
To: Michael O'Dowd
Project Manager

Date: October 17, 2016

From: Andreas Wolfe
Howard Stein Hudson

HSH Project No.: 2013061.14

Subject: MassDOT Highway Division
Allston I-90 Interchange Improvement Project
Task Force Meeting
Meeting Notes of October 13, 2016

Overview

On October 13, 2016, the Allston I-90 Task Force met to discuss changes in the preliminary design of the Allston I-90 Interchange Project. Changes in the design were triggered by several significant events: Houghton Chemical's willingness to yield up rail service, a reduction in capacity in the proposed commuter rail layover facility from fourteen train consists to eight, and the outputs from the Boston Planning and Development Agency's (formerly BRA) place-making study, presentation of which was completed to the taskforce in July of 2016. Presenters included Bruce Houghton of Houghton Chemical, Kevin Casey of Harvard University Community Affairs Department, Ed Ionata of Tetra Tech, Mike O'Dowd of MassDOT, Jim Kelleher of Tetra Tech and Mark Shamon of VHB.

Bruce Houghton kicked off the meeting with a short presentation discussing his company's history in Allston, his continued desire to do business in the community, and his nearly year-long negotiations with Harvard and CSX to give up his access to the rail spur which brings materials to and from his business. Rail services will continue for two years at the Houghton Chemical site after which they will be discontinued as will the spur line which makes this service possible. He was followed by Kevin Casey of Harvard University's Community Affairs Department who provided an overview of Harvard's land acquisitions in Allston, plans for their property, and impacts on the university's plans associated with the BPDA recommendations and the potential downsizing of the commuter rail layover facility. The final part presentation element of the evening was conducted by members of the MassDOT team who detailed refinements to Option 3K4 based on the recommendations of the BPDA effort.

While members of the taskforce were generally supportive of the changes proposed to 3K4, significant concern was voiced about the staging of West Station within the scope of the broader project as the approach to the project which is evolving based on discussions between Harvard and MassDOT moves construction of the station later into the project to allow greater flexibility in constructing other elements of the job and providing better access to development parcels. While the university has expressed the opinion

that pushing West Station further into the future eases and speeds development thereby making a neighborhood in Beacon Park Yard, a well-documented community desire, and that the delay also makes the construction of the station more certain, task force members note that this choice has the feel of forcing the community to bear the burdens of highway and building construction before receiving the benefit of a new rail connection to downtown.

Detailed Meeting Minutes¹

C: Ed Ionata (EI): Hello, I am Ed Ionata from Tetra Tech and this is meeting number twenty-nine. Tonight we have two initial presentations, one from Bruce Houghton of Houghton Chemical and one from Kevin Casey of Harvard University. Afterwards, we will hear from our project manager, Michael O'Dowd on progress since the last time we met, and our staff is going to go through the Boston Planning and Development Agency's (BPDA), formerly Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA), Placemaking Study, and its impact on the new design. I ask that you hold the questions until the end, except for those for Houghton Chemical and Harvard University.

Presentation by Bruce Houghton

C: Bruce Houghton (BH): First of all, I am on the Harvard-Allston Task Force. I have submitted my resignation, which they may choose to accept. Some feel that my ability to represent the business community there is compromised by the financial situation at play here with Harvard University. I have always represented the community, but in addition, I have to look out for the continuation and prosperity of my business. When I started this company over 20 years ago, I always envisioned the place where my company is based being my community, in addition to where I live.

I have a responsibility to my family, my employees and my community. These interests have never been in conflict for me, until right now because of my railroad siding. My business is in conflict with Harvard's development in the area, with the turnpike and with the Massachusetts taxpayers. However, I was most concerned with the interests of this community.

Recognizing this issue, last November, I approached Harvard to come to an agreement. I will have two more years of access to the railroad siding, at which point it will be surrendered. The loss of the siding means I will lose my largest service customer. We will likely move the services offered by that railroad siding to another one of our locations. Harvard and I have worked together to come to a mutual agreement. I want to thank them. This Harvard is different than the Harvard of ten years ago, when they originally bought the railyard. They understand that this is part of their community. I'd also like to thank the DOT, who never pushed me off my site. Lastly, I'd like to thank the community. I evaded your questions about this matter for a while, and I apologize for evading your questions. I had to do it

¹ Herein "C" stands for comment, "Q" for question and "A" for answer. For a list of attendees, please see Appendix 1.

this time, because this was a confidential agreement. This is not about the money, but it is about being part of your community.

A: Kevin Casey(KC): Thank you Bruce. This was a straightforward conversation. We wanted to make sure we understood everyone's need. This was an important site for Harvard and our long-term future.

C: (EI): Bruce will you take questions?

C: (BH): Sure

C: Galen Mook (GM): When is the last train run?

C: (BH): I don't know, in about 2 years. I will let you know, we have about 1 or 2 trains coming in every week.

Presentation by Kevin Casey

C: (KC): I'm Kevin Casey, the Associate Vice President of Community Affairs for Harvard. I have been the point person for Harvard's conversations in Allston such as this. We thought this was an opportune time to come back to the community and present what Harvard is communicating to MassDOT regarding our wishes for this area.

In 2002-2003, Harvard purchased what we refer to as Allston Landing North and Allston Landing South from the Massachusetts Turnpike Authority. All rail operations would continue by way of a permanent easement with CSXT. At that time, Harvard could not access the property. In 2009, Harvard wrote a letter of intent to purchase the CSXT easement, and outlined a contract with a series of action steps that would ultimately lead to yielding access of the site to Harvard, including performing environmental mitigation on both sites. Over the past 15 years, Harvard has contributed to consolidating property in this area and preparing land for this project. The immediate focus of the University is on the land north of Western Avenue. The intermediate focus is in the area between Western Ave. and Cambridge St., referred to as Allston Landing North and the long term focus is in the area of the current interchange, which we refer to as Allston Landing South. However, the process to redesign this interchange has accelerated our interests here.

Our Letter of Intent (LOI) states that this area shall include a 22 acre rail yard that feasibly can handle air rights construction. If that condition cannot be met, it was stated that the rail yard would disappear after 30 years. We understand, however, that once a rail yard is in place, it is difficult to remove. The LOI also includes West Station and access to the Paul Dudley White Path. The 22 acre rail yard has been the driving force around the configuration of the highway. As we continued to discuss the viability of air rights at the location, one thing that Harvard felt was that having a bypass

road² was necessary to maintain those air rights, and that it is not something that can be phased in at a later date. It would be too difficult to deck over an active rail yard. We felt that the bypass road, along with these other parts of the LOI must be included in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR).

Harvard currently has what is referred to as a springing easement for the railyard, which means that at a certain point some of the easements would return to Harvard, while others would return to the MBTA. Our goal in the presentation tonight was to determine how much of the MBTA's long-term layover needs can be achieved here using a more limited footprint that is more suitable to air rights development. Once you shrink the railyard, you can straighten the turnpike, make the air rights more developable, create more *terra firma* north of the Turnpike and realign South Cambridge Street to a straighter line. This would require that West Station be delayed slightly in order to accommodate the layover space at first. Eventually, the springing easement could go into effect and the layover space would be moved to another location and the rail station would be built, along with sizeable additional development.

Originally under the previous alternative, Alternative 3K-4, the development in the area served as the linchpin for the development of West Station. This remains the same. West Station wouldn't be constructed at the beginning as it may end up in a place that isn't appropriate for the development that comes around it. Rather it would be integrated into the development plan for the area once the Turnpike construction was completed. I understand this is a lot to take in, and hope this is the start of a productive conversation.

Q: Harry Mattison (HM): I appreciate Harvard working on a lot of the same elements as the community and the BPDA, however, I am really confused regarding the West Station portion. It sounds as if everything will be built, including the highway and railyard, but not West Station. The station would then be built at some later unspecified date.

C: Joe Beggan (JB): The railyard would not be in its permanent location, and there would be swing place to move elements around. Once development occurs, we could provide the proper space for the station in conjunction with the potential bus service and north-south bike/ped connections. We are confident then that the bypass road could be phased, and the tracks wouldn't be in the way.

Q: (HM): So the bypass road would also not be built initially? And what about the platform over the tracks?

C: (JB): The pedestrian/bicycle connection would be in the initial condition. Essentially the configuration of the roadway, development and station would be determined later. We don't want to do anything that locks things in place.

C: (HM): It feels like we are getting all of the bad stuff first; then we are getting the good stuff later.

² This bypass road has been discussed as an elevated roadway connecting West Station and the Cambridge Street Bridge running above the railroad tracks adjacent to the Pratt Street area.

- C: (KC): I disagree in the sense that with this new alternative, we are getting the street-grid the community has asked for, and the at-grade connection to the river. No wheel truing and no maintenance facility are proposed to exist at the site. The bypass will at least be in the DEIR, in order to achieve air rights over the rail yard.
- C: (HM): We do need to talk more about what comes when.
- C: (KC): That is true. We don't know all the elements of the plan, and there are quite a few remaining questions about remaining parcels.
- C: Jessica Robertson (JR): There are quite a few benefits to this. First, we never had a promise of service from day one at West Station with the former Alternative 3K-4. Second, we have seen similar issues with many of the big dig parcels, that when you build for potential air rights, you often build supports in the wrong place.
- C: (HM): There are lots of good upside here, I just want to be clear on what we are giving away first. With the Cambridge St. bypass, it was clear that would take a lot of traffic off of Cambridge St. If that's not built at the beginning, we're going to end up with the big fat streets that we are fighting against. There could be a lot of different impacts of this new design, and whether its impacts to the design, construction or phasing, I think we need to understand all of them before continuing.
- C: (Mark Kadish (MK): We need to have things documented so that in the future when this Task Force goes away, we can be assured that all particular parts of the plan are built and not dropped due to lack of funding.
- Q: Glen Berkowitz (GB): First of all, thank you. My quick question is regarding West Station. This Task Force seemed to think there would be some form of West Station built and serviced by the MBTA in the 2020-2025 time-frame. Under your new proposal, when would West Station open?
- A: (KC): That is uncertain at this point.
- C: (HM): Harvard does think in centuries.
- C: (KC): In its rudimentary form currently, the footprint we have proposed seems to require a sequence in phasing where West Station would come later. Perhaps there is an opportunity to have West Station from the beginning, but we do not know that at this point. But by undoing some parts of the LOI that I mentioned, we are looking at a different project and configuration.

MassDOT Presentation

- C: (EI): Thanks, let's end there for now. Mike O' Dowd is going to now introduce his team and look at the place making suggestions and changes to the current concept.

C: Mike O' Dowd (MOD): You likely already know this, but it is rare for a business owner to have so much care for the community, and that is certainly something that Bruce Houghton has. Since last July, a few things have changed based on the Place Making Study that the BPDA made. As we looked at these recommendations, we had to consider whether it was too costly, out of the project scope or had some other restricting factor. We would like to get as much as we can right tonight.

We need to find more space for the MBTA to provide their service. Several areas such as Readville and Widdett Circle have also been considered for expanded layover space. We also understood Kevin's need for having a space where air rights truly could be built. There are a lot of different pieces and components to these options, and I think this new alternative certainly improves on 3K-4, the previous alternative. We are not advocating or endorsing anything yet, our goal is to get your feedback.

It is also important to consider that everything we propose is in line with the Purpose and Need Statement of this project. That includes the highway operations, MBTA operations, and a street grid that does not send traffic through the neighborhood and does not present hurdles to development. The development of West Station is integral to the overall success of this project but we also need to plan something based on the financing we have. There are limits to the toll revenues in both quantity and how those can be spent.

We want to ensure that what we do now does not preclude anything that may be proposed down the road from Harvard, the BPDA or others. As a result of these new options and coordination efforts, we are delaying the filing of the DEIR for this project. The filing is likely to happen now in the late summer of 2017. This will incorporate these new ideas and give CTPS time to run a model for the site.

In addition, everyone here is in agreement that this project should have an open space component. I hope you will be pleasantly surprised by our new alternative tonight as we have taken that into consideration. There are important questions to ask regarding maintenance, and that we will continue to iron out in conversations with DCR. Chris is going to take over now.

C: Chris Calnan (CC): Thank you Mike. The next part of the presentation will focus on the Placemaking Study. There were 61 standards put forward in the study, and I'm going to go through the more major standards and how they have influenced our design. First, we have Charles River Edges and connections. We need an additional connection to the River. Our new concept shows ramps that would come off of Soldiers Field westbound and head straight into the interchange. This would take a significant amount of traffic off of Cambridge Street. The idea we are proposing tonight would shift Soldiers' Field Road (SFR) considerably further into the site and open up an at-grade connection to the Charles River for pedestrians and bicyclists. With this new thinking, we would depress a portion of SFR in order to provide the connection to the River, along with the ramps coming off of SFR to access I-90.

Another consideration of the study was regarding an east-west connection between Cambridge Street and West Station. Right now we are considering this bypass configuration for later, once significant

development at the future West Station has taken place. Next we have consideration for a North-South connection. MassDOT has been looking at this project both with a north-south connection and without. Our intention is to allow for those alternatives and let people comment on them later. The next place making standard was to provide additional width on the bridges over the turnpike. Our position is that this is not something that needs to happen from day one. We can expand the bridge down the road when development takes place.

Next, Cambridge Street connections to the north: there have always been two streets north of Cambridge St, which have been tied in with Harvard's plans for that area. We may be able to add a third connection here, but the phasing of this has not been worked out. Next we have a direct connection from Cambridge Street South to North Harvard Street. Previously we had connected Cambridge Street South to Lincoln Street, but it appears we may be able to instead bring it directly to N. Harvard Street. The next standard is to strengthen Cambridge Street's edges for early redevelopment. Some of the new street layouts you are about to see will show that possibility.

The final grouping of place making standards were areas within the new district. The first was to decrease slopes. It appears that the new alternative will have the potential to flatten things out. Then we have organizing blocks to create flexibility and efficient layout. We have created a new street grid with better parcel size. Finally, we will create a framework for development. We are not stating what development will take place, but the goal is to not preclude certain kinds of development. Next I think Jim Keller will go through some of the graphics.

C: Jim Keller (JK): Good evening everyone. We have been focusing the last couple months on the alignments of all the new streets and have tried our best to condense it down into this Power Point. We are going to focus tonight mostly on the changes. The conversations we have been having with Harvard have allowed us to look again at the highway alignment. We are proposing to shift the alignment of the highway south by about 100 feet. By doing so, Cambridge Street South can also shift south, the developable land northward increases. It also allows us to decrease the slopes to below 5% in places.

Q: (HM): Could you please clarify what would go in during the first phase and what wouldn't.

C: (JK): The roadways would all be in the first phase.

Q: (HM): So is MassDOT proposing to take some of the components of West Station, such as the bus access, out of phase one?

C: (JK): It will go into the draft DEIR.

C: (HM): I think as we go forward there is going to be a lot of confusion about what goes into the presentation if it's not split into phases.

C: (MOD): The key is making sure everything gets in to the DEIR, so that we can ensure that we can get all the feedback needed to then create a phasing to the project components.

C: (HM): It is hard to make honest or fair comments if the phasing is not known.

C: (MOD): Yes, what you said is key: there are many components to this project. What we need to do is introduce all these, so that as we move forward, we are not boxing us out of any particular component.

Q: Senator Will Brownsberger (WB): Yes, just a clarification. This new alignment reflects what Kevin pointed out at the beginning?

C: (JK): Yes it does. These major changes are guiding the new refinements, which are still to be developed at higher level of design. Moving along, currently outbound moves from SFR onto Cambridge Street use the northbound ramp. Under this refinement, there would be a vehicular connection directly into the project area and the current ramp would be repurposed into a wider path. Drivers destined for River Street would take the new connection followed by a right onto East Drive.

Q: (BH): The Hotel Lane is a permanent easement that the railroad used to have. I want to make sure that the access to my property is maintained. Also, now that I've given up a railroad spur named after me, perhaps this should be called Houghton Lane?

A: NCC: We can get that into the minutes, Bruce.

C: (JK): Orange streets represent future additions that may later become part of the project. There is a pretty dramatic difference between this and the previous plan, 3K-4. Before, we were constrained by the land owner, but due to the property changes and the Placemaking Study, this opened up a lot of possibilities.

Q: (JR): Are any movements remaining from Cambridge Street to Soldiers Field Road?

C: (JK): Yes, the southbound/inbound ramp will remain.

C: (JR): That signal currently has 4 or 5 phases.

C: (JK): Yes and the pedestrian crossing's there.

Q: (GB): This is phenomenal. Two questions though. Is the new Soldiers Field Road underpass under phase one, and secondly is it off line of the existing roadway, so construction could take place without affecting the current road?

C: (JK): Yes to both.

C: (FS): Fred Salvucci: First, this is terrific. It's a win for the park, for drivers and a win for Cambridge Street. It's unavoidable that some damage will be done to DCR land in the throat section of the project, but I think that this is a great improvement.

- C: (JK): This is only a westbound move, so on the north side of the new underpass, there will be no conflict. That means that the at grade river connection will have a direct shot to the Paul Dudley White Path. As Kevin mentioned earlier, we are coordinating with Harvard regarding streets running northward. Now we are considering Stadium Way, Cattle Drive and East Drive connecting the project are to Western Ave.
- Q: (HM): Would you not build Stadium Way during the first phase?
- A: (JK): Potentially you could.
- Q: (HM): So there are still only two north-south streets running to Western Avenue?
- C: (JK): It depends how it is phased. This relates to another change in the project area, which is the direct connection from Cambridge Street South to North Harvard Street: when 3K-4 had I-90 up further to the north that pushed Cambridge Street South further north as well. From a geometry perspective, it was hard to get Cambridge Street South to not hit Cambridge Street at a skew. We'll have to do more modelling, but it appears that this can work well. The cross section of Cambridge Street South would include a two-way protected bicycle facility on the north side, connecting to the Paul Dudley White Path.
- Q: Paula (Last Name Not Given): Is there any advantage to having a direct connection onto North Harvard Street for a homeowner?
- A: (JK): The advantage is for future development in the project site, but I wouldn't say there is an advantage for a North Harvard Street homeowner.
- C: Gerald Autler (GA): What we said in the place making study was that we wanted this to have additional study of the connection based on additional modelling. We think that with the addition of a third north-south street we won't see any adverse impact to North Harvard Street.
- C: (HM): What they should do is build all three of those north-south streets at the beginning, so that the traffic from the turnpike does not all feed onto North Harvard Street.
- C: Mark Shaman (MS): As part of our refined alternative, MassDOT is considering a reduction from fourteen consists to eight consists located at Beacon Park Yard. This will provide for increased land access, but does leave some long term operating needs unaddressed for the MBTA. The South Station Expansion Projects Environmental Impact Report states the need for space for 14 consists at this location, with the goal of moving some of the current layover off of the Old Colony Branch and having 60% of the layover on the Worcester and Providence Branches.
- C: Ari Ofsevit (AO): I've said this before, but this is nonsense. We are discussing midday layover. Currently during the midday, there is service only every two hours, serving major population centers such as Worcester, Brockton and Providence. For this project we are being told that these trains must

sit here in Allston for five hours. I know this is not a highway issue, but it's an issue with the MBTA and the Rail Division. This is making this project cost a lot more money. I would like to hear an explanation regarding why this isn't feasible.

- C: (MS): From the conversations I have had with the MBTA, I'm told this is an important location. However, I cannot answer your question about midday service. The trains would be serviced, cleaned and fueled in addition to laying over at this location.
- C: (GM): think this really needs to be looked into further together with the MBTA. Is the analysis available about how much layover is actually needed, and why the MBTA is O.K. bringing the capacity down to 8 trains.
- C: (MS): We are planning this based on the MBTA using 9-car trains in the future, but we don't have any information regarding planning for future headways. There is no analysis regarding the change in storage capacity. The goal is to retain access for the property owner, Harvard, based on a prior agreement and this allows us to do that.
- C: (FS): As of yet, the reservation for Harvard's air rights at West Station has not gone through the Massachusetts Environmental Protection Act (MEPA) Process. It will be required too and as part of that, analysis regarding the size of the rail yard will be expected. Keolis must analyze midday service as part of that. In Paris, Keolis's headquarters and largest service location, the company is running midday trains and not striving for layover space in the middle of the City. It deserves serious analysis.
- C: (MS): I believe this is a property transaction issue and therefore would not go through the MEPA process.
- A: (FS): Yes it would.
- C: (HM): We need to get the bottom of this.
- C: (MS): We are proposing this as a consideration.
- Q: (HM): Could you send the analysis that as been done to the Task Force?
- C: (MS): No analysis has been done yet. This is something we are considering, which means going forward and doing the analysis to examine it further.
- C: (KC): Essentially, we looked to see what could fit given the new land constraints.
- C: (HM): We were told that this revised concept was going to go into the DEIR. The truth is, it will need analysis before further progress is made.
- C: (MS): We understand that the analysis is needed.

- C: (WB): There is a need for maintenance space for the MBTA, and the management likely thought this was a great opportunity. What I do know is that the people at the MBTA believe that more space is needed; meanwhile abutters are fighting back about having that space close to their houses. Rethinking how the MBTA operates is a valid question to ask, but I think the MBTA is desperate for more space.
- C: (HM): What I'm surprised by is that the MBTA is considering not building the wheel truing and maintenance facility, even though the MBTA is struggling for space.
- C: (WB): Their thought process is such that they have heard from the community that these facilities are not wanted here, and they are actively looking for another location.
- Q: Patrick Greenwell (PG): Is the construction of West Station still considered as part of this?
- A: (MS): In terms of when and how, we do not know how things will be phased into the project. Right not, we don't think that West Station will be during the first phase of the project.
- C: (PG): I would like to reiterate that having the Commuter Rail prior to starting development is much more enticing than having it built some time in the future.
- C: (KC): This new alignment would provide a much better layout to design the station. We are thinking of designing the station in conjunction with the development so that it is in the right place.
- C: (FS): The analysis from the South Station DEIR says that the selection of layover space is subject to further analysis, and I think the analysis we are talking about now is the analysis that must happen, including Ari's proposal for increased midday service.
- Q: (GB): Are there alternatives that could be explored with respect to yard access.
- C: (MS): We have looked at it, and we do believe the currently provided access point is the best location as it avoids running over active tracks. Another option would be to use a tunnel, but there are a number of permitting issues there, but we could look at it a bit more.
- C: (JK): Moving along, the removal of the railroad spur has opened up a number of new options for us as I've said, but also involves looking further at the throat section. We had to look at all three throat options we are evaluating, and see how these would fit under the new alternative. This included the MassDOT concept, A Better City Concept and the Amateur Planner Concept. For the MassDOT concept, this opens up numerous accessibility improvements in that area as there are no grade crossings. For example, I-90 is no longer elevated over the railroad spur. For the A Better City Concept, much of the profile of the viaduct could be lowered. The amateur planner concept would have the main line tracks at grade, remove some retaining fill, and decrease costs. The geometry of all the alternative layouts would stay the same, and are not significantly changed from the removal of the

Houghton Spur. We will continue to explore these three options for the throat section as the main district layout is fine tuned.

Q: (JR): With the smaller rail yard, there are fewer switches needed to accommodate the trains. Wouldn't that have a positive impact on providing space for the Grand Junction to come down and interlock with the mainline tracks?

A: (MS): It would not. All the tracks that are coming through the throat section do not change. It is only until you enter the yard area that the tracks pan out.

C: (JK): I did not say this earlier, but I wanted to reiterate Kevin's point at the beginning that the new layout lends itself to considerable further development.

C: (EI): Questions or comments?

Q: (JR): I'm thrilled to see so many of our ideas incorporated. My question is about the options for the throat section. Will all the alternatives for the throat section receive a redesign to incorporate these changes?

C: (EI): What Jim just showed was a brief look at how the changes impact that design, but more will take place.

C: (JK): We will look much closely at the throat now. We still have the same rail cross section through that section, so it might be difficult to make substantial changes to the throat section.

Q: (GB): Jim, something you said was not obvious to me. Would moving I-90 closer to Commonwealth Avenue affect our current alternatives?

A: (JK): It may.

Q: (JR): Ari and Glen have asked that we open up the alternatives for the throat and try to make a few changes. If we do look at those again because of changes to the rail spur, would it be good to collaborate off line?

A: (MOD): We are hoping to do that and see what alternatives we come up with.

Q: (GB): I want to be clear about the new concept refinement. I understand that there are alternatives for the throat section, but it's very possible there will be additional alternatives for the main area now as well.

A: (MOD): That is still the case, there will be three alternatives advanced.

C: Ken Miller (KM): I'm suggesting though mixing and matching of throat alternatives with alternatives in the interchange area. Also, you mentioned earlier that a recommendation from the BPDA was for north-south connectivity, but I didn't see much mention of that.

Q: (CC): There was a slide on that but we went through it quickly. There will be some sort of bicycle/pedestrian connection as part of Phase 1.

C: (KM): I'm looking at this as not just a bicycle connection but mostly transit or high occupancy vehicles. If the alignment remains close to at grade with the ABC alternative, it becomes less expensive to build over the highway and you could potentially build a connection. I would love to see some transit modelling regarding what happens to travel times and ridership of buses in the area. Finally, it really would be great to see some analysis of the layover facility. The MBTA needs to have some forward thinking and flexibility regarding how the system might function in 20 or 30 years and how the future operations of the system affects how this is designed. There is still a federal environmental process that will take place after the DEIR and we will be looking for that analysis.

C: Bill Deignan (BD): I think we made a lot of improvement today, such as expanding park area along the Charles River, and the change of access to River Street. It is important to confirm that this won't hurt the signals along Cambridge Street and hopefully make the intersections in the area simpler. I find the timing of West Station very concerning. We need more information about how that will play out, and I do like the suggestion of having more transit modelling take place in the area. One more thing about access along the River, I do hope you've looked at how the depressing of Soldiers Field Road will function with increased flooding in the region in the future.

C: (EI): The early look at that is that we will need pumps, and there is a cost associated with that.

C: (AO): I think we've made a lot of improvement here. I think that the expanded parkland will be a huge benefit. I've seen that most of the people come off of Soldiers Field Road are taking a left onto Cambridge Street rather than a right onto River Street. As for concerns of going underneath the water table, this is something we've done in many circumstances and can be engineered to work.

I also heard earlier that there is no demand for West Station currently and that it would have to wait. I couldn't disagree more. Some of the trains on the Worcester Line are the busiest in the system. One concern we always hear about the Worcester Line is that it doesn't provide good connectivity to outside employment areas, and West Station would achieve that. According to the BPDA report, there are 850 residents of Allston who work in Newton. There is definitely demand for people who live in Metro West and who live in the immediate area.

My final point is to Bruce. Allowing the sale of the rail spur has really opened things up for the neighborhood, and I want to say thank you for that.

C: (JR): I would like to add one more suggestion. We should look at the idea of building a small footprint interim station for West Station before at the outset.

C: (PG): A couple more points I had, first is that we do really need transit modelling for the north-south connection and for rail. The 66 Bus Route is currently very heavily travelled and takes a very long time. My next point is that is that you should take into consideration future electrification for all the clearances.

C: (MS): We have held tight to 18 foot clearances on the rail for just that reason.

C: (PG): Great. My next point is that it will be easier to build some form of West Station while you are constructing the highway interchange. That will greatly improve your ability to access the site and it will consolidate construction so that abutters experience fewer side effects. I also wanted to propose if it was possible to incorporate an Amtrak layover into this location. You could make the connection from the Northeast Corridor directly out to Harvard and Allston, it would be great for Harvard-Yale Football games.

C: (GM): I wanted to take a chance to say thank you to Bruce Houghton. This is a complete makeover. I agree that shrinking the rail yard is a great benefit for the neighborhood. There never was a discussion about it from the beginning, and we do not have the numbers or the analysis. We don't want a yard here, but we do want a station. We are willing to compromise and take on some rail yard in exchange for a station. Without West Station, we do not have a reason to send buses here, but we do want this to be a transit hub. The station allowed us previously to have decking over the rail yard. Without the station, there is little incentive to build anything there. I'm horrified to think that this would end up like the Franklin Street Bridge, just a piece of crumbling asphalt.

Also, now you are saying the bypass road might be off the table, which was instrumental to making West Station, decking and even the People's Pike work, which we still don't have. My next point is voiced on behalf of Allston Village Main Streets, but Emma is not here. We need to limit as much of the funneling of traffic onto Linden Street as we possibly can. Lastly, you don't wait for development to build a train station; you build the train station to attract development. Whether or not the station reaches its full potential is another issue. I do imagine a future connection using the Grand Junction, but for now we need at least minimal service.

C: (FS): Given that the CTPS models will take a large amount of time, I think we need to examine less expensive and disruptive ways of modelling construction. If the Bypass Road and Stadium Way become later elements, we must build Cambridge Street and all the other streets with the intention that it's going to be built. If you don't you're going to spend extra money and have fights with the neighborhood because you are overbuilding certain streets for traffic that should not be there. In a perfect world you build it at once, but if there has to be staging, it is really important that you don't overbuild certain elements, and put some credibility into the proposed timing.

C: John Shields (JS): As many of you know I have been focused on this project from the point of view of connections to the River. I wanted to remind everyone to take a look at the diagram, the Charles

makes up the most space. That is the jewel and crown of the area. These elements of the plan are just as important as the Highway.

C: (KC): Harvard has always been a major supporter of West Station, we adopted the Bypass Road early and agreed to pay for part of the station. I don't want anyone to think that Harvard has diminished its interest in this station.

C: (JR): I want to agree with what people have said regarding the neighborhood streets. Any street wider than four lanes is not in accordance with what this neighborhood wants. A network of high traffic streets will face massive community opposition.

Q: (GB): What is the current thought process on the community meeting?

C: (NCC): The latest thought is late November or early December. I will send out PDFs to the Task Force of today's materials.

C: (JR): I remembered my other point. There was a slide that talked about the BPDA recommendation for wider bridges with additional landscaping. You commented that those could serve as a later improvement after the bridge. However, this fails to accomplish the main goal of those improvements, which is to make the area less desolate and more appealing in the interim before development is built.

C: (GA): Before everyone goes, I want to say that I have copies of the Placemaking Study for everyone to take home with them. I want to add that the Placemaking Study did not go into depth regarding phasing. We were not completely detailed and exhausted because we wanted to leave flexibility. We do not include things that were already well under consideration. All this is outlined in the Secretary's letter accompanying the study.

Next Steps

The next public information meeting will be held on December 8th at 6:30PM at the Jackson-Mann Community Center. The Jackson-Mann Center is located at 500 Cambridge Street in Brighton.

Appendix 1: Meeting Attendees

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Gerald	Autler	BPDA
Joe	Beggan	Task Force Member
Glen	Berkowitz	ABC Consultant
Jorge	Briones	Task Force Member
Nathaniel	Cabral-Curtis	Howard Stein Hudson
Donny	Dailey	MassDOT
Bill	Deignan	Task Force Member
Anthony	D'Isidoro	Task Force Member
Courtney	Dwyer	MassDOT D6
Mark	Fobert	TetraTech
Kurt	Gaertner	Executive Office of Environmental Affairs
James	Gillooly	Task Force Member
Patrick	Greenwell	Resident/Transit Matters
Karl	Haglund	Task Force Member
Ed	Ionata	TetraTech
Marc	Kadish	Task Force Member
Jim	Kelleher	TetraTech
Elizabeth	Leary	Task Force Member
Peter	Leis	Resident/Transit Matters
Christine-Melia	Marini	Boston Police Department
Harry	Mattison	Task Force Member
Ken	Miller	Federal Transit Administration
Galen	Mook	Task Force Member
Paul	Nelson	Task Force Member
Michael	O'Dowd	MassDOT
Ari	Ofsevit	Task Force Member
Ben	Rafati	MassDOT
Tad	Read	BPDA
Carol	Ridge-Martinez	Task Force Member
Jessica	Robertson	Task Force Member
Fred	Salvucci	Task Force Member
Mark	Shamon	VHB

John	Shields	Charles River Conservancy
Jeff	Shrimpton	MassDOT
Steve	Silveira	Task Force Member
Bob	Sloane	Walk Boston
Margaret	Van Deusen	Task Force Member
Andreas	Wolfe	Howard Stein Hudson
Farah	Wong	Allston-Brighton CDC