1	COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
2	CITY OF CAMBRIDGE
3	
4	IN RE: LICENSE COMMISSION GENERAL HEARINGS
5	Michael Gardner, Chairman
6	Robert C. Haas, Police Commissioner Gerard E. Mahoney, Deputy Chief
7	derard L. Handney, Deputy Cirrer
8	<u>STAFF</u> :
9	Elizabeth Lint, Executive Officer
LO	Held At
11	
12	Michael J. Lombardi Municipal Building 831 Massachusetts Avenue
13	Basement Conference Room Cambridge, Massachusetts
L4	
L5	Tuesday, June 28, 2011
L6	6:06 p.m.
L7	
18	
19	REPORTERS, INC.
20	CAPTURING THE OFFICIAL RECORD 617-786-7783 / FACSIMILE 617-639-0396
21	www.reportersinc.com

1		INDEX	PAGE
2	Application:	Idenix Pharmaceuticals, Inc.	4
3	Disciplinary:	El Coloso Market	123
4	Application:	Wagamama Boston One, LLC	4
5	Application:	Thelonius Monkfish, Ltd.	129
6	Application:	Handi Indian Restaurant, Inc. d/b/a Harvest Of India	146
7 8	Application:	J.H. Restaurant Cambridge, d/b/a John Harvard's Brew Hou	163 ise
9	Application:	Mass. Institute of Technology	179
10	Application:	Restaurant Associates, LLC, d/b/a Caspersen Hall Cafe	184
11	Application:	The Upper Crust Harvard, Square d/b/a The Upper Crust	190
13	Application:	L'Impasto, LLC, d/b/a L'Impasto	193
14 15	Application:	Go Cafe, LLC, d/b/a Rafiki Bistro	206
16	Application:	Life Alive Cambridge, LLC, d/b/a Life Alive Urban Oasis	211
17		& Organic Cafe	
18	Application:	Raymond Graham, d/b/a Unlimited Motors	222
19	Application:	Barismo, Inc., d/b/a	224
20		Dwelltime	
21	Disciplinary:	Afkor, Inc., d/b/a Cafe Anatolia	261

PROCEEDINGS

2

1

ELIZABETH LINT: Okay. We are going to begin.

This is the License Commission general hearing on Tuesday June 28, 2011. It's 6:03 p.m. We are at the Michael J. Lombardi Municipal Building, 831 Massachusetts Avenue, Basement Conference Room, Cambridge, Massachusetts.

Sitting tonight is Chairman Michael Gardner, to his right is Commissioner Robert Haas, and to his left is Deputy Chief Mahoney.

If anyone is here for the matter of, Wagamama, that has been continued to July 19th.

We have an application continued from June 14, 2011, Idenix Pharmaceuticals, Incorporated, located at 60 Hampshire Street, has applied to renew the July 7, 2010, special variance from the requirements of the

4

5

6

21

City of Cambridge Noise Control Ordinance, 1 pursuant to Cambridge City Code, Section 2 8.16.090(B). 3 MICHAEL GARDNER: I would ask the 4 representatives from Idenix to come forward 5 and please state and spell your names for the 6 record and identify your role, please. 7 RICHARD JOHNSTON: My name is Richard Johnston and I represent as counsel for 9 Idenix. 10 My name is Paul Fanny PAUL FANNING: 11 and I'm the Senior Vice President of Human 12 Resources. 13 SAM WILD: My name is Sam Wild and 14 I'm the facility director for Idenix 15 Pharmaceuticals. 16 PAUL BERENS: My name is Paul Berens 17 B-E-R-E-N-S, from Assentech. I'm an 18 acoustical consultant. 19 GREGORY TOCCI: My name is Gregory 20 Tocci from Tocci Associates, Cavanaugh & 21

Tocci. Tocci is spelled T-O-C-C-I.

_

_

to.

MICHAEL GARDNER: I'm sure, counsel, you've got a presentation in mind. I would like it if you would be so kind as to give us a bit of a procedural history to what brings you here this evening.

RICHARD JOHNSTON: Sure, I'd be happy

As I have said, I'm Richard Johnston and I have appeared for Idenix before the Commission on several prior occasions in connection with a prior application, as has Mr. Fanning.

In 2009, Idenix applied for a variance from the nighttime levels of 50 and asked for a variance at 60. There was a series of back and forth meetings. The Commission asked the company to undertake some additional remedial steps in connection with the noise levels on the roof. Idenix did so.

Eventually, after the hearing about a

year ago, the Commission granted a variance to Idenix for one year at 55. The variance was conditioned on several things. Number one was that the company continue to look at additional ways in which it might work to reduce the noise levels.

Number two was that additional testing occur, close to tonight's hearing, sometime in the late spring of 2011. And that if the company wished to extend the variance, that it submit a new application at the end of the one year.

So what has happened over the last year is that the company has, in accordance with the condition that it need to look at additional remedial measures, has carried out a series of measures.

And Mr. Fanning will be here to describe for you what those measures have been and will have photographs to explain precisely where the changes have occurred.

ŏ

In addition, testing has taken place. There was one round of testing in May of 2011. There was a second round of testing in early June of 2011, at which Ms. Boyer participated. And there was some additional tests about a week later when the company and its consultants thought the weather was going to be warm and might provide some additional, helpful results. It turned out that the warm front that came through during the day wasn't warm at night, so the results were basically the same as what they had been in the past.

We submitted the May and early June sets of results to you in connection with the variance application, and then a follow-up letter that came on June 10th. So you have two different sets of results conducted by two different firms. And Mr. Berens will describe in more detail what those results have shown.

To summarize, though, the results show that since 2008 there has been a

reduction in decibel levels of between four and seven decibels at the key location near the corner of Market and Clark Streets, which is the area where (A) most of the complaints have been generated, and (B) where most of the activity on the roof has taken place to remediate the sound issues. So Mr. Berens will be able to explain in somewhat more detail what the results mean.

Suffice it to say, that the company has managed to keep the sound levels below the variance level of 55.

However, the sound levels have not dropped at all locations at all times to below 50. As a result, the company is back looking for an extension of the variance at 55 for one year.

I might just say that Mr. Berens will describe this in somewhat more detail. But the testing was done in May and June under a worst-case scenario basis. So that everything

1,5

was turned on at Idenix that would be on in the warmest parts of the summer so that we would get readings that could be useful to you.

I will -- I think it would make more sense for me to wait until after you've heard from Mr. Fanning and from Mr. Berens to just briefly go through the arguments as to why we think the variance is appropriate. I'm happy to do that now, but I think it makes more sense to wait and get some of the more factual things out on the record.

MICHAEL GARDNER: That's fine.

And now Mr. Fanning.

PAUL FANNING: My name is Paul Fanning, I'm vice president of Idenix and I have responsibility for the facility's operation.

I thought one thing that would be helpful is just a recap. During the variance application process, there were two major

issues that we undertook.

_

ŏ

One, an extension of sound curtains along the roof and then down to the actual roof deck floor, which made a difference and was definitely an improvement.

And then, secondly, a replacement of RTU 8, which was one of the oldest units and actually had been identified by our sound consultant as one of the loudest units.

Since the application actually was -sorry -- since the variance was actually
granted last summer, we've undertaken a number
of additional actions, including removal of
exhaust fan 15; and we disconnected EF 9; we
removed exhaust fan 17; we removed RTU 15 from
the corner of Market and Clark; we relocated
RTU 14 to the front of the building over on
the Market Street side; and we also moved
exhaust fans 16 and 11 away from Clark Street
to the middle of the building.

And I should say that when we removed

15, we connected existing duct work to 9, we didn't disconnect 9, just for a clarification there. And I can show this picture.

Most of the items that I just listed were concentrated on the Market Street side in the upper left-hand corner. And, Sam, maybe if you get a chance, if you could key up -- we have sort of a before and after --

RICHARD JOHNSTON: And I'd like to just mention on the record that we did submit the chronology this evening that Mr. Fanning is about to discuss as well as photographs to the Commission so that you'll have your own sets.

But now he is not going to walk through what the chronology items are and point out on the pictures where it is the work was done.

PAUL FANNING: This is the area that was the before (indicating), so the RTU that I just -- well, actually, a couple of RTUs, 15

and 17, up in this corner (indicating). So this is where I'm talking about.

RICHARD JOHNSTON: Identify the corner so the people know --

PAUL FANNING: Okay. This is Market and Clark (indicating). So as you are looking out, Hampshire would be this way, and you are looking out toward Market and Clark this way (indicating). Let me show it to the audience as well.

Before I move on, though, in addition, in fact, some of the padding is not shown here because this is the before, but we've consolidated five exhaust fans into exhaust fan 2. I added padding around equipment in the corner of Market and Clark, a padded wall section on top of RTU 4, added a padded wall around exhaust fan 18, added a padded wall around exhaust fan 20, which was at Clark and Hampshire, and then added length to the padded wall near RTU-4.

Now, this is a bigger picture of the 1 padding itself (indicating). Okay. What I'm 2 referring to is in this section here 3 (indicating). So we've gone down to the deck 4 floor in some cases and we've actually 5 extended the -- and when we say "padding," 6 these are sound curtains, okay, that go up in 7 the summertime and then we take them down in the -- I guess around October or the end of 9 October. Okay. 10 MICHAEL GARDNER: So the packet that 11 has been shared with me looks like this photo 12 by ID'ing it is labeled on my set as Photo D. 13 The first photo is clearly A, the before photo 14 you showed us. But to me this looks like "D" 15 (indicating). 16 ROBERT HAAS: I think it's "C." 17 MICHAEL GARDNER: "B" which I think 18 it is, is clearly not it. 19 PAUL FANNING: This would be item 20 "D." Yes. 21

Now, I want to show you the "after."

So, just as a reminder, again, looking at this aerial, this is the section here we are talking about (indicating). Now, this is the area, it has essentially been removed. Okay.

So this is the after, this is B. Photo B in the application. Okay.

I don't know if you want to see the before again, just to kind of give you the --

MICHAEL GARDNER: So "A" is before and "B" is after, with respect to the materials that had been removed from that corner. Is this the same perspective?

PAUL FANNING: Yes, this is just a close-up of that same corner. So the before one, here, with the RTUs clustered in here, and then the after, we see it is gone.

Now, there was -- this one has been moved (indicating), so it's not completely gone. This one was part of the cluster that we took from up here and moved down here

behind a clear story (indicating). 1 RICHARD JOHNSTON: And, Paul, just 2 because you've been moving around from one diagram to another, let's just identify for 4 the record again which one you are pointing 5 to. 6 PAUL FANNING: Sure. So the before, 7 okay -- and this is A, okay. The B is --MICHAEL GARDNER: And so that photo 9 would have been taken approximately when? 10 PAUL FANNING: That was in 2008, I 11 believe, is what we identified it as. I think 12 it was the fall of 2008, I think. It was 13 2008 -- the spring of 2008. 14 And this is current, this is a real 15 I took this. This is B, this is time. 16 Exhibit B (indicating). 17 AUDIENCE MEMBER: The first one was 18 2009. (Peter) (inaudible). 19 PAUL FANNING: So '09. 20 MICHAEL GARDNER: So from a member of 21

1	the audience, we have had the correction that
2	because the A is showing a curtain, which I
3	take it is this three-sided box structure
4	there, and that means this was a photo from
5	2009?
6	PAUL FANNING: Yes, sir.
7	MICHAEL GARDNER: Is that right?
8	PAUL FANNING: Yes. I don't have the
9	exact date on that. Is that right, Kevin.
10	MR. KEVIN: Yes.
11	PAUL FANNING: And this was taken,
12	literally I think we took this one today,
13	we took that one today.
14	RICHARD JOHNSTON: And that is B.
15	PAUL FANNING: Yes, B.
16	RICHARD JOHNSTON: And just remind
17	everybody what "C" and "D" are, please.
18	PAUL FANNING: "C" is the before
19	aerial view I'm sorry. C is the current
20	C is the current view with the same corner.
21	The only thing that is different there, there

is a little bit of steel still in this one --1 Is that right, Sam, still a little 2 bit of steel up there? 3 MR. SAM: Yes. That is gone, 4 thought. 5 PAUL FANNING: So that was late May, 6 that would have been, because we had a crane 7 in early June come by and take some of the heavier pieces that were still remaining. 9 MICHAEL GARDNER: With all due 10 respect, I think you called that "C." I'm 11 looking at this, which looks -- "C" doesn't 12 look like that -- my "C" doesn't look like 13 that (indicating). 14 PAUL FANNING: I apologize. 15 MICHAEL GARDNER: So what is it? 16 looks like this (indicating) to me. So is 17 that "D"? 18 PAUL FANNING: Yes. Let me get my 19 hand out of the way here. That is "D" 20 (indicating). 21

1	MICHAEL GARDNER: And if you would,
2	again so this is looking toward the same
3	corner from a somewhat further perspective?
4	PAUL FANNING: Yes. It's taken from
5	the CDM building, which is adjacent, so you
6	get an aerial view of most of the roof
7	actually.
8	MICHAEL GARDNER: And when was this
9	taken, this is D?
10	PAUL FANNING: Late May.
11	MICHAEL GARDNER: Late May of 2011?
12	PAUL FANNING: Correct.
13	MICHAEL GARDNER: So I think we know
14	about A, B and D. Can you describe what "C"
15	is, please?
16	PAUL FANNING: So "C" is an earlier
17	photo. And this is, again, the 2009 time
18	frame, the same aerial view, it shows that
19	corner that we removed the equipment from.
20	MICHAEL GARDNER: So is it fair to
21	say that C was taken about the same time as A,

and that is May '09, but from a perspective a 1 little further away so you can see a little 2 more of the roof? PAUL FANNING: Yes, that's correct. 4 MICHAEL GARDNER: Thank you. 5 So A and C show us what it was about 6 the time you filed for the original variance, 7 and B and D show what it is today? PAUL FANNING: Right. That is correct. 10 MICHAEL GARDNER: We have a member of 11 the audience who is shaking his head and 12 saying "no." Because this procedure is a 13 little unusual, but I'd like to actually have 14 the record be clear. 15 If you could just come forward, you 16 can consult with the other people or you can 17 identify yourself and speak to us. 18 PETER LINQUIST: My name is Peter 19 Linguist and I live on the corner of Market 20 and Clark Streets. I just want to get the 21

sequence of this correct.

I know that 2008 -- I know that in 2008 was when most of this equipment arrived on the roof, and not 2009. It was during the permitting process for the chemical storage permit, which the landlord, Metropolitan Life, add applied for.

And what is important about that is that all of this remediation that has taken place only happened after it was mandated by this Commission.

MICHAEL GARDNER: I'm sorry. I perhaps misunderstood your role here, sir. We'll give you more of an opportunity to speak but, for the moment, I'm trying to establish the time line of the photos.

PETER LINQUIST. Just understand that
-- I think if you could read back what --

MICHAEL GARDNER: The question I asked was whether photos A and C represented the roof in the spring of '09, which I

understood was approximately the time the variance was requested; and I think I had a confirmatory from Mr. Fanning.

If you, Mr. Linquist, think that is inaccurate, we'll give you an opportunity to voice your objection after we hear from the company. If that's all right with you?

MR. LINQUIST: Yes.

MICHAEL GARDNER: Right now what we are thinking is A and C is '09, and B and D are the spring of '11. Is that right, Mr. Fanning?

PAUL FANNING: Yes. Again, the first set of pictures -- and I can go back and get the -- try to focus on the exact month -- but, yes, it is going back several years, the first set and the more recent ones.

Again, the idea being that we want to show how we kind of focused on that corner and cleaned out over the last couple of years a lot of the equipment, removed the equipment or

moved them in some cases.

MICHAEL GARDNER: Okay. Thank you.

RICHARD JOHNSTON: And just to summarize, as the chronology shows, a number of steps were taken before the variance was granted in June or July of 2010, and a number of other steps; I think about 11 in total have been taken since then.

And then to report on the test results that had been taken over May and June, Mr. Berens will speak to that.

ROBERT BERENS: My name is Robert

Berens and I work for Assentech in Cambridge.

And I was brought on in the spring primarily
to assist with some of the noise control and
some of the noise control assessment, to
assist Greg Tocci, Cavanaugh & Tocci, to give
them a second pair of eyes and bring our
experience into the whole thing.

MICHAEL GARDNER: Before you describe what steps you took and what you are

_

reporting, can you just describe your company in a little bit more detail, the kind of work you do.

ROBERT BERENS: Assentech is about a 50 person acoustical consulting firm. We are located at 33 Moulton Street in Cambridge. We do strictly acoustics. And we have an architectural and building mechanical systems group; we have a group that does sound systems; we have a group that does product noise control, things like that. But the company is, like I say, about 50 people and we do nothing but acoustics. That's what I do.

RICHARD JOHNSTON: Can you give a little bit of your own background.

ROBERT BERENS: My background is that I've been Assentech for about 22 years now.

Back in 1975, I was essentially Andrea Boyer's counterpart at the City of Boston. I worked for the City of Boston Air Pollution and Control Commission. I worked there for about

three years doing much of the same kind of work that Andrea does for the municipality of Boston and going out and telling people they were too loud and making them comply with the Boston noise regulations.

At about 1976, I actually sat in front of the Cambridge City Council and was testifying to the development of the Cambridge noise regulations, which is largely based on the regulations we had put together for the City of Boston.

So since then, I've worked for various and sundry engineering firms, five years at Stone & Webster, again, all within the acoustics realm. And for the past 20 years or so, I've been working as an acoustical consultant at Assentech.

MICHAEL GARDNER: Thank you.

ROBERT BERENS: Like I say, I was brought in in the spring to really look at some of the compliance issues that are being

_

raised here at the Idenix.

_

ŏ

- '

And one of the issues and that was identified in the variance granting is the issue of ambient noise.

What is the influence of the noise from the existing world, and how does that affect or impact noise levels that are measured when the compliance measurements are being made?

Andrea Boyer's measurements, whenever anybody sticks out a sound level meter, one measures all the sound that is present. So if we are measuring noise from Idenix, you are measuring not only noise from the rooftop equipment at Idenix, we are measuring noise from the traffic on the various and sundry local street, and neither Broadway or Hampshire Streets are particularly quiet streets, particularly during the daytime and early evening hours.

You pick out noise from some of the

other biotech firms closer to Kendall Square and the question is: How much the rest of the world is influencing the measurements that are being made and reported around the Idenix facility?

So what we wanted to do is really sort of back out how much noise Idenix is producing. And the way to do that is to measure all of the noise.

So we actually did two surveys, one in May and one in June, the same ideas for both of them. We made noise level measurements of six locations around the facility at two different times of the evening; one late evening when traffic noise is sort of dying down but not at its minimum level, and one set of surveys, a set of measurements around 2:00 in the morning when traffic noise is pretty much at its minimum.

And what we wanted to do was bring all the equipment that Idenix has up to its

_

full noise generating potential. So we simulated a hot summer nighttime condition where all of the equipment that would be running normally at night was operating.

And then all of the cooling, the air-conditioning equipment that would only operate on a night like tonight, you know, a hot, muggy, summertime condition.

So we faked the controls on the equipment to convince it to produce as much noise as it ever could. We then did a survey of noise levels at these six locations. We then shut everything off. We shut everything off at Idenix and re-measured how much noise was left. How much noise was being made at that point by traffic, biotech firms down in Kendall Square, conversations of people walking by at 2:00 in the morning as the bars closed. All of these things contribute to the noise levels around Idenix, and when Idenix is operating, can add to the total noise that

Idenix is making. 1 MICHAEL GARDNER: Just so I'm 2 following what you said, you did the testing around 10:30 and 2:30, and you did it with the 4 Idenix equipment going full blast? 5 ROBERT BERENS: Full blast and then 6 we shut it all of. 7 MICHAEL GARDNER: Both at 10:30 and 2:30 you shut it off both times, the same 9 evening, essentially contemporaneous, you got 10 one measurement with it running and you took 11 another measurement, essentially at the same 12 time, with it turned off? 13 ROBERT BERENS: Right. 14 MICHAEL GARDNER: Okay. 15 ROBERT BERENS: And that way we 16 really can get a, sort of, apples and apples 17 comparison of how much noise the world is 18 making and how much noise Idenix plus the 19 world is making. 20 We then do our acoustical magic and 21

do the logarithms subtraction. Unfortunately, it's a mess, but basically two noise sources of equal magnitude added together produces a level 3 DB higher than either one of them.

So you have one noise source making 50 DB, another noise source making 50 DB, and you stick a meter up, you turn them both on, you get a measure of 53 DB.

So, conversely, if you go out and you measure 53 DB, and you turn off one source and the level drops to 50, you say, "Well, we can do the backwards math and say, 'Well, the source that we just turned off must be contributing 50 DB as well.'"

So that is essentially what we did for figuring out how much noise Idenix, in the absense of all the noise from the rest of the world, was making.

MICHAEL GARDNER: And this has got something to do with the way the sound waves cancel each other out, that 50 plus 50 isn't a

hundred? 1 Right. It's all ROBERT BERENS: 2 pressure and logarithms and things like that. I wish it was easier --4 MICHAEL GARDNER: And it doesn't help 5 me to ask you what your honest opinion is, but 6 what's your opinion about the quality of the 7 science with respect to the logarithms? How widely accepted in the business 9 is this? 10 ROBERT BERENS: It is completely 11 verifiable. It's not really a black art, it 12 is just confusing. 13 And so essentially what we did was, 14 again, we measured with everything running at 15 full bore; turn everything off, measure the 16 background level; subtract the two; that is 17 how much noise Idenix was making at 10:30. 18 We then did the same thing at 2:00 in 19 the morning. Again, everything running full 20 bore; shut it off, measure the background; do 21

the subtraction; and that is the level that Idenix was producing.

MICHAEL GARDNER: And, again, with six separate readings from the six separate --

ROBERT BERENS: Three locations were the historical compliance locations along Clark Street, one at the corner of Market, one mid-block at Cross, and then one at the corner of Hampshire and Clark. So those three locations have been documented throughout the process here.

The measurements were made at an elevation of 16 feet in the air to comply with the elevated receptor locations of the second floor windows, the houses across the street and avoiding the barrier effect of the roof itself.

So this is -- and then the measurements at the three other locations, one was closer to the corner of Market and -- Broadway, one at the corner of Hampshire, and

,

right in front of the Idenix building.

Basically, both of them in the area right by the Camp, Dresser, McKee building, and then one a block away. So you get a handle on, again, what the existing ambient levels are in the area.

So the upshot of this whole thing is that we measured overall levels, which would be equivalent to the kind of measurements that Andrea would make in her compliance measurements. And we measured -- at 10:30, in the late evening period, we measured levels of about 54 to 56. That's with everything running full bore and background. And that dropped about a DB at the 2:00 level to a level of about 53 to 55; again, full bore operation of the Idenix equipment and all of the ambient noise.

The background levels at 10:30 at those locations was 46 to 53. So backing out -- you have the 10:30 measurements,

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

backing out, at the 46 to 53 range of background levels from the 54 to 56 total levels resulted in what's called an Idenix only contribution level that was about 52 to 55 DB.

RICHARD JOHNSTON: For then

Commissioner's ease, I would just mention that

Mr. Berens submitted a letter to Mr. Fanning

dated May 20, 2011, which is part of the

application for the variance, and these

numbers are found on page 4.

ROBERT BERENS: Okay. And the same type of thing happened late at night, at again 2:00 in the morning, with everything running, it was 53 to 55. So the background levels dropped back about 3 DB or so, 43 to 50 DB.

And then backing out the world from the total leaves Idenix only levels of, again, 52 to 55.

So what we are seeing is that Idenix is producing a level that is within compliance

of the variance; it's not yet down to the 50 that, albeit, the need for the variance, but it's a substantial improvement looking back to taking the total noise levels and comparing those to the earlier levels that had been measured without separating out Idenix from the rest of the world, and we are now looking at the total noise levels back in 2008, those levels were on the order of 59 to 61-ish, 58, 59, 60. So we are now down to levels of 54 to 56, 53 to 55 total levels.

So substantial improvement has been made over the past year or several years, but we are not down to the point where we don't need the variance.

And, again, the other half of the story here is that the background levels themselves are above the 50 DBA level.

So the limit, you know, the Cambridge City noise regulation says, "Thou shalt not make more than 50 DBA." Well, we turned

`

Idenix off, the levels dropped down to, like I say, 46 to 53, along those -- along Clark

Street at 10:00 at night. So even with Idenix shut off, they couldn't show compliance with a 50 DBA limit.

At 2:00 in the morning we got the ambient level down when the traffic died down enough to get ambient levels 50 and below.

Again, when Idenix is operating at essentially anything above 40, that is going to kick that 50 DBA background level, the Idenix contribution is going to push that over the 50 limit because the background level is at 50.

So there is a lot of interplay between existing background. The fact that they can't show compliance even if they are off, and the noise improvements that they've made, and I think we are coming at it to reduce the levels. Again, I think we have shown substantial improvement, and I think that's about the story I can tell at this

point.

So I'm glad to answer any questions that you may have.

RICHARD JOHNSTON: You might just mention or amplify the fact that essentially you did the same thing in early June and --

PAUL BERENS: Yes. There's actually two reports in the record, one for the May survey and one for June, which Ms. Boyer was along and observed.

RICHARD JOHNSTON: And the second set of results were submitted on June 10th to the Commission, and they included both a report from Assentech and a report from Tocci, which talked about the differences in DBA levels on the overall ambient plus Idenix between 2008 and 2011.

So I think that pretty much completes the scientific record that we intend to submit.

MICHAEL GARDNER: I have a couple of

questions about that, but I wonder if either 1 of the other Commissioners have any questions 2 at this point? No questions. ROBERT HAAS: 4 GERARD MAHONEY: No questions. 5 MICHAEL GARDNER: So part of what 6 I'm wondering about with respect to the 7 arguments you are presenting about the ambient noise is whether or not it proves too much. That is -- I mean, isn't this a fact of urban 10 life and any readings that the City would take 11 on any potential noise complaint, if we are 12 taking the noise, would get both the ambient 13 noise and the -- and your attempt to isolate 14 the Idenix out. 15 And yet the ordinance, as I 16 17 understand it that we are expected to enforce, doesn't do this analysis. It measures the 18 noise at the point of complaint or at an 19 appropriate point. 20 I can speak ROBERT BERENS: Yes. 21

from both sides of the regulatory fence here.

When I was with the City of Boston, we basically said, "This is a real problem with the City." And Boston and Cambridge are identical regulations, identical wording as a matter of fact. It's a problem.

If the ambient level is 50, there is no way that anybody can make any noise more than 40 -- sorry -- but they add up. You have to be more than 10 DB difference only the noise of your source controls.

As the quieter source gets louder, you get sort of an incremental increase to where they are equal, that's a 3 DB increase, and this becomes the noise of your source, and this is now the contributor, and as it goes up, it sort of passes it.

The problem here is -- okay, suppose the ambient is 49, there is the two guys with air conditioners. Okay. Now, guy one has an air conditioner that makes 47. Okay. That is

47 and 49. That just pushed the total level that the compliance officer would measure to 51. Now, if traffic dies down and it gets down to below 50, this 47 is now completely legitimate; he has no problem complying.

If his neighbor turned his air conditioner on, his air conditioner makes 47 as well, the two of them together now make 50. Are they both in violation or are they both in compliance?

The way we addressed it with the City of Boston, we said, okay, everybody gets their 50. We have to look at what the ambient conditions are. We have to back that out before we can hold somebody accountable for a measured level in excess of the stated regulatory requirement.

So in the Idenix case, you know, there is no way that, even if they turned off every piece of equipment on the rooftop, that they can show compliance when the ambient is

53.

So, again, what we did in Boston, we said: Okay. Without a variance, we give them the 50. If the background is 60 and we can prove -- hold their feet to the fire, they can proof that they are at 50, it is in compliance.

In this case with the variance, if we can hold their feet to the fire and show that they are making 55, they are in compliance with the variance, even though the total level measured may be higher than that because of the ambient conditions.

Does that answer your question?

MICHAEL GARDNER: Thank you, sir.

RICHARD JOHNSTON: Let me just make a few concluding remarks about why the variance ought to be granted.

As a special variance application, it requires the Commission to evaluate or balance the hardship to Idenix if the variance isn't

ŏ

granted against the hardships to the community if it is granted.

The Commission is also supposed to consider, under the terms of the ordinance, where the noise disturbance occurs in or across a buffer zone between two districts, which, in this case, it does, Idenix does along Clark Street.

Here Idenix has requested and needs the variance because it has to operate certain equipment at night during the summer at all times to maintain the kind of research lab that it has in the building below. And that point was made at the time we obtained the variance, and that point is still true.

Idenix has been able to out-source some functions out that enabled it to make some of the changes on the roof that it did.

But other research functions were made in the building and that requires the equipment on the roof to be operating at full

tilt. 1

> Idenix also should be given an extension of the variance because it has lived up to the terms of the variance that was granted just about a year ago.

> It was told to investigate additional opportunities on the roof. It did investigate those opportunities and, as Mr. Fanning described, it went through 11 different steps to try to bring the noise levels down.

> Even with those modifications however, Idenix will still be above 50 at some locations during some portions of the year.

> Now, during much of the year, it wouldn't be. There have been measurements all summer that have been below 50 and, as we know, air conditioners are not on all of the time because the temperatures are not as high all the time, but there are some portions of the year where it will be about 50 at some locations.

14 15 16

18 19

20

So without the continued variance,

Idenix could be forced to shut down the

research operations that exist at 60 Hampshire

Street and, consequently, put people out of

work.

The company has now operated under the variance at 55 for a year. And as far as Idenix is aware, there haven't been any registered complaints about its operations during that time frame.

So if a company has been able to operate during that year without causing significant disturbances in the neighborhood, the balance of hardship should be the same as they were last year or even more in Idenix's favor.

Furthermore, as Mr. Berens has explained, the ambient levels around Idenix are essentially above 50 at many of the locations. So even if Idenix were to shut down tomorrow, the noise level wouldn't be

that much different in the neighborhood. 1 Idenix really shouldn't be punished under this 2 balancing of hardships or something that exists irrespective of its operations. 4 So for all of those reasons and, in 5 particular, because the balance of hardships 6 was found by this Commission to favor Idenix 7 last year, and where the operations have continued in a non-prejudicial fashion over 9 the last year, it makes sense, as a matter of 10 logic, that the variance should be extended 11 for another year at 55. 12 And we are all available here to 13 answer any questions that you may have. 14 MICHAEL GARDNER: Commissioners, any 15 questions on that point? 16 17 ROBERT HAAS: No. GERARD MAHONEY: No questions. 18 MICHAEL GARDNER: I'm interested in 19 your areas of expertise. If what you're 20 saying is that this is really it, that there 21

כ

isn't additional technological improvement or capital investment that can get these levels consistently below 50, assuming you backed out the ambient noise, is that where we are?

PAUL FANNING: Yes. I think that it would be -- yes. There is really no major recommendation on the table that would allow us to guarantee that we get below 50.

We've taken all the recommendations from our consultants in implementing them. I don't want to say that it is an impossible task, I don't know. I guess, you know, if there were no rooftop units -- but we need the air-conditioning units to run the chemistry operation, so I don't know of any current capital that would get us there, that's correct.

RICHARD JOHNSTON: I just want to mention that in the past, Berens or Tocci, did evaluate another option, which is to put a large wall around the outside of the building;

and I don't remember how high it was going to be, something like 14 feet, but the neighbors didn't find that to be a very palatable solution because it substituted a visual problem for the sound problem. And that is still a theoretical possibility, but nobody really found it to be an attractive solution.

PAUL FANNING: Yes, that's true. But even there, that doesn't guarantee -- that recommendation was to allow the Idenix contribution to be below 50. That didn't necessarily mean that an as-found reading would be necessarily below 50 because of the background noise.

So I guess I would say that that's true, you know, a large wall could get our contribution below 50, and that capital improvement could still be revisited, but it won't necessarily guarantee an as-found reading to be below 50.

MICHAEL GARDNER: And are you able or

willing to identify for us the approximate
capital investment you've made in these
improvements?

PAUL FANNING: I wouldn't be able

PAUL FANNING: I wouldn't be able to say right now; I'd have to go back.

As far as historical, what we put in, to be accurate, I would really have to get back to you on that one. Because it goes back four years now and it's in the hundreds of thousands of dollars, that's for sure. Is it over a million? I don't know.

MICHAEL GARDNER: And there aren't really additional capital investments to be made at this point of the summation because you've filed out all the recommendations of your consultants or experts.

PAUL FANNING: Well, we are still continuing to evaluate other possibilities, but I wouldn't label them major, any major capital improvements at this point because we have taken every major recommendation at this

point, yes. 1

> MICHAEL GARDNER: And now I'm not exactly sure how you can answer this question for my education, but I'm sort of interested in how one gets to the psychological perception of a difference in 3 DBs, or the dropping from your 60 previously to the 55 level now?

> I don't know how to understand from just these numbers what kind of difference it makes in people's experience of the environment, and I don't know how you can answer that.

ROBERT BERENS: I would say the general rule of thumb is a 10 decibel increase is perceived as doubling in loudness. So if you go from an environment that is 50 DBA and the level goes up to 60, do you say, Hey, that's twice as loud?

And, conversely, if it goes from 60 to 50, do you say, Oh, that's about half as

15 17

21

19

loud as it used to be.

A five DB increase or decrease is perceptible -- you know, three to five DB is perceptible in the field. A one DB increase is, I think, back in the 20's, was defined as, What is the smallest increment that a wide spectrum of people can perceive in a laboratory situation. A one DB difference in the field is imperceptible.

So, to make a perceptible difference in the field in real life, you need to have that three to five DB difference, or people just really are not able to say, Oh, yes, that is significantly louder than it used to be. It's not twice as loud, but it's louder than it used to be. But it has to be above three to five DB.

So a one DB increase or decrease -one is within the error of the measurement
itself, the instrumentation has about a one DB
tolerance.

Certainly the conditions of -- the 1 ambient conditions -- when the fire truck goes 2 by, it is way up, there is all sorts of things that contribute to, you know, the perception 4 of one particular source getting louder or 5 quieter. 6 So the rule of thumb is ten DB is 7 twice as loud, three to five DB is clearly perceptible, one DB is not. 9 RICHARD JOHNSTON: And the Tocci 10 findings in the 2008 and 2011 were the four to 11 seven --12 GREGORY TOCCI: Four to seven. 13 ROBERT BERENS: So it's a noticeable 14 difference, it is not half as loud or twice as 15 quiet as it used to be. But it's in that four 16 to seven, that's a little bit better than the 17 three to five perceptible difference. 18 MICHAEL GARDNER: Any other 19 questions? 20 GERARD MAHONEY: None. 21

ROBERT HAAS: No. Thank you. 1 MICHAEL GARDNER: Any additional 2 comments you want to make before we open it to the floor? 4 RICHARD JOHNSTON: No. 5 MICHAEL GARDNER: If there are any 6 members of the public who would like to be 7 heard on this matter, please come forward and state and spell your name for the record. And 9 if you could make space at the table, that 10 would help. 11 PAUL FANNING: Sure. 12 PETER LINQUIST: I'm Peter Linguist, 13 I am a property owner and reside at 11 Market 14 Street on the corner of Clark Street. 15 MR. GARDNER: First, let me say I 16 apologize, sir, for cutting you off earlier. 17 It sounded like -- well, I I misunderstood. 18 misunderstood. 19 MR. LINQUIST: Okay. I'm a cranky 20 neighbor. I just want to set the record 21

straight. You heard one side of the story; there is a second side to the story.

First, I'd like to correct some statements that were made by various members of the Idenix crew.

Council mentioned that Market Street is the problem corner. The corner of Market and Clark is the problem corner where most of the complaints have come from. This is true in that I have been very vocal about this, but I am certainly not the only one in the neighborhood that has very strong feelings about this. And I have represented their feelings for four years now, and many of them have also spoken. So the corner of Market and Clark, number one, is not the only problem area.

The Council also mentioned that they have faithfully lived under the 55 decibel level for the past year. And they also mentioned that there haven't been any

complaints made in the last year.

Well, there was a complaint made to Andrea Boyer by myself in October, barely three months after the variance was granted. And this stemmed out of the fact that in September, a month earlier or almost a month earlier, Idenix had removed some of the curtains, baffling curtains, from the bottom of the baffles, and were clearly in violation of the noise ordinance.

I thought they were working on the equipment to improve the situation. And when I finally called Ms. Boyer, she said she would check into it. She got back to me and told me that it was being checked into, but it had something to do with the curtains being taken off in the event of a hurricane.

When I first called Ms. Boyer, I asked two things: One, that she come and take noise readings and verify my readings that they were in violation of the noise ordinance.

And the second thing was that I requested a hearing on the matter once she had received this.

I heard nothing until later in October when I received the letter from Mrs. Lint stating that they had looked into it, that the curtains had been, in fact, removed because of an impending hurricane, which never materialized in early September, and, for some unknown reason, the curtains were not reinstalled; whether it was because they didn't want to spend the money, they didn't care or whatever, the curtains were not installed for a month.

September was a very warm month and we suffered through excessive noise for more than a month until the air conditioners were shut down. So I'd like to correct Council on that point.

MICHAEL GARDNER: And the status of the curtains now?

ر

ŏ

MR. LINQUIST: They have been reinstalled. They were reinstalled -- I don't know, let's say, in April sometime would be my guess. And so, clearly, they have not lived up to the terms of the variance.

Nowhere in the variance did it say, "Oh, it's okay to take it down if it's going to rain." Nowhere in the variance did it say that.

I'm a little bit confused about
Mr. Berens' interpretation of the data which
was collected. He referred to Idenix only
numbers as being in compliance with the noise
ordinance.

Well, from my reading of the noise ordinance, that is not what the noise ordinance means. It's not Idenix only, it's the sum of all noises in the area that cannot exceed whatever level is stipulated.

The fact that they contend that they can't possibly meet this noise ordinance

because of background levels also is not addressed by the noise ordinance.

I think, if you read carefully the noise ordinance, the noise ordinance says that whatever the conditions are -- in essence, whatever the conditions are, they cannot exceed the limit.

It doesn't matter if it was at 50 degrees, the background noise, and they put one air conditioner up there and it pushed it over 50, they are not complying with it.

I do appreciate them showing us what the background levels are in the neighborhood. And that's what we enjoyed before Idenix moved into the neighborhood.

I was speaking to my neighbor the other night, the other day, and she said, "You know, it was the most amazing thing the night that they were sampling out there and they shut off all the Idenix equipment."

And at first she couldn't understand

כ

what had happened and then she realized all of this equipment was off.

And the tenant in her house came running downstairs, he was so upset at not knowing what had happened. That's how dramatic the difference is between equipment on and equipment off.

And if you look at the figures on Table 2 on Assentech's report, you'll see that this woman lives at Receptor 2, at the corner of Clark and Crossland. And her background noise there has registered in the middle of the night at 43 decibels. And then when the equipment goes on, it's 12 decibels higher; more than a doubling of the perceived sound. And this is a significant level.

I would like to point out that when this variance was issued last fall, or last summer, I'm sorry, a year ago, it was stipulated that Idenix would continue to work on this problem. And we've seen how they

removed all of this equipment from the corner of the building there.

But, Paul, can you maybe explain why that was done? What the reason was that you could remove that equipment?

PAUL FANNING: We were able to -- and I think Rich alluded to this earlier -- we were able to look at our chemistry operations and we were trying to identify what types of activities could we look at outside the company. And can we get out-sourcing certain things, certain activities, knowing that chemistry drives a lot of the requirements in terms of storage and air conditioning.

So there were two walk-in hoods in particular that determined that we could shut down, and that RTU was located in the corner. So by removing that and then re-ducting some of the exhaust fans into another RTU, we were able to clear that out and we basically did stop using those walk-in hoods by the

chemists.

MICHAEL GARDNER: So this is part of the out-sourcing that Mr. Johnston had alluded to?

PETER LINQUIST: Right. But I think that the point is that this wasn't done to make me happy, I don't believe. The way it was explained to me was this was done because their operational procedures had changed and the out-sourcing was the more beneficial thing.

PAUL FANNING: For the record, both. It was a win-win. We know that this would be a potential noise reduction -- so it was, I would say, it was for both purposes.

MICHAEL GARDNER: All right.

PETER LINQUIST: So the end result of that is -- and as far as I know, that was the only thing that was done in the course of 12 months to improve the noise situation here.

And if we go back historically and look at

data taken in 2010 at receptors 1, 2 and 3, at 16 feet, at 10 something at night, which were the only numbers that were available that they provided us with, all three receptors were reading at 55 decibels in 2010 at 10:00 in the evening.

In 2011, the only difference was that, on my corner, it experienced a one decibel drop. At the middle of the block it was the same, at receptor 2, and they got a reading of 56, one decibel higher on the corner of Hampshire and Clark.

So all the work that was supposed to have been done in the course of the year produced a one decibel drop in one location.

I also have an interest in the science of acoustical measurement. And if I could ask one of the members of one of the consulting firms a question, I would appreciate it.

ROBERT HAAS: No objection.

1	GERARD MAHONEY: No objection.
2	MICHAEL GARDNER: Go ahead.
3	MR. LINQUIST: I don't know who wants
4	to answer.
5	MICHAEL GARDNER: And identify
6	yourself for the record.
7	ROBERT BERENS: Well, ask the
8	question first and then we'll figure out who
9	gets to answer it.
10	PETER LINQUIST: In 2010 so I
11	guess it'S Mr. Tocci, I do believe he took
12	samples in 2010.
13	That same night, when you took the
14	readings prior to, I think, the final hearing
15	for the variance, you also took you took
16	readings at 16 feet and you took readings at 5
17	feet above the sidewalk; is that correct?
18	MICHAEL GARDNER: And just identify
19	yourself for the record, sir.
20	GREGORY TOCCI: My name is Greg
21	Tocci, Cavanaugh & Tocci Associates.

MR. LINQUIST: And the numbers that I saw on your report where receptor one at five feet aboveground readings of 52 decibels, and at receptors 2 and 3, at 5 feet, were 53 decibels.

And shortly thereafter or shortly before that, you took readings at those same locations but at an elevation of 16 feet and you got a reading ranging between 3 and 2 decibels higher than those at the five foot level. So now we are up to 16 feet.

MICHAEL GARDNER: Could you just answer, sir, so it can be picked up on the record. Mr. Linquist made I had statement and you are agreeing with it?

GREGORY TOCCI: Yes, I do.

PETER LINQUIST: Now, is it possible to speculate, if we went another five feet higher or ten feet higher, based on -- and you are all aware of how the street is laid out and where the samples were taken -- if we went

and took measurements at, say, 20 feet or 25 feet, you might get higher readings than you did at 16 feet and certainly higher readings than you did at five feet. Is that reasonable to anticipate?

GREGORY TOCCI: No, I would say not. The reason why some of it was at five feet or higher than the 16 feet was because the building roof edge is shielding much of the noise produced by the equipment. And that is why we went to 16 foot in order to be able to get a position that had a full few of sources on the roof.

PETER LINQUIST: But at 16 feet, you do not have full view. The building is 18 and change high.

GREGORY TOCCI: Mh-hmm. I think you are correct. But we felt that we had a substantial view of all those out-sources; most of those sources, particularly the major ones, were higher above the roof than that.

MR. LINQUIST: Well, the unfortunate part is that I have readings -- and the real unfortunate part is that the neighbor's second-story windows at midpoint are -- in my house, they are 18 feet, in the middle house it is 18 feet, the third house on the corner of Hampshire and Clark has four stories, their third floor is at 22 feet, their fourth floor is a 30 feet, and the fourth floor skylight is at 33 feet.

And I would beg to differ that moving to a higher elevation -- because particularly on that Hampshire Street property, the one on the corner of Hampshire, they are above the baffles, they are above some of the silence -- the sound attenuators that were put on the equipment, and they suffer a tremendous sound.

So I can see it walking from my second story to my third story with my sound meter in hand, my \$80 Radio Shack meter, which on numerous occasions that I tested it against

Andrea Boyer's or Bill Elliot's, it has read 1 very comparably. And I can experience a three 2 decibel difference walking up a flight of stairs and putting the meter out the window. 4 So I beg to differ that going beyond 5 the 16 feet mark is really a true measurement 6 of what the sound is hitting the windows where 7 people sleep in the neighborhood. One other issue I'd like to bring up 9 is in the middle of the block, across from the 10 receptor 2, in that area, on the Idenix roof 11 is a very large and old air-conditioning unit. 12 If I am correct -- and correct me if 13 I'm wrong if I'm wrong, Paul -- but that is a 14 unit that is the responsibility of your 15 landlord? 16 It could be, it's PAUL FANNING: 17 Depending on the one you are possible. 18 talking about. We have the --19 PETER LINQUIST: The noisiest one. 20 PAUL FANNING: If it is four, that 21

was a base unit that was put in -- I think I know the one you mean. It's not the highest one. That is probably a base unit.

PETER LINQUIST: This unit contributes in our estimation to a lot of noise on the block, not all of it, by any means. But when the compressor on that unit kicks in, it is very noticeable and it rumbles along and it's very noisy, the fans on it are very noisy. And this has come up in discussions about replacing it. And because it might be the landlord's responsibility, I guess, it can't be resolved to fix it or replace it. I don't know how old it is; it's quite old.

Unfortunately, you may not know the full history of all of this dating back to 2007 or 2006, but originally this noise issue came before this Commission as part of resistance to a permit for chemical storage, an increase quantity of chemical storage in

the Idenix facility. And inherent with that was the increased amount of equipment on the roof.

And at that time -- and, in fact, the applicant for that permit was the landlord, who is Metropolitan Life Insurance

Corporation, they are a real estate division,

I guess. And they are the ones that received the actual permit to store additional quantities of --

MICHAEL GARDNER: One of our commissioners would like to interject here.

GERARD MAHONEY: That is just a historical clarification.

That was actually an application for a license, a preamble storage license, which if memory serves me correctly, I was involved in that license process, and in the end result the license was not required because of the change in the state law with regards to the amounts of flammables.

So a permit was actually issued by 1 the fire department for the storage use of 2 flammables; a license if the quantities exceed a certain threshold that's issued by this 4 board. 5 PETER LINQUIST: And the previous 6 board did issue a license, or at least voted 7 to issue a license. 8 GERARD MAHONEY: I just wanted to 9 clarify the difference between a license and a 10 permit. 11 PETER LINQUIST: Am I not correct --12 MICHAEL GARDNER: The records will be 13 there and, if it is relevant, we can check it. 14 PETER LINQUIST: My point is that 15 this license presumably was to be granted to 16 the landlord and was to stay with the building 17 forever. 18 GERARD MAHONEY: Not really. 19 Okay. Go ahead MICHAEL GARDNER: 20 and make your point. 21

PETER LINQUIST: Well, for as long as 1 the landlord owned the building. 2 GERARD MAHONEY: No. Licenses are issued to the -- actually, in Chapter 148 it 4 states that, "The license runs with the land, 5 the owner of the land," which in most cases is 6 the owner of the building. So a tenant does 7 not get a license for the storage of flammables, the property owner does. But the license is only in effect --10 it has to be renewed every year and is only in 11 effect as long as the inventory meets or 12 exceeds the threshold stipulated by the fire 13 prevention regulations of the Commonwealth. 14 PETER LINQUIST: Meets or exceeds? 15 GERARD MAHONEY: There is a threshold 16 where you need a license. If you have 17 18 license. 19 20

21

flammables below that, you don't need a And their application was during a period of transition of those figures, the

state changed the figures.

PETER LINQUIST: I see. So this Commission granted a license that wasn't necessary?

MICHAEL GARDNER: That may or may not be the case. But would you make the point you are trying to get to.

PETER LINQUIST: The point I'm trying to get to is, if there was a license granted, or so this Commission agreed to grant a license, that this landlord has -- we've never heard from the landlord, and since this landlord, I thought, was holding this license, shouldn't they be responsible for some of this noise equipment, this equipment that is making some of this noise?

Now, maybe not, because maybe they don't need the license. It's news to me.

Because I was here at the hearing when it was voted by the Commission to grant a license for this chemical storage.

MICHAEL GARDNER: All right. I appreciate that.

PETER LINQUIST: It's a little historical background.

In summation, which I'm sure you are all happy to hear, I urge this Commission not to grant a permanent nor temporary extension to this variance.

What I would suggest, in the spirit of cooperation and fairness, is to set some definitive guideline for the company to meet the noise requirement or improve -- at least improve upon the situation that they have.

It was stated by everybody that there is nothing else that can be done. I heard that in 2009 when the company applied for a variance to 60 decibels, when they said there is nothing else we can do.

And in the magical period of six months later, according to their numbers, they brought the readings down to 55 decibels by

implementing additional things.

_

So I urge you not to just give a carte blanche extension of this variance, but to require Idenix to identify other means.

Mr. Tocci, in 2008, in the one of his reports, which I'm sure is in your files, outlined several possible techniques which could be used to bring this into compliance.

One was this great wall of China, which they have half-built anyway with these cloth baffles, it blocks the sun, it blocks the air in the neighborhood, it blocks our skyline views, it's a scar on the neighborhood, but it improved the sound.

The Commission frowned upon the idea of a 16-foot wall, so they put up twelve-foot baffles instead.

But there was an option that I had recommended to Mr. Gilman, who no longer is with Idenix, back in 2005 when they started putting the first pieces of equipment on the

roof.

And I met Mr. Gilman -- I had complained to a previous facility's manager there and never received any response.

And when Mr. Gilman came on board, we met on numerous occasions, and I suggested this to him because I have some experience in this type of thing -- not installing the equipment as close to the residential property as possible, but moving it back 50 or 60 feet where there was ample room on the roof and dumping it to where it should go.

And he said, "Well, we'll solve the problem." And 2006, 2007 rolled by, and the problem was getting worse, more equipment was showing up there.

But the solution to the problem as Mr. Tocci had identified in his report and was never spoken of again, was to relocate the equipment; some of it internally in the building, some of it further out on the roof,

he didn't specify the plan, but it's basically what I thought should have been done from day one, and what the engineers should have done, the same engineers that signed off on the building permits that their work would comply with the city noise ordinance.

And I think this is the option, to remove that equipment, put it where it should have been put on day one.

The neighborhood did not create this problem; we have inherited it. We do not like it and we are tired of it. Basically, it has gone on too long. And that company, if they had taken all the money that they have spent on lawyers and consultants and put this stuff where it should have been, moved it two years ago, three years ago, they'd have money in the bank today. Truthfully.

So I will end on that note. Thank you.

MR. GARDNER: If you wouldn't mind,

any questions?

ROBERT HAAS: I probably asked Mr. Linquist and Mr. Johnston. One of issues we keep on struggling with is the point of measurement and where is the appropriate point of reading. So I want to get your take of it now.

PETER LINQUIST: My take is a property line is a vertical plane. Because if a property line were not that, there would be no such thing as air rights, which we all own. So it's a vertical plane between two demarcation points.

MICHAEL GARDNER: Anything else?

RICHARD JOHNSTON: Our position has consistently been that the task actually should be taken even lower than five feet at the property line because the line is literally at the ground level.

Obviously, the Commission has taken a somewhat different position over the years and

as we did the tests higher up but, without 1 prejudice to the previous Commission, it 2 should be lower. PETER LINQUIST: People don't live on 4 the ground, people don't sleep on the ground, 5 they sleep on second and third and fourth 6 floors, and that's where the noise is a 7 problem. MICHAEL GARDNER: Mr. Linquist, 9 what's your perception of whether or not the 10 noise problem is better now than it was in 11 2009? 12 2009? When in 2009? MR. LINOUIST: 13 MICHAEL GARDNER: Well, when the 14 photos "A" and I think "C" were taken about 15 May of 2009? 16 PETER LINQUIST: Well, I'm looking 17 back at readings in 2009 that were taken in 18 September, and I'm seeing readings of 59, 59, 19 59. 20 So if I'm to believe these readings 21

. .

and compare it to the, what, you know, a 54, 55, 56 -- and I don't know what time of day these 59's were taken -- I would have to say, yes, it has improved.

MICHAEL GARDNER: That really wasn't my question. My question has got to do with the psychological perception of the noise.

PETER LINQUIST: It is wearing us all down, believe me, it is wearing us all down. This whole process has worn us all down but living with this noise on a daily, nightly basis -- it is fine for these people, they get paid to come in here and present a case and all that. I have to go home and sleep there it in and so do my neighbors and that is where the problem is. These people don't live in the neighborhood, they get paid to tell you something.

So what you are telling us is that all the steps, including the reconfiguration of their operation with respect to the moving

21

the chemistry functions out or taking all of the equipment off the roof or moving it, we have seen, is from your point of view; the noise problem has not improved since before when they were still doing those chemical operations internally and when all the equipment was on the roof.

That time period is between 2010, a year ago, and now is when those changes took place and, no, I cannot tell the difference. The meter says at my house it is one decibel quieter, which is within the statistical range of error of the meter. But the meter says it is one decibel quieter at my house, but exactly the same at the other two houses, the other two receptors, that has not changed.

Okay. Thank you. PETER LINQUIST: Thank you very much. MICHAEL GARDNER: Any other members of the public who would like to be heard? CHARLIE MARQUARDT: Charlie

MICHAEL GARDNER:

Marquardt, 10 Rogers Street, 02142.

_

I'm here to speak on my own behalf and East Cambridge team. We have an awful lot of concern about noise, noise impact on the neighbors, driven primarily, from our perspective, out of development that has occurred and will occur in the next couple of years.

If you notice, they are knocking down a lot of buildings in the neighborhood, so we are concerned about the setting of a precedent to allow companies to decide after building they can say "we'll go five decibels higher because it is no big deal." Think we just had testimony that five decibels higher is a pretty big deal. There is a psychological, there's relationship.

We heard the word "buffer," there is a "buffer zone" between the different buildings. What we've observed and what I have personally is that noise does not observe

ک

כ

a buffer, it goes right through; it doesn't exist, it's just a line on a drawing.

And we also want to make sure that there is concern expressed about the new neighbors that will be coming into this neighborhood. Just recently there was a building approved on the corner of Portland and Hampshire Streets that will be six or seven stories tall. So that will be a different type of reading.

And whether you consider the line of measurement, the ground or 16 feet, you now have people that will be living at 50, 60 feet up, and I think that could present a different conundrum.

MICHAEL GARDNER: The building you're talking about is a residential building?

CHARLIE MARQUARDT: Yes, it would be a residential on the second and the floors above; first floor and a parking. And it's

3234 Hampshire Street I think is the actual address. So all the monitoring is being done away from that, and I don't know if there's a way to start on that side as well.

And we are also worried about the discussion of talking about -- let's take ambient noise out and just measure our own little piece. While that might work scientifically, that is not the ordinance. We are worried about the impact on the people and everybody else that are hearing that noise and it can be caustic.

You know, the building I live in, when people move into my building, the first time they hear the engine blast from their jet turbine, it is rudely awakening. So I can only imagine what these folks are going through listening to 55, 53 continuously. It's a background that will not go away.

It may get better in the winter when you turn down the air conditioners, but I

think this is something that needs to be fixed, not put off for another year or two.

Let's make sure that companies understand that Cambridge has a noise ordinance for a purpose, and that purpose is to protect all of us so we can live long and healthy lives and not be driven to either physical or emotional distress. That that's all I have to say. Thank you.

MICHAEL GARDNER: Any other members of the public who want to be heard?

CAROL BERLIN: Carol Berlin, 257

Charles Street.

I sat on the rooftop mechanical committee and I live in East Cambridge. Charlie just mentioned that we have constant noise. This is a very tragic play out here because the building is smack in the middle of a residential neighborhood. So the reality is that they really could never get in compliance.

There is a big issue as to where they test this noise. They've never changed where it was being tested. There is going to be a lot of development that is coming up. This does set a precedence and I guess that is my concern.

I'm sad that Idenix just didn't move back into Kendall Square closer to where everything else is. But we are getting a lot more development now on Binney Street, on both sides of Binney Street, and also with MIT developing out there 26 acres.

It is becoming a major issue for East Cambridge. I walk down the street on a regular basis and people start bitching about the goddamn noise and we listen to it 24/7. People have stopped living on their third floors and moved to second floors. The noise is just getting terrible.

And this doesn't help this neighborhood. I know this is an issue for

them. I don't know what the solution is. But it is just smack in their face. The tragedy is that they tried to reinvent this building and I think this wasn't the right location for it.

So I just put out there that we are concerned about noise, the ambient noise. This is a build-out. This stuff does accumulate; it doesn't stop accumulating. And that is a major issue for us. Thank you.

MICHAEL GARDNER: Thank you.

KIM KAUFMAN: My name is Kim Kaufman. I live at 66 C Hampshire Street. So I live in one of three townhouses that abuts Clark and Hampshire.

And I feel that, you know, I want to urge you not to renew the variance. I feel that Idenix is being irresponsible and that they violated the noise ordinance several times. And the only reason that they get back into compliance is when the neighbors call to

complain.

One example is what Mr. Linquist said about the fencing, and another example is there was this horrible high-pitched whistling sound that was going on for weeks, and I didn't know what it was and it was very disruptive. It would go on about 20 minutes to a half-hour, and all the neighbors were talking about it, trying to figure out what it was.

And, finally, we determined it was coming from Idenix. And I called Andrea Boyer -- this was like a few weeks ago -- and she said she would check into it and I believe it stopped.

I saw a huge truck out there one day, so I'm assuming they did something to stop it. But that was going on for weeks and weeks, and I don't know that they would have done anything about that. So I don't feel that they've earned the right to continue with this

variance. I feel that they would be better in a facility where they could make the noise that they need to make.

And the responsibility of the City of Cambridge is to protect the well-being of the people that live there. My daughter sleeps on the fourth floor of our house and I cannot open the skylight because it is too noisy at night, because our skylight looks onto Idenix.

So I feel that we shouldn't be giving a variance to this company. Thank you.

MICHAEL GARDNER: Thank you.

LILA FLORES: Hello, I prefer to stand. My name is Lila Flores, I live at 64 Hampshire Street. I come here because when I lay up at night because I can't sleep because of the noise. I am in the second floor of 64 Hampshire. My two windows face Idenix roof. 22 foot level. And I notice that even with the window shut, even with earplugs, I can hear them, that's how powerful the noise is.

ŏ

So I wonder what can I do to get some piece and quiet. I'm going to come here and give my testimony to give proof to the Council that I cannot sleep and it's having a harmful impact on my life.

So the sleepless nights are awful. I cannot sleep at night, I have to lay up there until I finally -- it wears me out. Or I wake up in the middle of the night and I have to stay awake until I'm able to sleep again. And then in the morning, I have very unproductive days.

And so really in response to the City ordinance it hasn't been a solution for me, I still can't sleep, and I think you should consider the area for the neighbors. And so my ear is not a sophisticated decibel measurement, but my ear tells me that even before the ordinance, I still can't sleep at night especially in the summer when all the activity increases. And, really, I think that

either the measurements are between 50 and 55, right on the border, and my ears can feel that.

And so if they have moved the machines, they have moved the machines closer to my window, actually, which explains why I still can't sleep.

So, really, if you were in my shoes, anybody in the audience, you wouldn't want any tolerance of the decibels. You would just want calm and peace, right? You would just want to sleep.

I'm sorry, I get emotional because
I'm a very frustrated neighbor and I'm
desperate sometimes, so excuse me. When I
think of the solutions, I think about -- I
think that they can turn off the machines, and
apparently they can't do; and if they can't,
maybe they can use some of the power to move
there noise production to another place.
Maybe keep them quiet. Keep it quiet and move

2
 3
 4

the other ones. Or they can use their money and power to update the equipment for a quieter one, or to move everything inside the walls of their first floor.

And as Council, when you make your decision, please consider us neighbors, and that all we want is some peace and calm. And so I hope that you defend our quality of life.

And I know that businesses are important for Cambridge, but I think that this time people should come first. And so I really hope that you decide to give this variance -- I hope that whatever happens, you continue to monitor the noise levels that Idenix produces and that also you continue to see what you are doing for us neighbors.

And so if this noise keeps me up at night, I feel that another solution should be to keep us all up at night until we find a solution. Thank you.

MICHAEL GARDNER: Thank you.

MEAGAN BROOK: My name is Meagan
Brook and I live at 103 Inman Street and I was
a tangental party to a long, drawn-out noise
case involving 100 Inman Street which is a
building that was grandfathered in. It used
to be a Fleishman's Yeast Factory. And it was
and is a problem in our neighborhood. And so
I sympathize very deeply with the problems
these people are having.

And what we just heard is how all the people feel under an assault which crosses their property boundaries into their homes at all times and they can do nothing but beg the City of Cambridge to defend them. She said it. That is the word, we ask the City to defend us.

And I've asked the Commission for years to defend us. And we've heard over and over again the same arguments about how difficult the noise ordinance is to enforce and the courts and the this and the that. Yes

Q

and no. You know, the Dred Scott case lost, but it was right, was it not? Do the history books not tell us the Supreme Court of the United States was wrong in its decision on the Dred Scott case.

If you take your stand, the courts will either agree or not. The Commission should stand for the right and the noise ordinance and the clear will of the people to be protected.

Now, there is a 50 decibel DBA limit. But research is coming out all the time and it shows that people optimally need 30 or less decibels to sleep properly.

And, furthermore, it shows more and more and more that numerous serious chronic health conditions arise over years of poor sleep. And accidents arise from poor sleep. Work accidents, road accidents, domestic accidents, people falling down their stairs, whatever. This is costing our society more

than it would cost to control these noise sources in pain and suffering and money, just in money.

So you have to start somewhere. This is where the people of Cambridge start. This is it, it's got to start somewhere. Please do not extend this variance.

Carol is right, it's a precedent.

Richard Scaly said it was not a precedent but it is; that is how people perceive it and, therefore, that's what it is. It's a bad precedent, let's not continue with it.

These people actually came and seemed to say at one point -- I don't know want to go on too long, but somebody seemed to say that if they shut all their stuff off, they would still be in noncompliance of the ordinance. I never heard of anything so ridiculous. You can't be accused of causing noise when you are causing none.

If they can't get in compliance, they have to get their other research and development neighbors to help them be in compliance. There is a solution here.

Mr. Linquist said that first he was told nothing could be done because it was over 60, then it was over 55 and nothing could be done. We have all heard this. Something can be done with the will. It's a necessity; necessity is the mother of invention.

Thank you so much for your patience.

MICHAEL GARDNER: Thank you.

BARRY LEVIN: I live at 67 Hampshire Street. And my ears and bed would be about a hundred feet from the north corner of the building, it's 18 feet off the ground. My sense is it has gotten a bit worse since some of the equipment has migrated towards my end of the building.

I would also like to say that I, too, was plagued by the funny whistling sound,

,

which was sort of a flutist running up the scale followed by a symbol crashing and a shriek and then maybe 15 to 30 minutes of silence and then starting up all over again.

And which at 3:00 in the morning it is not so good, no matter what the ambient noise is. And it probably didn't violate the decibel level. Had it been a real set of musicians, I imagine they could have booked them on some statute for the disturbing the peace. And the general roar of the thing late at night starting maybe at 11 o'clock when the ambient drops off, is certainly perceptible. And to claim that the ambient is canceling the damage from this building is simply ridiculous. It is implausible.

I wasn't smart enough to call Andrea. I actually talked to Chris at Idenix. And if he was very nice but we were never able to pin down that whistling noise. And I find it actually implausible that nobody in that

building was able to hear it. And that just before this hearing, it finally miraculously stopped. But make of it what you will.

But I do think it's a real problem and I think that your continued vigilance and attention to this is really crucial. I think if you grant this variance it's a terrible thing. Thank you.

MICHAEL GARDNER: Thank you.

LINDA LINQUIST: My name is Linda
Linquist and I live at 11 Market Street.
Welcome to the Licensing Commission,
Mr. Gardner.

I am reading a letter from Gerald Urban, who lives at 82 Elm Street. He was not able to be here tonight and he wanted me to submit this testimony aloud for the record.

June 28, 2011. I am urging the License Commission to vote not to renew the special variance that was granted to Idenix Pharmaceuticals on July 7th, 2010. Idenix

Pharmaceuticals should be required to meet the full requirements of the City of Cambridge Noise Control Ordinance.

Cambridge City Code, Section

8.16.090(B). I will not review the testimony
that I have presented at several hearings over
the past few months -- many months.

And as a neighbor that was active in the zoning discussions in the 1990's regarding this area of Cambridge, it has never been clearer that this pharmaceutical laboratory is the wrong use for this location.

Idenix, in their application for development at this location, said they would abide by the Cambridge Noise Ordinance; and, as of this date, they have not done so.

Of course, I am saddened that the threat of a lawsuit caused a special variance to be given to Idenix. We are dealing with multibillion dollar corporations. Novartis is the majority owner of Idenix. And MetLife is

δ

the landlord and owner of the property. Both are multibillion dollar corporate entities. We're not dealing with a mop and pop owner that would face financial ruin if they had to abide by the law.

Idenix wrote the following in their
March 7, 2011 report to stockholders, and I
quote: "We have been involved in a dispute
with the City of Cambridge, Massachusetts, and
its License Commission pertaining to the level
of noise emitted from certain rooftop
equipment at our research facility located at
60 Hampshire Street in Cambridge.

"The License Commission has claimed that we are in violation of the local noise ordinance pertaining to sound emissions based on a complaint from neighbors living adjacent to the property.

We have contested this alleged violation before the Commission as well as the Middlesex County Massachusetts Superior Court.

"In July 2010, the activities at the building -- excuse me -- in July 2010, the License Commission as well as the Middlesex County Supreme Court, the License Commission granted us a special variance from the requirements of the local noise ordinance for a period of one year effective July 1st, 2010.

"We may, however, be required to cease certain activities at the building if

(A) the noise emitted from certain rooftop equipment at our research facility exceeds the levels permitted by the special variance; and

(B) the parties are unable to resolve this matter through negotiations and remedial action; or (C) our legal challenge to the position of the City of Cambridge and the License Commission is unsuccessful.

"In any event, we could be required to relocate to another facility which could interrupt some of our business activities and could be time consuming and costly." Unquote.

Clearly, Idenix understands that they may have to move their facility if they do not abide by the Cambridge Noise Ordinance. This event would not be a financial disaster for them. Idenix choose this location, agreed to meet the standards of noise ordinance, and now it's time that they are held accountable for their decision to locate their laboratory at a site surrounded by residential neighborhoods.

"As for their good faith efforts, they have been forced to make the changes they have made in their operations due to the advocacy of the community. No good faith there.

"The changes in their rooftop equipment has been heartbreakingly slow in coming. They have not made some of the changes that are way overdue, such as working with MetLife, their landlord, to update and move the noisy air conditioner on their roof, which generates a huge amount of noise and

which should be replaced and relocated with more modern equipment.

"Both Idenix and MetLife are profiting from the special variance issued by the License Committee because the property is now available for pharmaceutical laboratory use, thereby increasing its value.

"From the beginning, this has been a David and Goliath story. It's time that the License Commission due what is right: Stand up for the community, enforce the noise ordinance as written, and do not let billionaire corporate interests and the threats of lawsuits stop the Commission from protecting residential neighborhoods from disruptive and damaging noise. Vote against any effort to make permanent the special variance. Vote to end the special variance. Enforce the noise ordinance. Gerald Burgman June 28, 2010."

MICHAEL GARDNER: Thank you, ma'am.

A copy of that letter is in our records and is 1 on file. And I allowed you to read it into 2 the record for purposes of having the audience here. 4 Any there any other members of the 5 public who would like to be heard on this 6 matter? No? 7 I would like to give Idenix representatives an opportunity to respond to 9 some of the comments, but I would also like to 10 hear if Ms. Boyer has got any additional 11 information you feel would be helpful for us 12 to know. 13 ANDREA BOYER: I would just like 14 to --15 MICHAEL GARDNER: If you could come 16 forward and identify yourself. 17 ANDREA BOYER: Andrea Boyer, 18 investigator for the City of Cambridge License 19 Commission. 20 I was there to verify what was on and 21

what was not on. And what was in the report is true, and I just want to make sure from our side that we do have that for the record, that I was able to concur with their findings.

MICHAEL GARDNER: Thank you.

Any response? And I'm particularly interested in the issue of a so-called noisy air conditioner and the responsibility for that, the whistle, and another response to the comments and complaints that you've heard along with us.

ANDREA BOYER: The whistle issue has been fixed by the way.

PAUL FANNING: So the whistle issue has been fixed?

MR. GARDNER: So tell us about the whistle issue a little bit, if you could, since it's been a sort source of concern apparently about how long it went on before there was any action taken.

PAUL FANNING: Sure.

MICHAEL GARDNER: Which presumably relates in part to the good faith issue.

SAM WILD: Sam Wild, facility director.

The issue from the noise and the whistling they are talking about with the venting system off the liquid nitrogen tank.

The jacket on this system has to vent for the system to work properly and to maintain proper pressure.

What we have done is we brought in the company that installed the tank. We have asked for their input. And it turns out to be a high pressure liquid nitrogen tank. And we've added a regulator to the line, which would bring that pressure down and not allow it to vent the way it was venting. That was our solution.

PAUL FANNING: Other items, there has been some comments that we move the equipment over to the Hampshire Street side, which I

just wanted to point out isn't the case.

We've either removed the equipment or in some cases moved it back towards the CDM building, and in one case, moved it in the middle of some sound attenuation, but not over to the Hampshire Street side.

And Novartis is not a majority shareholder of Idenix. I just want to point that out.

Other items, I think in terms of the efforts that we've made, good faith-wise, and I know they may have gotten lost a little bit, but we've not actually done as-found readings.

We have intentionally turned all our equipment on to be the loudest it possibly could. And in some cases, we had a discussion with our consultants about whether we were actually overstating because it would be an extremely warm night.

So I just want to reinforce that those readings are very much just readings

Q

that you will not typically find. And if you actually go out on a given night, they are going to be lower because a number of those units will not be firing except on a really warm evening.

Secondly, the idea of moving some of the equipment -- we've talked a lot about other options. Moving equipment inside is possible to an extent but not completely. There is certain units that you need to have on the roof. And our consultants can talk more about why you need to have air, you need to have the supply, so there's certain fans that actually need to be on the roof.

There are also certain requirements from the chemical storage perspective that we don't think from a safety perspective are not willing to necessarily let the temperature rise too high because it could create safety issues and some violations in regard to chemical storage.

So just by the nature of having some chemistry and biological operations, we need to have those units operating. And in some cases, they have to be on the roof.

I also want to point out that we aren't the first pharmaceutical company to be there. There was there a pharmaceutical company before Idenix, so it was a laboratory operation when we moved in there in 2004.

We will continue to look at options and continue to do things. I don't want to leave the Commission with the notion that we won't continue to explore, but as recently as today we talked about things of what else could we do. And to the extent that there are some things that will help, we'll do that.

I answered a question earlier that are there capital improvements that will guarantee to get us in compliance.

MR. GARDNER: I never asked you a question about guaranteeing. I asked you

about whether there were capital improvements 1 that could -- capital changes that could make 2 improvements in the situation, I think. PAUL FANNING: Okay. Then let me 4 tell you that there are, there is always 5 things that we could continue to do; whether 6 they would improve it or not, I don't know. 7 In other words, are there certain capital things -- we put VFDs, for example, 9 and didn't get much of an improvement. 10 In fact, some of these things are 11 very difficult to say whether they gained us 12 improvement. Could we put more VFDs on? Yes 13 we could do that. 14 MICHAEL GARDNER: Could you explain 15 what a VFD is? 16 17 PAUL FANNING: Yes. Variable frequency drive. So it may take some of 18 the -- it can take some of the whining out of 19 a motor. 20 And also increasing wiring, we've 21

done as well. I didn't mention that, but that was something we did in 2009, but didn't get much of a pick-up. So we've explored a lot of things.

And so there are some things that we can still continue to do, but there are -- the fact of the matter is that the wall is still the best option. And that was something that was, I'll say, discouraged or we decided that really wasn't viable. But it is possible that we can go back revisit that.

In the absence of a wall, we'll continue to look at other things, but they are incremental. They ones we talked about as recently as today wouldn't get us to 50, let's put that it way.

MICHAEL GARDNER: Could you talk a little bit more about the so-called noisy air conditioner?

PAUL FANNING: The loudest unit I mentioned earlier RTU 12, that was replaced.

That was the oldest and loudest piece of equipment, and we actually did replace that. Moving it to a new location, a much quieter unit behind, a clear story.

The remaining units, there are some older exhaust fans, that is true. But air conditioning units, I have to look at the age of them. But RTU 12 is the one that was 20 years old. The others, as far as I know, are not anywhere near as old as that.

MR. GARDNER: Well, you will recall that you and Mr. Linquist had somewhat of a less than illuminating dialogue about whether there is a particular unit. And you said you thought you knew which one he was referring to. He was implying it wasn't yours, it was the landlord's, and that it was a major contributor to the noise.

I'm trying to find out what information you can provide us about the matter that was the subject of that colloquy.

PAUL FANNING: Sure. I believe that one is a unit we call No. 4. And that was one of the ones that we've been talking about recently.

There are some fans at the top of that. We talked about putting some shielding around the top, will that gain us three DB?

No. I don't think it will even get us one DB.

But that is something we have talked about recently. If it's the same unit that

Mr. Linquist is talking about. It is either that or another unit, I'd have to clarify which exact unit. But I think when I asked if it's the deck level, I think it is unit four.

MICHAEL GARDNER: Okay. Other questions?

GERARD MAHONEY: One quick question.

To what extent has the landlord participated or contributed to solving this problem?

PAUL FANNING: Well, we have -- we update them. As far as the remediation

efforts, we've been spearheading and taking, 1 I'd say, the lead to date. But they are 2 involved. In fact, our lead, we require 4 approval for certain things to happen on the 5 roof, so --6 RICHARD JOHNSTON: The leaves test. 7 Right. So we'll go PAUL FANNING: to our landlord to make sure that -- for 9 example, cleaning up that corner and removing 10 the RTUs and removing the exhaust fans -- or 11 moving those exhaust fans, because we did all 12 those things recently. And we had to go to 13 MetLife for their approval before we did it. 14 So they are clearly involved. 15 GERARD MAHONEY: But not really like 16 17 a -- I wouldn't characterize that as much of a hands-on approach; is that correct? Would you 18 agree with that? 19 I would say that we PAUL FANNING: 20 are definitely in the lead on the 21

implementation, yes, or have been so far. 1 GERARD MAHONEY: Thank you. 2 Anything further MICHAEL GARDNER: from Idenix? 4 RICHARD JOHNSTON: Yes. 5 commissioners who have been here previously 6 know, this issue has gone on for a number of 7 years. And the company went through a number of changes in order to get the variance in 2010. 10 The Commission set certain 11 conditions, based upon the fact that it came 12 to a conclusion that the balance of hardships 13 favored granting the variance to Idenix. 14 Idenix has lived up to the terms and 15 conditions of the variance that was granted 16 last year, there hasn't been any suggestion 17 that things have really gotten worse. 18 Certainly the formal record for the Commission 19 in terms of complaints does not register any 20 significant increase in problems over the last 21

year.

So I would suggest that the balance of hardships remains the same as it was last year or, if anything, favors Idenix because of the fact that they have made improvements over the last year in compliance with what the Commission asked them to do.

As you've heard, Idenix is not intending to remain static about this. If the variance is granted, as Mr. Fanning has said, Idenix will continue to look at other possibilities. To the extent that people have suggestions, Idenix is certainly willing to listen to those suggestions.

I think a large portion of what we all hear from the neighborhood is a sense of frustration about things that have happened to the neighborhood that make it something other than a residential neighborhood.

But it wasn't Idenix who zoned that building for laboratory space. It wasn't

ŏ

Idenix who has approved other buildings to come into the neighborhood, whether it be the immediate neighborhood or in the more distant East Cambridge vicinity.

And all of the things in the neighborhood contribute to make the sound levels more difficult.

And there is been a lot of discussion about whether the background noises should be separated out from what Idenix does. And maybe that solution will not come tonight or tomorrow. But as Mr. Berens said, when Boston confronted that issue, they recognized that people had to be given a certain liberty to live up to the amount allowed by the noise ordinance.

And if you take the arguments here to the logical conclusion, assuming as Mr. Berens has shown, that the background levels are at or above 50 already in that area, it means that if someone wants to come in and turn on

their air conditioner on the third floor, for whatever reason, they are in violation because the ambient right around them is over 50. Even if all they add is a half a decibel or a quarter decibel, they are in violation ever much as Idenix would be without variance.

And certainly I don't think the people are advocating that they not be allowed to put on air conditioners because of that theoretical possibility.

And the same applies to Idenix.

Idenix has obtained the variance. Idenix has done what it can as far to be able to keep the decibel level as low as possible and will continue to think about and implement where possible.

But Idenix should not be made the scapegoat for other things by way of developments that are happening, not only all over East Cambridge, but in large portions of metropolitan Boston.

So in conclusion, I would submit that for all the reasons that the Commission voted last year to grant the variance for one year, the Commission should grant the variance or grant an extension of the variance for another year.

MICHAEL GARDNER: Okay. I believe that Mr. Linquist has indicated a request to respond.

PETER LINQUIST: I would just like to say that this was not a flawless year. Two months after they were granted the variance, they took the curtains off and they did not replace them until April. So they took them off in September, and did not replace them until April.

Ms. Boyer, did I call you in October of 2010?

ANDREA BOYER: Yes, you did. There was actually a letter sent out that I can give you a copy of.

PETER LINQUIST: And when I called you, did I ask you to please come and take readings?

ANDREA BOYER: You may have.

PETER LINQUIST: And the other think
I asked at that time is that I would like a
hearing about this after the readings are
taken.

ANDREA BOYER: And that was addressed in the letter that Elizabeth Lint wrote to you also, about the explanation about the curtains, and then the weather.

And there was a warning letter sent to Idenix stating not to let that happen again, and the curtain issue be addressed also, but making sure it's not removed again.

PETER LINQUIST: So my point then is that Council was wrong. It was not an event-less year with perfect performance on the part of Idenix. They chose to take things down, they chose not to put them back up for

seven months. Thank you.

MICHAEL GARDNER: Thank you.

Despite the lateness of the hour and given the importance of the hour, I'll give Idenix, if you want, the chance to respond to the issue of the curtains and the hurricane.

PAUL FANNING: It is true, we didn't execute 1/00 percent on that one. The hurricane was coming, we took the bottoms off to allow for air flow to go underneath. And we got the letter from Mrs. Lint and we responded that it wouldn't happen again.

MICHAEL GARDNER: I guess when it became clear that the hurricane wasn't going to arrive, the explanation as to why the curtains weren't put back in the original status? Was it a matter of money? Management slippage?

PAUL FANNING: No. Our units weren't going on -- it was more the temperature at that point, our units weren't kicking on.

MICHAEL GARDNER: Is it the normal plan for the curtains to come down for the winter season?

PAUL FANNING: Yes, that's correct.

MR. GARDNER: And for both snow maintenance on the protection of the curtains or the fact that they don't need the air conditioning? Just educate up a little bit, please.

PAUL FANNING: It is both. You don't want to have snow. It is basically to allow for air floor to allow for poor weather in the winter conditions and you don't need them.

So we constructed the sound curtains so that they can be taken down reasonably quickly if there is, let's say, a hurricane. To get them up and get them back down.

And then from, let's say, October through April, our intention is we don't need them so we are going to take the bottom part off to allow for air flow or snow to go

underneath them. 1 MICHAEL GARDNER: Thank you. 2 And I'd be interested to know whether the Commissioners will be willing to grant a 4 temporary variance until the time of our 5 decision hearing which I believe is July 7th; 6 is that right? 7 It is July 7th. **ELIZABETH LINT:** Ιt is July 7th and I was just flipping through 9 paperwork, and I think the original variance 10 was July 7th. So it would still be in effect 11 until that date. 12 MICHAEL GARDNER: If we don't need to 13 extend the temporary variance until July 7th, 14 is there any interest in continuing the matter 15 until the July 7th decision hearing? 16 ROBERT HAAS: I would vote for a 17 continue, just under advisement --18 It is July ANDREA BOYER: Excuse me. 19 1st, sir. 20 MICHAEL GARDNER: So I'm interested 21

in whether or not the Commissioners are 1 willing to extend a temporary -- to make a 2 temporary extension of the variance until July the 7th, and take the matter under advisement 4 until that date? 5 ROBERT HAAS: Seconded. 6 MICHAEL GARDNER: So there has been a 7 motion made and seconded to grant a temporary extension of the variance until the decision 9 hearing on July 7th, and to take the matter 10 generally under advisement until that decision 11 hearing on July 7th. 12 All those in favor of that motion 13 signify by saying "aye." 14 ROBERT HAAS: Aye. 15 GERARD MAHONEY: Aye. 16 MICHAEL GARDNER: None opposed, so 17 the motion carries. The variance will be 18 extended until July 7th and we'll take the 19 matter up at that point. 20 I thank all of you for your 21

participation and patience and your forceful 1 advocacy this evening. 2 At this point, we'd like to take a brief recess of five minutes. And so without 4 objection, we'll recess for five minutes. 5 we'll ask those of you who are waiting to 6 please extend your patience. 7 (Brief recess at 8:11 p.m.) 9 (Back on the record) 10 11 **ELIZABETH LINT:** Okay. 12 Informational matter continued from 13 July 14, 2011, El Coloso Market. Hung Pham, 14 property owner at 102 Columbia Street. Due to 15 complaints received by the License Commission 16 alleged that the machinery on the property is 17 in violation of the Cambridge City Noise 18 Ordinance. 19 And I wonder, MICHAEL GARDNER: 20 Ms. Boyer, if can you give us an update on the 21

developments since we last met.

-

ANDREA BOYER: Yes, I can. At our last meeting it was brought to the attention that maybe when one unit was moved that another unit that was also existing, may also still be a violation.

And I went maybe a day or two later after this hearing, and had the one unit turned off and got readings of the unit that would remain.

It did show that it would be problematic. It was on the roof line, so I wasn't able to help the lot line, but at the roof line, it was a violation.

At that time, it was recommended that one was going to be removed so that there would be units downstairs.

So the one next to it was removed and put at ground level. And then the one that was left, that was loud, which was an air conditioning unit, that really had nothing to

do with the two noise violations; that was boxed just based on a recommendation to take away all the noise.

So right now, and according to the neighbors, there is not a lot of sound, just like maybe a normal air conditioning unit that is left.

MICHAEL GARDNER: This says, "moved to ground level" and this one says "removed." So there is two units, one is just gone, it doesn't exist any more, and the other one was moved to the ground level and a box was placed around an air conditioning unit.

ANDREA BOYER: Yes. And then there's the third one, removed, there's one way back.

MICHAEL GARDNER: It says, "B" --

ANDREA BOYER: It says "boxed." It was boxed. And then there was one that was to the far right of those two, the one that was moved to ground level, but that's not plugged in at all, it doesn't work. It's just not on.

The last situation that we have is 1 the one that was moved to ground level, that's 2 in an alcove. And no one has complained yet about the noise in the back, but I am 4 requesting that that is just boxed like the 5 other one so that there will be no problems in 6 the future. 7 Mr. Pham is not here today. I will call him tomorrow or the next day and ask him 9 to have that done or through the owner. 10 And then I would like to recommend 11 that -- this is on the last, agenda in July, 12 but if it is boxed by then then we can remove 13 it and no one would have to show up. We've 14 done that in the past in certain cases. 15 MICHAEL GARDNER: Do you understand 16 this, sir? 17 MR. PHAM: Yes. 18 MICHAEL GARDNER: And is this 19 satisfactory to you? 20 MR. PHAM: Yes. 21

MICHAEL GARDNER: And are there 1 currently any outstanding complaints? 2 I got an e-mail saying ANDREA BOYER: that it's been good, there is not as much 4 noise. 5 MICHAEL GARDNER: So your 6 recommendation is to continue the matter 7 generally until the last meeting in July? ANDREA BOYER: Yes. 9 MICHAEL GARDNER: To give the 10 opportunity for the boxing of the unit in the 11 alcove on the ground level? 12 ANDREA BOYER: Correct. And I 13 haven't received any complaints about that 14 one, but if it's a violation, if someone were 15 to complain, but it could be just better to 16 try to address it all one at a time. 17 MICHAEL GARDNER: Before we take 18 action on this, are there any members of the 19 public who would like to be heard on this 20 matter? 21

1	Seeing none, the pleasure of the
2	Commission?
3	ROBERT HAAS: We have it on already.
4	MICHAEL GARDNER: Yes. Well, I'd be
5	interested in an endorsement of this,
6	Ms. Boyer's plan, unless you feel that that is
7	too micromanaging?
8	ROBERT HAAS: Will that resolve
9	ANDREA BOYER: Yes, it should.
10	ROBERT HAAS: Then I would make a
11	motion to complete the work in time for the
12	scheduled hearing, and then we can review it
13	at that time and decide whether or not the
14	noise is still a problem. *
15	ANDREA BOYER: And if it doesn't
16	exist any more, we can take it off.
17	MICHAEL GARDNER: The motion having
18	been made?
19	ROBERT HAAS: Seconded.
20	MICHAEL GARDNER: The motion made and
21	seconded to continue the matter to allow the

additional improvements. 1 All those in favor signify by saying 2 aye? ROBERT HAAS: Aye. 4 GERARD MAHONEY: Aye. 5 MICHAEL GARDNER: None opposed, so 6 we'll procedure accordingly. 7 Thank you for your cooperation, sir, and the steps you've taken to deal with this 9 serious issue. 10 MR. PHAM: Thank you. 11 12 ELIZABETH LINT: Application for 13 Thelonius Monkfish, Ltd, Jamme K. Chantler, 14 manager, holder of a common victualer license 15 at 524 Massachusetts Avenue, has applied for a 16 new wine and malt beverages as a restaurant 17 license at said address. This address is 18 located in Cap No. 3. 19 MICHAEL GARDNER: Good evening. Ιf 20 you would both please state your names for the 21

record and spell them. 1 Bernard Goldberg, attorney for the 2 applicant, 620 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge. 4 JAMME CHANTLER: My first name is 5 Jamme, J-a-m-m-e. My last name is Chantler, 6 C-H-A-N-T-L-E-R. I'm the general manager of 7 Thelonius Monkfish, Ltd. BERNARD GOLDBERG: If I may amplify 9 on his position, he is the president, 10 treasurer, clerk, and director of the 11 corporation which is also Thelonius Monkfish, 12 Ltd., at 524 Massachusetts Avenue in 13 Cambridge. 14 And it's a comparatively new 15 restaurant. They initiated the operation in 16 February of 2011. 17 So far as Mr. Chantler is concerned, 18 he has a great deal of experience in 19 restaurants situated in Cambridge. He is the 20 president and other offices of the Pepper Sky, 21

which is on Pearl Street in Cambridge, and he has operated that for six years successfully.

And he now has put all of his efforts into the new restaurant, Thelonius Monkfish, Ltd.

He made something of it, and I don't want to belabor the point, and the hour is late, but I thought it was very poetic. He described his restaurant as a jazz-themed restaurant, as you can understand with the name, which is made up of a sushi and Asian fusion kitchen.

I have menus here. The smaller one is for a sushi menu, and the larger one is for the Japanese-Thai fusion type restaurant. And I will give those to Ms. Lint and she can pass those out to you for your review.

As far as the restaurant is concerned, I'm going to read quickly what he described the restaurant as.

The seating capacity is 49 and the

כ

interior features reclaim Old Grove oak, old barn board, plush brown leather chairs.

Owner Chantler believes that great food and jazz are characterized by spontaneity and joy. Nothing warms the paddle like an explosion of flavor or the heart like a burst of song. He and chef owner, are passionate about jazz and ethnic flavors, and that is why they branded the unique take on sushi and Asian specialties.

We love to jam on Asian culinary themes. Our menu reflects both our respect for gusto and tradition and our sense of play and innovation.

Being a jazz-themed sushi bar, we can honestly say our fish is so fresh it blows its own horn.

And that's the way he looks at his restaurant and operates that to the taste and delight of a lot of his customers. As a matter of fact, I have here, and I'll give

this to Ms. Lint for the file, the undersigned are in favor of the beer and wine license. There are over 600 names here, and I checked off for review all of those that are Cambridge residents. And there are about 60 to 70 percent of Cambridge residents which he gathered over the past two weeks. So I'll

In addition, I might add that Michael Besanti of Four Burgers, which is a most recent restaurant in Central Square, has a letter here in favor of it.

leave that in the file.

And, in addition, I have a motion by the City Council of Cambridge with a resolution to accepting the new restaurant, and it's signed by eight city councillors in connection with the new restaurant of Thelonius Monkfish. And that is to be put in the file.

I also have a certificate of merit from the Historical Society for its

achievement in the outstanding renovation of a commercial façade.

And, in addition, Mr. Chantler is a member of the Chamber of Commerce, is also a member of Central Square Community

Development -- not community development, but the business association -- and has participated in community endeavors with regard to his product line.

As far as the Cambridge Rindge and Latin School are concerned, I think he indicated to me that the field down in -- off of Western Avenue was a site for a health dedication and basketball playing, and he provided food there. So he is involved in community endeavors and wants to continue with that activity.

I think it's a wonderful restaurant, people enjoy it, and I think that he would be in a noncompetitive basis if he were not given the opportunity to compete with other

restaurants in the neighborhood if he did not 1 get a beer and wine license. 2 So I advocate that the Board look kindly on his application and give him the 4 beer and wine license so he can continue to 5 serve the citizens of Cambridge as well as the 6 community itself. Thank you. 7 MICHAEL GARDNER: Does the Pepper Sky have a beer and wine license? 9 BERNARD GOLDBERG: No, they do not. 10 MICHAEL GARDNER: And so what is your 11 experience with operating, managing, or being 12 involved in a restaurant serving beer and 13 wine? 14 JAMME CHANTLER: I managed a 15 restaurant called Thai Sweet Basil in Andover, 16 Massachusetts, for two and a half years, and 17 we had beer and wine there. 18 And as far as managing, that is 19 pretty much it. As far as working with beer 20 and wine, I was a waiter for many years as 21

well.

ROBERT HAAS: When you were at the other restaurant, was the liquor license in your name when you had the restaurant.

JAMME CHANTLER: No.

MICHAEL GARDNER: I would be interested in the process by which you gained all those signatures. Were they customers? Tell us how that happened.

JAMME CHANTLER: Well, just people who had finished eating, when they were leaving and we were saying thank you to them or whatever, and we said, "Would you like to support us in getting a beer and wine license?" and they said "Yes," and then they signed it. Essentially that's how it went.

MICHAEL GARDNER: And I'm not sure I understood the verb "accepting" the restaurant. I'm not sure what action the City Council actually took.

BERNARD GOLDBERG: That was a

1	resolution. I think you have the
2	resolution
3	ELIZABETH LINT: Yes. You just gave
4	me the letter. You didn't give me the
5	resolution.
6	GERARD MAHONEY: What is the size of
7	your staff, your current wait staff, or number
8	of employees?
9	JAMME CHANTLER: The wait staff is
10	four.
11	BERNARD GOLDBERG: And the cooking
12	staff is how many.
13	JAMME CHANTLER: Four.
14	BERNARD GOLDBERG: Four and four.
15	And the capacity is 49 seats.
16	MICHAEL GARDNER: The counsel action
17	was to go on record welcoming Thelonius
18	Monkfish to Cambridge and wishing them well as
19	they expand and prosper.
20	BERNARD GOLDBERG: Thank you.
21	I think, Ms. Lint, do you have any

support from --

letter from Mayor Marr, and he says that,
"Since opening in February 2011, Thelonius
Monkfish has been a welcome addition to
Central Square and the type of establishment
we want to encourage in the Square. Thelonius
Monkfish has added to the vibrancy in the
community and I hope you will favorably view
this addition."

I also have a letter from the Cambridge Chamber of Commerce, also in support of the application, from Kelly Thompson Clark. She says, "The restaurant looks to add much needed neighborhood establishment that will offer creative and affordable cuisine. A beer and wine license will add to their customer service options and add a boost of vitality to the nightlife of Central Square.

As you know, over the last couple of years it has been challenging to entice new

businesses into the Square. The economy has made it difficult for businesses to expand or locate to the area. They are thrilled to see things picking up and the fact that a new eating establishment will go into Central Square is great news for the community."

And I have a letter from John Clifford and Council, also in support of the application as well as Paul Barron.

BERNARD GOLDBERG: I might add that Councilor Chung has been out to the restaurant on several different occasions and has ordered take-out food, according to Mr. Chantler. So that could be, not a verbal report or written report, but certainly noticed.

MICHAEL GARDNER: Thank you. Any other questions?

ROBERT HAAS: I have no questions.

MICHAEL GARDNER: So what challenges do you see from being the manager of record for the first time in handling beer and wine?

JAMME CHANTLER: Well, I would want to make sure that the waiters follow correct protocol. So I will hire someone to come and teach safety with using alcohol. For example, not giving more than a certain amount of alcohol, and knowing the symptoms or signs of someone who is drunk or whatever, and making sure that we don't add to that problem in the community.

BERNARD GOLDBERG: And he is also concerned about the age of underage drinking.

MR. CHANTLER: Yes.

MICHAEL GARDNER: Any members of the public who would like to be heard on this matter?

DANIEL GOLDSTEIN: My name is Daniel Goldstein and I'm the owner of the Clear Conscious Cafe in Central Square and the vice president of the Central Square Business Association.

And I think that having Jamme

1	Chantler in Thelonius Monkfish in Central
2	Square is positive, and he is a responsible
3	community member, and I would be an advocate
4	to have him have a beer and wine license.
5	MICHAEL GARDNER: Any complaints in
6	the operation of Pepper Sky over the years?
7	ELIZABETH LINT: Not that I'm aware
8	of.
9	MICHAEL GARDNER: That you are aware
10	of, sir?
11	JAMME CHANTLER: No.
12	BERNARD GOLDBERG: Neither am I.
13	MICHAEL GARDNER: Any complaints in
14	the operation of this restaurant since it
15	opened in February?
16	ELIZABETH LINT: No.
17	(Discussion off the record.)
18	MICHAEL GARDNER: Are you, sir, aware
19	of the cap criteria and will you address each
20	of those points?
21	BERNARD GOLDBERG: Yes, I am. I

think the need would be for the -- if he doesn't get that license, he is in a very competitive situation because of all of the licenses in Central Square. And support -- the list that I have here of 600 some odd signatories, and the support of the City Council and the community residents, I think indicate that the support is there. And the need for support and lack of harm, certainly lack of harm -- I don't see any harm coming from operating a sushi and Japanese and Thai type of a restaurant.

MICHAEL GARDNER: And this is in the cap area, right? And tell us about any efforts to purchase an existing license.

BERNARD GOLDBERG: Well, to my knowledge, there are no existing beer and wine licenses in Central Square that he could purchase. His expenditure was great in the sense that he had an open space that was formerly a Taylor Cleanser type of an

1	operation, and there was an empty store and he
2	spent a great deal of money with regard to
3	restoring it and opening it up with new
4	furnishings and the like.
5	And to purchase a beer and wine
6	license, of which there are none, would be
7	most expensive for him and, there being none,
8	would be futile.
9	MICHAEL GARDNER: When you say there
10	are none, do you mean that there are none for
11	sale?
12	MR. GOLDBERG: None that I'm aware
13	of.
14	MICHAEL GARDNER: What type of
15	license are you seeking?
16	BERNARD GOLDBERG: A beer and wine
17	license.
18	MR. GARDNER: No value, no transfer.
19	BERNARD GOLDBERG: Yes. Thank you.
20	MICHAEL GARDNER: Are you familiar
21	with the type of training required by the City

of Cambridge to behold a beer and wine license 1 and to serve alcohol? 2 JAMME CHANTLER: No. ELIZABETH LINT: Also 21 Proof 4 training. We'll send you the information that 5 will be required. They'll come to you. 6 MICHAEL GARDNER: Well, that is the 7 kind of thing -- it would make me feel more confident if you knew what you are supposed to 9 do in advance of getting the license, there is 10 a certain training program that the City has 11 and you're enthusiastic about taking it. 12 It's a good BERNARD GOLDBERG: 13 comment because he would be very enthusiastic 14 with regard to taking whatever is necessary to 15 make him sure that he is operating the 16 restaurant properly with a beer and wine 17 license. 18 MICHAEL GARDNER: Any other 19 questions? 20 GERARD MAHONEY: I have none. 21

1	ROBERT HAAS: No.
2	MICHAEL GARDNER: The pleasure of the
3	Commission?
4	ROBERT HAAS: I make a motion to
5	approve the application.
6	GERARD MAHONEY: Seconded.
7	ELIZABETH LINT: No value, no harm.
8	MICHAEL GARDNER: So there has been a
9	motion made and seconded to approve a no
LO	value/no transfer beer and wine license for
L 1	these premises with you as the manager,
L2	provided that you take the 21 Proof training
13	that Cambridge provides.
L4	ROBERT HAAS: That would include your
15	wait staff as well.
L6	JAMME CHANTLER: Sure.
L7	MICHAEL GARDNER: The motion having
18	been made and seconded, all those in favor
19	signify by saying aye?
20	ROBERT HAAS: Aye.
21	GERARD MAHONEY: Aye.

1	MICHAEL GARDNER: So it is
2	conditionally granted and we wish you luck.
3	ELIZABETH LINT: Do you want a
4	six-month review on this?
5	MICHAEL GARDNER: Ms. Lint, having
6	advised us of our typical plan to do a
7	six-month review I think let's take
8	administrative notice of that and schedule it
9	for a review in December.
10	BERNARD GOLDBERG: Okay.
11	JAMME CHANTLER: Thank you.
12	ROBERT HAAS: Has Mr. Goldberg
13	explained to your client the implications of
14	your "no value, no harm" and no transfer
15	you can't use it for any pledge or anything
16	like that?
17	BERNARD GOLDBERG: I already did.
18	Thank you.
19	* * * *
20	ELIZABETH LINT: Application for
21	Handi Indian Restaurant, Incorporated, doing

business as Harvest of India. Avtar Singh, 1 Manager, holder of a common victualer license 2 at 1001 Massachusetts Avenue, has applied for a new wine and malt beverages as a restaurant 4 license at said address. This address is 5 located at Cap No. 2. 6 MICHAEL GARDNER: Please state your 7 name for the record, and spell it and also your address. WILLIAM GOLDBERG: William Goldberg, 10 attorney for Handi Indian Restaurant, 620 11 Massachusetts Avenue in Cambridge, 12 Massachusetts. 13 AVTAR SINGH: My name is Avtar Singh, 14 and I'm the president of Handi Restaurant. 15 MICHAEL GARDNER: Tell us about your 16 plans and tell us about the history of your 17 restaurant, I guess. 18 WILLIAM GOLDBERG: For purposes of 19 brevity, if the stenographer can read back 20 what the prior attorney said --21

(Off the record.)

This is a comparatively new operation. It was opened approximately almost a year ago. Mr. Singh has a restaurant now existing in Central Square called Shalimar, and he has owned that restaurant for a number of years. There has been no violations with respect to the operation of his restaurant.

He was assistant manager of that restaurant. And it's a family-owned restaurant. And as the opportunity came up for a space that was available at 1001 Massachusetts Avenue, there was an inclination by his son, who was in school, that he would like to continue and further the same kind of an operation and serve the type of food that is being served at Shalimar, which is an Indian restaurant, Indian food.

And consequently there was a space available and so he entered into a long-term lease for the premises. He remodeled the

promises. It cost him approximately \$125,000.

If you had the opportunity to go see the premises, you would note the newness in the picturesque type of restaurant that it is.

The restaurant is in Area 2. And prior to making the application for the no-value license before your Board, Mr. Singh made due diligence with respect to determining whether or not there was any availability of a license in Area 2, which is Harvard Square. And he made inquiry of the Harvard Square Business Association, he made inquiry of the Cambridge License Commission, and there was no availability of any malt and wine licenses available.

And, to my knowledge, there are none available, and to my additional knowledge, if there was one available it would be very expensive to purchase that kind of a license.

And, as the prior speaker said, it is an economic disadvantage not to have a malt

and wine or beer license.

I do have a list of signatures of persons who have been at the restaurant, and I'll give that to Ms. Lint. It's not as many as the prior speaker had for some reason, but it is maybe about 100 or 200 signatures. And the persons that have signed it basically live in and around the area, Dana Street, Ellery Street, Putnam, and the surrounding environment which is supporting this application.

Mr. Singh has been tip trained with respect to being assistant manager at the Shalimar Restaurant, he is familiar with the laws pertaining to the sale of alcohol to minors, and regarding the other requirements of that that will allow the sale of alcohol and deny the sale of alcohol.

We are dealing here with a history of where there is not availability of any of these beer and wine licenses. And Mr. Singh,

I've explained to him that in the event that the License Commission granted a no-value license, what that means is that he has no right to sell that license; if he were to sell the restaurant, it's not part of the business sale.

In talking with -- I talked with Ms. Chilson of Harvard Square with respect to this matter, and she could not be here, she had a prior engagement, but she indicated that she was supportive. And she also told me that the pursuit by the Cambridge License Commission in granting non-value licenses is well welcomed in the community.

Interestingly, how Cambridge has become such a mecca for restaurants of all kinds, and the people who frequent these restaurants would like to have a drink to the particular character of the restaurant.

And so we seek your approval of a non-value license, and commend the License

Commission for this kind of a procedure to 1 grant to people who want to bring restaurant 2 and food character to the city by issuing these non-value licenses. Thank you. 4 MICHAEL GARDNER: Thank you. I'm not 5 exactly sure I have an understanding of your 6 role at Shalimar. You're an assistant 7 manager. Does that mean you are not the manager of record? 9 AVTAR SINGH: My wife, she is the 10 11 manager. MICHAEL GARDNER: Any complaint 12 history at Shalimar? 13 ELIZABETH LINT: Not at Shalimar. 14 MICHAEL GARDNER: Any prior complaint 15 history with the applicant? 16 ELIZABETH LINT: We did have an issue 17 several months ago. One of my staff members 18 was walking by and there was a sandwich board 19 saying they were a BYOB. I had to have one of 20 the investigators go down and speak to him and 21

he said, "No, oh, no. Mr. Salon (sic) told me 1 I could do that." Well, we all know that 2 would never happened. And then I had to speak to them myself. And if he owns another 4 restaurant that has alcohol, he fully knows 5 that there is no BYOB in Cambridge. So that 6 was a grave concern. 7 And then there is another concern --So would you MICHAEL GARDNER: 9 address, sir, the history of this complaint 10 that Ms. Lint spoke about, including your best 11 memory of when it occurred and why. 12 I am not on location. AVTAR SINGH: 13 I don't know the people. They -- I don't 14 know. I have two weeks on location so I'm not 15 going there. My partner -- my partner, the 16 employee --17 THE STENOGRAPHER: Excuse me. Τ 18 cannot understand what he is saying. 19 WILLIAM GOLDBERG: Okav. The 20 employee. My partner -- if I may --21

MICHAEL GARDNER: Mr. Goldberg, we 1 have a member of the audience who may or may 2 not have information on this point. I'd defer to you. 4 AUDIENCE MEMBER: I'm the chef and --5 I'm the chef and over there is my manager is 6 off site. So many people you have beer and 7 wine. I'm working inside. He say, I have no beer and wine, but you can bring your wine. 9 That guy is fired. Not anybody inside people 10 with beer and wine and drinking (sic). 11 MICHAEL GARDNER: I'd ask you to 12 identify yourself for the record, state your 13 name and spell it. Will you do that? And 14 I'll try to summarize what I understood your 15 testimony to be. 16 But please identify yourself for the 17 record. 18 VINAY KUMAR: My name is Vinay 19 Kumar. 20 MICHAEL GARDNER: And can you spell 21

1	it.
2	VINAY KUMAR: V-i-n-a-y, K-u-m-a-r.
3	MICHAEL GARDNER: And did I
4	understand that you are a chef at the
5	restaurant?
6	VINAY KUMAR: Yes, sir.
7	MICHAEL GARDNER: And that you
8	understood that
9	VINAY KUMAR: He was not there. I'm
10	in the kitchen.
11	MICHAEL GARDNER: And this is
12	Valentine's Day?
13	VINAY KUMAR: Valentine's Day. So
14	many people called: Do you have beer and
15	wine? Like neighborhood people. Do you have
16	beer and wine? Then I'm inside working.
17	There is so many people, he's talking
18	about "do you have beer and wine." He said,
19	"you bring it." I have no beer and wine. You
20	bring it on, beer and wine. This is why
21	MICHAEL GARDNER: And the person who

did that was an assistant manager? 1 VINAY KUMAR: No manager, he was 2 working outside. MICHAEL GARDNER: And he was an 4 employee. 5 VINAY KUMAR: Yes. 6 MICHAEL GARDNER: And he is fired? 7 No. He was working one VINAY KUMAR: day. He is not in there any more. He is not 9 in the city. 10 MICHAEL GARDNER: I'm sorry. I'm 11 still not sure I understand what you're 12 saying. 13 VINAY KUMAR: I'm so many generations 14 in my restaurant. He is hired, he is out. So 15 I had the help wanted and he is hired. He 16 knows about the Indian food, he said. So many 17 people, he said, "Do you have a beer and 18 wine?" I have no beer or wine. I have no 19 beer or wine. Before he is working in a 20 restaurant, he has beer and wine. That's why 21

the people, he bring out. And I say it is not 1 allowed, the beer and wine. He is out 2 (inaudible) MICHAEL GARDNER: So what, if 4 anything, did you learn from that experience? 5 AVTAR SINGH: I never in my 6 experience at Shalimar, I never do, no 7 violations in 25 years, nothing. MICHAEL GARDNER: As the manager here 9 it is really your responsibility to make sure 10 that the staff or anybody who is an agent of 11 yours to also understand those rules, isn't 12 it? 13 AVTAR SINGH: Yes, I understand. 14 MICHAEL GARDNER: Mr. Goldberg, do 15 you have anything else to add? 16 WILLIAM GOLDBERG: I would just add 17 that this information is new to me, and I have 18 haven't had a chance to discuss it. Of 19 course, obviously, it's a serious matter that 20 has been addressed to the License Commission 21

and I don't think it will ever happen again.

The manager was not at the restaurant at the time. If I understood what was said by Mr. Kumar, they have -- I've gone by the restaurant and there is a gentleman that was handing out the menus at the restaurant.

And I think it may not have been the same gentleman, but I think the gentleman that had been fired took it upon himself to place the sign on that BYOB without the knowledge of this gentleman here.

I don't know that there was a complaint made, there probably was a complaint made by the License Commission and it just abated itself. One singular incident that occurred. And I hope that the Commission and the members of the board understand that it was a singular incident and never will happen and hasn't occurred since that time, and act accordingly.

ROBERT HAAS: It wasn't referred --

1	are you aware of that, Mr. Goldberg?
2	ELIZABETH LINT: I can't show that to
3	him (indicating).
4	MICHAEL GARDNER: I think you can
5	with permission of the subject.
6	ELIZABETH LINT: Not according to
7	MICHAEL GARDNER: I'll defer that to
8	you. So I am never really sure how to deal
9	with these in a public forum.
10	There is a report of a matter
11	approximately seven years old, that appears to
12	have resolved itself, but it's a matter of
13	some concern to the Commission.
14	Are you aware of what we are talking
15	about, sir?
16	AVTAR SINGH: Yes.
17	MICHAEL GARDNER: I leave it to you
18	with respect to any information you chose to
19	share about it in this forum.
20	WILLIAM GOLDBERG: The Commissioner
21	wants to know if you are aware of the

circumstance that occurred seven years ago, 1 to give him some explanation and detail. Are 2 you aware of it? AVTAR SINGH: Yes, yes. 4 WILLIAM GOLDBERG: Tell the 5 Commissioner, please. 6 ELIZABETH LINT: Generally, we would 7 have him write me a letter. ROBERT HAAS: So write a report and 9 explain the circumstances from your standpoint 10 and some assurances that it's not going to 11 impact your ability to hold a wine and beer 12 license. 13 WILLIAM GOLDBERG: Okay. 14 MICHAEL GARDNER: Anything else you 15 have to add? 16 WILLIAM GOLDBERG: I don't believe 17 I think that, in summary, I think that SO. 18 what's been learned here is a lesson and will 19 not be repeated. I don't have any idea what 20 happened seven years ago, but maybe it can be 21

1	explained by Mr. Singh. So I hope that the
2	board is understanding, and perhaps a letter
3	may clarify some of the issues that was
4	involved approximately seven years ago.
5	ROBERT HAAS: How long did your
6	family own Shalimar?
7	AVTAR SINGH: For 25 years.
8	ROBERT HAAS: How long have you been
9	affiliated
10	AVTAR SINGH: I started it myself and
11	my son comes in.
12	ROBERT HAAS: Who is the manager of
13	the restaurant now?
14	AVTAR SINGH: Myself and my wife.
15	MICHAEL GARDNER: I thought I
16	understood the wife was the manager.
17	WILLIAM GOLDBERG: The wife is the
18	manager of Shalimar. He is the manager of the
19	new restaurant. They work together as a
20	family.
21	MICHAEL GARDNER: And the son works

1	for you under your license?
1	
2	AVTAR SINGH: Yes.
3	ROBERT HAAS: What kind of a
4	license
5	AVTAR SINGH: Full liquor license.
6	ROBERT HAAS: Did you buy that
7	license?
8	AVTAR SINGH: When we bought the
9	restaurant, 25 years ago.
LO	MICHAEL GARDNER: Are there any
l1	members of the public who would like to be
L2	heard on this matter?
L3	Seeing none, could we perhaps
L4	consider a motion to review this, take this
L 5	matter under advisement until the July 7th
L6	hearing?
L7	GERARD MAHONEY: So moved.
18	ROBERT HAAS: Which means you would
L9	have to file the paperwork prior to July 7th
20	to Ms. Lint.
21	MICHAEL GARDNER: Motion has been

1	made to take this matter under advisement
2	until July 7th. Is there a second?
3	GERARD MAHONEY: Seconded.
4	MICHAEL GARDNER: All those in favor
5	signify by saying aye?
6	GERARD MAHONEY: Aye.
7	ROBERT HASS: Aye.
8	MICHAEL GARDNER: So we'll take the
9	matter under advisement.
10	And I think you can understand what
11	you need to do. And Ms. Lint is available if
12	you need any further clarification.
13	* * * *
14	ELIZABETH LINT: Application for J.H.
15	Restaurant Cambridge, LLC d/b/a John Harvard's
16	Brew House, Steen Sawyer, Manager, holder of
17	an all alcoholic beverages as a restaurant/
18	brewery license at 33 Dunster Street has
19	applied for a change of manager from Steen
20	Sawyer to Argemiro J. Santa, at said address.
21	MICHAEL GARDNER: Good evening.

Please identify yourself first for the record 1 and spelling your name, please. 2 My name is Argemiro ARGEMIRO SANTA: J. Santa, A-R-G-E-M-I-R-O, S-A-N-T-A. 4 KAREN SIMAO: K-A-R-E-N. S-I-M-A-O. 5 McDermott, Susie and Miller. 6 MICHAEL GARDNER: So, if you would, 7 please, tell us what you are proposing. KAREN SIMAO: This is an application for the transfer of manager of record at this 10 particular location as was submitted in the 11 application packet. 12 Mr. Santa does not have any direct 13 experience in alcohol service. That being 14 said, I do think that it is noteworthy to 15 point out the fact that Mr. Santa has been 16 with the company for 20 years. In fact, he is 17 originally from Columbia, came to this 18 country, started as a dishwasher, has moved 19 his way up to head chef. And during the 20 course of that, over several years, has been 21

involved in operations generally but not in a management position.

With the passing of Mr. Sawyer, the company has been very pleased with Mr. Santa's ability to follow protocol from the company's perspective, and have given him an opportunity that he is very happy to accept to move up to a management position.

He is very well aware of how seriously the company takes alcohol service, as well as this Commission, and the State Board, so he has done some in-house training, and the day-to-day operations he has been involved in.

The in-house training on some of that has already occurred. He is scheduled for tips training next week and he is aware of the 21 Proof program. He would like to get as much training as possible under his belt.

With that being said, he is an incredibly intelligent person, has a very

,

ŏ

practical sense of what is and is not acceptable, although it was not in this country, I do think it was noteworthy.

We've had these conversations that he was a restaurant owner and alcohol service in Columbia. And he very clearly says "I know that the rules are different. And in Columbia it presented its own challenges. For example, they are allowed to carry alcohol on the street, and he has to monitor not letting that happen into his own restaurant.

So he has an acute awareness of what the rules are and how you need to work with the situation to make sure that you are complying with them.

MICHAEL GARDNER: Thank you.

ROBERT HAAS: I'm a little bit surprised, given the nature of what John Harvard's Brew House is, that they would select a person to hold a liquor license who has no prior experience.

So I'm just curious: Why would they take that risk at this point?

KAREN SIMAO: I don't think it is a risk. I think it is rewarding a loyal staff member who has been with them for, as I mentioned, for 20 years, and has really been involved in the process.

Their philosophy is that: We train people, we grow people, and this is an example of what that is.

He is also very -- Mr. Santa is also very much aware of the pending alleged violations before this board. And corporate has discussed that with him and he understands how serious of an allegation that is. And, again, he is really well aware of the implications that come with that.

We've all seen managers of record with years of experience and that sometimes means that they become complacent. And so I do think that there is something to say about

1	somebody with a fire in the belly that has
2	moved up the ranks and is ready to seize a
3	very good opportunity.
4	GERARD MAHONEY: Have you always
5	worked at the Cambridge facility or have you
6	worked at the other John Harvard's?
7	ARGEMIRO SANTA: I've been in
8	training before I opened all of the John
9	Harvard's Brew House. Because before they
10	used to have like 13 restaurants.
11	GERARD MAHONEY: How many restaurants
12	do they currently have?
13	ARGEMIRO SANTA: Like on and off,
14	it's like 10.
15	MICHAEL GARDNER: So you can't be
16	there all hours of the day and night, seven
17	days a week, during the operations?
18	ARGEMIRO SANTA: Yes, I do.
19	KAREN SIMAO: He feels like he is
20	there all the time.
21	MICHAEL GARDNER: Well, we don't

think you can -- how do you ensure compliance 1 when you are not there? 2 The management, the KAREN SIMAO: associate manager that is in place, there is 4 no change to that. This is strictly a manager 5 of record level change. 6 So, for example, the general manager 7 who has been there, Ken, who I know many of you folks in this room are familiar with, as well as Ms. Boyer, he is still in place. So 10 this switch is really only removing 11 Mr. Sawyer, and everything else remains the 12 13 same. So Ken, who has been there for many 14 years, as well as their assistant managers, 15 everyone else is staying the same. 16 ROBERT HAAS: So tell me what your 17 current job is? What is your responsibility 18 currently now? 19 Right now I'm in the ARGEMIRO SANTA: 20 kitchen, the kitchen chef. But right now I'll 21

be involved in learning how to --

_

ROBERT HAAS: I'm not sure -- I'm not sure I buy the argument of the fire in the belly. I mean, there is certain responsibilities that are associated with being responsible for the proper management of the liquor license.

So aside from the tips training, I don't know if that is going to give him the training -- I mean, that is my concern.

KAREN SIMAO: I think there are three layers of training here that are more than this Commission perceives as the manager of record.

And I also notice the Board has approved people without experience in the past, and it depends on the applicant before you, obviously. But the three layers of training really are the in-house training, the tips training, and then the training done through the City here.

I think that that, coupled with the fact that this is not a new restaurant operation, there is a system in place here, and that there is supporting management, which goes to the Chairman's question, which is a very valid one, and are all key elements to make this equation work.

I think that if this were a new restaurant operation, there was no management team in place, there was not a history of operation spanning over two decades, that would be a different story. I would be making a different presentation to you.

But for all those reasons, they feel that he has performed every time he has been asked to do something, whether it is in compliance in the kitchen as head chef, or in front of the house, which is what he mentioned they had him involved in this progression, they are not just plucking him from the kitchen and doing this; there has been a

1	progression of front of the house work that he
2	has dealt with in terms of staff and employees
3	and day-to-day operations. And so part of
4	that has been dealing with alcohol service and
5	making sure it is done correctly.
6	He has not had an official title that
7	this Board is now being asked to grant him.
8	And with that we feel, as does the company, as
9	does Mr. Santa, that the training is
10	imperative; if you're going to take on that
11	kind of title, you need to have the real
12	training on this.
13	ROBERT HAAS: Did you ever work the
14	bar?
15	ARGEMIRO SANTA: No.
16	ROBERT HAAS: You never worked the
17	bar?
18	KAREN SIMAO: And I would suggest
19	that he wouldn't be the first manager of
20	record that
21	ROBERT HAAS: Again, I'm concerned,

_

given the fact that you've alluded that there has been an issue with that regard and that is City investigating.

And I'm just trying to get to a comfort level in terms of being sure that he fully understands the role and responsibility of the manager of record for an establishment that does serve alcohol.

KAREN SIMAO: And I think I that understand the point. I alluded to the disciplinary hearing, not because I think that it's up for consideration today, they are two separate and distinct hearings. But I understand the line of questioning --

ROBERT HAAS: So they theoretically have had a seasoned manager, and now you are looking at an individual who has had no prior experience to take that role and responsibility.

And, again, given the complexity in my mind of a restaurant, that may be the

1	nature of that business. But I'm surprised
2	the company is putting someone forward to
3	manager of record for an alcohol license, that
4	is my concern.
5	KAREN SIMAO: Again, we stand by the
6	fact that the disciplinary hearing has not
7	occurred yet, but we stand by the fact that
8	there was no violation.
9	MICHAEL GARDNER: So let me ask you:
10	What do you see as the principal challenges
11	you will face in taking on this role?
12	ARGEMIRO SANTA: I want to do it very
13	responsibly. I want to I know how it
14	works. I know how to serve alcohol. And I
15	want to be very responsible. I want to be
16	involved and be responsible and taken very
17	seriously.
18	MICHAEL GARDNER: Thank you.
19	GERARD MAHONEY: What happened to
20	Steen Sawyer?

has worked for the company, both at this location and the Framingham location, and he made some career decisions to move on; unlike many times where there is a quick departure. That was not the case here.

So he was as much involved in the day-to-day actions. Argemiro is on the premises, he is there 60 to 72 hours a week. I mean, this is the guy who is there all the time. So we really want to make sure that the person on the license is, in fact, there.

So there was no bad parting with Mr. Sawyer at all, it was a career decision for him. I actually believe he was moving to another state.

MICHAEL GARDNER: Any members of the public who would like to be heard on this matter? Any other questions or anything else you would like to add?

KAREN SIMAO: I have nothing further, Mr. Chairman. If you have any further

questions, I certainly understand questions posed by the Commissioner.

I would submit that it is not the first time that a manager or record has been approved without either having been a bartender or -- I've represented people who we've have come and they've gone through the tips training and certification and, ultimately leave. The company understands that their license hinges on their ability to have a manager of record who is going to comply with your regulations and ABCD's regulations.

And whether or not that is a good business decision for them, they feel that it is, and that's what I can represent to you.

And as a person certainly having spent some time with Mr. Santa and really speaking with him about how the operation works and the importance of training, I know that he is nervous, it's a little intimidating

coming before the Board for the first time.

But he is taking the training very seriously,
and so he understands how serious alcohol
service is.

MICHAEL GARDNER: So I'd ask Ms. Lint or any other members of the Board, have we ever granted approval of a general manager, a transfer, with any conditions or subject to a short review, have people come back in three months and tell us about their experience?

ELIZABETH LINT: Sure. Absolutely.

ROBERT HAAS: I think I would feel a lot more comfortable having a short review period, just to make sure that we have a sense, again, what is your reaction to it, and what some of the challenges are that are associated with this.

It is one thing to have some knowledge about a liquor establishment, now are responsible. You know, what does that mean? So I think that would be good. At

least it would make me feel more comfortable. 1 KAREN SIMAO: And, obviously, we 2 won't be opposed to that at all. I presume that is when the period 4 would start to run, when it's in the official 5 capacity? 6 MICHAEL GARDNER: The pleasure of the 7 committee? ROBERT HAAS: Make a motion to 9 approve the application for a change of 10 manager upon the completion of 21 Proof 11 training with a three-month review. 12 **GERARD MAHONEY:** Seconded. 13 MICHAEL GARDNER: So the motion has 14 been made and seconded to approve the transfer 15 of the general manager, subject to the 21 16 Proof training and subject to a three-month 17 review in which we would expect you will come 18 back and talk to us about your experience, 19 what you've learned, what the concerns are, 20 what the challenges have been, and how you've 21

1	done.
2	ARGEMIRO SANTA: Okay.
3	MICHAEL GARDNER: Motion having been
4	made and seconded, all those in favor signify
5	by saying aye?
6	ROBERT HAAS: Aye.
7	GERARD MAHONEY: Aye.
8	MICHAEL GARDNER: Not opposed. So we
9	wish you well. It looks like you've got an
10	awful lot to learn and in a challenging
11	environment. And the training will take you
12	so far, but we expect you to learn a lot from
13	the existing staff.
14	ARGEMIRO SANTA: Thank you.
15	KAREN SIMAO: Thank you very much.
16	Have a good evening.
17	* * *
18	ELIZABETH LINT: Application for
19	Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Dennis
20	Collins, Director of Housing, has applied for
21	a lodging house license with food at 305

Memorial Drive for 263 rooms and 496 1 occupants. Applicant is also seeking 2 exemption from the resident manager requirement. 4 MICHAEL GARDNER: If you would so 5 kindly state and spell your names for the 6 record and your affiliation. 7 DENNIS COLLINS: My name is Dennis Collins, D-E-N-N-I-S, C-O-L-L-I-N-S, and I am 9 the Director of Housing at MIT. 10 SONIA RICHARDS: My name is Sonia 11 Richards, S-O-N-I-A, R-I-C-H-A-R-D-S, and I'm 12 the program manager with the department of 13 facilities at MIT. 14 MICHAEL GARDNER: Okay. Tell us your 15 plans. 16 DENNIS COLLINS: We have a resident 17 hall at 305 Memorial Drive that we closed in 18 2008 for completion renovations, and that will 19 be opening on August 12th of 2011. So we are 20 requesting to re-apply for the lodging house 21

1	license to have it opened.
2	MICHAEL GARDNER: Any history of
3	complaints or other concerns, Ms. Lint?
4	ELIZABETH LINT: Well, it's bean
5	closed for two years or more than two years.
6	So not that I have any knowledge of it, but
7	GERARD MAHONEY: I'm somewhat
8	familiar. It's undergone a total gut rehab
9	basically to total reconstruction brought up
10	to code for safety enhancements, et cetera.
11	MICHAEL GARDNER: Do you hold other
12	lodging house licenses in Cambridge for
13	similar functions?
14	DENNIS COLLINS: Yes. We have 19
15	other residence also. And I'm on record for
16	those as well.
17	MICHAEL GARDNER: And our general
18	experience with MIT for running such
19	facilities?
20	ELIZABETH LINT: They are very
21	responsive to the Commission, I would say.

The residents have -- we generally have not had any problems with them, it's the frats that tend to be the issue.

MICHAEL GARDNER: If you would, sir, just you or either of you, tell us what the implications are and the pluses and minuses of having a resident manager and why you are seeking to not have one.

DENNIS COLLINS: I have staff in the building and on campus 24 hours a day, seven days a week. There is a new house master in the building. I have graduate resident's assistants, so I have one for every 40 students living on the floors with them. Anything that goes on in that building, registering parties, goes through my office.

I have resident managers working the 4:00 to 11:00 shift, the 11:00 to 7:00 shift, and during the day. I also have a night watchman in every one of my residence halls at night from midnight to 8:00 in the morning

overseeing anything that is going on. And 1 then they all report to me. 2 So anything that has gone on in these buildings is my full responsibility. 4 MICHAEL GARDNER: And the resident 5 manager just simply means somebody who is 6 living there as well as working there? 7 **DENNIS COLLINS:** Correct. MICHAEL GARDNER: And I take it, 9 because of the staffing levels you don't think 10 you need that? 11 DENNIS COLLINS: That's correct. 12 I came before the Board in the spring of 2010 13 for the same request for the other 19 14 residents halls. 15 MICHAEL GARDNER: So none --16 17 DENNIS COLLINS: None at all. building had a lodging house like this for 18 years. It didn't have one on record, the only 19 ones are the new ones we've opened since 2002 20 has ever reported as having somebody in-house. 21

1	MICHAEL GARDNER: Any members of the
2	public who would like to be heard on this
3	matter? Seeing none, pleasure of the
4	Commission?
5	GERARD MAHONEY: Make a motion that
6	the application be approved as submitted.
7	ROBERT HAAS: Seconded.
8	MICHAEL GARDNER: Motion having been
9	made and seconded to approve the application.
10	All those in favor signify by saying aye?
11	ROBERT HAAS: Aye.
12	GERARD MAHONEY: Aye.
13	MICHAEL GARDNER: We wish you well
14	and welcome to your students.
15	* * * *
16	ELIZABETH LINT: Application for
17	Restaurant Associates LLC, doing business as
18	Caspersen Hall Cafe at Harvard Law School.
19	Colleen Duddy, Manager, has applied for a
20	common victualer license to be exercised at
21	1585 Massachusetts Avenue. Said license if

granted would allow food and non-alcoholic 1 beverages to be sold, served, and consumed on 2 said premises with a seating capacity of 623 (426 inside seats and 197 seats on a seasonal 4 outdoor patio on private property). The hours 5 of operation will be 7:30 a.m. to 9:00 p.m. on 6 Mondays through Fridays and 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 7 p.m. on Saturdays and Sundays. 8 MICHAEL GARDNER: If you could all 9 state your names and spell them for the 10 record. 11 COLLEEN DUDDY: My name is Colleen 12 Duddy, C-O-L-L-E-E-N, D-U-D-D-Y, general 13 manager. 14 Alexandra, A-L-E-X-A-N-D-R-A, Offing, 15 O-F-F-I-N-G, Harvard University planning and 16 project management. 17 Terry, T-E-R-R-Y, TERRY CAPLARIO: 18 Caplario, C-A-P-L-A-R-I-O, manager. 19 MICHAEL GARDNER: Tell us about your 20 plans. 21

1	COLLEEN DUDDY: So we're here today
2	about the position to amend our current
3	license, which is up-to-date, it is under the
4	old name of Harkness Commons. So we will
5	reapply for a common victualer license for a
6	name change, and also to extend the seating.
7	We have added a roof deck, which has
8	an additional 119 seats. So our old license
9	was for the 426 indoor and 197 outdoor on the
LO	downstairs patio. With the renovation that
11	Harvard Law has undergone, they have built a
L2	roof deck for us, for the students, 119
13	students; therefore, we have applied for a new
L4	common victualer license.
15	MICHAEL GARDNER: So the 119 seats on
16	the roof deck, those are outside as well?
L7	COLLEEN DUDDY: Mm-hmm.
L8	MICHAEL GARDNER: History of
L9	complaints?
20	ELIZABETH LINT: None at all.
21	MICHAEL GARDNER: Have you maintained

your operation during the construction or have 1 you shut down? 2 COLLEEN DUDDY: We are actually operating a temporary cafe out of Town Hall, 4 which we have a current license for. So we 5 have closed down the Harkness Commons, but we 6 are operating a temporary cafe right now. 7 Will this facility GERARD MAHONEY: be open to the public? 9 COLLEEN DUDDY: It's the intention 10 for the Harvard students, but we don't close 11 our doors to the public. But the facility is 12 for Harvard students, but we don't turn the 13 public away. 14 MICHAEL GARDNER: So it's truly a 15 restaurant, it is not a dorm or you are not 16 serving food to residents? I'm trying 17 understand your operation. 18 COLLEEN DUDDY: It is very similar to 19 a university cafe. So there's numerous 20 stations, the kids come in, they grab what 21

they want to eat, there's a salad bar, things 1 of that nature. And they go through a 2 check-out counter at the end. It's very similar to most university cafes. 4 ROBERT HAAS: When do you plan on 5 opening your operation? 6 COLLEEN DUDDY: August 26th is the 7 anticipated opening date. The roof deck will not open until 2012. 9 GERARD MAHONEY: When the students 10 return to campus? 11 COLLEEN DUDDY: They are returning to 12 the Pound temporary cafe. So they will have 13 about a week of the temporary cafe, and a week 14 later -- the planning was little bit better in 15 those terms but unfortunately a week late. 16 17 ELIZABETH LINT: We tried to. We've had meetings about this throughout the course 18 of their preparations. And I should also tell 19 you that Ms. Duddy is not new to Cambridge, 20 that she's been managing other establishments 21

1	as well. So we certainly know who she is.
2	GERARD MAHONEY: I have nothing
3	further.
4	MICHAEL GARDNER: Any members of the
5	public who would like to be heard on this
6	matter?
7	Anything else you would like to add?
8	COLLEEN DUDDY: We're just excited to
9	get into the new building.
LO	GERARD MAHONEY: Motion to approve as
11	submitted.
L2	ROBERT HAAS: Seconded.
L3	MICHAEL GARDNER: So the motion to
L4	approve was submitted which, as I understand
15	it, is the name change and increase in
16	capacity.
L7	ELIZABETH LINT: And do I have the
18	abutter notifications as well.
19	MICHAEL GARDNER: Motion have been
20	made and seconded, all those in favor signify
21	by saying aye?

ROBERT HAAS: Aye. 1 GERARD MAHONEY: Aye. 2 MICHAEL GARDNER: So with none opposed, we wish you well. 4 COLLEEN DUDDY: Thank you very much. 5 6 ELIZABETH LINT: Application was 7 continued from April 26, May 17 and June 9, The Upper Crust Harvard Square, LLC, d/b/a The 9 Upper Crust. Jordan Tobins, manager, holder 10 of a wine and malt beverages as a restaurant 11 at 49B Brattle Street has applied for a 12 transfer of stock. Applicant is also applying 13 for a change of manager from Jordan Tobins to 14 Maura Smith. 15 You may recall there was an issue 16 with the manager application. I spoke where 17 Jeffrey Blum, who had been representing The 18 Upper Crust strictly for the change of stock. 19 But he contacted me today and he did 20 submit a letter and he said to "Please be 21

1	advised that The Upper Crust Harvard Square,
2	LLC, wishes to withdraw the application for
3	appointment of manager to be heard this
4	evening before the Board, and will submit a
5	new application shortly. This is a decision
6	management reached moments ago.
7	We also seek final approval for the
8	change of stockholders which was heard last
9	month and approved but tabled until today.
10	And that was may memory of what had
11	happened also.
12	ROBERT HAAS: So are they re-thinking
13	the
14	ELIZABETH LINT: They will be
15	reapplying for a new manager.
16	MICHAEL GARDNER: Can you remind us
17	what the transfer of stock involved, briefly.
18	ELIZABETH LINT: I could try.
19	MICHAEL GARDNER: I take it no one is
20	here this evening?
21	ELIZABETH LINT: No. He asked to be

excused since it had already been approved and it was strictly a formality. They were adding a stockholder. But that's what it appears to be, they were just adding a stockholder.

MICHAEL GARDNER: I'm wondering whether a motion would be in order to confirm the approval of the transfer of stock in recognition of the withdrawal of the manager change, simply subject to confirmation by Ms. Lint of the record of prior action of the Board.

ROBERT HAAS: Make a motion to accept the transfer of stock as posed. Also acknowledge the fact that the application for change of manager has been withdrawn.

GERARD MAHONEY: Seconded.

MICHAEL GARDNER: Motion having been made and seconded to approve under the conditions. All those in favor signify by saying aye?

ROBERT HAAS: Aye.

GERARD MAHONEY: Ave. 1 And you'll review the record, 2 Ms. Lint, and take appropriate action --ELIZABETH LINT: Yes. 4 5 ELIZABETH LINT: Application for 6 L'Impasto, LLC, doing business as L'Impasto. 7 Richard Passini, manager, has applied for a common victualer license to be exercise at 9 2263 Massachusetts Avenue. Said license if 10 granted would allow food and non-alcoholic 11 beverages to be sold, served, and consumed on 12 said premises with a seating capacity of 30 13 (24 seats inside and 6 seats on a seasonal 14 outdoor patio on public property). The hours 15 of operation will be 11:00 a.m. to 10:00 p.m. 16 seven days per week. 17 MICHAEL GARDNER: Thank you. Ιt 18 would be helpful to us if you would just state 19 and spell your names for the record. 20 RICCARDO PASSINI: My name is 21

Riccardo Passini, R-I-C-C-A-R-D-O, 1 P-A-S-S-I-N-I. 2 ANNALISA AVOLA: My name is Annalisa, A-N-N-A-L-I-S-A, Avola, A-V-O-L-A, attorney 4 for Riccardo Passini. 5 My name is Dean. DEAN PAPADENETRIOU: 6 D-e-a-n, last name is Papadenetriou, spelled 7 P-A-P-A-D-E-N-E-T-R-I-O-U. I'm an attorney in Boston, counsel to the owner of the property. 9 MICHAEL GARDNER: Tell us about the 10 plans, please. 11 ANNALISA AVOLA: Riccardo recently 12 purchased this restaurant from Attorney 13 Papadenetriou's client. Right now it is under 14 construction. His plan is to open a small 15 restaurant serving pizza, homemade fresh 16 pasta, breads and some other entrees which --17 I believed he submitted a proposed menu. 18 a very small restaurant. Probably intended to 19 do take out in the beginning and then slowly 20 to build up. I believe the seating capacity 21

is about 20 right now. So it's a very small 1 restaurant. 2 So right now under construction, hopefully opening up in maybe two or three 4 weeks. That's pretty much it. 5 Mr. Passini has a month's experience 6 as the executive chef at Fury in the North 7 End, and other restaurants such as Umbria, also in Boston. 9 He obtained his education in Italy. 10 And he worked in Morocco and Thailand as a 11 chef also. 12 MICHAEL GARDNER: Is this your first 13 experience as the owner operator of the 14 restaurant. 15 RICCARDO PASSINI: Yes, sir. 16 MICHAEL GARDNER: And what challenges 17 do you see in that new role? 18 RICCARDO PASSINI: It is going to be 19 my challenge and to provide to myself that I 20 can own a restaurant and provide good food and 21

good service. 1 MICHAEL GARDNER: And tell us about 2 your plans for things like traffic for supplies in and out, rubbish or trash removal, 4 steps to make sure you are compliant with road 5 dent control. 6 RICCARDO PASSINI: Can you --7 ANNALISA AVOLA: I'll restate your question. 9 He wants to know your plans for trash 10 control and also what you are going to do with 11 your trash, where are you going to put it? 12 RICCARDO PASSINI: The building has 13 a backyard and they put the trash, garbage, 14 disposal in that. 15 And what was of the other question? 16 How your supplies 17 MICHAEL GARDNER: will be coming in and out? 18 RICCARDO PASSINI: The restaurant has 19 like a back door, so it's going to be like a 20 private street. 21

1	MICHAEL GARDNER: An alleyway
2	perhaps?
3	DEAN PAPADENTRIOU: It's a private
4	driveway. It's shared as a right-of-way with
5	the residents on the other side of the
6	driveway. So it's not a parking lot; it's not
7	a parking area. It is just supposed to be a
8	driveway for deliveries and taking out the
9	trash.
10	GERARD MAHONEY: What was the prior
11	restaurant that was there?
12	DEAN PAPADENTRIOU: There was
13	GERARD MAHONEY: I'm trying to
14	visualize whether the building is.
15	DEAN PAPADENTRIOU: Okay. It's North
16	Cambridge on Massachusetts Avenue, it's the
17	block next to Pemberton Market.
18	GERARD MAHONEY: It used to be the
19	White Hen Pantry there, at the corner of State
20	Street there?
21	DEAN PAPADENTRIOU: That block but

1	GERARD MAHONEY: It's in the block
2	opposite St. John's Church?
3	DEAN PAPADENTRIOU: Yes.
4	MICHAEL GARDNER: And it was not a
5	restaurant before?
6	DEAN PAPADENTRIOU: It was. It has
7	been a restaurant and other food businesses
8	for at least the 30 years that my family has
9	owned that building.
10	ROBERT HAAS: So you are retaining
11	ownership of the building?
12	DEAN PAPADENTRIOU: Yes. I'm here to
13	support this application and I can speak to
14	that point.
15	MICHAEL GARDNER: And have you sent
16	out of the notices to the abutters and brought
17	proof of the notices back?
18	ANNALISA AVOLA: Yes. My client
19	there was one abutter, which when we called
20	the City Hall they gave us the name of the
21	abutter, which was just one abutter which was

his building. We sent the notice and he sent 1 it in the mail because we got the return 2 service immediately. I think he sent it out Thursday. 4 ELIZABETH LINT: I don't have them. 5 MICHAEL GARDNER: Explain the abutter 6 situation. 7 DEAN PAPADENTRIOU: From the outside it looks like one building, but it actually 9 has a firewall right in between there and it 10 was sold as two parcels. My family pushed the 11 first part, including this part of the 12 building five-store front in I think 1983. 13 And then purchased the other two on the corner 14 where the Griffin Real Estate Office is in 15 around 1989 or so. 16 So right now it is under one 17 ownership but technically it's two tax 18 parcels. 19 ANNALISA AVOLA: What about in back 20 21

1	DEAN PAPADENTRIOU: On Dover Street,
2	that is the property where we share the
3	right-of-way.
4	MICHAEL GARDNER: Is that with
5	residents? We need abutter notices for them,
6	don't we?
7	ELIZABETH LINT: Yes, absolutely.
8	And that street is in my mind from
9	past applications where there are abutters
10	there that like to be heard.
11	MICHAEL GARDNER: I recall lots of
12	concerns about rodent control.
13	ELIZABETH LINT: In that area?
14	MICHAEL GARDNER: Mm-hmm, around in
15	that area.
16	So is the appropriate thing to put
17	this matter over to the 19th, in terms of
18	notices to abutters and give people the
19	opportunity is that sufficient time?
20	ELIZABETH LINT: Yes. The only thing
21	that I would say is that if it was just simply

checking to see who actually -- I would go 1 over to assessors and look at the map. 2 ROBERT HAAS: But only --ELIZABETH LINT: But I know Dover 4 Street. 5 ROBERT HAAS: I think there is 6 probably more abutters that need to be 7 notified. 8 ANNALISA AVOLA: I mean, I don't 9 know the area, so when I called the assessor's 10 office that was the only address that they 11 gave me. At first they couldn't find the 12 address and then they transferred me to 13 someone else. 14 ELIZABETH LINT: And we also would 15 need a DPW sidewalk permit which also requires 16 City Council approval, and there is only one 17 City Council hearing in August. 18 MICHAEL GARDNER: That is for the 19 sidewalk seats. So can the application be 20 split to proceed just internally and then to 21

1	come back to amend for the sidewalk?
2	ELIZABETH LINT: It could be
3	conditional.
4	MICHAEL GARDNER: Well, DPW can
5	give can do their review, right?
6	ELIZABETH LINT: Exactly.
7	MICHAEL GARDNER: By the 19th. We
8	could conceivably consider it on the 19th, and
9	potentially approve conditional on City
10	Council approval of the sidewalk?
11	ELIZABETH LINT: Yes.
12	MICHAEL GARDNER: We are sort of
13	talking out loud here about how to help you
14	deal with this procedural problem. And I take
15	it that your desire is to get opened when you
16	can.
17	You say there is construction going
18	on now?
19	ANNALISA AVOLA: Yes.
20	MICHAEL GARDNER: And when is it
21	expected that you would, in fact, be in a

position to open? 1 ANNALISA AVOLA: We are not really 2 Probably -- we are hoping two to three weeks. We're hoping. And some of the 4 construction has been delayed; not to his 5 fault. 6 MICHAEL GARDNER: It is pretty clear 7 you can't open in two or three weeks because of this process. 9 ANNALISA AVOLA: Exactly. 10 MICHAEL GARDNER: Would a motion be 11 in order to defer this matter to the July 19th 12 meeting to give the applicant the opportunity 13 to perfect the abutters' notices and to carry 14 the permitting process for the outdoor seating 15 as far as they can prior to that point? 16 **ELIZABETH LINT:** 17 Yes. GERARD MAHONEY: So moved. 18 ROBERT HAAS: I just want to make a 19 comment. I seconded. 20 MICHAEL GARDNER: The motion has been 21

made and seconded.

And Commissioner Haas?

ROBERT HAAS: My question to you would be, since we know this street to be Dover Street, that it would behoove you and your client to have some conversation with the abutters.

Because I think what you want to try to do is to avoid having people who don't have a lot of answers coming to a meeting or a hearing and have them here -- so whatever you can do to mitigate that would be helpful probably.

So figure out who the abutters are and maybe kind of touch base with them and make sure that there's no issues or concerns that --

MICHAEL GARDNER: My guess is that it is going to be around rodent control and trash.

ROBERT HAAS: And so you want to make

sure that those things are going to be 1 addressed properly. 2 I think it is also a ELIZABETH LINT: delivery issue. 4 ANNALISA AVOLA: Okay. 5 MICHAEL GARDNER: So you need to make 6 sure that you have a plan about how frequently 7 trash is going to be picked up, matters of control over the dumpster lids, and keeping 9 them rat-proof, and general issues of 10 cleanliness and tidiness in the area. 11 If you're going to have a take-out 12 operation, what kind of steps you can take to 13 mitigate the careless disposal of paper and 14 other products. 15 Motion having been made and seconded 16 to defer the matter to July 19th. All those 17 in favor signify by saying aye? 18 RICHARD HASS: Aye. 19 GERARD MAHONEY: Aye. 20 MICHAEL GARDNER: None opposed. So 21

1 2 4 5 abutters. 6 ANNALISA AVOLA: 7 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 non-alcoholic beverages. 18 19 state and spell your name. 20 DANIEL GOLDSTEIN: My name is Daniel 21

sorry we can't deal more directly with it this evening, but we hope your course is clear. So if you have any questions, please discuss them with Ms. Lint. And it might be a good idea to confirm with her about your Thank you. ELIZABETH LINT: Application for Go Cafe, LLC, doing business as Rafiki Bistro. Daniel Goldstein, manager, holder of an all alcoholic beverages as a restaurant license and common victualer license at 1682 Massachusetts Avenue has applied to amend his common victualer license to include a seasonable patio, four tables and eight seats, on the public sidewalk for service of food and MICHAEL GARDNER: Sir, if you could

3

4

5

6 7

9

1011

12

13

14

15

1617

18

19

20

21

Goldstein. That is spelled D-A-N-I-E-L, G-O-L-D-S-T-E-I-N. I'm many owner and the operator of Rafiki Bistro, which is at 1682 Massachusetts Avenue.

MICHAEL GARDNER: Tell us about your plans.

DANIEL GOLDSTEIN: The idea is really just to add seating in front of the restaurant. The 1600 block has really morphed in maybe the past 24 months. So Temple Bar is there; they've added beautiful outdoor seating. I have good relationships with the Lee Brothers, Charlie Christopher in Hull. They have added seating in West Side Lounge to compliment what they have done across the street at the Cambridge Common. Peter Lombardi is my next-door neighbor. They have got an endless construction project that's going on. But it's also improving the condition of the street. And Jack's Stereo is disappearing, and that will get a face lift.

2

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

And, all of a sudden, that block has really a very nice appeal to it.

And we wanted to contribute to that. And we think it is good for business, we think it is good for the image of the neighborhood, and it represents -- it's starting to look like it's representing a destination for people to go to.

MICHAEL GARDNER: And have you gone to the DPW for a permit?

DANIEL GOLDSTEIN: I have talked to the DPW. I'm here a little bit out of order -- so I've had approval at the City Council, and I've notified my abutters, I've spoken with all my abutters. I think I have good standing as a community member in this new community; I've been there for 14 months. And I need to have the DPW come out and give their approval.

But there is already existing seating next door to me; no obstructions between the

ŏ

front of 1682 and the curb, so there is no tree wells, there's no bicycle racks, there's just a parking meter. So I need to have them come out, but I don't anticipate it being a problem.

ELIZABETH LINT: That's actually easier because it's not for alcohol service. You don't have the same space issues with the barriers everywhere.

ROBERT HAAS: So you wouldn't be serving alcohol outside?

DANIEL GOLDSTEIN: I think my strategy in the beginning is about supporting it. And I've talked to the local restauranteurs about having a nice experience in coming to that part of what lies between Porter and Harvard. And maybe next year, when I take advantage of a full season, I'll come before you again and ask to change it to offer alcohol. But at the moment, my intention is not to serve alcohol out there.

1	MICHAEL GARDNER: Are there any other
2	questions?
3	GERARD MAHONEY: I have none.
4	MICHAEL GARDNER: Is there anything
5	else you want to add, sir?
6	DANIEL GOLDSTEIN: No.
7	MICHAEL GARDNER: Are there any
8	members of the public who would like to be
9	heard on this matter?
10	Pleasure of the Commission?
11	ROBERT HAAS: Make a motion to
12	approve the application contingent upon DPW
13	approval.
14	GERARD MAHONEY: Seconded.
15	MICHAEL GARDNER: Motion having been
16	made and seconded to approve the application
17	conditional along with DPW approval. All
18	those in favor signify by saying aye?
19	RICHARD HASS: Aye.
20	GERARD MAHONEY: Aye.
21	MICHAEL GARDNER: Unopposed. So we

wish you well as you proceed in winding your way through the process.

DANIEL GOLDSTEIN: Thank you for your good wishes.

* * * * *

ELIZABETH LINT: Application for
Life Alive Cambridge, LLC, doing business as
Life Alive Urban Oasis & Organic Cafe. Heidi
Feinstein, manager, holder of a beer and malt
beverages as a restaurant license and common
victualer license has applied to amend her
common victualer license to include a
seasonable outdoor patio for three tables and
12 seats on the public sidewalk for services
of food and non-alcoholic beverages.

MICHAEL GARDNER: Good evening. If you could, could you just please state and spell your name for the record and describe your role.

HEIDI FEINSTEIN: My name is Heidi Feinstein. My role is owner/operator of the

this business.

I'm hoping to get three round tables with 12 chairs out front to do what Daniel said, contribute to the beauty and experience of being in Central Square.

MICHAEL GARDNER: And could you just describe your restaurant, how long you've been operating it and what the experience has been so far.

HEIDI FEINSTEIN: We've been opened for ten months and it's been amazing. I think we've been really embraced by the community. We have lines out the door. It's been a tough to two weeks, I can't get my air conditioner fixed, but otherwise it's been a joy. It's an organic vegetarian cafe.

MICHAEL GARDNER: Are you at the corner of Inman and Mass. Ave?

HEIDI FEINSTEIN: Yes. Right across the street.

MICHAEL GARDNER: I don't have an

1	address here, so I didn't want to the presume
2	too much.
3	ELIZABETH LINT: The sheet it was
4	in your packet.
5	GERARD MAHONEY: What is the
6	address?
7	HEIDI FEINSTEIN: 765 Massachusetts
8	Avenue. It's across from City Hall and the
9	post office, right next to 1369.
10	MICHAEL GARDNER: Right next to 1369?
11	And does it have seats out there or whose
12	seats are those?
13	HEIDI FEINSTEIN: Yes. Just the
14	space is different because of the curb cuts
15	and there is other things there.
16	MICHAEL GARDNER: So there is no
17	seats there now?
18	HEIDI FEINSTEIN: No.
19	MICHAEL GARDNER: There's no tables
20	or anything there now?
21	HEIDI FEINSTEIN: No. I started the

1	process in March and it has been confusing.
2	You know, I've been back and forth with Vinny.
3	And then he came and we talked and we created
4	a whole plan.
5	And then his boss, Bill Dwyer, came,
6	and he was like "No, no, no." And they have
7	been kind enough to move some things for me.
8	The solar power trash they had to move just
9	like a little bit to give me the space for a
10	table, but it's a tough area.
11	MICHAEL GARDNER: It is pretty small.
12	HEIDI FEINSTEIN: Yes, it's really
13	small. So Bill and Vinny said three tables
14	with 12 seats. And we came up with that and
15	they gave me the permit.
16	ELIZABETH LINT: I need a copy of it.
17	HEIDI FEINSTEIN: You don't have it?
18	ELIZABETH LINT: You need the permit
19	and we need a copy of it.
20	HEIDI FEINSTEIN: Okay.
21	MICHAEL GARDNER: And is there a City

Council approval that is required as well or 1 has that happened yet? 2 ELIZABETH LINT: Yes, yes. The last I heard from both Bill and Vinny, it was kind 4 of still up in the air. And I am speaking 5 with them on a regular basis about this. 6 MICHAEL GARDNER: Do you know when 7 the --ELIZABETH LINT: Because there were 9 already tables and chairs out on the street, 10 and then a bench. 11 HEIDI FEINSTEIN: Yes, right. And I 12 guess, you know, I was speaking to both of 13 them about this. 14 I went to Vinny in March, and he came 15 and we created a plan. And I thought that I 16 had approval for that. And I went to City 17 Council, and it was put on the City Council. 18 And I was told, again, by word of mouth, that 19 it was approved. 20 And then I went to Vinny, I paid the 21

money, I thought -- and then I went to Chris and I misunderstood Chris. I went to your office and I thought that it was all okay.

So it was a misunderstanding on my part with Chris, but I really thought -- and I even went to a workshop.

ELIZABETH LINT: Yes, you did.

HEIDI FEINSTEIN: I went to a workshop trying to streamline this process, and it was really crazy for me.

So I really don't know what to say except that I did misunderstand Chris and thought that I was allowed to put out those tables.

And then the bench that I put out was approved last year when I got my license. I applied for that bench with flower pots on either side and a sandwich board before I even opened. So I had the bench out when I first opened and the bench was wobbly, so I put it inside. And so I bought a new bench and I

thought that I --1 So when our tables were told to be 2 put inside, which we did immediately, I said to leave the bench out. So it has been 4 misunderstandings and a long process. 5 ROBERT HAAS: What you need now is a 6 copy of the DPW permit. We need some 7 indication that the City Council did, in fact, take action on your application. 9 HEIDI FEINSTEIN: How do I get --10 I'll call Vinny. But how do I get the --11 All she needs is ELIZABETH LINT: 12 the DPW permit because they wouldn't issue it 13 without City Council approval. So if she has 14 City Council approval, they'll issue the 15 permit. 16 And I need copy of that and I need a 17 copy of the letter affidavit. 18 HEIDI FEINSTEIN: 19 Okay. MICHAEL GARDNER: That is the form 20 that was in the packet that says you sent all 21

of the --1 HEIDI FEINSTEIN: That's what told me 2 to photocopy it and send it to the people. ELIZABETH LINT: I'll check on that. 4 HEIDI FEINSTEIN: So I was told, I 5 guess -- I mean, it's been so long now -- I 6 think it is two months ago now that the City 7 Council approved it; and I was told that it was approved. 9 So how do I -- will Vinny be able to 10 help my with that? Do I go to the city 11 clerk's office? 12 ELIZABETH LINT: Yes, the city 13 clerk's office, the city clerk or the city 14 council. 15 MICHAEL GARDNER: The city clerk has 16 the records of the City Council. 17 And we express our concern and 18 sympathy for you about the complicated process 19 that you had to go through. It can be 20 confusing and we take note of what happened 21

with you. 1 Are there any other questions? 2 ROBERT HAAS: No. GERARD MAHONEY: I have none. 4 MICHAEL GARDNER: Any members of the 5 public who would like to be heard on this 6 matter? 7 AUDIENCE MEMBER: May I ask one quick question. 9 MICHAEL GARDNER: You can, but only 10 if you identify yourself for the record and 11 spell your name. 12 ROBERT WINTERS: My name is Robert 13 Winters, R-O-B-E-R-T, W-I-N-T-E-R-S. That's 14 the first time I've been asked to spell it. 15 Is the proposal in any way 16 obstructing the pedestrian flow, because there 17 is a crosswalk and a crosswalk going right 18 through --19 HEIDI FEINSTEIN: They would never 20 allow that. We were very -- like, even the 21

handicapped ramps -- so they can get to the crosswalks, were not anywhere on the corner, we are exactly off the brick. So it has been difficult to find a space.

ROBERT WINTERS: That's it.

MICHAEL GARDNER: Thank you.

ROBERT HAAS: I make a motion to take the matter under advisement. You need to get everything resolved by July 7th.

that I could get this stuff to you tomorrow and then, like, be approved pending on me getting the permit to you, getting City Hall's approval and the permit from Vinny with the affidavit to your office tomorrow? If I can do that can I be approved?

MICHAEL GARDNER: Well, that would require an action of the Commission, and I wonder if you just want to address that as an alternative resolution.

ROBERT HAAS: I make a motion to

1	approve your application contingent upon the
2	completion of certification, and also the DPW
3	permit for the outside seating.
4	GERARD MAHONEY: Seconded.
5	MICHAEL GARDNER: So the motion
6	having been made and seconded to have a
7	conditional approval of the application upon
8	submission of the appropriate permits and
9	affidavit.
10	All those in favor signify by saying
11	aye?
12	ROBERT HAAS: Aye.
13	GERARD MAHONEY: Aye.
14	MICHAEL GARDNER: Unopposed. And as
15	I guess the closest neighbor to City Hall, at
16	least that I've had the experience of working
17	with so far, we wish you well and good luck in
18	your venture.
19	HEIDI FEINSTEIN: Thank you.
20	* * * *
21	ELIZABETH LINT: Application for

Raymond Graham, doing business as Unlimited Motors, has applied for a used car dealers license, office only, at One Mifflin Place.

There is a moratorium on these licenses. However, this is an existing license and Mr. Graham is going from being a corporation to being a DBA. So there is no change.

MICHAEL GARDNER: If you could, sir, just please state your name and spell your name for us and your affiliation with the business.

RAYMOND GRAHAM: My name is Raymond Graham, R-A-Y-M-O-N-D, G-R-A-H-A-M. My affiliation is I'm the owner. I was president of the corporation, and I'm just removing the other officers and going into business for myself.

MICHAEL GARDNER: Is there going to be any change in the business operations?

RAYMOND GRAHAM: No.

1	MICHAEL GARDNER: Any impact on the
2	neighbors or anything at all that would affect
3	how the business is perceived in the
4	neighborhood?
5	RAYMOND GRAHAM: No. Same office,
6	same everything, nothing will be changed.
7	GERARD MAHONEY: So you currently
8	conduct your business at that location?
9	RAYMOND GRAHAM: Yes. I've been
10	there since 2008.
11	MICHAEL GARDNER: Any complaints or
12	issues?
13	ELIZABETH LINT: No.
14	MICHAEL GARDNER: Any other
15	questions? Any member of the public who would
16	like to be heard? No.
17	Anything else you would like to add,
18	sir?
19	GERARD MAHONEY: Motion to approve is
20	submitted.
21	ROBERT HAAS: Seconded.

MICHAEL GARDNER: Motion having been 1 made and seconded to approve the change in the 2 business model, all those in favor signify by saying aye? 4 GERARD MAHONEY: Aye. 5 ROBERT HAAS: Aye. 6 MICHAEL GARDNER: Unopposed. We wish 7 you well. Sorry you had to wait so long. RAYMOND GRAHAM: Thank you very much. 9 10 ELIZABETH LINT: Application for 11 Barismo, Inc., doing business as Dwelltime. 12 Jaime Van Schyndel, manager, has applied for a 13 common victualer license to be exercised at 14 364 Broadway. Said license, if granted, would 15 allow food and non-alcoholic beverages to be 16 sold, served, and consumed on said premises 17 with a seating capacity of 20. The hours of 18 operation will be from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. 19 seven days per week. 20 MICHAEL GARDNER: Good evening. Ιf 21

you would be so kind to state and spell your 1 names for the record and also identify your 2 role in this matter. HONG XUE: Hong Xue, H-O-N-G, X-U-E. 4 Treasurer and kitchen manager. 5 JAIME VAN SCHYNDEL: My name is Jaime 6 Van Schyndel, that's spelled J-A-I-M-E, V-A-N, 7 S-C-H-Y-N-D-E-L. I'm the general manager of Barismo. 9 ISRAEL FRIDMAN: My name is Israel 10 Fridman, I-S-R-A-E-L, F-R-I-D-M-A-N. Barismo 11 shareholder. 12 MICHAEL GARDNER: Tell us about the 13 plans, please. 14 ISRAEL FRIDMAN: We are opening a 15 lunch-focused cafe. We are not going to be 16 serving alcohol. We are looking for 20 seats. 17 So we are looking at sandwiches, soup, salad, 18 and a limited coffee and tea. Morning hours 19 with a pastry program and baked goods. A 20 small kitchen and a bar in the front to serve 21

coffee drinks. 1 MICHAEL GARDNER: Has the space 2 operated in this fashion before or is this a new use? 4 ISRAEL FRIDMAN: This is a new use. 5 MICHAEL GARDNER: And so you'll have 6 a stove? 7 ISRAEL FRIDMAN: Yes. MICHAEL GARDNER: And all the 9 hoodings. 10 HONG XUE: Well, it's going to be 11 straight out baked goods; so it's not going to 12 be an electric oven running. There will be 13 convection -- because it's going to be 14 sandwiches so it's a lot of cold. 15 GERARD MAHONEY: No grease cooking? 16 HONG XUE: 17 No. MICHAEL GARDNER: And could you 18 describe, the two of you, what your experience 19 has been in running or working in this kind of 20 business in the past. 21

HONG XUE: I'm actually a chef. So I graduated from the Cambridge School of Culinary Arts. And I've been working in the food industry for several years. And I also teach at the Cambridge School of Culinary Arts right now as a chef instructor.

So I do work here, it's been about eight years now. And my family runs a restaurant business, so I grew up around a food background.

MICHAEL GARDNER: And you, sir?

JAIME VAN SCHYNDEL: I'm currently
the general manager, but I've also managed
several other coffee shops over the last
several years. So I have done smaller -- some
local places, Simond's up the street on
Massachusetts Avenue. So I've been doing this
for a little while.

MICHAEL GARDNER: And what are your plans with respect to deliveries, trash control --

U

JAIME VAN SCHYNDEL: For deliveries we are having a side door installed so that we are not interfering with the back of the space. So it's on Broadway, it's the old Hughley Auction House. And there is a side entryway for larger deliveries, but we are also having a hatch installed on the front. We intend to apply for a loading space. But the hatch would be where most of the deliveries would come in so we are not interfering with traffic on the side or --

GERARD MAHONEY: Well, when you say "hatch," are you referring to like a sidewalk hatch that would go down into the basement?

JAIME VAN SCHYNDEL: It's going to be built not into the sidewalk, but into the front of the building where the -- what do you call it -- like a bulkhead. So we are building it into the bulkhead and it's going to be about 36 inches with rails. The ceiling in the basement is fairly low, so it's not a

large distance to get past.

And as far as waste, pests, we would sign on for regular pest control. But we are going to build an enclosed area to handle waste because there is no storage area out back. So we would defer to the advice of special services for that.

MICHAEL GARDNER: And when do you plan to open?

JAIME VAN SCHYNDEL: At this point, six to ten weeks. Construction ends in the first few stages, getting the bar completed and the equipment installed.

GERARD MAHONEY: So you are talking about Labor Day?

JAIME VAN SCHYNDEL: Yes. We'll see. We are already auditioning staff and, given the scale of the shop, it's going to be an interesting project. I've managed shops of a slightly similar size before, but not necessarily this much space.

MICHAEL GARDNER: Any other
questions?
ELIZABETH LINT: I have the abutter
notifications but not the affidavit.
MICHAEL GARDNER: So you understand
in our packet we tell you to send out all the
notices to the abutters, and then we ask you
to sign a document that swears that you sent
all those notices to the abutters.
HONG XUE: Oh, I did. I actually
bring it in and drop it off.
ELIZABETH LINT: I'll check on that.
I don't have it, but I'll check on that.
HONG XUE: And also the receipt of
the 28th.
ELIZABETH LINT: Okay. I'll check on
that.
MICHAEL GARDNER: Are there any
members of the public that would like to be
heard on this matter? Mr. Winters? And
please state your name for the record.

ROBERT WINTERS: It's "Winters" with 1 an "s." And I live at 366 Broadway, directly 2 next door. 3 THE STENOGRAPHER: Excuse me. Ι 4 can't hear you. 5 GERARD MAHONEY: Please come forward 6 and keep your voice up. 7 My name is Robert ROBERT WINTERS: Winters and I live at 366 Broadway, which is 9 directly next door to the property. 10 And I did have a statement I wanted 11 to make, if I may. And I even brought a copy 12 for the record. 13 I am the most direct abutter to the 14 property in question. My building is at 366 15 Broadway, it stands only a few feet from the 16 neighboring building. And all residents of 17 366 Broadway share some concerns about any 18 possible generation of noise or other 19 nuisances that could possibly result from a 20 changing use of the neighboring building. 21

I'm speaking for all the residents at 366 Broadway, which include six adults and two, soon-to-be three, very young children aged 2 and under.

All of my tenants and I welcome the return of this building to active use. Let's be real clear about that.

For over three decades I've enjoyed a very cordial and cooperative relations with the previous occupants of the public auction house. We have shoveled each other's sidewalks, and I still have their phone number on my kitchen bulletin board for contact in case of emergencies and crime; that's been the nature of things.

And I'll also say that, without any prompting, I've actually cleaned their gutter for the last 25 years just as a convenience. Why not?

Several neighbors and I have effectively served voluntarily essentially as

a night watchman for the property all these years. Ours has been the ideal partnership for a mixed residential/commercial district, and I look forward to the possibility of enjoying a similar cooperative relationship with the new occupants of the building.

I've been aware of the proposal of a cafe, through, through second and third hand. It is sort of curious to say here that the first actual notification that I have received as a direct abutter happened within the past week when I received the official notification.

Up to this point, not a person affiliated with this has discussed any of the particulars about what is being proposed with me. That is not meant as a condemnation in any way, but it's a curiosity; especially since I'm sort of well-known as a rather cooperative neighbor, and so it left me rather curious.

When I got that letter, I asked my tenants for any feedback that they would like to give at this meeting. And they sent me a few things and I simply want to read off what my tenants offered.

They would like that there should be neither a fan nor air conditioning noise at night. None. They want no loud music or music audible outside at any time of day.

They have some concerns, and we hope that there would be no issues with fumes associated with food and drink preparation or that, if there are, that any problems should be dealt with swiftly and completely.

There should be no external trash or garbage storage. No trucks idling. My understanding is that this is a 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m. proposal. They don't want to hear any trucks backing up or otherwise being a disturbance either before 7:00 a.m. or after 7:00 p.m.

They do not want any trucks or customer's cars blocking Broadway Terrace, which -- this is the first I've heard of a side door, that would seem to imply blocking Broadway Terrace.

Something of great concern to me and, hopefully, this will not be a concern, but there should be no employees or customers loitering or smoking anywhere around 364 Broadway, including but not limited to, in front of the building, in the rear of the building, in the alleyway between 364 and 366 that we share, on Broadway Terrace, or the neighboring properties.

And any outside trash, garbage, or discarded food created by customers or employees, including our neighbor's properties, is to be dealt with swiftly and completely.

John also put in that any graffiti on the building is to be dealt with swiftly and

completely. And, in a slightly comic note, I'll point out that I generally have been the one to remove graffiti from one side of the building for the past 20 years.

In terms of noise generation, our cluster of buildings that face East Street, Broadway and Broadway Terrace, all have rear porches facing our abutting rear yards. And it is the nature of this space that any and all sounds produced in this rear yard area or adjacent properties are plainly audible to all residents of all of these buildings, especially during the warm weather months when the windows are open.

Across Broadway is the Longfellow
School Building, which has a brick exterior
and a courtyard that very effectively reflects
any and all sounds back across the street.
Conversations on the street, out front, are
plainly audible even at the rear of the
building; that is the nature of the beast.

And most of us do not use air conditioners and prefer open windows in the summertime. The sound of air conditioning and similar apparatus in the neighborhood of our building can be extremely disturbing. It is essential that a piece of our shared space not be disturbed by any equipment associated with the proposed commercial activity. To do so would irreparably harm the peace, both inside and outside of our home.

I also live on the second floor of 366 Broadway and I look out directly onto the roof of 364 Broadway. I can practically reach out and touch it. It's imperative that there be no mechanical equipment installed on this roof and that it will not be in any way audible.

Furthermore, since the proposed change of use will involve food preparation, something that has been not at this location in many decades, if ever, we ask that

appropriate steps be taken so that we are not unreasonably subjected to the byproducts of the proposed use.

As I mentioned earlier, I've been the ideal residential neighbor of a neighboring business for over three decades. I've always acted cooperatively and neighborly, and it's my intention to maintain the same relationship with my new neighbors. We look forward to the reactivation of this building, but we must insist that our reasonable concerns be met as a precondition to support any proposed use.

MICHAEL GARDNER: Thank you.

So I take it you haven't had much conversation with Mr. Winters or his tenants or other abutters?

I've got to give them a chance to respond.

JAIME VAN SCHYNDEL: I don't believe we -- we haven't at this point. We did talk with Chris Bassler and a few other people and

they advised us to go to the Neighborhood Association at a certain point.

At this point where we were in the process things had accelerated to the point where we needed to hit this milestone to continue the process, so we chose not to at this point. But we'll be going to the Neighborhood Association to talk about the proposed plan and get some feedback.

We are not going to go into this blind and mad. When we do our menu and when we do start to approach this, in terms of what the community wants, we do intend to reach out and approach everyone and say, "What to do think about what we are doing? And "How can we change things to fit?"

In terms of the music, that is not in our plans to have it loud. I can't speak to the capacity of people inside in terms of noise if people are talking and having conversations, but it's not our intention to

have loud music or to be that style of cafe. 1 We are not a loud, hipster vibe. We are going 2 with a more subtle classical, softer music. profile jazz, Spanish speaking, a softer side 4 of things. And we are going to approach that. 5 It's not in our wheelhouse to have any loud 6 music. 7 We are having the glass windows replaced, so that we can open them and we 9 won't be running air conditioners as much. 10 ROBERT WINTERS: Did I hear you 11 correctly that you are proposing to have 12 windows that open onto the street from in 13 front? 14 JAIME VAN SCHYNDEL: 15 ROBERT WINTERS: I would like to go 16 on record that I am vehemently opposed to that 17 application. If that is the case, I'm 18 vehemently opposed to that. 19 MICHAEL GARDNER: Thank you. I'll 20 leave it at that because I have another member 21

2

4

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

of the public that would like to be heard.

So if you would, please identify yourself.

STEVEN RECKHOW: I am Steven Reckhow, R-E-C-K-H-O-W. I live just around the block on 305 Harvard Street. I own this building and also the -- I developed the triple decker directly behind it, which I have interacted with Robert for over two years.

And we -- I think Robert would agree -- that we transformed that triple decker from being a, you know, something that dragged the neighborhood down to something that built the neighborhood up. We won a historic preservation award for redoing it. It's the state of the art in energy efficiency.

My wife and I have lived on that block for 20 years. This is, you know, part two of selecting a tenant that fits the neighborhood, and fits our identity as people who want to create a neighborhood around us

that is efficient and meets people's needs.

ŏ

The building is being refit from what it was before. For 62 years it was an auction house where people from out of town came in, delivered trucks in the backyard, and the backyard was potholes, and actually behind the triple decker they had a steel container back there that they wheeled stuff into for storage.

The building itself was a wreck.

Asphalt siding and whatever, and that is where their employees worked.

We dedicated all the space between the triple decker and this commercial space to residential. We completely transformed that space. The people who now own those units have adopted that space, it's completely changed. They are putting out window boxes, on what's going to be their space. They own the backyard now.

We gave that area over to them

•

effectively. We told these folks -- we told anybody who wanted to rent the space, "You can't use the backyard, you can't infringe on the residential space the way the previous auction house did." We want to respect this as a residential neighborhood.

We are putting a side door in so that, you know, when a delivery truck runs up, they can run down Broadway Terrace -- I mean, we are taking about a 50-foot run here -- to make deliveries.

We are also putting this hatch in at the sidewalk, which is -- it's the same thing that you see like if you go down to the Harvard Bookstore on Mass. Avenue, where deliveries come in; you know, it's just a short door at the sidewalk, and they run things down below.

And the deal with these folks is, nothing goes out through the back door, nothing goes through, no trash outside, no

deliveries, no trash going out the back way. We want to preserve that as the residential thing.

As far as the front façade, this place, it was built in 1928, basically, and it was, you know, it's a one-story brick building. And something happened at some point, I think the flashing at the roof failed and all the brick façade fell off.

And something happened, and they put up -- when we bought it, it had fiberglass fake shingles as the façade. We went to the Historic Preservation and said, you know, "Can we pull this off and see if we can pull it back to the historic way that it was?"

So when we started to pull it off, it looked good to begin with, and then it came down to like plywood, and we pulled the plywood off. And then it turned out that all of the original brick had been ripped off, all of the original transom windows had been

destroyed.

At that point, we went to the City and worked with a community development on the façade improvement program.

We went through their design process. We had researched the historic nature of the façade, and they set us up with our architect and we got the plans.

We went through the hearings with the Historic Preservation to restore it basically to the façade that it was before, including putting in again, you know, a 42-foot long transom light over, you know, all of windows that are there. All of the windows and doors stayed exactly where they are. What we are doing is we are replacing them with double-glazed low E windows.

The windows that are now like just single pane, they will open. It's kind of like what happens. I mean, that's what you see in Central Square and Harvard Square, it's

the way that commercial spaces -- they like to see opening spaces. They don't have to be open, they can be open. Fundamentally, it is New England, they don't open all that often but they are going to be really energy efficient.

Also, on the issue of HVAC, what was in there before was -- it was a cold stove. You know, the heating system, a steam system, that was replaced in 1984 with an oil-fired steam system, which obviously you can't -- you know, that's not a viable way to run a commercial space.

Once again, like we did in the triple decker, we are going for ultimate energy efficiency, and it does indeed require a compressor on the roof; I mean, that's just what happens.

And it's the most quietest unit that we can find, it is 17 Sear. I mean, this is like way over Energy Star. We are going over

the top on everything we can do to make this fit into the neighborhood.

And we -- you know, I have to take the flack for these guys on talking to the neighbors. Having worked on the triple decker back behind there for -- well, we are into three years now, and Robert can back me up on this stuff. And I know everybody in the neighborhood and we live just around the block. I talk to people all the time. Some of your tenants, Robert, do actually know who is coming in. And it is just this thing about, you know, you can't tell people who is coming in ahead of time because we didn't have a lease signed.

But the overwhelming response -- I mean, actually other than Robert, everybody is like, "Wow, you are bringing in a cafe.

That's a wonderful thing." So Robert and I will talk later.

HONG XUE: We ask Chris about --

(inaudible).

ISRAEL FRIDMAN: Well, Chris Bassler was not really encouraging. He was enthusiastic about our proposal. We've been in touch with him regularly, lots of e-mails have come back and forth, and we are following all of the regulations and all of the guidelines to the T.

Truly, we held back a little bit from contacting the neighborhood, we are looking for the right time to do it. And as Jaime just said before, the process accelerated a lot lately, more than our expectations. And we were planning on doing it soon -- that is just the way things happened.

MICHAEL GARDNER: I'll just ask the question to anyone here who thinks they might have experienced a -- or can provide an answer in terms of whether or not people are using air conditioning, or whether or not there is a roof unit, or whether or not windows are open.

Is our authority limited to the question of whether there is a violation or potential violation of the noise ordinance?

ELIZABETH LINT: Well, I think it is important to note, first of all, that there is no application for any type of entertainment license.

MICHAEL GARDNER: I did note that.

JAIME VAN SCHYNDEL: We are not that far along yet.

MICHAEL GARDNER: Well, you were talking about music and the type of music, and I noted that there was no entertainment license here, so that is a separate question. You certainly couldn't have music without an entertainment license.

I guess I'm asking about, you know, sort of a neighbor saying, "Well, we don't want any air conditioning and we don't want any units on the roof. Is our authority limited to "you don't go about 50 decibels?"

ELIZABETH LINT: Well, we are 1 controlled by the noise ordinance and the 2 units on the roof certainly are in Zoning's purview, not ours. But, again, it is the 4 noise ordinance, so that would be the 5 nighttime 50 decibels. 6 And as far as windows being opened, 7 the noise ordinance also tells us that sound of noise can't be plainly audible from 50 9 feet. 10 GERARD MAHONEY: I have a question 11 for the gentleman. You own the building, 12 correct? 13 JAIME VAN SCHYNDEL: Yes. 14 GERARD MAHONEY: What is the status 15 with regard to ISD with regard to permits for 16 construction renovation? 17 JAIME VAN SCHYNDEL: All the trades 18 have permits. 19 GERARD MAHONEY: So permits have 20 been issued? 21

JAIME VAN SCHYNDEL: Yes. 1 MICHAEL GARDNER: Including for this 2 hatch-type entryway? JAIME VAN SCHYNDEL: That part has 4 not. That is, you know -- we are going 5 through one more iteration with it. 6 GERARD MAHONEY: Subject to a design 7 change, I guess? JAIME VAN SCHYNDEL: Yes. Well, not 9 a design change; just a redefinition kind of a 10 thing. 11 GERARD MAHONEY: I understand. 12 MICHAEL GARDNER: I'm wondering 13 whether this is appropriate to take under 14 advisement for the July 7th decision meeting 15 and to give an any opportunity for -- based on 16 any information generated this evening -- for 17 either the parties who are present or for 18 others who may have an interest to provide 19 written material or opinion about the matter? 20 ROBERT HAAS: So it seems to me the 21

first place you want to start is with your immediate neighbor. I think you need to reassure him that some of these things are non-issues; and then to work through some of the concerns he has and reassure him that it's not going to disturb him or his tenants.

And it seems to also that if you're going to have a meeting, it would be great to have your neighbor with you who supports your proposal as opposed to trying to have that conversation with your other neighbors in the neighborhood and still have an abutting neighbor that has concerns over the property.

So I know you mentioned you would want to talk to Mr. Winters. I think you should do that, but also think you should talk about your business concepts and try to reassure him that it's not going to have an impact on the quality life of him and his tenants. And hopefully you will have the same relationship you had prior with your

neighbors. I think that's what you want. 1 ISRAEL FRIDMAN: We want to be a 2 community space. We want to be like a Simond's. 4 ROBERT HAAS: But I think it is 5 going to take some effort on your part to have 6 that conversation, and try to figure out what 7 the right answer is so you can live peaceably and also enjoyably. 9 JAIME VAN SCHYNDEL: Especially if 10 you are sitting through the first people on 11 the list, yes, definitely. 12 MICHAEL GARDNER: I don't actually 13 know how that's done. How you can design the 14 equipment and install it and then find out how 15 loud it is. 16 I take it there is has got to be ways 17 to try to get expert opinion, but I'm 18 perplexed about an issue like that, 19 particularly with such a close abutter. 20 I'm just talking, so I'm happy to get 21

any comments back, sir.

STEVE RECKHOW: I think that Robert and I have worked together over the last two and a half years on the triple decker behind his house. And he and I have a good way to talk together and that we can find a way that this will be agreeable between us.

Wouldn't you say, Robert?

ROBERT WINTERS: I don't know. That would be my hope. But, again, I'm somewhat mystified at the fact that you haven't uttered the word "cafe," although I've known about it for some time, with all this closeness and friendliness.

STEVE RECKHOW: I thought that I had actually.

options for the Commission to consider here.

One, is to take this matter under advisement until July 7th. Another option to potentially consider is to continue the matter to July

19th. And I'm wondering if the Commissioners have an opinion with respect to that?

ROBERT WINTERS: If I may suggest, since many of the people from the Neighborhood Association, but they will all express a lot of concerns about this. And I wasn't kidding when I see we welcome an active use, and even the notion of a cafe we'd welcome.

It was some of these other ancillary aspects that were of the greatest concern; primarily, that of noise generation.

I think that those members of the Neighborhood Association certainly have not had an opportunity to weigh-in on this at any public meeting.

So it seems to me to take it under advisement to a decision meeting wouldn't provide them that opportunity.

MICHAEL GARDNER: So I'm wondering whether how comfortable the applicant feels if we continue this matter generally to the July

19th meeting?

,

JAIME VAN SCHYNDEL: I think there is other ways to address the issues, and I'll be happy to sit down with all the abutters and work as much as I can to address all the concerns and incorporate them, even to the point of showing them some of the business plans of what we are trying to do with our menu.

We are trying to keep a low profile and not trying to be a burden on the neighborhood, not coming in with an attitude of maybe loud and flashy. And, yes, we'll shovel the sidewalks and do the things that matter and we'll listen to our neighbors.

MICHAEL GARDNER: So what's the compelling reason to not delay it for another 12 days, to allow more community process, and give us a chance to hear more directly about the progress that you've been able to make, including having the opportunity to have 12

more days to try to accommodate things?

I'm trying to understand what the compelling reason is to not go with the 19th?

JAIME VAN SCHYNDEL: I would think we can do it, it is just a matter of whether or not -- what would change between now and then other than we can reach out to the neighborhood, and I believe we can reach out to the neighborhood in the following week.

MICHAEL GARDNER: Well, one of things that would change is there would be an opportunity for us to hear directly from people, so there is an institutional advantage to us.

JAIME VAN SCHYNDEL: What would you be looking for from us to present to resolve the air conditioners? What other things do we need to present to you?

MICHAEL GARDNER: Well, ideally, the best outcome is if they have a public hearing and we get overwhelming support from the

neighbors about this exciting new idea. You 1 know, that isn't obviously always possible and 2 that part of our job to listen and consider and try to understand and come to a balance 4 and appropriate view. 5 I'm sorry, had I STEVE RECKHOW: 6 known, there are -- the three new owners in 7 the triple decker that directly abut the property, have all personally expressed 9 support for this project. 10 And, had I known, I could have 11 brought them, as well as two adjacent tenants 12 or owners on Broadway Terrace. And, actually, 13 Robert, I think one of them is one of your 14 tenants. 15 MICHAEL GARDNER: Okay. I got it. 16 And they could show 17 STEVE RECKHOW: up on short notice. 18 MICHAEL GARDNER: Thank you. The 19 pleasure of the Commission? 20 ROBERT HAAS: To continue until July 21

19th. 1 MICHAEL GARDNER: Is that in a form 2 of a motion. ROBERT HAAS: That's my inclination. 4 MICHAEL GARDNER: Okay. That's my 5 inclination as well. I'm looking for 6 a motion. 7 ROBERT HAAS: I make a motion to continue it to July 19th. 9 GERARD MAHONEY: Seconded. 10 MICHAEL GARDNER: Motion having been 11 made and seconded to continue the matter, I 12 take it, generally, until July 19th. 13 Just in terms of the discussion 14 point, I think what we are hopeful in terms of 15 that is that you have more time to do what can 16 be a difficult process of communication and 17 discussion with a variety of people with a 18 variety of interests, some of them very 19 strongly expressed, and some perhaps unknown; 20 and that you can then come back to us and 21

report more fully on your progress. 1 I see you've got your hand raised, so 2 before we take a vote, I'll give you an opportunity to say something. 4 HONG XUE: Would it be okay if we 5 actually have signatures from all the 6 neighbors and the support if we can? 7 JAIME VAN SCHYNDEL: A large portion of our client base already lives in the 9 neighborhood. 10 Actually, we are MICHAEL GARDNER: 11 not particularly in the business of giving you 12 advice, specifically about how to do this, but 13 if you've spent any time here this everything, 14 you've seen that we do accept signatures. And 15 I take it from your body language that you 16 have spent some time here this evening. 17 Motion having been made and seconded, 18 all those in favor signify by saying aye? 19 ROBERT HAAS: Aye. 20 GERARD MAHONEY: Aye. 21

MICHAEL GARDNER: None opposed. So 1 we'll continue the matter generally until July 2 19th. And let's just go off the record for 4 a minute and we'll take a quick break. 5 (Brief recess.) 6 MICHAEL GARDNER: We've been off the 7 record a few minutes, but we're about to go back on. We've taken a brief adjournment. 9 10 ELIZABETH LINT: A disciplinary 11 matter continued from May 17 and June 14, 12 Afkor, Inc., doing business as Cafe Anatolia. 13 Alp Hocagil, manager, holder of a common 14 victualer license at 251 Cambridge Street due 15 to a report from the Traffic, Parking and 16 Transportation Department regarding 17 outstanding parking tickets and Afkor, Inc.'s, 18 failure to adhere to the payment plan. 19 So I can report that as of this 20 morning, he is paid in full. 21

ROBERT HAAS: Good.

MICHAEL GARDNER: So, as I recall, sir, if you wouldn't mind, please, stating your name for the record and spelling it.

ALP HOCAGIL: My name is Alp Hocagil. My first name is spelled A-L-P, and my last name is spelled H-O-C-A-G-I-L.

MICHAEL GARDNER: You are the holder of the common victualer license?

ALP HOCAGIL: Yes, I'm the holder.

MICHAEL GARDNER: And as I recall one of things we were concerned about was that at different points you were using multiple vehicles with the possibility of having tickets issued on multiple vehicles or on different ones, including on a relative's. And we were concerned about whether or not you could meet the payment plan and, if you got a way going forward so you could avoid tickets in the future.

And we have heard from Ms. Lint that

all the tickets are paid, which is good. Just what is going to happen tomorrow?

ALP HOCAGIL: I don't have a -- I'm just using a friend's car, it's more than a month. I park in the spot where I used to park since a year, which is right on the McGrath Highway, next to the parking lot. And I was renting that place.

Now, it's been more than a few months and I have a delivery guy already doing the deliveries, that is why I don't have any problem.

And the other concern about Ms. Lint says that it's my brother's car. He was helping me out sometimes. So I know he has some tickets, and I already talked to him in May I think, he paid some of the tickets, but I will take care of that one, too. I will talk to him. He was back home, he came back, like, last Saturday, a week ago, but I will talk to him and take care of that.

MICHAEL GARDNER: Okay. Any other 1 questions? 2 But the only other ROBERT HAAS: No. thing I would say to you, I'm not prepared to 4 go through this again. We went through a long 5 history with you and so I'm warning you that 6 if you find yourself in this situation again, 7 I'm probably not going to be as patient. 8 ALP HOCAGIL: No, no. I'm in the 9 process to sell. I'm going back to school, 10 hopefully in September. 11 So, actually, I'm going to be here 12 the next hearing day for the license 13 application --14 GERARD MAHONEY: You are selling the 15 business? 16 ALP HOCAGIL: Yes. I have to go back 17 to school (inaudible) I have a master's 18 degree, so I'm going back to school. 19 MICHAEL GARDNER: Okay. Sorry you 20 had to wait so long for tonight, but it's 21

important to get these obligations taken care 1 of. 2 And I take it we'll put the matter on file, if that's the appropriate action. 4 it will be in the record with respect to, as 5 Commissioner Haas said, should there be any 6 other trouble. Is that right, Ms. Lint? 7 ELIZABETH LINT: Yes, you can do that. 9 GERARD MAHONEY: So moved. 10 MICHAEL GARDNER: Unless there is 11 another alternative? 12 I think as long ROBERT HAAS: No. 13 as the parking tickets are paid and, to your 14 point -- because part of the problem is not 15 just parking around your store, but when you 16 are making deliveries and stuff like that, 17 you're --18 ALP HOCAGIL: Well, the biggest 19 problem is when I was doing deliveries around 20 lunchtime. But I'm already out. Hopefully 21

I'm going to sign tomorrow the P & S. 1 MICHAEL GARDNER: All right. 2 Seconded? So the motion has been made and seconded to put the matter on file, with the 4 notation in the record, should there be any 5 additional difficulties, what will happen. 6 All those in favor signify by saying 7 aye? ROBERT HAAS: Aye. GERARD MAHONEY: Aye. 10 MICHAEL GARDNER: The aye's have it. 11 There is none opposed. So that's the action 12 we'll take and I wish you well in figuring out 13 a way to sell or change the business. 14 ALP HOCAGIL: Thank you very much. 15 Before we motion to MICHAEL GARDNER: 16 adjourn, there is one scheduling matter there 17 I'd like to raise. 18 There is currently a License 19 Commission Hearing scheduled for August the 20 16th and a decision hearing for the August 21

25th. 1 My plans are that I will be in town 2 on the 9th of August but I don't expect to be in town on the 16th of August, and I thought 4 there was some issues about whether there were 5 other vacation plans. 6 ROBERT HAAS: I want my vacation on 7 the 12th. 8 ELIZABETH LINT: I thought we already 9 changed it? 10 MICHAEL GARDNER: Oh, did you? 11 ELIZABETH LINT: I think they changed 12 I'll check, but I think they did. it. 13 MICHAEL GARDNER: Okay. So we are 14 going -- if it's fine with you, we'll move the 15 date to the 9th? 16 ROBERT HAAS: Yes, I'm fine for the 17 9th. 18 MICHAEL GARDNER: Okay. Do we need 19 a motion to change the schedule? But we'll 20 just take administrative notice that the time 21

1	date is going to be changed to the 9th.
2	ELIZABETH LINT: Yes, I'm fairly
3	certain that I did, but I'll look.
4	MICHAEL GARDNER: Okay. A motion to
5	adjourn is always in order.
6	GERARD MAHONEY: So moved.
7	MICHAEL GARDNER: The motion has been
8	made and seconded to adjourn, and we would
9	adjourn at approximately 10:47 p.m.)
LO	
l1	(Whereupon, at 10:47 p.m., the
L2	License Commission Hearing was adjourned.)
13	
L4	
L5	
L6	
L7	
18	
19	
20	
21	

1	CERTIFICATE
2	COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS SUFFOLK, SS.
3	SOLI GER, SS.
4	I, Evelyn M. Slicius, a Certified Shorthand Reporter and Registered Professional
5	Reporter, the undersigned Notary Public, certify that:
6	I am not related to any of the parties
7	in this matter by blood or marriage and that I am in no way interested in the outcome of this
8	matter.
9	I further certify that the testimony hereinbefore set forth is a true and accurate
10	transcription of my stenographic notes to the best of my knowledge, skills and ability.
11	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set
12	my hand this 5th day of July, 2011.
13	
14	Evelyn M. Slicius
15	Notary Public Certified Shorthand Reporter
16	License No. 127193 My Commission Expires:
17	May 15, 2013
18	
19	THE FOREGOING CERTIFICATION OF THIS TRANSCRIPT DOES NOT APPLY TO ANY REPRODUCTION OF THE SAME
20	BY ANY MEANS UNLESS UNDER THE DIRECT CONTROL AND/OR DIRECTION OF THE CERTIFYING REPORTER.
21	