
To: Mike O’Dowd
MassDOT Project Manager

Date: February 27, 2019

From: Erin Reed
Howard Stein Hudson

HSH Project No.: 2013061.14

Subject: MassDOT
Allston I-90
Task Force Meeting #34
Meeting Notes of February 27, 2019

Overview

On February 27, 2019, members of the Allston I-90 Interchange Improvement Project team and associated MassDOT staff held the 35th Task Force meeting for the job. The Task Force is composed of local residents, business owners, transportation, and open space advocates, as well as representatives of local, state, and federal governments. The purpose of the group is, through the application of its members’ in-depth knowledge, to assist and advise the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) in determining a single preferred alternative to be selected by the Secretary of Transportation for documentation in a joint Environmental Assessment and Environmental Impact Report (EIR) document.

The purpose of this Task Force meeting was to obtain feedback on the Hybrid At-Grade Alternative and Modified Hybrid-At Grade Alternative. The task force meeting followed a workshop model allowing for members of the project team to discuss the current status of the design of the two options and allowed for an open discussion of the alternatives. Task force members appreciated the tone and attitude of the task force meeting and appreciated that the project team is not hastily making a decision on which alternative to bring to final design. The project team admitted that there are still a number of variables to analyze before a decision is made.

Agenda

- I. Workshop..... Error! Bookmark not defined.
- II. Discussion 4

Detailed Meeting Minutes

Breakout Group Summaries

Modified Hybrid-At Grade Alternative (Soldiers' Field Road over I-90 Eastbound)

Jim Keller (Tetra Tech) provided attendees of this break-out group with an overview of this alternative. There are minor differences between placing Soldiers' Field Road (SFR) over the eastbound and westbound barrels of I-90. The vertical profile is similar, however the reverse curve associated with going over eastbound I-90 is sharper, while still within design standards. At this time, the project team is not anticipating major staging differences based on whether the parkway is placed over I-90 eastbound or westbound. During construction, MassDOT is seeking to maintain three lanes in each direction on I-90, two lanes in each direction on SFR, and two open tracks on the Worcester Main Line for as much of the duration of constriction as possible. The construction staging is being developed to address that things which are currently high as they pass through the throat need to move down, while things which are currently low need to move up. From a design, constructability, and geometry perspective, there are no fatal flaws with putting SFR over I-90 eastbound although environmental and historical permitting are still under review.

Advantages of the Modified Hybrid include the ability to place the SFR viaduct further away from the Paul Dudley White Path and placement of highway signage becomes easier, however the profile is slightly different. The project team is looking at a higher I-90 to avoid or minimize having to move underground utilities. MassDOT believes that the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority (MWRA) which maintains a large delivery line in the throat would want to avoid moving this line or making any part of it inaccessible for future maintenance. Additional conversations will need to take place between the two agencies to coordinate this issue. MassDOT expects MWRA will want to avoid having transmission moved under either alternative. MassDOT and MWRA still need to discuss the plans

Discussion focused on profile variations, the grade of the rail lines running through the throat, and the placement of switches between the two Worcester Main Line tracks. It was noted that the driver of the much of the profile in the throat is the height of the Grand Junction Line where it crosses the Charles River with impacts to both the SFR viaduct and the height of a future pedestrian/bicycle connection from Agganis Way. Task force members participating in this breakout group noted their preference for placing SFR over I-90 eastbound since this would move it further from the park land and Paul Dudley White Path along the Charles River.

Modified Hybrid-At Grade Alternative (Soldiers' Field Road over I-90 Westbound)

Rich Lennox (WSP) provided attendees of this breakout group with an overview of the alternative. He explained that two major factors are driving the project team's thinking regarding the profile of SFR over I-90 westbound: bringing I-90 down to clear the Grand Junction Line and utilities. With the utilities, the project team is currently considering two vertical profiles, one which minimizes utility impacts and one which hews more closely to roadway standards but has greater utility impacts. The project team needs to continue to coordinate with MWRA regarding the trunk line they maintain in the throat about how much vertical cover the utility would want between their line and any roadway. The project team is also looking to minimize the amount of fill needed to get the correct profile for the Worcester Main Line to have optimal switching to the layover yard and Grand Junction Line.

Task force members raised several questions about this alignment. The profile of SFR was of interest with several attendees asking about it. Currently, SFR would have about a 7% grade climbing onto the proposed viaduct. This version lowers I-90 somewhat and has some utility impacts. If I-90 were not lowered, thereby avoiding all utility impacts SFR would have a grade of 9-10%. To lower the grade further would require continuing to lower I-90 with attendant, increased utility impacts. There was also a discussion of the placement of signage on I-90 under the SFR viaduct and whether Big Dig standards could be applied to the signs. Project team member Erik Maki explained that between six and seven feet is needed for highway signage and Rich Lennox explained that the project team is currently evaluating the best balance between raising SFR and lowering I-90. Fred Salvucci asked whether additional land could be obtained from Boston University to enhance the park land along the Charles River. Erik Maki explained that taking additional space from the university would not be effective since track geometry drives much of where things are placed within the throat.

The next topic of discussion was the height of the Agganis Way footbridge in relation to the SFR viaduct and I-90. Assuming no lowering of I-90, the footbridge would be, at its highest point, higher than the current elevated mainline of I-90. The current lowering of I-90 envisioned by the project team reduces the footbridge elevation by roughly eight feet. The group also touched on the issue of utilities and how much these might cost. Chris Calnan (Tetra Tech) noted that there are major utilities in the throat, gas, water, sewer, and telecommunications and the costs of moving any of them are significant. The large MWRA line mentioned above is currently easily accessible for maintenance since it chiefly runs under unused space below the I-90 viaduct. Maintaining access to this line will be an important consideration for the advancing design.

The breakout group concluded with a discussion of open space. Placing SFR over I-90 westbound yields a small amount of additional parkland, as compared to eastbound, since straddle bents (extra-long supports) are required to support the longer curves to get over the eastbound barrel. Bob Sloane (WalkBoston) asked why the available parkland had gotten narrower since presentations made to the task force by the Independent Review Team (IRT). Rich Lennox explained that this is driven by the need to provide 4-foot shoulders, as per the Secretary's decision memo, and applicable barriers around the columns to hold up the SFR viaduct. Bill Deignan (City of Cambridge) commented that Cambridge would prefer to place SFR over eastbound to pull it further away from the Charles River and Magazine Beach suggesting that this would have an appreciable difference in noise heard in Cambridge from SFR. Regardless of the placement of SFR, Cambridge would prefer to see trees and rain gardens between separate bicycle and pedestrian treadways on the Paul Dudley White Path. Tad Read (City of Boston) asked whether a deck could be placed over the uncovered barrel of I-90. Chris Calnan noted that this would be a considerable expense and Rich Lennox noted that it would eat into the available parkland since an additional row of supports would be needed.

Full Group Discussion¹

- C: Nate Cabral-Curtis, Howard Stein Hudson:** Good evening, if anyone has any general questions or comments, we have both alternatives of the preferred option up on the screen. Rich and Jim will be answering questions
- C: Jim Keller, Tetra Tech:** We went through our presentation and we wanted to convene and get any thoughts so everyone can hear what everyone else is thinking.
- Q: David Loutzenheiser, Metropolitan Area Planning Council:** Based on what you know, do you see one option shaking out better than another? How are you going to decide?
- A: Jim Keller:** Chris and Mike O'Dowd can correct me, but we are picking up where the Independent Review Team (IRT) left off. Secretary Pollack's decision memo looks at the Hybrid Alternative as well as options for the Modified Hybrid over Eastbound. We're currently developing them concurrently, tying into the interchange, and then creating cross-sections in the corridor. The profiles are similar with some differences in horizontal alignment and some minor differences in the vertical alignment. Our approach is looking at the profiles as if they are functionally identical – the main reason for that is that the Grand Junction Line bridge. For most of the design this is sort of our “starting point” to tie into that bridge over the Charles River. The rail design team at VHB started there and worked back as the rail design drives the highway elevations. The highway for the Hybrid

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

and the Modified Hybrid is the same for both Eastbound and Westbound, maybe a few feet for columns here or there, but very similar. I-90's profile is driven by the Grand Junction line and then as you come west, the cut version assumes there will be some need for relocation of utilities versus the at-grade version which brings I-90 up as soon as possible to miss some of the major utilities. It looks like due to the need to drop the profile, the 60" Boston Water Sewer Commission drain line will be impacted for either.

A: Chris Calnan, Tetra Tech: We need to meet with DCR as the Parkway is their facility. MassDOT is in the process of setting up those meetings. We'll get feedback tonight, meet with DCR, MWRA, BWSC, and utilities. We are not at a decision-point yet.

A: Jim Keller: For the Modified Hybrid, Soldiers Field Road today is up against river. It shifts further south, but it's still a parkway, further under eastbound, might be difference, but increasing open space by shifting Soldiers Field Road. Moves structure from being close to Paul Dudley White bicycle path to further, so those plus westbound signage (maybe profile implications to get signage in—we're at really early stages for signage but a point worth hearing now) are advantages. A point has been made that it is easier to place those highway signs for the modified hybrid. Those conversations will have to happen.

Q: David Loutzenheiser: Can we call these Eastbound Hybrid and Westbound Hybrid?

A: Jim Keller: Yeah, I've been struggling with what to call these. I went back to the Secretary's decision, where it was called the Highway At-Grade Hybrid so then we called the second the Modified Highway Hybrid. We hope to choose one before we have to rename them all.

Q: Tad Read, Boston Planning and Development Agency: I'm trying to remember if the MWRA facility has portions underneath the existing Turnpike at-grade or is it all under an elevated highway currently?

A: Jim Keller: It's all under the Paul Dudley White bike path, between Soldiers Field Road and the Mass Turnpike.

Q: Tad Read: Is there a precedent for facilities like that underneath extensive at-grade infrastructure?

A: Jim Keller: MassDOT is setting up meetings with MWRA and BWSC to talk through it. I don't know precedents, but relocation, from an engineering perspective, of the longitudinal sewer is an option. Would MWRA be open to having a transmission line under the interstate? You have to think about structures rising up to the highway. There have been some fatalities due to rims from some of

the covers popping up. You would have to weld them and there are a lot of issues with that. We're not sure. We think putting it in the mainline would be a last resort.²

Q: Tad Read: So, relocation would probably be under Paul Dudley White bike path?

A: Jim Keller: Could be, yes.

C: Glen Berkowitz, *Community Member*: To supplement that answer, the precedent I'm aware of is that the Big Dig which took elevated I-93 in South Bay area and flipped it to put it at-grade. I believe you'll find a series of significant utilities with manhole covers in the roadway surface on I-93 south of Kneeland Street. I agree that manhole covers, and safety have been an issue, even with tragic fatalities, but those covers were close to 50 years old. As far as I'm aware, the Big Dig ones, I don't believe there have been any issues.

A: Jim Keller: It's worth pointing out that these are the same for Hybrid and Modified. Either way, we'll have to relocate at least some because it'll be exposed, but maybe you don't have to move it all. The watermain is more of a concern. We'll do our homework between now and then, but we'll discuss this in detail in March. The PDW gives you a corridor to put that pipe. To relocate the water main you would have to go down, under that pipe – today it's on top. That's the complex one; it's not impossible, but that's what we're looking at.

C: Fred Salvucci, *Community Member*: To disagree with what you said a minute ago about hoping getting down to one quickly, what you're doing here is terrific. This is a real honest look at two approaches with advantages/disadvantages and sharing with everyone. I encourage you to carry both, not just take the utility guys at their word and make that the end of the story. I really appreciate that this is a good beginning of the challenges. The utilities add complexity, constructability adds another, and you can't decide until you know if you can build it. I know it's annoying but keep carrying both.

A: Jim Keller: We have no intention of picking one before staging, for sure.

C: Fred Salvucci: Terrific job, you laid out so understandably and being honest about what you don't know yet. Constructability could end up making the call one way or the other.

² The trend of recent years has been for MWRA to seek as few obstructions over their water delivery lines as possible. At the Casey Arborway, a row of trees was deleted from the project to comply with this approach.

C: Jack Wofford: Thanks to Mike and the team for this approach, with two options and seem open to people saying “hey what about this” without coming in proposing one. It’s tapping the best of the people in the room in a way that will benefit the project. Mike O’Dowd, I’m a broken record on process and want to say in front of everyone that this is a great tone compared to the last meeting. If you can have this tone on the West Station flip with two tables, and same with the river edge, you’ll have an awful lot of people supporting what comes out in the end, and it will be improved by that process.

A: Mike O’Dowd: Thanks Jack.

C: Ari Ofsevit, *Livable Streets Alliance*: I agree that this has been great. Lots of progress since I was last in these meetings before Wednesday night classes. I’m excited to see where we go.

C: Jessica Robertson, *Resident*: Since I was talking about it last time, great tone, great to see where you’re working before you’ve solved every little thing and discuss pros and cons of the different options.

C: Laura Jasinski, *Charles River Conservancy*: To the extent you’re taking this feedback back, with the Modified Hybrid, we’re excited to see parkland benefits and taking the elevated Soldiers Field Road away and adding width in some places.

C: Steve Kaiser, *Resident*: A quick observation. Good personal interaction between presenters and citizens. Maybe it was because they were not using PowerPoint, I’m not sure. Last time I had a sense of tension between the members of the Advisory Committee and the consultant presenters. I didn’t see that tonight. Like they needed to do the work and they did the work and then presented it. Even if incomplete, they had done work. Superior performance and good exercise in public process.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: So, you’re saying we should figure out how to present utilities at two tables.

A: Jessica Robertson: It’s not two tables—I’m actually not a fan of the multiple tables since things get said that not everyone gets to hear. It’s about the attitude and tone the team is bringing and where the work is at.

A: Nate Cabral-Curtis: For anyone that is concerned about what they may have missed at the other table, we had note takers at each table. We’ll write it all up so you can read it.

C: Galen Mook, *MassBIKE*: I echo the thanks and appreciation. This was a better meeting now than a month ago. I’m going to start calling the Modified- the Better Hybrid. It has a better grade on the

Agganis connection to BU/Brookline, easier transition to get over everything, better from connectivity. The viaduct is further from the river.

Q: Bill Deignan, *City of Cambridge*: In a similar vein, I think that the modified hybrid “better hybrid” has benefits for parkland, parkland experience, and for moving vehicles away from the river. In the narrowest section, if you can find more space between the separated paths for trees, landscaping, etc. – will be exposed, so trees can provide shade, especially in a hotter future. Rain gardens, etc. lots that can be done in that area to make it a great experience and a great path. In all the options, the viaduct has a much lower profile. I do worry about flood elevations—are those the newest flood elevations from MassDOT and the Boston Harbor Risk Assessment?

A: Mark Fobert, *Tetra Tech*: It’s the last FEMA update. The resiliency study was in the DEIR and will be in the next, but this is strictly levels.

C: Bob Sloane, *WalkBoston*: Thank you for the process, very good. I am skeptical of many things presented. Chiefly that the park is not adequate now, since it’s no longer a park, it’s two paths. We’re going from an 8-foot path to two, 10-foot paths. We’re not gaining very much and no room for landscaping. That’s not a very good solution for a park. I hate to be the only one to say it but that’s really, really not acceptable. The other problem is that the Eastbound option requires some sort of temporary relocation for westbound traffic during construction to demo the viaduct and rebuild.

A: Jim Keller: Both will likely require temporary at-grade roadways within the throat. We haven’t staged it fully yet, that’s our April meeting, but in both variations that will be needed. You’re taking the elevated and lowering it and taking the at-grade and raising it. That traffic will have to move. Soldiers Field Road, Westbound barrel, Eastbound, all will have to shift

C: Bob Sloane: If we’re going to have to live with a park that’s only two paths, we’ll have to address the question about whether we can do something in the river. This has been forbidden for five years. DEP isn’t here but they caused the problem in the first place. If we’re stuck with two paths, we have to look at something in the river.

C: Tom Nally, *A Better City*: It’s really terrific to share work-in-progress where the answer isn’t done yet. The open process as we’ve all said is terrific. Continue it to the extent we can through the rest of this series of meetings. We all learn from it and that’s most important.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: I have a compliment and then a question. Can you bring up the narrowest cross-sections for both? Compliment first. Thank you for sharing the .pdf you shared in advance. That’s the first time I think that’s happened in this process. I’ve talked to many of the group and I think we all

appreciated it. Thank you for treating both options with equal level of care and attention. It's obvious from everything that you've literally done as much work and analysis on both. Fantastic to see that. Now the question I have has to do with the note on both that says "wall/fence". Under the Hybrid, when the IRT showed its version in September, right after Jack Wright finished his presentation Bob asked if we could fill in between the columns with a solid wall. I think Jack said, it's 14.5' clearance, and you're 6-7' below grade, so probably that's about 7' of clearance at the level of the path. Jack said there's no way you could put a solid wall in without then having to do mechanical ventilation of Westbound because of Soldiers Field Road. Can you show the Hybrid with only a fence, not a wall? Because on the Eastbound the ventilation issue goes away, you could have a wall if you wanted to. Have you solved that ventilation issue, or should we be considering the Hybrid a fence rather than a solid wall?

A: Jim Keller: At this concept level, we just didn't want to dictate one, which is why it says wall/fence. We don't have an answer yet. But this is again pretty similar for both, because the Grand Junction Line has to raise with a retaining wall there.

A: Chris Calnan: Glen I think you're right, it's basically a security issue. Stuff and people need to be blocked from the interstate. But we don't know what that will block look like.

A: Jim Keller: We have to figure out if one side of ventilation is sufficient, because that would solve the problem. On the Eastbound variant we have the same problem with rail. The tie into the Grand Junction Line over the river is what is driving design.

C: Robert LaTremouille, FOWA: You're going to find that saving the right turn onto River Street will be popular in Cambridge. The left-turn traffic has been so heavy that traffic has been diverted to other areas. By having only, the right-turn you'll probably increase traffic to Cambridge, so keep an eye on traffic studies to see if one-lane is sufficient.

A: Jim Keller: Lots of thought is going into that.

C: Fred Salvucci: To counterpoint that, one of the advantages of not having that right turn is that it'd be much better for the river edge and bicycles and pedestrians. If that ramps stays there the bicycle and pedestrian situation doesn't get much better and it's atrocious today. There may be other solutions but there was a good reason not to have that ramp. More work is needed to solve it. But the point I wanted to make was: if you're in the Eastbound hybrid, then as Chris just said, you'll need something there for a barrier for the interstate. That might as well be a wall, and if it's a wall, it's a very effective noise barrier. Most noise is from trucks and wheel noise. Even with no wall, you've got a benefit because I-90 is lower. The benefit increases if you add a wall. The elevation of the Charles

and elevation of the cut, the wall probably helps with flooding potential as well. You also need pumping capacity. A wall can serve double-duty: a noise barrier, and a flooding barrier. If Paul Dudley White is overtopped by the river in an extreme event, having the wall will help since the road is down. I suspect that it's a consideration during construction as well, because extreme flooding doesn't always come with a warning. If the river goes up during construction, that's probably the worst possible time for it since pieces will be missing. There's a lot of promise in this design that, in the end, you'll get noise suppressant and flood protection. And you can think through it during construction staging as well. Not a complaint, just something to think about as you think through constructability and staging. As a vegetarian I don't like the two-birds and one-stone phrase, but you get the idea.

C: Glen Berkowitz: Not to take issue with any of my fellow stakeholders in the room, but I would encourage all of us to reread the Secretary's decision memo. I did that today, and no matter how much some of us, myself included, thought getting our toes wet as part of a good solution was good, it's crystal clear that she made her decision largely in-part because she rejected any option that required going into the river. For those of us who hope this process does not go on for another 4.5 years, this has to be a two-way street. It can't be stakeholders asking MassDOT and team to do things that we want but then not agreeing to reciprocate when MassDOT makes decisions that largely but not 100% give us what we want. We should be respectful of those to the extent we each choose. I don't think we should be telling MassDOT, "the parkland isn't as generous as I like, can you make it wider by going into the river". That's not going to get us to a preferred alternative and moving forward as quickly as possible. I think the Independent Review Team was very straight when they presented. In that cross-section they were showing 16' parkland but with a single path, not a double, and you all heard correctly that Secretary's memo talks about divided paths. That takes more width for the buffer. It's 6' vs. 4' buffer. The IRT told us this could happen, but you knew you had to provide 4' shoulders mandated in memo, she left it up for inside-shoulders on I-90. You're showing them at 4', but we knew already 4' was gone because of the outside shoulders. The widest that little sliver could be would be another 4'.

A: Jim Keller: We also added width for the columns, from a structural perspective, it was taking some liberties to show them at 1.5'. We're showing at 3', that changed a bit as well. As well as 4' shoulders inside and out, 11' total.

C: Glen Berkowitz: In conclusion, the great thing about these options in this narrow section is you have dual paths with a bit of separation. The Secretary's memo is clear that in this narrow part she wanted to accommodate the dual paths but there won't be much room to lay down and read a book. I don't mean that pejoratively, we all wish it was wider. But it increases parkland on either end, but is

that this best we're going to get out of this? I just don't think that we should keep relitigating issues that were clearly decided in the memo. I recommend we find a way to be at peace with that so we can build a collaborative process.

C: Henrietta Davis: In the spirit of what Glen said but a bit not, I think a lack of screening in that area is somewhat problematic. That green needs to be not just flat, but screening for pedestrians and bicyclists. Going through the area is not like being on 10' of asphalt with AstroTurf between. I favor glass over a vegetated wall for light and visibility. We should try to find a way to have trees or some screening for shading. Even if it is made out of metal or wood; it will break up the dessert kind of feeling. I can't tell how long that narrow section is...

C: Jessica Robertson: It's a couple hundred feet.

C: Jim Keller: At the narrowest, say 500 to be conservative.

C: Henrietta Davis: Also screens for Magazine Beach. We've told people at the Cambridge community meeting that there will be trees—at risk of being made a liar, I urge you to find a way to make that happen. I'm sure creative solutions exist.

Q: Jessica Robertson: Are we assuming that we're assuming that 7 feet of Boston University land?

A: Jim Keller: Yes.

C: Bob Sloane: In defense of what I was saying, I think part of what I was responding to was shock from the IRT plan showing 16' of landscape-able land, to almost nothing in this 500' area. What I'm saying is that if you look at that dashed line, that's a part of the project that has not been explored. If it's 10' or so what we've been talking about with the Watershed Association about ecological treatment. That means doing something to it, but it's a cliff right now. It strikes me that whatever we do it involves ecological restoration, but it also enlarges the park. We ought to be sitting down with DEP and saying "do you really mean we can't do anything on that slope? Can we put trees and bushes there?" We'll need soil, maybe more, but now that we only have a 2' park, we ought to do that. CRWA people and others should be involved in that meeting. It can't be left untreated. You're going to put a temporary Soldiers Field Road on top of it.

A: Jim Keller: There will likely be a bank restoration mitigation included in this process. There was some discussion of that earlier, and there will be more.

C: Bob Sloane: This could be much better than what it is.

C: David Loutzenheiser: Sitting in this room I realize it's probably about 26' wide. I would recommend dedicating a mini-charette to talk through that design. It's premature to talk too much about specifics but we care about it, having a charette when it's the right time is a good opportunity to use this room as a scale model.

C: Ari Ofsevit: I was basically going to say the same thing. There are examples in other cities where in places there are split paths that then merge in constricted areas, so we could maybe do that here in the narrow areas. That would be a great activity for a task force meeting. It might almost be fun. I'm also happy to come up with a list of paths where these things have done. Chicago, New York, etc. great to look at examples, feel free to email me about it.

A: Nate Cabral Curtis: We could look at something like what we did building a protected intersection for Melnea Cass Boulevard out of foam core tiles.

C: Fred Salvucci: One of the advantages of this much more open process is that you get all of us fighting each other rather than you. Let me disagree with my friend Glen. The Secretary made a terrific decision based on good but incomplete work by IRT. You've done more drilling down. There will be more detail when you get into constructability, when you sit with MWRA, etc. In letters from CWRA and CLF, I wish either was here, they said some filling of river was okay with them if it was for remediation of the riverbank. That hasn't been explored yet. My understanding of constructability in IRT is that you first have the PDW go somewhere else—structure on the river, or Cambridge—and then put SFR right up against the river to maximize construction space. When you have to figure out how to insert an MWRA line into that space, my guess is that you end up with a system that lets the basic construction not the interstate and rail go forward and that some of these issues about how best to deal with the space in between the bank and the road, it's quite likely that people at DCR, MWRA and BWSC may themselves say we want to deal with this some more. I think we should be okay with that. To me the issue is to avoid having it be on the critical path of getting the basic infrastructure done. The more effective that construction is the less spillover traffic into the neighborhoods there is, and the less disruption of commutes out west to Worcester. It'll be a discussion within Environmental Affairs of "so what if there's a bit of water fill if that's what it takes to get remediation of the river bank that CLF and CRWA were advocating". None of us in this room know yet what it's going to take to relocate those utility lines. Let's not take such a hard line yet. There might be a place for the environmental agencies agree that more space is good even at the cost of river fill. The Secretary made good decision, but more information will keep coming, so let's not draw a hard line yet.

C: Nate Cabral Curtis: The next meeting is 3/27, same time and location, focused on utilities.

Q: Steve Kaiser: In terms of procedure, when do you get traffic engineers involved in analyzing these plans? For the final design.

A: Jim Keller: That's a parallel track, that's moving forward.

C: Steve Kaiser: The Pike has excellent traffic counts, speeds, volumes by hour. It shows 3-lanes on Pike works fine. If you do 3-lanes and a breakdown lane you can save 5-7' of width.

A: Jim Keller: That is a discussion for a different day. There will be a full-blown traffic study.

C: Steve Kaiser: Make sure they study three versus four lanes.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Thank you folks and have a great evening.

Next Steps

The task force will next meet on March 27th when utilities will be discussed.

Appendix 1: Meeting Attendees

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation
Berkowitz	Glen	Community Member
Bourassa	Eric	MAPC
Breadib	Liz	Community Member
Brownsberg	William	MA State Senate
Cabral-Curtis	Nate	Howard Stein Hudson
Calnan	Chris	Tetra Tech
Ciommo	Mark	City Councilor
Conroy	Bill	Boston Transportation Department
Craig	Keith	NB Development Group
Dailey	Donny	MassDOT
Davis	Henrietta	Cambridgeport, resident

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation
Deignan	Bill	City of Cambridge
Driessen	Guus	Brookline Transportation Board
D'Isidoro	Anthony	Allston Civic Association
Haglund	Karl	Department of Conservation and Recreation
Hamilton	Sarah	MASCO
Jasinki	Laura	Charles River Conservancy
Kadish	Marc	Allston Board of Trade
Kaiser	Steve	Cambridge Resident
Keller	Jim	Tetra Tech
La Tremouille	Robert J.	FOWA
Leary	Elizabeth	Boston University
Lopez	Oscar	Office of Representative Honan
Loutzenheiser	David	Metropolitan Area Planning Council
Mande	Pallavi Kalia	Charles River Watershed Association
Marini	Christine	Boston Police Department
Mook	Galen	MassBicycle
Nally	Tom	A Better City
O'Dowd	Mike	MassDOT
Ofsevit	Ari	Livable Streets Alliance
Ostrander	Cassie	Federal Highway Administration
Read	Tad	Boston Planning and Development Agency
Robertson	Jessica	Allston Resident
Ryerson	Hazel	Allston Resident
Salvucci	Fred	Community Member
Sullivan	Amy	Federal Highway Administration

Last Name	First Name	Affiliation
Wofford	Jack	Cambridge Resident
Worhunsy	Courtney	MassDOT District 6