



June 20, 2014

To: Mike O'Dowd
Allston I-90 Interchange Improvement Project
Project Manager

From: Nathaniel Curtis
Howard/Stein-Hudson
Public Involvement Specialist

RE: **MassDOT Highway Division
Allston I-90 Interchange Improvement Project
3rd Taskforce Meeting
Meeting Notes of June 11, 2014**

Overview

On June 11, 2014 the Allston Interchange Improvement Project taskforce held its third meeting. The taskforce 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 taskforce is, through the application of members' in-depth local knowledge, to assist and advise MassDOT in developing an implementable design for the reconstruction of the I-90 Allston Interchange, the Allston viaduct and Cambridge Street in the vicinity of the interchange. The chance to reconfigure the interchange has emerged through the opportunities presented by the implementation of All Electric Tolling (AET) and the structural deficiency of the I-90 Allston viaduct. MassDOT sees the project not only an opportunity to improve safety on the Turnpike by straightening it and addressing a structurally deficient bridge, but also to improve safety and connections for all modes of travel in the area around the interchange, particularly along Cambridge Street which has been noted by local residents as dangerous and acting as a barrier between Allston and the Charles River. Another major goal of the Allston Interchange project is to provide the commuter rail conditions necessary for the expansion of South Station and the eventual creation of West Station in the old Beacon Park yard as well as the inauguration of Diesel Multiple Unit (DMU) service along the Grand Junction line from Allston into Cambridge and Somerville. As was explained by MassDOT's project manager, Mike O'Dowd in the opening portion of this meeting, while the agency has not yet secured the funding to build West Station as part of this project, and therefore cannot formally declare its intent to construct it along with the rebuilt interchange, MassDOT is actively seeking to secure funding and will continue to plan for the station.

The purpose of the meeting summarized herein was to present two key project elements to the taskforce. The first of these was a crucial project constraint, the Allston I-90 Viaduct where it passes through the narrowest section of the MassDOT right-of-way in the area of the Grand Junction Railroad Line. The narrowness of this point, combined with the project requirement to keep eight lanes of traffic operating on the Massachusetts Turnpike during the much-needed reconstruction of the viaduct has pushed the project team to consider a construction staging plan which would require structure to be built over a portion of the Charles River Reservation which while technically parkland is currently entirely inaccessible to members of the community and is generally in poor condition. Under the staging plan considered, this enlargement of the viaduct would remain as part of the rebuilt structure to provide the new span with shoulders and space for acceleration/deceleration. The total lack of these features on the current structure is a major reason for it being seen as providing inadequate and substandard safety features. The expansion considered by the project team, it is worth noting, is the minimum allowable to meet current safety requirements and adhering to full standards would necessitate an even greater widening of the structure. It is likewise worth underscoring that MassDOT does not see making these changes as a capacity enhancement, creating conditions which would draw more cars through the interchange, but a safety improvement to better serve existing traffic.

The presentation of this concept triggered a significant discussion among taskforce members much of which centered on a concern that MassDOT and its consultant team are not understanding and incorporating the direction of the taskforce which includes a desire to minimize both permanent and construction impacts to parkland. This was paired with another taskforce concern that the agency has yet to begin incorporating bicycle and pedestrian accommodations which the membership sees as crucial to the community into the project. During this discussion it emerged that by and large the taskforce sees little value in the two suburban interchange types and would prefer to concentrate future efforts on the development of the urban type.

It is worth noting that the previous two taskforce sessions, May 7th and 21st, were in a large part provided to the taskforce with the idea of ensuring that all members are working with the same background knowledge as the project team particularly with regard to constraints. Issues of bicycle and pedestrian connectivity have been heard clearly by MassDOT. The taskforce meeting on June 25th will address these connections in all of the directions previously discussed: Lincoln Street to the Charles River parallel to the Worcester/Framingham Line, along Cambridge Street from Harvard Street to the River, and from the area south of the interchange around Boston University to Cambridge Street. This session will also address some "out of the box" thoughts regarding reconstruction of the interchange provided by taskforce members at the session summarized herein.

This meeting's second purpose was to introduce the taskforce to the evaluation criteria which will be used to differentiate among the options for reconstructing the interchange. These criteria are an amalgam of points made by the taskforce and those used by MassDOT on any major project. As compared to the discussion encapsulated in the previous paragraph, the criteria triggered relatively little conversation however it was requested that when discussing streetscape, the criteria be expanded to address specific streets in the project area by name. The consultant team will continue to refine these criteria with input from the taskforce.

Detailed Meeting Minutes¹

Opening Remarks

- C: Ed Ionata (EI): Good evening and welcome to the third taskforce meeting for the Allston I-90 Interchange Improvement Project. As the MC and facilitator of the taskforce I want to quickly run through tonight's agenda. We will first discuss any administration items we need to discuss. We will then move onto the discussion of the viaduct structure. John Freedman from WSP will discuss the viaduct structural report and we will save as much time at the end for an open question and answer discussion. Before we get started I would like to introduce Jo-Ann Barbour, Executive Director of the Charlesview Residence and Charlesview, Incorporated. Welcome.
- C: Jo-Ann Barbour (JB): Good evening everyone. I am happy to see such a great turnout here tonight. I wanted to give a brief overview about the Charlesview Residence and the Charlesview Community Center. The old Charlesview, Incorporated used to be located by the Harvard School of Business and owned in partnership with Harvard. The new Josephine Fiorentino Community Center that you sit in tonight has been developed with purpose of serving the Allston/Brighton community and its residents. We encourage the use of taskforce meetings, community meetings, neighborhood activities and other programs. The facility is not just here for the residents of this building, but for the entire neighborhood community. Feel free to visit our website at www.charlesviewcommunity.org and check out our calendar section for upcoming events; thank you.
- C: EI: Thanks Jo-Ann. Let's quickly get into the administrative items and the discussion of the detailed meeting minutes. The website is now up and running and the web address is

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

<http://www.massdot.state.ma.us/highway/HighlightedProjects/AllstonI90InterchangeImprovementProject.aspx>. The minutes from tonight's meeting will be posted to the website and the minutes, materials and all presentations from the previous public information meeting and taskforce meetings have already been posted to the site. That covers my introduction to this evening's agenda; I will now introduce your project manager, Michael O'Dowd.

- C: Michael O'Dowd (MOD): Good evening and welcome back to the third taskforce meeting. I apologize that I had to miss the 2nd meeting. I heard through the press and the design team that there was a lot of discussion about West Station. The discussion surrounded the ideas of whether West Station will be built, not built, integrated into this project or not integrated to this project. I will say that we are working to incorporate all elements of West Station into this project, but we cannot commit and say that we will be building a West Station. We are working internally with our partner agencies, chief among them the MBTA, trying to figure out where West Station would best be located and how it would best fit for a north to south connection across the CSX Beacon Park Rail Yard. Right now we do not have funding for West Station but we are seeking the revenue to support that construction. We have an onsite meeting with the MBTA and planning staff to walk the site, identify where West Station would best be suited and how it can be integrated into this project.

I have received a couple of calls and emails asking about what we are doing in the taskforce. I met with many community members and some of you last fall in order to get a better sense of the ideas and community concerns that are happening in this area. The goal of the taskforce is to help us develop an interchange that will best suit the needs for the community and the users of the interchange. We are no further along that what you see us presenting tonight, we do not have fine-grained designs available. We are still in the process of gathering information from all of you that will help and assist us moving in order to meet the goals of the community. We don't have a final design that is why we are all here tonight. We have heard a lot about pedestrian connections, shared-use paths, the pedestrian footbridge, Lincoln Street, the Boston University side and the Western Avenue side. These are all things we are working with you to solve within the goals of the project and the objectives of the project. I want to continue this taskforce to reach a preferred alternative that will incorporate the taskforce input and the abutting property owner's inputs.

One more thing before we move on. I have read through the minutes and something that has disappointed me is the lack of dialog exchanged between taskforce members. There are over 50 taskforce members and only 10 spoke at the last meeting. I want you all to open us and tell us what you think and what you hear other community members talking about. We want to hear from all of you.

- C: El: Thank you, Mike. I would say that the last taskforce meeting was a heavy duty information download which may have lowered our level of conversation. We will discuss the viaduct report next and then try to leave at least an hour for open discussion. We can run a little late if needed tonight compared to the last taskforce meeting at the Honan Library. I would now like to introduce Richard Lennox from WSP.

Discussion of the I-90 Viaduct

- C: Rich Lennox (RL): Thank you, Ed, again, my name is Rich Lennox with WSP and I'm going to take some time to talk about the viaduct and how it relates to the whole project. At the first taskforce meeting, we noted that its condition is one of the primary reasons for this project.

Q: Marc Kadish (MK): Excuse me, but what is WSP?

A: RL: WSP is the name of our company.

Q: MK: Is that the whole name?

A: RL: Yes, it is.

C: MK: I'm sorry; I thought it might be a city agency or something like that.

A: RL: No, that's the whole name, but it's a fair question. We're working on the design team with MassDOT, TetraTech and the rest of the crew.

So tonight I want to talk about the viaduct and its role as one of the primary reasons for this project. I will walk through several items relation to the structure and the deficiencies associated with it beyond its physical condition. We will also discuss the potential extents of new viaduct structure, some of the constraints associated with it, and then a conceptual reconstruction approach. Here's a slide with which I believe you are all familiar showing the existing conditions: the steel is corroded and the concrete is spalling in places. That's typical throughout the structure. There have been some repairs made to it over time and even those newer repairs are starting to fail. You can see in the image how the columns have deteriorated. In addition to the visible physical deficiencies, we have done some materials testing and there is a lot of chloride in the concrete from years of deicing salt which is leading to corrosion of the structure's rebar. Beyond the physical issues, there are some other elements. The structure is over 50 years old and dates from the early 1960's. It wouldn't meet today's design codes and criteria for safety and loading. It's carrying 140,000 vehicles per day which is not the volume anticipated at its time of construction. There's no room for a shoulder which is a significant safety issues. The railings don't conform to current safety criteria. If you look at this image of the bridge's deck you can see all the patches and other repairs to it. You can also see these numerous deck joints. Each span has an open joint which allows for infiltration by water and deicing chemicals which leads to structural deterioration and a thud each time a vehicle crosses over the joint. Those are issues that can be fully or partially rectified with a new structure. So in summary, between the physical and safety issues, this structure is really getting to the end of its useful life and therefore we have recommended replacement.

With that, let me give you an overview of the extents of the proposed reconstruction that will be part of this project. If you look at this aerial view, you can see in orange the length of the existing structure and you can probably recognize from this image and discussing it that one of the goals of the project is to realign I-90 and as such there's not a complete overlap between the existing structure and where the likely new alignment of I-90 would be which you can see here.

Q: Jessica Roberts (JR): To the west of there, there's an access that goes underneath the Turnpike to the rail yard, is that all on embankment or is some on viaduct?

A: RL: There's a small, 40-foot tunnel, two of them actually, one for vehicular access and one for an old rail siding that comes off diagonally and that whole section is all on embankment except for those two little sections.

Coming back to slide, approximating the alignment of I-90 that we've been showing with the various concepts we've been looking at, just to give a sense of the difference in the alignment, where the current viaduct heads off to the north here...²

Q: Alana Olsen (AO): So just to be clear, embankment means the road is built on a solid hill as opposed to the viaduct which is on a bridge?

A: RL: Yes, that's correct. Currently, the highway comes underneath Cambridge Street at-grade and then begins to elevate. This section up in here is elevated, but it's on embankment, it's not a structure.

Coming back to the viaduct structure, there's not a complete overlap between the existing structure which curls off to the north towards the tollbooths and the proposed future alignment. We've highlighted here in red what we think of as the new path for the viaduct which would have the same eastern abutment near Commonwealth Avenue the way it does today and then terminate towards the

² Here, Rich was interrupted by a question from the taskforce.

west depending on all the final clearances of the rail lines as to where we can get the structure down and onto first an embankment and then to grade.

Q: MK: So there's no alternative to a structure, to just have something on an embankment in any of those parcels?

A: RL: In the area shown in red?

C: MK: I'm not sure, if maybe it's just a big savings.

A: RL: Based on some of the constraints we were going to discuss in just a few minutes, it's not really possible. In getting the structure rebuilt over the various rail lines, the MBTA commuter rail, the Grand Junction Line (GJL), and the line to Houghton Chemical, we need to have clearance for those tracks. A lot of those rail connections, whether it's to Houghton Chemical or for the yard tracks is going to drive the extent of elevation and routing of the future alignment of I-90. In terms of clearance over the rail, the outline in red gives you a general sense of what will likely need to be on a structure.

Touching on the constraints we have and how we will get this structure rebuilt, we've brought along a section which was shown at the last meeting indicating a typical section that's along this tangent portion of I-90 where it runs between Boston University (BU) property and Soldiers Field Road (SFR). In getting the structure rebuilt we have some constraints on us. Number one, how do we keep eight lanes of traffic, four in each direction, open while we rebuild in roughly the same footprint. We have SFR almost immediately to the North. We have to maintain at least one open MBTA rail line, we have to maintain the connection to GJL, and the spur to Houghton Chemical and all this has to occur within a pretty limited distance so it's a challenging undertaking to fit all those components and keep them operational while we get a new structure built.

What I want to walk through here is a concept that we came up with a concept that our team has come up with to accomplish all of these tasks. This concept focuses on two lanes of reconstruction at a time and rebuilding the structure in two-lane stages. The beginning stage would include building two lanes to the north of the existing structure between it and SFR. There would need to be a temporary adjustment to the rail lines underneath the structure to give us the space need. This cross-section, which is a little further to the east than the previous section, shows how we would initiate the reconstruction. As you can see we proceed in phases, first we build two new lanes off to the north, shift traffic to them, and demolish two lanes off the existing structure. We repeat that process from the north side to the south side of viaduct using temporary supports to carry the existing structure as we work out way across, until we have a completely new structure. Another way to look at that is with this plan view of this key section showing the portion of viaduct I'm talking about with Buick Street on the south and SFR on the north.

Q: Joe Orfant (JO): So to clarify, when you talk about widening to the north, does this mean a permanent encroachment onto the park reservation?

A: RL: Correct. Under this concept, we would widen to the north, towards SFR. We would bring the new structure to approximately the edge of SFR eastbound. In some cases, there might be a slight overhang of the SFR travel lanes.

Q: Harry Mattison (HM): Is this a temporary shift? It sounded originally like this would be a temporary phase associated with construction, but now it sounds as if the new permanent alignment of the Turnpike viaduct is going to move, whatever 50 feet, permanently closer to the river than today.

A: RL: O.K. what I was going to get to next is the completed structure which under this concept would be wider. It would allow us to take the two lanes that we need in order to get the structure rebuilt and then convert them into shoulders and possibly acceleration/deceleration lanes depending on the final

configuration of the rest of the interchange. As I mentioned earlier, a big safety deficiency of the existing structure is that it has no shoulders.

Q: HM: And who owns the land where you would be building the additional viaduct structure?

A: RL: A portion of it is the Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) right-of-way (ROW).

Q: HM: So where you would build that left-most pile, who owns that property?

A: RL: Some of it would project over onto DCR property, the rest is already in the state highway layout of the current alignment which is already owned by MassDOT.

Q: HM: But it's not just project over, you're talking about actually building on DCR parkland? The piece of land between SFR and GJL, that's state-owned DCR parkland. Is that right?

A: RL: Yes.

Q: HM: So you would be taking the parkland?

A: RL: There would have to be an agreement; something worked out between the two agencies.

Q: HM: And is that land part of the Charles River Reservation?

A: JO: I do want to clarify that the land being discussed is not currently roadway that is the park reservation.

A: RL: If you think back to our last meeting and the constraints we articulated, the historic designation of SFR is also one of the issues that we face with this process. This is one concept that we have been walking through.

Q: Bill Deignan (BD): This concept, as it moves closer to SFR, all of the concepts you've shared with us thus far show a multiuse path along this space. Does this concept allow space for that path to continue towards the GJL Bridge and on into Cambridge?

A: RL: This particular section shows the viaduct about as far to the east as is possible. To get this concept to work, there would be a slight shift of the GJL tracks to get the vertical clearance we need. The bicycle and pedestrian connection would need to happen before this point because by the point shown on this slide, the GJL is already to the north and getting ready to cross the river into Cambridge. The intent is not to push the GJL track to extreme north against SFR for its entire length; it would cross towards the south side of the viaduct pretty quickly, so there would be potential space for the bicycle/pedestrian connection along the buffer.

Q: Matthew Danish (MD): You could have a shoulder today, but you put the shoulder in as a travel lane instead. I just want to point that out. When you move the highway 50 feet to the north, or northeast, is that in the red line and what effect does that have on the curve we are trying to straighten out?

A: RL: Under this scenario, I just want to underscore that the widening is between 30-35 feet, not 50, but it would shift the center line of the alignment slightly to the north which would provide us with some benefit as we go to make this turn back towards the west.

Q: Wendy Landman (WL): Do you have other, additional concepts that you will walk us through this evening?

A: RL: I don't have anything else for tonight; this is the one we're walking through for this meeting.

Q: WL: So you don't have a concept which doesn't encroach further towards the River?

A: RL: Not that we're looking at tonight.

C: WL: As a taskforce member, I would urge you to come back to us with a concept that doesn't do that.

A: El: O.K. we get that. Rich, why don't you go back to your cross-section and point out the constraints on the south side.

C: RL: On the south side, there's really no room to move. The viaduct is already pushed as far south towards BU as it can go. There are actually some elements of the viaduct already on BU property.

Q: Pete Stidman (PS): So can you explain why you're widening the highway and what the benefits of doing that are?

A: RL: One of the main constraints is how we get this portion of the construction complete and how to maintain the required rail and traffic movements. One of the benefits of widening is to facilitate and manage keeping traffic moving on the mainline during construction. The secondary benefit, after construction, is to provide shoulders on the highway and on the final highway configuration it will allow for the ramp merging space.

Q: AD: Are you taking two lanes out for each phase on construction?

A: RL: Yes but we will maintain four lanes westbound the only difference is that they will be split two and two. We will also maintain all four lanes eastbound.

Q: Glen Berkowitz (GB): Under this concept, do you have a permanent taking of what is designated as park land?

A: MOD: Yes

Q: GB: You have made several references that this is the first concept you are showing but I'm interpreting some of what you said as you have other concepts you may show. My question is are you showing this to us today as something you know we are not going to like so that you show us something later that we'll hate less than this or are you are sincerely showing this to us first because this is your favorite approach to how to build the job?

A: RL: No. This is a concept that we have taken further compared to some of the other concepts in terms of how we can physically do this.

Q: GB: So is this or is this not your favorite?

C: El: Glen it seems that your real question is, do you have any concepts that work better than this and that don't touch Soldiers Field Road?

Q: GB: No, my real question is, are you showing us this concept today because you have decided it is your favorite?

A: El: No. From my view point we don't have other concepts as developed as this one yet. We are showing you this concept because this is a constructible concept. Correct me if I'm wrong³ but this is one of the only concepts we have worked through that and determined works in terms of sequence and

³ This question was addressed to Richard Lennox.

traffic flow. This is being provided to give you all a feeling for the physical constraints that are there. All the input we are getting is important. That is what we are getting out of this. I want people here to understand that we have some physical constraints that are going to be difficult to work against and while providing a way to maintain traffic during the construction period.

- C: GB: I have to tell you, I'm not expecting you to show us every single thing you guys think about at your office but I do expect you to decide whether you think something passes the smell test before you show it to us. As I'm sitting here now, I really don't understand why you are showing this to us. Maybe I'll understand it better two or three taskforce sessions from now but I certainly don't understand it as I sit here right now.
- C: El: Correct me if I'm wrong but I will speak for the design team in saying we are scratching our heads in trying to figure out how we can make this work without moving towards Soldiers Field Road.
- C: Chris Calnan (CC): We've got eight lanes today and we have to rebuild the viaduct in a similar footprint. In order to demolish the existing viaduct and rebuilt it in a similar footprint we need space to maintain the travel lanes. That is what this concept accomplishes by kicking the viaduct out a little to the north, we are able to phase the construction and keep the I-90 mainline operational. We understand the preference not to expand towards the historic parkway but as Ed mentioned, we have to look at a constructible and feasible alternative in order to rebuild the viaduct.
- Q: JO: I want to ask a question about constructability. Recently you've listed constructability issues and you've talked about the maintenance of certain functions and rail through the area. You have some parameters you're working in. My question is why wasn't the protection of historic parkland one of those parameters that you considered? Why was the give on the parkland side?
- A: CC: In the second taskforce we highlighted the constraints, the historic parkway and the impacts it would have. We need to work through that and we understand the sensitivity there.
- C: JO: Right but you have given us an alternative with moving parts that have not only construction impacts but permanent impacts on the parkland. There is a huge conflict with article 4(F) so why would you not approach this from the beginning? It would be helpful for me to understand why there was absolutely no other give to any other space besides the open space.
- Q: Anthony D'Isodoro (AD): Has there been any discussion about taking two lanes out of service or would that be disastrous?
- A: MOD: Yes that is something where consideration has been given. You are looking at a cross-section right now and as Chris had pointed out, this is something that is constructible. Joe, we recognize there are people who have the same concern about the parkland as you do. I know you operate it and maintain it.
- Q: AD: I don't know if you understood my question. My question is could there be a possibility for a design change to legitimately move from eight lanes down to six lanes during construction.
- A: MOD: We are looking at doing that on a project along Commonwealth Avenue. It is going to cause a lot of pain. It is a matter of what is an acceptable level of pain for people traveling I-90.
- Q: HM: Mike on that subject, what was the level of pain that expected when the Craigie Bridge was shut down?
- A: MOD: That would depend on who you ask Harry.
- Q: HM: What was MassDOT's position before the project started?

- A: MOD: We thought that we had come up with a feasible method in diverting traffic by using I-93 and several other bridges that cross the Charles River. That is a different project and I would be happy to sit down with you and talk about that. The reduction of lanes on the Commonwealth Avenue Project I mentioned will be on very short intervals of time.
- Q: AD: Could there be some alternative transportation strategies that could be put forward to help mitigate the pain. Not eliminate the pain but to lessen the pain.
- A: MOD: Yes and that brings up a great point. Those are things we need to consider before we seriously try to impact 4(F) from a permanent basis. Joe, you and I both recognize it is a consideration that we have to strongly give and we can't do it giving a half effort.
- Q: JO: I guess this is a larger philosophical question. When the give comes, why is it always in the parks and the open space?
- A: MOD: That is a great point.
- C: JO: That is a test that you are going to have to answer because we and other people are going to want to know why.
- C: MOD: I agree with you and keep in mind that one of the things that we are trying to do here is increase safety. Safety has been and is a problem here. You're right in that we should not be relying on parklands as the basis to improving safety but we need to look someplace as to how we can improve safety on the viaduct structure.
- C: JO: If this cross-section proposal survives I see a very vigorous alternative analysis happening.
- Q: WL: Why is there not a temporary viaduct and why is there not an end point back where the roadway ends?
- A: MOD: Wendy, we may very well end up in that position but in order to do that we have to offset the gains and the losses. If we put back a viaduct with the exact same dimensions we have today, we will have lost the opportunity to improve safety functions here on the highway. Maybe there needs to be some give and take here.
- C: WL: Maybe we need to slow the road down.
- A: MOD: It's an interstate. Slowing it down is a little more difficult than a local street.
- C: Paula Ferrer (PF): I wanted to add my outrage to this proposal also because I think it smacks in the face of what we said collectively here when we met the first day. We all agreed that we have some overarching principals and priorities for the project that included prioritizing people over vehicles. Improving connections and right now the proposal impinges our ability to be able to meet some of those goals by actually going further into our parklands. Maybe I don't understand the nitty-gritty engineering constraints that you have but if we are trying to right some of the wrongs of the original interchange, why can't we do it with this project and help improve the conditions for those of us who live here?
- Q: PS: How much of the new shoulders will be encroaching into the existing Turnpike and how much additional width will be added?
- A: MOD: It would be a four foot shoulder on the left side.
- Q: PS: How much would it encroach into the parkland?

- A: MOD: I don't know what the exact encroachment is, it's not 50 feet, and it's probably less than 30 feet. I am not sure what the exact dimension is.
- A: CC: If we were to apply the full standards to this section, we would have a 10 foot inside shoulder and another 10 foot shoulder on the opposite side. What we are showing you is something smaller than what is standard for a highway of this size. It is moving in the direction of smaller. If we were to apply the full width, we would be out even further to the north.
- C: Bruce Houghton (BH): It seems to me that with the constraints that we have and I do recognize them, the essence will be what your prioritization is. This prioritization prioritizes what you perceive as a deceleration but you haven't decided where the deceleration takes place and where the exit ramps are. It also prioritizes your perception of safety and the necessity of having a shoulder or a breakdown lane where this is none now. What the people here are prioritizing and I'm not sure whether or not a decision will have to be made as to what is most important. Is it most important to have a shoulder on the viaduct? Or is it most important to retain the parkland as it currently is today because I'm not sure if they are in direct conflict with each other. Ultimately I think a choice will have to be made for one or the other because I don't think they can both be accommodated for. If you are widening the road and you can't go towards Commonwealth Avenue you can only go towards the Charles River. The purpose of widening the road is your perception of the necessity for safety and shoulders. That is causing the extension towards Soldiers Field Road. Unless you can give us a proposal that somehow does both, one of those things has to give.
- C: MOD: There is a balance that needs to be found.
- C: BH: Yes and so people have a better understanding you could show the space needed for deceleration or loss of safety; that way people here are seeing something different than just the taking of parkland.
- C: RL: This is depicting the final version of what the finished structure would look like under this particular concept.
- Q: JR: I have two questions. Could you tell us what the actual property line is on the south side of the viaduct and whether or not there is some amount of space over the tracks and still within MassDOT property that you could expand on? The second question is what are the crash statistics for this section of the roadway? The rest of the Turnpike heading downtown has no shoulders. In order to add shoulders on those sections you would have to knock down buildings. I'm wondering why a certain cross-section is acceptable for part of it and not acceptable for this part of it.
- A: RL: The purple line we are showing here on this section which is only a few feet away from the southern edge of the existing viaduct depicts where the layout is so there is just about no space.
- A: MOD: In some instances it actually extends beyond that line.
- Q: JR: Exactly how many feet is that because you're adding a four foot shoulder?.
- A: RL: I don't know the exact dimensions off the top of my head.
- Q: JR: How about my other question about the crash statistics?
- A: Mark Gravalles (MG): We may not have the crash statistics for you tonight but just because we don't have a shoulder at certain locations heading towards Boston doesn't mean that we don't think it is an unsafe condition. We have a project that will be advertised sometime in 2015 where MassDOT and the Massachusetts Turnpike Authority will be working on an analysis to determine where shoulders are needed and where some widening can occur. Shoulder widths and their necessity is something that is on our radar and I can look into that and see if we have the data.

- A: MOD: It is something that has to be obtained. We do have some crash data at the interchange section but we are aware that we will need to look at it and expand it.
- Q: HM: I have two questions. The first is in terms of 4(F) and as Joe had mentioned, do we agree that there must be a fairly significant mitigation component to account for what is going to be taken?
- Q: JR: Joe, could you explain what Section 4(F) is and Article 97?
- A: JO: Section 4(F) refers to Section 4(F) of the National Transportation Act of 1966 and sets a very high standard for federally funded highway projects. It says that when there is a large impact on parkland or historic structures that it is the responsibility of MassDOT and Federal Highway to show proof that there is no other feasible option. A discussion of mitigation would then follow that. In some ways you're jumping the gun when we are talking about potential mitigation because we still have a huge amount of territory to get through before that. Article 97 refers to Article 97 of the Massachusetts State Constitution that says parkland should be kept and preserved as parkland forever. In order to change parkland or sell it off, it requires a two-thirds vote by the Legislator which often happens. We often do land swaps with MassDOT.
- There are a couple of assumptions within the cross-section that we haven't discussed. My first question is what are the current lane width on the viaduct and if a shoulder is incorporated, will there be a lane width reduction? Are you really expecting drivers to pull over into a four foot shoulder or is a four foot shoulder there just to collect debris?
- A: MOD: Right now you only have a one foot shoulder out there.
- C: JO: If you are asking us to live with a permanent four foot shoulder, I have to ask you what the purpose of that and I do understand that snow storage is important. These are the larger questions.
- A: MOD: Joe, could you confirm to the best of your knowledge that the fence line closest to the viaduct that is out there right now is the parkland line.
- A: JO: I would have to go out there and walk the site. I'd also check the records at DCR.
- C: MOD: It may look severe but I don't think it is as bad as you think. We still don't have a defined fence line however we hope to in the next couple of weeks.
- C: WL: But moving the roadway 50 feet closer to Soldiers Field Road...
- A: MOD: It is not 50 feet. The schematic shows that it is 30 feet.
- C: WL: That is still a huge impact.
- A: MOD: But it is not 30 feet into parkland is what I'm getting at; we are not changing the use of the parkland.
- C: HM: No, you are taking the parkland.
- C: MOD: We are getting bogged down too soon and too quickly on this issue.
- C: GB: Mike, as you know I'm always looking for ways to support you whenever I can.
- A: MOD: That's debatable
- C: GB: I just wanted to say that everything you've presented within the last hour makes perfect sense to me. I understand everything you're trying to do. I didn't enter the taskforce thinking that safety on I-90

mattered more than safety on Soldiers Field Road. If you want to convince me that we need to widen I-90 and move into parkland than I want an opportunity to convince you that we need to widen Soldiers Field Road and put safety shoulders in there too. As part of that, why don't you propose moving the Paul Dudley White Bike Path into the Charles River and like you said at the first taskforce, we should be able to wrap this up within three or four sessions, we don't need 10 or 12.

Q: MOD: Can we all agree that there may be some temporary impacts and they could be elevated impacts over the parkland that would be necessary in reconstructing the viaduct and I-90?

A: GB: No.

Q: MOD: Could we live with some temporary impacts?

A: GB: No, I don't think we can because I don't think we have enough information to decide.

Q: HM: The question I was trying to ask was whether it is a temporary, permanent, 30 foot or 50 foot impacts, you and I would have to agree that there must be some type of mitigation. Are we in agreement that some mitigation would be necessary?

A: MOD: One of the things with the 4(F) impacts as Joe mentioned is first the necessity to avoid it. Secondly is minimizing it and third mitigate the impact. We have to first demonstrate that it is not an avoidable impact and we aren't there yet.

C: HM: If we got there, mitigation would be necessary. Do you have any ideas as to what that mitigation would be?

A: MOD: No, not at this point.

Q: HM: I think for this taskforce to operate more effectively and to address the level of controversy and negative impacts both on the internal connections and of the taking of parkland it would be helpful if you could bring some mitigation options so that we understand the balance. My second question is what other configurations are you studying? Are you aware of the ideas of eliminating the viaduct completely, bringing it down to grade and pulling the rail tracks about the highway?

Q: MOD: Do you mean a tunnel?

A: HM: No, the mainline at grade and the train tracks above it. Is that a proposal you've heard before?

C: MOD: I can't say that I have.

Q: HM: What is the mechanism for us as a taskforce and a community to do that kind of brainstorming with you? This is an especially important question to answer given the early stage that we are at and you saying that everything is still open for discussion.

A: MOD: Harry could you point out what you were just talking about in bringing the viaduct down to grade and putting the train tracks above it.

C: HM: I don't think I want to discuss that specifically. I want to discuss more generally how we get outside the box as a taskforce and with the consultant team so we are not just looking at 130 feet of roadway over the train tracks. There are other possibilities.

C: MOD: Yes there are. With this presentation we are trying to demonstrate some of the constraints and demonstrate the need to reconstruct the viaduct. According to Rich's viaduct analysis it does need to be reconstructed. The real complexities are answering the question of how do we reconstruct it?

- A: HM: I think that is an assumption Mike, as to whether or not we need to construct it. I'm not debating that the current viaduct is in poor condition. The question is whether or not there needs to be a new viaduct.
- A: MOD: Our analysis indicates that there does in fact need to be a new viaduct.
- Q: HM: I disagree. I am asking if you can put the existing viaduct on the ground. In 50 or 75 years your successors are going to come back again and say the Mike O'Dowd Memorial Highway is deficient and they're going to show my grandchildren the same pictures. We need to think more creatively about the viaduct and whether it is above grade, below grade or at grade. My question is what kind of format do you think would work best for that kind of brainstorming?
- A: MOD: We have had internal discussion and we have discussed bring the viaduct below grade and we continue to run into the issue that we currently have the needs to maintain the tracks that are currently out there now and the rail yard tracks. We have to maintain all of the MBTA commuter rail traffic, I-90 traffic and the Grand Junction line. I believe this was pointed out in the last meeting as one of the constraints.
- Q: HM: So you have analyzed it completely?
- A: MOD: Analyzed it completely? No. Conceptually considered it to the point that we did not see a reason to progress it further? Yes.
- Q: HM: Can you share that with us?
- A: MOD: Sure
- Q: MD: Can you show the original cross-section as it is right now? Now could you please show the new cross-section? Why are the rail tracks in completely different location? It looks like you shifted everything outward. You shifted the Grand Junction line outward and you shifted Worcester line outward as well. My second question is if you move the Grand Junction line back to where it is now, can you not move a portion of Soldiers Field Road underneath the viaduct structure?
- A: RL: The critical section and the section where we showed you how we'd step across with the new construction are at slightly different points along the viaduct. This image shown here is taken approximately at Buick Street. The next cross-section is the critical section where the Grand Junction would have to cross under the viaduct.
- Q: MD: So there is a lot of empty space under the viaduct that could be used? You could conceivably have a section of Soldiers Field Road go underneath the viaduct
- A: RL: The section I was depicting was a little further to the east.
- C: ED: You are talking about moving Soldiers Field Road away from the Charles River and under the viaduct?
- A: MD: Yes and saving the parkland.
- C: GB: The easiest way to put Soldiers Field Road under the viaduct would be to widen the viaduct.
- C: Galen Mook (GM): I know there are concerns about parkland being taken but to me, that is not parkland, it is a speedway. There are no picnics happening on Soldiers Field Road. If you were to take Matt's suggestion and move Soldiers Field Road towards the viaduct it would free up some parkland and therefore be a form of mitigation back to Harry's point. What really aggravates me about the image you have shown there, is that I don't believe that is truly parkland. To say that it is parkland that is being

taken is technically right and there are air rights over parkland and I understand that. We need to think outside the box as Harry was saying to free up real park land.

C: AD: Just to revisit the alternative plans for construction and the discussion of pain. To help mitigate the pain, one example that was brought to my attention was that you could implement All Electronic Tolling (AET) a little bit earlier in construction. That might allow you to maintain six lanes of traffic during construction instead of eight.

C: MOD: That is a great point, we are looking into that.

C: ED: I want to take a pause for a moment for the agenda. I think this is a great discussion and we are getting a lot of great feedback. We have more slides left. Can I see a show of hands as to if we want to work through this now and move the selection criteria to the next meeting. Do we want to keep this discussion going?

C: GB: I think frankly in plain English you have just wasted all of our time for the last 45 minutes and I have to assume you came in here tonight knowing everything that would be said. I know you guys well enough to believe that firmly. Why you are choosing to play poker with us I just don't know. I think you are literally wasting our time and you should go back and when you come up with something you think makes sense come back and present it because right now you are wasting our time.

Q: Wayne Mackenzie (WM): Have you considered having one of the temporary lanes reversible; way you could change directions for rush hour such as when most traffic is heading west in the evening.

A: ED: Yes, I think that is a great point and we can consider it, Wayne.

I want to go back to Glen's comment. We are not playing poker here. The intent of this presentation tonight was to familiarize many of the taskforce members about the geometric constraints that we are up against. The first thing the engineers are going to look at is the question of, can we build a safe highway and meet the Federal Highway Standards.

C: PF: I respect your desire to keep those of us who are less familiar with the engineering challenges informed but I ask you please to go back to our first meeting and consider our priorities. At no point did that include infringing upon parkland. For you to come to us and present this proposal that did exactly that it really is a waste of our time. I feel really disrespected.

C: Jim Gillooly (JG): I am Jim Gillooly, the Commissioner of transportation for the City of Boston and the Boston Redevelopment Authority. I came tonight intending to make a few points and I think open space gives me an opportunity to reinforce folks' position on that. I want to discuss the bigger importance of land use and the opportunity to expand open space. It is important that we don't lose sight of that. There are opportunities to create more open space. The conversation surrounds the idea of stitching together a street system that is respectful of the existing neighborhood and considerably downsizing the area including Cambridge Street. Pedestrian and bicycle issues are extremely important in all aspects of this. I am glad to hear Mike's comments about West Station. The New Balance and Assembly Square areas have benefitted tremendously with the investments made in public transportation. In general we need to figure out how this land will be used. This needs to happen with MassDOT and the larger partners in the area. When we are all finished here we do not want to have any regrets. Going back to the discussion about the viaduct I am having flashbacks to the Central Artery Project and Albany Street. I think a huge benefit would be to show graphics that compare what is out there today and what is proposed. As you show these comparisons it would be useful to have a shadow or overlap of the existing roadway and proposed. It is difficult when it is only a verbal discussion. A picture can save a lot time and debate. Thank you.

C: Kairos Shen (KS): My name is Kairos Shen. I am the director of planning at the Boston Redevelopment Authority. I appreciate the presentation in showing how complicated it is in reconstructing the viaduct. I

think there are a number of things that have to do with open space and I think the discussion begins with taking the camera further back and understanding that there are over 100 acres that this project will impact. I think it is an important conversation for this taskforce and make sure there is a clear vision of what this 100 acre space will serve as and what kind of neighborhood we intend to build. There is an opportunity for a major transformation in terms of open space that would allow us to meet some of issues that other folks raised today and the creation of significantly more open space in this area. We at the city want to make sure we work with MassDOT and the taskforce to make sure we include the scope that is necessary to answer the questions that I am hearing. I think we are jumping into the mechanics too quickly and this is only a very small part, it just happens to be the most difficult part. I think we need to step back and work with the institutes that Commissioner Gillooly already mentioned to determine what kind of neighborhood this is going to be. I want to reinforce that we, the Boston Redevelopment Authority, the Boston Transportation Department, and other city officials will be working closely with MassDOT to expand this study and incorporate the questioned raised today. I feel like we need a broader perspective and going back to the principals that this taskforce discussed and agreed on at the initial taskforce meeting. We don't want to lose sight of that. Thank you.

- C: RL: I want to wrap us that last few slides and touch on a comment that Galen had brought up. The key in terms of your comment about moving Soldiers Field Road over would be where the support would take place. The yellow shown here is the initial phase and then walking through each phase as each one is completed in red. Ultimately once this portion is done we can begin looking at the big picture of the realignment of I-90 and make that connection on the last phase to realign a portion of I-90 out into the CSX Rail Yard.
- Q: MK: Has it been determined what piece is going to happen first? Would this be the first piece? It would be helpful to know that looking down the road which is happening first, second, third, etc.
- A: RL: The plan is for All Electronic Tolling to be in place at the start. There will be no new tolls at the beginning or during construction. It goes back to the bigger picture of the rest of the concept including Cambridge Street how they are tying into the entire system beyond just the viaduct portion.
- C: CC: it is a good comment. We have to maintain all the ramp connections during construction and although this discussion is about the viaduct as the plans further develop we need to look at the entire interchange.
- C: MG: In terms of the All Electronic Tolling, the gantry systems will be completed July 15, 2016. The demolition contractor for all of the toll booths through the state is going into effect on July 16, 2016. There is going to be a major coordination effort and this project being one of them.
- C: Rochelle Dunne (RD): I'm curious, with all of these projects going on at the same time; I am one of those people you are talking about. Behind me is the Amtrak line, and the CSX Train Yard, then an embankment and then Cambridge Street. I also have BU on another side. I have no green space at my house. It would be nice to know what part is going to be first. This literally is my back yard. I live on Pratt Street. I'm worried about the construction in relation to the impacts of health and my children's health. Living amongst all of that is going to be difficult. I want a timeline.
- C: ED: We are not even sure of our design yet. A timeline will be worked out much further down the line. We can't embark on the discussion of construction without knowing the design. I want to introduce Joe Freedman to discuss the MEPA and NEPA approach to this. We will continue as long as people want to stay.

Discussion of the MEPA/NEPA Approach and Evaluation Criteria

- C: Joe Freedman (JF): Thanks. As Ed said I am Joe Freedman. I am here to talk to you all tonight about the MEPA and the NEPA process which is going to be a major part of this project in order to get to the environmental process. It is significant that we evaluate each of the alternatives including what happens

if we do not build this project. We need public involvement which is why we are all here tonight. We talked a little bit about this and thank you to Joe Orfant for the explanation of Section 4(F) and Article 97. Soldiers Field Road is in the Charles River Basin and falls under the category of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. The Council on Environmental Quality has regulations that govern NEPA and MEPA environmental documentation. If we eliminate an alternative we have to specify why we did it. We have to include taking no action. You may have heard of that discussed as a "no-build alternative." The MEPA regulations require an additional review of feasible alternatives and an analysis of the differences in alternatives.

We have developed a series of criteria and we will give you a handout at the end that follows a rating system evaluation. The first set of criteria deals with multimodal connectivity which is one of the major purposes of the project. The second is traffic operations which includes safety; how well the alternative improves safety throughout the project area, reduce travel time and connectivity. Streetscape is important, it is a 100 acres. It is an environmental document so we will have to look at the environmental factors, the Charles River. We have to look at noise impacts and possible mitigation plans. Additional items are parks and open space, contaminated soils and air quality. We must look at how well each of these items accommodates future claims. Some alternatives will be easier to build than others. We have to look at the cost, the schedule and how well it reaches the purpose and needs of the overall project. Nate will now come around and handout the evaluation criteria matrix.

Q: HM: Looking at the screen I see that the suburban type interchange is still shown. Are they still being activity considered as possible outcomes by MassDOT?

A: CC: The suburban interchange is shown however we are no longer advancing those concepts any further.

Q: HM: Does that mean they can be discarded?

A: CC: They have to be part of the formal record and evaluate them against the criteria. I know there are some fatal flaws with them and group three is really where the emphasis is being place now to advance the alternatives.

Q: HM: Will we spend any more time in the taskforce discussing the suburban options?

A: CC: I don't think so.

Q: MOD: Would the taskforce be prepared to dismiss them?

C: HM: I would be happy to make a motion to dismiss them unless others want voice their support for them. Can we dispatch of them and not waste our time talking about these giant looping off ramps that we know you're never going to build.

C: MOD: It's unfortunate that you feel we are wasting your time but I have already heard from one of the taskforce members that they are not ready to dismiss the concept. We need to have a collective consensus amongst the entire taskforce.

Q: HM: Well, can we have that discussion as a taskforce?

Q: WL: Can we back up from that? I have another question regarding alternatives to the roadway because I think it drives a lot of the decision making. If you were to measure how much time it takes to get from 128 to the interchange and compare it with the future 45 mph steady speed which if we realistically look at this as an urban highway with 70 mph speeds it brings up all the issues of the width of the lanes, shoulders and safety. I think we should put this on the table because this highway is not in the middle on Montana and it's not even in the middle of Massachusetts, it really is an urban roadway and the

impacts directly affect the abutting neighborhoods. I would ask that you think about what it would do to design this highway with lower speeds and then come back with different interchange options.

- C: HM: I am interested in what it will take to get rid of the two suburban type alternatives that we are actively considering. You are never going to build them and Harvard is not going to let you slice up their land.
- A: JF: Harry, I can tell you right now that the reason they are on the presentation still is because they are feasible alternatives. That doesn't mean they are going to get built and it doesn't mean that they are preferred alternatives. The environmental documentation needs to be thorough and needs to be complete.
- C: El: We will finish the documentation and at some point we will not have to have any more discussion on the suburban type interchange alternatives. I do not believe we need to discuss the suburban type interchange alternatives any further as a taskforce based on what we hear right now.
- C: MOD: That is the point of the evaluation criteria form that was just passed out. We want to hear what you know and what little you know about each of the conceptual alternatives shown thus far and evaluate them against each other. In order to evaluate and move forward with the urban type alternatives you will need more information from us.
- C: GM: I have a quick question. First off I want to say I appreciate the homework and you showing us how the process works from your side.
- A: El: Some of what this does is helps us pull questions from you, the engineers and the environmental process and ask the question, do we have enough information to analyze this alternative.
- C: GM: To play off that I want to focus quickly on the point of community cohesion as a nebulous and I am not sure what that means but I am going to interpret that as connecting the community. Something that has been left out of this meeting and the previous meeting is the connection between North and South Allston. This is something that has been on the table since the first meeting. I don't see where that lies here. I don't think we as a taskforce have enough information to get that point going and I would love to find a positive in there and some sort of connection that connects us across this project.
- A: JF: Galen I would say that is something that is part of this criterion. Factors such connections to the south, through the project area and how well the new streetscape connects to the existing street network.
- Q: GM: That is what you mean by community cohesion?
- A: JF: Yes. Some of the alternatives will work to better knit the community back together and provide some of the connections that haven't been available.
- C: GM: I look forward to seeing that.
- C: Tad Read (TR): I have heard a couple of suggestions. One is that we act up a little bit and the other is that we step back a little bit. The comment about backing up and with respect to what Harry said seems to mostly focus on the alternatives and the viaduct itself. I thought it was a good suggestion that we set back and look at the different possibilities as to how we can do this by placing the roadway at grade and elevate the narrow train way above it. My question is, do other taskforce members agree and if so, do you think it would be useful? The other suggestion I heard about stepping back came from the Commissioner and Kairos. Stepping back in these terms would refer more to looking at the neighborhood as a larger context and what it would look like and how it might connect to the neighborhoods around it. Does the taskforce feel that this is important and if so, how do we move forward with those two suggestions.

- A: MOD: What would be helpful for us is having some feedback on each of the alternatives that have been shown and showing the missing parts, the flaws and maybe there are good parts in one and bad parts in another. We haven't received any feedback up to this point. I have received comments from Galen that we have not provided a connection from North and South Allston and that is understood. We know that we have to show you that. We want to hear the positive things, the negative things and things that need to be worked on a little more.
- Q: AO: You have shown us group 1 as a suburban type, group 2 as a suburban type and I may not be an engineer but I do know that I do not live in a suburb. We only have one urban type. Did you guys discard 15 other urban types that may be a greater use of our time to evaluate and how did you get to these three groups. There is nothing under streetscape and what does streetscape even mean? If we are talking about connectivity can we also talk about connectivity to the Charles River?
- A: JF: I'll answer the first part as to what streetscape means. Streetscape simply refers to what the streets are going to look like.
- Q: AO: Which streets?
- A: JF: Cambridge Street and the street network in the surrounding area. Are there specific standards we want to propose to these streets? Landscaping?
- Q: AO: In your matrix can we add the individual streets to help us define that better. Streetscape is the only thing that doesn't have anything under it. Are there other urban type interchanges that we could look at? I feel like you've given us something that you've already baked.
- C: Tom Yardley (TY): I want to make it clear that the taskforce has just asked for additional urban type concepts but there was no response. I don't think there was any recognition.
- Q: AO: Mike you said a long time ago that you were exploring a lot of different options. I am not an engineer but I do imagine that there is more than one type of urban interchange. Why are we not looking at any of those concepts? Can we just have them please or can you explain why we can't?
- C: El: I understand what you're saying. You want a variety of different urban interchange concepts: some with the trains above, some with the trains below, big ideas, outside the box ideas. I think what I am hearing is if we have looked at these ideas and discarded them, we should explain why.
- A: AO: Instead of you explaining why, I would like you to give the taskforce the opportunity to look at them and determine whether or not they should be discarded.
- C: David Loutzenheiser (DL): I feel like we should flip this around and one, use the open space along the river to triple the size in width. Two it should connect A and B. Three it should have a streetscape that does this and then, MassDOT comes back with alternatives that we can rate.
- C: PF: I know that the cost and the schedule are probably pretty important. I am concerned that we are trying to retrofit the available options based on budget. I am willing to write grants to support this project if I knew there was a better option than what I have been given. We have been given suburban type options when we do not live in a suburban type neighborhood. We are completely disconnected from the river, from access to the main streets and access to public transportation. We would like to see from the project team, the institutes in the area and everyone sitting around the table a solution that can solve all of these problems.
- Q: JR: Going back to Tad's point, I want to know how we incorporate the land-use section of this project into the discussion.

- A: MOD: We have looked at options multiple urban interchange options that we have not brought with us. We would be happy to bring them and post them on the site so you can look at them. They are less advanced than what you have seen so far. As far as the land use goes, we have been very clear that there is potential for land use development mostly due to the amount of land that will be freed up. Harvard is a property owner and we need to start having more frequent conversations with Harvard. I think what we need to take into context here is what we can do to create more open space in the future with the alternatives that we have looked at.
- Q: WM: When is the best time to have a conversation about the impacts on the neighbors and the community? We need to understand when we will have a mitigation conversation. That's what we want to hear: conversations about noise barriers and toll discounts. When is the best time to have a conversation that talks about the impacts to us?
- A: EI: That conversation starts now and it leads into the environmental documentation. Looking at the alternatives we have to determine which options offer the most opportunity for mitigation and what the scenarios look like.
- C: KS: I know that MassDOT is very respectful of to the forum of the taskforce and Commissioner Gillooly and I have spoken to the Mayor about the concerns raised in this taskforce group. I want to ask and suggest to the task force that the BRA, MassDOT and MBTA sit down and have a conversation that discusses how we can work with all of you and incorporate the ideas discussed in this taskforce into an overall plan. This would require taking some steps backwards. My question is, would the taskforce feel comfortable with this idea. MassDOT has many stakeholders and community issues, city building issues, access issues, and I think an additional dialog would help advance the process along with the taskforce input.
- A: BH: Kairos, it is difficult for me who then understands who is making the decisions. I don't know if I have total comfort with handing this back to the BRA. I do want to say I do have a great deal of faith in you. I think for the BRA, BTM the City and MassDOT to come up with a comprehensive plan and then bring that back to the taskforce would very much enhance and help the discussion of this taskforce.
- C: KS: This point that the Commissioner made earlier about working with the landowners, Harvard and BU it very important. If we can get those landowners in the room with DCR it could at least allow us some time for preparation and to gather information.
- C: AO: Kairos I think that sounds great. I just want to add what something that David was talking about earlier and that is some of the initial principals and goals that were developed by the taskforce. Then we can trust you to be our advocate to talk about what we want and have been talking about.
- C: KS: Tad Read and Vineet Gupta have been here representing the city but going back to the principles that were talked about at the first taskforce meeting yes, you can give those to us. We can work on developing additional alternatives based on tonight's conversation. May I see how people feel about that with a show of hands?
- C: MOD: I asked earlier as a baseline if any of the conceptual alternatives presented offer the opportunity to meet some of the things you all want.
- A: JR: None of the conceptual alternatives presented have a north-to-south link. That was a number one priority. We want to be able to get across the project.
- A: GB: I agree.
- C: BH: We don't want to look or hear about the construction piece. We want to see more of a community view, not highway construction plans. We want to talk about how this will integrate into our

neighborhood not how it will be built. It is important for us to step back and ask how this will create a better neighborhood and city for the people, not the highway.

C: MOD: I don't want people in the taskforce to think that we are not considering that when we are looking at and developing these alternatives.

C: BH: Meeting with the BRA, the City, Harvard and BU to understand their plans is important. We want to know what the neighborhood is going to look like. These are the concepts we want to discuss not adding lanes to a highway. We want to hear about access to the river.

A: MOD: Understood.

C: GM: I agree. I love the framing of what the neighborhood would look like. I have some concern over what we just did. Now it sounds like the BRA, Harvard, BU and the City are going to determine what the land is going to look like. Knowing full well the politics and environment of Harvard and BU, we are talking about land use and we want access to the river, bicycle paths and maybe BU and Harvard don't want that. The conversations that happen outside the taskforce should go on public record. I want these institutions to present what they think their land will look like. I don't have faith in the outside conversation.

C: BH: I think part of that process is to help the taskforce and community rather than make the decisions. We want them to come back with recommendations and help the process move forward for all parties involved.

C: GM: I would prefer to have that conversation in this room with Harvard and BU.

C: KS: I think the Harvard issue is its own. The Mayor raised the point that there are over 100 acres opening up here that is Harvard's land. We have to work with Harvard hand in hand in order to balance the institutional use with the non-institutional use. The Mayor wants more housing. We want to update housing projects into mixed-use areas. Some of these changes may be good for certain individuals and bad for others. We want to help develop alternatives, not make decisions for the taskforce. MassDOT is an agency for the state. I don't want folks to think that we are making decisions for them. Commissioner Gillooly mentioned the state wants to hear more input about the Turnpike. This is indeed a very political project and much more than a highway project.

Q: GM: Will this all happen on the public record?

A: KS: I do not consider anything I do private. I think it's complicated because Harvard may make some advances in their ideas and their process without it happening on the public record. We do have experience working with them. I worry about a large scale project being dictated by constructability issues.

C: HM: There is a line between civic value and financial value. We all know that the City, the State, Harvard and BU will all gain significant value if the Turnpike is moved. Jessica Robertson said we have been very clear about connecting roads and having a connection from Commonwealth Avenue to Western Avenue. There is a certain level of negotiation that needs to happen. We don't need to be in the room for the conversation with MassDOT and the property owners. We do however expect you to close the deal. If you are going to come back to us and apologize for not being able to make the connections we want I think you've gotten the sense of how we are going to feel about that. No, we don't need to be in the room with Steve, Elizabeth and Mike. We want to trust you with all the resources you have to come back once it is done and discuss the topics like streetscape and how wide the cycle track is.

C: BD: I completely agree with your suggestion of stepping back and viewing this in more broad terms. The City of Cambridge would like to participate in this conversation. Some of the things that we think

about in Cambridge that are not neighborhood specific but do affect us are considering the basic users, the people who cycle and walk. How we can improve intersections. How we can reduce the noise impacts. How we can improve connector roads to Western Avenue. How cars access the Turnpike. These issues need to be on the table.

- C: MOD: We welcome the discussion with the City and are more than happy to sit down with them. If the Mayor is prepared to assist us in developing interchange alternatives we have no problem with that. Our priority is that we have an interchange and a viaduct that are deteriorating. We have a lot to reconstruct and in our thinking of doing so we have not forgotten the importance of reconnecting Cambridge Street. As Bruce pointed out, maybe we need to look at this from more of a neighborhood perspective and start integrating the highway into the existing neighborhoods. We want to make this neighborhood more livable and better for you, the people who live here. I'm not opposed to work with the City.
- C: BH: I look forward to you coming back.
- C: Name not Given (NNG): As a person who has lived here most of my life it is difficult for me to allow you to team up with the BRA and Harvard after what they did with our perfectly good housing projects. Now to turn over what you are calling a local taskforce and turn it over to the city makes no sense. In terms of West Station there is nothing further east than where you want to put your West Station. 10 years ago we asked MassDOT to give us a stop on the Green Line. MassDOT came back and did a study. They said the best place for a commuter rail stop is the central residential area and sure enough that is where it ended up. I have a major concern is giving this project back to the City. All of the big stakeholders don't want what is best for the people who live in Allston. There aren't too many people living down by BU.
- C: WM: We aren't suggesting that we give the taskforce over to the city. We are suggesting that we gain the weight of the Mayor's office to help support and progress the discussion and help to develop the alternatives.
- C: NNG: I am a Cambridge resident and wasn't able to attend the first public meeting. I appreciate the offer you are making. I want to be sure you are aware that the Cambridgeport neighborhood is dying from the noise coming from the Turnpike. The quality of life is degrading and it's not just the construction noise, it's constant. Please keep that in mind.
- C: NCC: Thank you. Our next meeting will be on June 25 at 6:00PM right here.

Next Steps

The next taskforce meeting will be held at **6PM on Wednesday, June 25th at the Fiorentino Community Center**. The Fiorentino Center is located at 123 Antwerp Street in Allston.

Appendix 1: Meeting Attendees

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Jo-Ann	Barbara	Charlesview, Inc.
George	Batchelor	MassDOT
Joseph	Beggan	Taskforce Member
Glen	Berkowitz	Taskforce Member
Andrew	Bettinelli	Taskforce Member
Nathaniel	Cabral-Curtis	Howard/Stein-Hudson
Craig	Cashman	Taskforce Member
Jim	Cerbone	MassDOT
Alex	Chase	Filling in for Councilor Ciommo
Matt	Ciborowski	MassDOT
Ryan	Coholan	MBTA
Jim	Curley	Taskforce Member
Donny	Dailey	MassDOT
Matthew	Danish	Taskforce Member
Bill	Deignan	Taskforce Member
Anthony	Disidoro	Filling in for Paul Berkeley
Brian	Doherty	Taskforce Member
Brian	Doherty	Taskforce Member
Stacey	Donahoe	MassDOT
Rochelle	Dunne	Taskforce Member
John	Fallon	MassDOT
Paola	Ferrer	Taskforce Member
Heidi	Freimanis-Cordit	Newman Properties
Abby	Furey	Filling in for Anabela Gomes
Robert	Gale	Community Resident
James	Gillooly	Taskforce Member
Mark	Gravallese	MassDOT
Nick	Gross	Howard/Stein-Hudson
Vineet	Gupta	Taskforce Member
Bruce	Houghton	Taskforce Member
Marc	Kadish	Taskforce Member
John	Laadt	Taskforce Member
Wendy	Landman	Taskforce Member
Robert	LaTremouille	Community Resident
Elizabeth	Leary	Taskforce Member
David	Loutzenheiser	Taskforce Member
Will	Luzier	Taskforce Member
Wayne	Mackenzie	Taskforce Member
Christine	Marini	BPD
Harry	Mattison	Taskforce Member
Walter	McDonald	Community Resident
Tim	McHale	Community Resident
Galen	Mook	Taskforce Member
Tom	Nally	Taskforce Member
Carol	O'Hare	Community Resident
Alana	Olsen	Taskforce Member
Joe	Orfant	Taskforce Member
Richard	Parr	Community Resident

Tad	Read	Taskforce Member
Matt	Robere	Allston/Brighton TAB
Jessica	Robertson	Taskforce Member
Anthony	Toppi	Community Resident
Tom	Yardley	Taskforce Member