

In The Matter Of:

BROOKLINE ZONING BOARD APPEALS HEARING

HEARING - Vol. 4

March 26, 2014

MERRILL CORPORATION

Legalink, Inc.

101 Arch Street
3rd Floor
Boston, MA 02110
Phone: 617.542.0039
Fax: 617.542.2119

Brookline Zoning Board Appeals Hearing

Case Number 20130094

40B Application by Chestnut Hill Realty

The Residences of South Brookline

March 26, 2014 at 7:00 p.m.

Office of Town Counsel

333 Washington Street, 6th floor

Brookline, Massachusetts 02445

Merrill Corporation LegaLink, Inc.

179 Lincoln Street, Suite 401

Boston, Massachusetts 02111

(617) 542-0039 Fax (617) 542-2119

Reporter: Kristen C. Krakofsky

Page 2	Page 4
<p>1 Appearances 2 Board Members 3 Jessie Geller, Chairman 4 Jonathan Book 5 Chris Hussey 6 Mark Zuroff, Associate Member 7 Avi Liss, Associate Member 8 9 Samuel Nagler, Esquire, Krokidas & Bluestein 10 Edith M. Netter, Esquire, 11 Edith M. Netter & Associates, P.C. 12 Alison Steinfeld, 13 Planning & Community Development Director 14 Steven Schwartz, Esquire, Goulston & Storrs 15 Kien Ho, BETA Group 16 Robert Michaud, P.E., 17 MDM Transportation Consultants, Inc. 18 19 20 21 22 23 24</p>	<p>1 Other administrative details? Am I forgetting 2 anything? Ms. Steinfeld? 3 MS. STEINFELD: No. You're fine. 4 MR. GELLER: Okay. One last reminder -- I'm 5 not totally fine -- one last reminder. Our next 6 hearing is April 10th at 7:00, same place. That will 7 be a hearing that is dedicated to review of stormwater 8 and drainage issues. 9 Okay. Let's commence with peer review. 10 MR. HO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For the 11 record, my name is Kien Ho with BETA Group. We're the 12 traffic consultant for the Town of Brookline. 13 And if I may, Mr. Chairman, what I'd like to 14 do is, before I actually get into my presentation, I'd 15 like to spend a minute just to explain to the board 16 members and particularly the audience today what is a 17 peer review, because I think it's important to 18 understand what is our role as a peer reviewer for the 19 Town of Brookline. 20 MR. GELLER: I assume you'll be drawing a 21 distinction with a pure consultant? 22 MR. HO: Yes. 23 What is a peer reviewer? A reviewer is not an 24 independent study. It is an independent review by</p>
Page 3	Page 5
<p>1 PROCEEDINGS 2 7:03 p.m. 3 MR. GELLER: Good evening, everyone. This is 4 a continuation of our hearing on 40B involving the 5 Residences of South Brookline. As you may recall, at 6 the last hearing we heard testimony from the various 7 boards and town departments. Tonight is going to be 8 dedicated exclusively to a review of traffic and 9 transportation issues, and we have a peer reviewer here 10 to assist us in this task. 11 My name again, for anyone who may have 12 forgotten it, is Jessie Geller, to my left is 13 Christopher Hussey, my further left is Jonathan Book, 14 and at the end is Avi Liss. To my right is Mark 15 Zuroff, and our legal counsel, Sam Nagler, is to my far 16 right. 17 Tonight's hearing is being tape recorded and 18 videotaped for public record. If you are speaking 19 tonight, I would ask that you start by giving us your 20 name and your professional address and speak loudly and 21 clearly. Given the focus of this evening's hearing, 22 you should anticipate that at one or more times you may 23 be interrupted and we may have good, bad, or 24 indifferent questions for you.</p>	<p>1 registered professional engineers. I think it's 2 important to indicate that, you know, we are -- I am a 3 registered professional engineer and I think mainly 4 because any recommendations that we've provided -- I am 5 held accountable because I'm a registered professional 6 engineer. And my job doesn't end when the permitting 7 process is completed. Any recommendations, any design 8 that we recommended, I am ultimately held accountable. 9 Now, what is a good traffic report? My role 10 is to ensure that the interest of the Town in terms of 11 if the proponent has provided a good traffic report or 12 if the report is being done professionally according to 13 industry standards and guidelines. 14 What's that? What's the industry standard? 15 What's that all mean? 16 It all has to do with basically what I've 17 listed here. There are four basic entities that we 18 have to make sure that the traffic study conforms to. 19 The Institute of Transportation Engineers is an 20 organization which is recognized by the federal highway 21 government where a lot of -- where all the traffic 22 engineers refer to the ITE, whether it's the trip 23 generation book or whether it's the -- you know, 24 related to parking generation. So every traffic</p>

Page 6

1 engineer uses that as the guideline.
 2 The Federal Highway Administration -- any
 3 design that we will recommend or any design that the
 4 proponent, the applicant, is recommending has to
 5 conform to the MUTCD, which is the Manual of Uniform
 6 Traffic Control Devices which has been put out by
 7 Federal Highway. So that's another standard that we
 8 have to conform to.
 9 Certainly the State of Massachusetts, MassDOT,
 10 there are guidelines of the state that has
 11 specifically -- you know, demonstrate as to how the
 12 traffic study should be conducted, so we want to make
 13 sure that the study is being done according to the
 14 state guidelines.
 15 Locally, the Town of Brookline, there are
 16 rules and regulations that we have to make sure that,
 17 you know, the study is being conformed to. For
 18 example, whether there is street signage or parking,
 19 you know, related to zoning, which I will talk a little
 20 bit about later on, the adequacy of parking for this
 21 project.
 22 So other than conformance to all the
 23 standards, what do we look for specifically in our
 24 review?

Page 7

1 Here are basically six components that we will
 2 look into specifically:
 3 The study area: You know, the adequacy of the
 4 area that we will look into to make sure that there
 5 aren't other streets within the study area that's being
 6 overlooked by the applicant.
 7 Data collection: The time of the day when
 8 data is collected. It's very important. We want to
 9 make sure that data is not collected when there is a
 10 school vacation period. So it has to be done at the
 11 right time.
 12 Analysis methodology: In all the design
 13 guidelines and standards, there's a specific software
 14 that's been approved that the applicant has to use, and
 15 that's called Syncro Software Analysis. We want to
 16 make sure that the proponent is using that software.
 17 In addition, we want to make sure that there
 18 are many ways to input the data and to integrate the
 19 analysis results. So we want to make sure that all
 20 that is done properly and according to, you know,
 21 industry standards and guidelines.
 22 Once you have completed the study, the
 23 results, which indicate the level of impact
 24 associated -- you know, because of this project, the

Page 8

1 roadway system intersection, we want to make sure the
 2 proponent has adequately addressed and mitigated the
 3 impact associated with the project.
 4 And finally, the site plan, the overall layout
 5 in terms of traffic circulation, pedestrian movement,
 6 safety of vehicles, you know, especially emergency
 7 vehicle access in and out to the site. So essentially,
 8 those are the components that we will look into as part
 9 of our review.
 10 With that, I'm just going to start with the
 11 study area. Showing here is the project site and
 12 throughout my presentation the orientation of -- you
 13 know, my slide's going to be consistent with this slide
 14 right here and this is Independence Drive. As, you
 15 know, my presentation -- what I'll do is I'll refer to
 16 Independence Drive as north and southbound and I'll be
 17 consistent with that. VFW Parkway is over here, and
 18 heading north, which is not shown on the map, you head
 19 towards Grove Street. Independence turns to Grove, and
 20 Beverly is over here. So that's the orientation
 21 throughout my presentation.
 22 What the proponent has done is -- shown here
 23 are the intersections. There are approximately, you
 24 know, eight intersections which the proponent has

Page 9

1 included in this study starting from Sherman Road,
 2 Independence, all the way heading up to -- this is the
 3 intersection of Beverly and Independence, and showing
 4 here, that's outside which -- you know, the map,
 5 unfortunately, is out of this -- it's the South Street
 6 and Independence Drive intersection. Over here is the
 7 intersections of Russett Road and Asheville and South
 8 Street and Asheville Road. So those are the eight
 9 intersections.
 10 The little dotted or broken circle lines,
 11 those are the two intersections which is the proposed
 12 site drive curb cut. That's right here, which is on
 13 the West Brookline side, and at the other drive, which
 14 is on the east.
 15 So overall, those are the eight intersections
 16 where the proponent has collected traffic counts in
 17 early April of 2012 and they were collected during the
 18 peak hours, which is in the morning between 7:00 and
 19 9:00 a.m. and the evening peak commuting hours is
 20 between hours 4:00 and 6:00 p.m.
 21 What they have also done is they have used
 22 some old data along Independence Drive which is dated
 23 2007. What we have indicated to the applicant is that
 24 the 2007 48-hour counts, which they have provided --

Page 10

1 actually, it looked at the 24-hour volume at that
 2 location, which is a little outdated. We request that
 3 the proponent should collect new data along
 4 Independence drive.
 5 And in addition to the new data, we have
 6 suggested that they should also collect speed data
 7 because speed data was not provided as part of the
 8 analysis. Mainly it has to do with -- because
 9 Independence Drive is a four-lane roadway which is over
 10 50 feet wide and in certain areas actually even wider,
 11 which is 55 feet. I'll talk a little more about
 12 Independence Drive later on as part of the mitigation.
 13 In addition to traffic count, what they have
 14 done is also they've looked at the accident analysis of
 15 each intersection. What they have done is they've used
 16 MassDOT data, and a lot of times with MassDOT accident
 17 data -- because a lot of times they get the data from
 18 the Town, the police department, and then somehow they
 19 would input that data in their data system.
 20 Our experience is that during the data, you
 21 know, transition from the Town to that data system, a
 22 lot of the accident data sometimes could be missed. So
 23 what we have requested of the proponent is that in
 24 addition to the data that they have looked at from

Page 11

1 MassDOT, they should also, you know, obtain data from
 2 the local police department to make sure that there
 3 aren't any data that they may have missed at these
 4 locations.
 5 I think what's important is that the
 6 proponent, which has not looked at -- which I will
 7 actually spend a little more time on later on as part
 8 of the mitigation -- is these streets right here that
 9 are shown in read circles. Again, I will talk a little
 10 more about this later on as part of the mitigation.
 11 For example, at Russett Road, Bonad Road, South Street,
 12 Beverly, and at this corner right here we want the
 13 proponent to look at pedestrian safety connection
 14 because the Baker School is right here. And certainly,
 15 you know, the critical intersection, which is outside
 16 of Brookline, the intersection of VFW and Independence
 17 Drive, which is in Boston.
 18 So these are the locations that, in addition
 19 to what they have, you know, we would want them to, you
 20 know, give us some information as to what, if anything,
 21 that needs to be done or its impact associated with the
 22 proposed project.
 23 Once the data is collected, typically the next
 24 step is to do the traffic analysis. Before I get into

Page 12

1 the trip distribution table right here, I just wanted
 2 to spend a little time on the analysis component of it.
 3 So based on the data, the proponent has
 4 generated a trip generation for the project. As part
 5 of the trip generation, it indicated that what they
 6 have done is -- during the morning peak hour there will
 7 be approximately 100 new trips because of this new
 8 project. And this is within the one peak hour in the
 9 morning, somewhere between 7:30 and 8:30 a.m. when a
 10 lot of the folks are heading out to work.
 11 During the evening peak hour, folks returning
 12 home, there's a total of over 120 trips added -- new
 13 trips added to the roadway system. So that's part of
 14 the trip generation.
 15 On a given day, the estimated total number of
 16 trips added to the system is approximately 1,200
 17 vehicles per day. So those are the trip generations
 18 that the proponent has generated.
 19 The concern that we have is, you know, once
 20 they have estimated the number of new trips that are
 21 going to be generated because of this project, it's
 22 where they're coming from, these new trips, and where
 23 they're going do. And I've shown here, which is a map
 24 of the project area, and the trip distribution is

Page 13

1 essentially telling us, you know, the percentage of
 2 people, where they're, you know, going to and from the
 3 site and to where they're going, whether it's work or,
 4 you know, any trips that they're making.
 5 So in the traffic report, the only information
 6 that was given under the trip distribution -- I'll
 7 start at the bottom -- is they're telling us that
 8 approximately 35 percent of the trip, you know,
 9 originated -- you know, going to and from the VFW
 10 Parkway and approximately 55 percent actually, you
 11 know, heading north and south towards Grove Street, and
 12 then the remaining 5 percent is South Street, and the
 13 last 5 percent is Beverly Road.
 14 The information which is very important to us
 15 as we look at where the folks are coming from and going
 16 to, that's missing which -- what's not clear is this
 17 segment right here which we think, you know, there's
 18 going to be a lot of folks, especially with the large
 19 complex, Building 13 that's located over here, that
 20 there isn't any information as to, you know, how much
 21 of that traffic is going to be coming in and out of
 22 Asheville which could potentially, you know, most
 23 likely go through the neighborhood. That's shown right
 24 here.

Page 14

1 So what we would like to do is we have asked
 2 the applicant that they should provide us with that
 3 information so we can have a clear understanding of
 4 what the potential impact is within this area.
 5 The next thing which I would like to do is, I
 6 just want to talk a little about the traffic analysis
 7 result and then I'll get into the mitigation concerns
 8 that we have.
 9 The analysis results right now -- what the
 10 proponent has shown is there aren't any major issues
 11 with intersection operation based on -- as a result of
 12 this project. We would like the proponent to relook at
 13 or reanalyze some of the intersections, especially with
 14 the new data that they will be collecting so we can
 15 compare it and especially with more information on
 16 where the trips are coming from, especially in the
 17 eastern section of the development because I think
 18 those information will give us a better understanding
 19 of the overall traffic analysis result and its
 20 associated impact because of this project.
 21 But in any case, what I'd like to do is
 22 just -- based on what was provided to us, I just wanted
 23 to point out and discuss the concern that we have, what
 24 was given as part of the mitigation in the report at

Page 15

1 this point in time.
 2 Shown here -- basically what I have shown is,
 3 you know, there are numerous residential streets which
 4 were not mentioned in the mitigation. The concern that
 5 we have is, we think there's going to be a large
 6 percentage of vehicle trips that are going to use
 7 Asheville right here into this neighborhood where
 8 they'll cut through, you know, whatever they need to
 9 get to. So I think Beverly, Bonad, Russett, South
 10 Street, Asheville, I think all those streets need to be
 11 looked into to see if there's any potential impact,
 12 whether it's in the future especially. People are
 13 going to use those as a cut-through street.
 14 If it's anything else, also, you know, with
 15 the Baker School right here, some sort of a pedestrian
 16 safety connectivity. It think that's going to be some
 17 benefit to the pedestrian activity in that area.
 18 The mitigation that the proponent has proposed
 19 essentially, which I'm just going to point out very
 20 quickly and summarize, is they have proposed as off
 21 site, and which is shown right here, the intersection
 22 of Asheville and Russett, they're proposing that there
 23 should be a four-way stop condition. The proponent did
 24 not provide any four-way stop analysis.

Page 16

1 Typically, we would like to see the warrant
 2 analysis to make sure that when you're putting an
 3 all-way stop, you're not creating a condition that's
 4 essentially unsafe. Areas where an intersection -- in
 5 our experience, if you're providing a four-way stop,
 6 you could create more accidents because what's going to
 7 happen is, you know, people realize that 50 percent of
 8 the time or more they go through the intersection and
 9 that there's no one on the side street. They'll end up
 10 just blowing through the stop sign or they're just
 11 going to do a rolling stop, which potentially could
 12 create a lot of accidents.
 13 There are other improvements that the
 14 proponent has proposed, especially the connection of
 15 the roadway to the site, which is Asheville. Currently
 16 the roadway width is very narrow, which is only 18
 17 feet. The proponent did recommend that it will be
 18 widened to 22 feet, which is wider than what's out
 19 there.
 20 Our recommendation is that, you know, the 22
 21 is still narrow. I think it should be 24 feet mainly
 22 because, you know, you consider the vertical alignment
 23 and the horizontal alignment within that section of the
 24 roadways, especially, you know, a larger truck,

Page 17

1 emergency vehicle having to negotiate as they, you
 2 know, access in and out of the site.
 3 You know there are other sidewalk improvements
 4 which they have suggested within the site -- again this
 5 is just within the site -- and they also recommended
 6 some improvement at their new curb cut: site drive,
 7 stop signs, some streetscaping, tree plantings, and
 8 whatnot.
 9 They did mention a little about TDM. What is
 10 TDM? Transportation Demand Management. What that
 11 means is, you know, ways to encourage folks so that
 12 they don't drive the car such as -- currently there's a
 13 shuttle bus at, you know, Hancock Village that takes
 14 folks to the train station. We would like to recommend
 15 that, you know, those shuttle services be increased
 16 because you're going to be adding a lot more, you know,
 17 folks at the site.
 18 In addition, the two Zipcars currently that
 19 they provide, we recommend that they should also
 20 increase that to encourage folks that live in the area
 21 so that they don't have to drive, so that they could
 22 take the shuttle and use the transit.
 23 So I think, essentially, those were the
 24 mitigations that they have recommended. So what we

Page 18

1 would like to see is, additional mitigation should be
 2 considered.

3 For example, as I have indicated earlier on,
 4 Independence Drive. You know, the old data indicated
 5 that there's approximately 14,000 cars that go through
 6 that roadway, and it's a four-lane roadway. As to
 7 comparison as to -- you know, so people know what that
 8 14,000 cars is -- and if you're familiar with Route 16
 9 in Wellesley, that goes through Wellesley, Route 16,
 10 which is essentially a two-lane roadway, and that
 11 roadway serves approximately 16,000 to 20,000 cars per
 12 day depending on which section of Route 16, from Newton
 13 all the way to, you know, Wellesley Square. So that
 14 section of roadway is two lanes, and in this case it's
 15 14,000 and it's four lanes.

16 So what we would like the applicant to look
 17 into is, you know, do we really need the four-lanes?
 18 Can this section of the roadway be designed so that --
 19 what we call the term is a "complete street." What
 20 that means is we want to make sure that that roadway
 21 can accommodate vehicle volume, safe bicycle, you know,
 22 accommodation, safe pedestrian crossing at this
 23 intersection right here.

24 And I'll give you an example. The crosswalk

Page 19

1 at the intersection of Sherman and Independence, that's
 2 approximately 55 feet. That's a long crosswalk. So by
 3 reducing the width of the roadway, the four lane is
 4 really not needed. So you're reducing the crosswalk
 5 distance, and you're providing a safer crossing.

6 What we also would like the proponent to look
 7 at is the intersection of Sherman and Independence. I
 8 have tried to drive from, you know, one end of the site
 9 drive to the other side and it is very, very difficult
 10 to cross and find an adequate gap. So we would like
 11 the proponent to look to see if that intersection
 12 warrants some kind of a traffic single, whether it's a
 13 vehicle control or a pedestrian control, just to
 14 provide added safety to, you know, the intersection.

15 Certainly other intersections also to look
 16 into is -- you know, if that intersection does warrant
 17 some kind of a signal, can that be coordinated with the
 18 signal at Beverly or at South Street or maybe even at,
 19 you know, the intersection in Boston, the VFW
 20 Parkway -- that's over here -- so that they would all
 21 synchronize and talk to one another.

22 So I think those are some of the mitigations
 23 that we would like the proponent to consider, whether
 24 it's within the site and also, you know, surrounding

Page 20

1 the neighborhood adjacent to the site.

2 I just want to talk a little about parking
 3 associated with this project. What we have looked at
 4 is we did, you know, a quick estimate as to -- we did a
 5 comparison as shown here in this chart. Very simple.
 6 You know, we have proposed approximately 192 units.
 7 The proposed -- which is based on a rate of 1.4 and the
 8 number of parking spaces that they're providing is 342.

9 If we go with the zoning that's required in
 10 Brookline, what I'm showing here is 2.0, 2.3. The 2.0
 11 is really -- you know, essentially it's a one- to
 12 two-bedroom on the 2.0 rate. If it's a three-bedroom,
 13 a four-bedroom, then 2.3. So based on that
 14 information, we would come up with a total number of
 15 parking spaces, 360.

16 We have some concern with the 1.4 rates. It
 17 is unclear exactly how that rate is derived. The
 18 report did identify some observations which they have
 19 done based on existing condition of the site, and that
 20 is in April of last year. That made some observation
 21 as to, you know, what is the capacity of the occupancy
 22 of those parking lots. I think, based on that study,
 23 they indicated that currently I think it's 1.3 rates.
 24 So as a result, you know, if they could provide 342 and

Page 21

1 so that gives you a rate of 1.4 and that appears to be
 2 adequate.

3 The concern that we have is the 1.4 rate is --
 4 you know, if they could clarify exactly how they
 5 derived that rate. And also the concern that we have
 6 is the observation that they have done because, you
 7 know, I have driven the site, you know, like about 7:30
 8 or so and, you know, it's essentially at capacity.
 9 That's what you have at the existing site. So we're
 10 concerned that, you know, the 1.4 rate is, you know,
 11 maybe misleading.

12 The other concern that we have has to do
 13 with -- if you look at the 1.4 rate and the 342 spaces,
 14 it's okay if the development is one cluster. You know,
 15 if they're all in, like, one area.

16 But in this case, they're actually scattered,
 17 some over here and some over on this side. So if you
 18 look at the information that was provided to us,
 19 especially at Building 19, there are 116 units and
 20 there are about 146 spaces. So if you take that ratio,
 21 you're actually, you know, approximately like 1.25 rate
 22 I think. So while you may be 1.4 and 342 spaces, your
 23 parking spaces are actually scattered, you know,
 24 throughout the site. The report did indicate that

Page 22

1 Building 19 would have to share, you know, some of the
 2 parking spaces that's shown here at this location. So
 3 we do have some concern with parking that's being
 4 generated for the study.
 5 MR. BOOK: Excuse me. I'm just having
 6 trouble understanding the relationship between the
 7 rates and the number of spaces. For example, if the
 8 proposed is 1.4 spaces per unit -- is that what it is?
 9 1.4 spaces per unit?
 10 MR. HO: That's my understanding, yes.
 11 MR. BOOK: So 1.4 spaces at 192 units is what,
 12 268?
 13 MR. HUSSEY: 1.78. Actually, it appears in
 14 the MDM report, as well, as 1.4.
 15 MR. HO: Right.
 16 MR. HUSSEY: If you take the numbers, the 342
 17 parking spaces, divide it by 192, you get 1.78.
 18 MR. LISS: 1.4 times 192 is 268.8.
 19 MR. HO: Like I said, we questioned the 1.4.
 20 You know, why 1.4 it says in your report. And then if
 21 you look at the graph that was given to us, I think
 22 it's this one here, it shows 1.78.
 23 MR. LISS: So it could very well be a typo.
 24 MR. HO: It could be.

Page 23

1 MR. BOOK: And the same -- the numbers don't
 2 work out in what's stated as what's required under the
 3 Brookline zoning, two spaces for 192 units is 360.
 4 MR. HO: I didn't get into the detail. I know
 5 this is something that we had worked out with some of
 6 the folks here with me today. And the zoning also
 7 takes into consideration, you know, the affordable and
 8 then the market rate. So those are the fine details
 9 that we tried to, you know, compensate for. For
 10 example, the affordable units, we used the 2.0 or the
 11 one car per -- so we took all that into consideration,
 12 so fine detail calculations. So based on that, all
 13 said and done, you know, the magic number was 360.
 14 MR. BOOK: Thank you.
 15 MR. HO: I do want to spend a little time
 16 regarding the site plan. We do have a lot of concern
 17 associated with the layout of the site. I think I have
 18 mentioned earlier on -- I'll start with Asheville Road
 19 right here -- the proponent is proposing a 22-foot, you
 20 know, widening. We think it should be 24 feet.
 21 And the other concern that we have is the
 22 steep grade that is over this area right here. And
 23 based on the plan that, you know, we have, we have at
 24 least about 10 percent grade. And 10 percent is the

Page 24

1 max the design would allow. We would like to, you
 2 know, understand a little better on -- while this is 10
 3 percent, if you're going straight, it's okay, but then
 4 you also have a lot of other side streets that you have
 5 to connect to, and more so you have to connect to
 6 Building 19 via garage, you know, at both the upper and
 7 the lower level right here.
 8 So when you have a very steep grade, you have
 9 a vertical alignment and then you have also potentially
 10 some site line issues that we would have going in and
 11 out of the garage.
 12 And not knowing the detail of the design,
 13 because a lot of the design is still on a conceptual
 14 level, as we all know the site right here, this entire
 15 site on Building 13, if you go up and observe it, you
 16 know, there is a lot of ledge and it's kind of like up
 17 in the hill. So there has to be a lot of ledge that
 18 needs to be removed to physically make this site
 19 buildable. So those are some of our concerns related
 20 to the grading itself.
 21 We have also some concern with the emergency
 22 vehicle turnaround at some of the hammerhead areas. I
 23 know in this case, I believe the assumption is that
 24 while it's shown as a roundabout, that you could

Page 25

1 actually drive over this circle right here. So I think
 2 this is just one of the few areas that we have some
 3 concern with, you know, the hammerhead design.
 4 I understand the proponent has done some
 5 AutoTURN analysis. So what that is is a computer
 6 software where it actually shows the turning path of an
 7 emergency vehicle or any truck that you would like to
 8 see, whether it's a 18-wheeler, it's a moving company
 9 that comes to the site.
 10 So we have requested that the proponent
 11 provide us with that information. And I believe
 12 recently, you know, they have done some analysis, so we
 13 will review that AutoTURN analysis as it relates to the
 14 hammerhead design for the site traffic circulation.
 15 Not mentioned here is you want to make sure
 16 that pedestrian connection -- I know the proponent has
 17 identified some additional sidewalk, so we want to make
 18 sure that the proper crossing location -- you know,
 19 those are the details that need to be shown mainly
 20 because of the vertical alignment of the steep
 21 roadway. You know, sometimes placing location of the
 22 crosswalk and pedestrian safety, those are very, very
 23 important.
 24 This is another hammerhead design we would

Page 26

1 like some AutoTURN analysis to look into to make sure
 2 that they are functional from an emergency vehicle
 3 standpoint.
 4 Finally, what I'd like to do is touch a little
 5 on the construction traffic aspect of it, which the
 6 truck study did not mention. I think a lot has to do
 7 with -- our biggest concern is Building 19, the site
 8 right here. Certainly, other sites, you know, there
 9 will be, you know, contractors, delivery truck traffic
 10 going to be generated. We would like to know where,
 11 you know, they'll be going to and from.
 12 And especially this site right here which is
 13 consistent with a lot of ledge. We know the proponent
 14 would have to clear a lot of ledge. And I know our
 15 site reviewer took a quick look at this site right
 16 here. We seem to think that approximately 20,000 tons
 17 of ledge might have to be moved to make this
 18 buildable. Again, that's information based on what we
 19 have. And so that equated to a lot of trucks that have
 20 to haul out ledge. And we would like to know how those
 21 trucks, you know, would be handled as to how they would
 22 get to where they need to get to to unload that ledge.
 23 And certainly delivery trucks, you know, contractors'
 24 vehicles.

Page 27

1 So I think construction traffic is also our
 2 concern in terms of, you know, how this project is
 3 going to be constructed and how the neighborhood in the
 4 area, including Independence Drive, will be impacted in
 5 the future.
 6 So in summary, you know, we -- I know in our
 7 report we have a short summary but I take liberty to
 8 try to break it out. So there are about 13 concerns
 9 that we have listed here. I talked about every single
 10 one of them, so I will not repeat them. And so I think
 11 we have some work to do with the proponent to try to,
 12 you know, resolve some of the concerns that we have,
 13 data that they need to collect in terms of addressing
 14 some of the neighborhood streets, especially with
 15 traffic calming. That's something that, you know, we
 16 looked into. They would have to collect some data on
 17 whether it's Russett or South Street because we need to
 18 have a base information later on even when the project
 19 gets built to evaluate the potential cut-through of
 20 those neighborhood streets.
 21 So the next step is really to work with the
 22 proponent and to update our report once we have some of
 23 the issues resolved. And that concludes my
 24 presentation.

Page 28

1 MR. HUSSEY: It sounds like you have not been
 2 able to view the applicant's PowerPoint presentation.
 3 There are a number of drawings there that show the fire
 4 truck and the hammerhead configurations. They may have
 5 been using this AutoTURN program that you talked
 6 about. You can get it online, I think, through the
 7 Town, the PowerPoint presentation.
 8 MR. HO: I actually do have those
 9 presentations and, you know, I've gone through them
 10 quickly. They were very small, so I'm requesting, you
 11 know, a larger version so I could see, you know,
 12 whether the turning path hits any cars that's going to
 13 be parked, you know, as they make the three-point turn
 14 at the hammerhead.
 15 MR. HUSSEY: Okay. Because I think that's
 16 really one of the critical arguments. The applicant
 17 maintains they are successfully addressing the
 18 emergency vehicle issue and the various town
 19 departments are not agreeing with them. We need to
 20 have somebody clarify who is right on that issue.
 21 MR. GELLER: Questions, let's start with
 22 those.
 23 MR. LISS: This is your expertise. However,
 24 I'm trying to understand how -- it seems one of your

Page 29

1 recommendations was to convert Independence from four
 2 lanes to two lanes to what you called a "complete
 3 street," I believe.
 4 My mind thinks: Four lanes, better, more
 5 cars; two lanes, bad, less cars. Can you explain for
 6 me what the conversation of four lanes to two lanes
 7 actually does? What would be the impact if that was a
 8 course followed by the proponent? What would that
 9 result in?
 10 MR. HO: I think the conversion of the -- say
 11 it's from four lanes to three lanes or two lanes, the
 12 benefit that you get when we say a complete street
 13 is -- there's always competing interests. Do you want
 14 cars to go through there smoothly without any
 15 interruptions, which could mean they could fly through,
 16 you know, this section of Independence Drive? And
 17 that's one of the data, you know, that we have
 18 requested, you know, when they do go out and collect
 19 new data. We want to include speed.
 20 We seem to think that right now the four
 21 lanes, you have more than enough capacity to handle the
 22 14,000 cars per day, based on our experience.
 23 So I think with a narrow street -- another
 24 term they use is "road diet" -- you could design the

Page 30

1 roadway that you could accommodate your capacity, which
 2 is car, mixture of car can go through, because you
 3 don't want to provide the road diet where you create a
 4 choke hole. You don't want that. So you want to have
 5 a roadway system that could accommodate the cars and at
 6 the same time, you know, bicycles can safely, you know,
 7 travel that section of the roadway and pedestrians can
 8 safety cross that section of the roadway.
 9 So I think it's -- overall, you know, the
 10 complete street will provide safety with vehicle
 11 operation, safety with pedestrian, safety with bicycle,
 12 and that's what we are looking into.
 13 MR. HUSSEY: Now, the definition of four-lane
 14 nature of that, does that include parking on both
 15 sides? So is it four lanes plus parking on both
 16 sides?
 17 MR. HO: Right now what you have is four lanes
 18 with parking, and that's very, very wide. Because
 19 whether coming up from Sherman or any of the other side
 20 streets right now, not only do you have to look at four
 21 lanes of traffic, but also you have competing cars that
 22 are parked on the street that a lot of times block your
 23 view, so it's a site line issue.
 24 MR. HUSSEY: Okay. Thank you.

Page 31

1 MR. ZUROFF: Just a follow-up on that. You
 2 said you wanted to avoid a choke point if the road was
 3 narrowed, but you've got a rotary at Grove Street that
 4 no matter how quickly the cars go through Independence
 5 Drive, they're still going to hit the rotary and at
 6 that point, and I know it exists now, that's a choke
 7 point. I mean, rotaries don't flow smoothly. They
 8 stop and start. So are you considering that in your
 9 analysis and your new recommendations?
 10 MR. HO: As a roundabout? In terms of a
 11 roundabout at some point --
 12 MR. ZUROFF: All that traffic that comes
 13 northbound is going to hit that rotary at some point.
 14 MR. HO: I think when I say choke point, what
 15 I meant is, you know, create traffic congestion. You
 16 know, meaning cars would actually, you know, stop and
 17 create a queuing problem.
 18 So I think in the case of the roundabout or
 19 the rotary that you have today is to slow cars down so
 20 that they could enter the intersection safely and not
 21 create any major queuing backup. So I think the
 22 roundabout, or the intent of any roundabout is to --
 23 you could increase or process a much larger capacity.
 24 That's if everyone knows how -- you know, what they

Page 32

1 have to do to enter a roundabout. You know, you're
 2 supposed to yield as you enter and, you know, so if
 3 everyone, you know, knows what they're doing, a
 4 roundabout can effectively slow and calm traffic,
 5 provide both capacity and safety. That's the function
 6 of the rotary.
 7 MR. ZUROFF: But realistically, not everyone
 8 knows what they're doing when they hit a rotary or a
 9 roundabout. And if you're proposing a solution that
 10 would allow the traffic to go continuously from
 11 Independence Drive, from VFW Parkway all the way to the
 12 rotary, then you're going to have traffic, I would
 13 think -- and I'm asking you -- you're going to have
 14 traffic backing up not only at the rotary but it's
 15 going to back up past Russett and it's going to back up
 16 onto Independence Drive.
 17 And so I think, the way I see it is, you're
 18 going to actually cause more of a backup and more of a
 19 congestion because people flow through rotaries
 20 quickly. A lot of people don't know what to do at a
 21 rotary.
 22 MR. HO: I have specifically requested that
 23 the proponent would look into that and I would like
 24 to -- you know I want them to tell me, because I'm

Page 33

1 curious as to if we could better manage Independence
 2 Drive. How can we improve Independence Drive? You
 3 have four lanes, you have 14,000 cars, you have 55 feet
 4 of crosswalk. What can we do to improve Independence
 5 Drive? So I want them to tell me basically what are
 6 your options.
 7 If they can convince me that a two-lane or
 8 three-lane is not going to work, I'm willing to, you
 9 know, take all that into consideration and evaluation.
 10 So that's my point to the applicant.
 11 MR. GELLER: Any other questions?
 12 MR. BOOK: We heard concerns from the fire
 13 department and transportation about -- you had
 14 mentioned it a minute ago -- the driveways with the
 15 hammerhead turnarounds. And I don't know if this is an
 16 appropriate question to ask you, but are there
 17 alternatives to that, to that design that are better
 18 that would work in the area, or are you not -- you
 19 haven't yet formulated if it's even a problem?
 20 MR. HO: I have not looked at the details of
 21 the truck turning radius analysis. I have seen a
 22 hammerhead that's being designed for, you know, whether
 23 it's an emergency vehicle or a truck to turn around.
 24 There are right-of-way issues.

Page 34

1 The ideal solution is a cul-de-sac. Basically
 2 an open-wide traffic circle. In the old days we can
 3 see a lot of big circles and, you know, a fire truck
 4 just makes one big circle and they're out of there. So
 5 that's the ideal. And I think that design feature
 6 typically requires a lot more right-of-way, if I may
 7 say, and the hammerhead, you know, significantly
 8 reduces the right-of-way in terms of accommodating a
 9 hammerhead.

10 MR. GELLER: But the usage of a hammerhead
 11 design is not illegal; correct?

12 MR. HO: No, it's not.

13 MR. GELLER: It is used?

14 MR. HO: Yes.

15 MR. GELLER: Okay. And the question becomes
 16 whether there's sufficient width and length to support
 17 that usage, and that's dictated by the length of the
 18 driveway and other factors.

19 MR. HO: Right. What we would look into is --
 20 as we look into the detail of the hammerhead design --
 21 is we would look into a snow combination. Because if
 22 you go out to the site more recently, we noticed that
 23 some of the turnaround is used for snow storage. So
 24 when you have that situation, the hammerhead -- the

Page 35

1 fire truck can't use the turnaround.
 2 So I think we would like to see a slightly
 3 larger hammerhead. In the event if you can't --
 4 ideally, you know, if they would not use it as a snow
 5 storage area. And just in case -- you know, sometimes
 6 the plower, they just plow it into the corner. Because
 7 that would restrict the length and the width of the
 8 fire truck to make that turn. So those are the things
 9 that we would look into in terms of the hammerhead
 10 design.

11 MR. GELLER: Are you aware of any safety
 12 regulations or guidelines that govern or dictate usage
 13 of hammerhead turnarounds?

14 MR. HO: As long as the AutoTURN analysis
 15 demonstrates that they could physically make the
 16 three-point turn without encroaching any parked cars in
 17 the area where there are parking spaces, I think that
 18 usually meets the design standard.

19 MR. GELLER: And there are no independent
 20 regulations that you're aware of that govern using
 21 these kinds of turnarounds?

22 MR. HO: No.

23 MR. GELLER: Do you have a question,
 24 Mr. Hussey?

Page 36

1 MR. HUSSEY: The hammerhead -- I guess one of
 2 the other questions I've got relative to emergency
 3 vehicles is that, looking at the eastern -- the western
 4 end of this site, there's a long drive from
 5 Independence Drive over towards the Baker School with a
 6 hammerhead configuration there. Should the width of
 7 that driveway be sufficient for fire trucks to pass?

8 MR. HO: We would like to see, you know, a
 9 roadway minimum with 24 feet and I know --

10 MR. LISS: Can you go to a different slide? I
 11 think it will be better referenced that way.

12 All right. So if you look in the western top
 13 corner I believe is what Mr Hussey is speaking about.
 14 So that -- he's asking, in it's current state can
 15 two --

16 Well, you can speak for yourself.

17 MR. HUSSEY: Go ahead.

18 MR. LISS: My understanding is that two fire
 19 trucks -- in this current state, can two fire trucks
 20 pass each other on that level?

21 MR. GELLER: Yeah. Once a fire truck does
 22 turn around at the hammerhead, assuming there's a fire
 23 truck at the entrance, can they pass?

24 MR. LISS: Right.

Page 37

1 MR. HO: I'd like clarify with the applicant
 2 if that section of roadway is 22 feet or 24 feet
 3 because if it's 22 feet, I think I would be concerned.
 4 I think two fire trucks would have a tough time passing
 5 each other.

6 If it's 24 feet, I think that's something that
 7 would not be an issue.

8 MR. GELLER: Mr. Schwartz, do you know the
 9 answer to the question?

10 MR. SCHWARTZ: 22.

11 MR. GELLER: 22. So is it a concern?

12 MR. HO: Yes, I would be concerned. I think
 13 that applies to -- you know, on Asheville. As I
 14 indicated earlier, I think they're proposing 22 feet.

15 MR. HUSSEY: My other question is procedural,
 16 actually.

17 MR. GELLER: Procedural for --

18 MR. HUSSEY: For getting the information from
 19 MDM, updating your information and getting back to us.

20 MR. GELLER: Yeah. We'll address that.

21 MR. HUSSEY: Okay.

22 MR. GELLER: And if I forget for some reason,
 23 kick me or raise it again.

24 You started your presentation with basically

Page 38

1 outlining for us how you go about your analysis, does
 2 it meet standards and guidelines. There is information
 3 that's missing, and you've noted what you believe is
 4 missing and needs to be filled in both in terms of
 5 content that is dated as well as content that was not
 6 supplied.
 7 Forgetting that for the moment, do you believe
 8 that the methodology of analysis is correct in this
 9 report in general from what we see, of the information
 10 we do see?
 11 MR. HO: I think the trip generation
 12 methodology is acceptable. And the analysis, what they
 13 have presented is acceptable also, the software that
 14 they have used. But I would like to see some updates
 15 before I draw my final conclusion on the analysis
 16 results, because the results, you know, basically
 17 dictates the mitigations that we will get into.
 18 MR. GELLER: Thank you.
 19 MR. HUSSEY: I do have one more question.
 20 On page 3 of your letter that we received
 21 recently you indicated that using the ITE methodology,
 22 the proposed 144 additional residential apartment units
 23 are expected to generate approximately 1,300 vehicle
 24 trips a day. And I'm sort of curious, shouldn't the

Page 39

1 number of vehicle trips be predicated upon the number
 2 of parking spaces rather than on the number of dwelling
 3 units?
 4 MR. HO: No. The ITE has two sets of
 5 guidelines for the number of trips, you know,
 6 associated with the number of units and they have also
 7 very specific guidelines as to parking generation, the
 8 need for parking. So those are two independent sets of
 9 design guidelines that we follow. And those are all
 10 based on very, very expensive research as to why they
 11 did -- you know, what they have to do.
 12 MR. BOOK: Can I just ask for clarification?
 13 So when you refer to the 1,300 additional trip
 14 generations a day -- and that's from the 192 units?
 15 MR. HO: Yes, that is correct.
 16 MR. BOOK: So when you say the 1,300, that's
 17 1,300 both in and out combined or one round trip?
 18 MR. HO: That's total in and out on a given
 19 day.
 20 MR. BOOK: So in and out are counted
 21 separately?
 22 MR. HO: Right. I take that back.
 23 So the 1,300 is on a given day. If you were
 24 to stand, say, for example -- you know, this is just

Page 40

1 for explanation purposes. If you were to stand, say,
 2 in front of all the major gateways, entrance points on
 3 the site, you know, if you have like five or six people
 4 in all the gateways, if you were to count on a given
 5 day, 24 hours, you would come out to a total of cars
 6 coming and going in the site of 1,300 cars per day.
 7 MR. BOOK: So the 1,300 is the incremental
 8 addition from the 192 units? Or that's the total for
 9 the entire --
 10 MR. HO: That's the new trips. Those are the
 11 new trips.
 12 MR. BOOK: 1,300?
 13 MR. HO: The 1,300 doesn't exist right now.
 14 MR. BOOK: And that's based on just averages
 15 on other projects? I mean, how do they --
 16 MR. HO: That's based on the ITE trip
 17 generation. You know, there's a formula that we would
 18 use to estimate that trip. This is based on a lot of
 19 research that they have done.
 20 MR. BOOK: And I realize this isn't the most
 21 urban part of Brookline but nonetheless, it's not --
 22 we're not out in Texas. I mean, people -- not
 23 everybody jumps in their car all the time to drive. I
 24 mean, that's an accurate -- I guess I'm finding it a

Page 41

1 little hard -- I'm a little surprised that 192 units
 2 would generate -- and that's 340-odd cars -- that that
 3 would generate 1,300 trips a day; that people are
 4 jumping in their car that much and going in and out.
 5 So does it take into consideration the area that you
 6 live in?
 7 MR. HO: Oh, yeah. It's basically, you know,
 8 a lot of research being done and it's the ITE trip
 9 generation that everyone, you know, uses to estimate
 10 trips, whether it's on a given day or, you know, during
 11 peak hours that I've indicated during the commuting,
 12 morning and the evening peak hours.
 13 MR. LISS: Can I just follow up on that real
 14 quick.
 15 So Brookline is diverse. Northern and
 16 Southern Brookline is clearly very different. When you
 17 put this in the system, do you say Brookline 02446 and
 18 then it just says, okay, population, or do you say this
 19 is the, you know, per capita? Does it take into
 20 consideration the uniqueness of this area? I mean, I
 21 guess that's really what you said, but can it do that?
 22 MR. HO: Well, you know, to explain it very
 23 easily, the analysis taken into consideration of, you
 24 know, folks -- the percentage of folks, where they're

Page 42

1 going to work and, you know, the typical trips for
 2 residents. You know, when they would leave and when
 3 they would come back. You know, so that's really what
 4 that is. And, you know -- yeah. I'm not going to get
 5 into any more detail on that.

6 MR. HUSSEY: It works out to be about three
 7 and a third times each day somebody would go out and
 8 come back if you take the 1,300 and divide it by 192.

9 MR. LISS: Yeah. But there could be two to
 10 four people in a unit. There could be five people in a
 11 unit, or four.

12 MR. HUSSEY: Well, it's a little less than two
 13 parking spaces per dwelling unit.

14 MR. LISS: But don't forget -- so that takes
 15 into consideration, I'm presuming -- one of the issues
 16 is, you could get picked up, carpooled. So someone
 17 else living there, someone can pick you up, so it's
 18 just a new destination generation.

19 MR. HUSSEY: That's true. Maybe more than one
 20 car per unit maybe is not unreasonable.

21 MR. GELLER: Anything else?
 22 Thank you.

23 MR. HO: You're welcome.

24 MR. GELLER: Don't go too far.

Page 43

1 MR. HO: I'll be right here.

2 MR. NAGLER: Just one quick question. Does
 3 the applicant's traffic consultant agree with the 1,300
 4 number?

5 MR. HO: Yes, we agree. They generated the
 6 number. They generated the 1,300. And so based on the
 7 methodologies as they have derived, we agree with the
 8 way they derived the total volume.

9 MR. GELLER: Thank you.

10 Mr. Schwartz, did you want to take a moment
 11 and rebut or respond to some of the questions?

12 MR. SCHWARTZ: We'll have our traffic
 13 consultant do that, and I'll reserve some time at the
 14 end.

15 MR. MICHAUD: For the record, my name is
 16 Robert Michaud, a principal at MDM Transportation
 17 Consultants based in Marlborough, Massachusetts at
 18 28 Lord Road. I'm very pleased to be before the Board
 19 this evening as a follow-up to our prior testimony.

20 What I'd like to do tonight is review some of
 21 what Mr. Ho had presented as it was documented in his
 22 peer review we received later on Friday. We really
 23 only had a couple of days to look at this. And I'd
 24 also like to try to fold some of our comments in in a

Page 44

1 way that is responsive to some issues that you've heard
 2 from other departments like Police, Fire, and Public
 3 Works.

4 Just as a precursor, we fully intend to
 5 produce a response document to this Board that will go
 6 through each and every comment and provide an
 7 appropriate technical response, as is the customary
 8 standard and practice. I have, over the last two days,
 9 been very busy working with an applicant who is very
 10 much appreciative of responding efficiently and
 11 appropriately to comments.

12 What I heard tonight did throw me a little
 13 bit, to be honest, in that some of the material that
 14 was presented by the reviewer was not presented in the
 15 documented peer review letter that we received, you
 16 know, and it really relates to the expansion of the
 17 study area which appears, in my view, to be somewhat
 18 contrary to what was presented in that written
 19 document.

20 So I do fully expect that as we move forward
 21 there would be someone level of communication between
 22 the review consultant and the applicant, me in
 23 particular, so that we can appropriately respond in
 24 advance of a public hearing without hearing things for

Page 45

1 the very first time. So with that as an opening, we
 2 appreciate the comments, and what I'd like to do is
 3 step through the individual pieces of peer review.

4 We're pleased, generally, with what the peer
 5 review findings were. There were many levels of
 6 concurrence and agreement.

7 First, at least we believe based on what we
 8 had you seen on Friday, that the study was, in fact,
 9 identified as an appropriate system of intersections to
 10 study as part of this project; secondly, that the trip
 11 generation methodology, as they stated in their
 12 submittal, is appropriate and to industry standard;
 13 that the trip distribution methodology is appropriate
 14 and follows industry standard; that the traffic
 15 operations as they were modeled, in fact, do meet
 16 industry standards, and that the findings of that
 17 indicate that the impact of traffic operations as
 18 reported in our November traffic report are accurate.
 19 And that's a quote.

20 And those results indicate for all of the
 21 locations studied within the study area that we can
 22 achieve a level of service D or better operations,
 23 which is an acceptable operating and design standard
 24 within an urban environment, so a recognized industry

Page 46

1 standard.

2 So I'll step through each one of those points

3 perhaps to enlighten some of the conversation that was

4 just mentioned. We have here, of course, the

5 intersections that Mr. Hoe had indicated in his review

6 were appropriate and provided the primary basis of our

7 findings and recommendations.

8 As a point of information, in the early

9 planning efforts for this property five years ago, we

10 also considered the roundabout to the north and the

11 signal on the Boston side of the world and we have

12 information for that. But really, because of the

13 evolution of this particular project to a much smaller

14 project of a residential nature, that the intersections

15 that were documented in November, which is shown as

16 solid dots, as well as the signals at Independence

17 were, in fact, appropriate and we believe that to be

18 the case for this peer review.

19 Notwithstanding that, we'll be glad to

20 consider requests to study additional locations within

21 the neighborhood in the context of the likely level of

22 impact that this project will have in that area.

23 The findings in November, as we presented

24 them, would indicate that at 196 residential units and

Page 47

1 using trip patterns that are well established based on

2 existing documented patterns for Hancock Village, that

3 a little over half of the trips that would be generated

4 from this development would be oriented to the north.

5 And that represents an increase over the course of a

6 typical commuter hour of about one vehicle per minute.

7 That is the highest level of impact that this

8 particular proposal will have on Independence Drive,

9 Grove Street, or points north.

10 When you look at local roadway connections,

11 Beverly Road, for instance, we expect that those trip

12 increases would be in the order of one vehicle every 10

13 to 12 minutes, five cars over the course of an hour,

14 and likely for South Street.

15 And within the neighborhood that's most

16 proximate to Asheville Road, we expect that the trip

17 increase in that vicinity would be about one vehicle

18 every two minutes, 30 or 40 vehicles over the course of

19 an entire hour.

20 Those numbers were presented in the November

21 study and we believe, based on what was submitted at

22 peer review, are an appropriate representation, an

23 accurate representation of the level of impact that

24 this project will have on area roads. And that was

Page 48

1 modeled and presented in the study to show that at each

2 individual study location, that in most cases we have a

3 level of service A, B, or C operation.

4 Five years from now, with background growth

5 independent of this project and the additional trips

6 that I just mentioned, and at only one location would

7 we see a level of service D, which is, again, an

8 acceptable operating standard, which is at the

9 intersection of Gerry and Independence, the left turn

10 movement exiting that driveway.

11 So the findings indicate very convincingly and

12 clearly using industry standards that the impact of

13 this project based on industry standards will not

14 materially change traffic, that intersections of the

15 study will operate well below capacity.

16 We also stated in our testimony that the trip

17 generation rates that we used, while they're the

18 industry standards, are, in fact, much higher than the

19 realities that currently occur at Hancock Village,

20 which we've inventoried. We have the information, the

21 trip generation information, for the folks who live in

22 Hancock Village. We know how many units are in Hancock

23 Village, and we can compare that to the industry

24 standards. And we did that at last I spoke. Those

Page 49

1 indicate that the industry standard trip rates which

2 were used are about 30 percent higher than what

3 actually occurs for this existing residential

4 neighborhood.

5 We also very clearly stated that the trip

6 distribution patterns, which were reviewed by Mr. Hoe,

7 depend on existing observed documented patterns for the

8 folks who live in Hancock Village. So there's no

9 magic. We're not really guessing at what these

10 patterns are going to be. We know what they are based

11 on how people use the streets today for Hancock Village

12 and the adjoining neighborhood. So we're confident

13 that what we've presented is the appropriate industry

14 standard and shows that there's a very modest impact

15 that will not change traffic operations.

16 That said, we are well aware that supplemental

17 data has been requested and we are, in fact, in the

18 process of obtaining that based on what we read in the

19 review, submitted review. We are in the process of

20 conducting a speed study and additional traffic counts

21 on Independence Drive.

22 As a point of information, the growth patterns

23 that were applied really do reflect documented

24 town-provided traffic counts for Beverly Road and South

Page 50

1 Street. So those two signalized locations were the
 2 subject of redesign by the Town in 2005, so we have
 3 real data that we are able to compare it to.
 4 In 2012 when our accounts were established at
 5 those very same locations, direct comparison of data
 6 shows that there's no growth whatsoever over a
 7 six-plus-year period. Nevertheless, we've used a
 8 1 percent annual growth rate in our assessment which we
 9 believe is conservative, a high guess as to what might
 10 occur over the next five-year period.
 11 So we'll do the count as suggested, but we
 12 also have more pertinent information that very clearly
 13 supports that what we've presented to the Town is
 14 conservative.
 15 Second, travel speed surveys. We have
 16 proactively started collecting speed information for
 17 Russett Road in particular. We did that in February of
 18 this year, and we're in the process of doing that for
 19 Independence Drive.
 20 The finding to date is interesting. Russett
 21 Road is a narrow road. It's a parking lot in a
 22 neighborhood setting. It's a low-volume, local
 23 roadway. The speed characteristics of that roadway
 24 reflect that condition. The regulatory allowed speed

Page 51

1 limit on Russett Road is 30 miles an hour. The speed
 2 survey done using radar recorder equipment over an
 3 extended period of time indicates that the 85th
 4 percentile speeds that exist on Russett Road are 20
 5 miles an hour and directly reflect the condition of
 6 being a narrow road with parking.
 7 That will directly factor into the site line
 8 calculations that have been provided and discussed with
 9 this Board which exceed the minimum design criteria by
 10 a factor of two. So we don't expect, even with the
 11 newer information, that there will be any new findings
 12 or a need to adjust what we've presented in terms of
 13 driver location, layout, or ability to meet criteria.
 14 Third, crash data, a subject requested by peer
 15 review and made a point of discussion by the police
 16 department. We proactively had requested those
 17 records, received them yesterday. We'll present that
 18 information shortly, but the finding of that is that
 19 the local crash records are not materially different
 20 than what we've already presented in the November study
 21 and, in fact, have been updated to the latest
 22 three-year period and that those findings indicate that
 23 the crashes on any neighborhood street are lower than
 24 average. Well below average, in fact, and do not shed

Page 52

1 any new light on the need for safety counter measures.
 2 That said, it's a snapshot of what we've
 3 received from the police department. This will be
 4 documented more formally in a response document. But
 5 over a three-year period, there have been 14 crashes on
 6 the roads that comprise Independence Drive, South
 7 Street, Russett Road, Asheville Road, Beverly Road, all
 8 roads within the area that we've defined as our study
 9 area.
 10 Of those 14, only three were in some way
 11 related to a pedestrian incident at or near a
 12 crosswalk, and more than half of these are actually
 13 crashes that do not occur at intersections. They are a
 14 direct result of hitting car doors, running into trees,
 15 leaving moving cars, and other nonpedestrian-related
 16 matters and they're not necessarily all concentrated at
 17 any one given location.
 18 This graphic presents information for each of
 19 the years, 2011, '12, and '13 in a graphical format to
 20 give you a sense as to where these crashes are
 21 occurring based on the local records and the nature of
 22 the crashes. And what's interesting is that if you
 23 look at the intersections at Gerry Road or Sherman and
 24 Thornton, you'll see that there are two crashes at each

Page 53

1 over a three-year period. The balance of crashes out
 2 of the entire 14 occur at midblock locations that are
 3 likely to be associated with people opening up car
 4 doors. It's difficult having a four-lane section that
 5 really has parking as part of one of the travel lanes,
 6 so you're going to have occasions when people open up
 7 cars doors and things of that nature.
 8 When you look at the crash-rate analysis, when
 9 you take those crashes and you apply them to the
 10 individual study intersections that we looked at, the
 11 signal at Russett Road, for instance, the two primary
 12 driveways serving Hancock Village, Asheville Road,
 13 you'll see that one or two crashes might occur over the
 14 course of an entire two-year period at this location.
 15 The cash rate calculates to be just more than .12,
 16 which is about five times below average. There's no
 17 distinct trend here. Crashes occur and are
 18 quantifiable, but there's no distinct trend and there's
 19 no distinct location where an above-average crash
 20 experience occurs.
 21 These are the results that were presented in
 22 the November study which show a very similar pattern,
 23 and again the trip crash rate is well below average.
 24 Another point of discussion, the site

Page 54

1 circulation emergency access. Mr. Hoe indicated they
 2 want to see the AutoTURN analysis. We'll walk through
 3 what we've provided to the Board. The findings for
 4 that, we've modeled emergency access and circulation
 5 using Brookline's largest potential response vehicle,
 6 which is the E1 Bronto, 100-foot tower truck. It's a
 7 very large vehicle. We've done computer modeling which
 8 shows that the maneuvering areas to and within the
 9 project site using 22-foot-wide roadways is acceptable
 10 and appropriate to accommodate that largest designed
 11 vehicle and other vehicles that also currently respond.
 12 The design for this facility is consistent
 13 with approved Brookline residential projects, which
 14 I'll walk through in a moment, and is also consistent
 15 with recently approved residential projects in adjacent
 16 communities, particularly Newton and Needham, which are
 17 known as mutual aid communities, communities that have
 18 the ability to share emergency response assets.
 19 And finally, we understand that there's some
 20 reluctance or some concern on the design of hammerheads
 21 and there are options, at least in one particular area,
 22 to make adjustments to the extent that's desirable,
 23 something the fire department would like to work with
 24 the applicant on.

Page 55

1 This is all being done in the context of a
 2 project in which the building will be sprinklered, so
 3 the nature of the emergency response is going to be
 4 factored against a sprinklered building. The
 5 likelihood of having to respond to a multiple-alarm
 6 event is diminished with the function of the type of
 7 design that's being contemplated for the project.
 8 So we talked about the access along
 9 Independence at two locations, one to the west, one to
 10 the east, and the Asheville connection and we've
 11 conducted AutoTURN analysis using the largest designed
 12 vehicle available to the Town. And we've drawn
 13 circulation paths for each of the primary aisles or
 14 lanes that serve the existing Hancock Village and the
 15 proposed largest building in this case. We've done the
 16 same for the west side. And we've identified locations
 17 A, B, and C which in every case are shown to have more
 18 than acceptable maneuvering area to allow for the full
 19 maneuver of a vehicle around, to return at the same
 20 time an approaching vehicle would be travelling. So
 21 there's sufficient width, there's sufficient
 22 maneuvering area for that largest vehicle. Same with
 23 Location B behind that building.
 24 The hammerhead design at Location C would

Page 56

1 service this building, and based on the analysis of the
 2 largest vehicle, it has more than ample maneuver area
 3 with surplus to boot that would allow for a simple
 4 maneuver consistent with other approved projects in
 5 Brookline and other mutual aid communities and the
 6 ability to have another vehicle approaching at the same
 7 time without inhibiting the ability for that vehicle to
 8 exit the site.
 9 This location does have some flexibility in
 10 terms of allowing for a more traditional cul-de-sac
 11 design. It would result in less landscaped area, so
 12 the applicant's position in presenting this was to
 13 retain as much landscaped area as possible. It works,
 14 but it can certainly be converted in this instance to a
 15 larger cul-de-sac element.
 16 As we look at the Independence connections to
 17 the east and to the west toward the Baker School, we've
 18 done the same analysis on the east side which shows,
 19 again, while this is not a traditional cul-de-sac
 20 element, it provides more than ample maneuvering area
 21 without any impact to parking for that largest vehicle
 22 to reverse direction and to have another vehicle follow
 23 in the opposite direction with the ability to be
 24 bypassed.

Page 57

1 And here's the hammerhead nearest the Baker
 2 School. That's the Baker School over here. You can
 3 see that the limits that have been defined are, in
 4 fact, probably much more than you really need for a
 5 traditional hammerhead design. You can have multiple
 6 large vehicles in this area and still have the ability
 7 to reverse directions with a T maneuver to exit the
 8 site. So there's no issue with the ability for this
 9 project, as it's currently designed, to appropriately
 10 accommodate the largest designed vehicle that is
 11 available to the Town, or multiple vehicles, for that
 12 matter.
 13 As a point of reference, we have been involved
 14 with designing other projects that have the same types
 15 of design features, or others have. In the case of
 16 Brookline, the Olmstead Hill development in particular
 17 which was approved in 2010 and built in 2012, has a
 18 long roadway connection shown here with a side
 19 connection to the rear of this building and that
 20 building. That, in fact, has that hammerhead design in
 21 that orientation.
 22 Here is the site plan that was approved. It
 23 shows that long extension, the hammerhead design. The
 24 AutoTURN analysis of that plan indicates the ability to

Page 58

1 handle that brunt of vehicle acceptably at a
 2 three-point turn without impact to parking.
 3 What's interesting in this particular example,
 4 it's only a recent project, but its design is much more
 5 constrictive than what is being proposed for this site
 6 at Location C or Location E, as I just presented. The
 7 residential design that we've presented to this Board
 8 is far less restrictive than this, another approved
 9 project in town.
 10 In other mutual aid communities, communities
 11 where fire assets may be shared with Brookline, for
 12 instance, Needham on Greendale Avenue, that hammerhead
 13 design right here -- in fact, this one is a bit more
 14 restrictive than what's being proposed, but this was
 15 approved and allows for that three-point turn maneuver.
 16 110-115 Dedham Street in Newton, another
 17 mutual aid community, connection to a hammerhead
 18 serving multiple residential units. This is a common
 19 design element for sites that require hammerhead
 20 design. It is a tool used for designers to ensure that
 21 there's ample maneuvering space for the given design
 22 vehicle.
 23 Other projects in Brookline, Hammondswood,
 24 hammerhead design, pseudo-hammerhead on this side of

Page 59

1 the building. So there are many examples of where this
 2 is actually used.
 3 As we prepare our supplemental data
 4 collection, our continued evaluation of crash data,
 5 traffic volume, speeds, we will be evaluating potential
 6 improvements to Independence Drive. We think that
 7 there are positive things that may contribute to safety
 8 and traffic calming in particular along that road.
 9 We are currently evaluating the feasibility of
 10 replacing the four-lane section with a single-lane
 11 section and an adjacent bike lane with parking. That
 12 form of design is achievable within the existing curb-
 13 to-curb dimension of the street and can be done in a
 14 way that does not influence the roundabout or the
 15 signal systems at either Russett Road or South Street.
 16 Four-lane sections don't exist in that area of -- it's
 17 really Grove Street. Right at that point is Grove
 18 Street.
 19 But the section that we're looking at is south
 20 of Russett Road. It's the section where parking is
 21 allowed during daytime hours on either side of the
 22 street and that creates issues that are reflected in
 23 the crash data that I just mentioned. It's very
 24 difficult for somebody who's approaching thinking

Page 60

1 they've got a lane to find out that they've got five
 2 feet of effective width because someone is parked on
 3 the curb. And so effectively, during daytime hours,
 4 that road really does function as a single lane in both
 5 directions and there is benefit, in our opinion, to
 6 formalizing that. But it's not something that this
 7 applicant necessarily proposed independently as a
 8 function of their project, but is willing to evaluate
 9 and consider those in cooperation with the Town.
 10 Beyond the restriping initiative, questions
 11 arose on whether or not a signal is appropriate for
 12 Sherman and Thornton, for instance, or Gerry Road.
 13 We've conducted a full signal warrants analysis. The
 14 warrants that would dictate the need for a signal, for
 15 the benefit associated with a signal, are not met.
 16 We also have considered warrants associated
 17 with pedestrian crossing signals. There are two types
 18 of signals that are considered. One is the traditional
 19 flashing beacon. It's more of a heads up to a motorist
 20 that someone is in the crosswalk. It makes the driver
 21 more aware of activity in a crosswalk.
 22 The second form is known as a HAWK, which is a
 23 pedestrian-activated signal that literally shows a red
 24 ball, so you're required to stop. It's a middle ground

Page 61

1 between a flashing beacon and a full traffic signal.
 2 That's the best way to put it. And that technology has
 3 been used in Brookline. Again, the applicant will work
 4 with the Town to evaluate these types of improvements
 5 and possibly to help and assist in advancing them.
 6 The applicant has always said that they were
 7 interested in expanding TDM measures through the
 8 expansion of the Zipcar availability to the extent that
 9 Zipcar allows that. There's a petition process of
 10 sorts that you need to go through. They are willing to
 11 consider expanding the shuttle service. That was part
 12 of the testimony I provided to this Board last time I
 13 was here, and we'll certainly consider other things
 14 like additional bike racks throughout the development.
 15 These are the types of signals that we're
 16 currently evaluating. This is the HAWK, High-Intensity
 17 Activation Crosswalk. This is done at a pedestrian
 18 push-button activated or motion-activated type
 19 feature. It does require a stopped position for
 20 vehicles on Independence Drive.
 21 The second form is this form, which is a
 22 flashing beacon. This example is actually one that we
 23 designed, my firm designed, at Kringle Candle in
 24 Western Massachusetts on the state highway. So the

Page 62

1 equipment that's shown here is state-approved and
 2 endorsed equipment. You can see that some of the
 3 features that make it effective are delineated, in this
 4 case brick stamped type pedestrian crossing, clearly
 5 visible signs. And you can't see it quite in this
 6 diagram, but there are actually yellow balls. They get
 7 activated through a motion detection system if a
 8 pedestrian attempts to cross.

9 The fire department comments from March 5th in
 10 particular, we've reviewed those. I've already
 11 described the AutoTURN analysis and findings. The
 12 emergency response times was a concern that was
 13 raised. It's certainly something that the team is
 14 concerned with as well. You know, this particular
 15 portion of Brookline is located on the border of
 16 Boston, and it's likely to rely upon, to the extent
 17 needed, a mutual aid agreement that exists with Boston
 18 and other communities.

19 We know that Brookline has a mutual aid
 20 agreement that allows it to share resources, fire asset
 21 resources, trucks, equipment, and people with adjoining
 22 communities. So we wanted to understand the context in
 23 which a response would be provided to this development,
 24 to the existing Hancock Village, to the Baker School,

Page 63

1 or any other use that is in this section of Brookline.
 2 So we know there's a mutual aid agreement that allows
 3 the community who has opted in to send a request of
 4 assets from an other community within the Commonwealth
 5 that has also opted in. Boston is one of those
 6 communities, West Roxbury section in particular.

7 Within the proximity of Hancock Village,
 8 Boston Fire Department District 12 actually has a fire
 9 station with ladder and an engine capability that is
 10 within a five-minute drive of Hancock Village, and
 11 implementing the mutual aid agreement would allow
 12 Brookline to meet its obligations in emergency response
 13 to comply with MFPA and ISO standards that Chief Ford
 14 had mentioned at the March 5th hearing.

15 So just as a point of context, what's shown
 16 here is a two-mile ring around Hancock Village which is
 17 right there. And you'll see the number of fire
 18 stations that exist in the Boston Fire District.
 19 There's a lot of them. And one in particular you zero
 20 in on is located within a five-minute drive -- response
 21 time, I should say, of Hancock Village. It's actually
 22 equidistant to the exiting Brookline station that was
 23 mentioned by Chief Ford.

24 So this is a point of context and information

Page 64

1 that the applicant wanted to understand because they're
 2 concerned, as anybody would be, about the ability for a
 3 town emergency response team to get to the existing
 4 Hancock Village, the Baker School, and/or their own
 5 project that they're proposing. And there's reason to
 6 believe that through the mutual aid agreement and the
 7 proximity of that station, that provides an additional
 8 level of comfort, if you will, that the MFPA and ISO
 9 standards can be met through the mutual aid agreement
 10 that exists today.

11 So in conclusion, our next steps, and they're
 12 underway now, is data collections, evaluation. We're
 13 going to develop conceptual improvements that reflect
 14 initiatives on Independence Drive, and we'll document
 15 that in a comprehensive response. If there's any
 16 particular question that the Board has, I'm glad to
 17 answer it.

18 MR. GELLER: When you say that you will be
 19 submitting a complete response, you'll be submitting it
 20 in a written format, I assume?

21 MR. MICHAUD: Correct. We have a number of
 22 comments that were issued in letter form from Police,
 23 Fire, Public Works. Some which reflect questions or
 24 comments that have been made by the peer reviewer. So

Page 65

1 rather than do this piecemeal, what we'd like to do is
 2 a comprehensive single response.

3 Obviously, there's more work to do in having
 4 that response reviewed by our peer reviewer and there
 5 will probably be another round of responses to that, so
 6 there's a bit of a process to go. You know, we hope to
 7 do this in preferably one or obviously probably two
 8 steps. We want to provide that comprehensive written
 9 response.

10 MR. GELLER: In terms of process -- and I
 11 think this goes to your question, Mr. Hussey -- how
 12 would this be effectuated? I assume that the parties,
 13 through Ms. Steinfeld, will set up meetings and there
 14 will be some communications so that Mr. Hoe can get
 15 what supplemental information he's looking for, and
 16 also point to clarity communications between the
 17 parties so that you can arrive at your final
 18 supplemental report.

19 MR. MICHAUD: It would be my preference, and I
 20 would appreciate it, if there could be some line of
 21 communication, because we're in the line of business to
 22 try to efficiently and comprehensively address issues
 23 and if we don't know about those issues until the night
 24 of the hearing, for instance, it's hard to respond to

Page 66

1 those. And we take written reports seriously. We
 2 think that they're comprehensive and while may not
 3 address every single issue, there may be other
 4 questions that arise, we don't want any surprises, so
 5 having that level of open communication I think would
 6 benefit both sides.

7 MR. GELLER: Okay. Well, make sure it takes
 8 place.

9 MS. STEINFELD: If I could clarify, just so I
 10 know the process, are we expecting the applicants'
 11 consultants to submit a written report or that I will
 12 arrange meetings between the two consultants -- peer
 13 reviewer and the consultant?

14 MR. GELLER: I think before they're able to
 15 submit their supplemental report in response, that
 16 there are a number of questions that need to be
 17 answered and there's some clarity that needs to be
 18 worked through, so I think they need to communicate
 19 first so that that supplemental report can be issued.
 20 And obviously, once that supplemental report issues,
 21 we'll need you to look at it and respond.

22 MS. STEINFELD: Okay. Thank you. And excuse
 23 me, for the record, Allison Steinfeld, planning
 24 director.

Page 67

1 MR. GELLER: I was wondering who you were.

2 MR. HUSSEY: One more question. I understand
 3 that you both have used the classification of urban
 4 environment as the basis for your studies? Is that
 5 correct?

6 MR. MICHAUD: My answer to that would be that
 7 we've applied a suburban standard to estimating the
 8 traffic-generating characteristics of this project; a
 9 suburban standard in which public transportation,
 10 things like shuttles to Coolidge Corner and other
 11 locations don't exist. So the trip rate methodology
 12 that we used is a suburban standard. It's a higher
 13 generating standard that we know is conservative.

14 The urban context that I mentioned relates to
 15 levels of service and operating standards within an
 16 urban environment where you have dense residential
 17 development, neighborhoods, commercial uses, things of
 18 that nature. A traditionally accepted design standard
 19 is a level of service D or better. We've achieved
 20 that. So that's the context of my comment.

21 MR. HUSSEY: Okay. Thank you. That clarifies
 22 it.

23 MR. GELLER: Can you speak briefly to the --
 24 there seems to be some kind of a mystery about

Page 68

1 calculation of the number of spaces per unit, whether
 2 it's 1.4 or 1.78 -- where the math is inconsistent.

3 MR. MICHAUD: The site plan shows 1.78.
 4 That's the number. I don't know where the -- I'll have
 5 to research where that 1.4 --

6 MR. HO: It's in your report.

7 MR. MICHAUD: Okay. That's probably a typo.
 8 So the site plans correctly represent the parking.

9 MR. GELLER: 1.7?

10 MR. MICHAUD: Yes.

11 MR. HUSSEY: That's the number I got too.

12 MR. GELLER: Thank you.

13 MR. SCHWARTZ: Mr. Chairman, if I could, I
 14 wasn't planning on speaking tonight but I think
 15 something a little bit unusual happened, so I felt I
 16 should take a few minutes to speak.

17 For the record, I'm Steven Schwartz of the
 18 firm Goulston & Storrs, counsel for the applicant. And
 19 for the record, I think it's important -- Mr. Michaud
 20 alluded to it -- but for the record, I'd like to read
 21 some statements in the peer review report so that
 22 everybody hears them and they're in the record.

23 "Study area: The study area is appropriate
 24 for the proposed project. The roadways and

Page 69

1 intersections that will be most impacted by travel
 2 paths of traffic associated with the proposed project
 3 have been included and analyzed.

4 "Trip generation traffic increases: The trip
 5 generation estimates were calculated according to
 6 industry standards. The trip generation methodology is
 7 appropriate for this project. The traffic study
 8 appropriately utilized the higher trip generation
 9 method of the two. In this case, the ITE data.

10 "Trip distribution: The trip distribution
 11 method is appropriate for the project.

12 "Traffic operations analysis: Due to the
 13 multiple driveways and different travel patterns, we'll
 14 share traffic increase resulting in less impact to any
 15 one location.

16 "Site plan review: Based on the existing
 17 observed parking demand, the 1.4 spaces" -- now we know
 18 it's 1.78 -- "is sufficient for the proposed
 19 expansion." Nothing in the site plan review about
 20 grades, site distances, et cetera.

21 So, what are you going to believe? There are
 22 times when, due to the passage of time or new
 23 circumstances, you might have a requirement for further
 24 information. That's not the case here.

Page 70

1 This report is dated March 20th, six days
 2 ago. It was delivered to the applicant three business
 3 days ago. One can speculate what happened. I'm not
 4 going to do that, but one can speculate. Apparently
 5 somebody thought this initial report was too positive.
 6 There's also an element of fundamental
 7 fairness here. As Mr. Michaud said, we expected peer
 8 review and we thought we had an agreement with the Town
 9 that you were going to give us an opportunity to study
 10 it and present an adequate response at a public
 11 hearing.
 12 That clearly did not happen here. We're
 13 hopeful that going forward that will be the case.
 14 Thank you. Mr. Chairman.
 15 MR. GELLER: Thank you.
 16 Mr. Hoe?
 17 MR. HO: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to make
 18 some clarification here. I think the gentleman had
 19 read some of our comments -- I think he's reading it
 20 out of context.
 21 For example, you know, the proponent was very
 22 weak in identifying mitigation. Okay? And I think it
 23 was very clear in our memorandum where it indicated
 24 that traffic calming, you know, needs to be considered

Page 71

1 for this project.
 2 I think when we had mentioned traffic calming,
 3 we were referring to the neighborhood streets. We're
 4 not just referring to Independence Drive, because this
 5 study right here, studied areas, basically indicated
 6 that, you know, the overall study is focused on
 7 Independence Drive.
 8 But the study should also include -- you know,
 9 if, as we move forward, as we work with the proponent
 10 in coming up with traffic calming for the neighborhood,
 11 the proponent would have to look at the residential
 12 streets such as Russett or South Street or Beverly
 13 Street. Those are the streets that are right next to
 14 the development.
 15 So how do you do traffic calming? One of the
 16 process of traffic calming is you need to know what's
 17 out there today because at some point, whether it's a
 18 raised intersection, whether it's a speed bump that
 19 you're providing, you need to determine, you know, that
 20 that's going to be effective. The only way to find
 21 that out is you have to collect more data. So
 22 regardless of, you know, whatever the proponent had
 23 indicated, you know, additional data that they would
 24 have to follow to form the baseline.

Page 72

1 So the gentleman just indicated about the trip
 2 distribution. He didn't read the whole paragraph,
 3 because at the very end of our paragraph we did say,
 4 however, that information was not provided for the
 5 Building 13 that's coming out of Asheville. Okay? So
 6 the gentleman has to read the whole thing out of, you
 7 know, context a little. There was no information
 8 provided. All we're asking for is clarification.
 9 While we agree that the trip distribution is accurate,
 10 the methodology, there's no issue, we're asking for
 11 more information to clarify what's going on at the
 12 traffic that's coming out of Asheville.
 13 So I think it's additional information and
 14 additional data that we are requesting, and that's what
 15 we are asking. So I just wanted to, you know, make
 16 that clarification.
 17 MR. GELLER: I would like to say one thing
 18 that I think is important and I'm sensitive to. And
 19 there are two sides to it, and I recognize that. We're
 20 under relatively tight constraints and I know that the
 21 reviews are going on as quickly as possible and I
 22 believe that people are fairly trying to disseminate
 23 information in a fair and reasonable fashion, giving
 24 others as much chance as possible for there to be

Page 73

1 adequate reviews and responses.
 2 Having said that, I would urge everyone to try
 3 harder to give everyone a fair opportunity to review
 4 information and respond.
 5 MS. STEINFELD: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. If I
 6 could address the issue of the distribution of the
 7 report. Upon receipt of the report, we immediately
 8 distributed it to the ZBA internally and to the
 9 applicants and subsequently placed it on the web all
 10 within two hours. Thank you.
 11 MR. SCHWARTZ: Just to be clear, we have no
 12 issue with the distribution of the report. I think the
 13 Board understands that.
 14 MR. GELLER: I understand. I think there are
 15 time constraints, but we're doing the best we can with
 16 it.
 17 MR. SCHWARTZ: We understand that. That's not
 18 what we're talking about.
 19 MR. GELLER: Anything else?
 20 Okay. So what we will do is, we are going to
 21 continue until the next hearing date, which is
 22 April 10th, 7:00, same location, I believe. The next
 23 hearing will be dedicated in particular to stormwater
 24 review, and it will follow in the same order that you

1 saw at tonight's hearing proceedings, so we would
2 expect to have a response from the applicant after we
3 hear peer review. Thank you.

4 (Proceedings suspended at 8:52 p.m.)

5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

1 I, Kristen C. Krakofsky, Court Reporter and
2 Notary Public in and for the Commonwealth of
3 Massachusetts, certify:

4 That the foregoing proceedings were taken
5 before me at the time and place herein set forth and
6 that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of
7 my shorthand notes so taken.

8 Dated this 7th day of April, 2014.

9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

Kristen Krakofsky, Notary Public
My commission expires November 3, 2017.

A			
ability 51:13 54:18 56:6,7,23 57:6,8,24 64:2	activity 15:17 60:21	ago 33:14 46:9 70:2,3	33:21 35:14 38:1,8 38:12,15 41:23 53:8 54:2 55:11 56:1,18 57:24 60:13 62:11 69:12
able 28:2 50:3 66:14	added 12:12,13,16 19:14	agree 43:3,5,7 72:9	analyzed 69:3
above-average 53:19	adding 17:16	agreeing 28:19	and/or 64:4
acceptable 38:12,13 45:23 48:8 54:9 55:18	addition 7:17 10:5,13,24 11:18 17:18 40:8	agreement 45:6 62:17,20 63:2,11 64:6,9 70:8	annual 50:8
acceptably 58:1	additional 18:1 25:17 38:22 39:13 46:20 48:5 49:20 61:14 64:7 71:23 72:13,14	ahead 36:17	answer 37:9 64:17 67:6
accepted 67:18	address 3:20 37:20 65:22 66:3 73:6	aid 54:17 56:5 58:10,17 62:17,19 63:2,11 64:6,9	answered 66:17
access 8:7 17:2 54:1,4 55:8	addressed 8:2	aisles 55:13	anticipate 3:22
accident 10:14,16,22	addressing 27:13 28:17	alignment 16:22,23 24:9 25:20	anybody 64:2
accidents 16:6,12	adequacy 6:20 7:3	Alison 2:12	apartment 38:22
accommodate 18:21 30:1,5 54:10 57:10	adequate 19:10 21:2 70:10 73:1	Allison 66:23	Apparently 70:4
accommodating 34:8	adequately 8:2	allow 24:1 32:10 55:18 56:3 63:11	Appeals 1:5
accommodation 18:22	adjacent 20:1 54:15 59:11	allowed 50:24 59:21	Appearances 2:1
accountable 5:5,8	adjoining 49:12 62:21	allowing 56:10	appears 21:1 22:13 44:17
accounts 50:4	adjust 51:12	allows 58:15 61:9 62:20 63:2	applicant 6:4 7:6,14 9:23 14:2 18:16 28:16 33:10 37:1 44:9,22 54:24 60:7 61:3,6 64:1 68:18 70:2 74:2
accurate 40:24 45:18 47:23 72:9	adjustments 54:22	alluded 68:20	
achievable 59:12	Administration 6:2	all-way 16:3	applicants 66:10 73:9
achieve 45:22	administrative 4:1	alternatives 33:17	applicant's 28:2 43:3 56:12
achieved 67:19	advance 44:24	ample 56:2,20 58:21	Application 1:7
activated 61:18 62:7	advancing 61:5	analysis 7:12,15,19 10:8,14 11:24 12:2 14:6,9,19 15:24 16:2 25:5,12 25:13 26:1 31:9	applied 49:23 67:7
Activation 61:17	affordable 23:7,10		applies 37:13

apply 53:9	65:17	available 55:12 57:11	20:19,22 23:12,23
appreciate 45:2 65:20	Asheville 9:7,8 13:22 15:7,10,22	Avenue 58:12	26:18 29:22 39:10
appreciative 44:10	16:15 23:18 37:13	average 51:24,24 53:16,23	40:14,16,18 43:6,17
approaching 55:20 56:6 59:24	47:16 52:7 53:12	averages 40:14	45:7 47:1,21 48:13
appropriate 33:16 44:7 45:9,12,13	55:10 72:5,12	Avi 2:7 3:14	49:10,18 52:21 56:1
46:6,17 47:22 49:13	asked 14:1	avoid 31:2	69:16
54:10 60:11 68:23	asking 32:13 36:14 72:8,10	aware 35:11,20 49:16 60:21	baseline 71:24
69:7,11	72:15	a.m 9:19 12:9	basic 5:17
appropriately 44:11,23 57:9 69:8	aspect 26:5	<hr/>	basically 5:16 7:1 15:2 33:5
approved 7:14 54:13,15 56:4	assessment 50:8	B	34:1 37:24 38:16
57:17,22 58:8,15	asset 62:20		41:7 71:5
approximately 8:23 12:7,16 13:8,10	assets 54:18 58:11 63:4		basis 46:6 67:4
18:5,11 19:2 20:6	assist 3:10 61:5		beacon 60:19 61:1,22
21:21 26:16 38:23	Associate 2:6,7		believe 24:23 25:11 29:3
April 4:6 9:17 20:20 73:22	associated 7:24 8:3 11:21 14:20		36:13 38:3,7 45:7
75:8	20:3 23:17 39:6 53:3		46:17 47:21 50:9
area 7:3,4,5 8:11 12:24	60:15,16 69:2		64:6 69:21 72:22
14:4 15:17 17:20	Associates 2:11		73:22
21:15 23:22 27:4	assume 4:20 64:20 65:12		benefit 15:17 29:12 60:5,15
33:18 35:5,17 41:5	assuming 36:22		66:6
41:20 44:17 45:21	assumption 24:23		best 61:2 73:15
46:22 47:24 52:8,9	attempts 62:8		BETA 2:15 4:11
54:21 55:18,22 56:2	audience 4:16		better 14:18 24:2 29:4 33:1
56:11,13,20 57:6	AutoTURN 25:5,13 26:1 28:5		33:17 36:11 45:22
59:16 68:23,23	35:14 54:2 55:11		67:19
areas 10:10 16:4 24:22 25:2	57:24 62:11		Beverly 8:20 9:3 11:12 13:13
54:8 71:5	availability 61:8		15:9 19:18 47:11
arguments 28:16			49:24 52:7 71:12
arose 60:11			Beyond 60:10
arrange 66:12			bicycle 18:21 30:11
arrive			bicycles 30:6

<p>big 34:3,4 biggest 26:7 bike 59:11 61:14 bit 6:20 44:13 58:13 65:6 68:15 block 30:22 blowing 16:10 Bluestein 2:9 board 1:5 2:2 4:15 43:18 44:5 51:9 54:3 58:7 61:12 64:16 73:13 boards 3:7 Bonad 11:11 15:9 book 2:4 3:13 5:23 22:5,11 23:1,14 33:12 39:12 39:16,20 40:7,12,14 40:20 boot 56:3 border 62:15 Boston 1:17 11:17 19:19 46:11 62:16,17 63:5 63:8,18 bottom 13:7 break 27:8 brick 62:4 briefly 67:23 broken</p>	<p>9:10 Bronto 54:6 Brookline 1:5,8,12 3:5 4:12,19 6:15 9:13 11:16 20:10 23:3 40:21 41:15,16,17 54:13 56:5 57:16 58:11,23 61:3 62:15,19 63:1 63:12,22 Brookline's 54:5 brunt 58:1 buildable 24:19 26:18 building 13:19 21:19 22:1 24:6 24:15 26:7 55:2,4,15 55:23 56:1 57:19,20 59:1 72:5 built 27:19 57:17 bump 71:18 bus 17:13 business 65:21 70:2 busy 44:9 bypassed 56:24</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">C</p> <hr/> <p>C 1:21 48:3 55:17,24 58:6 75:1 calculated 69:5 calculates 53:15 calculation 68:1</p>	<p>calculations 23:12 51:8 call 18:19 called 7:15 29:2 calm 32:4 calming 27:15 59:8 70:24 71:2 71:10,15,16 Candle 61:23 capability 63:9 capacity 20:21 21:8 29:21 30:1 31:23 32:5 48:15 capita 41:19 car 17:12 23:11 30:2,2 40:23 41:4 42:20 52:14 53:3 carpooled 42:16 cars 18:5,8,11 28:12 29:5,5 29:14,22 30:5,21 31:4,16,19 33:3 35:16 40:5,6 41:2 47:13 52:15 53:7 case 1:6 14:21 18:14 21:16 24:23 31:18 35:5 46:18 55:15,17 57:15 62:4 69:9,24 70:13 cases 48:2 cash 53:15 cause 32:18 certain 10:10</p>	<p>certainly 11:14 19:15 26:8,23 56:14 61:13 62:13 Certainty 6:9 certify 75:3 cetera 69:20 Chairman 2:3 4:10,13 68:13 70:14,17 73:5 chance 72:24 change 48:14 49:15 characteristics 50:23 67:8 chart 20:5 Chestnut 1:7 Chief 63:13,23 choke 30:4 31:2,6,14 Chris 2:5 Christopher 3:13 circle 9:10 25:1 34:2,4 circles 11:9 34:3 circulation 8:5 25:14 54:1,4 55:13 circumstances 69:23 clarification 39:12 70:18 72:8,16 clarifies 67:21 clarify 21:4 28:20 37:1 66:9 72:11</p>
--	---	--	--

<p>clarity 65:16 66:17</p> <p>classification 67:3</p> <p>clear 13:16 14:3 26:14 70:23 73:11</p> <p>clearly 3:21 41:16 48:12 49:5 50:12 62:4 70:12</p> <p>cluster 21:14</p> <p>collect 10:3,6 27:13,16 29:18 71:21</p> <p>collected 7:8,9 9:16,17 11:23</p> <p>collecting 14:14 50:16</p> <p>collection 7:7 59:4</p> <p>collections 64:12</p> <p>combination 34:21</p> <p>combined 39:17</p> <p>come 20:14 40:5 42:3,8</p> <p>comes 25:9 31:12</p> <p>comfort 64:8</p> <p>coming 12:22 13:15,21 14:16 30:19 40:6 71:10 72:5,12</p> <p>commence 4:9</p> <p>comment 44:6 67:20</p> <p>comments 43:24 44:11 45:2 62:9 64:22,24 70:19</p> <p>commercial</p>	<p>67:17</p> <p>commission 75:11</p> <p>common 58:18</p> <p>Commonwealth 63:4 75:2</p> <p>communicate 66:18</p> <p>communication 44:21 65:21 66:5</p> <p>communications 65:14,16</p> <p>communities 54:16,17,17 56:5 58:10,10 62:18,22 63:6</p> <p>community 2:13 58:17 63:3,4</p> <p>commuter 47:6</p> <p>commuting 9:19 41:11</p> <p>company 25:8</p> <p>compare 14:15 48:23 50:3</p> <p>comparison 18:7 20:5 50:5</p> <p>compensate 23:9</p> <p>competing 29:13 30:21</p> <p>complete 18:19 29:2,12 30:10 64:19</p> <p>completed 5:7 7:22</p> <p>complex 13:19</p> <p>comply 63:13</p> <p>component 12:2</p> <p>components</p>	<p>7:1 8:8</p> <p>comprehensive 64:15 65:2,8 66:2</p> <p>comprehensively 65:22</p> <p>comprise 52:6</p> <p>computer 25:5 54:7</p> <p>concentrated 52:16</p> <p>conceptual 24:13 64:13</p> <p>concern 12:19 14:23 15:4 20:16 21:3,5,12 22:3 23:16,21 24:21 25:3 26:7 27:2 37:11 54:20 62:12</p> <p>concerned 21:10 37:3,12 62:14 64:2</p> <p>concerns 14:7 24:19 27:8,12 33:12</p> <p>concludes 27:23</p> <p>conclusion 38:15 64:11</p> <p>concurrence 45:6</p> <p>condition 15:23 16:3 20:19 50:24 51:5</p> <p>conducted 6:12 55:11 60:13</p> <p>conducting 49:20</p> <p>confident 49:12</p> <p>configuration 36:6</p> <p>configurations 28:4</p> <p>conform</p>	<p>6:5,8</p> <p>conformance 6:22</p> <p>conformed 6:17</p> <p>conforms 5:18</p> <p>congestion 31:15 32:19</p> <p>connect 24:5,5</p> <p>connection 11:13 16:14 25:16 55:10 57:18,19 58:17</p> <p>connections 47:10 56:16</p> <p>connectivity 15:16</p> <p>conservative 50:9,14 67:13</p> <p>consider 16:22 19:23 46:20 60:9 61:11,13</p> <p>consideration 23:7,11 33:9 41:5,20 41:23 42:15</p> <p>considered 18:2 46:10 60:16,18 70:24</p> <p>considering 31:8</p> <p>consistent 8:13,17 26:13 54:12 54:14 56:4</p> <p>constraints 72:20 73:15</p> <p>constrictive 58:5</p> <p>constructed 27:3</p> <p>construction 26:5 27:1</p> <p>consultant 4:12,21 43:3,13 44:22 66:13</p>
--	--	---	---

consultants 2:17 43:17 66:11,12	11:12 35:6 36:13 67:10	cross 19:10 30:8 62:8	day 7:7 12:15,17 18:12 29:22 38:24 39:14,19 39:23 40:5,6 41:3,10 42:7 75:8
contemplated 55:7	Corporation 1:15	crossing 18:22 19:5 25:18 60:17 62:4	days 34:2 43:23 44:8 70:1,3
content 38:5,5	correct 34:11 38:8 39:15 64:21 67:5 75:6	crosswalk 18:24 19:2,4 25:22 33:4 52:12 60:20,21 61:17	daytime 59:21 60:3
context 46:21 55:1 62:22 63:15,24 67:14,20 70:20 72:7	correctly 68:8	cul-de-sac 34:1 56:10,15,19	Dedham 58:16
continuation 3:4	counsel 1:10 3:15 68:18	curb 9:12 17:6 59:12 60:3	dedicated 3:8 4:7 73:23
continue 73:21	count 10:13 40:4 50:11	curious 33:1 38:24	defined 52:8 57:3
continued 59:4	counted 39:20	current 36:14,19	definition 30:13
continuously 32:10	counter 52:1	currently 16:15 17:12,18 20:23 48:19 54:11 57:9 59:9 61:16	delineated 62:3
contractors 26:9,23	counts 9:16,24 49:20,24	customary 44:7	delivered 70:2
contrary 44:18	couple 43:23	cut 9:12 15:8 17:6	delivery 26:9,23
contribute 59:7	course 29:8 46:4 47:5,13,18 53:14	cut-through 15:13 27:19	demand 17:10 69:17
control 6:6 19:13,13	Court 75:1	<hr/> D <hr/>	demonstrate 6:11
conversation 29:6 46:3	crash 51:14,19 53:19,23 59:4,23	D 45:22 48:7 67:19	demonstrates 35:15
conversion 29:10	crashes 51:23 52:5,13,20,22 52:24 53:1,9,13,17	data 7:7,8,9,18 9:22 10:3,5 10:6,7,16,17,17,19 10:19,20,21,22,24 11:1,3,23 12:3 14:14 18:4 27:13,16 29:17 29:19 49:17 50:3,5 51:14 59:3,4,23 64:12 69:9 71:21,23 72:14	dense 67:16
convert 29:1	crash-rate 53:8	date 50:20 73:21	department 10:18 11:2 33:13 51:16 52:3 54:23 62:9 63:8
converted 56:14	create 16:6,12 30:3 31:15,17 31:21	dated 9:22 38:5 70:1 75:8	departments 3:7 28:19 44:2
convince 33:7	creates 59:22		depend 49:7
convincingly 48:11	creating 16:3		depending 18:12
Coolidge 67:10	criteria 51:9,13		derived 20:17 21:5 43:7,8
cooperation 60:9	critical 11:15 28:16		described 62:11
coordinated 19:17			
corner			

<p>design 5:7 6:3,3 7:12 24:1,12 24:13 25:3,14,24 29:24 33:17 34:5,11 34:20 35:10,18 39:9 45:23 51:9 54:12,20 55:7,24 56:11 57:5 57:15,20,23 58:4,7 58:13,19,20,21,24 59:12 67:18</p> <p>designed 18:18 33:22 54:10 55:11 57:9,10 61:23 61:23</p> <p>designers 58:20</p> <p>designing 57:14</p> <p>desirable 54:22</p> <p>destination 42:18</p> <p>detail 23:4,12 24:12 34:20 42:5</p> <p>details 4:1 23:8 25:19 33:20</p> <p>detection 62:7</p> <p>determine 71:19</p> <p>develop 64:13</p> <p>development 2:13 14:17 21:14 47:4 57:16 61:14 62:23 67:17 71:14</p> <p>Devices 6:6</p> <p>diagram 62:6</p> <p>dictate 35:12 60:14</p> <p>dictated 34:17</p>	<p>dictates 38:17</p> <p>diet 29:24 30:3</p> <p>different 36:10 41:16 51:19 69:13</p> <p>difficult 19:9 53:4 59:24</p> <p>dimension 59:13</p> <p>diminished 55:6</p> <p>direct 50:5 52:14</p> <p>direction 56:22,23</p> <p>directions 57:7 60:5</p> <p>directly 51:5,7</p> <p>director 2:13 66:24</p> <p>discuss 14:23</p> <p>discussed 51:8</p> <p>discussion 51:15 53:24</p> <p>disseminate 72:22</p> <p>distance 19:5</p> <p>distances 69:20</p> <p>distinct 53:17,18,19</p> <p>distinction 4:21</p> <p>distributed 73:8</p> <p>distribution 12:1,24 13:6 45:13 49:6 69:10,10 72:2,9 73:6,12</p>	<p>District 63:8,18</p> <p>diverse 41:15</p> <p>divide 22:17 42:8</p> <p>document 44:5,19 52:4 64:14</p> <p>documented 43:21 44:15 46:15 47:2 49:7,23 52:4</p> <p>doing 32:3,8 50:18 73:15</p> <p>doors 52:14 53:4,7</p> <p>dots 46:16</p> <p>dotted 9:10</p> <p>drainage 4:8</p> <p>draw 38:15</p> <p>drawing 4:20</p> <p>drawings 28:3</p> <p>drawn 55:12</p> <p>drive 8:14,16 9:6,12,13,22 10:4,9,12 11:17 17:6 17:12,21 18:4 19:8,9 25:1 27:4 29:16 31:5 32:11,16 33:2,2,5 36:4,5 40:23 47:8 49:21 50:19 52:6 59:6 61:20 63:10,20 64:14 71:4,7</p> <p>driven 21:7</p> <p>driver 51:13 60:20</p> <p>driveway 34:18 36:7 48:10</p>	<p>driveways 33:14 53:12 69:13</p> <p>due 69:12,22</p> <p>dwelling 39:2 42:13</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">E</p> <hr/> <p>E 58:6</p> <p>earlier 18:3 23:18 37:14</p> <p>early 9:17 46:8</p> <p>easily 41:23</p> <p>east 9:14 55:10 56:17,18</p> <p>eastern 14:17 36:3</p> <p>Edith 2:10,11</p> <p>effective 60:2 62:3 71:20</p> <p>effectively 32:4 60:3</p> <p>effectuated 65:12</p> <p>efficiently 44:10 65:22</p> <p>efforts 46:9</p> <p>eight 8:24 9:8,15</p> <p>either 59:15,21</p> <p>element 56:15,20 58:19 70:6</p> <p>emergency 8:6 17:1 24:21 25:7 26:2 28:18 33:23 36:2 54:1,4,18 55:3 62:12 63:12 64:3</p> <p>encourage 17:11,20</p>
---	--	--	---

encroaching 35:16	estimated 12:15,20	64:3 69:16	49:17 51:21,24 57:4
endorsed 62:2	estimates 69:5	exists 31:6 62:17 64:10	57:20 58:13
engine 63:9	estimating 67:7	exit 56:8 57:7	factor 51:7,10
engineer 5:3,6 6:1	et 69:20	exiting 48:10 63:22	factored 55:4
engineers 5:1,19,22	evaluate 27:19 60:8 61:4	expanding 61:7,11	factors 34:18
enlighten 46:3	evaluating 59:5,9 61:16	expansion 44:16 61:8 69:19	fair 72:23 73:3
ensure 5:10 58:20	evaluation 33:9 59:4 64:12	expect 44:20 47:11,16 51:10	fairly 72:22
enter 31:20 32:1,2	evening 3:3 9:19 12:11 41:12	74:2	fairness 70:7
entire 24:14 40:9 47:19 53:2	43:19	expected 38:23 70:7	familiar 18:8
53:14	evening's 3:21	expecting 66:10	far 3:15 42:24 58:8
entities 5:17	event 35:3 55:6	expensive 39:10	fashion 72:23
entrance 36:23 40:2	everybody 40:23 68:22	experience 10:20 16:5 29:22	Fax 1:18
environment 45:24 67:4,16	evolution 46:13	53:20	feasibility 59:9
equated 26:19	exactly 20:17 21:4	expertise 28:23	feature 34:5 61:19
equidistant 63:22	example 6:18 11:11 18:3,24	expires 75:11	features 57:15 62:3
equipment 51:2 62:1,2,21	22:7 23:10 39:24	explain 4:15 29:5 41:22	February 50:17
especially 8:6 13:18 14:13,15,16	58:3 61:22 70:21	explanation 40:1	federal 5:20 6:2,7
15:12 16:14,24 21:19	examples 59:1	extended 51:3	feet 10:10,11 16:17,18,21
26:12 27:14	exceed 51:9	extension 57:23	19:2 23:20 33:3 36:9
Esquire 2:9,10,14	exclusively 3:8	extent 54:22 61:8 62:16	37:2,2,3,6,14 60:2
essentially 8:7 13:1 15:19 16:4	excuse 22:5 66:22	E1 54:6	felt 68:15
17:23 18:10 20:11	exist 40:13 51:4 59:16		filled 38:4
21:8	63:18 67:11	F	final 38:15 65:17
established 47:1 50:4	existing 20:19 21:9 47:2 49:3,7	facility 54:12	finally 8:4 26:4 54:19
estimate 20:4 40:18 41:9	55:14 59:12 62:24	fact 45:8,15 46:17 48:18	find

19:10 60:1 71:20	follow	four-lanes	38:23 41:2,3
finding	39:9 41:13 56:22	18:17	generated
40:24 50:20 51:18	71:24 73:24	four-way	12:4,18,21 22:4 26:10
findings	followed	15:23,24 16:5	43:5,6 47:3
45:5,16 46:7,23 48:11	29:8	Friday	generating
51:11,22 54:3 62:11	follows	43:22 45:8	67:13
fine	45:14	front	generation
4:3,5 23:8,12	follow-up	40:2	5:23,24 12:4,5,14
fire	31:1 43:19	full	38:11 39:7 40:17
28:3 33:12 34:3 35:1,8	Ford	55:18 60:13 61:1	41:9 42:18 45:11
36:7,18,19,21,22	63:13,23	fully	48:17,21 69:4,5,6,8
37:4 44:2 54:23	foregoing	44:4,20	generations
58:11 62:9,20 63:8,8	75:4,6	function	12:17 39:14
63:17,18 64:23	forget	32:5 55:6 60:4,8	gentleman
firm	37:22 42:14	functional	70:18 72:1,6
61:23 68:18	forgetting	26:2	Gerry
first	4:1 38:7	fundamental	48:9 52:23 60:12
45:1,7 66:19	forgotten	70:6	getting
five	3:12	further	37:18,19
40:3 42:10 46:9 47:13	form	3:13 69:23	give
48:4 53:16 60:1	59:12 60:22 61:21,21	future	11:20 14:18 18:24
five-minute	64:22 71:24	15:12 27:5	52:20 70:9 73:3
63:10,20	formalizing		given
five-year	60:6	G	3:21 12:15 13:6 14:24
50:10	formally	gap	22:21 39:18,23 40:4
flashing	52:4	19:10	41:10 52:17 58:21
60:19 61:1,22	format	garage	gives
flexibility	52:19 64:20	24:6,11	21:1
56:9	formula	gateways	giving
floor	40:17	40:2,4	3:19 72:23
1:11	formulated	Geller	glad
flow	33:19	2:3 3:3,12 4:4,20	46:19 64:16
31:7 32:19	forth	28:21 33:11 34:10,13	go
fly	75:5	34:15 35:11,19,23	13:23 16:8 18:5 20:9
29:15	forward	36:21 37:8,11,17,20	24:15 29:14,18 30:2
focus	44:20 70:13 71:9	37:22 38:18 42:21,24	31:4 32:10 34:22
3:21	four	43:9 64:18 65:10	36:10,17 38:1 42:7
focused	5:17 18:15 19:3 29:1,4	66:7,14 67:1,23 68:9	42:24 44:5 61:10
71:6	29:6,11,20 30:15,17	68:12 70:15 72:17	65:6
fold	30:20 33:3 42:10,11	73:14,19	goes
43:24	four-bedroom	general	18:9 65:11
folks	20:13	38:9	going
12:10,11 13:15,18	four-lane	generally	3:7 8:10,13 12:21,23
17:11,14,17,20 23:6	10:9 18:6 30:13 53:4	45:4	13:2,3,9,15,18,21
41:24,24 48:21 49:8	59:10,16	generate	15:5,6,13,16,19 16:6

<p>16:11 17:16 24:3,10 26:10,11 27:3 28:12 31:5,13 32:12,13,15 32:15,18 33:8 40:6 41:4 42:1,4 49:10 53:6 55:3 64:13 69:21 70:4,9,13 71:20 72:11,21 73:20</p> <p>good 3:3,23 5:9,11</p> <p>Goulston 2:14 68:18</p> <p>govern 35:12,20</p> <p>government 5:21</p> <p>grade 23:22,24 24:8</p> <p>grades 69:20</p> <p>grading 24:20</p> <p>graph 22:21</p> <p>graphic 52:18</p> <p>graphical 52:19</p> <p>Greendale 58:12</p> <p>ground 60:24</p> <p>Group 2:15 4:11</p> <p>Grove 8:19,19 13:11 31:3 47:9 59:17,17</p> <p>growth 48:4 49:22 50:6,8</p> <p>guess 36:1 40:24 41:21 50:9</p> <p>guessing 49:9</p> <p>guideline 6:1</p>	<p>guidelines 5:13 6:10,14 7:13,21 35:12 38:2 39:5,7,9</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">H</p> <hr/> <p>half 47:3 52:12</p> <p>hammerhead 24:22 25:3,14,24 28:4 28:14 33:15,22 34:7 34:9,10,20,24 35:3,9 35:13 36:1,6,22 55:24 57:1,5,20,23 58:12,17,19,24</p> <p>hammerheads 54:20</p> <p>Hammondswood 58:23</p> <p>Hancock 17:13 47:2 48:19,22 48:22 49:8,11 53:12 55:14 62:24 63:7,10 63:16,21 64:4</p> <p>handle 29:21 58:1</p> <p>handled 26:21</p> <p>happen 16:7 70:12</p> <p>happened 68:15 70:3</p> <p>hard 41:1 65:24</p> <p>harder 73:3</p> <p>haul 26:20</p> <p>HAWK 60:22 61:16</p> <p>head 8:18</p> <p>heading 8:18 9:2 12:10 13:11</p> <p>heads 60:19</p>	<p>hear 74:3</p> <p>heard 3:6 33:12 44:1,12</p> <p>hearing 1:5 3:4,6,17,21 4:6,7 44:24,24 63:14 65:24 70:11 73:21,23 74:1</p> <p>hears 68:22</p> <p>held 5:5,8</p> <p>help 61:5</p> <p>high 50:9</p> <p>higher 48:18 49:2 67:12 69:8</p> <p>highest 47:7</p> <p>highway 5:20 6:2,7 61:24</p> <p>High-Intensity 61:16</p> <p>hill 1:7 24:17 57:16</p> <p>hit 31:5,13 32:8</p> <p>hits 28:12</p> <p>hitting 52:14</p> <p>Ho 2:15 4:10,11,22 22:10 22:15,19,24 23:4,15 28:8 29:10 30:17 31:10,14 32:22 33:20 34:12,14,19 35:14,22 36:8 37:1,12 38:11 39:4,15,18,22 40:10 40:13,16 41:7,22 42:23 43:1,5,21 68:6 70:17</p> <p>Hoe 46:5 49:6 54:1 65:14</p>	<p>70:16</p> <p>hole 30:4</p> <p>home 12:12</p> <p>honest 44:13</p> <p>hope 65:6</p> <p>hopeful 70:13</p> <p>horizontal 16:23</p> <p>hour 12:6,8,11 47:6,13,19 51:1,5</p> <p>hours 9:18,19,20 40:5 41:11 41:12 59:21 60:3 73:10</p> <p>Hussey 2:5 3:13 22:13,16 28:1 28:15 30:13,24 35:24 36:1,13,17 37:15,18 37:21 38:19 42:6,12 42:19 65:11 67:2,21 68:11</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">I</p> <hr/> <p>ideal 34:1,5</p> <p>ideally 35:4</p> <p>identified 25:17 45:9 55:16</p> <p>identify 20:18</p> <p>identifying 70:22</p> <p>illegal 34:11</p> <p>immediately 73:7</p> <p>impact 7:23 8:3 11:21 14:4,20</p>
---	---	--	--

15:11 29:7 45:17 46:22 47:7,23 48:12 49:14 56:21 58:2 69:14 impacted 27:4 69:1 implementing 63:11 important 4:17 5:2 7:8 11:5 13:14 25:23 68:19 72:18 improve 33:2,4 improvement 17:6 improvements 16:13 17:3 59:6 61:4 64:13 incident 52:11 include 29:19 30:14 71:8 included 9:1 69:3 including 27:4 inconsistent 68:2 increase 17:20 31:23 47:5,17 69:14 increased 17:15 increases 47:12 69:4 incremental 40:7 Independence 8:14,16,19 9:2,3,6,22 10:4,9,12 11:16 18:4 19:1,7 27:4 29:1,16 31:4 32:11,16 33:1,2 33:4 36:5 46:16 47:8 48:9 49:21 50:19	52:6 55:9 56:16 59:6 61:20 64:14 71:4,7 independent 4:24,24 35:19 39:8 48:5 independently 60:7 indicate 5:2 7:23 21:24 45:17 45:20 46:24 48:11 49:1 51:22 indicated 9:23 12:5 18:3,4 20:23 37:14 38:21 41:11 46:5 54:1 70:23 71:5 71:23 72:1 indicates 51:3 57:24 indifferent 3:24 individual 45:3 48:2 53:10 industry 5:13,14 7:21 45:12,14 45:16,24 48:12,13,18 48:23 49:1,13 69:6 influence 59:14 information 11:20 13:5,14,20 14:3 14:15,18 20:14 21:18 25:11 26:18 27:18 37:18,19 38:2,9 46:8 46:12 48:20,21 49:22 50:12,16 51:11,18 52:18 63:24 65:15 69:24 72:4,7,11,13 72:23 73:4 inhibiting 56:7 initial 70:5 initiative 60:10 initiatives	64:14 input 7:18 10:19 instance 47:11 53:11 56:14 58:12 60:12 65:24 Institute 5:19 integrate 7:18 intend 44:4 intent 31:22 interest 5:10 interested 61:7 interesting 50:20 52:22 58:3 interests 29:13 internally 73:8 interrupted 3:23 interruptions 29:15 intersection 8:1 9:3,6 10:15 11:15 11:16 14:11 15:21 16:4,8 18:23 19:1,7 19:11,14,16,19 31:20 48:9 71:18 intersections 8:23,24 9:7,9,11,15 14:13 19:15 45:9 46:5,14 48:14 52:13 52:23 53:10 69:1 inventoried 48:20 involved 57:13 involving 3:4	ISO 63:13 64:8 issue 28:18,20 30:23 37:7 57:8 66:3 72:10 73:6 73:12 issued 64:22 66:19 issues 3:9 4:8 14:10 24:10 27:23 33:24 42:15 44:1 59:22 65:22,23 66:20 ITE 5:22 38:21 39:4 40:16 41:8 69:9 IV 1:1 <hr/> J <hr/> Jessie 2:3 3:12 job 5:6 Jonathan 2:4 3:13 jumping 41:4 jumps 40:23 <hr/> K <hr/> kick 37:23 Kien 2:15 4:11 kind 19:12,17 24:16 67:24 kinds 35:21 know 5:2,23 6:11,17,19 7:3 7:20,24 8:6,13,15,24 9:4 10:21 11:1,15,19 11:20 12:19 13:1,2,4 13:8,9,11,17,20,22
--	---	--	---

<p>15:3,8,14 16:7,20,22 16:24 17:2,3,11,13 17:15,16 18:4,7,7,13 18:17,21 19:8,14,16 19:19,24 20:4,6,11 20:21,24 21:4,7,7,8 21:10,10,14,21,23 22:1,20 23:4,7,9,13 23:20,23 24:2,6,14 24:16,23 25:3,12,16 25:18,21 26:8,9,10 26:11,13,14,20,21,23 27:2,6,6,12,15 28:9 28:11,11,13 29:16,17 29:18 30:6,6,9 31:6 31:15,16,16,24 32:1 32:2,3,20,24 33:9,15 33:22 34:3,7 35:4,5 36:8,9 37:8,13 38:16 39:5,11,24 40:3,17 41:7,9,10,19,22,24 42:1,2,3,4 44:16 48:22 49:10 62:14,19 63:2 65:6,23 66:10 67:13 68:4 69:17 70:21,24 71:6,8,16 71:19,22,23 72:7,15 72:20</p> <p>knowing 24:12</p> <p>known 54:17 60:22</p> <p>knows 31:24 32:3,8</p> <p>Krakofsky 1:21 75:1,10</p> <p>Kringle 61:23</p> <p>Kristen 1:21 75:1,10</p> <p>Krokidas 2:9</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">L</p> <hr/> <p>ladder</p>	<p>63:9</p> <p>landscaped 56:11,13</p> <p>lane 19:3 59:11 60:1,4</p> <p>lanes 18:14,15 29:2,2,4,5,6 29:6,11,11,11,21 30:15,17,21 33:3 53:5 55:14</p> <p>large 13:18 15:5 54:7 57:6</p> <p>larger 16:24 28:11 31:23 35:3 56:15</p> <p>largest 54:5,10 55:11,15,22 56:2,21 57:10</p> <p>latest 51:21</p> <p>layout 8:4 23:17 51:13</p> <p>leave 42:2</p> <p>leaving 52:15</p> <p>ledge 24:16,17 26:13,14,17 26:20,22</p> <p>left 3:12,13 48:9</p> <p>legal 3:15</p> <p>LegalLink 1:15</p> <p>length 34:16,17 35:7</p> <p>letter 38:20 44:15 64:22</p> <p>let's 4:9 28:21</p> <p>level 7:23 24:7,14 36:20 44:21 45:22 46:21 47:7,23 48:3,7 64:8</p>	<p>66:5 67:19</p> <p>levels 45:5 67:15</p> <p>liberty 27:7</p> <p>light 52:1</p> <p>likelihood 55:5</p> <p>limit 51:1</p> <p>limits 57:3</p> <p>Lincoln 1:16</p> <p>line 24:10 30:23 51:7 65:20,21</p> <p>lines 9:10</p> <p>Liss 2:7 3:14 22:18,23 28:23 36:10,18,24 41:13 42:9,14</p> <p>listed 5:17 27:9</p> <p>literally 60:23</p> <p>little 6:19 9:10 10:2,11 11:7 11:9 12:2 14:6 17:9 20:2 23:15 24:2 26:4 41:1,1 42:12 44:12 47:3 68:15 72:7</p> <p>live 17:20 41:6 48:21 49:8</p> <p>living 42:17</p> <p>local 11:2 47:10 50:22 51:19 52:21</p> <p>Locally 6:15</p> <p>located 13:19 62:15 63:20</p>	<p>location 10:2 22:2 25:18,21 48:2,6 51:13 52:17 53:14,19 55:23,24 56:9 58:6,6 69:15 73:22</p> <p>locations 11:4,18 45:21 46:20 50:1,5 53:2 55:9,16 67:11</p> <p>long 19:2 35:14 36:4 57:18 57:23</p> <p>look 6:23 7:2,4 8:8 11:13 13:15 18:16 19:6,11 19:15 21:13,18 22:21 26:1,15 30:20 32:23 34:19,20,21 35:9 36:12 43:23 47:10 52:23 53:8 56:16 66:21 71:11</p> <p>looked 10:1,14,24 11:6 15:11 20:3 27:16 33:20 53:10</p> <p>looking 30:12 36:3 59:19 65:15</p> <p>Lord 43:18</p> <p>lot 5:21 10:16,17,22 12:10 13:18 16:12 17:16 23:16 24:4,13 24:16,17 26:6,13,14 26:19 30:22 32:20 34:3,6 40:18 41:8 50:21 63:19</p> <p>lots 20:22</p> <p>loudly 3:20</p> <p>lower 24:7 51:23</p>
--	--	---	---

<p>low-volume 50:22</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">M</p> <hr/> <p>M 2:10,11 magic 23:13 49:9 maintains 28:17 major 14:10 31:21 40:2 making 13:4 manage 33:1 Management 17:10 maneuver 55:19 56:2,4 57:7 58:15 maneuvering 54:8 55:18,22 56:20 58:21 Manual 6:5 map 8:18 9:4 12:23 March 1:9 62:9 63:14 70:1 Mark 2:6 3:14 market 23:8 Marlborough 43:17 Massachusetts 1:12,17 6:9 43:17 61:24 75:3 MassDOT 6:9 10:16,16 11:1 material 44:13 materially 48:14 51:19</p>	<p>math 68:2 matter 31:4 57:12 matters 52:16 max 24:1 MDM 2:17 22:14 37:19 43:16 mean 5:15 29:15 31:7 40:15 40:22,24 41:20 meaning 31:16 means 17:11 18:20 meant 31:15 measures 52:1 61:7 meet 38:2 45:15 51:13 63:12 meetings 65:13 66:12 meets 35:18 Member 2:6,7 members 2:2 4:16 memorandum 70:23 mention 17:9 26:6 mentioned 15:4 23:18 25:15 33:14 46:4 48:6 59:23 63:14,23 67:14 71:2 Merrill 1:15 met</p>	<p>60:15 64:9 method 69:9,11 methodologies 43:7 methodology 7:12 38:8,12,21 45:11 45:13 67:11 69:6 72:10 MFPA 63:13 64:8 Michaud 2:16 43:15,16 64:21 65:19 67:6 68:3,7,10 68:19 70:7 midblock 53:2 middle 60:24 miles 51:1,5 mind 29:4 minimum 36:9 51:9 minute 4:15 33:14 47:6 minutes 47:13,18 68:16 misleading 21:11 missed 10:22 11:3 missing 13:16 38:3,4 mitigated 8:2 mitigation 10:12 11:8,10 14:7,24 15:4,18 18:1 70:22 mitigations 17:24 19:22 38:17 mixture 30:2 modeled</p>	<p>45:15 48:1 54:4 modeling 54:7 modest 49:14 moment 38:7 43:10 54:14 morning 9:18 12:6,9 41:12 motion 62:7 motion-activated 61:18 motorist 60:19 move 44:20 71:9 moved 26:17 movement 8:5 48:10 moving 25:8 52:15 multiple 57:5,11 58:18 69:13 multiple-alarm 55:5 MUTCD 6:5 mutual 54:17 56:5 58:10,17 62:17,19 63:2,11 64:6,9 mystery 67:24</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">N</p> <hr/> <p>Nagler 2:9 3:15 43:2 name 3:11,20 4:11 43:15 narrow 16:16,21 29:23 50:21 51:6 narrowed</p>
---	---	---	--

31:3 nature 30:14 46:14 52:21 53:7 55:3 67:18 near 52:11 nearest 57:1 necessarily 52:16 60:7 need 15:8,10 18:17 25:19 26:22 27:13,17 28:19 39:8 51:12 52:1 57:4 60:14 61:10 66:16,18 66:21 71:16,19 needed 19:4 62:17 Needham 54:16 58:12 needs 11:21 24:18 38:4 66:17 70:24 negotiate 17:1 neighborhood 13:23 15:7 20:1 27:3 27:14,20 46:21 47:15 49:4,12 50:22 51:23 71:3,10 neighborhoods 67:17 Netter 2:10,11 Nevertheless 50:7 new 10:3,5 12:7,7,12,20,22 14:14 17:6 29:19 31:9 40:10,11 42:18 51:11 52:1 69:22 newer 51:11 Newton 18:12 54:16 58:16	night 65:23 nonpedestrian-relat... 52:15 north 8:16,18 13:11 46:10 47:4,9 northbound 31:13 Northern 41:15 Notary 75:2,10 noted 38:3 notes 75:7 noticed 34:22 Notwithstanding 46:19 November 45:18 46:15,23 47:20 51:20 53:22 75:11 number 1:6 12:15,20 20:8,14 22:7 23:13 28:3 39:1 39:1,2,5,6 43:4,6 63:17 64:21 66:16 68:1,4,11 numbers 22:16 23:1 47:20 numerous 15:3 <hr/> O <hr/> obligations 63:12 observation 20:20 21:6 observations 20:18 observe 24:15 observed	49:7 69:17 obtain 11:1 obtaining 49:18 obviously 65:3,7 66:20 occasions 53:6 occupancy 20:21 occur 48:19 50:10 52:13 53:2,13,17 occurring 52:21 occurs 49:3 53:20 Office 1:10 Oh 41:7 okay 4:4,9 21:14 24:3 28:15 30:24 34:15 37:21 41:18 66:7,22 67:21 68:7 70:22 72:5 73:20 old 9:22 18:4 34:2 Olmstead 57:16 once 7:22 11:23 12:19 27:22 36:21 66:20 online 28:6 open 53:6 66:5 opening 45:1 53:3 open-wide 34:2 operate 48:15	operating 45:23 48:8 67:15 operation 14:11 30:11 48:3 operations 45:15,17,22 49:15 69:12 opinion 60:5 opportunity 70:9 73:3 opposite 56:23 opted 63:3,5 options 33:6 54:21 order 47:12 73:24 organization 5:20 orientation 8:12,20 57:21 oriented 47:4 originated 13:9 outdated 10:2 outlining 38:1 outside 9:4 11:15 overall 8:4 9:15 14:19 30:9 71:6 overlooked 7:6 <hr/> P <hr/> page 38:20 Pages 1:2 paragraph
---	---	--	--

72:2,3	41:11,12	65:1	possible
parked	pedestrian	pieces	56:13 72:21,24
28:13 30:22 35:16	8:5 11:13 15:15,17	45:3	possibly
60:2	18:22 19:13 25:16,22	place	61:5
parking	30:11 52:11 60:17	4:6 66:8 75:5	potential
5:24 6:18,20 20:2,8,15	61:17 62:4,8	placed	14:4 15:11 27:19 54:5
20:22 21:23 22:2,3	pedestrians	73:9	59:5
22:17 30:14,15,18	30:7	placing	potentially
35:17 39:2,7,8 42:13	pedestrian-activated	25:21	13:22 16:11 24:9
50:21 51:6 53:5	60:23	plan	PowerPoint
56:21 58:2 59:11,20	peer	8:4 23:16,23 57:22,24	28:2,7
68:8 69:17	3:9 4:9,17,18,23 43:22	68:3 69:16,19	practice
Parkway	44:15 45:3,4 46:18	planning	44:8
8:17 13:10 19:20	47:22 51:14 64:24	2:13 46:9 66:23 68:14	precursor
32:11	65:4 66:12 68:21	plans	44:4
part	70:7 74:3	68:8	predicated
8:8 10:7,12 11:7,10	people	plantings	39:1
12:4,13 14:24 40:21	13:2 15:12 16:7 18:7	17:7	preferably
45:10 53:5 61:11	32:19,20 40:3,22	pleased	65:7
particular	41:3 42:10,10 49:11	43:18 45:4	preference
44:23 46:13 47:8	53:3,6 62:21 72:22	plow	65:19
50:17 54:21 57:16	percent	35:6	prepare
58:3 59:8 62:10,14	13:8,10,12,13 16:7	plower	59:3
63:6,19 64:16 73:23	23:24,24 24:3 49:2	35:6	present
particularly	50:8	plus	51:17 70:10
4:16 54:16	percentage	30:15	presentation
parties	13:1 15:6 41:24	point	4:14 8:12,15,21 27:24
65:12,17	percentile	14:23 15:1,19 31:2,6,7	28:2,7 37:24
pass	51:4	31:11,13,14 33:10	presentations
36:7,20,23	period	46:8 49:22 51:15	28:9
passage	7:10 50:7,10 51:3,22	53:24 57:13 59:17	presented
69:22	52:5 53:1,14	63:15,24 65:16 71:17	38:13 43:21 44:14,14
passing	permitting	points	44:18 46:23 47:20
37:4	5:6	40:2 46:2 47:9	48:1 49:13 50:13
path	pertinent	police	51:12,20 53:21 58:6
25:6 28:12	50:12	10:18 11:2 44:2 51:15	58:7
paths	petition	52:3 64:22	presenting
55:13 69:2	61:9	population	56:12
pattern	physically	41:18	presents
53:22	24:18 35:15	portion	52:18
patterns	pick	62:15	presuming
47:1,2 49:6,7,10,22	42:17	position	42:15
69:13	picked	56:12 61:19	primary
peak	42:16	positive	46:6 53:11 55:13
9:18,19 12:6,8,11	piecemeal	59:7 70:5	principal

43:16	8:24 9:16 10:3,23	61:18	raised
prior	11:6,13 12:3,18	put	62:13 71:18
43:19	14:10,12 15:18,23	6:6 41:17 61:2	rate
proactively	16:14,17 19:6,11,23	putting	20:7,12,17 21:1,3,5,10
50:16 51:16	23:19 25:4,10,16	16:2	21:13,21 23:8 50:8
probably	26:13 27:11,22 29:8	P.C	53:15,23 67:11
57:4 65:5,7 68:7	32:23 70:21 71:9,11	2:11	rates
problem	71:22	P.E	20:16,23 22:7 48:17
31:17 33:19	proposal	2:16	49:1
procedural	47:8	p.m	ratio
37:15,17	proposed	1:9 3:2 9:20 74:4	21:20
proceedings	9:11 11:22 15:18,20		read
3:1 74:1,4 75:4	16:14 20:6,7 22:8	<hr/> Q <hr/>	11:9 49:18 68:20
process	38:22 55:15 58:5,14	quantifiable	70:19 72:2,6
5:7 31:23 49:18,19	60:7 68:24 69:2,18	53:18	reading
50:18 61:9 65:6,10	proposing	question	70:19
66:10 71:16	15:22 23:19 32:9	33:16 34:15 35:23	real
produce	37:14 64:5	37:9,15 38:19 43:2	41:13 50:3
44:5	provide	64:16 65:11 67:2	realistically
professional	14:2 15:24 17:19	questioned	32:7
3:20 5:1,3,5	19:14 20:24 25:11	22:19	realities
professionally	30:3,10 32:5 44:6	questions	48:19
5:12	65:8	3:24 28:21 33:11 36:2	realize
program	provided	43:11 60:10 64:23	16:7 40:20
28:5	5:4,11 9:24 10:7 14:22	66:4,16	really
project	21:18 46:6 51:8 54:3	queuing	18:17 19:4 20:11
6:21 7:24 8:3,11 11:22	61:12 62:23 72:4,8	31:17,21	27:21 28:16 41:21
12:4,8,21,24 14:12	provides	quick	42:3 43:22 44:16
14:20 20:3 27:2,18	56:20 64:7	20:4 26:15 41:14 43:2	46:12 49:9,23 53:5
45:10 46:13,14,22	providing	quickly	57:4 59:17 60:4
47:24 48:5,13 54:9	16:5 19:5 20:8 71:19	15:20 28:10 31:4	Realty
55:2,7 57:9 58:4,9	proximate	32:20 72:21	1:7
60:8 64:5 67:8 68:24	47:16	quite	reanalyze
69:2,7,11 71:1	proximity	62:5	14:13
projects	63:7 64:7	quote	rear
40:15 54:13,15 56:4	pseudo-hammerhead	45:19	57:19
57:14 58:23	58:24		reason
proper	public	<hr/> R <hr/>	37:22 64:5
25:18	3:18 44:2,24 64:23	racks	reasonable
properly	67:9 70:10 75:2,10	61:14	72:23
7:20	pure	radar	rebut
property	4:21	51:2	43:11
46:9	purposes	radius	recall
proponent	40:1	33:21	3:5
5:11 6:4 7:16 8:2,22	push-button	raise	receipt
		37:23	

73:7 received 38:20 43:22 44:15 51:17 52:3 recognize 72:19 recognized 5:20 45:24 recommend 6:3 16:17 17:14,19 recommendation 16:20 recommendations 5:4,7 29:1 31:9 46:7 recommended 5:8 17:5,24 recommending 6:4 record 3:18 4:11 43:15 66:23 68:17,19,20,22 recorded 3:17 recorder 51:2 records 51:17,19 52:21 red 60:23 redesign 50:2 reduces 34:8 reducing 19:3,4 refer 5:22 8:15 39:13 reference 57:13 referenced 36:11 referring 71:3,4 reflect 49:23 50:24 51:5	64:13,23 reflected 59:22 regarding 23:16 regardless 71:22 registered 5:1,3,5 regulations 6:16 35:12,20 regulatory 50:24 related 5:24 6:19 24:19 52:11 relates 25:13 44:16 67:14 relationship 22:6 relative 36:2 relatively 72:20 relook 14:12 reluctance 54:20 rely 62:16 remaining 13:12 reminder 4:4,5 removed 24:18 repeat 27:10 replacing 59:10 report 5:9,11,12 13:5 14:24 20:18 21:24 22:14,20 27:7,22 38:9 45:18 65:18 66:11,15,19,20 68:6,21 70:1,5 73:7,7	73:12 reported 45:18 Reporter 1:21 75:1 reports 66:1 represent 68:8 representation 47:22,23 represents 47:5 request 10:2 63:3 requested 10:23 25:10 29:18 32:22 49:17 51:14,16 requesting 28:10 72:14 requests 46:20 require 58:19 61:19 required 20:9 23:2 60:24 requirement 69:23 requires 34:6 research 39:10 40:19 41:8 68:5 reserve 43:13 Residences 1:8 3:5 residential 15:3 38:22 46:14,24 49:3 54:13,15 58:7 58:18 67:16 71:11 residents 42:2 resolve 27:12 resolved	27:23 resources 62:20,21 respond 43:11 44:23 54:11 55:5 65:24 66:21 73:4 responding 44:10 response 44:5,7 52:4 54:5,18 55:3 62:12,23 63:12 63:20 64:3,15,19 65:2,4,9 66:15 70:10 74:2 responses 65:5 73:1 responsive 44:1 restrict 35:7 restrictive 58:8,14 restripping 60:10 result 14:7,11,19 20:24 29:9 52:14 56:11 resulting 69:14 results 7:19,23 14:9 38:16,16 45:20 53:21 retain 56:13 return 55:19 returning 12:11 reverse 56:22 57:7 review 3:8 4:7,9,17,24 6:24 8:9 25:13 43:20,22 44:15,22 45:3,5 46:5
--	--	---	--

46:18 47:22 49:19,19 51:15 68:21 69:16,19 70:8 73:3,24 74:3	Robert 2:16 43:16	2:9	66:1
reviewed 49:6 62:10 65:4	role 4:18 5:9	saw 74:1	serve 55:14
reviewer 3:9 4:18,23,23 26:15 44:14 64:24 65:4 66:13	rolling 16:11	says 22:20 41:18	serves 18:11
reviews 72:21 73:1	rotaries 31:7 32:19	scattered 21:16,23	service 45:22 48:3,7 56:1 61:11 67:15,19
right 3:14,16 7:11 8:14 9:12 11:8,12,14 12:1 13:17,23 14:9 15:7 15:15,21 18:23 22:15 23:19,22 24:7,14 25:1 26:8,12,15 28:20 29:20 30:17,20 34:19 36:12,24 39:22 40:13 43:1 58:13 59:17 63:17 71:5,13	rotary 31:3,5,13,19 32:6,8,12 32:14,21	school 7:10 11:14 15:15 36:5 56:17 57:2,2 62:24 64:4	services 17:15
right-of-way 33:24 34:6,8	round 39:17 65:5	Schwartz 2:14 37:8,10 43:10,12 68:13,17 73:11,17	servicing 53:12 58:18
ring 63:16	roundabout 24:24 31:10,11,18,22 31:22 32:1,4,9 46:10 59:14	second 50:15 60:22 61:21	set 65:13 75:5
road 9:1,7,8 11:11,11 13:13 23:18 29:24 30:3 31:2 43:18 47:11,16 49:24 50:17,21,21 51:1,4,6 52:7,7,7,23 53:11,12 59:8,15,20 60:4,12	Route 18:8,9,12	secondly 45:10	sets 39:4,8
roads 47:24 52:6,8	Roxbury 63:6	section 14:17 16:23 18:12,14 18:18 29:16 30:7,8 37:2 53:4 59:10,11 59:19,20 63:1,6	setting 50:22
roadway 8:1 10:9 12:13 16:15 16:16 18:6,6,10,11 18:14,18,20 19:3 25:21 30:1,5,7,8 36:9 37:2 47:10 50:23,23 57:18	rules 6:16	sections 59:16	share 22:1 54:18 62:20 69:14
roadways 16:24 54:9 68:24	running 52:14	see 15:11 16:1 18:1 19:11 25:8 28:11 32:17 34:3 35:2 36:8 38:9 38:10,14 48:7 52:24 53:13 54:2 57:3 62:2 62:5 63:17	shared 58:11
	Russett 9:7 11:11 15:9,22 27:17 32:15 50:17,20 51:1,4 52:7 53:11 59:15,20 71:12	sections 59:16	shed 51:24
	S	seen 33:21 45:8	Sherman 9:1 19:1,7 30:19 52:23 60:12
	safe 18:21,22	segment 13:17	short 27:7
	safely 30:6 31:20	send 63:3	shorthand 75:7
	safer 19:5	sense 52:20	shortly 51:18
	safety 8:6 11:13 15:16 19:14 25:22 30:8,10,11,11 32:5 35:11 52:1 59:7	sensitive 72:18	show 28:3 48:1 53:22
	Sam 3:15	separately 39:21	showing 8:11 9:3 20:10
	Samuel	seriously	shown 8:18,22 11:9 12:23 13:23 14:10 15:2,2 15:21 20:5 22:2 24:24 25:19 46:15 55:17 57:18 62:1 63:15

<p>shows 22:22 25:6 49:14 50:6 54:8 56:18 57:23 60:23 68:3</p> <p>shuttle 17:13,15,22 61:11</p> <p>shuttles 67:10</p> <p>side 9:13 16:9 19:9 21:17 24:4 30:19 46:11 55:16 56:18 57:18 58:24 59:21</p> <p>sides 30:15,16 66:6 72:19</p> <p>sidewalk 17:3 25:17</p> <p>sign 16:10</p> <p>signage 6:18</p> <p>signal 19:17,18 46:11 53:11 59:15 60:11,13,14,15 60:23 61:1</p> <p>signalized 50:1</p> <p>signals 46:16 60:17,18 61:15</p> <p>significantly 34:7</p> <p>signs 17:7 62:5</p> <p>similar 53:22</p> <p>simple 20:5 56:3</p> <p>single 19:12 27:9 60:4 65:2 66:3</p> <p>single-lane 59:10</p> <p>site 8:4,7,11 9:12 13:3 15:21 16:15 17:2,4,5</p>	<p>17:6,17 19:8,24 20:1 20:19 21:7,9,24 23:16,17 24:10,14,15 24:18 25:9,14 26:7 26:12,15,15 30:23 34:22 36:4 40:3,6 51:7 53:24 54:9 56:8 57:8,22 58:5 68:3,8 69:16,19,20</p> <p>sites 26:8 58:19</p> <p>situation 34:24</p> <p>six 7:1 40:3 70:1</p> <p>six-plus-year 50:7</p> <p>slide 8:13 36:10</p> <p>slide's 8:13</p> <p>slightly 35:2</p> <p>slow 31:19 32:4</p> <p>small 28:10</p> <p>smaller 46:13</p> <p>smoothly 29:14 31:7</p> <p>snapshot 52:2</p> <p>snow 34:21,23 35:4</p> <p>software 7:13,15,16 25:6 38:13</p> <p>solid 46:16</p> <p>solution 32:9 34:1</p> <p>somebody 28:20 42:7 59:24 70:5</p> <p>somewhat 44:17</p>	<p>sort 15:15 38:24</p> <p>sorts 61:10</p> <p>sounds 28:1</p> <p>south 1:8 3:5 9:5,7 11:11 13:11,12 15:9 19:18 27:17 47:14 49:24 52:6 59:15,19 71:12</p> <p>southbound 8:16</p> <p>Southern 41:16</p> <p>space 58:21</p> <p>spaces 20:8,15 21:13,20,22 21:23 22:2,7,8,9,11 22:17 23:3 35:17 39:2 42:13 68:1 69:17</p> <p>speak 3:20 36:16 67:23 68:16</p> <p>speaking 3:18 36:13 68:14</p> <p>specific 7:13 39:7</p> <p>specifically 6:11,23 7:2 32:22</p> <p>speculate 70:3,4</p> <p>speed 10:6,7 29:19 49:20 50:15,16,23,24 51:1 71:18</p> <p>speeds 51:4 59:5</p> <p>spend 4:15 11:7 12:2 23:15</p> <p>spoke 48:24</p> <p>sprinklered 55:2,4</p>	<p>Square 18:13</p> <p>stamped 62:4</p> <p>stand 39:24 40:1</p> <p>standard 5:14 6:7 35:18 44:8 45:12,14,23 46:1 48:8 49:1,14 67:7,9 67:12,13,18</p> <p>standards 5:13 6:23 7:13,21 38:2 45:16 48:12,13,18,24 63:13 64:9 67:15 69:6</p> <p>standpoint 26:3</p> <p>start 3:19 8:10 13:7 23:18 28:21 31:8</p> <p>started 37:24 50:16</p> <p>starting 9:1</p> <p>state 6:9,10,14 36:14,19 61:24</p> <p>stated 23:2 45:11 48:16 49:5</p> <p>statements 68:21</p> <p>state-approved 62:1</p> <p>station 17:14 63:9,22 64:7</p> <p>stations 63:18</p> <p>steep 23:22 24:8 25:20</p> <p>Steinfeld 2:12 4:2,3 65:13 66:9 66:22,23 73:5</p> <p>step</p>
--	---	---	--

11:24 27:21 45:3 46:2	52:8 53:10,22 68:23 68:23 69:7 70:9 71:5 71:6,8	26:1 66:7	73:18
steps	subject	surplus	tape
64:11 65:8	50:2 51:14	56:3	3:17
Steven	submit	surprised	task
2:14 68:17	66:11,15	41:1	3:10
stop	submittal	surprises	TDM
15:23,24 16:3,5,10,11 17:7 31:8,16 60:24	45:12	66:4	17:9,10 61:7
stopped	submitted	surrounding	team
61:19	47:21 49:19	19:24	62:13 64:3
storage	submitting	survey	technical
34:23 35:5	64:19,19	51:2	44:7
stormwater	subsequently	surveys	technology
4:7 73:23	73:9	50:15	61:2
Storrs	suburban	suspended	tell
2:14 68:18	67:7,9,12	74:4	32:24 33:5
straight	successfully	synchronize	telling
24:3	28:17	19:21	13:1,7
street	sufficient	Syncro	term
1:11,16 6:18 8:19 9:5 9:8 11:11 13:11,12 15:10,13 16:9 18:19 19:18 27:17 29:3,12 29:23 30:10,22 31:3 47:9,14 50:1 51:23 52:7 58:16 59:13,15 59:17,18,22 71:12,13	34:16 36:7 55:21,21 69:18	7:15	18:19 29:24
streets	suggested	system	terms
7:5 11:8 15:3,10 24:4 27:14,20 30:20 49:11 71:3,12,13	10:6 17:4 50:11	8:1 10:19,21 12:13,16 30:5 41:17 45:9 62:7	5:10 8:5 27:2,13 31:10 34:8 35:9 38:4 51:12 56:10 65:10
streetscaping	Suite	systems	testimony
17:7	1:16	59:15	3:6 43:19 48:16 61:12
studied	summarize		Texas
45:21 71:5	15:20	T	40:22
studies	summary	T	Thank
67:4	27:6,7	57:7	4:10 23:14 30:24 38:18 42:22 43:9 66:22 67:21 68:12 70:14,15 73:5,10 74:3
study	supplemental	table	thing
4:24 5:18 6:12,13,17 7:3,5,22 8:11 9:1 20:22 22:4 26:6 44:17 45:8,10,21 46:20 47:21 48:1,2 48:15 49:20 51:20	49:16 59:3 65:15,18 66:15,19,20	12:1	14:5 72:6,17
	supplied	take	things
	38:6	17:22 21:20 22:16 27:7 33:9 39:22 41:5 41:19 42:8 43:10 53:9 66:1 68:16	35:8 44:24 53:7 59:7 61:13 67:10,17
	support	taken	think
	34:16	41:23 75:4,7	4:17 5:1,3 11:5 13:17 14:17 15:5,9,10,16 16:21 17:23 19:22 20:22,23 21:22 22:21 23:17,20 25:1 26:6 26:16 27:1,10 28:6
	supports	takes	
	50:13	17:13 23:7 42:14 66:7	
	supposed	talk	
	32:2	6:19 10:11 11:9 14:6 19:21 20:2	
	sure	talked	
	5:18 6:13,16 7:4,9,16 7:17,19 8:1 11:2 16:2 18:20 25:15,18	27:9 28:5 55:8	
		talking	

30:9 31:14,18,21 32:13,17 34:5 35:2 35:17 36:11 37:3,4,6 37:12,14 38:11 59:6 65:11 66:2,5,14,18 68:14,19 70:18,19,22 71:2 72:13,18 73:12 73:14	64:10 71:17 tonight 3:7,19 43:20 44:12 68:14 tonight's 3:17 74:1 tons 26:16 tool 58:20 top 36:12 total 12:12,15 20:14 39:18 40:5,8 43:8 totally 4:5 touch 26:4 tough 37:4 tower 54:6 town 1:10 3:7 4:12,19 5:10 6:15 10:18,21 28:7 28:18 50:2,13 55:12 57:11 58:9 60:9 61:4 64:3 70:8 town-provided 49:24 to-curb 59:13 traditional 56:10,19 57:5 60:18 traditionally 67:18 traffic 3:8 4:12 5:9,11,18,21 5:24 6:6,12 8:5 9:16 10:13 11:24 13:5,21 14:6,19 19:12 25:14 26:5,9 27:1,15 30:21 31:12,15 32:4,10,12 32:14 34:2 43:3,12	45:14,17,18 48:14 49:15,20,24 59:5,8 61:1 69:2,4,7,12,14 70:24 71:2,10,15,16 72:12 traffic-generating 67:8 train 17:14 transcript 75:6 transit 17:22 transition 10:21 transportation 2:17 3:9 5:19 17:10 33:13 43:16 67:9 travel 30:7 50:15 53:5 69:1 69:13 travelling 55:20 tree 17:7 trees 52:14 trend 53:17,18 tried 19:8 23:9 trip 5:22 12:1,4,5,14,17,24 13:6,8 38:11 39:13 39:17 40:16,18 41:8 45:10,13 47:1,11,16 48:16,21 49:1,5 53:23 67:11 69:4,4,6 69:8,10,10 72:1,9 trips 12:7,12,13,16,20,22 13:4 14:16 15:6 38:24 39:1,5 40:10 40:11 41:3,10 42:1 47:3 48:5	trouble 22:6 truck 16:24 25:7 26:6,9 28:4 33:21,23 34:3 35:1,8 36:21,23 54:6 trucks 26:19,21,23 36:7,19 36:19 37:4 62:21 true 42:19 75:6 try 27:8,11 43:24 65:22 73:2 trying 28:24 72:22 turn 28:13 33:23 35:8,16 36:22 48:9 58:2,15 turnaround 24:22 34:23 35:1 turnarounds 33:15 35:13,21 turning 25:6 28:12 33:21 turns 8:19 two 9:11 17:18 18:14 23:3 29:2,5,6,11 36:15,18 36:19 37:4 39:4,8 42:9,12 44:8 47:18 50:1 51:10 52:24 53:11,13 55:9 60:17 65:7 66:12 69:9 72:19 73:10 two-bedroom 20:12 two-lane 18:10 33:7 two-mile 63:16 two-year 53:14 type
thinking 59:24 thinks 29:4 third 42:7 51:14 Thornton 52:24 60:12 thought 70:5,8 three 29:11 42:6 52:10 70:2 three-bedroom 20:12 three-lane 33:8 three-point 28:13 35:16 58:2,15 three-year 51:22 52:5 53:1 throw 44:12 tight 72:20 time 7:7,11 11:7 12:2 15:1 16:8 23:15 30:6 37:4 40:23 43:13 45:1 51:3 55:20 56:7 61:12 63:21 69:22 73:15 75:5 times 3:22 10:16,17 22:18 30:22 42:7 53:16 62:12 69:22 today 4:16 23:6 31:19 49:11			

<p>55:6 61:18 62:4 types 57:14 60:17 61:4,15 typical 42:1 47:6 typically 11:23 16:1 34:6 typo 22:23 68:7</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">U</p> <hr/> <p>ultimately 5:8 unclear 20:17 understand 4:18 24:2 25:4 28:24 54:19 62:22 64:1 67:2 73:14,17 understanding 14:3,18 22:6,10 36:18 understands 73:13 underway 64:12 unfortunately 9:5 Uniform 6:5 uniqueness 41:20 unit 22:8,9 42:10,11,13,20 68:1 units 20:6 21:19 22:11 23:3 23:10 38:22 39:3,6 39:14 40:8 41:1 46:24 48:22 58:18 unload 26:22 unreasonable 42:20 unsafe 16:4</p>	<p>unusual 68:15 update 27:22 updated 51:21 updates 38:14 updating 37:19 upper 24:6 urban 40:21 45:24 67:3,14 67:16 urge 73:2 usage 34:10,17 35:12 use 7:14 15:6,13 17:22 29:24 35:1,4 40:18 49:11 63:1 uses 6:1 41:9 67:17 usually 35:18 utilized 69:8</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">V</p> <hr/> <p>vacation 7:10 various 3:6 28:18 vehicle 8:7 15:6 17:1 18:21 19:13 24:22 25:7 26:2 28:18 30:10 33:23 38:23 39:1 47:6,12,17 54:5,7,11 55:12,19,20,22 56:2 56:6,7,21,22 57:10 58:1,22 vehicles</p>	<p>8:6 12:17 26:24 36:3 47:18 54:11 57:6,11 61:20 version 28:11 vertical 16:22 24:9 25:20 VFW 8:17 11:16 13:9 19:19 32:11 vicinity 47:17 videotaped 3:18 view 28:2 30:23 44:17 Village 17:13 47:2 48:19,22 48:23 49:8,11 53:12 55:14 62:24 63:7,10 63:16,21 64:4 visible 62:5 volume 1:1 10:1 18:21 43:8 59:5</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">W</p> <hr/> <p>walk 54:2,14 want 6:12 7:8,15,17,19 8:1 11:12,19 14:6 18:20 20:2 23:15 25:15,17 29:13,19 30:3,4,4 32:24 33:5 43:10 54:2 65:8 66:4 wanted 12:1 14:22 31:2 62:22 64:1 70:17 72:15 warrant 16:1 19:16 warrants 19:12 60:13,14,16 Washington</p>	<p>1:11 wasn't 68:14 way 9:2 18:13 32:11,17 36:11 43:8 44:1 52:10 59:14 61:2 71:20 ways 7:18 17:11 weak 70:22 web 73:9 welcome 42:23 Wellesley 18:9,9,13 west 9:13 55:9,16 56:17 63:6 western 36:3,12 61:24 we'll 37:20 43:12 46:19 50:11 51:17 54:2 61:13 64:14 66:21 69:13 we're 4:11 21:9 40:22 45:4 49:9,12 50:18 59:19 61:15 64:12 65:21 70:12 71:3 72:8,10 72:19 73:15,18 we've 5:4 48:20 49:13 50:7 50:13 51:12,20 52:2 52:8 54:3,4,7 55:10 55:12,15,16 56:17 58:7 60:13 62:10 67:7,19 whatnot 17:8 whatsoever 50:6</p>
---	--	---	--

<p>wide 10:10 30:18</p> <p>widened 16:18</p> <p>widening 23:20</p> <p>wider 10:10 16:18</p> <p>width 16:16 19:3 34:16 35:7 36:6 55:21 60:2</p> <p>willing 33:8 60:8 61:10</p> <p>wondering 67:1</p> <p>work 12:10 13:3 23:2 27:11 27:21 33:8,18 42:1 54:23 61:3 65:3 71:9</p> <p>worked 23:5 66:18</p> <p>working 44:9</p> <p>works 42:6 44:3 56:13 64:23</p> <p>world 46:11</p> <p>written 44:18 64:20 65:8 66:1 66:11</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">Y</p> <hr/> <p>yeah 36:21 37:20 41:7 42:4 42:9</p> <p>year 20:20 50:18</p> <p>years 46:9 48:4 52:19</p> <p>yellow 62:6</p> <p>yesterday 51:17</p> <p>yield 32:2</p>	<hr/> <p>Z</p> <hr/> <p>ZBA 73:8</p> <p>zero 63:19</p> <p>Zipcar 61:8,9</p> <p>Zipcars 17:18</p> <p>zoning 1:5 6:19 20:9 23:3,6</p> <p>Zuroff 2:6 3:15 31:1,12 32:7</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">0</p> <hr/> <p>02111 1:17</p> <p>02445 1:12</p> <p>02446 41:17</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">1</p> <hr/> <p>1 50:8</p> <p>1,200 12:16</p> <p>1,300 38:23 39:13,16,17,23 40:6,7,12,13 41:3 42:8 43:3,6</p> <p>1-75 1:2</p> <p>1.25 21:21</p> <p>1.3 20:23</p> <p>1.4 20:7,16 21:1,3,10,13 21:22 22:8,9,11,14 22:18,19,20 68:2,5 69:17</p> <p>1.7 68:9</p> <p>1.78</p>	<p>22:13,17,22 68:2,3 69:18</p> <p>10 23:24,24 24:2 47:12</p> <p>10th 4:6 73:22</p> <p>100 12:7</p> <p>100-foot 54:6</p> <p>110-115 58:16</p> <p>116 21:19</p> <p>12 47:13 52:19 53:15 63:8</p> <p>120 12:12</p> <p>13 13:19 24:15 27:8 52:19 72:5</p> <p>14 52:5,10 53:2</p> <p>14,000 18:5,8,15 29:22 33:3</p> <p>144 38:22</p> <p>146 21:20</p> <p>16 18:8,9,12</p> <p>16,000 18:11</p> <p>179 1:16</p> <p>18 16:16</p> <p>18-wheeler 25:8</p> <p>19 21:19 22:1 24:6 26:7</p> <p>192 20:6 22:11,17,18 23:3 39:14 40:8 41:1 42:8</p>	<p>196 46:24</p> <hr/> <p style="text-align: center;">2</p> <hr/> <p>2.0 20:10,10,12 23:10</p> <p>2.3 20:10,13</p> <p>20 51:4</p> <p>20th 70:1</p> <p>20,000 18:11 26:16</p> <p>2005 50:2</p> <p>2007 9:23,24</p> <p>2010 57:17</p> <p>2011 52:19</p> <p>2012 9:17 50:4 57:17</p> <p>20130094 1:6</p> <p>2014 1:9 75:8</p> <p>2017 75:11</p> <p>22 16:18,20 37:2,3,10,11 37:14</p> <p>22-foot 23:19</p> <p>22-foot-wide 54:9</p> <p>24 16:21 23:20 36:9 37:2 37:6 40:5</p> <p>24-hour 10:1</p> <p>26 1:9</p> <p>268</p>
--	---	--	---

22:12	55		
268.8	10:11 13:10 19:2 33:3		
22:18			
28	<hr/> 6 <hr/>		
43:18	6th		
	1:11		
<hr/> 3 <hr/>	6:00		
3	9:20		
38:20 75:11	617		
30	1:18,18		
47:18 49:2 51:1	<hr/> 7 <hr/>		
333	7th		
1:11	75:8		
340-odd	7:00		
41:2	1:9 4:6 9:18 73:22		
342	7:03		
20:8,24 21:13,22	3:2		
22:16	7:30		
35	12:9 21:7		
13:8	<hr/> 8 <hr/>		
360	8:30		
20:15 23:3,13	12:9		
<hr/> 4 <hr/>	8:52		
4:00	74:4		
9:20	85th		
40	51:3		
47:18	<hr/> 9 <hr/>		
40B	9:00		
1:7 3:4	9:19		
401			
1:16			
48-hour			
9:24			
<hr/> 5 <hr/>			
5			
13:12,13			
5th			
62:9 63:14			
50			
10:10 16:7			
542-0039			
1:18			
542-2119			
1:18			