
To: Michael O'Dowd
Project Manager

Date: July 11, 2016

From: Nick Gross
Howard Stein Hudson

HSH Project No.: 2013061.14

Subject: MassDOT Highway Division
Allston I-90 Interchange Improvement Project
Boston Redevelopment Authority – Placemaking Output Meeting – Part 1
Meeting Notes of June 27, 2016

Overview

On June 27, 2016, members of the Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA) and The Cecil Group in association with the Allston I-90 Interchange Improvement Project held the first of two placemaking output meetings. While members of the I-90 Interchange Improvement Project Team and MassDOT staff associated with the job were in attendance, the PowerPoint, recommendations, and meeting material presented was entirely produced by the BRA and The Cecil Group. The purpose of the meeting was for the BRA's consultant, The Cecil Group, to provide their recommendations as they relate to the developed base alternative known as the MassDOT 3K-4 Alternative for the draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR).

The meeting was kicked off by Steve Cecil – The Cecil Group with an overview of the evolution of the interchange alternatives dating back to 2014. While the purpose of The Cecil Groups agenda was to present their recommendations for the MassDOT 3K-4 Alternative, it was noted that there were many positive aspects to the MassDOT 3K-4 Alternative that had resulted from extensive community engagement and input, specifically, a compact design that tucks the highway alignment to create a new street grid and the creation of a robust transit station known as West Station.

The key task associated with the placemaking effort, as indicated by The Cecil Group was to convert the community's ideas and thoughts into a series of recommendations known as placemaking standards. The purpose of these standards is to ensure that future infrastructure, specifically transportation infrastructure, does not preclude placemaking opportunities within the project area. It was described by the BRA that the placemaking standards described herein should be considered as the City of Boston's recommendations and/or checklist for evaluating the DEIR.

The placemaking standards were broken down into five dimensions: *Public Realm/Open Space*, *Mobility/Connectivity*, *Development Potential/Flexibility*, *Distinctive Place/Context Sensitive*, and *Energy Efficiency/Sustainability*. Each standard was further categorized into two types of placemaking standards

referred to as *Transformative Standards* and *Other Placemaking Standards*. It was noted that the *Transformative Standards* would require modifications or refinements to the MassDOT 3K-4 Alternative while the *Other Placemaking Standards* may be met within the MassDOT 3K-4 Alternative.

The highlighted *Transformative Standards* described in the presentation were as follows:

1. Add I-90 and Soldiers Field Road (SFR) connections to relief traffic
2. Realign portions of SFR in order to create additional park space along the River
3. Provide a primary, at-grade pedestrian and bicycle connection to the Charles River edge
4. Provide for an additional east/west street connection between Cambridge Street and the West Station Area
5. Provide a third north/south arterial link known as ‘Cattle Drive’
6. Consider a direct North Harvard Street intersection alignment

Most of the recommendations were well received by the task force however the idea of aligning North Harvard Street as a direct connection to the I-90 ramp system was not. Additional concern was voiced towards the lack of consideration of sea level rise. The concern of creating a boat section in order to provide an at-grade crossing over SFR and how it relates to sea level rise was questioned. Many task force members thanked the BRA and The Cecil Group for their level of detailed work and positively regarded the presented material as a lot to consider and would require further analysis before providing comments.

The larger question of how the recommendations will be incorporated into the MassDOT 3K-4 Alternative was the underlying concern for most task force members. MassDOT’s response was that all of the recommendations put forward by the BRA and The Cecil Group will be determine where they can be integrated into the existing plan for the DEIR. It is MassDOT’s goal not to propose anything that would preclude other improvements for the future. The BRA announced that they will be accepting comments regarding the placemaking standards and recommendations until Monday, July 18.

Detailed Meeting Minutes¹

C: Ed Ionata (EI): Good evening everyone, I’m Ed Ionata from TetraTech. Tonight’s presentation will be entirely provided by the BRA. We have had a request that everyone identifies themselves before we get started.²

¹ Herein “C” stands for comment, “Q” for question and “A” for answer. For a list of attendees, please see Appendix 1. For copies of meeting flipcharts, please see Appendix 2.

² For a listing of attendance, please see Appendix 1.

- C: Tad Read (TR): Good evening, my name is Tad Read and I am the Deputy Director of Strategic Planning at the BRA. I'm going to turn it over to Steve Cecil from the Cecil Group for the presentation but before I do, I'd like to make a few notes. On July 13, 2016 we are going to hold the second part of tonight's meeting. We're not going to walk through everything tonight; our plan is to walk through the top tier recommendations for the placemaking study. Once the presentation concludes we will hand out all of the recommendations in written form. We will continue the conversation on July 13, 2016.
- C: Steve Cecil (SC): Thank you Tad. It's been a few months since we last met and the weather is much better now. We have been working to translate our analysis and convert the ideas into thoughts with a series of recommendations for your consideration. Our focus has been on the draft recommendations. We printed a number of copies for back up documents and more are being printed. Just to get a sense of the audience, how many of you have attended the previous task force placemaking study meetings? We have been tasked to create an evaluation for MassDOT's roadways and transit infrastructure to set the stage and not preclude placemaking opportunities for the future.

The main focus of our task has been an extensive analysis of the base alternative known as MassDOT's 3K-4. We are now focused on the combination of analysis and transportation networks as we plan for future frameworks. There are many stakeholders in the area including Harvard University (HU), Boston University (BU), and Houghton Chemical just to name a few. The City of Boston has also set angles and goals to incorporate into this study; many of which focus on mixed-use development in the form of transit orientated development (TOD).

Our study area focus is pictured on the screen. This incorporates the area directly subject to the transportation infrastructure and investments on the table. We like this angle because it shows the Charles River, BU, Cambridge Street, and the neighborhood. The MassDOT 3K-4 Alternative works in the 3D overpasses over the highway alignment. The study context is focusing on the MassDOT 3K-4 Alternative. We have been listening and thinking about the community and task force process as well as the at-grade concepts. BU, HU, the Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR), and others have key roles in this area as owners and of strong interest.

In our past presentation we emphasized the fact that we are listening to the community placemaking issues. Our job has been to listen to your considerations and concerns. Now we're trying to physically understand the implications of these considerations. You may remember the analysis of traffic circulation and placemaking to understand how that works. Ralph DeNisco from Nelson\Nygaard walked us through that previously. We should also remember the interchange design itself has evolved dramatically through the course of the task force meetings.

Part of this process has been an evolution of a series of ideas. There have been a series of points that we want to underline which includes major benefits and gains through community conversation. We want to focus on the aspects that we don't want to change. There are a lot of very positive aspects with the MassDOT 3K-4 Alternative. This is a compact design and essentially tucks and holds the highway

alignment so we can develop a new grid of streets. The notion of West Station being a robust part of this project is now a given but it hasn't always been that way.

We're seeking multimodal connections to the Charles River for pedestrians and bicycles. We want to preserve the Grand Junction and its ability to transform and adapt to future transit and rail demands. The reconstruction of the Franklin Street Footbridge and additional parkland along the Paul Dudley White Path (PDWP) are all things we are supportive of. Future development and provisions of future air rights developments relating to access, spacing, and size have all been acknowledged through the evolution of MassDOT's 3K-4 Alternative.

We've taken all of this and created a series of placemaking standards. These standards try to make sure the infrastructure in the future doesn't preclude placemaking opportunities. These can be thought of as the City of Boston's recommendations for measuring the draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). We are laying the groundwork for future master plans. In the end, this is meant to be a shared evaluation tool for the concepts that have emerged to this point. We are looking at placemaking from a five dimensional perspective.

The placemaking analysis and dimensions include *Public Realm/Open Space*, *Mobility/Connectivity*, *Development Potential/Flexibility*, *Distinctive Place/Context Sensitive*, and *Energy Efficiency/Sustainability*. As you may recall, we created a heat map for each of these elements. We are looking to create flexibility for good solutions and where challenges occur. Some of you may remember that our analysis is built on layers which define flexibility. The underlying focus of this presentation is the recommendations based on the analysis which outlines our findings.

We are going to continue to work with you, the City of Boston's goals, the driving principles developed to this point, and the attitudes towards public realm and open space that are so valued. The big picture regarding the recommendations is that we have two types of placemaking standards. The first type is what we're calling transformative standards. There will be transformative ideas in the design that has been produced to-date that will require changes to the MassDOT 3K-4 Alternative in order for those standards to be met.

The second is simply other placemaking standards. These standards may be met by the current MassDOT 3K-4 Alternative or any reasonable variation. We want to begin focusing on transformative standards that shift the way infrastructure will develop. In terms of organizing these standards we want to focus on the Charles River edges its connections, areas along and above the highway and rail alignment, Cambridge Street and the connections north, areas within the new district, area-wide standards, and guidelines for future master planning.

The first transformative idea is the solution that we should find additional ways to create connections along Soldiers Field Road (SFR). If you look at the configuration of the MassDOT 3K-4 Alternative, there is a concentration of locations that can be improved. The important idea is to add additional

movement and shift a couple of ramps to a central location towards the new street grid area. There is a series of related changes by creating a better ramp system. This will relieve and remove traffic from the River Street intersection while widening the narrow stretch of the PDWP.

The tight corridors of this triangle are difficult to adapt to. By shifting the connections and new connections we think there will be more opportunity for adaptations. The next idea is to shift the alignment of SFR inland. Shifting SFR means access to Houghton Chemical has to shift with changes to the MBTA yard. By bringing SFR inland there are a number of clear benefits. We are able to create robust open space and continue the Emerald Necklace. We've taken a look at the Charles River Basin (CRB) and tried to think about what happens when the roadway and open space interact.

Those spots and widening represent the node that can and should occur with the realignment of SFR. There is an important characteristic in how it shifts. The plan to access the parkland is to provide an at-grade connection from the new area to the Charles River for bicycles and pedestrians. This would require lowering SFR into a boat section so that these modes could pass over SFR on a viaduct. That complex of ideas is a way of restructuring MassDOT's 3K-4 Alternative. The quality of open space and non-motorized connections are of significant importance.

The next area under discussion is the edge of the project and rail alignment. The fundamental idea is that an additional street would provide a new connection above the rail and highway alignment from West Station and tie into the Cambridge Street Bridge over I-90. This connection would benefit bicycles, pedestrians, and vehicles. Folks traveling from the south could make a more direct connection to the highway ramps. Over time we must anticipate how air rights will develop. There are many different ways which we can look at additional connections.

Shuttles and buses will be directly integrated into the plan. There is an opportunity for shuttles and buses to make it across the alignment to connect to places north and south. There are several ways to make it happen through West Station and we think that should be included in the project. When we look at the bridges, we think they should be designed to be generous for open space, bicycles, pedestrians, and for people who want to get on and off shuttles. Here is an example from Columbus, Ohio showing wide bridges with park space. We're suggesting that West Station has plazas and green space to make a generous station.

Under the existing plan there are two connections from Cambridge Street north. HU is growing with their Institutional Master Plan (IMP) and the circulation around West Station, including its ramps were aligned to meet those two roadways. There has been an evolution in think about this from HU's perspective and that is to institute three streets that cross Cambridge Street and lead into the I-90 interchange area. The fundamental idea is to expand the number of routes in order to increase choices. From an urban design standpoint, it begins to set up a different grid and blocks that have been part of the previous design work.

C: TR: Just to be clear, the three connecting roads are called East Drive, Cattle Drive, and Stadium Way.

C: SC: Correct. This is a very important idea but will require further analysis. North Harvard Street and how it connects into the rest of the network has been setup under the MassDOT 3K-4 Alternative to not have a direct connection. If we make this a direct connection it may increase traffic on North Harvard Street but we believe it is something that should be evaluated. There are other benefits to having a straighter alignment. Long narrow blocks are difficult to development. The priority is to make sure blocks and spaces have adequate depth.

The areas within the new district will all have a series of standards but we've heard a great deal can be accomplished by limited the maximum grade to less than 5%. If you're grade is below 5% it is considered accessible. That holds with keeping the slopes in reasonable framework. In thinking about block development and the recommendation of shifting access points off of SFR, the other alignments are intended to create a friendlier grid. For vibrant mixed-use development, it is important to not be limited with our choices.

The area-wide standards have been developed to ensure we have a walkable place. Considerations to maximum design speed, street hierarchy, and other opportunities to create a sustainable environment are considered here. Considerations for future master plans are outlined in the documents that we will pass out. With that, we've provided all of the highpoints. We have about 50-60 points to distribute. Our next step is to get feedback from you. We'll then provide a report that would be transformative and become extremely helpful to measure ideas over the years.

C: TR: It's great to see so many people but we only printed 60 copies. If you would like us to email you a copy we can send that to you. Please provide us with your email.

Question/Answer

Q: Jessica Robertson (JR): This is the first time we've seen a 3D model. It looks like none of the streets are at-grade, is that true?

A: SC: Generally speaking yes. The streets vary quite a bit in order to reach the alignment above grade. The areas in-between would likely have to be filled in. The underlying land is low. It's complicated because of the embankments. The answer is yes, most roadways would be above grade.

C: JR: The way it's shown in plan-view is that the inbound frontage road is high and the outbound is at-grade. It all seems raised in the 3D model. The street most towards the Charles River is also above grade and the thought was to preserve access and the view shed to the Charles River.

C: SC: It's a complicated 3D puzzle. When you look at the area as a whole, there is a low lying area between the two higher levels. We end up with inclines and land that you can use for foundations in the future on space that will end up being filled.

C: JR: In the future, it might be helpful to show the feet above sea level at each intersection. It doesn't have to be relative to grade. That will help give us all a clearer understanding of what this will look like outside of a 2D plan.

A: SC: I believe the MassDOT team has provided that but I agree that is an important idea.

Q: David Loutzenheiser (DL): First off well done. This should have been done two years ago. My question is how far you have to run the ramps back with a standard of 5% grade or less?

A: SC: 5% is a gradual slope, the ramp length will vary around the site.

C: TR: I believe most of the MassDOT 3K-4 Alternative has 5% or less grades too.

A: Chris Calnan (CC): The MassDOT 3K-4 Alternative has no grades over 5%.

Q: Ken Miller (KM): How does this relate to MassDOT's 3K-4 Alternative? You presented 60 recommendations. Is the next step to discuss the extent that they are consistent and inconsistent with MassDOT? If so, how do you get to an agreement? How does it get operationalized into a feasible alternative?

A: SC: From our perspective, we are setting the review criteria for future decisions. It becomes a matter of how MassDOT takes these recommendations and moves ahead with them. In some cases, these recommendations may be transformative for the MassDOT 3K-4 Alternative and it would be up to MassDOT to make that decision.

Q: KM: I'm curious to know the kinds of things that have been talked about regarding development, whether that's mixed-use, and how consistent it is with HU. Has HU presented a plan for their anticipated development and a timeline for that?

A: Joseph Beggan (JB): Our work right now is focused on the area identified in our 10 year Institutional Master Plan (IMP): This location consist of the space south of Western Avenue and east toward the Charles River. The future research campus between Cambridge Street and Western Avenue was pulled together years ago. The area south of Cambridge Street has no land use plan. There is a lot of ongoing work associated with this job and we are looking to see how this plays out.

- C: SC: Our process with the placemaking recommendations is to make sure good choices are not foreclosed. There is a lot of thinking in regards to infrastructure long before people know how it would play out.
- C: Harry Mattison (HM): This was a fantastic presentation and I appreciate the work you've done. Every suggestion you made was wonderful and spot on. I have one question regarding the expansion of parkland along the Charles River. How large of a piece of land are you talking about? Is it feet or acres?
- C: SC: In terms of depth, we really don't have the numbers pinned down. We are thinking about this from a contextual standpoint and as a whole system of connected open spaces. The tradeoff is relates to the flexibility of open space and future land use.
- C: TR: Generally speaking, we have been looking in comparison at other parks that are somewhere in the range of 100-200 feet wide.
- C: HM: A lot of us are hoping to see a wider configuration than what has previously been shown. We want to see open space where there could be a summer concert, a place to throw a Frisbee, or a place to set out and have lunch for people who will be eventually working here. The at-grade crossing to the Charles River is spot on, that's how people want to get there. My question is about the east-west connections. You mentioned it but I didn't see it in the drawings.
- C: SC: We are not considering that a transformative standard so we didn't show it. We think one or more east-west corridors along the green space will create opportunities for a new open space network. We don't want to simply create individual open spaces. We found three to four dozen ways to accomplish this.
- C: HM: The idea of having a linear park is something that we have been proposing since the beginning. We couldn't have built the Commonwealth Avenue mall if we planned for it to be a street in the middle. The idea with placemaking is to get from the parks to the Charles River.
- C: SC: We agree there needs to be a strong pedestrian connection built in.
- C: TR: MassDOT 3K-4 has a multimodal path along Cambridge Street South.
- C: HM: Sure that's great but the Commonwealth Avenue mall isn't a cycle track. We would love to see what has been built on Western Avenue in Cambridge but there is a big difference between that and a linear park.
- Q: Name Not Given (NNG): What is the current thinking on timing for all of this?

A: MOD: Ideally, we want to take the information presented by Steve and his team, absorb it, and evaluate it with HU and BU. We want to be able to move forward with the DEIR filing in the first quarter of 2017 with the feasible recommendations presented tonight incorporated.

Q: NNG: Are you breaking ground in 3 years, 10 years, 20 years?

A: MOD: I'd love to say 3 years. The way we see it playing out, by 2018 we could be able to put together an advertising procurement for a design-build package and break ground in 2019. With that said, we still don't have the selection of a preferred alternative so I would guess that 2019 is on the aggressive side.

C: Brent Whelan (BW): This has been an enlightening set of suggestions. My comments and concerns relate to the re-alignment of North Harvard. The community has made it clear from the beginning that North Harvard Street should not be a direct connection to the I-90 ramp system. It's a real danger and clear that if you align North Harvard Street it is going to increase traffic.

C: SC: I agree and it sound counter intuitive. The intuitive thinking says to connect the dots but the consideration about the people and delay in turning movements is something we are also considering. If people are delayed for 15 seconds are they going to change their route? We want to check this out to ensure we get it right. We want to protect the quality of the neighborhood.

Q: BW: I would mention traffic calming measures as a counter to that statement. My second comment is that you made no mention of rising sea levels. No one is talking about it and it is a huge concern. Are there resiliency measures built into these recommendations?

A: SC: We have definitely incorporated resiliency measures with the specific recommendations. Sea level rise is complicated here because the Charles River is not tidal. Cambridge and Boston both have resiliency plans. Raising infrastructure and future development is all part of this. Resiliency also has to do with storm events. We have put area wide standards regarding resiliency into our recommendations and suggested way on how to handle that.

C: Pallavi Mande (PM): I would like to see the finer grain emendations. You mentioned it but the east-west connection doesn't look like anything more than a pathway. I was disappointed not to see that. I'm wondering why you chose not to show that?

A: SC: Our charge has been to develop recommendations that do not preclude good solutions. We tested multiple solutions and felt there were several ways to accomplish that goal.

C: PM: I want to make a distinction. There is a major difference between design solutions and design principles. Giving this a framework plan is not giving it principles. The principles are lacking.

- C: TR: For example, number 50 talks about guidelines for future master planning. We can take a look at it, there were many good ideas that came up during this process and we thought those ideas should be memorialized.
- C: PM: It shouldn't be limited to considerations for future master plans. This is something we want to see. We don't want to just have it framed for a future effort.
- C: SC: If you take another look at the language that we provided and suggest different language that could better represent that we are open to your comments.
- A: TR: This isn't a plan, it's a study. The purpose is not to preclude the establishment of a future neighborhood.
- C: Tom Nally (TN): Thank you for all of this, it is a lot to absorb in one sitting. Thank you for giving us too much to think about. I'm hesitant to say any of your ideas a great or poor, that is going to take a while for us to think about and walk through.
- C: Bob Sloan (BS): I agree with everyone that this is great work. I'm wondering how this goes forward in preparing the DEIR. The work as the Task Force is to advise and comment on the decisions for each of the 60 recommendations. It would be useful for us to hear what you think is and isn't possible or a reality.
- C: SC: This will be incorporated in the ongoing process and the development of the concepts as they are prepared for the DEIR.
- Q: JR: The Cecil Group made a bunch of suggestions. Is MassDOT going to incorporate any of these elements? Is the DEIR going to reflect some of these changes?
- A: MOD: There is no firm decision on that yet. However I would imagine some of these recommendations will be incorporated into the MassDOT 3K-4 Alternative.
- C: JR: That is great to hear.
- A: MOD: We don't want to do anything that would preclude other improvements for the future.
- C: JR: Great.
- Q: NNG: Do the plans you've shown have constraints based on HU's ownership?
- A: SC: Some of the transportation improvements will happen on land that is owned by HU.

C: Carol Ridge-Martinez (CRM): My understanding of this study is to make sure that this future street grid doesn't preclude any of the stuff we've been talking about. In general, the street grid looks the same and it doesn't appear that you're advocating for much change besides some minor tweaks. It looks like the shapes and grids are very challenging.

C: TR: This is a skeletal street grid now and it will be filled with secondary streets in the future. The blocks will be smaller.

Q: Marc Kadish (MK): Is the open space shown in yellow and is that owned by HU?

A: SC: It's largely owned by HU but Houghton Chemical is there too.

C: Galen Mook (GM): I want to thank both sides of the table. I also want to echo Bob Sloan's point regarding process. What's the connection to the MassDOT plan with all of this? Is it on the task force to help the process smoothly enough so that Mike is presenting this plan before the DEIR? My question is regarding the widths of the streets. We were previously shown cross section widths of 100 feet way out of the scale we would like to see. I'm wondering if that has been addressed. The plan is also missing the connection from Commonwealth Avenue to the Charles River via a pathway or network.

C: SC: We are demonstrating the cross section in the plan. These are guidelines and standards. We are keeping the lanes as narrow as possible. Let's take a step back. If we can reduce the number of cars on Cambridge Street by creating more and better options, that is a positive. We want to create robust transit and bicycle infrastructure. We are trying to setup the framework to reduce demand on Cambridge Street and provide more options internally. That's how you get to smaller streets.

Q: GM: What happen with the one-way in one direction and another one-way in the other direction?

A: Ralph DeNisco (RD): You're onto the main point. Additional internal connections would minimize the widths of the streets. We're looking closely at the left-turn lanes in order to minimize width, reduce congestion, and create additional connections to SFR in order to minimize circulation around the area.

A: SC: We have incorporated the notion of street hierarchy as well. Streets will be designed differently with different standards depending on their role and location. Access to certain parcels may be via air rights.

C: GM: I want to encourage a more direction connection from Commonwealth Avenue to the Charles River. Perhaps a viaduct could preclude that or help that, who knows.

Q: Glen Berkowitz (GB): Kudos to you and your team. This is clearly a holistic tempt to integrate so much. There is a lot of information that we're going to need to work though. My question is, if this

project cost \$1 before you started your work, do you have a sense of cost that includes these recommendations?

A: SC: It's important for everyone to understand that MassDOT needs to serve a regional transportation need. The considerations we're bringing in have great local benefits. Things like relocating SFR are going to be expensive to accomplish. There are huge benefits but less directly linked to MassDOT's charge.

C: JR: We would love to see that and it sounded like Ralph said you've done some more detailed work. We would love to see more detail about where you were able to get rid of left-turn lanes.

A: RD: We haven't actually done that level of analysis. That level of detail would follow after our general analysis.

Q: JR: Is the final product of this effort going to be substantially more detailed?

A: TR: No.

C: SC: These recommendations will be most useful moving forward as a measuring basis.

C: TR: If this is redesigned for three streets we'd like to see the model re-run to see the flow of vehicles. Then we may be able to determine some reduction in certain intersections.

Q: NNG: Has there been any thought given to how much open space could be here? You showed a diagram with a number of different footprints. If you have major pedestrian routes do you have a sense of minimum and maximum path widths? I would strongly recommend taking it a step further.

C: SC: I believe the open space question has been answer in some of the previous work. It's probably worth looking at and recycling some of that information. The large blocks in the middle of the triangle could become many different things. Some of this has been outlined by HU's IMP. The IMP suggests that 20% of the land should be dedicated to open space. Hopefully this area will resemble some of the rich open spaces we see in places like the Back Bay.

C: NNG: As this moves into a design in the future you'll find that typology is difficult to apply because this parcel is idiosyncratic. It has a bunch of edges that aren't parallel and other nodes that are more difficult to handle than a cookie cutter recommendation.

C: Bill Deignan (BD): I liked the regional transit connections that include buses and shuttles to Commonwealth Avenue. The regional connections to the Grand Junction and People's Pike seems less detailed. I also liked the mixed-use transit oriented development (TOD) area and noticed you are

concealing parking. My question is regarding the increased space along the Charles River. Will this require change to the access for the on and off-ramp at River Street?

A: SC: We're seeing the potential for people wanting to take a right-turn there and the ramp which serves the right-turn would no longer be utilized.

A: RD: It can be accomplished.

Q: BD: Would that section of roadway be in a boat section?

A: SC: Yes, we think that would be the way to do it.

Q: JR: Why not just remove one lane?

A: RD: There are a number of ways to do it.

C: JR: We don't want to create new recirculation.

C: Fred Salvucci (FS): We are now dealing with a different era with a more progressive Federal Legislative. The cost of River Street ramp away from the Charles River probably construes Section 4(F) considerations. There is an obligation under Federal Law with the objective to minimize cost by dumping cost on abutters. Current law says you're not supposed to think about it like that. MassDOT has an obligation to mitigate. The relocation of the River Street ramp, SFR, and the ability to rebuild the Grand Junction over SFR are construed as Section 4(F) obligations. We should design this the right way through MEPA, NEPA, and Section 4(F). We shouldn't separate those out. Some of these improvements have mitigation offsets. The driver is how to build this right. We know it's going to be tough to finance this. The worst thing we could do is build the project the wrong way. It's MassDOT's responsibility to do that. It's not MassDOT's responsibility to build the open space that Harry wants to see. That's a discussion between HU and the City of Boston. We cannot expect MassDOT to pay for parks and anything beyond responsible mitigation for its damage.

C: SC: I think we should all thank the mandated process. We have to sit around the table until the right answer emerges.

Q: DL: What's the commitment from MassDOT to model the SFR shift? Does DCR have a strong position on this?

A: MOD: We're going to look at all the recommendations and suggestions in order to determine where they can be integrated. We'd like to look it over with DCR and see where it falls.

Q: DL: Does DCR have a position on the realignment of SFR?

- A: Karl Haglund (KH): The question of alignment goes to Fred's suggestion. Some alignment is driven by the Highway and anything beyond that may be a community development process that would need to be split up between the funder and the landowner.
- C: TR: I want to point out a few last things. When the DEIR comes out, these standards should be used as your check list of items. In terms of next steps, we would love to keep Steve and Ralph on board forever but our contract won't extend much longer. We need to wrap this effort up by July. The point is to bring everything we've heard and your comments for a final meeting in July.
- C: MOD: Thank you Tad and thank you everyone for coming out.

Next Steps

The second iteration of the BRA – placemaking output recommendations for the I-90 Interchange Improvement Project will be held on July 13, 2016 at 6:00 p.m. at the Fiorentino Community Center located at 123 Antwerp Street, Allston. All task force meetings are open to the public.

Appendix 1: Meeting Attendees

| First Name | Last Name | Affiliation |
|------------|---------------|---------------------|
| Sasma | Albert | Community Member |
| Gerald | Autler | Task Force Member |
| Joseph | Beggan | Task Force Member |
| Andrew | Bettinelli | Task Force Member |
| Jorge | Briones | Task Force Member |
| Shawn | Burns | BPD |
| Nathaniel | Cabral-Curtis | Howard Stein Hudson |
| Chris | Calnan | TetraTech |
| Steve | Cecil | Cecil Group |
| Tony | D'Isidoro | Task Force Member |
| Bill | Deignan | Task Force Member |
| Ralph | DeNisco | Nelson\Nygaard |
| Jason | Derosier | ABCDD |
| Stacey | Donahoe | MassDOT |
| Josh | Fiala | MAPC |
| Mark | Fobert | TetraTech |
| Dan | Gastler | Community Member |
| Jim | Gillooly | Task Force Member |
| David-Marc | Goldstein | Brookline TMM/AC |
| Anna | Greenfield | Skanska |
| Nick | Gross | Howard Stein Hudson |
| Karl | Haglund | Task Force Member |
| Marc | Kadish | Task Force Member |
| Jim | Keller | TetraTech |
| Elizabeth | Leary | Task Force Member |
| Jia Hul | Lee | Community Member |
| Roy | Leo | DCR |
| Sharon | Long | Community Member |
| Oscar | Lopez | Task Force Member |
| David | Loutzenheiser | Task Force Member |
| Eric | Maki | TetraTech |

| | | |
|------------|----------------|-------------------|
| Pallavi | Mande | Task Force Member |
| Christine | Marini | BPD |
| Harry | Mattison | Task Force Member |
| Anne | McKinnon | Community Member |
| Ken | Miller | Task Force Member |
| Galen | Mook | Task Force Member |
| Tom | Nally | Task Force Member |
| Paul | Nelson | Task Force Member |
| Mike | O'Dowd | MassDOT |
| Tad | Read | Task Force Member |
| Robyn | Reed | CRC |
| Carol | Ridge-Martinez | Task Force Member |
| Matt | Robare | WickedLocal |
| Jessica | Robertson | Task Force Member |
| Steve | Silveira | Task Force Member |
| Bob | Sloan | WalkBoston |
| Karl | Smith | Community Member |
| Renata von | Tscharner | CRC |
| Liam | Walsh-Mellett | Community Member |
| Emma | Walters | Task Force Member |
| Margrita | Wesehler | Community Member |
| Brent | Whelan | Community Member |
| Anolg | Yu | Community Member |