

17

---

To: Michael O'Dowd  
Project Manager

Date: September 4, 2015

From: Nick Gross  
Howard Stein Hudson

HSH Project No.: 2013061.14

Subject: MassDOT Highway Division  
Allston I-90 Interchange Improvement Project  
Task Force Meeting #12  
Meeting Notes of August 5, 2015

---

## Overview

On August 19, 2015 members of the Allston I-90 Interchange Improvement Project team and MassDOT staff associated with the job held the 12<sup>th</sup> task force meeting. Generally speaking the task force membership is reflective of the initial task force with the addition of representatives from the Charles River Watershed Association as well as newly seated members in replacement for previously seated organizations.<sup>1</sup> The task force is composed of local residents, business owners, transportation, and green space advocates, as well as representatives of local, state, and federal governments. The purpose of the task force is, through the application of its members' in-depth knowledge, to assist and advise MassDOT in determining a single preferred alternative to be selected by the Secretary of Transportation for documentation in a joint Environmental Assessment and Environmental Impact Report (EIR) document.

The meeting summarized herein addressed Harvard University's plan for the area, the Boston Redevelopment Authority process which will take place in parallel to the MassDOT effort in Allston, and introduced the place-making effort associated with the MassDOT project as well as the members of the consultant team which will facilitate it. With regard to Harvard University's presentation, the response from the task force was to request that a similar presentation be made at a later date by Boston University, the other major institutional player in the project area. In terms of both the BRA process and the place-making effort associated with the DOT project, the task force universally expressed a strong desire to bring the discussion as quickly as possible to a point of specifics rather than working at the level of flexibility, not precluding future development, and general principles. With regard to the current preferred concept, 3-J and its variants, the task force continues to be of two minds: one, that specific elements within that plan, such as a vehicular connection from Cambridge Street to Commonwealth Avenue be fully explored to the group's satisfaction, and two, the lurking concern that a better plan, specifically an all at-grade approach

---

<sup>1</sup> A listing of task force membership can be found at:

<http://www.massdot.state.ma.us/highway/HighlightedProjects/AllstonI90InterchangeImprovementProject/TaskForceMembers.aspx>

outlined by community member Ari Ofsevit should supplant the 3J series, thereby making the discussion of specifics associated with that suite of concepts invalid.

## Detailed Meeting Minutes<sup>2</sup>

---

C: Ed Ionata (EI): Good evening everyone. My name is Ed Ionata and I work for TetraTech. Tonight we are going to give you an update on the project to-date and then transition into the place-making presentation to show where place-making will be applied to the current concept. The first portion of the project update tonight will be an explanation of the Harvard University's letter of intent (LOI). Kevin Casey, Harvard University's associate vice president for public affairs and communication is here tonight to present the Letter of Intent (LOI)

### *Harvard University Presentation*

C: Kevin Casey (KC): Thank you Ed and thank you MassDOT for inviting me to present this evening. My name is Kevin Casey and am here tonight representing Harvard University. The document I would like to discuss is a LOI which is a non-binding document that Harvard executed with the Commonwealth of Massachusetts last September. It captured elements and priorities that would need to be in place for a project to pass muster to execute a land transaction necessary for the realignment of I-90. In 2009, Allston Landing looked very much like an active rail yard. Part of that is the result of the activity that has been going on dating back about 15 years. In 2003, Harvard purchased Allston Landing North and Allston Landing South. At this time you wouldn't have noticed any change because the basic operations continued. Harvard had the underlying land rights purchased through those transactions. There are also easements held by MassDOT and CSX which allow them to operate on those properties.

In 2005, Harvard began to have discussions with CSX to look at a potential arrangement where those rights could be unified. In 2009, we reached what we called a definite agreement. This contract outlined the milestones and condition of the property which would have to take place for them to yield up CSX's easement rights. The agreement says that CSX would have to relocate their rail operations which have now largely been accomplished. As part of this, CSX would need to remove the structures on the facility as well as do an environmental investigation to remediate any environmental contaminations. Once all of those things were accomplished, then the property could be turned over to Harvard University. When you look at Allston Landing North now, you can see that much of that has been accomplished. The environmental investigations are largely complete and the buildings have

---

<sup>2</sup> 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.

been demolished. Up the street from here there is a state-of-the-art, groundwater remediation program underway.

Allston Landing South is a little bit behind in the process. The environmental investigation is ongoing and the rail related buildings are in the process of being removed. Harvard and CSX are in the process of discussing the remediation that would be acceptable to address the contamination that is underground. We expect all of this to be complete by the time the Allston I-90 Improvement Project requires it to be. During the time this effort was beginning, Harvard's planning was focused locally and much more to the north. In 2013, Harvard's near-term attention shifted to the 10 year institutional master plan. The master plan lays out a significant development program and is partnered with a couple of other major projects. You can see the evidence of this with the Continuum Project which will be opening sometime this fall as well as the demolition and removal of Charles View.

In the mid-term, Harvard would be looking at the Allston Landing North property as the potential site for an enterprise which would be a potential Kendal Square configuration. We had an immediate and a mid-term vantage point that would take us out 15-20 years. We were not focused on Allston Landing South in anyway during this process. That changed when the condition of the viaduct became public. MassDOT began looking at multiple options to replace the deficient highway infrastructure and one option was to realignment of I-90. The realignment of I-90 would require the new highway to be built on land that Harvard now owned. Ultimately, a land transaction would be needed between the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and Harvard University in order for this project to go forward. This project drew Harvard's attention to the longer term horizon and fast forwarded our look at the features that would be necessary to entertain this kind of land transaction.

The work Harvard had done up to this point had already proven successful. CSX had already moved their operations and left an empty pallet for this project to be considered. At this point we began to have discussions with MassDOT about what the elements of a project would need to be in order for the parties to agree on a land transaction. These discussions began to take place parallel to the discussion that you were having. What occurred was an execution of a non-binding letter of intent (LOI) that was signed in September of 2014. The LOI is a set of principles that suggest that if they are met, will lead Harvard into a land transaction with the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. If the principles elements are not met, then it is uncertain that Harvard would be able to make the land transaction. Our goals entering that discussion included maximizing regional development opportunities in Allston Landing and that the replacement of the existing I-90 ramps and infrastructure should be built to minimize highway layout while creating an urban street grid. We asked for the reconstruction of Cambridge Street to occur at-grade to help unify the neighborhood. Finally, we asked that West Station be built into the program which would be fully accessible to motor vehicles, pedestrians, and bicycles.

Harvard views the key components of this project as interrelated; this project is not a series of individual parts. The first significant piece is the realignment of I-90. MassDOT has significant lay-up and lay-over needs for commuter rail. MassDOT is hoping that this will carry some of the work

necessary to support their rail systems. Harvard has gone through a lot in the past to remove a rail yard so to have the desire to reintroduce a rail yard is one that we had a lot of discussion about. It boiled down to a rail yard that is up to 22 acres which is a feature that made its way into the LOI. I should also mention that as this project gets built; it is Harvard's intent to maintain the subsurface rights. Air right developments are critically important not only to knit the neighborhoods together but to mask the rail presence for the long-term when development occurs on those air rights. For those reasons, we think the 22 acre rail yard could become permanent because it would be decked over and developed. If it is not able to be decked over and the air rights are not viable, then this LOI suggest that Harvard has the right to extinguish those rail rights after 30 years. The other thing that needs to be considered in terms of air rights is height. The height of West Station will affect the connecting roads as well as the economically viable and technologically feasible fashion of the project.

The LOI also talks about the components of streets and paths. It says that a ramping system, frontage roads, and/or the connecting streets between I-90 and Cambridge Street must minimize the extent of the state highway layout, support the introduction of an urban street grid, and align with the existing and current planned City of Boston street network. The LOI talks about redesigning Cambridge Street between Windom Street and Soldiers Field Road (SFR) as an at-grade urban boulevard. It also includes the development of a multi-use path for pedestrians and cyclists connecting SFR with Cambridge Street. Another key component is West Station. It states in the LOI that West Station must have a two-platform, 4-track, 800 foot long station that is accessible to vehicles, pedestrians, and bicycles. It must also have a fully accessible single platform for MBTA interim commuter rail use. The elevations of the air rights platform will determine the viability of air rights development. The grades of the north-south connecting roads and the details of related infrastructure, including berms, also are important factors in the redevelopment of Allston Landing. This is the prism that Harvard will be evaluating ideas moving forward. I hope that this will help you when you turn your attention to the LOI. Before I leave, I want to say that it makes Harvard very supportive of the planning program that the BRA and MassDOT will be undertaking. It is going to be important in figuring out what the future may look like without predetermining what might be done in 15-20 years.

C: Jessica Robertson (JR): I wanted to thank you for coming and presenting. It is extremely useful for us to have all of this for our context. I would like to invite Boston University (BU) to do the same thing.

A: Steve Silveria (SS): BU doesn't own any of the land.

C: JR: Yes but there's an institutional master plan that goes up to the projects edge. It would be great to have that context as well.

C: SS: Okay.

## *Allston I-90 Interchange Improvement Project Presentation*

C: EI: Thank you Kevin. Next up we have Mike O'Dowd to cover some additional studies that are being sponsored by MassDOT.

C: Michael O'Dowd (MOD): Thanks everybody for coming out tonight. We have received a carefully drafted concept which is very similar to some of the concepts that our design team had considered and evaluated last year. Since then, we've brought in an independent design team to do a completely unbiased approach in evaluating the feasibility of that concept. There has been a lot of talk and requests made of us to look at other ideas before we box ourselves into the three alternatives we currently have.

Q: JR: Do you have an idea of a timeframe when we might see some of those results?

A: MOD: It will probably take the team around 8-12 weeks to do a full assessment. There are many moving elements including the rail yard, West Station, the highway configuration, the connecting streets, SFR, and the Allston Esplanade.

Q: JR: Would it be possible to have an interim check-in?

A: MOD: Yes.

C: JR: It would be great for us to help guide some of that work and the tradeoffs.

C: MOD: I hope to have more information for you when we see each other again in September.

C: JR: If there is too much to cover in a task force meeting we could have a separate subcommittee.

Q: Harry Mattison (HM): I want to go a step further. What public participation is planned in this independent review?

A: MOD: Right now the team is going to do a completely unbiased approach with no involvement from anybody including the current project team. The team tasked to examine this will be looking at the design concept with no marks, parameters, or constraints. Once they determine whether or not it is feasible, then we'll have an opportunity to take a look at it together. Once we received feedback we'll bring in the team and they can do a presentation for you.

C: HM: That's the opposite of what I was hoping we would do which would be a much more interactive collaborative process. Your team has a ton of knowledge and the community has a ton of knowledge. It

doesn't make sense to have this team go off for three months and make a decision on whether or not it works. We should be working closely, collaboratively, and frequently on this.

A: MOD: I agree. You'll be able to give us feedback once the team has had an opportunity to review the information, the project site, survey information, and constraints. Once they have an opportunity to do that, then they will present their findings to you.

Q: HM: Would that be in 2-3 weeks after they've had a chance to review the site?

A: MOD: It will be 2-3 weeks before they are under contract. That is why I'm giving myself 8-12 weeks to ensure we have the timeframe to bring them on-board, get them under contract, and let them start evaluating the conditions of the site. Then they can begin to look at the concept that was drafted.

Q: HM: Okay so once they are under contract and their wheels are turning can we start working with them?

A: MOD: Once the team has an opportunity to review the information that has been presented then there will be an opportunity to present their findings to you.

C: HM: We're not asking for them to give us a presentation. That's the fundamental problem with this whole thing. We're looking to sit with them to work on stuff together in a different kind of format.

A: MOD: Please give them an opportunity to get up to speed with all of the information that you've currently had available over the past two years. We've conducted three public information meetings and 12 task force meetings. They need to look at the other options that have been done before they can compare it against the concept that has been developed by Ari.

Q: Robin Pope (RP): I would like to ask a question in terms of the objective of the study. I understand that Harvard is planning to put its medical school in this area in remote future. The American Institute of Medicine suggests that the major cause of American deaths is caused by the automobile. I was curious to know MassDOT and Harvard University's concern about getting people out of the automobile and walking on the streets.

A: MOD: It's a good point. From our perspective based on the unbiased study done on the concept, it will be to look at the feasibility of a multimodal interchange. There are going to be environmental impacts associated with that as part of that assessment. We have committed that we are advancing forward with a draft environmental impact report (DEIR) of the concepts that we presented to the public to-date.

C: RP: I was asking how you are planning to get rid of the atrocious death rates relating to automobiles. I could not understand Harvard saying it depends on what conditions we lay down when there are other

things that could help. In the past, things that have been offered by private people have been overturned.

- A: MOD: I think what you are referring to goes back to the fundamentals of this task force and the shared-priorities. There are a number of priorities and concerns that MassDOT, Harvard, and the task force agree upon. Our goals of increasing safety for pedestrians, transit users, and cyclist are part of this study.
- C: Ari Ofsevit (AO): Hi, I'm Ari Ofsevit. I'm glad you'll be looking over my plan. I would hope that the team would be interesting in talking with me because my idea was just a sketch. I think there are a lot of people who have interest in this and I hope they would talk to us when going through all the information you have put together over the last couple of years. If they're looking at what I've done, it would be nice to have a meeting to look at similar sketches that are and are not available right now.
- A: MOD: When we bring the team on board we will get them in touch with you.
- C: EI: Before we get to the place making definitions and principles, we mentioned that there will also be a place making consultant brought on by the BRA. David Grissino from the BRA is here to talk about the scope and schedule.

### *Boston Redevelopment Authority RFP*

- C: David Grissino (DG): Good evening everyone. At the meeting in July I mentioned that the state charged Harvard and the BRA to integrate collaboratively on the place making component. We are about to seek authorization to issue a request for proposal (RFP) to bring on a consultant to work on the place making element. We were authorized to issue the RFP on Monday. Tonight, I'd like to walk through the mechanics of the RFP and provide some insight on what the content is going to look like.

This Wednesday at 10:00am will be the bidder's conference. This will be an opportunity for people who are interested in the RFP to come ask questions to the BRA. We are very interested in making sure the work of this consultant can begin as quickly as possible. We have a three week window for our consultants to submit the RFP back to us. All of the proposals will be due on September 9. We are looking to interview selected candidates on Monday, September 14. The overarching goal with the RFP is to have a consultant under contract by October. In terms of the study, we hope to have it completed by March. The RFP has been broken into two phases. We have structured the RFP to allow us the opportunity to have meaningful input that we can bring back to the MassDOT team.

The major goal of this study is not to develop a master plan for the area; it is to make sure all the fundamental pieces of this project are in the right place. As the concept moves into a design, we want to make sure the design will not preclude a range of successful design outcomes. We don't intend on

doing the design but we want to do enough tests to make sure we know where the ramps, elevations, and all the different component are. Establishing the core principles up front and having something to share will be very important. We are going to spend more time tonight talking about those principles. As part of phase 1 we will be evaluating 3J-3, analyzing the ramps, elevations, evaluating the potential for future decking, and looking at West Station.

We are anticipating that our work will be fully integrated into this projects process and we hope to have a smaller group meeting more frequently than this task force. This is collaboration between MassDOT, Harvarad, the BRA, and all of you. It is important to us to develop shared principles that we will all operate under. CSS has been brought on by MassDOT and has some overlap in terms of place making. CSS has been engaged and will be working with us because they have a different area of focus. It is important to understand that they are working in concert with us. With that I want to turn it over to Tad Read and Kate Fichter to talk more about place making.

C: Kate Fichter (KF): Hi everybody, my name is Kate Fichter. I am the assistant secretary of policy and coordination at MassDOT. I am pinch-hitting for David Molher tonight who couldn't be here. David will be co-leading the place making effort with Tad and David from the BRA. Tonight I wanted to introduce myself and offer myself as a resource. The main thing I want to say is that MassDOT is very aware of the public's interest in the place making element of this project. We consider it to be as important as the transportation aspect. As a trained urban planner, I can also say that urban planning and design isn't necessarily our core strength at MassDOT which is why we formed this collaborative partnership. We are looking very forward to seeing the results from the consultant selection process and getting the effort off the ground. We are also here tonight to hear about the shared priorities. We want to hear from you on what you think is right, wrong, and for you to tell us if there are things we need to add.

C: Tad Read (TR): Thank you Kate. Good evening everybody I'm Tad Read. I am the acting director of planning at the BRA. I want to acknowledge that it was at the behest of Secretary Pollack that Kate reached out to me to undertake the place making study. I also want to acknowledge that Harvard has a very strong interest in this study. I know we will be seeing a lot of participation and collaboration with Harvard moving forward on this. I'd like to talk about the place making principles. You are going to see a presentation by CSS and after that we would like to have a conversation with you to get feedback regarding some draft principles. We have principles on boards and we will display them around the room. As part of that discussion we are going to ask you to come up and write your comments on the boards. The idea is to provide some ideas and let you give us your feedback. The idea of a principle is the lens through which all the ideas of this project will be filter.

The first principle is as follows. New infrastructure would not preclude the development of new districts and neighborhoods that have the flexibility to support a range of densities and land uses. The second principle is, to the greatest extent possible, streets and block should be designed at a human scale, with every attempt to make pedestrians feel safe, comfortable, engaged, and visually stimulated.

The third principle is, to create graceful transitions that encourage and ensure compatibility in scale and character between higher densities and lower densities. The fourth principle is, access to useable open space for active and passive recreation. The fifth principle is, the study should look at the impacts of climate change and those impacts should be part of the thinking in terms of the design of the infrastructure. The sixth principle is, streets and blocks should be designed to provide active and generous street edges that provide safe movements of pedestrians and bicycles while also supporting vehicular movement and transit. The seventh principle is, the Boston Complete Streets Design Guidelines should be applied to all streets in Boston under City control including the neighborhoods and districts within and surrounding the proposed new Allston I-90 interchange. The last principle is that new streets should accommodate vehicles in a safe, dependable, and predictable manner, without leading to harmful congestion.

Q: Bruce Houghton (BH): You're talking about the continuous areas around the turnpike; all of which are owned by Harvard. I'm wondering if it is your intent to actually provide zoning restrictions on the development of the area?

A: TR: That's a really important point and I'm glad you asked. The point of the study is to make sure infrastructure does not preclude the eventual development of a neighborhood. We are not designing or planning new infrastructure. We want to determine if certain plans will support future development. We won't be doing zoning as part of this study.

C: David Loutzenheiser (DL): When I look at these principles they can go either way. We've talked a lot about the generalities but I think we need to start associated numbers with items. When you say lessen the impact of the interchange, what does that mean? I think there should be more specificity with this.

A: TR: I hear you. The point of the principles is that they are broad ideas that are not geographically specific. Within the RFP we talk about more specifics. The principles are intended to be broad. As we go through this study, we will talk about specific numbers and ideas.

C: Renata von Tscharnher (RVT): I'm delighted you used the term place making. You are talking about neighborhoods, livable streets, multimodal, and transportation making. What really makes this place a place is that it is on the Charles River. I know you mentioned connections to the Charles River but I think part of place making is to determine what's unique about this area. I would like to have that component of place making added.

A: TR: That is exactly the type of comment we want to hear during the breakout discussion. That is a great comment, thank you.

C: RP: If you really want a beautiful river, you need to do a lot more such as removing the streets. If you are serious about this and how this is unique, you need to open up the possibilities.

A: TR: There will be plenty of time in the discussion to talk about those ideas.

C: KF: The BRA is going to do a competitive selection for a consultant team to help them work with the community and Harvard to development the place making concepts. At the same time, MassDOT has also engaged urban design consultants to help us understand the place making aspects of the design we are doing. These two teams are going to be working together. We're going to hear from Deneen Crosby with CSS.

### *Place Making Overview*

C: Deneen Crosby (DC): Hi everyone my name's Dennen Crosby. I am a landscape architect with CSS. Tonight we are going to go through the specifics of the current concepts to gain a better understanding of what it will look like and how connections are being made. We'll then talk about the place making components and site capacity. After that we'll open it up to a broader discussion. As Tad said, we will come back at the next meeting with some new concepts.

This image shows the current 3J concept in a 3D model. In this model, Cambridge Street is relatively flat and Cambridge Street South has a few gentle slopes. The connecting streets to West Station rise up to meet the station. In this scenario we would end up with a road pattern that is low, high, low, high, low. The next image shows bicycle and pedestrian connections. Specifically this image shows connections from North Allston to Allston Village, North Allston to West Station, and North Allston to the Charles River. In order to get to West Station from North Allston, a pedestrian or cyclist would use Seattle Street. If you are looking to connect to Western Avenue from Stadium Way you may prefer to use the East Drive connector.

Q: Marc Kadish (MK): Is there a crossover to Commonwealth Avenue in that image?

A: DC: Yes. These are all bicycle and pedestrian connections.

Q: MK: Is there a vehicular connection to Commonwealth Avenue?

A: DC: No. The connections shown are all bicycle and pedestrian.

Q: MK: If you are coming up Commonwealth Avenue from Kenmore Square do you still have to go past the BU Bridge to Harvard Avenue and back track around?

A: DC: Yes. Right now there are no new vehicular connections over the rail yard. There are vehicular connections to the station but not all the way through.

Q: HM: Can you ride your bicycle through those connections?

A: DC: Yes. I'm going to cover the specifics in my presentation.

C: HM: Okay.

C: DC: I know that the slopes on the connecting streets have been a topic of conversation. Seattle Street to West Station has a slope of approximately 4.5% for 625 feet. In total, it is a climb of about 33 feet. The East Drive Connector has a gentler slope. The slope on the East Drive Connector is about 3.5% for 1,130 feet and it climbs 44 feet. If you are continuing onto the Charles River you will descend 25 feet.

Q: AO: For the 5% grade coming off the Charles River, what are the American's with Disability Act (ADA) regulations? Is 5% allowable?

A: DC: Yes. Up to 5% is fine.

Q: AO: Do you need level areas as part of that?

A: DC: No. At 5% or under you do not need level areas.

C: AO: Okay.

C: DC: For comparison, Market Street in Brighton is 2000 feet long with an average climb of about 3.3 feet. The next image shows a steeper slope on Beacon Street. Beacon Street is approximately 1525 feet with an average climb of about 4.5 feet. As part of this effort we started to look at the widths of the streets and the street character as well.

This cross-section shows Cambridge Street South. It is 107 feet from the outside of sidewalk to the outside of sidewalk. Of the 107 feet, 54 feet is roadway. This leaves about half of the cross-section for off-street amenities. On this cross-section these amenities include a 6 foot buffer, 6.5 foot one-way cycle track, 6 foot planting zone, and an 8 foot sidewalk. These features are included on both sides of the street. The reason for a 6 foot buffer is for the potential for on-street parking in the future if the street becomes more of a retail street. 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue in New York City is a similar street for comparison with a distance of 57 feet curb to curb.

The next cross-section example I wanted to show is a typical section along Cambridge Street. Back-of-sidewalk to back-of-sidewalk is currently 128 feet. Curb-to-curb is 79 feet. The sidewalk level section is very similar to Cambridge Street South. The only difference is a 3 foot buffer compared to a 6 foot

buffer. Seaport Boulevard in the Seaport District is a similar street in comparison with curb-to-curb dimensions as Cambridge Street. Seaport Boulevard is about 10 feet wider. Beacon Street at Coolidge Corner is wider compared to Cambridge Street but has the same curb-to-curb. Beacon Street at Coolidge Corner has a much wider median with the MBTA Green Line.

East Drive has a 75 foot cross-section from curb-to-curb and 119 foot cross-section back-of-side to back-of-sidewalk. Within this section there isn't much space for furnishings or plantings however we are able to maintain cycle-tracks and sidewalks on either side. Columbus Avenue in Boston has a similar curb-to-curb comparison. The last image I wanted to show is the East Drive Connector with a greenway feature. This image shows the required space to add additional plantings and wider pedestrian and bicycle amenities. This would also allow for a more pleasant connection to the Charles River.

Cambridge Street South and the East Drive Connector play a big role in the connection to the Charles River and Esplanade. The widening of the Esplanade on this concept is in the range of 40-60 feet. This widening would be situated at the location of the touch down point for the pedestrian and bicycle bridge over SFR. Right now this place serves as a connection rather than a large park where people will hang out.

Q: Alana Olsen (AOL): Are there any connections from Allston south of I-90 to the Esplanade? For example, if you lived on Ashford Street how will you get to the Esplanade?

A: DC: There will be connections to the Esplanade from Allston Village and points south through West Station. As part of the current West Station design there is a stair and elevator connection at Babcock Street, a ramp connection at Agganis Way, and another ramp connection at Malvern Street.

C: AOL: Okay.

Q: JR: At the last meeting there was some talk about segmenting funding and phasing. It was my understanding that the highway portion would be built in one phase and West Station and relating rail operations would be built in another. Would the bicycle and pedestrian connections that go south of I-90 be consider as part of West Station? If that is true, it sounds like those connections would not be built until West Station is built.

A: MOD: We are striving to include bicycle and pedestrian connections across I-90 without relying on connections at West Station. If West Station doesn't follow the same track as the rest of the project we are still going to try to make the bicycle and pedestrian connections over I-90.

Q: JR: Are you saying that if West Station is going to be built is phase 3 for example, phase 1 will include bicycle and pedestrian connections?

A: MOD: Yes. That is what we are striving for.

C: Andreas Wolfe (AW): I'm Andreas Wolfe with MassBike. I want to make it clear that there are missing connections from Agganis Way to the ramp you have proposed.

A: DC: It's been shown as part of West Station.

C: AW: There is still no direct connection from Agganis Way.

C: Name Not Given (NNG): You showed the cross-section for streets but I think you need to put some time into understanding what the ramps and stairs will look like too.

C: DC: That's a good point, thank you.

C: NNG2: I know your purpose is to test out the current scheme. I'm trying to read this in both plan and section in order to imagine what the grades are going to be like. My observation is that this will be pretty close to torture to try to get from North Allston to Allston Village. I'm wondering if the correct way to do this is to simply show desire lines. Perhaps then there is a way to make those two variables come together and achieve a reasonable grade.

Q: RP: Is it technologically infeasible to have cars go under the I-90 and use a tunnel?

A: DC: I would say it is technologically feasible but I think there would be a lot of concern regarding safety of people going that distance underground.

C: RP: I'm not talking about underground; I'm just talking about under the viaduct.

A: DG: You could go as far as the rail. I-90 is elevated in this section because of the rail use.

C: Paola Ferrer (PF): In the last year we've seen a number of consultants and team members join this project. I don't know if they have all participated in our initial walk through and cycle tours of the area. I would like to put it out there that I would like to encourage them to walk and bike in our neighborhood. A lot of the times proposals come in without a real understanding of what it feels like to live here. After the BRA interviews the consultants it should be an obligation of the team to tour the neighborhood.

C: Bob Sloan (BS): I recognize that this may be too far out or too expensive but I am wondering if you considered having a connection to the Esplanade that would hug the rail line from Cambridge Street to Pratt Street and continuing onto the Charles River. That way the connection would not conflict with the roadway and it could have sound protection from noise and vibration. The right-of-way (ROW) and grade changes would not be as significant if this was done.

- A: DC: There are a lot of things to consider. Quickly looking at that idea I would be concerned by the isolation and safety issue.
- C: JR: I think Bob is referring to a connection directly on the south side of the rail tracks so you would be up against the backyards of residential homes.
- C: BS: Wadsworth Street needs noise protection anyway, it could be combined.
- C: AOL: I think your slide and Bob's point illustrate the fact that what this project is doing in its proposed state is functionally moving I-90 closer to the Allston Village neighborhood and not guaranteeing that it will reduce traffic congestion. Even with this plan, we still can't get to the Charles River; it's very disappointing.
- C: DC: The point of our presentation is to explain and show all of the conditions.
- C: Pallavi Mande (MP): You have proposed connections to the Esplanade but there really isn't much of an Esplanade right now. You are talking about street widths and bicycle and pedestrian access but what would it take to rethink what this place is going to be if you are not reconfiguring the Charles River's edge. I feel like there is an opportunity still to ask the big questions.
- C: DG: I think that's a great point. As MassDOT's consultant, CSS has been charged to focus on the pieces of the infrastructure that are part of the project. The work the BRA's consultant will be doing will be to look further out. Right now there is an anticipated filing in June of 2016 for the DEIR. We want to make sure we frontload our process in order to respond to that. We will be looking at the concepts. We won't be designing that but we want to understand how they will be accommodated.
- Q: HM: I'm wondering if you are endorsing or reporting the facts of the current 3J concept?
- A: DC: We are just reporting the facts.
- C: HM: In that case I look forward to being able to work together to help improve this so we can feel some passion about this. You're not winning any awards by making a path 15 feet wider.
- A: DC: It is an improvement.
- C: HM: You're right. I'm not saying it isn't better but I think your bar is too low. The reason there are so many people here and there is so much excitement is because when you look at the land value Harvard has and the potential for BU to access the Charles River it really looks like you could do something great here. The reality is the path is only 20 feet wider. That's not exciting. How does this make life

for someone on Ashford Street any better? How is West Station a great transit hub? You didn't talk about West Station once as a place.

A: DC: We're not done with our presentation.

C: Skip Smallridge (SS): Good evening. I'm going to talk a little bit about the components of place making and site capacity. I'm also going to discuss how these pieces will come together and how we will analyze these pieces. Streets, parks, squares buildings, plazas, icons, and transportation nodes are all part of place making. I want to focus on the last two.

I wanted to show Post Office Park because most of you have been there and I think most of you probably enjoy it. Post Office Park is approximately two acres so keep that in mind. We also have squares like City Square which was made available by a highway project next to Rutherford Avenue. The point here is that all of these spaces were purposefully designed and are contained. Buildings and plazas are similar; we don't want to end up with left over spaces. Icons are not often thought of as being part of place making however the CITGO sign in Kenmore Square very much represents a place. This beautiful 8 foot tall pear has become an icon in the Dorchester community.

The point of all this is not to create things but to create places. Arguably one of the most important places to create as part of this project is West Station. Transit stations are becoming more and more iconic. The term transit node covers sidewalks, crosswalks, entryways, gates, and access. All of the photograph examples of transit nodes I have shown work their way into a block and the surrounding place.

C: ETTY Padmodipoetro (EP): Hi everyone, my name is ETTY Padmodipoetro. In the context of everything, pedestrian bridges are very small but we have a big opportunity in terms of place making with this type of infrastructure. I want to show you a few examples of pedestrian bridges locally and around the world. One of the things I would really like to bring into this project is a sense of joy.

There will be two pedestrian bridges as part of this project. One will connect Franklin Street to Harvard Avenue. The other pedestrian bridge will connect from the West Station area to SFR. It is going to be challenging because of the difference in elevations. On the other hand it will create an opportunity to be something unique. I am looking forward to working with everyone and determining the principles by which we will move forward with to do our sketches. The next thing for the pedestrian bridges will be for us to look into dynamics and site constraints.

C: SS: Thank you ETTY. Deneen talked a bit about place making in terms of the existing designs. A lot of people have said, "Do not preclude." That is the basis of the work we will be doing as well as maintaining flexibility. We'll have to think about phasing as we move forward in creating an environmental you all want to see. Someone raised a point about slopes. When coming down East Drive the slope is approximately 3.5% and Seattle Street is approximately 4.5%. I wanted to show a

street that had both of these conditions and many different building types as well. We selected School Street from Washington Street to the bottom of Beacon Street. This street is not similar to East Drive or the Seattle Street Connector in terms of appearance but it will look similar in terms of slope and number of access points. When we get into 4.5% slopes it becomes more difficult. The way to overcome this is to break it down into reasonable increments and turn it into a vibrant street with multiple activities. The bottom line is that the slopes can work on all of the north-south connectors. The cross streets are a bit more difficult but still pretty easy to deal with.

I'm going to run quickly through a number of building forms that may be potentially built on the site. A hotel is approximately 60 feet deep and 180 long. A hotel with a garage can range up to 180 feet deep and 200 feet long. A multi-family apartment fits within that block size. A conventional office building is about 90 feet deep and 200 feet long. Some office buildings are bigger such as in Kendall Square which range up to 125 feet deep and 200 feet long. Optimal parking for a two-bay garage is 120 feet deep and 200 feet long. Retail and restaurants range from 80 to 100 feet deep and anywhere from 25 to 100 feet long. When you put it all together you end up with a minimum composite block that is approximately 125 feet deep and 200 feet long. This is not a big block. It is not big enough to carry a multi-family dwelling.

You may be wondering what this means? The smallest block size we are talking about is 150 feet by 200 feet and the largest block size we are talking about is 200 feet by 300 feet. This is still a work in progress but you will see based off of our sketches that even the largest blocks fit multiple times within these parcels. The dimensions and building types are adequate for various types of building uses.

- C: JR: You pointed out something really important. The block size people want to see in an urban environment from a walkable perspective would fit multiple times in some of these parcels. Eventually when it is all built out we would like to see some cross streets. If you're having a cross street between East Drive and Stadium Way, it will be important to determine the grade of that cross street.
- A: SS: We'll be looking at that and there are many ways we can deal with it. The BRA will also be taking a look at that.
- C: JR: I hope we can bring in some of our value judgments and not just test what is theoretically feasible. We want to test whether it is desirable.
- A: SS: The other issue here is that we won't be able to provide access everywhere. For example, in locations where there is a median, there will be right-in and right-out access only. There is one other thing that I should mention. We will also be looking at the geometry of the roads leading to West Station to ensure that it allows place making as well as air rights development.
- C: BH: I'm having a difficult time comparing the project vision and what is reality. The presentation is as if you have an open opportunity to create a little city with nice neighborhoods, destinations, and places

where people want to go. That might be true along Cambridge Street but the BRA has only said that they will not preclude things. This is all institutional land and you're here presenting parks, greens, and townhouses. I'm not sure that Harvard wants to put townhouses on their land. The reality of institutional growth is similar to Forest Cities that MIT developed in Cambridge. That was an institutional purchase and that is an institutional development.

What is going to make this place a destination is if people live here. If people don't live here, this will be a Post Office Square or Forest Cities at night. It might be a nice place but it won't be part of this neighborhood. Unless the BRA comes down and says they want to do more by zoning in height restrictions and new neighborhoods where people live, this won't be anything. A large amount of your presentation is only practical along the Charles River, West Station, and Cambridge Street. I feel like you are building up an expectation by showing people. Unless Harvard is willing to develop their land in that way, which would be surprising, then we're talking about something that is a dream as a planner and not reality. Plan Cambridge Street, at least Harvard can agree with you there.

A: DG: What you're talking about takes a very long time. We have 6 months until a DEIR is finalized. We're looking at June to achieve the goal of what I believe you're talking about. Right now, our goal is to make sure this project provides an opportunity to have all of the conversations you just brought up.

Q: BH: Is that your ultimate goal? Are you really thinking and planning about putting restrictions on properties that will accommodate housing?

A: DG: We need to set the stage for those conversations to happen. Our goal right now is a short term one. We want to put ourselves in the right places to start having those conversations.

C: BH: I think it's important that the neighborhood recognizes that you can plan for opportunity. It's hard to sit here and say we are planning neighborhoods. At this time all of this is just a dream.

C: EI: At this point I think we'll open it up to a larger discussion. We have set September 17 to hold the next task force meeting. The highway and interchange is the topic in the rotation. The place making and transit issues will be included in that.

### *General Discussion*

Q: Anthony D'Isidoro (AD): Does local art and culture factor into place making? I haven't seen much of this included in our conversation.

A: TR: Yes. These are preliminary draft principles. We are going to break out into smaller groups and spread the boards around the room. Each board has a guiding principle on it and we would like you to write your comments and amendments on the board. We'll then reconvene in 20 minutes to hear your thoughts.

Q: HM: What is the schedule for the meeting tonight? Is this meeting going until 10:00pm?

A: TR: We can go as long as necessary.

C: AD: Let's go until 11:30pm.

Q: HM: We've been talking about principles for two years. When do we sit down and try to fix the plan so we are not trying to work around all the problems that are caused by having a huge viaduct up in the air? Instead of bouncing around from topic to topic each month, when do we get to focus on the fundamental problems?

A: TR: CSS has just been brought up board and we don't have a consultant on board yet. We are just starting these analyses and conversations. Tonight you saw a very early preliminary analysis that will need to more critiques and analysis. We thought it might be a good idea to start with some guiding principles because we don't have our consultants on board yet. If you feel that we don't need to have that conversation than that's okay.

C: JR: Let's put up the principles, walk around, and if everyone seems happy we can wrap up sooner than 20 minutes.

C: HM: You could just look at the comment letters we've written that are 10 pages long that we send in every 3 months. Those letters will tell you what are principles are.

C: PF: You could also look into the meeting minutes from the first meeting.

C: JR: It sounds like the BRA is trying to boil down all of our principles. They're asking us to double check and see if they forgot anything important.

C: HM: How about we just talk about how far we can move SFR to make a real Esplanade instead of writing a principle that says, "We envision a green space that has natural resources that can enrich the quality of people's lives." Let's just talk about moving the road and making a real park. A lot of people don't want a wider path, they want a real park.

C: TR: The thought he was to get everyone in the room on the same page. If you feel that this step has already been done we can pass. I'm hearing Jessica say that she's open to the activity. Are there others in the room who are open to providing comments and feedback on the principles?

C: PF: If this is going to help advance the process I am willing to participate. You need to understand that you have a group of people here who live in this neighborhood. As Harry said, we have been submitting comments every month and at this point I just copy and paste what Harry writes and send

it in. There is a level of frustration because we've been presenting these issues ever since the Cambridge Street overpass project came about. I know that a lot of the consultants don't live in the neighborhood and that they travel from suburbia. I'm welcome to the breakout activity but I hope that from here on out, someone keeps track of this stuff.

Q: HM: When do we get to talk about the tangible suggestions that we make over and over again? Everyone knows that we have expressed our concern about flipping East Drive and the Stadium Way Connector but we never talk about it.

A: DC: That is one of the concepts that is being studied.

A: TR: We're moving as fast as we can and we have a process that we have to go through to get consultants on board. We'll be coming back to you in late October or early November to have a meeting.

C: HM: This isn't directed to the BRA, this is for MassDOT.

C: TR: Can I suggest we put the principle boards up on the table and invite folks to come up and make comments.

Q: JR: A lot of us are frustrated because these principles have been talked about from the beginning and a lot of the issues that were illustrated tonight have been raised months ago. The question is not, what are these test going to find out, the question is, once we get an answer of "no," will we be redesigning the roadway?

A: MOD: The principles that Tad and the BRA are trying to work on are going to make sure everyone is on the same page and prioritize the concerns.

C: JR: That's great but we've all been on the same page for a long time. Your presentations in the past have included a lot on our principles. I think we agree on the principles but there is another conversation happening on designs, traffic modeling, and intersection modeling on a roadway that does not adhere to our principles and goals.

A: MOD: That is why we are trying to integrate the place making elements into the transportation modes. This is a multimodal interchange and the result isn't going to make everybody happy. We ultimately want to have the land owner, the City, and the public to agree that this project provides the basis for what we all want and then we can advance it further.

Q: HM: How is the highway driver not happy with this plan?

- A: MOD: That goes back to the suburban interchange option. We would still have that on the table if we were favoring highway drivers. Do drivers like going through 8-10 signalized intersections to get on the highway? No. They are there so slow cars down and create a safer pedestrian environment.
- C: HM: I guess the feeling is when we look at something like the plan to relocate the bridge to the Charles River we're horrified. We're looking at a plan that feels optimized for highway drivers. We all know Harvard would never in a second allow you to build a suburban interchange. We would love to see a great transit stop and great bicycle routes instead of 6 lane roads. We're wondering when we're going to be able to work on that with you instead of talking about principles. You can write a principle but then you give us plans that is impossible for a child to ride their bicycle on.
- A: MOD: This project is intended to make the conditions much better than what currently exist today. This will be a transformative project that is going to make this area a lot more accessible for a lot more people. The principles are similar to the principles that were developed from day one but these are the planning principles.
- C: NNG2: It seems to me that you are in a difficult spot. I fear that what people are saying is that they can already look at the drawings and see that there isn't going to be much place making. The plans are lacking access to the Charles River, the blocks are too big, the ramps are too high, and the paths are too narrow. I think a lot of people are worried about this new evaluation because the CSS and BRA might side with the highway engineers. People seem uncertain about this process because it sounds like it is going forward with someone that hasn't been agreed upon.
- C: JR: I'm not so much worried about that. I'm worried about the BRA process taking a couple of months and at the same time Mike and his team is going to continue to work on their plans. This project is going to create a nicer place than what we have today but it's still not good enough. Let's fix what we have now and stop advancing the design.
- C: AO: In a lot of places we're seeing 4-5% grades and we're hearing that it could be done but it's going to be more difficult. We're also looking at an urban highway that is 135 feet wide with full breakdown lanes. We need to look at making that narrower. It doesn't feel like the highway is feeling any pain. It feels like the cyclists who are climbing 5% hills are feeling the pain.
- Q: AD: I think the disconnect is that MassDOT is more privy to the financial situation of the Commonwealth in terms of what they could actually support. We're not privy to that information. We keep saying we should do this and we should do that but we're not being told flat out that you can't afford certain things. We'd like you to be honest with us. We're all aware of the 5 year Capital Investment Plan (CIP) and we know that plan is supposed to be announced by the end of this year. Would it be possible to make the process of developing the CIP available to this task force so we could gain a stronger understanding of what is going on?

- A: MOD: I understand what you're saying. We are absolutely utilizing some form of the project selection matrix to what is being developed as part of the CIP. The Secretary of MassDOT directs us and we have to be able to satisfy our concerns. The Secretary could tell me right now that the money isn't available. It is however possible over the next several years to find the necessary money to fund this project. I don't think there is anyone in this room that could answer those questions.
- C: AD: Let's say for example that there is a much better design that would be more expensive. Aren't we then herding ourselves in the sense that we are pushing this project further and further? Are you going to tell us that it is possible but it will need to be addressed in "phase 2?"
- A: MOD: That may happen. I could tell you that my priority right now is to ensure the safety of the viaduct. I'm being straightforward when I say that. I want to find the most cost effective, proven, and feasible alternative. I don't want it to be driving the opportunity to better improve what currently exists. As a highway agency it's easy for us to say that we'll replace a piece of infrastructure in the same configuration that it's currently in. If we don't consider the long-term impacts associated with that, then it is a bad move on our part.
- Q: JR: We already know that there are certain problems that are existing in the current plan. In the meantime, can we start addressing some of the problems that we already know exist?
- A: MOD: Yes. On September 17, we are going to go through the challenges and constraints of the existing plan. Mike Hall will be prepared to layout the existing demands that are being placed on this neighborhood.
- C: JR: We've already seen that presentation six times.
- A: MOD: This one will be different.
- C: HM: How about we do something completely different.
- C: Galen Mook (GM): I'd like to get us back on track with the initial conversation. Fred Salvucci has had his hand raised for a while now.
- C: Fred Salvucci (FS): I'm not very interested in agreeing or disagreeing. I'm interested in win-win solutions. This highway as it is proposed is already dramatically better than what is out there today. I think that is a win. Restoring the passenger rail service to this area is a big deal and the fact that it is on the table is a win. Those are both very good things; they're win-wins. They would both be great for the neighborhood and great for the region.

This project is very complicated and I think I have an idea to reduce the amount of confusion. I respect the issue of money. I also want to point out that I met Ari Ofsevit this weekend and he is a genius. In

my opinion Ari's plan is better and it will cost less. Ari's plan is conceptual and it needs work but it is a win-win. If the profiles come down, 50% of the earlier discussion will be satisfied. If we bring the profile down the grades become dramatically better. If we flip East Drive and Stadium Way that would be a win too. If we do these things 90% of the concern will be resolved. I know Mike Hall and the team have a job to do by making the numbers work. Another way to make the numbers work is to put in more cross-streets. This would allow you to split up the traffic in more ways.

Ari's plan is the best thing I've seen in terms of bring the profile down. Would anyone be unhappy if Mike came back next month and said that they could create an option a lot like Ari's? I think if those pieces could be made to work it would dramatically advance the entire design. There is the other goal here to get through the environmental process and being able to build this thing before the viaduct falls down. If we can get these 3-4 issues settled then this process will run a lot smoother. After that, then we can talk about place making within a happier context.

C: GM: I'd like to hear the pros and cons of the proposed concept.

C: JR: All along we've been wanting to see props and cons of each alternative.

C: RP: I'd like to comment on your concern regarding users. There is a lot of research showing that the more roads you build the more vehicular users you attract. It may be radical but it would be much better to close the Turnpike. You could turn this entire area into a park and put the highway higher so people could go under.

C: HM: I was hoping we could wrap up remembering Fred's comments. I agree it would be a huge step forward.

C: MOD: The intent for the next meeting is to discuss traffic implications with the swapping of East Drive and Stadium Way.

C: HM: Can you email us the presentation before the meeting so we can read it. Let's just cut to the chase.

C: JR: The presentations take way too long.

C: PF: The traffic presentations are boring and they're not practical for our discussion. The data that is presented to us is presented in a way that favors more lanes and a wider viaduct. There are communities that have managed to control traffic in urban areas without increasing highways.

A: MOD: That is another item we want to discuss with you. If we take the volume of vehicles that are using the Allston interchange today and remove the interchange that exists, we want to ensure those users can still get to their destinations. We don't want to force people to take another and new routes.

C: JR: You're proposing to add more cars.

A: MOD: This is what we are hoping to walk you through at the next meeting. We want to discuss how we can free up various paths for accessibility, pedestrians, and bicycles. We want to show you what an urban interchange will look like with existing volumes.

C: JR: We've already seen that.

A: MOD: No you haven't. We've showed you the projections for 20 years out.

Q: JR: We don't care what the data says on this design. There are major fatal flaws with this design. We want you to spend the next six weeks getting to a place with this design which includes better options. Can you stop working on this design and spend your time fixing the issues?

A: MOD: I'm not advancing the design right now.

Q: JR: If we find a different design that everyone agrees works better, spending our time on this traffic analysis is a waste of time. Can we figure out if these other options work better?

A: MOD: If any of the proposed plans or variations turns out to be a better alternative then we will flip gears and go forward with that plan.

C: TR: I'd like to make a quick observation. I think we are hearing that people have some fundamental questions about the proposed design. Instead of continuing to look at how the design is going to work, it sounds like the request is being made to respond to the unknown questions. It feels like we are having the same conversation over and over. If we have the kind of conversation you mentioned at the next meeting it is going to be viewed as unproductive by this group.

A: MOD: That would be unfortunate. I expect the presentation to be new information.

C: JR: We don't care about new information on a poor design.

A: MOD: We are looking at two independent design options.

Q: JR: can we talk about that next time?

A: MOD: Yes.

Q: JR: Can we talk about that the whole time? Can we at least talk about it at the beginning and save Mike Hall's traffic analysis for the end?

A: MOD: We will discuss both.

Q: JR: My question is, can we talk about the stuff that is more important to us first?

A: MOD: We'll talk about the alternatives. We will also speak to the at-grade alternative that is being evaluated.

C: JR: I feel like you're dodging my question. We don't have time for all of that information. The things that are most important to us are not the traffic scenarios on the current design.

C: Pallavi Mande (PM): There was only one diagram that shoed the creation of a new Esplanade. This neighborhood has been requesting a conversation regarding the Esplanade so I would like to add that to the agenda.

Q: Renatta von Tscharnner (RVT): Can you also add the projected numbers based on the addition of a transit station?

A: MOD: Absolutely. Keep in mind that this area is going to be developed over the next 20 years. All of the development through Boston, Cambridge, and Somerville utilizes this area as a transportation hub. It is the development in cities that drives the demand for transportation.

C: AO: I agree that we need to get more people to places like Kendall Square. The problem is that if we build the highway first, more people are going to use the highway. If we are truly trying to get people to Kendall Square we need to build West Station. The reason Kendall Square works so well is because 60% of the people who live and work there don't drive. We need to continue to keep those numbers of cyclist high because if we don't, the result will be gridlock and the economic development will fail. Kendall Square is one of the main economic drivers of the Commonwealth and one of the reasons we have money to do projects like this. We need to ensure that Kendall Square can remain one of the top bio-tech clusters in the world. Part of the reason for that is because you can get to Kendall Square without a car.

C: MOD: Thank you Ari. I think that's a good point to wrap up on.

## ***Next Steps***

---

The next task force session will be held at 6PM on Thursday, September 17 at the Fiorentino Community Center. The Fiorentino Community Center is located at 123 Antwerp Street in Allston. All task force sessions are open to the public.

## Appendix 1: Meeting Attendees

---

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Sara Heler	Ayanian	Allston Resident
Joseph	Beggan	Task Force Member
Tegin	Bennet	City of Cambridge
Glen	Berkowitz	ABC
Andrew	Bettinelli	Task Force Member
Jorge	Briones	Task Force Member
Norman	Brown	Bayside Engineering
Kevin	Casey	Harvard University
James	Cerbone	MassDOT
Rick	Coloni	MassDOT
Chris	Conroy	Allston Resident
Deneen	Crosby	CSS
Donny	Dailey	MassDOT
Marc	Ebuna	Transit Matters
Paola	Ferrer	Task Force Member
James	Gillooly	Task Force Member
David	Grissino	Task Force Member
Nick	Gross	Howard Stein Hudson
Karl	Haglund	DCR
Marc	Handley	Harvard University
Marc	Kadish	Task Force Member
Ken	Kruckemeyer	LivableStreets Alliance
Robert	La Tremouille	FOWG
John	Laadt	Task Force Member
Oscar	Lopez	Task Force Member
Sean	Macaluso	Task Force Member
Clancy	Main	Task Force Member
Pallavi	Mande	Task Force Member
Christine	Marini	Boston Police Department
Walter	McDonald	Cambridgeport Resident

Galen	Mook	Task Force Member
Meredith	Mooney	Boston University
Tom	Nally	Task Force Member
Paul	Nelson	Task Force Member
Carol	O'Hare	Cambridgeport Resident
Ari	Ofsevit	LivableStreets Alliance
Alana	Olsen	Task Force Member
Etty	Padmodipoetro	Urban Ideas Lab
Rich	Parr	Task Force Member
Bob	Pessek	Allston Civic Association
Robin	Pope	Graz University
Tad	Read	Task Force Member
David	Read	Dana-Farber Cancer/East Coast Greenway
Matt	Robare	Allston/Brighton TAB
Jessica	Robertson	Task Force Member
Apratim	Sahay	Charles River Conservancy
Fred	Salvucci	Brighton Resident
Margela	Shirley	Geocomp Corporation
Steve	Silveira	Task Force Member
Bob	Sloan	WalkBoston
Skip	Smallridge	CSS
Tony	Timperio	HDR
Samuel	Trafidillo	Transit Matters
Renata	von Tscharner	Charles River Conservancy
Kevin	Wright	Task Force Member