

Minutes of the Cambridge Historical Commission

August 4, 2022 – Meeting conducted online via Zoom Webinar (876 3150 0967) - 6:00 P.M.

Members present (online): Bruce Irving, *Chair*; Susannah Tobin, *Vice Chair*; Chandra Harrington, Liz Lyster, Jo Solet, Yuting Zhang, *Members*; Gavin Kleespies, Kyle Sheffield, *Alternate Members*

Members absent: Joseph Ferrara, *Member*; Paula Paris, *Alternate Member*

Staff present (online): Charles Sullivan, *Executive Director*, Sarah Burks, *Preservation Planner*

Public present (online): See attached list.

This meeting was held online with remote participation and was closed to in-person attendance, consistent with the provisions set forth in the Act Relative to Extending Certain State of Emergency Accommodations signed by Governor Baker on July 16, 2022. The public was able to participate online via the Zoom webinar platform.

With a quorum present, Mr. Irving called the meeting to order at 6:04 P.M. He explained the online meeting instructions and public hearing procedures, then introduced commissioners and staff. He explained the Consent Agenda procedure and asked if there were any objections to passing cases 4832, 4833 and 4834 per the Consent Agenda policy.

Case 4832: 59 JFK St., by Trinity Realty II, LLC, owner, o/b/o Grafton Street Pub & Grill, tenant. Install internally-illuminated neon blade sign.

Case 4833: 3 Brattle St., by Crown Castle Fiber, LLC. Install small cell facility with double acorn pole and whip antenna.

Case 4834: 2 Willard Street Ct., by Jeffrey Kripke. Replace door and windows at front entry vestibule.

Dr. Solet indicated her interest in hearing Case 4833 (3 Brattle St). Ms. Harrington moved to approve cases 4832 and 4834 per the policy. Ms. Lyster seconded the motion. The motion passed in a roll call vote 7-0 (Harrington, Lyster, Solet, Tobin, Zhang, Irving, Kleespies).

Public Hearings: Alterations to Designated Properties

Case 4833: 3 Brattle St., by Crown Castle Fiber, LLC. Install small cell facility with double acorn pole and whip antenna.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides of the existing street light pole near the corner of Brattle and JFK streets. He noted that the Commission had approved four small cell installations last year.

Bryn Thornburgh of Crown Castle shared her screen and presented the proposed new double acorn pole with attached whip antenna and equipment cabinet.

Ms. Lyster asked if the antenna could be located on the traffic light and what its function was. Ms. Thornburgh answered that the City did not allow the installations to be located on traffic light poles. She explained that small cells provide additional service to people in a busy area like Harvard Square.

Dr. Solet noted that the proposed design for the new pole was not an exact replica of the existing pole and lamps. She asked if the equipment produced heat and noise and if it would meet the noise ordinance requirements. Were there other possible locations for the installation? Ms. Thornburgh answered

that the equipment would meet the noise ordinance requirements. The location had been reviewed by the Massachusetts Historical Commission and the Cambridge Pole & Conduit Commission to determine the best possible site.

Mr. Irving asked for public questions and comments.

Marilee Meyer of 10 Dana Street asked if it could be located further from the building. She noted that it would be in the sight line of someone exiting the subway station.

Mr. Irving closed the public comment period.

Ms. Harrington asked if the company anticipated more such installations in the next few years. Ms. Thornburgh said she was not aware of future installations, but it would depend on signal needs.

Ms. Lyster said she saw no reason why the new pole shouldn't exactly replicate the details of the existing pole.

Dr. Solet said it would not be a good location due to outdoor dining at the corner restaurant.

Ms. Zhang asked if the intention was to replicate the pole design details. Ms. Thornburgh answered in the affirmative. They had selected the plans from the original pole manufacturer.

Mr. Kleespies moved to approve the application on the condition that it would be a replica of the existing pole's design details. Ms. Lyster seconded the motion, which passed 6-1 in a roll call vote. (Harrington, Lyster, Tobin, Zhang, Irving, and Kleespies voted yes; Solet voted no).

Case 4835: 30 JFK St., by Waugh Building LLC. Exterior renovations including masonry repairs and new storefront systems. Install address/identity sign.

Mr. Irving recused himself from the matter because he was good friends with the architect. He turned off his audio and video. Vice Chair Tobin assumed the chair.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and described the Waugh Building, which was built in 1936 and altered in 1962 with two additional stories and storefront changes.

Timothy Mansfield of Cambridge Seven Associates said the storefronts had been renovated ca. 1980 in a clumsy way. The proposal was to bring the building up to current codes and return the façade to the 1964 design. They would remove the fire escapes, replace the storefronts and windows with the original aluminum profiles. The sign structures would be preserved.

Dr. Solet asked about the balcony on the fourth floor. Was the railing new? Mr. Mansfield said it was an existing balcony and would be restored for use by a tenant.

Ms. Lyster asked about the window mullions. Mr. Mansfield said they would keep the fenestration pattern and restore the vertical mullions.

Ms. Zhang asked about repointing of the brick masonry. Mr. Mansfield said the two diffusers between floors two and three would be removed and infilled with brick. The masonry would be repointed.

Mr. Kleespies asked if the bricks were being replaced. Mr. Mansfield replied in the negative. The

bricks would be cleaned and repointed.

Ms. Tobin asked for public questions and comments.

Patrick Hickox of Cedar Lane Way in Boston commented that it was a modest building as originally designed and that this was a straight-forward restoration that would clean up earlier alterations.

Ms. Tobin closed the public comment period.

Dr. Solet said she thought the proposal would make good improvements to the building and said she would support it. She moved to approve a Certificate of Appropriateness for the project, subject to staff review and approval of construction details. Mr. Sheffield seconded the motion, which passed 7-0 in a roll call vote. (Harrington, Lyster, Solet, Tobin, Zhang, Kleespies and Sheffield)

Case 4836: Brattle Street from Mason to Craigie streets, by City of Cambridge. Install two-way separated bicycle lanes with flex posts and low concrete barriers; related alterations to signs, roadway, select curbs and ramps.

Mr. Irving returned to the meeting and resumed the chair.

Mr. Sullivan showed slides and described the proposal and the background of the city Ordinance requiring separated bike lanes across the city. He noted the existing materials for sidewalks in the project area including bluestone on the north side of Brattle Street and around the corner on Craigie Street.

Brooke McKenna of the Traffic, Parking and Transportation department introduced herself and the other members of the City's project team. She shared her screen and described the reasons for these types of projects. Andreas Wolfe, also from the Traffic department, reviewed the plans and renderings to describe the details of the configuration of the sidewalks and travel lanes. He described the two types of barriers to be used between the bike lanes and automotive lanes including flex posts and concrete curbs. The flex posts would be used where extra visibility was needed such as near driveways and side streets. Parking would be located on the south side of Brattle Street. He explained modifications to the roadways and sidewalks at Willard Street, Longfellow Park, and the intersection of Craigie and Sparks streets. The end of Craigie Street at Sparks would be closed. The stop line on Sparks Street would move forward for better visibility of traffic on Brattle Street. He explained that the modifications would slow speeds and create less likelihood of crash fatalities. He described the timeline of public meetings and phased construction. Plans for phase two, from Sparks Street to Mt. Auburn Street would come before the Commission during the winter months.

Mr. Sullivan explained that in the Old Cambridge Historic District the Historical Commission had jurisdiction over sidewalks and structures such as raised islands and curb changes but did not review street signs or pavement markings.

Ms. Harrington asked if a Certificate of Hardship might be an alternative if the proposal could not be found appropriate. Mr. Sullivan said that hardship circumstances could be considered including the need to prevent traffic deaths and provide safe cycling accommodations.

Dr. Solet asked if there had been traffic studies to document where bike accidents had occurred. Ms. McKenna explained that the city maintained a database of crashes that informed the decisions about the bicycle network. The data was available in the Open Data set. The Bike Network Vision process had designated Brattle Street as a location for separated bike lanes. Dr. Solet remarked that pedestrians would not expect two-way bike lanes when crossing the street. She expressed doubt that narrowing the travel lanes would make things safer. Where would the plows push the snow? Mr. Wolfe answered that national best practice concluded that narrowing travel lanes resulted in more alert and safer driving. Ms. McKenna said the separated bike lanes on Cambridge Street had resulted in a reduction in speeds by 25%.

Mr. Kleespies shared his experience as a cyclist. The traffic calming measures undertaken several years ago on Brattle Street had made him feel less safe. Plastic flex posts were an unattractive material. He asked if a more permanent design and materials would feel safer and improve the appearance. Ms. McKenna said the design used on Western Avenue was the gold standard but was very expensive and time consuming. The City Council had asked for quick-build lanes for safety and climate reasons. Kathy Watkins, City Engineer, provided the River Street project as an example. It took five years to design and build and cost \$50 million. Mr. Kleespies said he would feel better about the modifications if the goal was to eventually end up with something like at Western Avenue. Could an island connected to the Craigie Street sidewalk be built rather using a temporary barrier? Ms. Watkins answered that it would impact a water main and would need to be a capital project.

Mr. Sheffield asked if more information could be provided about the longer-term plans for Brattle Street. Quick built projects could become permanent, such as on Cambridge Street. Ms. Watkins said the list of capital projects was for five years. The ordinance requirement for 25 miles of quick build bike lanes had a shorter deadline.

Mr. Irving asked for public questions of fact.

Meg Koerner of 121 Brattle Street noted that eight cars shared a driveway plus additional delivery and trash vehicles. She asked if the Commission's review was about preserving the historic character and appropriateness? She and her neighbors had to follow every rule, as should the City. She asked why the roundabout plan had been dropped and noted that she had never heard about the public meetings about the project.

Itamar Turner-Trauring asked if a full-build design would be implemented when Brattle Street was added to capital projects list. Ms. Watkins said that would be a full build design.

Marie Saccoccio of 55 Otis Street said that city staff had a conflict of interest in presenting the project because they worked at the pleasure of the city management.

Heather Hoffman of 213 Hurley Street asked if the two bike lanes had a barrier between them. How would people know it was two-way bike traffic? What about e-bikes? Ms. McKenna said they were

separated by pavement markings but not a physical barrier. Additional pavement markings would indicate two-way travel. E-bikes were becoming more common across the country and mixing them with regular bikes was working. The two-way lanes would allow room for passing.

Christopher Cassa of 103 Gore Street asked if there was a specific time period to which the historic district was preserved? Was safety within the purview of the Commission? Mr. Sullivan said the Commission's jurisdiction was of the physical environment but transportation safety, parking regulations, and traffic were outside its purview. He urged the commissioners not to substitute their judgement on these issues for those of professional traffic engineers and planners. The historic district included buildings and structures from approximately 1720 to 2010 and represented an evolution of the built environment, not a single moment in time. The district was constantly evolving.

James Williamson asked if safety was a topic of conversation or not. The presenters had raised the issue but the public was not allowed to address it? He said a lot of people were disturbed by the two-way lanes in Harvard Square. What were the safety results of that project? He said he had heard Joe Barr say it wasn't ideal for bikes and pedestrians.

Joan Pickett of 59 Ellery Street asked if the use of only concrete curbs had been considered. Ms. McKenna indicated it had, but vertical elements were necessary. Mr. Wolfe said vertical options other than flex posts had been considered but would take up more space.

Dan Totten of 54 Bishop Allen Drive asked why the quick build in Harvard Square in 2017 had not been brought to the Historical Commission for approval. Ms. Watkins said that project was done with only pavement markings and flex posts in the street but did not have physical changes to curbs or sidewalks.

Mr. Irving opened public comment.

Joseph Koerner of 121 Brattle Street said he was a daily cyclist and found the area between Mason Street and Brattle Square to be the most dangerous part of his route. He said it would be a mistake to extend the two-way bike lane. He noted that Lincoln Institute had sixty cars coming and going on the north side of Brattle Street. Stopping the lane at Craigie Street would create discontinuity.

Philip Ballentine of 1 Craigie Street said the public safety benefits of protected bike lanes exceeded the convenience of a small cell antenna.

Mr. Cassa said the project would address safety concerns but might change the look of Brattle Street. Speeds had gone down on Cambridge Street. He said he was glad to see the concrete barriers and more open space on Craigie Street.

Ms. Turner-Trauring said she was excited to be able to bike on the street more safely. She noted that biking had a long history in Cambridge, 30 years longer than driving automobiles.

Ann-kristin Lund of 27 Craigie Street said the changes should be appropriate to the character of

the district. The visual clutter of the flex posts and markings should be reduced. The plastic flex posts were too modern. Planters or other vertical elements would be a more appropriate choice. She noted that the bike lanes on Huron Avenue did not use flex posts. She asked why she had not been contacted earlier about the project since her property was at the corner of Craigie and Sparks.

Ms. Pickett said the white flex posts would destroy the aesthetic quality of Brattle Street. Both Brattle Street and Harvard Square were iconic locations that deserved careful design consideration. She said the ordinance did not make Brattle Street a mandatory location for separated bike lanes. Brattle Street was not unsafe in its current form so the Commission should not consider a certificate of hardship based on safety concerns.

Ms. Hoffman said a certificate of hardship was not a valid option if the safety of two-way lanes was in question. The design should not be unpredictable and confusing. Consider the aesthetics of the design.

Ms. Saccoccio said a certificate of hardship shouldn't be on the table if safety wasn't in the Commission's purview. The design was chaotic and visually cluttered.

Mr. Totten said he did find Brattle Street to be a scary place to bike and was in favor of a separated lane. It was a temporary measure to protect lives.

Ms. Meyer asked if Sparks Street traffic during rush hours had been studied. The concrete curbs were preferable to the flex posts.

Mr. Williamson said the two-way lanes in Harvard Square had ruined that part of Brattle Street and made it unsafe for pedestrians. Pedestrian safety was just as important.

Cynthia Broner of 236 Brattle Street said the Boston facilities were not comparable to Cambridge. The City had not adequately reached out to neighbors.

Annette LaMond of 7 Riedesel Avenue said she was a proponent of the rotary. Two-way cycle lanes would not be safe.

Benjamin Schenker of 662 Green Street spoke in favor of the plan as proposed. It looked great and Brattle Street in its current condition was not safe for cycling.

Mr. Irving closed public comment.

Ms. Lyster asked if other approvals were needed for the project. Ms. McKenna answered that there were not. Ms. Lyster said a color or material change with the concrete curbs would help with visibility and be more appropriate in appearance and material than flex posts. She said she could see the logic to improving cycling facilities on this part of Brattle Street because there were no shops and no public buses.

Dr. Solet said the planning had been inadequate and unsupported by data. She said it should not have been brought to the commission during the summer and with no notice.

Ms. Zhang said she appreciated the city's efforts to provide a network of bike lanes. She said she

had concerns about the design of the two-way turn at Brattle and Craigie.

Mr. Kleespies thanked the city staff. He said he supported separated lanes on Brattle Street. Though a very old street it had always been a thoroughfare and not only used by residents of the neighborhood. He said more durable and appropriate materials could be employed without requiring a lengthy construction process. He suggested planters or a fence as alternatives to the flex posts.

Ms. Tobin said she supported bike lanes but did not think the quick build design was the right solution. Planters or another more appropriate material could be just as visible as the flex posts.

Mr. Sheffield said the design was functional and put safety first. Brattle Street was a thoroughfare in the Old Cambridge Historic District and a full build solution would be warranted. The solution could create a good precedent for other locations. Cambridge could be a leader. Materials should enhance the streetscape. Traditional materials should be employed. Raising the grade of the bike lanes to the same level as the sidewalks should be considered.

Mr. Irving asked about Huron Avenue's bike lanes and the priority level of separated lanes on Brattle Street. Ms. McKenna said those bike lanes had been designed longer ago and was not up to the standards of the Cycling Safety Ordinance. Though the ordinance did not call out Brattle Street, it does require 25 miles of separated travel lanes. The Cycling Network Vision plan identified Brattle Street as an important part of the network.

Mr. Sullivan suggested the Commission ask the applicants to continue the hearing and give some of the ideas discussed some consideration. Ms. Watkins said a continuance and staff consultation could be helpful. A continuance to September 8 would be acceptable. Mr. Kleespies moved to approve the requested continuance. Ms. Lyster seconded the motion. The motion passed 6-1. (Harrington, Lyster, Tobin, Zhang, Irving, and Kleespies voted yes; Solet voted no). Mr. Irving called for a brief recess at 9:37 P.M. and reconvened the meeting at 9:49 P.M.

Public Hearing: Demolition Review

Case D-1619: 12 Lake View Ave., by Jefferson M. Case and Elizabeth Green Case. Retroactive application to demolish house (1846). *The owners have requested a postponement until a date to be determined.*

James Rafferty, attorney for the applicants, requested the hearing be postponed until September 8.

Mr. Sheffield moved to grant the requested postponement. Ms. Harrington seconded the motion. The motion passed 7-0 in a roll call vote. (Harrington, Lyster, Solet, Tobin, Zhang, Irving, Sheffield)

Landmark Designation Proceedings

Case L-143: The Pit, Harvard Square Plaza. Consider petition of registered Cambridge voters to initiate a landmark study for The Pit.

Mr. Burks showed slides and summarized the staff memorandum about the history of the Harvard Square plaza, headhouse, and the area known as The Pit. The current configuration of the roads and

pedestrian areas dated to the period when the red line was extended from Harvard Square to Alewife. Construction took place between the late 1970s and mid-1980s. She showed images of The Pit under construction and described the features of it including two curved areas near the new headhouse that were at lower grades than the street and kiosk. She described the popularity of the area all ages and classes, but that it had been especially frequented by young people who used it as a gathering place and formed a community there.

Ben Simon spoke on behalf of the petitioners who had requested a landmark study of the Pit. He said the Pit was a popular spot for alienated youth. He said he was a musician and punk rock kid who hung out there. The sunken design of the space combined with the amphitheater form helped a group gather without being interrupted by people crossing through the space. The design intentionally made it difficult to cross through the Pit. The alienated youth liked the “underground” quality of the space. It was insulated from the surrounding activity of Harvard Square but was still part of the public environment. The new design for the plaza would eliminate the Pit. This type of space for the working class was being replaced in cities all over the country. He said his family was displaced by the increased costs in Cambridge. The history of the Punk culture was in danger of disappearing. Private clubs that were popular venues for punk rock had closed. The Pit community was diverse in age, race and income level but everyone got along. He said the planning process was advertised as relating to the Kiosk and Plaza but didn’t mention the Pit. He said he was unaware of the planned destruction of the Pit until June when people gathered for a Pit-a-palooza to celebrate and say goodbye to the space. The working group had been appointed top down and did not include representation by Punks or musicians. The 84-page final report did not mention Punk culture at all. A landmark study could remedy the mistake. He said he disagreed with the staff description of the new design as not altogether different from the existing Pit. He said it would no longer be a sunken space and the amphitheater design would be destroyed. The history of this period of Cambridge’s past and of the working class generally was worth preserving. The multi-cultural working-class space was very special. Many people could offer information about the Pit if the landmark study was undertaken.

Mr. Irving asked for questions of fact.

Ms. Harrington asked about the timing of the project and if it could be stopped at this point. Mr. Sullivan answered that the Commission had approved a Certificate of Appropriateness and the permits were issued for construction. Starting a landmark study would not change that fact.

Ms. Harrington asked Mr. Simon if he had thought about other ways to document and preserve the history of the Pit. Mr. Simon said he was interested in documenting the history, but he also wanted the physical structures to be preserved. Construction had not commenced in that part of the plaza and with a new City Manager he thought it would not be impossible to change gears.

Mr. Sullivan described the placemaking study of 2013-2015, consultant-led working group in 2017-2018 and the extensive community engagement that took place during that time. The Historical Commission held two public hearings in its review and approval process.

Kathy Watkins explained that the design was meant to provide flexible space for gatherings and performances. The grade of the Pit and the sidewalk in front of the bank was unchanged but the grading of the other parts of the plaza were evened out to improve accessibility through the plaza.

Dr. Solet said the way we ask whose history matters has changed since 2019. She said she would support a landmark study of the Pit.

Mr. Kleespies asked if Community Preservation Act funds could pay for an art project or marker to recognize the history of the Pit. Mr. Sullivan said CPA funds could be used for markers but the Arts Council might be more suited to thinking about a way to commemorate the Pit.

Mr. Irving asked for public questions and comments.

Trudi Goodman of 1221 Cambridge Street said she was a musician and teacher. The new design looked like a suburban mall. The Pit had acoustical qualities and didn't require electrical amplification. Sound would bounce everywhere with the new design.

Mr. Totten asked if the Commission could rescind its prior approval. Mr. Sullivan replied in the negative. Mr. Totten said he had encouraged Mr. Simon to submit the petition after being convinced that the Pit's history matters. He asked if there were ways to preserve some elements of the Pit and encouraged documentation of this unique history.

Ms. Hoffman confirmed the welcoming nature of the space. She spoke in favor of a landmark study.

Ms. Saccoccio said she had been involved with the study process for the redesign of the kiosk and plaza and the Pit had not been considered. No one representing that history had been involved. She supported a landmark study.

Mr. Simon said the study would be worth doing, even if it doesn't stop the construction project.

Mr. Irving closed public comment period.

Ms. Harrington said she related to Mr. Simons feelings about his history being overlooked and forgotten. She explained that she had started an oral history project for Black Cantabrigians. She encouraged him to bring together the people that he knew and get them to document their stories.

Ms. Lyster agreed that something should be done to document the Pit's history. She suggested a permanent display of photographs but encouraged Mr. Simon to consider what would be the best way.

Dr. Solet asked if the construction contract could be renegotiated or paused. Ms. Watkins said there were two bidding processes and contracts. The surface contract was permitted with the MBTA and though the shovels weren't in the ground the materials were being ordered and the contractors were

mobilized. She said she would be happy to talk to Ben. An operator for the kiosk could have an exhibit about the Pit and Punk scene that would celebrate the history.

Ms. Tobin thanked Ben and Kathy for their ideas and suggested that such an exhibit could regularly rotate back into the kiosk. She said the oversight was a learning moment to recognize that we always have blind spots.

Ms. Zhang said she often stopped at the Pit during her time as a student at Harvard and felt a strong connection to the space. She offered to help Ben make connections with designers at Havorson. Just because the space was changing didn't mean that the history of the Punk community at the Pit was dead or dying.

Mr. Kleespies said he had also spent a lot of time hanging out in the Pit. It was a place with a lot of energy and a lot going on. The diverse subcultures tolerated each other there. He noted that the physical design of the Pit had already evolved from its original plan. The long bench was added to deter skateboarding. A tree died and its planter was removed. A landmark study was not the right tool. The Pit could continue to evolve. There could be a trail of radical places in Cambridge like the Pit, the ManRay, etc. The landmark study of the EMF building did not change the change in use of the building. It wasn't the right tool. An oral history or other historical documentation would be a better approach. He offered to help.

Mr. Irving commended the members on their generous offers of help. Ms. Harrington and Ms. Lyster also volunteered to help. Mr. Sullivan said we could convene the group to offer ideas but recommended that the Commission decline to initiate a landmark study.

Mr. Simon said a study would give the project legitimacy. He expressed concern that his limited time and resources would not allow him to lead a project.

Ms. Harrington moved to not initiate a landmark study because it could not interrupt the process already underway. Mr. Kleespies seconded the motion. The motion passed 6-1. (Harrington, Lyster, Tobin, Zhang, Irving, and Kleespies voted yes; Solet voted no).

Preservation Grants

PG 22-2: 35 Harvey Street, by Homeowners Rehab, Inc. Increase \$100,000 grant approved in November 2021 with an additional \$60,000 to cover increased scope and costs.

Mr. Sullivan described the application to increase an existing grant due to an increase in the scope of restoration.

Mr. Sheffield moved to approve the grant. Ms. Lyster seconded. The motion passed unanimously in a roll call vote. moved to adjourn. Mr. Sheffield seconded the motion, which passed unanimously in a roll call vote. (Harrington, Lyster, Solet, Tobin, Zhankg, Irving, Sheffield)

Mr. Sheffield moved to adjourn and Mr. Kleespies seconded. The motion passed unanimously in a roll call vote. (Harrington, Lyster, Solet, Tobin, Zhankg, Irving, Sheffield). The meeting adjourned at 11:45 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Sarah L. Burks

Sarah L. Burks
Preservation Planner

Members of the Public
Present on the Zoom Webinar online, August 4, 2022

Marilee Meyer	10 Dana St, 404
John Hawkinson	CambridgeDay.com
Marie Elena Saccoccio	55 Otis St
Brooke McKenna	Traffic, Parking & Transportation Department
Stuart Pitchel	SRP Signs for 59 JFK St
Patrick Lee	Grafton Street Pub & Grill, 59 JFK St
Timothy Mansfield	Cambridge Seven, 1050 Mass. Ave.
Jeffrey Kripke	
Mark Cabral	
Lisa Green Case	12 Lake View Ave.
James J. Rafferty	907 Mass. Ave.
Sumi Fasolo	Cambridge Seven, 1050 Mass. Ave.
Kathy Watkins	City Engineer, Public Works
Andreas Wolfe	Traffic, Parking & Transportation Department
Cynthia Broner	246 Brattle St, Unit 11
Izzat	28 Surrey St
Bryn Thornburgh	Crown Castle, 3200 Horizon Dr, Ste 150
Barbara	246 Brattle St
Emily	16 Magnolia Ave, Unit 2
Erica Busa	411 Main St, Stoneham, MA
Madeline Jacquet	8 Willard St
Nathan Wong	1188 Centre St
Christopher Cassa	103 Gore St, Apt 2
Mark	169 Upland Rd
Philip Ballentine	1 Craigie St, Apt 46
Caroline	200 Brattle St
Milton	'-
James Williamson	1000 Jackson Pl
Ann-kristin Lund	27 Craigie St
Gianna Cornacchini	28R Cherry St, Somerville MA 02144
Karen Falb	245 Brattle St
Patrick Hickox	32 Cedar Lane Way, Boston, MA 02108
Denise	2203 Mass Ave
Jerry Friedman	Public Works, 147 Hampshire St
Mary Armistead	66 Fresh Pond Pkwy
Helen	34 Beacon St
Justin Corbett	10 Washington Ave.
Joan Pickett	59 Ellery St
Itamar Turner-Trauring	139 Oxford St
Wendy Kraus	410 Robinwood Dr NE, Bainbridge Island, WA 98110

Brigid	32 Cedar Lane Way
Whitney Warren	2 Church St, West Newbury, MA 01985
Heather Hoffman	213 Hurley St
Riley Shannon	3200 Horizon Dr, Suite 150
Benjamin Simon	67 Bishop Allen Dr., #2
Trudi Goodman	1221 Cambridge St, Apt 708
Corey Runkel	9 Eustis St.
Annette LaMond	7 Riedesel Ave
Benjamin Schenker	662 Green St, #3
Joseph Koerner	121 Brattle St
Weston J Waugh	3535 6th Ave N, St Petersburg, FL. 33713
Maxwell Solet	15 Berkeley St
Nate F	Cncmnc
Jude Sirois	One Waterhouse St, 41
Jason Epstein	58 Lake View Ave
Dan Totten	54 Bishop Allen Dr #2
Amanda Sindel-Keswick	7 Cornelius Way
George Schneeloch	81 School St, 1
Mark Boswell	Walden St
Janis Devereux	255 Lake View Ave

Note: Town is Cambridge, unless otherwise indicated.