

Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission

May 2, 2019 - 806 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge Senior Center - 6:00 P.M.

Members present: Bruce Irving, *Chair*; Susannah Tobin, *Vice Chair*; William G. Barry, Jo Solet, *Members*; Gavin Kleespies, Kyle Sheffield, *Alternates*

Members absent: Robert Crocker, Joseph Ferrara, Chandra Harrington, *Members*; Paula Paris, *Alternate*

Staff present: Charles Sullivan, *Executive Director*, Sarah Burks, *Preservation Planner*;

Public present: See attached list.

With a quorum present, Mr. Irving called the meeting to order at 6:04 P.M. He introduced the commission members and staff. He noted that both alternates could vote on all matters. He dispensed with the consent agenda.

Public Hearings: Alterations to Designated Properties

Case 4093: Harvard Square Kiosk and Plaza, by City of Cambridge. Renovate and alter the Harvard Square Kiosk and Plaza.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides of the kiosk and the plaza and described the history of this area of Harvard Square. He showed historic photographs to document the various forms of the subway headhouse, moved to its present location in 1983 and re-used as a news kiosk.

Kathy Watkins, City Engineer, showed slides, provided the background of the project, and summarized the public engagement process to date. She noted that the MBTA was in the process of rebuilding its elevator in the plaza. She described the existing plaza design, condition, accessibility problems, and pinch points. It was a challenge to eliminate steps and design an accessible plaza. She indicated on a plan and section drawing where it would be possible to plant trees and where planters would be placed for smaller plant material. She noted that the project did not include replacement of the MBTA headhouse. She described the proposed materials of granite, wire cut brick pavers, and black metal.

Ted Touloukian, architect for the kiosk renovation and re-use, showed slides and described the timeline of the kiosk. Some restoration aspects of the design were focused on the kiosk completion date of 1928. There were many photographs from that time to aid in the restoration. When the kiosk was re-installed in 1983, alterations and new features were added that reflected its new use as a newsstand. He noted that the west elevation originally had no windows or doors but was open to the staircases and escalator. The rooftop signs were added in the mid-twentieth century. He described the design proposal, which would include folding doors on the west side, digital rooftop signs for information and revenue, accessible entries, and wayfinding signs. The building would be used for visitor information as well as a flexible space for civic functions, commercial use, and performances. Preservation work would include masonry repairs, rebuilding the south wall, removing non-original hardware, replacing the windows with new steel windows, and installing new doors hung from the existing steel framing. The copper roof had reached the end of its life and needed to be replaced. It would be replicated in red copper with soldered, folded flat-lock seams. The perimeter dentil band would be replicated in copper to match the existing. The existing cypress wood ceiling would be repaired to the full extent possible with select areas needing replacement.

The paint colors had been analyzed by Building Conservation Associates. The steel would be painted dark and the wood a light color. Lam Partners had consulted on the lighting design. Pendant fixtures similar to those selected in 1977 would be used. Up-lighting at the perimeter of the building, under the steel members would also be installed. Conduit would be contained within the roof and would not be visible. A ceiling fan would be added for air circulation. The backlit “Harvard Square” signs would be retained. Electric radiant and baseboard heating would be installed. Water and sewer connection would be installed and would be available if needed in the future.

Mr. Irving described the Commission’s procedures for questions of fact and public comment.

Dr. Solet asked the location of handrails. Ms. Watkins answered that there would be railings at a ramp located next to the kiosk.

Mr. Kleespies asked how the building would be maintained. Ms. Watkins answered that the city would hire an operator who would be responsible for the kiosk and some of the plaza activities. Details would be worked out when the operator was selected. Mr. Kleespies asked for more information about the rooftop signs. Ms. Watkins said the digital signs would could advertise city events and provide an income stream to help maintain the kiosk and plaza activities.

Mr. Barry asked if the new “Harvard Square” signs on the north and south elevations would be in place of the original grilles. Mr. Touloukian replied in the affirmative. Dr. Solet asked if the sign panels would be centered on the walls. Mr. Touloukian indicated they would.

Carol O’Hare of 172 Magazine Street asked how many roof top signs were on the building and when they first appeared. Mr. Sullivan said they were there by the 1940s and originally said “MTA Rapid Transit 8 Minutes to Park St.” and later said “MBTA Rapid Transit to all Points.” He said he was originally opposed to the reintroduction of signs but had been convinced that if an income stream was needed then signs of the same size and location as the original would be appropriate. Ms. O’Hare asked how long the signs were in place and if they were illuminated. Mr. Sullivan said they were removed when the kiosk was dismantled in 1979 for subway construction. He did not know if they were illuminated. A member of the public offered that she remembered they were lit with red lights. Fred Myer said he remembered individual light bulbs.

Marilee Meyer of 10 Dana Street asked about the dimensions of the granite bench in the plaza, paving inside the kiosk, “Out of Town News” signs, west elevation, and patination of the copper. Ms. Watkins replied that the back of the seat wall would be 24-30 inches. A knee wall was not proposed for the west elevation. The “Out of Town News” signs would not be retained, the brick paving would carry through the inside of the kiosk, the red copper would patinate to green.

Michael Brandon of 27 Seven Pines Avenue asked if wired glass had been considered. Mr. Touloukian said it had been studied, but clear glass had been chosen for increased transparency. Mr. Brandon asked if three rooftop signs had ever been installed at the same time. Mr. Sullivan indicated that there had

always been three. Mr. Brandon asked about the budgeting and relationship to Eliot Street. Ms. Watkins said the capital project budget had appropriated funds for reconstruction of Eliot Street, the kiosk and the plaza. All together the budget was about \$12.5M. Mr. Brandon asked if the group had considered putting a toilet in the kiosk. Ms. Watkins said the building was too small to have toilets and still function for other activities. Mr. Brandon asked about the timeline for construction and the status of the lease. Ms. Watkins answered that the lease ran through July 31, 2019 with an option to extend. Construction would hopefully start within a few months. Phasing was being figured out. Access to the headhouse and elevator would be maintained throughout construction.

Suzanne Blier of 5 Fuller Place asked if anything precluded the knee wall on the west side, why wire glass was not selected, could the signs show historic images, could they live stream events, could landscaping like at Quincy Square be planted, could the seating be broken up into smaller units, could a water bottle filler be added to the plaza? Ms. Watkins said many things were feasible but not part of the proposal. It had been decided not to put a water filler in an urban plaza. The programming of the signs had not been decided yet. Mr. Touloukian said wired glass had originally been used for safety reasons, not aesthetic. Safety could now be achieved without wires and clear glass was selected for transparency. By not adding a knee wall on the west side, the space would be lighter and more flexible.

Fred Meyer of 83 Hammond Street asked if the study had considered going back to a watch tower design or didactic figural sculptures in the plaza. How would advertising revenue compare to tourism revenue? Why was 1928 the chosen historical time period rather than 1630, 1775, or 1828? Ms. Watkins answered that the Request for Information had been put out to potential operators. The financial discussions were ongoing. There had been a lot of interested in putting educational information in the kiosk but the plaza was intended to be kept open.

Ken Taylor of 23 Berkeley Street asked about the species of trees selected for the plaza. Bryan Jereb of Halverson Design said the six trees would be Marmo Maples. Were crosswalks in the scope? Ms. Watkins said the crosswalk on the Harvard Yard side would be replaced. The super crosswalk was being evaluated.

Janet Lee asked if there would be visual displays of information. Ms. Watkins indicated there would be such information inside the kiosk. Ms. Lee asked if it was possible for Out of Town News to retain some presence in the kiosk. Ms. Watkins said that had not been ruled out but would depend on the operator. Ms. Lee asked about the perimeter seating. Ms. Watkins said the seat wall would help define the space and provide protection. There would also be movable chairs and tables.

Ms. Meyer asked if the railing could be funky and designed by an artist. Ms. Watkins said the intent was to keep the railing minimal. One percent for art money was allocated for temporary art installations which could be potentially edgier than permanent art.

Denise Jillson asked if the Sheldon Cohen marker would be re-installed. Ms. Watkins said it

would go back in approximately the same location. A new memorial tree and marker would replace one previously planted for Marlene Methelis.

Mr. Irving opened the public comment period.

Peter Valentine of 37 Brookline Street remarked that Cambridge was the most important city in the country because George Washington took command of the military forces here. Newspapers and information needed to be available in the building. The colors should be bright like gold and yellow. This is the place where it happened.

Ali Sullo of 69 Walker Street commended the study process. She had hoped the mezzanine level of the subway station could be renovated also. The MBTA headhouse looked nice in the renderings but was not so good looking in reality. Could the city coordinate with the T to spruce things up? Ms. Watkins said they had communicated with the T but the headhouse was not on their upcoming project list. The new elevator would be glass and not wrapped with advertising.

Ms. Meyer questioned the contrasting paint colors. She spoke in favor of more landscaping, more green, because it would be too hot without it. What about plaza lighting? Advertising should be limited to the headhouse, not the kiosk. She lamented the lack of a knee wall on the west side. Glass doors would resemble a shopping mall café. Could the roof signs be smaller? The kiosk would look like a slick new building. It looked too gentrified. Too bright and shiny and stripped down.

Ms. Blier agreed. The plaza needed shade elements and more landscaping. If the operator wants a knee wall, it should be an option. The taxis should be removed to provide more room for landscaping. A water bottle refill station was important.

Ms. Lee suggested solar charging stations and translucent green umbrellas, like foliage.

Mr. Myer said historic exhibits under umbrellas rather than tables and chairs was a good idea. There should be statues representing historical figures and events. The space should explain what is unique about Cambridge and Harvard Square.

Ms. O'Hare said she liked taming signs because this was not Las Vegas or Times Square. Signs are a jumble and distract from the buildings. The harmony and visual music of Harvard Square was being overwhelmed by signs. The rooftop signs should not return to the kiosk. LED signs would be very bright. Animated signs would distract from the quality of the space.

Mr. Taylor said there had not been consensus in the working group about the rooftop signs but there was clear consensus about the importance of historical information. The signs would do injustice to the restoration of the kiosk. He suggested up-lighting the trees and bouncing downlights off light-colored paving to help illuminate the buildings. He suggested a light-colored paver for the crosswalks.

Mr. Brandon said the umbrellas should not have advertising on them. He spoke against the rooftop signs. There were other ways to get revenue.

Pebble Gifford of 15 Hilliard Street said the rooftop signs should not be put back. The history of

Cambridge should be better conveyed.

Ms. Jillson supported up-lighting in the trees but discouraged light-colored paving. She said the square footage of the advertising on the kiosk roof would be much smaller than what had been on the old elevator and tourism booth. The screens could live stream important events and public service announcements.

John DiGiovanni of 50 Church Street thanked Charles Sullivan, the Historical Commission and the City for saving the kiosk in the 1970s. The use of the kiosk should be public, not private. He hoped it would be a place for people to have Instagrammable moments and celebrate the Square.

Ms. Lee suggested inscriptions in the bricks with historical information, timeline or quotes. There could be a design in the pavement, like the maze on the Greenway.

Heather Hoffman of 213 Hurley Street said Harvard Square shouldn't look like Disney World or Cypress Gardens with their Kodak moment markers. She recalled being able to look at the whole world in the newsstand publications.

Mr. Irving closed the public comment period.

Dr. Solet said she loved trees but did not want leaf blowers in the plaza. The traffic lights and crosswalk lights were not properly timed and it was very dangerous.

Mr. Kleespies said he agreed with Mr. Sullivan that everyone loves Harvard Square the way it was when they first experienced it. He approved of keeping the Sheldon Cohen marker. The RFP should require historical content inside the building. He suggested replacing the taxi stand with food trucks.

Mr. Barry asked if sign details would come back to the Commission. Mr. Sullivan recommended approval in principle and to return with more info about size, motion, proportion, and broadcasting. Mr. Barry said that although they were inelegant signs, they did contribute to the interestingness of the Square. He said he had come around to seeing them as an integral part of the story of the kiosk.

Mr. Sheffield said the study and design processes were exceptional. He did not support the signs. Moving images could be distracting to motorists.

Mr. Irving agreed with Mr. Barry about the signs. They could be funky and a way to scuff up the jewel.

Mr. Sullivan provided background on the sign proposal. They started out as billboards on top of the kiosk, which he discouraged. Then signs integrated into the glazing were proposed but the technology for that was not perfected. It was not determined yet if the income stream from roof signs would be needed, but the City wanted an option. He recommended a Certificate of Appropriateness for the project, including approval in principle for the signs with the condition that they come back when more information was available. Ms. Watkins reported the City's Manager's directive that the kiosk operations be self-sustaining.

Dr. Solet moved to find that more information about the signs was needed before the Commission

could vote on the project. The motion was not seconded.

Mr. Sheffield moved to approve the kiosk and plaza designs with the exception of the roof signs. Dr. Solet seconded the motion. The motion failed 2-4 with Mr. Sheffield and Dr. Solet voting in favor and Mr. Irving, Ms. Tobin, Mr. Barry, and Mr. Kleespies voting opposed.

Mr. Kleespies moved to approve the application, as submitted, including approval in principle of the signs with the condition that the applicant return to the Commission with more detail about the signs at a later date. Mr. Barry seconded the motion which passed 4-2 (Irving, Tobin, Barry, Kleespies in favor and Solet, Sheffield opposed).

Case 4094: Byerly Hall, 8 Garden St., by President & Fellows of Harvard College, owner. Install an emergency generator.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides of the building in Radcliffe Yard. He noted the proposed location of the emergency generator behind the wall on Garden Street. It would be visible through an iron fence.

Fiona Imami of Radcliffe Facilities Management explained that the increase of severe storms and power failures had prompted the application. The emergency generator would power fire alarms, lighting and heating to prevent frozen pipes. The location was chosen after much thought about how to minimize the impact of the installation. The unit would be sunk 3.5 feet below sidewalk level. An exhaust stack with a 6-inch diameter was required 10 feet above the enclosure. Additional plantings would be added to screen the installation from public view. The exhaust stack would be painted the same color of the downspouts on the building.

Mr. Sheffield asked about the material of the exhaust stack. Ms. Imami said it would be painted steel.

Mr. Kleespies asked how Byerly Hall differed from other buildings on Radcliffe Yard. Was this the first such generator? Ms. Imami said there was an existing generator in Agassiz Hall that served several buildings. This new generator would fulfill the remaining need in Radcliffe Yard.

Dr. Solet noted that the noise level of the generator would exceed the projected 70db because of its location between two brick walls.

Mr. Barry said the stack was a long length of unsupported material. Ms. Imami clarified that there would be small angled brackets to support the stack.

There being no comments from the public, Mr. Irving closed the public comment period.

Mr. Kleespies moved to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness based on a finding that the proposed plantings would largely screen the generator and with the condition that the applicant make it as inconspicuous as possible. Ms. Tobin seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

Case 4095: 1991 Massachusetts Ave., by Oaktree 2013 Mass Ave LLC. Alter design of the 4th floor residential roof decks and associated fenestration of the new building.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and explained the case history. Construction was now underway after

years of court cases. The developer had come back with a request to change the 4th floor decks and related windows and doors. He described views of the affected areas of the building from Blake Street and Orchard Street.

Phil Terzis of Oaktree Development displayed the proposed changes to the design in a projected PDF document. The residential units were now being considered for sale rather than rental. The overall area of deck would remain the same, but the space would be redistributed to specific residential units. Partitions between private decks would be added. Doors out onto the decks would be relocated. He displayed a series of renderings of the approved/proposed views from several vantage points on the surrounding streets. He described the proposed materials including Trex decking for the partition walls.

Dr. Solet asked if they would increase acoustical remediation around the mechanical units because of the addition of partition walls. Mr. Terzis said Acentech was their acoustical consultant and they would follow their suggestions.

Mr. Kleespies said the partition walls would have an impact on the visual character of the building. He asked how tall they would be. Mr. Terzis answered that the walls would be approximately 5' tall.

Mr. Brandon of 27 Seven Pines Avenue asked if the Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC) had reviewed the proposed changes. Mr. Terzis said he had not yet reached out to the MHC. He said he would contact Paul Hotz at the MHC.

Mr. Irving opened the public comment period.

Mr. Brandon said the partition walls would create the impression of increased mass. The appearance would be less appealing. He asked why they were seeking a Certificate of Appropriateness rather than an amendment. He said the original certificate had lapsed, though the City Solicitor had instructed the board that there was good cause to allow the project to proceed.

Richard Clarey of Brookford Street said the views of the church building would be lost by the new building. The new building should never have been approved in the first place. He said the developers would never make a single concession and didn't budge.

Mr. Sullivan said the application was advertised with a new case number because the original case had been approved a long time ago. He said it was his opinion that the effects of the changes were inconsequential and not incongruous.

Mr. Barry moved to approve the application, as submitted with the finding that the changes were inconsequential and not inappropriate. Mr. Sheffield seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

Public Hearings: Demolition Review / Landmark Designation Proceedings

Case D-1524: 68 Spring St., by David Appleby. Remove and reconstruct gable roof and ell of house (1844).

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and described the architecture and history of the 1844 Greek Revival house. He described later alterations to the building including barge board (date unknown), shingled walls

(1937), and aluminum siding (1973). He explained that the house originally had a portico across the front. He showed slides of two similar buildings nearby on Thorndike Street. He summarized the history of owners and residents of the house. He recommended the Commission find the house significant for the reasons described in the staff report.

Mr. Irving explained the two-part demolition review process and said the question of significance would be considered first, before hearing about the proposed design. There being no questions or comments on significance, he closed the public comment period on that topic.

Dr. Solet moved to find the house significant as defined in the ordinance and for the reasons given in the staff report. Mr. Kleespies seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

Mr. Irving asked the applicants to present their design proposal for the project.

Tobin Shulman, the architect, projected a PDF of the plans and elevations for the project. He explained that the ell would be removed and reconstructed. A deck would be constructed at the rear. The roof would be raised a little to achieve more head height on the third floor. He said the existing stair was very dangerous and would be rebuilt. On the outside, the entablature and corner boards would be restored, as well as flush boarding in the gable end. The barge board would be removed and clapboards installed on the walls below. Appropriate trim would be added around the doors and windows. New window openings would be added on the left (east) side, but not on the existing non-conforming right (west) side wall. Similar detailing would be used on the back of the building, except the pilasters would not be as heavy.

Mr. Sheffield asked how much the roof would be raised. Mr. Shulman answered that it would be raised 2' 9". Mr. Sheffield asked if the new ell needed zoning relief. Mr. Shulman said it did not, but the new roof did because of the existing non-conforming setback on the right (west) side.

Dr. Solet asked if they had investigated what was existing under the siding and weren't they excited about it. Mr. Shulman said they were eager to find out, but that he was not optimistic about finding anything in good condition. Dr. Solet asked about the proposed new windows and original transom. Mr. Shulman described the Simulated Divided Light clad double-hung windows. The transom lights were not original, but he would check again to be sure. Dr. Solet asked why the dormers were not the same on east and west sides. Mr. Shulman said the shallow shed dormer on the west side was set far back and its purpose was to give height to the stair. The more visible east side would have small one-window wide dormers appropriate to the style of the house.

Maria Saccoccio of 55 Otis Street asked if the entire roof would be removed in order to raise it. Mr. Shulman replied in the affirmative. Ms. Saccoccio noted that the prior owner had told her that the wind shear from the taller building next door was terrible and that snow builds up in the narrow space between the two houses.

Beaver Spooner of Walden Street asked the distance between the buildings and their relative age. Mr. Shulman answered 1.9 feet and #68 was older.

Mr. Irving opened the public comment period.

Betty Saccoccio of Otis Street said the house would lose integrity with a new roof line and dormers. She noted that she did like the proposed changes to the windows.

Mr. Brandon asked about the dimensions of the lot and the dimensions of the house. Mr. Shulman provided the dimensions including the proposed new height of 32' 3" and the width of 20' 6".

Marie Saccoccio said she was concerned about raising the roof and adding dormers.

Heather Hoffman of Hurley Street said it would likely be visible from Hurley Street. She commented that most of the changes at the rear of the building were improvements.

Mr. Sheffield said the transformation of the house was admirable. He commended the sensitivity of the design. He noted that the top of the second-floor windows, which now meet the entablature, would be changed by lifting the roof. He suggested that the corner boards of the ell be simplified and not have capitals so that the prominence of the main block of the house would be maintained. He recommended squaring off the entry stairs and making the west wall fire rated to one hour. He recommended that the jog between the ell and the main block be at minimum the width of the pilaster so that it could be fully seen.

Mr. Irving and Mr. Barry both agreed with those recommendations.

Dr. Solet asked about paint color. Mr. Shulman said they hadn't discussed it yet but that he was familiar with the Commission's book on that topic.

Dr. Solet moved to find the existing ell and roof not preferably preserved within the context of the proposed partial demolition, construction, and improvements. Mr. Barry seconded the motion, which passed 6-0.

Demolition Delay Ordinance

Mr. Sullivan introduced the discussion explaining that Steve Bardige, Heddi Siebel, and Alexander von Hoffman, all of Stearns Street, had approached the staff recently about the idea of extending the length of the demolition delay in the Cambridge ordinance.

Mr. Bardige explained that the neighborhood experience with the 60 Stearns Street demolition application and a couple of others nearby caused them to reflect on the effectiveness of the ordinance for neighborhoods like theirs, which were largely made of small vernacular houses that were unlikely to rise to the level of landmark significance. He said he believed the intent of the demolition delay was to slow things down enough to consider options other than demolition but the hot housing market in Cambridge made it likely that developers would just build the six-month delay into their project timeline and be unconvinced to change their projects in substantial ways. He said they had met with seven city councilors who had given favorable feedback on the idea of increasing the delay period to twelve months. He asked the Commission for its advice and support. A citizens' petition to the Council had a timeline built into it for action, according to the City Clerk.

Heddi Siebel said the staff had provided data in the form of the demolition case log. She had

studied that data and found that between 1996 and 2001 there was an average demolition of 1.5 houses per year but in the last five years, the average had jumped to 8.5 houses per year.

Alexander von Hoffman explained that large new luxury housing was replacing small old houses but the number of units did not very often increase, resulting in the same number of units but for a much increased selling price. Extending the demolition delay would not solve all the problems, but it would provide the Historical Commission with a stronger tool. He asked for feedback from the Commission.

Dr. Solet asked about the length of the delay in other towns. Mr. von Hoffman said that Arlington and Newton both had a twelve-month delay.

Mr. Kleespies said the graphics in the presentation were good. A map of neighboring towns with their delay periods noted would be helpful. The increased rate of demolition per year could be presented graphically. What was the percentage change in demolition after the delay period, then and now? He cautioned that the proposal could be seen as a counter to the Affordable Overlay proposal. He also cautioned that increasing the delay might not change the rate of demolition but increase the sales prices even further if developers build in the carrying costs.

Mr. Irving suggested finding a turncoat developer in another town that could explain the economic calculations used to determine feasibility of a project with a delay period.

Mr. Sheffield questioned how much was being driven by developers vs. the end users of the new homes.

Dr. Solet asked if there was a march planned on the topic of demolition. Mr. von Hoffman said there was a walking tour in their neighborhood planned as this year's Cambridge Janes Walk. He explained the history of Janes Walks, named in honor of Jane Jacobs.

Mr. Sullivan provided a history of the demolition delay ordinance, Cambridge having been the first to pass such an ordinance in the state. He said he would like a chance to look over the ordinance and decide if there were other possible amendments to proposed.

Mr. Barry said the definition of demolition might be an area of the ordinance that could be improved.

Dr. Solet asked how the staff and Commission work load might be impacted by a longer delay. Would applicants return over and over during the longer period?

The proponents agreed to continue the discussion with staff and the Commission before filing their petition.

Minutes

Mr. Kleespies moved to approve the April 4 minutes as submitted. Mr. Barry seconded the motion, which passed 4-0. Dr. Solet and Ms. Tobin abstained from voting since they had not been present.

Director's Report

Mr. Sullivan said he had no additions to his written report.

Mr. Kleespies moved to adjourn. Mr. Irving seconded, and the motion passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 10:33 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah L. Burks
Preservation Planner

**Members of the Public
Who Signed the Attendance List on May 2, 2019**

Kathy Watkins	Department of Public Works
Phil Terzis	Acorn Holdings, Newton 02458
Ted Touloukian	Touloukian & Touloukian, Boston 02110
Peter Valentine	37 Brookline St
David DeCelis	226 Windsor St
Peter Torpey	2 Forest St. #5
Peter Kroon	16 Linnaean St
Cynthia Smith	37 Crescent St
Bryan Jereb	339 D St, Boston, 02127
Grisnette Colon	91 Perkins St, Somerville 02145
Jared Ransdell	356 K St, S. Boston, 02127
Janet Lee	31 Kingston St, Somerville 02144
Marilee Meyer	10 Dana St
Suzanne Blier	5 Fuller Pl
Ali Sullo	69 Walker St
Fred Meyer	83 Hammond St
Kenneth Taylor	23 Berkeley St
Mark Verkennis	1350 Massachusetts Ave
Fiona Imami	79 Brattle St
Michael Brandon	27 Seven Pines Ave
Dick Clarey	15 Brookford St
Beaver Spooner	329 Walden St
Charles Fineman	75 Winter St
John Hawkinson	jhawk@alum.mit.edu
John DiGiovanni	50 Church St
Denise Jillson	2 Brattle Sq
Marie Saccoccio	55 Otis St
Carol O'Hare	172 Magazine St
Betty Saccoccio	55 Otis St
Alexander von Hoffman,	43 Stearns St
Heddi Siebel	41 Stearns St
Steve Bardige	55 Stearns St

Note: Town is Cambridge, unless otherwise indicated.