, 116:8</p> <p>conversations [6] - 19:13, 19:17, 20:8, 20:14, 21:11, 22:12</p> <p>converted [1] - 64:16</p> <p>convey [1] - 117:2</p> <p>convinced [1] - 187:6</p> <p>Coolidge [2] - 4:6, 4:8</p> <p>Copenhagen [2] - 75:18, 75:19</p> <p>copies [2] - 49:13, 117:6</p> <p>copy [1] - 49:6</p> <p>corner [5] - 24:1, 29:19, 30:1, 30:4, 30:5</p> <p>correct [8] - 56:18, 59:12, 60:7, 129:7, 129:9, 182:18, 183:4, 184:19</p> <p>correction [1] - 197:7</p> <p>corrections [1] - 197:16</p> <p>corridor [2] - 153:19, 154:1</p> <p>cost [5] - 66:3, 100:18, 113:13, 114:6, 169:15</p> <p>costs [2] - 172:9, 176:9</p> <p>council [1] - 164:11</p> <p>Council [13] - 4:19, 5:12, 11:15, 11:17, 11:18, 15:4, 15:6, 79:4, 79:18, 81:5, 85:6, 85:14, 127:11</p> <p>Council's [2] - 6:2, 6:4</p> <p>count [3] - 46:6, 57:19, 143:5</p> <p>counterbalance [1] - 64:13</p> <p>country [4] - 76:10, 152:9, 179:16, 179:17</p> <p>counts [1] - 45:16</p> <p>county [1] - 162:10</p> <p>couple [8] - 3:10, 6:16, 80:9, 84:19, 150:7, 182:4, 183:10, 189:5</p> <p>course [12] - 11:11,</p>	<p>34:7, 35:4, 36:7, 41:15, 41:17, 46:18, 125:4, 135:18, 140:19, 155:9, 155:13</p> <p>court [1] - 24:8</p> <p>courthouse [1] - 142:3</p> <p>cover [3] - 88:7, 144:3, 180:12</p> <p>covered [6] - 25:5, 79:7, 85:18, 91:4, 91:5, 189:3</p> <p>CRA [5] - 13:4, 107:2, 109:9, 110:13, 183:2</p> <p>crafting [1] - 93:15</p> <p>create [6] - 10:8, 13:7, 27:5, 80:14, 95:13, 178:11</p> <p>created [3] - 25:19, 84:13, 90:15</p> <p>creates [1] - 46:19</p> <p>creating [9] - 10:12, 10:14, 10:17, 19:3, 46:4, 48:7, 109:16, 151:15, 167:9</p> <p>creation [1] - 3:17</p> <p>credit [1] - 136:12</p> <p>crisp [1] - 104:15</p> <p>criteria [3] - 98:19, 99:14, 165:11</p> <p>Critical [1] - 45:1</p> <p>critical [8] - 45:14, 71:13, 97:16, 153:5, 154:9, 155:14, 158:14, 166:9</p> <p>criticism [1] - 47:11</p> <p>crosses [1] - 61:14</p> <p>crowd [1] - 181:14</p> <p>crucial [1] - 169:5</p> <p>cultural [1] - 134:16</p> <p>curious [2] - 53:1, 57:6</p> <p>current [11] - 8:1, 11:6, 33:19, 85:4, 89:17, 121:9, 121:14, 123:7, 124:17, 142:16, 193:11</p> <p>cut [1] - 106:6</p> <p>cuts [1] - 70:3</p>
D				
<p>Dacey [1] - 32:14</p> <p>daily [1] - 37:18</p> <p>dark [6] - 88:11, 103:7, 104:3, 137:2, 137:3</p>				

<p>darker [1] - 89:1</p> <p>darkness [1] - 170:4</p> <p>darn [1] - 190:19</p> <p>data [11] - 41:5, 41:8, 65:3, 65:6, 65:8, 72:13, 73:7, 78:1, 125:18, 125:19, 156:2</p> <p>date [9] - 2:6, 7:15, 7:17, 8:1, 33:17, 78:7, 182:6, 196:7, 197:7</p> <p>dead [2] - 155:11, 157:7</p> <p>deal [2] - 60:15, 154:7</p> <p>dealing [1] - 54:7</p> <p>decade [1] - 181:5</p> <p>December [1] - 198:9</p> <p>decide [2] - 133:18, 134:10</p> <p>deciding [1] - 63:7</p> <p>decision [6] - 2:7, 7:17, 53:19, 54:1, 59:18, 63:8</p> <p>decisions [2] - 104:4, 104:5</p> <p>declining [1] - 71:17</p> <p>dedicated [1] - 84:10</p> <p>deep [1] - 61:5</p> <p>define [1] - 176:1</p> <p>defined [1] - 82:3</p> <p>defines [2] - 27:4, 60:4</p> <p>definite [1] - 196:7</p> <p>definitely [2] - 47:10, 159:16</p> <p>definitions [1] - 17:8</p> <p>deliberation [1] - 17:11</p> <p>delineate [1] - 165:10</p> <p>delivered [1] - 197:3</p> <p>delve [1] - 22:6</p> <p>demand [7] - 75:11, 96:16, 109:16, 110:3, 192:2, 192:8</p> <p>demanding [1] - 110:4</p> <p>demographic [1] - 72:7</p> <p>denied [1] - 141:18</p> <p>dense [2] - 135:12, 190:3</p> <p>density [16] - 120:14, 122:2, 122:6, 122:8, 131:19, 132:2, 173:15, 174:8, 175:6, 175:19, 176:13, 185:3, 185:6, 191:5, 191:7, 194:10</p> <p>Department [7] - 2:3, 2:13, 32:11, 73:9,</p>	<p>127:7, 140:18, 197:4</p> <p>derive [1] - 156:5</p> <p>described [1] - 115:10</p> <p>design [20] - 8:8, 17:2, 17:8, 18:11, 22:8, 28:15, 30:6, 30:11, 32:2, 84:11, 84:12, 95:11, 95:12, 123:4, 174:16, 175:2, 176:1, 176:3, 176:10, 186:8</p> <p>designated [1] - 141:12</p> <p>desirability [1] - 174:8</p> <p>desirable [2] - 179:15, 179:17</p> <p>desire [1] - 4:11</p> <p>desires [1] - 103:11</p> <p>desperate [1] - 140:10</p> <p>desperately [1] - 167:12</p> <p>destination [3] - 60:11, 60:12, 60:13</p> <p>detail [2] - 17:1, 95:8</p> <p>detailed [4] - 49:18, 68:9, 123:4</p> <p>details [3] - 17:7, 22:7, 50:1</p> <p>determination [1] - 53:11</p> <p>determine [3] - 12:8, 52:5, 132:11</p> <p>develop [7] - 33:4, 97:10, 99:14, 108:19, 118:8, 145:8, 158:3</p> <p>developed [3] - 134:12, 170:17, 187:10</p> <p>developer [27] - 14:7, 14:8, 14:11, 14:16, 95:16, 100:18, 101:6, 101:19, 126:18, 128:1, 128:2, 139:4, 139:5, 139:7, 144:17, 145:3, 152:15, 159:13, 163:2, 163:5, 169:19, 170:10, 172:15, 175:7, 180:2, 186:16, 188:12</p> <p>developer's [2] - 113:17, 139:9</p> <p>developers [9] - 84:6, 134:7, 134:18, 155:16, 166:6,</p>	<p>175:10, 191:15, 191:16, 193:12</p> <p>developing [3] - 37:4, 84:7, 158:1</p> <p>development [79] - 2:10, 9:4, 21:9, 27:18, 36:6, 36:8, 37:8, 40:2, 40:17, 44:9, 64:3, 64:10, 66:18, 68:4, 68:6, 79:15, 80:11, 80:13, 81:2, 82:9, 83:3, 83:19, 84:16, 85:8, 85:10, 89:10, 89:14, 90:1, 90:5, 90:16, 92:7, 92:10, 92:12, 96:2, 100:6, 102:4, 103:18, 108:11, 108:14, 109:2, 109:5, 113:11, 122:18, 123:2, 126:6, 130:2, 130:17, 130:19, 131:8, 134:2, 135:12, 135:15, 135:16, 136:10, 136:11, 144:10, 153:1, 153:7, 156:12, 157:17, 159:10, 159:19, 160:15, 161:8, 163:16, 164:8, 168:7, 169:19, 171:1, 171:12, 171:18, 171:19, 172:7, 172:11, 182:14, 188:4, 189:1, 193:15</p> <p>Development [4] - 1:13, 2:3, 2:11, 197:4</p> <p>developments [3] - 25:19, 74:17, 132:13</p> <p>devoted [2] - 3:9, 158:12</p> <p>difference [4] - 113:14, 125:5, 128:10, 130:11</p> <p>differences [3] - 37:12, 70:9, 92:15</p> <p>different [38] - 13:18, 13:19, 16:1, 18:19, 19:15, 19:17, 20:1, 20:15, 22:10, 23:7, 23:12, 23:17, 24:15, 27:11, 27:19, 35:6, 35:7, 35:8, 40:8, 45:9, 57:14, 63:1, 86:14, 87:18, 93:14, 94:1, 94:6, 94:8, 94:9, 95:5, 96:14,</p>	<p>108:6, 110:12, 127:12, 153:13, 165:4, 187:9</p> <p>difficult [7] - 36:9, 38:6, 39:14, 66:15, 95:7, 170:3, 178:10</p> <p>dig [1] - 34:3</p> <p>digest [3] - 49:4, 60:19, 158:9</p> <p>dimension [1] - 125:5</p> <p>DIRECT [1] - 198:18</p> <p>direction [6] - 42:10, 45:19, 65:15, 69:18, 74:5, 95:15</p> <p>DIRECTION [1] - 198:18</p> <p>directly [2] - 68:3, 162:16</p> <p>Director [1] - 13:11</p> <p>disagree [1] - 142:12</p> <p>disappointed [1] - 138:15</p> <p>disclosing [1] - 169:13</p> <p>disclosure [3] - 131:16, 132:5, 168:19</p> <p>discouraging [1] - 62:5</p> <p>discriminatory [2] - 140:10, 140:14</p> <p>discuss [2] - 9:1, 18:15</p> <p>discussed [10] - 16:17, 17:19, 21:10, 22:11, 26:8, 31:10, 87:9, 101:11, 128:13, 172:4</p> <p>discussing [1] - 6:8</p> <p>discussion [22] - 6:1, 6:5, 16:10, 16:19, 28:4, 29:17, 40:13, 45:3, 67:2, 88:4, 108:5, 118:11, 124:16, 148:2, 148:3, 149:16, 150:3, 150:10, 158:8, 160:19, 183:1, 196:12</p> <p>discussions [9] - 8:5, 8:7, 9:15, 10:1, 11:12, 88:3, 131:3, 143:12, 193:13</p> <p>display [1] - 23:3</p> <p>disposition [2] - 4:6, 4:12</p> <p>disputing [1] - 52:18</p> <p>distinction [1] - 54:6</p> <p>distribute [1] - 115:14</p> <p>distributed [1] - 20:3</p> <p>District [4] - 2:11,</p>	<p>2:12, 4:2, 13:3</p> <p>district [6] - 27:15, 89:5, 89:6, 105:3, 151:3, 160:14</p> <p>districtwide [1] - 159:16</p> <p>diverse [2] - 20:1, 21:7</p> <p>diversity [2] - 16:5, 97:16</p> <p>documented [1] - 58:13</p> <p>DOES [1] - 198:17</p> <p>dollar [1] - 156:6</p> <p>dollars [3] - 156:7, 164:13, 165:18</p> <p>done [14] - 13:14, 14:5, 14:14, 43:9, 92:3, 95:2, 107:2, 107:3, 110:14, 136:9, 136:10, 152:8, 160:18, 174:10</p> <p>dormant [1] - 141:13</p> <p>DOT [5] - 100:16, 101:7, 103:14, 127:19, 182:8</p> <p>DOT's [3] - 101:15, 101:19, 181:6</p> <p>double [1] - 143:5</p> <p>down [21] - 22:2, 22:5, 26:9, 39:9, 42:4, 42:15, 46:3, 50:19, 51:2, 60:9, 65:9, 68:10, 89:2, 91:13, 108:17, 118:14, 145:2, 175:17, 178:1, 179:9, 190:10</p> <p>downtown [1] - 195:9</p> <p>downward [2] - 42:8, 63:12</p> <p>DPW [1] - 73:9</p> <p>drawing [1] - 192:3</p> <p>drawn [1] - 97:13</p> <p>draws [1] - 97:12</p> <p>drew [1] - 173:19</p> <p>drive [11] - 38:15, 38:17, 39:9, 41:13, 42:3, 42:15, 45:17, 63:14, 71:18, 92:9</p> <p>driven [1] - 100:11</p> <p>drives [1] - 92:10</p> <p>driving [11] - 19:7, 33:8, 38:4, 42:4, 42:11, 43:3, 43:14, 43:19, 63:13, 65:4, 75:7</p> <p>during [1] - 173:10</p> <p>dwelt [1] - 132:8</p> <p>dwindle [1] - 112:13</p>
---	--	---	--	--

<p>dynamic [1] - 174:7</p>	<p>element [4] - 15:16, 16:16, 21:12, 80:5</p>	<p>environmental [1] - 10:18</p>	<p>excellence [1] - 111:13</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">F</p>
<p>E</p>	<p>elements [6] - 17:13, 18:10, 23:1, 26:8, 80:2, 86:2</p>	<p>Environmental [1] - 13:12</p>	<p>excellent [2] - 36:17, 137:16</p>	<p>fabric [1] - 29:5</p>
<p>early [4] - 118:16, 120:2, 125:19, 176:13</p> <p>easier [1] - 91:1</p> <p>easily [1] - 67:18</p> <p>East [8] - 20:3, 32:19, 117:1, 117:15, 118:2, 119:10, 135:10, 137:19</p> <p>east [1] - 50:7</p> <p>east/west [1] - 26:18</p> <p>easy [1] - 177:2</p> <p>ECaPs [6] - 11:8, 47:16, 124:12, 125:6, 138:5, 183:7</p> <p>echo [1] - 143:6</p> <p>economic [19] - 10:11, 10:19, 68:4, 68:6, 83:3, 100:8, 100:10, 101:13, 120:9, 133:8, 134:14, 164:8, 167:13, 168:18, 172:3, 172:5, 172:7, 172:17, 191:8</p> <p>economically [1] - 184:17</p> <p>economics [6] - 102:4, 113:11, 168:8, 179:8, 179:18, 183:18</p> <p>economy [1] - 10:9</p> <p>edge [1] - 110:6</p> <p>edges [2] - 28:2, 175:16</p> <p>effect [4] - 52:16, 56:17, 110:8, 110:16</p> <p>effective [1] - 75:9</p> <p>efficiency [1] - 83:18</p> <p>effort [2] - 74:2, 175:12</p> <p>efforts [2] - 34:2, 138:7</p> <p>egg [1] - 179:6</p> <p>eight [2] - 68:14, 119:10</p> <p>EIR [1] - 109:9</p> <p>either [6] - 26:12, 49:5, 103:16, 146:13, 191:2, 192:16</p> <p>elaborate [2] - 28:16, 176:10</p> <p>elect [1] - 89:11</p> <p>electronically [1] - 197:4</p>	<p>eliminating [1] - 141:9</p> <p>eloquent [1] - 180:13</p> <p>elsewhere [1] - 75:17</p> <p>emphasis [3] - 10:16, 25:17, 135:5</p> <p>emphasize [1] - 112:8</p> <p>emphasized [2] - 10:7, 14:1</p> <p>Empire [1] - 185:16</p> <p>employees [3] - 43:10, 98:8, 187:16</p> <p>empty [1] - 64:9</p> <p>encourage [1] - 73:14</p> <p>encouraged [1] - 156:8</p> <p>end [7] - 34:4, 68:11, 78:15, 112:15, 145:9, 175:14, 180:15</p> <p>ended [2] - 47:14, 107:6</p> <p>ending [2] - 96:7, 141:19</p> <p>endorse [1] - 135:8</p> <p>energy [1] - 83:18</p> <p>engaged [1] - 74:3</p> <p>engagement [1] - 18:18</p> <p>engine [3] - 10:11, 172:3, 172:5</p> <p>engineer [2] - 61:10, 106:18</p> <p>engineering [2] - 44:14, 52:3</p> <p>engineers [1] - 107:14</p> <p>enhances [1] - 26:19</p> <p>enjoying [1] - 142:14</p> <p>enormous [1] - 49:4</p> <p>ensure [1] - 80:10</p> <p>entering [1] - 185:11</p> <p>entire [4] - 10:6, 54:10, 119:18, 144:4</p> <p>entirety [1] - 35:13</p> <p>entities [1] - 126:18</p> <p>entity [1] - 124:10</p> <p>entry [2] - 26:1, 29:2</p> <p>enumerable [1] - 117:17</p> <p>envelope [1] - 179:13</p> <p>envelopes [1] - 31:19</p> <p>environment [4] - 21:1, 24:19, 58:10, 97:15</p>	<p>environments [1] - 83:1</p> <p>envision [1] - 67:18</p> <p>envisioned [2] - 79:11, 82:8</p> <p>Equal [1] - 140:13</p> <p>equally [1] - 36:2</p> <p>equipment [2] - 177:3, 178:12</p> <p>equivalent [1] - 128:18</p> <p>era [1] - 164:17</p> <p>ERRATA [1] - 197:1</p> <p>Errata [2] - 197:2, 197:7</p> <p>escape [1] - 25:1</p> <p>especially [4] - 25:13, 66:4, 119:7, 164:16</p> <p>essentially [3] - 120:10, 131:1, 131:10</p> <p>establishing [2] - 27:3, 27:16</p> <p>establishments [1] - 82:3</p> <p>estate [1] - 179:15</p> <p>estimates [1] - 36:11</p> <p>evening [4] - 32:8, 78:15, 111:18, 150:6</p> <p>event [1] - 180:4</p> <p>events [3] - 19:15, 24:15, 123:9</p> <p>eventually [7] - 51:4, 52:6, 56:6, 56:8, 58:1, 106:8, 106:9</p> <p>evolve [2] - 80:17, 83:15</p> <p>evolved [2] - 80:17, 124:17</p> <p>exacerbated [1] - 119:14</p> <p>exact [1] - 44:18</p> <p>exactly [5] - 36:14, 98:18, 107:16, 109:10, 176:5</p> <p>example [6] - 36:17, 38:11, 39:17, 42:3, 67:14, 125:8</p> <p>examples [2] - 142:1, 159:18</p> <p>exceed [1] - 46:10</p> <p>exceedance [1] - 165:15</p> <p>exceedances [2] - 165:11, 165:13</p> <p>exceeded [1] - 90:18</p>	<p>exclusion [1] - 160:12</p> <p>exclusionary [1] - 141:7</p> <p>exercised [1] - 5:19</p> <p>exercising [1] - 164:4</p> <p>exist [1] - 88:8</p> <p>existing [1] - 26:12, 29:5, 40:11, 40:12, 48:3, 63:19, 66:7, 86:18, 131:7, 131:11, 159:7</p> <p>expand [3] - 67:7, 67:13, 162:11</p> <p>expanded [1] - 109:13</p> <p>expect [1] - 41:2</p> <p>expected [2] - 37:2, 37:5</p> <p>expensive [1] - 25:15</p> <p>experience [1] - 115:9</p> <p>experiencing [1] - 64:7</p> <p>expiration [1] - 8:1</p> <p>Expires [1] - 198:15</p> <p>explain [3] - 77:10, 111:4</p> <p>explained [1] - 47:2</p> <p>explanation [1] - 65:10</p> <p>exploratory [1] - 33:18</p> <p>express [2] - 124:7, 145:14</p> <p>expressed [1] - 133:15</p> <p>expressing [1] - 133:13</p> <p>extend [3] - 2:6, 7:15, 187:15</p> <p>extending [2] - 25:3, 26:16</p> <p>Extension [1] - 70:13</p> <p>extension [1] - 8:11</p> <p>extensive [2] - 19:9</p> <p>extent [5] - 66:2, 100:8, 103:17, 151:18, 157:14</p> <p>extra [2] - 149:4, 166:9</p> <p>extract [1] - 123:13</p>	<p>facilitate [3] - 73:14, 178:7, 182:8</p> <p>facilitated [1] - 16:8</p> <p>facilitates [1] - 174:16</p> <p>facilitating [1] - 170:19</p> <p>facilities [1] - 101:7</p> <p>facing [1] - 133:9</p> <p>fact [10] - 4:13, 76:8, 81:4, 128:15, 139:3, 142:18, 176:18, 177:1, 177:2, 194:10</p> <p>factor [4] - 34:19, 36:7, 36:8, 39:14</p> <p>factored [2] - 13:18, 39:13</p> <p>factors [2] - 35:18, 103:9</p> <p>facts [1] - 36:13</p> <p>fades [1] - 88:19</p> <p>fair [3] - 33:9, 140:15, 142:5</p> <p>Fair [1] - 140:12</p> <p>fairly [1] - 90:10</p> <p>faith [1] - 181:4</p> <p>fallow [1] - 170:18</p> <p>familiar [5] - 84:18, 86:8, 101:3, 132:3, 191:19</p> <p>families [9] - 25:13, 25:16, 181:16, 192:9, 192:11, 195:18, 195:19, 196:3, 196:4</p> <p>family [2] - 15:17, 16:6</p> <p>FAR [27] - 86:10, 86:13, 112:18, 112:19, 113:2, 120:18, 120:19, 121:2, 121:6, 121:7, 125:2, 128:6, 128:16, 129:4, 129:11, 129:17, 130:11, 130:12, 130:15, 132:9, 132:12, 132:14, 138:12, 146:9, 146:12, 169:7, 191:5</p> <p>far [1] - 33:7, 44:4, 52:19, 53:16, 57:5, 70:13, 113:7, 156:10, 157:4, 171:18, 181:3</p> <p>FAR's [1] - 157:13</p>

farmer's [2] - 20:6, 20:7
FAROOQ [21] - 3:8, 4:18, 5:4, 5:8, 6:14, 9:8, 49:8, 70:18, 72:17, 76:19, 78:9, 96:5, 96:19, 98:10, 98:13, 99:9, 102:1, 104:8, 128:3, 129:9, 193:8
Farooq [1] - 1:12
Farris [2] - 111:17, 111:19
FARRIS [3] - 111:18, 111:19, 195:17
Farris's [1] - 118:9
fast [2] - 36:14, 138:1
faster [1] - 37:4
favor [2] - 7:8, 8:16
fear [4] - 103:5, 168:9, 172:13, 173:9
fearful [2] - 170:13, 172:19
fears [1] - 167:19
feasibility [4] - 155:13, 156:10, 171:4, 172:17
feasible [2] - 155:18, 170:9
feature [3] - 29:13, 135:16, 136:3
federal [7] - 121:5, 121:13, 146:15, 146:16, 147:2, 147:15, 147:16
Federal [2] - 14:6, 140:18
federally [2] - 16:14, 117:8
feds [1] - 170:1
fee [1] - 30:11
feedback [8] - 11:19, 19:5, 20:1, 20:13, 22:4, 29:10, 191:17, 193:14
feelings [1] - 193:1
feet [20] - 61:8, 62:4, 62:17, 82:4, 88:16, 88:17, 89:18, 90:2, 101:16, 119:11, 123:6, 125:9, 125:11, 129:11, 129:12, 144:4, 144:13, 147:1, 147:7, 147:9
felt [5] - 103:5, 154:16, 184:6, 184:10, 194:15
few [6] - 12:11, 20:5, 156:1, 158:10, 171:6, 173:1

fewer [2] - 42:11, 63:14
Fifth [1] - 26:16
fight [1] - 4:16
figure [3] - 41:3, 41:12, 183:14
figures [1] - 169:13
filed [3] - 143:9, 143:13, 143:16
filing [2] - 2:7, 7:16
fill [1] - 28:9
final [2] - 89:10, 124:14
finalize [1] - 79:3
finalizing [2] - 119:5, 120:7
financial [9] - 102:4, 103:13, 103:16, 103:19, 155:13, 156:9, 158:14, 169:12, 171:4
financially [1] - 170:9
fine [1] - 192:6
finish [1] - 111:10
finished [1] - 77:13
fire [1] - 181:6
firm [1] - 104:14
first [12] - 61:13, 101:1, 101:10, 102:2, 112:15, 123:2, 135:4, 143:13, 146:6, 158:7, 172:19, 189:7
fit [1] - 75:11
five [9] - 39:5, 73:4, 96:17, 108:2, 121:12, 132:14, 149:13, 184:16, 187:17
flex [1] - 74:18
flexibility [9] - 91:1, 93:8, 94:13, 95:18, 99:3, 99:15, 175:2, 186:16, 188:11
flies [1] - 179:3
Floor [1] - 1:6
floor [17] - 16:1, 17:3, 17:15, 20:9, 21:3, 25:8, 82:1, 87:12, 93:15, 129:5, 129:13, 130:9, 130:14, 132:17, 181:16, 195:4
floors [2] - 17:5, 81:13
flow [1] - 135:17
flowing [1] - 135:19
FLYNN [2] - 8:14, 158:6
Flynn [1] - 1:10

focus [5] - 33:11, 34:2, 74:17, 88:4, 171:12
focuses [3] - 28:2, 33:6, 57:18
focusing [1] - 73:18
focussed [3] - 12:5, 21:15, 74:8
folks [7] - 62:9, 62:15, 114:18, 165:7, 179:1, 191:11, 194:12
follow [2] - 60:16, 152:12
followed [1] - 36:16
following [1] - 21:11
food [1] - 25:14
foolish [1] - 161:18
foot [6] - 40:1, 81:7, 81:8, 84:9, 147:5, 194:13
footage [2] - 172:15, 194:17
footprint [1] - 53:9
FOR [1] - 1:2
force [15] - 32:4, 32:10, 32:17, 33:3, 34:7, 71:7, 71:10, 73:17, 125:14, 125:15, 160:2, 160:4, 163:17, 166:8
Force [2] - 67:12, 119:6
forced [2] - 154:7, 188:5
foregoing [1] - 197:15
FOREGOING [1] - 198:16
forgive [1] - 189:10
form [10] - 16:18, 18:1, 18:4, 18:10, 22:9, 27:5, 27:10, 27:17, 76:7, 94:7
formal [3] - 118:3, 118:7, 118:12
formas [1] - 169:1
formed [1] - 118:19
formula [1] - 184:6
formulating [1] - 128:13
forth [4] - 61:18, 71:12, 177:4, 198:7
fortunate [1] - 14:3
forum [7] - 21:11, 22:2, 22:5, 23:2, 23:4, 26:9, 116:1
forums [2] - 19:13, 118:10
forward [12] - 18:11, 23:16, 32:2, 96:3,

106:2, 115:6, 127:10, 158:18, 165:1, 167:14, 178:14, 196:11
forwarded [1] - 11:15
forwards [1] - 39:16
Foundry [1] - 142:2
four [10] - 9:19, 40:7, 48:18, 56:16, 57:3, 86:10, 150:13, 151:5, 155:5, 187:19
frame [2] - 30:2, 100:19
framework [3] - 27:3, 83:17, 95:12
Francisco [1] - 148:19
frankly [3] - 33:14, 105:1, 172:19
frequency [1] - 178:13
frequently [2] - 175:11, 187:18
friendly [1] - 16:6
FROM [3] - 70:15, 100:13, 105:16
front [2] - 152:2, 186:13
frontage [2] - 81:15, 81:16
frustrating [1] - 170:5
fulfill [1] - 100:19
full [6] - 64:12, 68:14, 131:15, 168:19, 193:18
fully [2] - 60:19, 138:6
function [1] - 73:3
functions [1] - 24:14
fund [4] - 84:8, 84:10, 101:6, 170:11
fundamental [1] - 62:12
funds [2] - 87:14, 91:6
future [11] - 54:9, 66:7, 66:13, 76:6, 78:2, 92:12, 95:15, 107:5, 109:15, 110:2, 153:15

G

gain [2] - 122:6, 167:2
galaxy [1] - 100:15
game [2] - 62:13, 133:11
garage [2] - 68:10, 68:14
garages [2] - 64:9, 64:11

garden [1] - 152:4
gather [4] - 8:4, 41:7, 136:1
gathering [3] - 24:15, 65:6, 180:19
gee [1] - 156:14
GENERAL [2] - 1:3, 2:2
general [11] - 15:14, 39:8, 45:10, 46:10, 58:7, 80:2, 106:4, 151:4, 167:11, 171:6, 178:16
generally [7] - 20:14, 26:9, 27:14, 46:13, 58:9, 82:19, 93:3
generate [4] - 40:9, 101:17, 103:19, 191:8
generated [1] - 37:12
generating [2] - 14:14, 63:19
generation [4] - 35:19, 36:3, 37:10, 44:10
generations [1] - 13:17
gentleman [1] - 100:11
gentlemen [1] - 149:19
genuine [1] - 116:8
Gerald [2] - 133:4, 133:5
GERALD [1] - 133:5
GFA [1] - 140:17
giant [1] - 186:12
given [6] - 55:14, 105:19, 118:17, 165:7, 180:1, 192:7
glad [2] - 49:1, 124:5
go-round [1] - 173:1
goal [4] - 10:8, 92:4, 97:1, 111:13
goals [1] - 171:4
God [2] - 157:7, 173:9
goddamn [1] - 176:4
golden [1] - 179:6
gonna [1] - 144:5
Google [3] - 157:19, 164:9, 164:10
Googles [2] - 187:14, 195:6
goose [1] - 179:6
gory [1] - 49:19
Government [1] - 14:6
government [8] - 130:6, 134:7, 134:19, 141:17, 144:1, 144:3, 144:7

<p>governor [2] - 177:16, 187:15</p> <p>granting [1] - 120:9</p> <p>grappling [1] - 185:7</p> <p>great [12] - 58:15, 65:16, 107:18, 109:14, 137:16, 149:1, 174:9, 176:15, 180:14, 184:18, 188:19, 196:10</p> <p>greater [3] - 53:14, 91:2</p> <p>green [5] - 20:19, 24:19, 89:1, 142:15</p> <p>Green [2] - 70:12, 178:11</p> <p>grocery [2] - 21:5, 25:10</p> <p>gross [1] - 129:5</p> <p>ground [13] - 16:1, 17:5, 17:14, 20:9, 21:3, 25:8, 45:6, 81:13, 82:1, 87:12, 93:14, 130:9, 190:11</p> <p>group [1] - 118:3</p> <p>groups [5] - 12:6, 71:17, 72:7, 118:4, 118:8</p> <p>grow [2] - 72:15, 98:16</p> <p>growth [6] - 64:17, 79:11, 79:13, 80:10, 108:1, 134:14</p> <p>GSA [14] - 100:12, 100:13, 126:18, 127:7, 128:1, 131:4, 147:3, 152:13, 155:14, 169:1, 169:13, 169:14, 182:8, 193:10</p> <p>guarantee [3] - 163:9, 164:3, 186:1</p> <p>guess [10] - 7:14, 70:17, 96:6, 156:19, 157:14, 179:11, 180:11, 181:10, 181:18, 188:6</p> <p>guidance [2] - 94:14, 95:16</p> <p>guidelines [11] - 17:2, 17:8, 18:12, 28:15, 32:2, 84:13, 84:15, 95:12, 123:4, 123:5, 123:11</p> <p>guilty [1] - 176:9</p> <p>gut [1] - 193:1</p> <p>guys [2] - 145:17, 172:8</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">H</p> <p>half [7] - 87:5, 87:7, 87:8, 90:12, 143:1, 155:3, 188:13</p> <p>Hall [1] - 186:3</p> <p>Hamilton [1] - 106:15</p> <p>Hancock [1] - 185:18</p> <p>hand [14] - 20:18, 99:13, 101:15, 103:13, 103:15, 147:7, 163:11, 163:15, 170:8, 170:12, 175:6, 186:6, 194:4, 198:9</p> <p>handle [2] - 108:1, 159:5</p> <p>hands [3] - 7:9, 8:17, 98:17</p> <p>happier [1] - 145:17</p> <p>happy [4] - 72:11, 96:8, 123:18, 184:15</p> <p>hard [12] - 49:6, 49:13, 74:7, 88:10, 98:17, 103:7, 104:15, 117:5, 132:11, 159:11, 167:18, 171:5</p> <p>Harrington [2] - 20:4, 118:6</p> <p>Harvard [1] - 174:5</p> <p>Hasson [2] - 139:12, 139:14</p> <p>HASSON [4] - 139:13, 139:15, 140:2, 140:7</p> <p>HAWKINSON [1] - 99:8</p> <p>headways [2] - 109:19, 155:3</p> <p>hear [11] - 36:10, 75:8, 106:11, 140:3, 157:6, 167:18, 179:7, 193:13, 194:6, 194:11, 194:13</p> <p>heard [7] - 14:19, 15:3, 30:2, 92:17, 93:10, 176:16, 194:18</p> <p>HEARING [1] - 1:3</p> <p>hearing [18] - 2:6, 4:3, 4:6, 4:14, 7:16, 9:2, 11:16, 15:4, 17:10, 77:12, 78:6, 100:3, 112:8, 129:3, 137:4, 173:8, 196:6, 198:7</p> <p>Hearing [1] - 2:8</p> <p>hearings [4] - 3:14, 6:3, 137:13, 143:11</p>	<p>heart [2] - 10:10, 117:9</p> <p>Heather [2] - 142:9, 142:10</p> <p>HEATHER [1] - 142:10</p> <p>height [21] - 16:19, 18:9, 27:11, 88:8, 89:2, 94:7, 120:14, 122:5, 122:8, 123:7, 125:3, 132:17, 185:3, 190:7, 190:10, 191:3, 191:4, 191:18, 192:10, 194:7, 194:8</p> <p>heights [2] - 88:13, 88:14</p> <p>held [2] - 19:16, 143:12</p> <p>hello [5] - 116:17, 139:13, 142:10, 146:3</p> <p>help [8] - 63:1, 95:15, 99:14, 110:17, 118:8, 131:18, 151:2, 163:19</p> <p>helpful [2] - 113:2, 153:9</p> <p>helping [2] - 31:15, 63:8</p> <p>hereby [1] - 197:16</p> <p>herein [1] - 198:7</p> <p>hereunto [1] - 198:9</p> <p>hi [1] - 133:5</p> <p>hiding [1] - 35:17</p> <p>high [6] - 58:7, 138:12, 172:1, 181:17, 189:17, 190:17</p> <p>higher [10] - 44:19, 45:4, 109:16, 114:5, 132:14, 147:17, 183:11, 184:18, 185:6, 185:9</p> <p>highest [1] - 76:10</p> <p>highly [1] - 63:9</p> <p>Highway [1] - 45:18</p> <p>hire [1] - 191:12</p> <p>historical [1] - 114:18</p> <p>historically [1] - 97:5</p> <p>history [1] - 11:6</p> <p>hit [2] - 56:6, 56:9</p> <p>hitting [2] - 58:1, 72:15</p> <p>Hoffman [2] - 142:9, 142:11</p> <p>HOFFMAN [1] - 142:10</p> <p>hold [2] - 5:12, 164:3</p> <p>home [1] - 187:19</p>	<p>homeless [7] - 140:11, 140:16, 141:5, 141:7, 141:9, 141:14, 142:6</p> <p>Homeless [1] - 141:3</p> <p>homelessness [2] - 141:16, 141:19</p> <p>hope [6] - 17:1, 28:15, 109:12, 123:17, 125:17, 142:18</p> <p>hopefully [1] - 122:10</p> <p>hoping [5] - 16:3, 28:9, 54:1, 139:7, 168:17</p> <p>hot [1] - 97:6</p> <p>hour [9] - 37:16, 46:11, 71:14, 74:14, 107:5, 107:7, 109:19, 110:3</p> <p>hours [2] - 117:17, 187:15</p> <p>House [2] - 136:7, 164:1</p> <p>housekeeping [1] - 6:16</p> <p>houses [1] - 152:10</p> <p>Housing [3] - 81:2, 90:10, 140:12</p> <p>housing [68] - 3:17, 10:14, 15:11, 15:12, 15:14, 15:17, 17:14, 21:16, 21:17, 31:13, 37:13, 40:5, 62:7, 66:3, 66:4, 80:4, 80:12, 85:11, 86:11, 86:14, 86:17, 86:19, 90:7, 91:18, 92:4, 92:5, 97:2, 98:5, 112:11, 112:15, 113:5, 113:10, 113:13, 113:16, 114:1, 114:3, 115:17, 122:12, 122:14, 125:2, 125:3, 138:11, 140:15, 141:15, 142:5, 144:15, 151:1, 151:6, 158:17, 161:12, 166:13, 166:17, 167:5, 167:10, 178:19, 179:13, 181:11, 181:12, 183:13, 184:1, 184:5, 185:8, 192:7, 192:8</p> <p>huge [4] - 37:11, 70:8, 143:2, 158:9</p> <p>Hugh [9] - 1:9, 150:11, 167:7, 173:11, 173:17, 173:19, 179:11,</p>	<p>190:15, 195:2</p> <p>HUGH [5] - 7:5, 129:10, 150:12, 150:17, 174:3</p> <p>Hugh's [2] - 160:10, 168:4</p> <p>hundred [2] - 30:3, 173:6</p> <p>Hurley [1] - 142:11</p> <p>hurried [1] - 145:13</p> <p style="text-align: center;">I</p> <p>iceberg [1] - 61:5</p> <p>idea [11] - 25:3, 27:2, 34:4, 57:12, 57:13, 93:13, 128:17, 161:7, 162:3, 168:15, 188:10</p> <p>ideas [5] - 22:18, 77:17, 78:3, 79:1, 188:19</p> <p>identified [1] - 91:15</p> <p>identify [2] - 20:8, 21:13</p> <p>identifying [2] - 135:15, 136:2</p> <p>identity [1] - 136:2</p> <p>idle [1] - 141:13</p> <p>illusive [1] - 24:2</p> <p>illustrate [2] - 63:1, 63:4</p> <p>illustration [1] - 47:1</p> <p>imagine [4] - 91:15, 133:2, 145:16, 159:11</p> <p>imagined [1] - 81:9</p> <p>immediate [1] - 58:10</p> <p>immense [1] - 138:3</p> <p>impact [18] - 34:14, 35:18, 43:4, 44:7, 45:13, 46:18, 47:6, 48:2, 53:5, 53:13, 53:19, 54:7, 57:5, 57:13, 140:10, 160:5, 177:6</p> <p>impacted [3] - 57:9, 57:16, 118:5</p> <p>impacting [1] - 58:10</p> <p>impacts [14] - 35:8, 35:10, 37:7, 38:1, 58:4, 58:8, 58:13, 58:18, 59:1, 59:19, 60:2, 165:6, 166:5, 166:7</p> <p>impediments [1] - 142:4</p> <p>implemented [1] - 109:17</p> <p>imponderables [1] - 157:2</p>
---	--	---	--	--

<p>importance [6] - 16:13, 17:4, 26:10, 26:15, 178:5, 178:6</p> <p>important [38] - 14:2, 15:16, 18:10, 18:16, 36:2, 37:16, 37:19, 38:8, 39:7, 52:1, 54:6, 58:3, 76:16, 124:8, 124:9, 135:13, 151:7, 152:7, 156:2, 159:1, 159:5, 160:7, 160:11, 160:17, 161:1, 161:15, 162:5, 168:5, 168:6, 182:6, 182:11, 184:7, 184:8, 184:10, 191:10, 192:1, 192:17, 192:18</p> <p>imposed [1] - 66:1</p> <p>imposing [1] - 176:9</p> <p>impossible [2] - 153:2, 157:11</p> <p>impress [1] - 178:3</p> <p>impression [2] - 49:19, 54:19</p> <p>improve [3] - 34:6, 143:11, 178:18</p> <p>improvements [10] - 84:3, 109:15, 109:17, 159:6, 159:15, 160:1, 161:11, 165:19, 175:16, 181:5</p> <p>improving [1] - 166:1</p> <p>IN [2] - 198:9, 198:17</p> <p>inalterable [1] - 177:1</p> <p>inappropriate [1] - 173:15</p> <p>inaudible [1] - 195:19</p> <p>inaudible [1] - 105:16</p> <p>inbound [1] - 110:3</p> <p>INC [1] - 1:17</p> <p>incentive [2] - 80:19, 90:9</p> <p>incentives [1] - 82:2</p> <p>inclined [1] - 179:13</p> <p>include [14] - 5:2, 17:2, 53:17, 121:15, 130:3, 132:19, 144:1, 146:13, 146:14, 146:15, 146:17, 147:12, 147:13</p> <p>included [9] - 26:16, 80:16, 81:4, 85:18, 85:19, 113:1, 118:18, 130:7, 151:9</p>	<p>includes [3] - 31:1, 85:9, 121:4</p> <p>including [3] - 118:5, 123:5, 147:2</p> <p>inclusion [1] - 86:1</p> <p>inclusory [3] - 86:11, 86:14, 128:11</p> <p>income [14] - 15:12, 80:15, 87:2, 98:4, 98:9, 101:18, 114:3, 142:5, 166:18, 167:5, 167:10, 184:5, 184:8</p> <p>incorporated [2] - 79:14, 80:3</p> <p>increase [8] - 66:18, 81:8, 89:17, 121:3, 125:8, 141:15, 163:3, 178:2</p> <p>increased [4] - 21:18, 122:15, 122:16, 122:19</p> <p>increases [2] - 109:15, 174:7</p> <p>increasing [7] - 21:18, 66:2, 83:17, 86:9, 122:2, 122:7, 161:11</p> <p>incredibly [1] - 124:9</p> <p>indeed [1] - 185:10</p> <p>Index [1] - 2:15</p> <p>indicated [1] - 61:4</p> <p>indicates [1] - 88:12</p> <p>individual [7] - 59:14, 59:16, 59:19, 61:15, 84:6, 141:4, 164:4</p> <p>individually [1] - 84:7</p> <p>individuals [1] - 82:19</p> <p>indoor [1] - 94:4</p> <p>indoor/outdoor [2] - 25:6, 94:4</p> <p>influence [1] - 38:19</p> <p>influenced [1] - 37:11</p> <p>influences [2] - 38:12, 103:10</p> <p>inform [2] - 14:15, 158:15</p> <p>information [22] - 19:2, 44:18, 49:4, 59:4, 59:8, 71:16, 77:18, 78:4, 102:7, 104:10, 110:15, 113:3, 113:4, 119:15, 125:17, 132:19, 133:8, 158:9, 158:19, 180:7, 194:1, 194:5</p> <p>infrastructure [7] - 73:10, 122:17, 123:2, 162:8, 162:9,</p>	<p>163:13, 166:2</p> <p>ingredients [1] - 181:8</p> <p>initiating [1] - 189:14</p> <p>Innovation [2] - 32:15, 32:16</p> <p>innovation [11] - 29:8, 82:16, 87:13, 91:4, 96:13, 96:15, 96:19, 97:6, 98:6, 114:16, 115:1</p> <p>input [3] - 34:1, 176:14, 177:5</p> <p>insist [1] - 163:18</p> <p>instance [2] - 130:8, 165:14</p> <p>instantly [1] - 106:7</p> <p>instead [4] - 48:13, 143:9, 143:14, 174:11</p> <p>INSTRUCTIONS [2] - 197:1, 197:5</p> <p>instrument [1] - 95:7</p> <p>insufficient [1] - 176:19</p> <p>integrate [1] - 123:10</p> <p>integrated [1] - 160:14</p> <p>intend [1] - 102:9</p> <p>intense [1] - 33:10</p> <p>intent [4] - 78:2, 80:18, 137:12, 184:4</p> <p>intention [1] - 137:10</p> <p>interact [1] - 23:5</p> <p>interest [15] - 5:9, 15:10, 15:17, 16:6, 16:10, 20:16, 21:5, 24:5, 24:12, 25:5, 26:4, 28:13, 133:13, 133:14, 136:19</p> <p>interested [2] - 31:16, 159:17</p> <p>interesting [5] - 23:7, 23:10, 24:2, 116:7, 154:16</p> <p>interests [2] - 21:2, 170:14</p> <p>international [1] - 111:5</p> <p>interrupt [2] - 65:13, 128:4</p> <p>intersection [11] - 45:15, 46:8, 51:8, 52:8, 54:3, 55:8, 56:15, 57:3, 154:2, 154:10, 166:2</p> <p>intersection's [1] - 154:2</p> <p>intersections [21] - 47:3, 47:12, 50:6,</p>	<p>51:6, 51:13, 52:4, 52:6, 53:12, 53:16, 55:18, 56:7, 56:9, 56:17, 57:4, 57:8, 57:15, 57:18, 60:7, 61:15, 153:5, 153:11</p> <p>intimate [1] - 24:4</p> <p>intolerable [1] - 45:13</p> <p>introduced [3] - 82:12, 82:17, 126:1</p> <p>introducing [1] - 10:13</p> <p>invested [1] - 117:16</p> <p>invited [1] - 118:6</p> <p>involved [1] - 176:2</p> <p>Iram [15] - 1:12, 9:7, 15:1, 30:14, 46:2, 74:19, 79:6, 80:5, 100:2, 101:8, 103:2, 126:1, 129:1, 183:1, 193:7</p> <p>IRAM [21] - 3:8, 4:18, 5:4, 5:8, 6:14, 9:8, 49:8, 70:18, 72:17, 76:19, 78:9, 96:5, 96:19, 98:10, 98:13, 99:9, 102:1, 104:8, 128:3, 129:9, 193:8</p> <p>Iram's [1] - 49:16</p> <p>irons [1] - 181:6</p> <p>irregularities [1] - 111:6</p> <p>issue [13] - 28:15, 67:11, 68:16, 68:18, 91:18, 124:8, 165:19, 178:9, 186:8, 187:7, 187:9, 189:9, 194:3</p> <p>issues [13] - 30:6, 66:16, 67:1, 77:15, 88:1, 91:14, 94:15, 100:15, 149:15, 150:2, 150:9, 158:12, 185:2</p> <p>ITE [1] - 61:10</p> <p>item [5] - 5:19, 6:11, 21:10, 120:2, 125:18</p> <p>items [7] - 3:11, 5:9, 6:17, 10:7, 91:15, 115:4, 180:12</p> <p>iteration [2] - 9:17, 47:7</p> <p>itself [4] - 5:7, 11:14, 129:6, 185:19</p>	<p>January [3] - 11:13, 152:14, 182:5</p> <p>JEFF [8] - 77:7, 78:10, 79:6, 96:6, 129:8, 129:16, 132:7, 196:8</p> <p>Jeff [5] - 1:14, 12:15, 77:1, 79:5, 96:12</p> <p>jerk [1] - 155:7</p> <p>jobs [4] - 25:18, 26:1, 26:2, 26:6</p> <p>Joe [1] - 99:13</p> <p>John [1] - 185:18</p> <p>JOHN [1] - 99:8</p> <p>joint [3] - 11:16, 15:4, 17:10</p> <p>Joseph [1] - 1:15</p> <p>JR [37] - 50:2, 50:5, 50:14, 50:18, 51:7, 51:16, 52:14, 52:19, 53:8, 54:14, 55:3, 55:10, 55:15, 56:1, 56:10, 56:13, 57:2, 59:7, 59:12, 59:15, 60:5, 60:17, 61:2, 69:1, 69:4, 69:6, 69:11, 69:15, 70:1, 70:6, 70:11, 70:16, 72:14, 74:9, 150:15, 180:11, 190:8</p> <p>Jr [1] - 1:10</p> <p>judgment [2] - 58:18, 59:4</p> <p>July [1] - 112:4</p> <p>June [3] - 11:15, 15:5, 112:4</p> <p>jurisdiction [1] - 142:6</p> <p>jurisdictions [1] - 140:16</p> <p>just... [1] - 40:16</p>
K				
<p>K-Surp [1] - 35:11</p> <p>K2 [25] - 9:14, 11:11, 12:19, 18:17, 28:17, 30:19, 35:1, 40:14, 80:3, 80:17, 81:4, 82:6, 82:10, 84:14, 85:3, 87:16, 117:18, 118:1, 120:12, 121:2, 122:2, 125:6, 128:7, 157:5, 183:6</p> <p>K2-C2 [3] - 48:1, 49:9, 138:4</p> <p>Kaiser [3] - 106:13, 106:15, 111:9</p> <p>KAISER [4] - 106:14, 111:10, 195:10, 195:12</p>				
J				
<p>James [1] - 116:12</p> <p>JAMES [1] - 4:15</p>				

<p>keep [3] - 30:7, 62:11, 114:7</p> <p>keeping [4] - 92:3, 93:5, 105:5</p> <p>Kendall [70] - 2:11, 9:5, 10:6, 10:10, 12:9, 20:5, 25:12, 28:18, 29:6, 29:8, 29:12, 29:18, 30:17, 32:5, 32:9, 32:18, 33:5, 34:6, 34:12, 36:1, 40:3, 40:4, 41:6, 43:7, 43:19, 44:2, 50:7, 50:12, 50:16, 55:14, 61:8, 67:11, 73:17, 79:10, 79:12, 80:7, 80:8, 80:9, 82:11, 83:5, 84:1, 84:5, 85:16, 92:8, 92:19, 97:6, 99:5, 109:5, 117:9, 117:12, 117:14, 119:6, 124:14, 130:16, 136:4, 136:5, 138:8, 141:11, 143:2, 148:15, 151:6, 151:12, 152:1, 155:10, 157:16, 161:9, 171:15, 177:11, 183:4, 188:18</p> <p>key [19] - 6:9, 15:10, 21:9, 21:14, 23:15, 26:8, 28:14, 29:13, 30:6, 36:7, 36:8, 67:11, 80:5, 84:11, 86:7, 91:14, 102:13, 125:1, 164:7</p> <p>KeyWord [1] - 2:15</p> <p>kill [1] - 179:6</p> <p>kind [34] - 21:9, 41:19, 52:4, 52:10, 55:1, 61:16, 70:2, 90:15, 97:2, 101:17, 103:6, 104:6, 114:18, 120:14, 129:13, 153:13, 153:14, 156:6, 162:19, 165:4, 168:10, 169:5, 171:19, 175:18, 176:12, 176:13, 180:18, 191:3, 191:4, 191:5, 191:7, 191:18, 192:19</p> <p>kinds [5] - 26:10, 99:15, 114:4, 160:1, 165:12</p> <p>knit [1] - 153:5</p> <p>knowing [2] - 55:4, 169:5</p>	<p>knowledge [2] - 10:9, 192:15</p> <p>known [2] - 9:5, 44:16</p> <p>KS [4] - 2:11, 2:12, 9:12, 86:2</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">L</p> <hr/> <p>lab [6] - 99:7, 99:8, 99:9, 99:10, 172:2, 192:13</p> <p>labor [2] - 71:6, 71:10</p> <p>laboratory [1] - 37:13</p> <p>ladies [1] - 149:18</p> <p>laid [1] - 179:6</p> <p>land [18] - 4:6, 4:12, 37:11, 100:17, 121:14, 134:12, 141:10, 141:12, 141:17, 142:13, 146:13, 146:15, 146:18, 147:8, 147:13, 147:16, 158:2, 185:9</p> <p>Land [4] - 46:4, 47:8, 47:10, 51:14</p> <p>landmark [9] - 30:4, 88:18, 148:14, 148:15, 180:16, 185:11, 185:14, 185:15, 185:18</p> <p>landmarks [1] - 18:7</p> <p>landscape [2] - 30:10, 183:8</p> <p>large [11] - 18:1, 23:18, 96:17, 97:8, 117:11, 148:6, 148:13, 160:12, 173:18, 186:5, 186:14</p> <p>largely [3] - 3:9, 71:16, 100:11</p> <p>larger [7] - 79:9, 82:15, 83:4, 93:19, 97:12, 116:9, 156:18</p> <p>largest [1] - 117:11</p> <p>last [19] - 12:11, 13:5, 34:9, 34:13, 50:6, 87:18, 94:16, 115:19, 117:11, 127:4, 129:3, 136:17, 146:5, 147:4, 163:6, 169:10, 178:18, 179:11, 183:2</p> <p>lastly [3] - 115:5, 123:12, 138:19</p> <p>laws [1] - 162:7</p> <p>Lawson [1] - 198:5</p> <p>lay [2] - 11:3, 98:18</p>	<p>layered [1] - 44:8</p> <p>laying [1] - 141:13</p> <p>layout [1] - 22:8</p> <p>layouts [2] - 23:7, 23:8</p> <p>lays [2] - 11:5, 120:16</p> <p>lead [1] - 173:12</p> <p>leading [1] - 126:16</p> <p>lease [1] - 98:12</p> <p>leases [1] - 98:7</p> <p>least [8] - 41:9, 87:5, 90:11, 121:12, 121:16, 121:17, 144:14, 177:10</p> <p>leave [4] - 67:9, 178:15, 181:18</p> <p>leaving [1] - 79:2</p> <p>led [2] - 66:6, 66:11</p> <p>Lee [5] - 111:17, 111:18, 115:13, 115:15, 118:9</p> <p>LEE [3] - 111:18, 111:19, 195:17</p> <p>left [1] - 152:6</p> <p>legal [1] - 162:18</p> <p>legislative [1] - 189:9</p> <p>legislature [2] - 177:19, 189:10</p> <p>less [9] - 25:15, 48:1, 52:12, 54:3, 62:10, 63:19, 82:4, 113:7, 167:4</p> <p>letter [2] - 112:2, 120:16</p> <p>level [13] - 26:1, 26:2, 44:19, 45:4, 52:9, 53:4, 58:7, 58:14, 68:3, 104:12, 153:12, 165:14, 166:5</p> <p>levels [4] - 60:6, 92:1, 184:10, 192:12</p> <p>leverage [1] - 134:6</p> <p>License [1] - 198:14</p> <p>lie [1] - 170:18</p> <p>life [2] - 152:5, 177:1</p> <p>lifestyle [1] - 74:8</p> <p>lifetime [1] - 152:17</p> <p>light [2] - 46:14, 46:17</p> <p>lighter [2] - 88:19, 89:1</p> <p>likely [3] - 35:10, 38:10, 88:3</p> <p>limit [3] - 65:19, 106:5, 157:13</p> <p>limitations [2] - 83:9, 144:14</p> <p>limited [4] - 62:7, 83:8, 88:15, 177:4</p> <p>limiting [1] - 61:18</p> <p>limits [2] - 66:1, 88:8</p>	<p>LINE [1] - 197:8</p> <p>line [3] - 110:17, 111:11, 154:18</p> <p>Line [24] - 67:14, 67:17, 68:13, 70:12, 70:14, 74:11, 75:2, 75:4, 108:15, 109:14, 154:15, 155:1, 159:7, 159:14, 162:5, 163:4, 163:9, 164:7, 177:11, 178:11, 178:13, 181:4, 187:7, 187:11</p> <p>linear [1] - 64:17</p> <p>link [1] - 47:8</p> <p>links [2] - 29:3, 49:10</p> <p>list [1] - 193:18</p> <p>listed [1] - 121:1</p> <p>listening [3] - 136:19, 149:7, 190:5</p> <p>live [21] - 38:10, 38:13, 38:15, 43:7, 44:12, 57:3, 60:14, 69:8, 70:6, 71:6, 71:7, 71:11, 106:15, 109:3, 117:13, 181:14, 190:16, 192:9, 192:10, 192:11</p> <p>liveable [1] - 10:14</p> <p>lively [2] - 20:17, 24:12</p> <p>living [3] - 62:16, 188:3, 195:18</p> <p>Liza [3] - 1:14, 6:18, 78:9</p> <p>LIZA [4] - 7:1, 7:12, 7:19, 8:9</p> <p>lobbied [1] - 187:15</p> <p>lobby [4] - 81:19, 177:15, 189:15, 189:16</p> <p>lobbying [2] - 164:16, 189:9</p> <p>local [2] - 21:6, 61:12</p> <p>locally [1] - 16:7</p> <p>located [3] - 17:17, 18:7, 28:1</p> <p>location [6] - 18:5, 49:12, 54:8, 182:16, 185:5, 186:9</p> <p>look [42] - 10:5, 13:9, 17:13, 22:9, 35:9, 37:15, 37:18, 39:16, 40:17, 42:14, 47:11, 48:13, 49:7, 53:5, 61:14, 63:10, 64:10, 65:2, 65:4, 65:5, 65:8, 74:11, 78:17, 88:5, 91:16, 93:1,</p>	<p>94:12, 105:1, 115:6, 119:17, 120:4, 123:9, 134:12, 136:6, 143:10, 160:2, 171:7, 179:1, 183:19, 186:2, 192:6, 196:11</p> <p>looked [18] - 13:16, 13:17, 30:16, 33:13, 40:10, 40:11, 47:15, 71:2, 71:4, 71:12, 82:13, 84:2, 89:4, 95:13, 107:4, 113:12, 124:19</p> <p>looking [37] - 13:3, 14:7, 15:11, 15:13, 16:4, 17:3, 18:4, 18:8, 21:6, 22:17, 23:11, 23:15, 30:15, 33:18, 35:12, 39:16, 40:5, 47:15, 48:5, 85:8, 91:19, 92:1, 93:12, 93:13, 94:18, 94:19, 122:12, 123:3, 125:7, 130:16, 155:16, 156:9, 158:18, 161:15, 161:16, 166:5, 167:14</p> <p>looks [5] - 29:13, 45:15, 52:3, 132:4, 132:12</p> <p>lose [1] - 144:8</p> <p>Lou [4] - 51:18, 180:10, 190:14, 190:15</p> <p>LOUIS [37] - 50:2, 50:5, 50:14, 50:18, 51:7, 51:16, 52:14, 52:19, 53:8, 54:14, 55:3, 55:10, 55:15, 56:1, 56:10, 56:13, 57:2, 59:7, 59:12, 59:15, 60:5, 60:17, 61:2, 69:1, 69:4, 69:6, 69:11, 69:15, 70:1, 70:6, 70:11, 70:16, 72:14, 74:9, 150:15, 180:11, 190:8</p> <p>Louis [1] - 1:10</p> <p>lousy [1] - 143:18</p> <p>love [1] - 177:17</p> <p>lovely [1] - 174:13</p> <p>low [15] - 15:11, 15:12, 26:13, 87:1, 98:5, 114:2, 138:12, 138:13, 142:5, 166:17, 167:5, 167:10, 184:5, 184:7, 184:16</p> <p>low-mod [1] - 15:11</p>
---	---	---	--	---

<p>lower [7] - 17:5, 26:2, 28:8, 114:2, 188:17, 192:12</p>	<p>materials [1] - 196:9 math [1] - 146:5 matrix [1] - 125:1 matter [5] - 46:2, 53:17, 53:18, 132:5, 169:13</p>	<p>1:10, 1:10 Members [2] - 116:19, 131:14 members [5] - 22:1, 100:5, 117:2, 117:6, 119:1</p>	<p>minimum [9] - 86:17, 87:4, 89:8, 89:9, 90:18, 91:2, 113:6, 125:14, 185:1 minimums [1] - 83:11 minute [1] - 149:13 minutes [3] - 106:5, 106:12, 117:5</p>	<p>177:18, 187:9, 189:8 monitor [1] - 65:1 months [10] - 7:19, 8:1, 12:11, 33:4, 101:10, 150:14, 156:1, 173:1, 184:2, 184:13</p>
M				
<p>magenta [1] - 31:7 magic [2] - 107:11 main [3] - 83:7, 85:17, 113:8 Main [2] - 4:7, 154:13 maintained [1] - 97:17 maintenance [1] - 26:3 major [7] - 35:4, 74:16, 75:17, 81:14, 82:5, 82:9, 83:13 majority [2] - 2:11, 152:10 makers [1] - 141:1 manage [1] - 75:10 manager [2] - 117:18, 177:8 Manager [3] - 1:12, 3:7, 118:14 manure [1] - 173:6 marginally [1] - 66:19 market [6] - 20:6, 20:7, 25:7, 157:15, 192:7, 195:16 marketing [1] - 192:1 markets [1] - 179:17 Marriott [1] - 26:17 Mary [2] - 1:10, 158:5 MARY [2] - 8:14, 158:6 Mass [5] - 2:6, 4:7, 4:9, 5:5, 7:14 mass [5] - 62:10, 66:8, 176:19, 177:10 Massachusetts [3] - 1:7, 139:16, 162:18 MASSACHUSETTS [1] - 198:3 massDOT [3] - 32:12, 177:16, 177:17 massing [17] - 23:7, 23:11, 27:12, 27:14, 27:18, 28:10, 31:2, 31:8, 94:10, 173:2, 173:3, 173:14, 174:16, 175:5, 176:6, 176:14, 190:2 master [2] - 118:17, 119:19 match [2] - 42:7 material [1] - 13:7</p>	<p>matters [1] - 8:19 max [1] - 97:18 maximize [2] - 89:11, 194:10 maximum [3] - 122:14, 123:13, 157:13 maximums [2] - 83:12, 87:11 MBTA [2] - 108:7, 163:1 McKinney [1] - 141:2 McKinney-Vento [1] - 141:2 mean [37] - 12:14, 14:3, 35:4, 35:7, 45:11, 46:8, 48:9, 56:19, 60:14, 63:3, 63:6, 67:10, 76:17, 99:12, 101:2, 125:3, 129:17, 145:4, 148:8, 148:9, 148:11, 148:14, 148:16, 148:17, 148:18, 149:1, 152:3, 155:15, 156:12, 157:1, 157:18, 171:19, 172:4, 172:8, 175:3, 194:8 meaningfully [1] - 118:18 means [4] - 41:1, 98:18, 99:1, 180:18 measure [2] - 146:12, 153:13 measures [1] - 165:12 Medford [1] - 50:19 media [1] - 19:14 meet [4] - 101:19, 114:7, 134:15, 136:1 meeting [16] - 3:5, 3:9, 3:13, 4:16, 4:18, 4:19, 5:12, 6:2, 6:18, 13:5, 17:11, 34:9, 34:14, 96:1, 114:14, 135:11 Meeting [2] - 1:6, 2:4 meetings [4] - 19:1, 19:15, 34:8, 159:3 member [2] - 125:12, 127:17 Member [4] - 1:9, 1:9,</p>	<p>memos [1] - 165:9 mentally [2] - 129:14, 131:17 mention [1] - 148:19 mentioned [10] - 5:10, 25:9, 30:14, 80:6, 88:1, 119:16, 126:11, 148:18, 159:3, 190:1 mentioning [1] - 92:14 message [1] - 117:2 met [2] - 20:1, 20:5 methodology [1] - 44:6 Metropolitan [1] - 74:4 microphone [1] - 140:1 Microsoft [4] - 157:19, 164:9, 164:10, 187:14 Microsofts [1] - 195:5 mid [2] - 97:4, 98:15 mid-20th [1] - 171:15 mid-tier [2] - 97:4, 98:15 middle [10] - 28:5, 80:15, 87:2, 98:4, 98:9, 108:17, 167:3, 184:7, 184:17, 188:14 midsize [1] - 97:4 might [20] - 4:10, 13:9, 14:17, 18:6, 39:9, 45:10, 48:8, 48:12, 54:18, 77:17, 93:15, 94:12, 94:14, 116:6, 130:9, 130:10, 154:6, 175:2, 190:3 millennium [1] - 195:8 million [10] - 5:16, 89:18, 90:2, 90:8, 91:7, 119:11, 120:11, 147:7, 156:7 millions [4] - 61:7, 62:4, 62:16, 125:10 mind [6] - 61:14, 92:3, 93:5, 105:5, 126:5, 190:14 minds [1] - 188:9 mine [1] - 193:4</p>	<p>misconstrued [1] - 184:3 misleading [1] - 121:8 missing [4] - 20:10, 55:11, 102:8, 159:1 mission [1] - 124:9 MIT [16] - 12:18, 29:7, 31:4, 35:5, 48:10, 85:5, 85:19, 107:3, 108:4, 108:7, 110:18, 114:17, 119:12, 146:5, 163:16, 164:10 mix [1] - 27:15 mixed [2] - 19:7, 80:14 Mobility [2] - 67:11, 119:6 mobility [6] - 32:4, 32:9, 33:5, 34:6, 73:16, 125:15 mod [1] - 15:11 mode [12] - 38:2, 38:5, 38:13, 39:1, 39:8, 41:4, 42:14, 42:19, 44:11, 63:13, 75:16, 76:12 model [9] - 23:3, 23:5, 27:14, 31:1, 111:3, 151:13, 171:15, 174:10, 176:7 modelled [1] - 130:17 modelling [2] - 101:13, 104:12 models [3] - 99:4, 99:15, 173:11 moderate [9] - 87:1, 98:5, 114:2, 166:17, 167:5, 167:10, 184:5, 184:7, 184:16 modes [6] - 33:6, 73:12, 73:15, 160:2, 161:10, 162:3 moment [4] - 26:3, 28:1, 31:1, 180:4 momentum [1] - 164:6 Monday [1] - 5:11 money [10] - 100:17, 108:9, 133:18, 162:13, 163:3, 163:7, 177:3,</p>	<p>mosaic [4] - 140:11, 140:16, 141:8, 141:9 most [18] - 30:17, 33:10, 37:15, 39:13, 45:7, 72:4, 85:17, 88:2, 89:6, 91:17, 126:6, 135:13, 152:7, 153:6, 179:15, 179:17, 182:2, 193:15 mostly [4] - 16:4, 16:11, 21:15, 193:19 motion [2] - 7:3, 8:11 motivated [1] - 172:8 Motor [1] - 65:8 movable [1] - 23:9 move [7] - 15:9, 18:11, 23:6, 23:16, 107:13, 127:7, 181:2 moved [4] - 4:11, 7:5, 8:12, 155:7 movements [1] - 151:18 moving [5] - 32:1, 81:13, 97:9, 125:13, 173:12 MRX [1] - 183:3 multiple [1] - 24:14 municipal [2] - 140:19, 177:14 murk [1] - 104:7 murkiness [1] - 169:11 murky [1] - 170:2 must [3] - 101:5, 112:11, 189:18 MXD [5] - 13:2, 31:7, 86:1, 113:9, 144:12</p>
N				
<p>name [8] - 99:6, 106:2, 106:3, 106:14, 136:17, 146:6, 174:1 names [1] - 105:18</p>				

narrow [3] - 74:12, 75:5, 171:9
national [2] - 40:19, 152:9
natural [2] - 20:18, 24:17
naturally [2] - 135:17, 135:19
nature [1] - 195:2
navigating [1] - 104:3
near [4] - 54:9, 62:11, 76:5, 78:1
nearly [1] - 37:18
necessarily [2] - 35:7, 84:5
necessary [3] - 101:17, 106:3, 164:2
necessity [1] - 178:13
need [51] - 17:6, 18:10, 25:11, 26:18, 35:9, 42:19, 43:1, 61:9, 61:10, 67:15, 67:17, 77:16, 77:18, 78:4, 79:3, 98:4, 100:17, 102:19, 103:14, 104:3, 109:14, 113:18, 119:17, 120:17, 122:14, 122:16, 127:6, 133:7, 135:13, 141:14, 141:15, 142:11, 148:7, 148:14, 150:6, 151:5, 164:14, 165:17, 167:1, 167:2, 181:8, 182:14, 183:12, 185:5, 185:8, 185:10, 188:11, 189:9, 189:12, 192:3
needed [1] - 163:3
needing [1] - 16:14
needs [20] - 16:11, 21:9, 62:14, 67:6, 67:19, 84:4, 97:16, 98:11, 100:19, 101:7, 101:15, 101:19, 103:12, 122:18, 126:12, 134:15, 167:1, 167:12, 180:15
negotiating [1] - 167:16
negotiation [2] - 122:4, 133:10
negotiations [2] - 133:10, 135:2
neighborhood [9] - 10:15, 19:8, 52:11,

54:10, 54:12, 118:4, 148:5, 167:11, 174:9
neighborhoods [4] - 27:2, 29:9, 61:16, 118:5
neighbors [2] - 8:5, 8:6
nervous [3] - 173:4, 175:6, 179:4
network [6] - 73:13, 148:5, 151:9, 151:17, 160:11, 173:16
networking [1] - 188:10
NetZero [1] - 83:15
never [2] - 96:18, 186:3
new [30] - 14:9, 25:18, 25:19, 39:11, 42:1, 48:5, 48:6, 48:7, 48:16, 62:16, 64:3, 64:5, 64:14, 66:4, 79:15, 82:9, 83:10, 86:11, 101:7, 110:16, 113:1, 115:2, 121:19, 122:14, 130:19, 131:8, 145:6, 158:3, 177:3, 178:11
New [2] - 65:16, 136:6
news [1] - 175:3
next [14] - 3:13, 6:2, 6:11, 28:11, 44:17, 61:6, 78:19, 88:5, 116:15, 126:8, 155:7, 156:1, 158:10, 181:5
nexus [1] - 101:14
nice [1] - 111:3
night [2] - 113:15, 187:18
nine [3] - 60:6, 73:4, 187:17
nobody [6] - 52:18, 108:9, 155:11, 186:5, 194:14
non [6] - 81:1, 83:11, 146:15, 146:16, 161:10, 162:3
non-car [2] - 161:10, 162:3
non-federal [2] - 146:15, 146:16
non-residential [2] - 81:1, 83:11
none [1] - 70:12
Norfolk [1] - 111:19
normally [1] - 128:4
North [4] - 36:16,

38:15, 90:16, 112:14
north [3] - 51:10, 56:2, 70:12
north/south [1] - 26:15
northwest [1] - 69:16
NOT [1] - 198:17
Notary [2] - 198:6, 198:13
note [2] - 93:9, 197:6
noted [2] - 71:15, 197:16
nothing [2] - 51:16, 147:11
notice [1] - 18:16
noticeable [1] - 36:6
notification [1] - 19:10
noting [1] - 89:8
notion [1] - 82:12
November [8] - 3:19, 4:5, 6:1, 6:6, 78:7, 196:6, 196:8
number [19] - 18:19, 41:2, 41:15, 42:5, 46:7, 46:11, 55:7, 58:9, 61:6, 88:15, 98:8, 108:6, 116:4, 116:9, 158:12, 165:18, 166:19, 173:2, 182:18
numbers [6] - 55:4, 55:6, 60:12, 88:10, 146:10, 183:5

O

O'Brien [6] - 45:18, 47:8, 47:9, 47:10, 51:14
o'clock [1] - 68:15
O'Leary [2] - 133:4, 133:5
O'LEARY [1] - 133:5
objectives [1] - 96:2
obtain [1] - 19:5
obviously [8] - 15:10, 39:4, 40:14, 43:15, 58:19, 160:19, 178:16, 184:11
occupied [1] - 2:12
occurred [2] - 112:7, 148:1
October [3] - 1:4, 3:4, 8:2
odds [1] - 100:9
OF [5] - 1:2, 198:3, 198:16, 198:17, 198:18
offer [3] - 134:17, 168:13
office [3] - 40:6, 41:1, 61:8
OFFICIAL [1] - 1:18
offset [2] - 143:3, 174:17
offsetting [1] - 166:7
oftentimes [1] - 36:15
old [2] - 114:17, 155:4
once [4] - 43:14, 145:11, 165:3, 194:17
one [75] - 3:14, 26:8, 29:17, 31:1, 34:5, 38:14, 45:19, 48:8, 49:2, 49:12, 51:5, 51:19, 55:18, 56:6, 56:9, 57:7, 61:13, 63:9, 64:18, 65:9, 68:3, 68:8, 69:5, 70:2, 70:3, 70:19, 72:18, 74:13, 74:14, 74:15, 76:10, 88:17, 100:1, 101:15, 102:13, 103:13, 104:16, 107:2, 108:6, 111:11, 112:16, 114:13, 115:7, 119:1, 120:18, 121:9, 121:16, 125:14, 128:5, 130:4, 134:4, 134:5, 135:13, 144:17, 147:18, 148:6, 148:8, 151:12, 154:6, 154:9, 155:8, 170:8, 173:19, 174:11, 178:18, 179:15, 179:16, 179:19, 181:11, 186:13, 189:19, 191:2, 192:16, 193:9
ones [8] - 52:6, 57:12, 57:19, 83:14, 88:3, 127:12, 154:9, 189:14
ongoing [3] - 9:16, 88:4, 193:14
online [1] - 119:13
open [71] - 12:6, 16:9, 16:11, 16:15, 17:6, 17:18, 18:1, 18:3, 20:9, 20:15, 21:19, 22:10, 22:12, 23:17, 23:19, 24:3, 24:11, 24:13, 24:18, 28:14, 30:11, 34:8, 67:9, 77:14, 79:2, 82:5, 82:10, 82:12, 84:2, 87:8, 87:10, 90:12,

90:15, 90:18, 91:2, 91:8, 92:14, 92:16, 115:16, 121:11, 122:1, 122:6, 122:7, 125:4, 132:17, 135:14, 138:12, 148:2, 148:6, 148:10, 148:12, 151:8, 151:15, 151:16, 152:1, 156:18, 158:17, 160:6, 160:8, 160:12, 173:16, 173:19, 174:15, 180:17, 185:3, 185:19, 188:8, 188:13, 194:9
operated [1] - 2:13
opinion [1] - 164:5
opinions [4] - 23:18, 27:11, 92:16, 155:18
opportunities [1] - 83:2
opportunity [12] - 22:6, 99:17, 105:14, 105:19, 117:11, 137:14, 144:8, 144:18, 145:12, 145:14, 160:8, 168:7
opposing [1] - 21:1
opposite [5] - 28:7, 30:3, 37:3, 45:19, 107:17
optimistic [1] - 152:8
option [1] - 107:19
options [3] - 23:12, 93:1, 95:19
orange [2] - 31:4, 85:13
order [3] - 14:9, 178:7
Ordinance [7] - 2:10, 6:4, 6:5, 9:4, 41:7, 43:5, 140:9
ordinance [2] - 43:11, 141:6
organization [1] - 99:7
original [4] - 18:16, 86:9, 138:17, 197:2
originally [1] - 31:3
otherwise [2] - 180:5, 180:7
ought [2] - 186:15, 188:19
ourselves [4] - 145:15, 150:4, 167:16, 170:19
outcomes [1] - 23:14
outdoor [1] - 180:19

<p>outflow [1] - 9:14 outreach [2] - 18:17, 23:13 outside [1] - 74:13 outsourced [1] - 26:4 overall [7] - 52:11, 58:8, 59:6, 63:17, 80:6, 89:16, 154:4 Overlay [1] - 2:11 overridden [1] - 118:2 overwhelm [1] - 28:14 overwhelming [1] - 106:19 owe [1] - 145:15 own [10] - 42:9, 112:4, 127:8, 143:5, 145:8, 145:14, 169:3, 170:14, 171:4 owned [4] - 16:7, 16:15, 117:8, 141:17 ownership [1] - 65:4</p>	<p>Parking [1] - 73:8 Parking's [1] - 165:8 parks [1] - 143:5 parochial [2] - 171:9, 178:3 part [26] - 14:11, 18:11, 18:13, 18:16, 19:19, 20:7, 23:5, 23:13, 28:11, 28:17, 30:18, 31:9, 60:13, 62:6, 62:18, 67:1, 82:5, 82:14, 84:13, 84:15, 87:2, 99:13, 101:8, 136:9, 138:7, 177:6 participate [1] - 118:7 participated [1] - 158:7 participating [2] - 72:8, 117:17 particular [23] - 9:13, 9:16, 10:7, 52:3, 52:9, 54:7, 54:15, 54:17, 82:2, 82:6, 84:4, 86:4, 86:6, 89:4, 103:18, 114:16, 138:10, 154:6, 159:12, 163:13, 182:16, 185:5, 186:9 particularly [5] - 22:7, 83:10, 114:14, 151:12, 156:11 parties [3] - 24:15, 134:4, 135:7 partner [2] - 14:7, 164:15 parts [3] - 80:8, 80:9, 81:18 pass [2] - 139:6, 157:7 past [5] - 9:18, 33:13, 103:6, 178:1, 184:12 path [3] - 141:19, 170:7, 171:3 pathways [3] - 148:5, 151:18, 181:1 pattern [2] - 38:18, 154:4 patterns [2] - 38:9, 38:19 pay [2] - 32:13, 165:18 paying [1] - 166:6 payments [2] - 81:1, 90:9 PB [1] - 2:5 peace [1] - 139:14 peak [7] - 37:16, 71:14, 75:6, 107:5,</p>	<p>107:7, 109:19, 110:3 pedestrian [4] - 4:9, 5:5, 22:15, 166:1 pending [1] - 33:1 people [69] - 19:18, 20:8, 21:13, 21:17, 22:6, 22:9, 23:4, 23:10, 38:3, 38:9, 39:3, 39:4, 40:19, 41:2, 41:10, 41:12, 42:9, 42:13, 42:19, 43:3, 43:6, 43:8, 43:12, 43:18, 44:11, 50:8, 63:14, 63:15, 65:3, 69:6, 69:8, 69:12, 69:17, 70:2, 71:3, 71:5, 71:7, 71:11, 72:2, 72:3, 74:18, 75:1, 95:6, 99:3, 106:4, 116:3, 116:4, 116:9, 134:16, 135:17, 138:7, 139:1, 142:14, 145:10, 154:19, 156:13, 157:6, 157:19, 161:13, 166:18, 176:17, 184:3, 184:11, 186:6, 188:3, 188:19, 190:16, 192:10 people's [4] - 38:12, 41:18, 63:13, 126:2 per [4] - 81:6, 81:8, 84:9, 166:17 percent [34] - 30:4, 42:4, 42:7, 42:13, 65:3, 69:7, 69:11, 75:18, 75:19, 76:5, 76:9, 81:15, 86:16, 87:1, 87:4, 89:8, 90:14, 96:17, 107:7, 108:2, 108:3, 113:5, 122:1, 122:3, 125:8, 144:15, 182:17, 184:6, 184:9, 184:15, 184:16, 184:19, 195:14 percentage [4] - 63:14, 166:16, 183:11, 194:9 perception [1] - 128:8 perennial [2] - 62:1, 173:5 perhaps [5] - 68:10, 117:10, 172:18, 173:5, 174:18 perimeter [1] - 151:11 period [3] - 33:4, 36:19, 75:6 permeability [1] -</p>	<p>27:1 Permit [3] - 13:1, 60:1, 162:15 permit [1] - 162:13 Permits [1] - 165:9 permitted [1] - 59:2 permitting [1] - 162:9 person [2] - 42:16, 44:9 perspective [9] - 10:19, 11:1, 103:12, 108:7, 120:5, 171:8, 171:9, 171:11 perspectives [1] - 108:6 petition [12] - 3:16, 11:14, 79:17, 86:12, 87:3, 88:5, 121:14, 124:15, 128:9, 128:14, 137:7 Petition [2] - 2:9, 9:3 pharmacy [2] - 21:6, 25:10 Philadelphia [1] - 136:7 phone [1] - 191:14 physical [1] - 130:14 Picasso [1] - 186:12 pick [1] - 191:14 picking [2] - 150:7, 169:9 picture [1] - 13:8 picturesque [1] - 20:19 piece [8] - 71:13, 102:8, 110:18, 151:7, 159:1, 160:7, 161:6, 166:10 pieces [4] - 12:4, 13:10, 103:9, 160:13 place [13] - 10:18, 18:18, 35:1, 48:2, 56:15, 127:6, 127:11, 127:19, 135:17, 148:16, 149:3, 171:17, 195:17 Place [2] - 4:6, 4:8 places [10] - 16:6, 16:7, 25:15, 63:18, 68:11, 136:8, 141:11, 151:16, 162:8, 183:10 Plan [1] - 117:18 plan [23] - 16:2, 33:5, 36:15, 40:14, 42:3, 45:9, 62:13, 76:11, 83:16, 92:13, 96:3, 103:18, 118:1, 119:15, 119:18,</p>	<p>122:2, 123:11, 125:19, 151:12, 157:5, 163:16, 163:17, 183:7 Planned [1] - 2:10 planner [1] - 124:11 planners [1] - 171:5 PLANNING [1] - 1:2 Planning [42] - 2:9, 3:5, 3:12, 7:13, 9:2, 11:16, 11:18, 13:2, 17:9, 17:12, 31:6, 31:11, 32:19, 79:18, 84:18, 85:7, 86:8, 86:12, 87:2, 87:9, 88:12, 95:17, 96:9, 99:17, 101:5, 112:9, 117:1, 117:3, 117:14, 117:15, 118:2, 120:12, 124:6, 124:8, 127:18, 135:11, 137:19, 165:11, 177:4, 196:16, 197:6, 197:15 planning [21] - 5:13, 39:1, 39:14, 44:3, 44:4, 63:2, 74:4, 103:12, 118:17, 119:19, 120:3, 123:1, 124:10, 125:18, 126:5, 134:11, 135:10, 138:3, 170:15, 190:12 plans [3] - 67:6, 74:16, 175:10 plate [1] - 132:17 plates [1] - 17:3 play [4] - 38:10, 117:13, 159:9, 189:1 played [4] - 156:14, 175:4, 181:9, 190:3 playing [2] - 156:14, 173:10 plays [1] - 29:5 Plaza [1] - 186:3 plaza [3] - 24:1, 24:13, 152:2 plazas [1] - 20:17 plenty [1] - 153:17 plus [2] - 15:18, 86:10 pocket [1] - 174:5 Point [3] - 36:16, 90:16, 112:14 point [26] - 28:7, 56:12, 65:18, 66:11, 67:9, 72:16, 76:18, 81:6, 91:6, 94:17, 96:15, 97:18,</p>
P				
<p>P-o-o-n-e-n [1] - 146:6 p.m [3] - 1:5, 2:9, 196:15 pace [4] - 36:7, 37:2, 37:4, 159:9 PADEN [4] - 7:1, 7:12, 7:19, 8:9 Paden [1] - 1:14 page [1] - 49:11 PAGE [2] - 2:1, 197:8 paid [1] - 67:19 pane [1] - 54:12 par [1] - 90:14 paragraph [1] - 109:11 parallel [2] - 28:19, 95:13 parcel [5] - 9:16, 10:5, 11:6, 12:10, 89:4 parcels [1] - 179:16 park [14] - 24:1, 27:8, 121:17, 143:1, 143:4, 148:12, 148:13, 148:15, 149:1, 149:3, 174:2, 174:6, 185:12, 186:10 Park [3] - 148:17, 185:13, 186:6 parking [11] - 4:10, 42:2, 42:6, 61:18, 62:5, 64:9, 68:10, 83:8, 83:9, 87:11, 119:8</p>				

<p>102:12, 103:4, 113:8, 113:9, 118:9, 120:13, 127:4, 127:12, 132:9, 134:6, 169:10, 185:1, 186:12</p> <p>pointed [1] - 90:13</p> <p>points [5] - 29:17, 115:13, 122:9, 124:7, 125:1</p> <p>police [1] - 152:3</p> <p>policy [3] - 140:19, 141:10, 177:9</p> <p>political [3] - 120:9, 163:18, 164:1</p> <p>politics [1] - 152:9</p> <p>pony [1] - 164:12</p> <p>POONEN [1] - 146:3</p> <p>Poonen [1] - 146:4</p> <p>poorest [1] - 72:3</p> <p>popular [2] - 24:8, 25:7</p> <p>population [1] - 142:6</p> <p>portion [1] - 71:17</p> <p>portrayed [1] - 115:8</p> <p>position [1] - 107:11</p> <p>positives [1] - 102:18</p> <p>possibility [1] - 157:9</p> <p>possible [2] - 73:11, 110:8</p> <p>postcards [1] - 19:11</p> <p>posted [1] - 109:18</p> <p>potential [6] - 76:6, 88:16, 159:6, 160:16, 162:2, 167:9</p> <p>potentially [1] - 28:10</p> <p>pound [2] - 173:6, 173:7</p> <p>pounds [1] - 173:6</p> <p>poverty [2] - 141:16, 141:19</p> <p>power [1] - 67:16</p> <p>practice [1] - 167:17</p> <p>precise [1] - 153:14</p> <p>precision [1] - 55:1</p> <p>predicted [1] - 40:18</p> <p>prefer [2] - 24:10, 49:13</p> <p>preferences [1] - 100:9</p> <p>prepared [3] - 31:3, 31:19, 139:17</p> <p>present [3] - 12:1, 35:14, 41:9</p> <p>presentation [5] - 49:16, 76:18, 77:13, 96:7, 148:2</p> <p>presented [2] - 61:1, 147:4</p> <p>presenting [2] -</p>	<p>79:17, 91:12</p> <p>preserved [1] - 114:19</p> <p>President [1] - 32:15</p> <p>pressure [2] - 187:12, 188:2</p> <p>PRESTON [17] - 51:18, 52:17, 54:5, 54:16, 55:9, 55:12, 55:17, 56:5, 56:11, 57:7, 57:11, 77:4, 106:10, 111:8, 140:4, 161:5, 193:3</p> <p>Preston [1] - 1:8</p> <p>pretty [4] - 38:14, 72:10, 143:8, 190:19</p> <p>prevent [1] - 159:13</p> <p>previous [2] - 138:5, 159:3</p> <p>previously [1] - 42:5</p> <p>priced [1] - 97:7</p> <p>primarily [1] - 27:13</p> <p>principle [1] - 123:1</p> <p>principles [1] - 14:16</p> <p>priorities [4] - 21:13, 79:14, 102:15, 102:18</p> <p>prioritization [1] - 115:11</p> <p>prioritized [1] - 21:19</p> <p>priority [7] - 21:14, 104:6, 177:9, 177:15, 178:4, 178:6, 189:13</p> <p>private [6] - 14:7, 14:8, 89:19, 131:9, 163:19, 164:4</p> <p>pro [1] - 169:1</p> <p>problem [13] - 46:12, 51:9, 74:12, 74:13, 75:13, 97:19, 110:19, 151:19, 159:17, 162:6, 163:12, 178:9, 194:7</p> <p>problems [7] - 55:7, 75:4, 111:5, 133:11, 153:17, 153:18, 154:5</p> <p>proceedings [1] - 198:8</p> <p>proceeds [2] - 80:11, 89:14</p> <p>process [49] - 4:13, 5:13, 5:14, 5:17, 5:18, 9:14, 10:1, 10:6, 11:9, 12:5, 12:19, 15:9, 16:8, 19:10, 19:19, 28:11, 29:16, 30:7, 30:19,</p>	<p>32:13, 34:11, 35:1, 39:15, 40:4, 40:10, 48:14, 58:5, 84:16, 84:17, 92:19, 101:5, 118:15, 118:17, 118:19, 120:1, 120:3, 123:19, 126:16, 133:15, 134:5, 134:11, 134:18, 135:6, 138:4, 138:5, 176:1, 176:3, 177:7, 178:18</p> <p>processing [1] - 22:3</p> <p>produce [1] - 140:14</p> <p>produced [1] - 155:9</p> <p>producing [1] - 169:16</p> <p>professor [1] - 146:5</p> <p>profit [1] - 113:13</p> <p>profitable [3] - 101:6, 169:18, 170:11</p> <p>program [4] - 100:16, 104:14, 169:15, 169:16</p> <p>programming [2] - 84:3, 91:8</p> <p>programs [1] - 91:9</p> <p>project [33] - 13:1, 35:10, 37:13, 44:16, 51:11, 53:3, 53:13, 59:1, 59:14, 81:10, 85:11, 101:3, 110:4, 110:5, 126:9, 145:5, 145:6, 163:2, 165:3, 165:7, 165:17, 166:4, 167:4, 167:8, 168:2, 168:3, 170:9, 172:17, 175:18, 178:5, 180:14, 182:13</p> <p>projecting [1] - 153:15</p> <p>projects [6] - 36:14, 59:16, 64:11, 84:19, 89:15, 184:13</p> <p>promise [1] - 142:19</p> <p>promote [2] - 82:1, 134:13</p> <p>promoting [2] - 82:2, 96:13</p> <p>prompt [1] - 94:11</p> <p>pronged [1] - 94:18</p> <p>proper [1] - 154:13</p> <p>properly [1] - 119:15</p> <p>Properties [3] - 109:9, 110:14, 119:12</p> <p>properties [1] - 19:12</p> <p>property [3] - 5:7, 134:8, 164:4</p> <p>proponent [1] - 80:13</p>	<p>proponents [1] - 184:13</p> <p>proportion [3] - 15:13, 21:17, 138:11</p> <p>proportions [1] - 183:4</p> <p>Proposal [2] - 77:8, 79:8</p> <p>proposal [14] - 11:3, 19:3, 35:6, 35:9, 79:17, 85:8, 91:3, 93:16, 94:19, 105:1, 138:17, 139:2, 147:1, 157:3</p> <p>proposals [7] - 31:5, 31:8, 48:6, 48:16, 49:5, 137:13, 169:3</p> <p>propose [1] - 99:4</p> <p>proposed [11] - 7:17, 53:6, 88:9, 90:5, 95:4, 119:2, 120:17, 132:1, 140:7, 140:13, 141:6</p> <p>proposing [1] - 48:10</p> <p>Protection [1] - 140:13</p> <p>provide [16] - 16:3, 17:7, 24:6, 62:14, 67:5, 83:2, 91:1, 94:13, 94:14, 95:15, 101:15, 102:7, 160:9, 163:6, 191:3, 191:4</p> <p>provided [4] - 15:14, 83:10, 90:18, 180:6</p> <p>providing [3] - 83:1, 95:16, 109:19</p> <p>proximity [1] - 58:15</p> <p>PTDM [4] - 41:6, 43:4, 65:3, 74:15</p> <p>public [41] - 2:6, 3:14, 4:5, 4:13, 7:16, 9:2, 10:13, 11:9, 12:5, 16:9, 16:16, 24:3, 25:6, 27:8, 34:8, 34:9, 67:8, 77:12, 77:14, 79:13, 79:14, 82:5, 82:9, 87:10, 90:12, 92:11, 92:18, 94:4, 96:9, 100:4, 105:11, 119:9, 121:11, 125:4, 131:14, 137:14, 143:11, 148:13, 157:10</p> <p>Public [3] - 2:8, 198:6, 198:13</p> <p>public's [1] - 137:3</p> <p>PUD [9] - 2:11, 2:12, 9:12, 13:1, 31:4,</p>	<p>84:17, 86:2, 91:3, 114:13</p> <p>PUD-KS [4] - 2:11, 2:12, 9:12, 86:2</p> <p>PUDs [3] - 30:16, 96:14, 115:4</p> <p>purple [4] - 31:12, 85:5, 88:11, 88:19</p> <p>purpose [1] - 33:3</p> <p>pursuits [1] - 84:11</p> <p>push [7] - 41:19, 42:10, 134:6, 156:10, 179:13, 184:17, 194:6</p> <p>put [12] - 13:9, 43:19, 45:6, 79:7, 87:19, 124:19, 144:9, 149:3, 173:2, 175:12, 179:2, 186:18</p> <p>putting [7] - 54:13, 54:17, 112:10, 127:10, 130:15, 168:1, 169:1</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Q</p> <hr/> <p>questioning [1] - 173:18</p> <p>questions [7] - 49:1, 78:18, 96:8, 105:7, 149:15, 182:4, 191:1</p> <p>queueing [1] - 57:4</p> <p>queues [1] - 46:19</p> <p>quick [6] - 50:2, 68:8, 96:12, 122:9, 122:10, 189:6</p> <p>quickly [4] - 32:9, 80:4, 85:4, 158:10</p> <p>Quincy [1] - 68:11</p> <p>quite [10] - 20:2, 20:5, 20:16, 66:19, 98:17, 109:6, 124:12, 126:19, 153:16, 186:5</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">R</p> <hr/> <p>R&D [3] - 40:6, 61:8, 98:11</p> <p>rail [1] - 70:16</p> <p>raise [5] - 65:18, 67:3, 114:12, 149:14, 182:4</p> <p>raised [3] - 158:13, 190:15</p> <p>Raising [2] - 7:9, 8:17</p> <p>raising [4] - 66:11, 68:2, 113:12, 150:2</p>
---	---	--	--	--

<p>ran [1] - 109:18</p> <p>ranging [1] - 23:18</p> <p>Rashid [2] - 139:12, 139:15</p> <p>RASHID [4] - 139:13, 139:15, 140:2, 140:7</p> <p>RASMUSSEN [26] - 32:8, 49:15, 50:11, 50:17, 51:4, 51:12, 53:2, 53:10, 56:8, 56:19, 57:10, 58:2, 59:10, 59:13, 59:17, 62:19, 67:10, 68:13, 68:18, 69:3, 69:5, 69:10, 69:14, 69:19, 70:8, 74:10</p> <p>Rasmussen [2] - 13:10, 119:7</p> <p>rate [2] - 84:9, 98:12</p> <p>rather [7] - 86:9, 95:3, 151:9, 157:12, 157:19, 158:2, 170:18</p> <p>ratio [3] - 122:13, 147:10, 147:17</p> <p>rational [3] - 108:13, 109:7, 187:3</p> <p>rationale [1] - 120:9</p> <p>re [4] - 35:12, 143:9, 143:16, 180:12</p> <p>re-cover [1] - 180:12</p> <p>re-filed [2] - 143:9, 143:16</p> <p>re-looking [1] - 35:12</p> <p>reach [3] - 8:7, 88:16, 96:15</p> <p>reached [2] - 75:18, 76:9</p> <p>reaches [1] - 33:7</p> <p>reaching [1] - 115:6</p> <p>react [2] - 137:6, 191:18</p> <p>reacting [1] - 194:2</p> <p>read [8] - 88:10, 124:12, 124:13, 124:14, 138:2, 139:18, 165:8, 197:15</p> <p>readily [1] - 66:9</p> <p>readiness [2] - 84:4, 91:9</p> <p>reading [1] - 197:6</p> <p>ready [2] - 6:11, 169:2</p> <p>real [4] - 46:18, 93:17, 179:15, 184:9</p> <p>realistic [1] - 161:14</p> <p>realistically [1] - 161:13</p> <p>realize [2] - 15:7, 190:6</p>	<p>really [82] - 4:7, 9:18, 10:7, 10:10, 10:12, 10:14, 22:5, 23:9, 25:7, 35:16, 36:9, 36:17, 37:1, 38:7, 38:12, 38:19, 39:8, 40:19, 41:8, 43:3, 45:7, 46:9, 46:15, 49:19, 54:11, 62:5, 70:12, 71:13, 73:6, 73:17, 74:7, 74:12, 74:13, 75:5, 76:12, 79:3, 81:11, 81:19, 82:10, 88:2, 97:5, 97:15, 98:17, 99:2, 104:2, 104:15, 107:9, 114:1, 115:15, 127:16, 130:4, 134:9, 142:18, 143:7, 144:19, 145:15, 148:7, 151:5, 151:13, 158:6, 158:11, 159:5, 161:7, 162:1, 164:19, 166:8, 167:2, 167:14, 168:17, 169:4, 177:7, 178:2, 181:7, 181:16, 188:12, 189:12, 189:15, 192:2, 194:16</p> <p>realm [3] - 10:13, 16:9, 157:8</p> <p>reason [5] - 109:3, 144:8, 180:5, 180:7, 197:7</p> <p>REASON [6] - 197:9, 197:10, 197:11, 197:12, 197:13, 197:14</p> <p>reasonable [3] - 136:9, 146:11, 151:15</p> <p>reasoning [1] - 65:19</p> <p>reasons [2] - 80:5, 172:7</p> <p>recap [1] - 15:2</p> <p>received [3] - 22:4, 29:10, 93:11</p> <p>receives [1] - 121:18</p> <p>recent [1] - 178:1</p> <p>recently [2] - 30:17, 81:5</p> <p>recess [1] - 149:17</p> <p>recognizes [2] - 29:4, 74:6</p> <p>recommend [1] - 120:15</p> <p>recommendation [3] - 79:4, 83:8, 86:10</p> <p>recommendations [5]</p>	<p>- 79:9, 80:4, 118:1, 119:3, 120:16</p> <p>recommended [8] - 28:18, 30:12, 81:14, 84:8, 86:13, 117:13, 128:7, 166:15</p> <p>recommending [1] - 128:9</p> <p>reconvene [1] - 149:19</p> <p>record [3] - 112:6, 197:17, 198:7</p> <p>RECORD [1] - 1:18</p> <p>rectifying [1] - 151:19</p> <p>Red [22] - 67:13, 67:17, 68:13, 70:14, 74:11, 75:2, 75:4, 108:15, 109:14, 154:15, 155:1, 159:7, 159:14, 162:5, 163:4, 163:9, 164:7, 177:11, 178:13, 181:4, 187:6, 187:10</p> <p>red [1] - 46:14</p> <p>redevelop [1] - 14:12</p> <p>redeveloped [1] - 150:18</p> <p>redevelopment [2] - 80:12, 117:8</p> <p>redo [1] - 176:10</p> <p>redoing [1] - 34:12</p> <p>redraft [1] - 78:19</p> <p>reduced [1] - 122:7</p> <p>reduction [1] - 122:1</p> <p>reference [1] - 49:13</p> <p>referred [2] - 124:13, 126:2</p> <p>referring [5] - 40:4, 49:17, 82:11, 82:17, 102:9</p> <p>refine [2] - 11:13, 17:2</p> <p>refined [2] - 32:1, 95:14</p> <p>reflect [2] - 129:5, 138:3</p> <p>reflects [2] - 138:6, 139:3</p> <p>refresher [1] - 85:1</p> <p>regard [6] - 16:18, 17:16, 18:4, 22:8, 184:1, 187:5</p> <p>regarding [1] - 80:6</p> <p>regardless [3] - 59:6, 71:6, 71:9</p> <p>region [3] - 68:7, 159:17, 172:5</p> <p>region-wide [1] - 159:17</p> <p>regional [6] - 66:16, 74:2, 140:17, 171:8,</p>	<p>171:11, 178:5</p> <p>regionally [1] - 172:6</p> <p>Registry [1] - 65:8</p> <p>regularly [1] - 67:3</p> <p>reiterate [1] - 113:19</p> <p>rejected [1] - 143:9</p> <p>related [1] - 104:11</p> <p>relating [1] - 142:4</p> <p>relation [1] - 17:6</p> <p>relationship [2] - 16:12, 118:13</p> <p>relative [3] - 54:12, 55:7, 57:13</p> <p>relatively [1] - 177:2</p> <p>relevant [2] - 125:17, 131:16</p> <p>relief [1] - 142:15</p> <p>reluctant [1] - 175:13</p> <p>remain [3] - 67:1, 131:2</p> <p>remember [1] - 4:10</p> <p>reminding [1] - 12:14</p> <p>remiss [1] - 127:19</p> <p>repeating [3] - 150:13, 179:12, 189:11</p> <p>replaced [1] - 131:6</p> <p>replacing [1] - 64:15</p> <p>report [6] - 72:11, 109:8, 109:13, 110:7, 110:14, 124:14</p> <p>Reporter [2] - 198:5, 198:13</p> <p>REPORTER [1] - 198:18</p> <p>REPORTERS [1] - 1:17</p> <p>representation [2] - 32:18, 42:12</p> <p>representative [1] - 33:1</p> <p>representatives [3] - 177:13, 189:12, 189:16</p> <p>represents [3] - 50:12, 117:10, 134:9</p> <p>REPRODUCTION [1] - 198:17</p> <p>request [3] - 5:14, 7:15, 121:10</p> <p>Request [1] - 2:6</p> <p>requested [1] - 120:8</p> <p>requesting [1] - 5:16</p> <p>requests [1] - 123:18</p> <p>require [7] - 4:12, 74:16, 81:6, 92:4, 113:16, 120:8, 159:12</p> <p>required [7] - 67:19,</p>	<p>80:13, 81:1, 87:11, 119:15, 134:3, 184:14</p> <p>requirement [6] - 87:13, 91:3, 112:10, 114:2, 114:8, 196:2</p> <p>requirements [21] - 79:13, 80:19, 81:14, 82:14, 83:13, 83:18, 85:15, 85:17, 86:6, 86:7, 90:6, 90:8, 93:2, 93:3, 95:1, 103:13, 103:16, 104:1, 114:15, 125:2, 126:12</p> <p>requires [1] - 194:9</p> <p>requiring [3] - 74:18, 113:10, 163:12</p> <p>rescheduled [1] - 116:5</p> <p>Research [1] - 2:12</p> <p>reserved [2] - 78:11, 82:18</p> <p>reserving [1] - 81:17</p> <p>reside [1] - 139:15</p> <p>resident [2] - 71:10, 125:11</p> <p>residential [16] - 61:8, 81:1, 83:11, 83:12, 85:9, 88:14, 89:16, 90:1, 131:9, 134:15, 169:18, 181:13, 182:15, 182:17, 183:13, 191:15</p> <p>residents [6] - 20:2, 24:17, 25:18, 26:5, 115:18, 122:4</p> <p>Residents' [1] - 112:3</p> <p>residents' [1] - 120:13</p> <p>resiliency [1] - 123:10</p> <p>resolved [1] - 187:7</p> <p>resounding [1] - 52:16</p> <p>resource [2] - 75:10, 158:2</p> <p>RESPECT [1] - 198:17</p> <p>respect [2] - 120:18, 162:7</p> <p>respond [1] - 193:9</p> <p>responded [1] - 194:15</p> <p>responding [1] - 126:17</p> <p>Response [3] - 105:9, 116:13, 149:11</p> <p>response [1] - 148:1</p> <p>responsible [1] - 58:5</p> <p>rest [3] - 14:12, 91:5, 114:3</p> <p>restrictive [1] - 93:6</p>
--	---	---	--	--

<p>resubmit [1] - 112:6 result [6] - 11:9, 41:14, 61:11, 63:2, 152:19, 153:6 results [1] - 34:19 retail [21] - 16:1, 16:5, 17:15, 21:7, 21:8, 25:11, 37:14, 40:6, 81:17, 82:2, 82:3, 87:12, 93:9, 93:12, 93:13, 93:18, 94:3, 130:9, 131:9, 182:15 returning [2] - 4:1, 4:2 review [7] - 84:16, 85:12, 85:14, 89:3, 95:17, 99:17, 165:4 reviewing [1] - 35:15 revised [2] - 121:1, 121:7 revisions [1] - 176:8 rezoning [19] - 4:8, 6:8, 9:11, 9:13, 13:3, 18:15, 19:3, 21:14, 31:8, 31:9, 85:2, 85:5, 118:8, 118:15, 118:19, 119:5, 120:7, 124:15, 124:18 RFQ [1] - 193:11 rich [1] - 10:13 riders [1] - 110:1 ridership [1] - 109:15 riding [1] - 155:10 rights [2] - 141:5, 164:5 rise [1] - 181:17 risk [2] - 152:16, 156:12 road [1] - 175:18 roads [1] - 63:4 roadway [1] - 73:13 Roberts [1] - 1:14 ROBERTS [8] - 77:7, 78:10, 79:6, 96:6, 129:8, 129:16, 132:7, 196:8 rocket [1] - 58:6 role [3] - 29:4, 29:7, 76:16 rolling [1] - 65:7 rooftop [1] - 152:4 Room [1] - 1:6 Rosemary [3] - 116:16, 124:2, 124:3 ROSEMARY [1] - 124:3 round [4] - 88:6, 135:2, 135:4, 173:1 roundly [1] - 143:8</p>	<p>roundtable [3] - 5:12, 18:13, 147:4 route [3] - 44:12, 110:4 rule [2] - 45:11, 46:10 rules [1] - 42:2 run [1] - 188:15 running [1] - 32:13 rushing [1] - 126:9 Russell [1] - 1:9 RUSSELL [5] - 7:5, 129:10, 150:12, 150:17, 174:3</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">S</p> <hr/> <p>S-t-o-h-l-m-a-n [1] - 136:18 sad [1] - 145:15 SAME [1] - 198:17 San [1] - 148:19 satisfied [1] - 84:6 Saturday [1] - 22:3 Saturday's [1] - 23:2 saw [4] - 87:18, 106:16, 108:4, 146:19 scale [4] - 26:13, 28:8, 83:3, 117:11 scaling [1] - 54:10 scenario [2] - 47:19, 48:7 scenarios [3] - 34:5, 57:14, 63:2 schedule [1] - 109:19 science [2] - 39:19, 53:18 scope [1] - 164:19 screwed [3] - 107:17, 108:8, 111:1 Second [1] - 1:6 second [11] - 3:15, 7:6, 8:13, 8:14, 58:18, 65:14, 102:1, 121:10, 123:2, 125:17, 147:19 section [1] - 49:10 Section [2] - 2:9, 9:3 sector [5] - 79:12, 140:11, 140:16, 141:7, 141:9 see [41] - 11:11, 22:13, 23:10, 37:3, 37:19, 39:15, 40:5, 53:6, 69:15, 72:14, 73:5, 75:17, 100:5, 102:10, 109:4, 114:1, 114:18, 115:6, 134:19, 143:10, 144:7,</p>	<p>145:5, 150:18, 151:8, 151:10, 153:7, 153:9, 153:10, 154:3, 156:10, 158:2, 162:1, 162:7, 167:7, 168:3, 170:17, 170:18, 179:3, 180:16, 181:14, 188:11 seeing [5] - 31:17, 39:2, 61:17, 135:6, 167:14 seeking [2] - 60:1, 123:13 seem [4] - 126:4, 126:13, 173:15, 190:3 segue [1] - 61:19 select [2] - 22:12, 128:1 selected [1] - 151:13 semi [1] - 25:5 semi-covered [1] - 25:5 senators [1] - 177:13 send [2] - 49:10, 49:14 sense [8] - 44:13, 45:5, 63:6, 63:7, 126:14, 151:4, 160:3, 192:12 sent [3] - 5:13, 19:11, 112:3 separately [2] - 30:17, 40:7 September [2] - 7:1, 7:11 series [3] - 18:2, 19:16, 27:5 serious [1] - 125:5 seriously [1] - 124:12 serve [2] - 93:19, 94:5 served [1] - 154:19 service [2] - 153:12, 165:14 services [1] - 102:3 serving [1] - 177:11 session [2] - 78:19, 108:4 set [10] - 14:15, 24:15, 31:16, 32:10, 79:9, 79:13, 84:12, 174:18, 198:7, 198:9 setbacks [2] - 17:3, 132:18 sets [1] - 10:4 setting [4] - 24:4, 24:11, 24:17, 30:1 settings [1] - 20:18</p>	<p>settlement [3] - 38:9, 38:18 seven [3] - 76:9, 132:15, 143:1 seven-and-a-half [1] - 143:1 several [6] - 151:16, 152:5, 179:1, 183:12, 184:2, 184:12 severe [1] - 123:9 sewer [4] - 162:12, 162:13, 162:14 shadow [1] - 121:19 shape [2] - 93:15, 101:4 share [5] - 72:11, 114:13, 161:11, 164:13, 166:6 shared [3] - 22:16, 83:1, 84:8 sharing [1] - 19:2 sheet [2] - 105:12, 197:7 SHEET [1] - 197:1 Sheet [2] - 197:3, 197:7 shift [1] - 83:5 short [5] - 12:2, 70:13, 109:11, 149:17, 168:19 Shorthand [2] - 198:5, 198:13 show [2] - 153:4, 194:4 showing [1] - 42:16 shown [3] - 22:18, 55:19, 56:18 shows [4] - 46:3, 69:9, 115:15, 156:15 side [6] - 51:10, 56:3, 159:2, 166:12, 166:13, 167:13 sided [2] - 133:9, 133:10 sides [1] - 179:7 sift [1] - 23:1 sign [1] - 105:12 Sign [1] - 197:7 sign-up [1] - 105:12 signal [2] - 67:16, 165:18 signature [1] - 135:14 SIGNATURE [1] - 197:1 signed [1] - 105:13 significant [16] - 33:15, 35:5, 36:5, 62:6, 66:12, 85:10, 107:1, 121:3,</p>	<p>121:17, 151:16, 152:16, 155:16, 160:7, 160:16, 182:6, 187:2 significantly [2] - 35:6, 66:19 similar [5] - 17:9, 17:13, 29:10, 53:4, 90:3 similarly [1] - 166:1 simple [1] - 31:18 simply [3] - 127:9, 127:15, 192:19 single [3] - 47:18, 53:6, 65:6 singular [1] - 117:10 sit [4] - 22:2, 22:5, 26:9, 46:13 site [40] - 14:12, 14:15, 15:15, 16:13, 18:3, 18:8, 19:2, 19:6, 19:18, 20:11, 22:7, 22:8, 22:13, 22:14, 23:11, 24:2, 24:7, 26:16, 27:8, 28:5, 29:4, 29:5, 29:6, 29:14, 31:3, 41:11, 82:7, 87:6, 94:11, 96:2, 102:17, 113:6, 117:9, 138:11, 144:4, 150:18, 151:17, 155:17, 170:17, 178:14 sitting [2] - 26:13, 100:11 situation [5] - 44:16, 100:10, 119:13, 120:4, 124:17 situations [2] - 46:7, 153:2 six [4] - 7:19, 8:1, 120:16, 132:15 Sixth [3] - 26:11, 52:9, 52:15 size [6] - 15:17, 68:9, 93:4, 98:7, 121:17, 131:6 sized [1] - 151:15 skip [1] - 42:17 slide [4] - 22:19, 50:6, 69:1, 69:3 slightly [2] - 110:5, 110:11 slow [1] - 118:14 small [1] - 116:4 smaller [12] - 18:2, 24:3, 53:8, 82:3, 82:18, 83:3, 97:13, 160:13, 173:16, 173:19, 174:13,</p>
--	---	---	--	--

<p>188:16 social [1] - 19:14 sold [1] - 195:14 solution [2] - 62:7, 110:8 solutions [2] - 34:4, 107:10 solved [1] - 33:16 solving [1] - 111:5 someone [1] - 166:13 someplace [1] - 67:7 Somerville [3] - 50:9, 55:16, 69:16 sometime [2] - 138:2, 141:13 sometimes [2] - 72:1, 89:12 somewhat [3] - 106:17, 142:12, 162:6 somewhere [1] - 114:8 soon [1] - 31:14 sooner [1] - 48:9 sorry [3] - 88:15, 159:13, 178:18 sort [70] - 15:8, 16:6, 17:1, 17:4, 17:7, 17:9, 17:19, 18:7, 18:11, 18:14, 19:8, 20:16, 20:19, 21:1, 21:7, 22:3, 23:1, 23:4, 23:6, 23:14, 24:6, 24:7, 24:13, 24:16, 25:2, 26:2, 27:4, 27:7, 27:8, 27:13, 27:14, 27:16, 27:17, 28:4, 28:7, 28:12, 28:19, 29:13, 30:3, 30:15, 30:18, 31:15, 31:18, 33:17, 37:5, 38:6, 43:13, 45:10, 46:9, 46:12, 47:4, 53:13, 58:6, 64:17, 92:7, 94:17, 130:18, 133:11, 148:14, 150:13, 151:3, 153:12, 154:14, 159:8, 171:19, 173:16, 175:1, 175:15, 180:16, 189:14 sound [2] - 96:7, 121:3 sounds [1] - 181:1 South [1] - 51:2 south [1] - 50:7 southern [1] - 142:3 space [81] - 16:2, 16:9, 16:11, 16:15, 17:6, 17:18, 17:19,</p>	<p>18:1, 18:2, 18:3, 21:19, 23:17, 23:19, 24:11, 24:13, 24:19, 25:6, 28:14, 30:11, 81:17, 82:5, 82:10, 82:13, 82:16, 82:17, 83:1, 84:2, 87:8, 87:10, 87:13, 89:11, 90:12, 90:15, 90:18, 91:2, 91:4, 91:8, 92:14, 92:16, 96:14, 96:16, 97:1, 98:6, 99:1, 99:7, 99:10, 114:16, 115:1, 115:16, 121:11, 122:1, 122:6, 122:7, 125:4, 132:18, 135:14, 136:3, 138:13, 142:15, 148:3, 148:6, 148:10, 148:12, 151:8, 152:2, 156:18, 158:17, 160:6, 160:8, 160:12, 173:19, 174:12, 174:15, 180:17, 185:3, 185:19, 186:2, 186:4, 188:8, 188:13, 194:9 spaces [21] - 18:2, 20:9, 20:15, 22:10, 22:12, 24:3, 24:4, 24:18, 27:4, 27:7, 42:6, 93:17, 93:18, 93:19, 94:2, 94:4, 94:5, 151:16, 173:17, 174:13, 188:16 speaking [3] - 46:13, 124:6, 183:2 Special [3] - 13:1, 60:1, 165:9 specific [8] - 17:16, 43:16, 44:1, 44:14, 54:8, 59:3, 71:1, 98:6 specifically [1] - 12:9 speeds [1] - 155:5 spell [1] - 106:3 spelling [1] - 136:17 spend [1] - 119:2 spending [1] - 108:2 spirit [1] - 70:19 split [1] - 184:9 spoken [2] - 119:7, 193:15 sponsored [1] - 13:4 sporting [1] - 24:7 spot [3] - 180:19, 183:10, 185:11 spread [3] - 69:19,</p>	<p>75:1, 171:13 spreading [2] - 74:18, 75:6 Spring [1] - 116:18 spring [1] - 138:14 squander [2] - 145:12, 145:13 Square [76] - 2:11, 9:5, 10:6, 10:10, 12:9, 20:6, 29:6, 29:8, 30:17, 32:5, 32:9, 32:18, 33:5, 34:6, 34:12, 36:1, 40:3, 40:5, 41:6, 43:7, 43:19, 44:2, 50:8, 50:13, 50:16, 55:14, 61:9, 67:11, 73:17, 79:10, 79:12, 80:7, 80:9, 82:12, 83:6, 84:1, 84:5, 85:16, 92:8, 92:19, 97:6, 99:5, 109:5, 109:6, 117:10, 117:12, 117:14, 119:6, 124:14, 130:16, 136:4, 136:5, 136:6, 138:9, 141:11, 143:3, 148:15, 148:17, 148:19, 151:6, 151:12, 152:1, 154:1, 155:10, 157:16, 161:9, 171:16, 174:3, 174:4, 174:5, 177:11, 183:4, 185:13, 186:6 square [26] - 30:2, 40:1, 61:7, 62:4, 62:16, 81:7, 81:8, 82:4, 84:9, 89:18, 90:2, 101:16, 119:11, 125:9, 125:11, 129:11, 129:12, 136:7, 144:13, 147:1, 147:5, 147:7, 147:9, 172:15, 174:6, 194:16 squares [1] - 20:17 squeezed [1] - 145:17 SS [1] - 198:4 Staff [1] - 1:13 staff [6] - 77:19, 100:4, 127:5, 150:4, 173:1, 191:11 stage [6] - 10:4, 14:15, 33:18, 85:12, 85:15, 98:16 staggered [1] - 111:1 staging [1] - 159:19 stakeholders [2] -</p>	<p>34:1, 117:16 stall [1] - 112:14 stalled [1] - 37:1 stand [1] - 112:2 standalone [1] - 82:13 standard [2] - 111:12, 166:16 standing [2] - 75:3 standout [1] - 88:17 start [12] - 3:5, 10:3, 34:11, 35:15, 46:11, 73:5, 81:12, 135:5, 145:7, 150:1, 150:11, 183:15 started [3] - 11:12, 73:4, 99:12 starting [4] - 9:17, 34:3, 46:18, 161:6 startup [2] - 98:16, 195:3 startups [3] - 97:4, 97:14, 99:2 State [3] - 32:11, 164:1, 185:16 state [14] - 68:3, 106:2, 152:9, 163:8, 164:7, 164:8, 164:15, 177:12, 178:5, 178:7, 187:8, 187:13, 188:4, 189:17 statement [1] - 139:17 statement(s) [1] - 197:17 states [1] - 58:19 station [2] - 152:3, 155:11 stations [1] - 155:2 status [1] - 85:5 stay [1] - 161:2 stemmed [1] - 12:19 stenographer [1] - 106:4 step [2] - 28:11, 58:6 steps [2] - 76:12, 89:2 STEVE [4] - 106:14, 111:10, 195:10, 195:12 Steve [11] - 96:11, 99:19, 106:13, 106:14, 108:12, 109:11, 126:11, 154:15, 159:4, 169:8, 189:4 Steve's [1] - 193:9 Steven [2] - 1:9, 137:1 STEVEN [23] - 5:2, 5:6, 7:6, 8:12, 60:16, 60:18, 61:3,</p>	<p>65:13, 68:8, 68:16, 70:4, 100:1, 100:14, 103:2, 106:8, 129:1, 131:12, 169:9, 174:4, 189:5, 190:9, 192:15, 193:4 Stevens [2] - 116:15, 116:18 STEVENS [1] - 116:17 stick [1] - 123:1 sticking [1] - 184:8 still [14] - 8:5, 8:7, 22:3, 22:19, 57:5, 77:15, 79:2, 95:18, 104:11, 105:14, 112:2, 138:16, 148:12, 187:2 Stohlman [3] - 136:15, 136:16, 143:7 STOHLMAN [2] - 136:16, 137:16 stop [1] - 72:16 store [4] - 21:5, 25:10, 37:14, 145:7 stories [2] - 195:10, 195:11 story [2] - 41:1, 157:15 strategy [1] - 80:7 street [7] - 5:3, 39:10, 43:16, 44:1, 45:7, 153:19, 174:19 Street [23] - 26:11, 26:17, 28:6, 28:8, 29:19, 31:13, 45:17, 46:4, 51:2, 87:13, 90:11, 106:15, 107:8, 112:1, 116:18, 124:4, 133:6, 136:17, 142:11, 146:4, 153:18, 154:12, 154:13 streets [15] - 22:16, 24:3, 26:7, 27:3, 43:2, 50:10, 52:16, 54:17, 56:3, 61:13, 63:12, 64:8, 70:3, 72:1, 81:15 strict [1] - 95:2 strictly [1] - 64:6 strike [1] - 102:19 strong [4] - 27:16, 29:3, 113:8, 113:9 strongest [2] - 72:4, 72:13 structure [1] - 122:19 structured [1] - 32:12 stuck [1] - 162:6 student [1] - 85:11</p>
---	---	---	---	--

<p>studied [1] - 34:13</p> <p>studies [6] - 31:2, 40:19, 44:4, 107:1, 173:2, 173:3</p> <p>study [30] - 18:17, 28:19, 31:17, 44:3, 51:10, 53:7, 53:19, 54:7, 61:5, 62:18, 80:18, 81:4, 81:14, 82:6, 82:10, 82:12, 84:2, 84:14, 85:1, 85:16, 92:9, 119:14, 124:12, 124:13, 125:6, 128:7, 130:16, 130:18, 153:3, 160:18</p> <p>Study [6] - 28:17, 79:10, 85:3, 117:14, 120:12, 125:6</p> <p>stuff [6] - 91:12, 138:16, 156:6, 171:7, 173:5, 191:13</p> <p>Styrofoam [2] - 173:11, 176:5</p> <p>subcommittee [1] - 119:1</p> <p>subdivision [1] - 162:11</p> <p>subject [2] - 43:10, 101:11</p> <p>subjects [1] - 101:10</p> <p>submitted [1] - 79:18</p> <p>subscribed [1] - 197:16</p> <p>subscribed [1] - 187:11</p> <p>subsidized [1] - 98:12</p> <p>suburban [1] - 162:10</p> <p>suburbs [1] - 171:14</p> <p>success [1] - 136:11</p> <p>successful [1] - 186:3</p> <p>suddenly [1] - 104:14</p> <p>sufficient [1] - 101:18</p> <p>sufficiently [2] - 101:5, 170:10</p> <p>suggest [4] - 64:13, 110:11, 121:9, 144:11</p> <p>suggested [5] - 31:9, 88:13, 119:17, 128:7, 129:2</p> <p>suggestions [3] - 25:14, 27:19, 175:15</p> <p>sum [2] - 153:5, 154:10</p> <p>summarize [6] - 12:1, 12:12, 80:1, 106:18, 117:4, 182:3</p> <p>summarizing [1] -</p>	<p>80:1</p> <p>summary [2] - 86:5, 90:3</p> <p>summer's [1] - 138:16</p> <p>Sums [1] - 45:1</p> <p>sums [1] - 45:14</p> <p>sunlight [1] - 121:18</p> <p>support [6] - 25:3, 25:9, 29:2, 110:2, 162:2, 178:16</p> <p>supported [1] - 27:15</p> <p>supporting [1] - 97:14</p> <p>supportive [2] - 73:11, 97:10</p> <p>supposed [4] - 36:18, 42:3, 64:11, 143:3</p> <p>Surp [1] - 35:11</p> <p>surprise [2] - 21:4, 91:18</p> <p>surrounding [1] - 27:1</p> <p>surveys [1] - 43:9</p> <p>Susan [1] - 32:6</p> <p>Susanne [9] - 13:10, 51:19, 52:1, 60:18, 73:8, 73:16, 125:15, 154:15, 161:19</p> <p>SUSANNE [26] - 32:8, 49:15, 50:11, 50:17, 51:4, 51:12, 53:2, 53:10, 56:8, 56:19, 57:10, 58:2, 59:10, 59:13, 59:17, 62:19, 67:10, 68:13, 68:18, 69:3, 69:5, 69:10, 69:14, 69:19, 70:8, 74:10</p> <p>suspect [1] - 180:1</p> <p>sustain [2] - 10:8, 74:7</p> <p>sustainability [2] - 83:12, 87:14</p> <p>sustainable [2] - 10:17, 73:12</p> <p>Suzannah [8] - 1:15, 10:1, 12:11, 14:19, 82:11, 88:1, 91:12, 92:14</p> <p>SUZANNAH [1] - 15:1</p> <p>Swaathi [1] - 1:15</p> <p>synthesize [2] - 13:7, 22:5</p> <p>synthesizing [1] - 23:14</p> <p>system [8] - 63:4, 67:16, 67:17, 68:12, 82:15, 107:16, 107:18, 177:10</p> <p>Systems [1] - 2:12</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">T</p> <p>table [1] - 157:4</p> <p>tailored [1] - 86:3</p> <p>talent [1] - 97:12</p> <p>tall [5] - 27:19, 144:5, 174:19, 190:19, 195:8</p> <p>taller [4] - 18:6, 28:3, 181:13, 188:15</p> <p>tallest [1] - 123:8</p> <p>task [13] - 32:4, 32:9, 32:10, 32:17, 33:3, 34:7, 73:16, 125:14, 125:15, 160:2, 160:4, 163:17, 166:8</p> <p>Task [2] - 67:12, 119:6</p> <p>tasked [1] - 19:2</p> <p>tax [1] - 164:13</p> <p>team [1] - 135:10</p> <p>Team [6] - 32:19, 117:1, 117:15, 118:3, 135:11, 137:19</p> <p>teams [2] - 193:16, 193:19</p> <p>tech [2] - 172:1, 190:18</p> <p>technical [1] - 67:13</p> <p>technicality [1] - 77:8</p> <p>technically [1] - 132:6</p> <p>techniques [1] - 44:14</p> <p>technology [3] - 157:15, 158:1, 158:4</p> <p>Ted [1] - 102:8</p> <p>telephone [1] - 124:4</p> <p>ten [9] - 38:11, 39:6, 41:1, 42:4, 42:7, 48:11, 119:10, 132:15, 156:7</p> <p>ten-story [1] - 41:1</p> <p>tenable [1] - 165:7</p> <p>tenant [1] - 194:16</p> <p>tenanted [1] - 195:15</p> <p>tended [1] - 24:10</p> <p>tends [1] - 95:6</p> <p>tentatively [1] - 78:8</p> <p>term [7] - 24:17, 38:19, 62:13, 66:16, 68:5, 134:14, 136:12</p> <p>terms [30] - 3:11, 5:9, 6:3, 14:14, 16:12, 17:13, 19:6, 35:7, 36:3, 40:9, 41:10, 58:8, 63:11, 71:3,</p>	<p>72:18, 73:2, 73:12, 77:16, 80:2, 98:7, 102:14, 105:4, 115:9, 119:18, 120:14, 128:6, 132:9, 151:14, 185:4, 194:13</p> <p>terribly [1] - 173:4</p> <p>terrific [1] - 185:13</p> <p>testify [1] - 137:15</p> <p>text [1] - 15:7</p> <p>THE [9] - 1:2, 1:18, 70:15, 100:13, 105:16, 198:16, 198:17, 198:18</p> <p>theme [2] - 36:10, 93:11</p> <p>themselves [1] - 169:17</p> <p>THEODORE [57] - 3:3, 6:13, 6:15, 7:3, 7:7, 7:10, 7:13, 8:3, 8:10, 8:13, 8:15, 8:18, 49:2, 50:4, 76:17, 77:3, 77:6, 77:9, 78:13, 96:10, 98:2, 98:11, 99:18, 105:6, 105:10, 105:17, 106:9, 106:13, 111:16, 116:11, 116:14, 124:2, 127:2, 128:19, 133:3, 136:14, 137:9, 139:11, 139:19, 140:6, 142:8, 145:19, 149:8, 149:12, 149:18, 158:5, 161:4, 169:8, 180:10, 182:1, 192:5, 193:5, 195:7, 195:11, 195:13, 196:1, 196:10</p> <p>Theodore [1] - 1:8</p> <p>theory [1] - 133:11</p> <p>therefor [1] - 197:7</p> <p>therefore [2] - 162:3, 165:17</p> <p>thereof [1] - 3:18</p> <p>they've [3] - 150:13, 153:11, 176:11</p> <p>thinking [9] - 34:3, 70:19, 80:16, 95:9, 104:17, 114:19, 143:16, 158:15, 169:2</p> <p>thinks [1] - 127:18</p> <p>Third [14] - 29:19, 45:17, 47:9, 51:15, 87:12, 90:11, 107:8, 124:4, 133:6, 146:4, 153:18, 154:8,</p>	<p>154:12, 165:15</p> <p>third [5] - 46:16, 55:5, 55:10, 55:13, 108:12</p> <p>thirds [1] - 152:6</p> <p>THIS [1] - 198:16</p> <p>thoughtful [1] - 95:14</p> <p>thoughts [3] - 94:8, 112:7, 181:17</p> <p>thousand [8] - 90:7, 144:4, 150:19, 151:5, 183:13, 183:15, 183:16, 194:13</p> <p>thousand-foot [1] - 194:13</p> <p>three [27] - 5:18, 15:18, 56:16, 57:3, 65:7, 71:17, 81:7, 81:10, 87:5, 87:7, 87:8, 90:12, 105:18, 106:5, 106:12, 117:5, 121:17, 122:9, 126:17, 133:9, 133:10, 151:5, 174:13, 184:10, 187:19, 188:13, 196:4</p> <p>three-and-a-half [5] - 87:5, 87:7, 87:8, 90:12, 188:13</p> <p>three-bedroom [1] - 15:18</p> <p>three-sided [2] - 133:9, 133:10</p> <p>three-year [1] - 5:18</p> <p>threshold [3] - 191:1, 191:10, 192:17</p> <p>thresholds [2] - 45:11, 52:5</p> <p>throughout [3] - 3:18, 32:18, 123:12</p> <p>throw [1] - 104:17</p> <p>thrown [1] - 146:10</p> <p>thumb [1] - 46:10</p> <p>ticking [1] - 143:15</p> <p>tied [1] - 68:3</p> <p>tieing [1] - 101:1</p> <p>tier [4] - 97:4, 97:11, 98:8, 98:15</p> <p>ties [2] - 183:17, 185:2</p> <p>timekeeper [1] - 106:6</p> <p>timeline [3] - 127:8, 161:2, 168:4</p> <p>timetable [3] - 152:13, 160:4, 160:5</p> <p>timing [2] - 89:13, 102:6</p> <p>tiny [2] - 75:1, 174:5</p>
---	--	---	--	---

<p>tip [1] - 61:4 Title [1] - 141:2 TO [1] - 198:17 today [7] - 4:14, 6:8, 107:8, 109:8, 146:19, 176:17, 180:9 today's [1] - 3:9 together [8] - 11:2, 11:4, 13:10, 101:2, 124:19, 144:11, 169:1, 173:2 tolerable [1] - 45:13 Tom [3] - 136:14, 136:16, 143:6 TOM [2] - 136:16, 137:16 tomorrow [1] - 76:14 tonight [12] - 9:1, 106:16, 112:9, 124:13, 124:16, 125:16, 126:1, 126:12, 129:2, 159:4, 166:14, 173:8 took [4] - 18:18, 35:1, 163:4, 163:7 tool [1] - 45:14 top [3] - 128:12, 128:17, 195:4 topic [3] - 4:4, 5:1, 63:10 total [4] - 5:16, 86:19, 147:6, 169:6 totally [4] - 101:2, 174:7, 175:14, 176:10 tough [1] - 104:5 towards [5] - 28:6, 43:14, 140:10, 141:18, 165:18 tower [1] - 195:8 trade [1] - 122:3 tradeoff [4] - 115:10, 115:12, 116:8, 118:10 traditionally [1] - 175:8 Traffic [2] - 73:8, 165:8 traffic [41] - 35:8, 35:19, 36:3, 37:12, 37:18, 39:1, 39:9, 39:12, 46:6, 53:7, 53:19, 54:6, 58:1, 58:4, 58:18, 59:2, 59:19, 60:2, 61:9, 61:12, 64:1, 64:6, 64:7, 64:14, 64:18, 104:13, 106:16, 106:17, 107:1,</p>	<p>107:4, 107:7, 107:10, 107:14, 108:3, 119:8, 153:3, 153:6, 154:8, 154:12, 159:2, 165:6 trained [1] - 124:11 trains [2] - 109:18, 110:19 transcript [5] - 7:2, 197:2, 197:6, 197:15, 197:16 TRANSCRIPT [1] - 198:17 Transcript(s) [1] - 2:4 transcripts [1] - 6:19 transfer [1] - 115:3 transform [1] - 117:12 transformation [1] - 102:16 transformed [1] - 19:7 transit [31] - 13:17, 33:9, 33:10, 36:4, 38:17, 41:15, 62:10, 63:3, 63:15, 66:8, 67:8, 68:4, 70:10, 73:18, 75:9, 84:3, 107:16, 107:17, 108:3, 108:5, 109:13, 110:13, 111:6, 111:14, 159:6, 159:19, 161:10, 176:19, 177:10 transition [2] - 6:11, 12:13 translate [1] - 44:10 translates [2] - 46:12, 90:5 translating [1] - 87:6 Transportation [7] - 2:12, 2:13, 13:12, 14:10, 32:11, 127:7, 140:18 transportation [29] - 11:1, 13:13, 32:5, 33:6, 34:10, 62:14, 66:16, 67:1, 67:5, 73:12, 76:8, 83:7, 119:9, 131:11, 153:2, 159:2, 161:6, 165:6, 166:12, 169:14, 170:12, 176:15, 176:16, 178:2, 178:9, 181:3, 187:6, 189:7, 191:9 travel [6] - 38:2, 38:12, 39:1, 39:8, 41:4, 41:18 tremendous [3] -</p>	<p>164:16, 167:9, 176:9 trend [6] - 37:3, 39:18, 42:8, 72:6, 73:6 trends [11] - 33:19, 38:7, 38:18, 63:5, 63:11, 63:12, 65:1, 65:2, 65:9, 71:1, 71:3 triangle [1] - 151:19 tried [2] - 12:1, 132:10 tries [1] - 11:3 trip [4] - 13:16, 37:10, 43:17, 44:10 trips [15] - 36:4, 40:9, 41:14, 41:16, 42:11, 42:17, 44:7, 54:2, 58:9, 63:11, 64:15, 65:11, 75:19 trivial [1] - 125:10 trouble [1] - 153:8 true [3] - 47:7, 190:8, 198:7 truly [2] - 80:14, 138:2 trust [1] - 99:13 Trust [2] - 81:3, 90:10 try [17] - 12:7, 48:12, 63:1, 63:10, 64:19, 73:9, 79:19, 91:10, 116:7, 129:16, 139:19, 146:12, 157:2, 167:17, 171:7, 171:12, 182:3 trying [18] - 8:7, 22:4, 22:19, 37:5, 42:10, 45:5, 56:3, 74:5, 81:19, 91:13, 101:4, 103:10, 103:11, 153:4, 153:7, 154:12, 156:3, 173:5 tucked [1] - 28:5 Tuesday [1] - 1:4 turn [6] - 14:18, 46:14, 51:1, 113:4, 189:16, 193:1 turned [1] - 178:1 turns [1] - 154:13 twice [3] - 46:14, 116:5, 123:7 two [20] - 3:14, 21:1, 45:9, 58:6, 94:17, 94:18, 101:8, 107:1, 116:3, 117:19, 125:13, 138:7, 146:11, 146:17, 152:6, 174:13, 186:11, 187:19, 188:9, 190:14</p>	<p>two-part [1] - 101:8 two-pronged [1] - 94:18 two-thirds [1] - 152:6 type [5] - 24:11, 25:14, 27:17, 37:11, 84:17 types [9] - 17:16, 20:9, 22:10, 22:14, 22:17, 24:13, 93:14, 93:18, 94:2 typical [1] - 93:18 typically [3] - 71:15, 94:3, 122:4</p> <p style="text-align: center;">U</p> <p>U.S [1] - 2:13 ultimate [2] - 101:6, 134:14 ultimately [5] - 78:17, 86:12, 92:5, 127:13, 177:16 unacceptable [1] - 59:1 unaffordability [1] - 66:3 unavoidably [1] - 104:2 uncomfortable [1] - 104:4 UNDER [1] - 198:17 under [10] - 31:13, 40:13, 47:18, 84:17, 85:14, 90:5, 95:4, 99:16, 120:2, 140:11 undermine [1] - 172:16 undersigned [1] - 198:5 understood [1] - 67:15 undertaken [1] - 165:12 underway [2] - 30:14, 32:4 unduly [1] - 170:14 unfair [1] - 122:3 unfold [1] - 36:15 unfortunate [1] - 166:14 unfortunately [1] - 100:6 unhappy [1] - 143:7 uniform [1] - 93:13 Union [1] - 148:19 unique [2] - 100:10, 130:5 Unit [1] - 2:10</p>	<p>unit [1] - 141:10 units [10] - 3:17, 15:18, 80:15, 87:2, 90:7, 151:1, 151:6, 183:13, 183:15, 196:3 universal [1] - 72:10 UNLESS [1] - 198:17 unless [3] - 104:13, 162:12, 180:6 unsolvable [1] - 133:11 untenable [1] - 168:2 unto [1] - 139:14 unused [1] - 142:16 up [73] - 3:11, 5:13, 6:1, 6:5, 6:10, 32:11, 34:4, 35:3, 35:17, 41:9, 45:16, 45:17, 45:18, 46:3, 47:15, 51:1, 51:2, 51:13, 52:15, 54:10, 54:19, 56:16, 60:16, 65:7, 77:14, 78:15, 88:2, 105:12, 105:13, 107:6, 107:8, 107:17, 108:8, 111:1, 111:2, 111:10, 112:15, 119:3, 120:11, 122:5, 123:6, 130:13, 134:17, 138:8, 140:8, 140:14, 141:6, 141:10, 142:4, 143:4, 143:17, 145:9, 150:7, 150:9, 164:4, 164:12, 167:1, 169:9, 173:10, 173:14, 175:5, 175:8, 175:14, 176:6, 181:10, 185:9, 189:13, 189:15, 191:14, 192:11, 194:11, 194:19 up-zoned [1] - 120:11 up-zoning [7] - 119:3, 140:8, 140:14, 141:6, 141:10, 142:4, 143:4 Update [1] - 2:3 update [3] - 3:6, 18:12, 30:9 updated [1] - 34:18 updating [1] - 12:13 upgrade [1] - 177:10 upgrades [1] - 67:16 upset [1] - 175:14 upside [1] - 60:9 urban [16] - 20:17,</p>
---	---	--	--	--

<p>27:5, 27:15, 27:16, 27:17, 29:5, 30:2, 30:6, 65:16, 84:11, 84:12, 171:13, 171:16, 186:14, 186:15, 190:12</p> <p>urbanistic [1] - 24:11</p> <p>usable [2] - 180:17, 186:4</p> <p>USC [1] - 141:3</p> <p>useful [5] - 15:2, 45:8, 110:18, 125:16, 191:17</p> <p>uses [15] - 16:2, 20:10, 21:3, 22:17, 24:6, 24:16, 25:8, 27:16, 83:10, 90:10, 93:15, 101:17, 172:1, 172:2, 191:18</p> <p>usher [2] - 74:5</p> <p>usual [1] - 3:6</p> <p>utilitarian [1] - 81:18</p> <p>utilization [1] - 141:18</p>	<p>view [5] - 120:13, 124:7, 127:12, 191:3, 192:4</p> <p>violation [3] - 140:15, 141:2, 141:4</p> <p>vision [9] - 10:3, 12:8, 14:14, 80:6, 95:14, 126:2, 138:8, 145:8, 145:14</p> <p>visit [1] - 75:17</p> <p>voiced [1] - 176:15</p> <p>Volpe [40] - 2:12, 3:10, 6:7, 6:16, 9:5, 9:10, 14:10, 18:15, 19:1, 19:3, 19:6, 19:18, 31:3, 35:11, 49:11, 82:7, 87:6, 89:4, 100:13, 111:4, 113:1, 113:6, 117:9, 118:16, 118:19, 119:12, 126:18, 129:6, 130:19, 131:4, 138:11, 139:3, 140:8, 140:18, 147:3, 150:18, 157:6, 158:8, 182:8</p> <p>volume [4] - 36:5, 55:11, 55:13, 197:6</p> <p>volumes [1] - 155:9</p> <p>vote [1] - 143:17</p> <p>voted [1] - 117:2</p>	<p>102:11, 150:7, 158:11</p> <p>welcome [1] - 3:4</p> <p>Wellington [2] - 20:4, 118:6</p> <p>Wellington-Harrington [1] - 118:6</p> <p>west [1] - 51:17</p> <p>whereas [1] - 54:9</p> <p>whereby [1] - 170:7</p> <p>WHEREOF [1] - 198:9</p> <p>whole [15] - 30:19, 33:12, 40:10, 54:12, 57:13, 89:5, 100:15, 138:15, 151:3, 154:5, 160:13, 163:17, 165:4, 166:19, 178:11</p> <p>wholeheartedly [1] - 137:18</p> <p>wide [2] - 118:17, 159:17</p> <p>widespread [1] - 25:9</p> <p>Williamson [1] - 116:12</p> <p>WILLIAMSON [1] - 4:15</p> <p>willing [2] - 163:6, 164:12</p> <p>Windsor [1] - 51:2</p> <p>winning [1] - 29:2</p> <p>winter [1] - 119:8</p> <p>Winthrop [3] - 174:3, 174:4, 186:6</p> <p>wish [1] - 175:17</p> <p>wishes [2] - 146:1, 149:9</p> <p>WITNESS [1] - 198:9</p> <p>wonder [1] - 157:14</p> <p>wonderful [2] - 152:4, 186:2</p> <p>wondering [1] - 61:16</p> <p>word [1] - 112:15</p> <p>workers [4] - 20:2, 20:5, 24:10, 67:4</p> <p>workforce [4] - 21:8, 71:4, 84:4, 91:9</p> <p>works [3] - 175:5, 176:7, 194:8</p> <p>worried [1] - 152:12</p> <p>worst [5] - 37:17, 38:1, 75:13, 154:10, 154:11</p> <p>worth [3] - 104:17, 105:5, 138:16</p> <p>written [2] - 111:12, 139:17</p> <p>www.reportersinc.com [1] - 1:19</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Y</p> <p>year [7] - 5:18, 37:6, 39:10, 44:17, 47:18, 65:6, 65:7</p> <p>years [15] - 9:19, 18:19, 38:11, 39:5, 39:6, 48:11, 48:18, 61:6, 81:7, 81:10, 117:19, 143:1, 153:10, 154:19, 155:10</p> <p>yellow [2] - 85:13, 89:1</p> <p>yesterday [2] - 5:15, 5:18</p> <p>yesterday's [1] - 5:15</p> <p>York [2] - 65:16, 136:7</p> <p>younger [1] - 181:14</p> <p>youngest [1] - 72:2</p> <p>yourself [1] - 70:5</p> <p>youthful [1] - 174:7</p>	<p>134:5, 134:18, 137:7, 138:6, 138:17, 140:8, 140:14, 141:6, 141:10, 142:4, 143:4, 145:6, 147:1, 160:5, 166:15</p> <p>zoom [2] - 12:18, 37:6</p>
V			Z	
<p>vacant [3] - 141:13, 141:16, 142:16</p> <p>valley [1] - 180:1</p> <p>valuable [3] - 110:9, 125:16, 158:2</p> <p>value [1] - 120:11</p> <p>variation [1] - 18:8</p> <p>varied [1] - 92:15</p> <p>varies [2] - 31:18, 89:12</p> <p>variety [2] - 93:14, 93:17</p> <p>various [4] - 30:16, 34:1, 59:3, 178:1</p> <p>Vehicle [1] - 65:8</p> <p>vehicles [2] - 36:4, 154:18</p> <p>Vento [1] - 141:2</p> <p>venues [1] - 19:1</p> <p>verbally [1] - 131:18</p> <p>verify [1] - 137:4</p> <p>versions [1] - 45:9</p> <p>versus [6] - 37:13, 37:14, 113:13, 121:18, 159:10, 173:19</p> <p>viability [3] - 100:8, 100:10, 191:9</p> <p>viable [3] - 75:16, 76:7, 76:12</p> <p>vibrant [2] - 76:2, 174:6</p> <p>Vice [1] - 1:8</p>	W	<p>wait [3] - 119:5, 127:10, 127:15</p> <p>waiting [1] - 125:13</p> <p>walk [3] - 38:16, 41:16, 161:13</p> <p>walking [5] - 33:8, 38:5, 63:15, 73:15, 73:19</p> <p>walkway [1] - 26:14</p> <p>wants [5] - 46:3, 134:3, 134:4, 134:9, 188:12</p> <p>warning [1] - 106:12</p> <p>Washington [3] - 136:6, 148:17, 185:13</p> <p>wasting [1] - 143:14</p> <p>water [1] - 157:8</p> <p>ways [6] - 37:1, 50:15, 96:1, 102:16, 146:11, 146:17</p> <p>weather [1] - 123:9</p> <p>website [3] - 49:6, 49:9, 49:17</p> <p>week [2] - 34:9, 183:2</p> <p>weeks [4] - 35:14,</p>	<p>ZBA [1] - 8:19</p> <p>Zelinski [2] - 198:5, 198:12</p> <p>Zip [1] - 43:8</p> <p>zoned [1] - 120:11</p> <p>zones [1] - 86:4</p> <p>Zoning [40] - 2:9, 2:9, 2:11, 9:2, 9:3, 11:8, 12:18, 28:2, 29:1, 31:2, 40:12, 40:13, 42:1, 58:16, 58:19, 59:6, 59:10, 60:3, 77:1, 77:2, 77:8, 78:16, 78:19, 79:8, 80:3, 81:11, 85:15, 85:19, 86:2, 86:6, 101:4, 127:11, 127:14, 127:19, 129:19, 133:15, 139:6, 139:8, 139:9, 144:12</p> <p>zoning [49] - 3:15, 6:7, 9:11, 10:5, 11:3, 11:7, 11:14, 12:15, 16:3, 16:8, 31:17, 31:18, 48:3, 58:11, 80:19, 83:7, 86:18, 89:5, 89:6, 89:17, 90:9, 93:2, 94:19, 95:4, 95:10, 103:18, 111:7, 111:12, 118:17, 119:3, 120:17, 127:6, 130:12,</p>	