MEMORANDUM |

To:	Michael O'Dowd Project Manager	Date:	January 4, 2016
From:	Nick Gross Howard Stein Hudson	HSH Project No.:	2013061.14
Subject:	MassDOT Highway Division Allston I-90 Interchange Improvement Project Public Information Meeting Meeting Notes of December 8, 2015		

Overview

On December 8, 2015 members of the Allston I-90 Interchange Improvement Project team and MassDOT staff associated with the job held the a public information meeting at the Jackson Mann Community Center located at 500 Cambridge Street, Allston. The meeting was attended by approximately 120 people including 21 task force members, and representatives of State Representative Kevin Honan and City Councilor Mark Ciommo's Offices. The purpose of the meeting was to provide the public, an update on the projects advancement since the last public information meeting held in June of 2015 as well as to solicit questions and comments regarding the ongoing process.

The meeting was kicked off by MassDOT's project manager, Michael O'Dowd, who announced that the senior leadership staff at MassDOT has formally committed to advancing the two at-grade alternative concepts put forth by Ari Ofsevit and A Better City (ABC) into the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) process along with the MassDOT Concept 3K. This announcement was first made at the December 2, 2015 task force meeting and has been extremely well received and applauded by both task force members and community at-large. Subsequent of this announcement, Michael O'Dowd stated that as the project now moves forward with three alternatives into the environmental review process, the project team will develop a new set of evaluation criteria to work in parallel with the project's shared-priorities.

In summarizing the project teams presentation, Chris Calnan from TetraTech provided an update on the most recent MassDOT Concept 3K plan and highlighted the key features including the "flip" of East Drive and Stadium Way to lower the overall interchange elevations, the addition of Cambridge Street South to better accommodate bicycle and pedestrian movements through the project area, as well as the charge in looking at a north-south vehicular connection over the Beacon Park Yard (BPY) via Malvern Street. Mark Shamon from VHB presented an update on the latest advancement of West Station and the BPY facilities followed by Dennis Baker from HNTB presenting the findings of the feasibility analysis of the two alternative at-grade concepts previously mentioned.

The overall feeling voiced by the community was generally positive with many attendees thanking MassDOT for advancing all three alternatives into the MEPA environmental process. A number of community members also recognized that MassDOT and the project team have made significant strides in positively advancing the MassDOT 3K Concept since the last public information meeting based on public involvement and task force meetings. With that said, a common theme of "feeling overbuilt" was reiterated as members of the audience compared the new proposed street grid to a Houston (Texas) sized roadway network. It is worth noting that the future traffic projections for the interchange and its connector roads already assume a high transit mode share due to the presence of West Station. Further, much of the need for width is driven by the presence of turning lanes which are needed to compensate for the loss of the current interchange's grade separated ramps. Likewise, while there are several roadways with a six lane cross section within the parcel, many pedestrian crossings are shorter, only crossing five lanes, which is the norm on main roads elsewhere in Allston such as at the intersection of Brighton Avenue and Harvard Street.

Additional significant themes voiced included the demand for a north-south connection over the BPY for transit vehicles, consideration to relocate the multiuse path connection from Harry Agganis Way to Buick Street, a stronger focus in the Franklin Street footbridge touchdown points into the larger non-motorized network, and the suggestion to develop a 3D model as well as a hierarchy of streets for the entire project area. By the conclusion of the meeting, there was an overall feeling of consensus voiced by the public as well as task force members that taking the best elements of all three alternatives and creating a single preferred alternative could be achieved.

Agenda

I. Welcome & Introductions

II. Introduce Concept 3K

III. West Station & Layover Facilities

IV. Introduce Alternative Concepts
- *A Better City Concept*
- *Amateur Planner Concept*

V. Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA) Placemaking Study Update

VI. Ongoing Public Outreach

VII. Discussion/Question/Answers

Detailed Meeting Minutes[1]

C: Michael O'Dowd (MOD): Thank you all for joining us tonight for a presentation on the Allston I-90 Interchange Improvement Project. In case any of you do not know who I am, my name is Michael O'Dowd and I am the project manager from MassDOT. I'm sure Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis has been able to get a hold of you at the door but if he hasn't, please sign-in on your way out in the lobby. By providing your contact information it allows us to send notifications for future public information meetings. I should also note that Joe Sakelos from ATM Transcripts is here. Joe is a stenographer and he will be taking a full verbatim transcript of this evening. That transcript will be placed on the project website once it is complete.

The advertising for tonight's public information meeting was placed in the Boston Globe on Tuesday, November 24 and Tuesday, December 1. It was advertised in the Boston Herald on Tuesday, November 24 and Tuesday, December 1. The meeting was advertised in the Allston/Brighton TAB on Friday, November 20 and Friday, December 4. It was also advertised in the Cambridge Chronicle on Thursday, November 19 and Thursday, December 3. Tonight's meeting was also advertised in El Planeta on Friday, November 20 and Friday, December 4. As you can see, tonight's meeting received a fair amount of publicity. The reason for tonight's meeting is to provide an update since the last public information meeting in June, 2015. The public information meeting in June was held just prior to us reconvening the task force. Similar to the June meeting, the purpose of tonight is to bring everyone up to speed with the happenings that have transpired over the last six months.

Tonight you will see the work that has developed through the task force process as well as some of the concepts that have been presented to MassDOT by task force members. The first was presented to us by Tom Nally and Glen Berkowitz representing A Better City (ABC). The second was presented to us by Ari Ofsevit who is a representative of the LivableStreets Alliance. Both of these concepts propose an at-grade highway and have been further developed by HNTB. MassDOT directed HNTB to conduct a fully independent feasibility assessment of those two at-grade concepts. I am pleased to report that the feasibility findings from HNTB were presented to the senior leadership team at MassDOT and both concepts will be advanced into the projects MEPA process along with the MassDOT concept.

Many of you may be familiar with the MassDOT concept(s) known as the 3J series. This was the concept that was filed in the Environmental Notification Form (ENF) last year. The MassDOT 3J Concept has now progressed through the task force and public involvement effort into what we are referring to as Concept 3K. There are some minor changes between Concept 3J and Concept 3K. Chris Calnan and his team at TetraTech will lay out those changes for you this evening. I should note that the two at-grade concepts are focused primarily in the narrowest section between Soldiers Field Road

[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.

(SFR), the viaduct, and the Charles River. The purpose of the at-grade concepts is to reduce the amount of viaduct structure that exist today, lower the overall grade, and lower the project cost.

I want to quickly walk you through the shared priorities for the project. We've shown them to you before and MassDOT sees these as critical success factors. These priorities were developed in conjunction with the task force and through public comment. The shared priorities serve as the framework for the overall goal and objective for the project. As we move forward in evaluating the two at-grade concepts as well as the MassDOT concept, we are going to develop a new set of criteria that will encompass the shared priorities. The evaluation criteria will allow MassDOT to measure each concept on a level playing field. That is an overview of what will be occurring over the next few months.

Before I introduce Chris, I would like to talk about infrastructure funding. At the last public information meeting in June there was a discussion about funding. Funding is a regular topic of concern for MassDOT on both the highway and transit side. As we move forward we will need to develop conceptual estimates for each of the alternatives. At this point, the financing for this project still needs to be finalized. We are fully expecting to be utilizing metropolitan highway toll revenue; however that money has not yet bet earmarked or identified formally. Toll revenue cannot be used for the rail, transit, and placemaking components. We still need to identify a funding mechanism for those elements.

At this point I would like to introduce the team that will be presenting MassDOT's 3K alternative, the rail and transit components, as well as the feasibility study associated with the two at-grade alternatives. To my left is Chris Calnan from Tetra Tech and to his left is Mark Shamon from VHB. VHB has been brought on to address the design of West Station and the rail improvements within the BPY. To Mark's left is Dennis Baker from HNTB who will be presenting the findings of the two at-grade concepts. At this point we are going to dive into the presentation; here is Chris Calnan.

Discussion of Option 3K

C: Chris Calnan (CC): Good evening everyone. I'd like to kick things off by walking you through the highlights of the new MassDOT concept known as Concept 3K. Six months ago when we last met with the public we had reached Concept 3J. This was the same concept that MassDOT filed as part of the MEPA ENF. Tonight we are going to show you the new features of the 3K alternative and how we got there. Shortly after the June, 2015 public information meeting we started to dive into the refinements of a new concept. Through the MEPA ENF and input from the BRA, the task force, Harvard University, and other public comments, we began looking at the new Concept 3K. The major desires with Concept 3K were to lower the overpass and entire interchange elevations as well as the Connector road closest to the Charles River.

The major features common to both the 3J and 3K concepts included the realignment of the Turnpike and replace the viaduct. Both concepts will have dedicated pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure as well as the incorporation of the West Station and rail yard improvements. There will be north-south pedestrian and bicycle connections, a redesigned Cambridge Street as a "Complete Street," and the realignment of SFR to increase open space along the Charles River.

The new elements associated with Concept 3K include the introduction of the parallel road in the middle of the interchange known as Cambridge Street South. We've taken that road and shifted it close to the Turnpike. This allows us to create a new connection to SFR heading inbound. It also allows for a more concentrated pedestrian and bicycle connection over SFR to the Paul Dudley White Path (PDWP). The biggest highlight of this feature is the change in elevation of the two connecting roadways to West Station. With the previous Concept 3J, the elevation pattern was elevated, to at-grade, to elevated, to at-grade. In Concept 3K both the Stadium Way and the Seattle Street Connector are elevated with the East Drive and West Connector at-grade. We refer to this as the "flip." One of the major features with this is the ability to lower the East Drive Connector overpass by approximately 10'. The overall theme here is to drive the elevations down in order to make pedestrian and bicycle conditions more suitable.

At this point I'd like to quickly remind folks of the vehicular movements in and out of the interchange. When traveling from the west using the eastbound off-ramp you will be able to take the Seattle Street or Stadium Way Connector to access Cambridge Street and Cambridge Street South. When traveling from the east using the westbound off-ramp you will be able to take the East Drive Connector or the West Connector to access Cambridge Street or Cambridge Street South. In regards to the eastbound on-ramp you will be able to use the Stadium Way or the Seattle Street Connector. In regards to the westbound on-ramp you will be able to use the outer roadways including the West and East Drive Connector to head west.

We also want to bring you up to speed with the traffic operations. We've been looking at a sensitivity analysis for Concept 3K and I should note we do not have finalized traffic volumes from the Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS). We took the Concept 3J traffic volumes and manually assigned them to Concept 3K. Moving forward we will be studying three variants of the 3K Concept. Concept 3K-1 is planned to have Cambridge Street with a two-way circulation pattern and no Cambridge Street South. Concept 3K-2 shows Cambridge Street and Cambridge Street South being one-way pairs. Concept 3K-4 shows Cambridge Street and Cambridge Street South being two-way pairs. All of these alternatives are subject to change and refinements based on public input.

Another element that we've heard is important to the community is a north-south vehicular connection through West Station to Packards Corner. We are required to investigate this connection through the MEPA certificate and CTPS is currently preparing some model results for us to better understand this. As we look at this connection we will be evaluating both vehicular and transit connections. We are going to look at the operations of vehicular connection first and then we'll look at the transit

connection. The major consideration with this connection is an extremely constrained right-of-way (ROW). With that I am going to turn it over to Deneen Crosby with Crosby Schlessinger Smallridge (CSS).

Discussion of Green Connections

C: Deneen Crosby (DC): Thank you Chris. Tonight I am going to walk you through the pedestrian and bicycle connections for Concept 3K. All of the streets within the project area have sidewalks and separated bicycle lanes. Along the north side of Cambridge Street South we are showing a widened greenway. The greenway will also occupy the east side of Stadium Way and the west side of the Seattle Street Connector. All of these greenway connections will be made up of a two-way separated bicycle facility, a widened sidewalk, and plantings. The greenway along the north side of Cambridge Street South is proposed to tie into to a non-motorized bridge to connect users to the Charles River. As an example cross section of the greenway, we are proposing a 9' planting strip, a 12' two-way separated bicycle facility, a 6' planting strip, a 12' sidewalk, and another 12' for public space.

In looking at connections from the south such as the Malvern Street connection, a pedestrian or cyclist would take a multiuse path around West Station to the greenway on the west side of Seattle Street and turn right onto the greenway along the north side of Cambridge Street South. Alternatively you could go through West Station and use the greenway on the east side of Stadium Way and turn right onto the greenway on the north side of Cambridge Street South. The connection from Babcock Street is a stair and elevator connector. There is also a shared-use path (SUP) from Harry Agganis Way to connect through the station to the street network on the northern side of the Turnpike. The section along the Charles River is being widened. In the future there will be enough space for plantings and separated facilities for pedestrians and bicycles.

C: Skip Smallridge (SS): Good evening everyone my name is Skip Smallridge and I am with CSS. I'm going to walk you through a potential full build scenario for the project area. We have created a diagram to test the proposition that Concept 3J had more development potential than Concept 3K. The diagram shows three things. The first is between Cambridge Street and Cambridge Street South. You'll notice that there are a lot of additional streets that we've added. Those streets are included to provide access to the future parcels. Some of these streets would likely be restricted to right-turns in and right-turns out. The bottom line is that all of the parcels can have vehicular access of some kind.

The second issue is the scale of the parcels. We went through a process with the task force where we took various building topologies and tested them to see how they would fit into the parcels. Some of the parcels have odd geometry which was one of the issues we discovered. The great majority of the parcels have a geometric configuration and a scale that gives enormous flexibility for development. The third item relates to elevation changes. We wanted to test how elevation would influence development. We looked at air rights development over I-90 and the BPY. The main item we wanted to look at was the two elevated streets that come up to meet West Station becoming a development. It's all technically

feasible and the bottom line is that buildings create the walls for these streets. Having active buildings that create definition is a big part of placemaking.

Discussion of the Franklin Street Footbridge

C: CC: Thank you Skip. We are also looking at the Franklin Street footbridge and discussing ways we can improvement that. We brought on Urban Ideas Lab who will be our bridge architect and guiding the vision of this facility. Urban Ideas Lab has looked at a preliminary urban design analysis and developed some conceptual sketches for the Franklin Street footbridge. The next step is to test those conceptual designs and refine the urban design analysis based on the results. Today we are looking at the existing constraints and the site design parameters. The touch-down points are paramount to this in order for this footbridge to function properly.

The first option for the Franklin Street footbridge is called Option A. This option shifts the bridge location to the west as well as the ramp to access it. On the southerly side, the touch-down point lands to the west of the former Ace Ticket building. The second option is called Option B. This option is in a very similar footprint to the existing bridge. Option B shifts the structure slightly to the east. On the north side of the Option B, the touch-down point is very similar to what exist today. On the south side the touch-down point comes down into the Regina Pizzeria parking lot. We think the location of Option B is better than Option A in terms of desire lines.

MassDOT has recently introduced a new planning and design guide for separated bicycle lanes. This document came out last month and we are excited to use it going forward on this project. We believe the guidelines of this document will improve the safety for all road users. We've heard it is preferred by both motorist and cyclist. The bottom line is that it is going to attract more people to cycling in order to emphasize the mode shift that we are trying to achieve. We're looking to utilize the guideline along the Cambridge Street corridor. The design principles going forward will help us minimize exposure to vehicular conflicts, enhance the visibility for all travel modes, as well as encourage desirable yielding behaviors between motorist, pedestrians, and cyclist. Next up is Mark Shamon with VHB who will talk about West Station.

Discussion of West Station

C: Mark Shamon (MS): Thank you Chris. I'm going to provide an update on West Station and the BPY. Similar to what you've seen before, the BPY is going to be a facility that will provide a layover for 14 consists locomotives from South Station. We are still looking at a pit track where the MBTA would do Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) inspections. There will be a car wash at the west end of the pit track and a wheel truing station to the south of that. We're looking to place a sound wall near that facility between the area of Linden and Pratt Street. West Station itself will have two platforms and four tracks. It will serve the existing single track and the MBTA will be adding an additional track as

part of the Boston Landing Project. MassDOT will also be adding two more tracks for freight and future Grand Junction use.

When you last saw West Station we were still considering a two or three level station. Right now we are down to a two level station. We've eliminated the mezzanine level and brought the bus level down to the lowest level possible above the top of the platforms. MBTA buses are expected to have their own specific berths. On the back side we would have right side in and right side out drop-offs. The front is intended for shuttle buses, kiss-and-ride, drop-offs, and taxis. We are also showing a bus layover space. The shared use path allows people that want to get from one side of the station to the other to do so without having to use the station. We are looking to have a cover over the entire station as desired by the MBTA to provide a dry place for people to wait for their bus.

The pathways around West Station from Harry Agganis Way, Babcock Street, and Malvern Street all allow people to cross over the BPY without relying on the station. The Harry Agganis Way multiuse path will have separated uses. We are showing this as a 13' wide bicycle path with an 8' sidewalk. At Babcock Street we are looking to place a stair and elevator system because of the elevations. The Harry Agganis Way path connection has a very flat profile. The path is approximately 1000' at a 1% grade and intended to be a non-dismount connection for cyclists. The Malvern Street ramp is going to be steeper than the Harry Agganis Way ramp but it is much shorter.

We are looking at noise mitigation throughout the project. The South Station Expansion Project identified the area of the BPY near Pratt and Wadsworth Street for receiving noise barriers. The type of noise barrier we are looking at is a concrete structure with 4" thick panels. There are various treatment options and MassDOT will be working with the community to address those. We are planning to put the noise barrier as close to the source of the noise as possible which ends up being approximately 9' from the trains. That covers my presentation, at this point I'm going to hand it over to Dennis Baker from HNTB.

Discussion of the ABC and Amateur Planner Concept Feasibility Work

C: Dennis Baker (DB): My name is Dennis Baker and I work for HNTB. As Mike O'Dowd mentioned earlier, HNTB was brought in to do a feasibility study of two alternative concepts that were brought forward by members of the task force. Tonight I'd like to explain the work that we've done, show you the concepts, and give a summary of our findings. The good news is that we found that both concepts are feasible to construct. Our work was mostly focused on refining the geometry and mathematics to get the highway and railroad profiles to fit within the constraints on the site. We also looked at the big issues regarding environmental impacts.

Concept 3K is what we are referring to as the base concept for MassDOT. The first alternative concept was put forth by ABC with the goal to get as many transportation elements at-grade as possible. The second alternative was created by Ari Ofsevit who writes a blog called the *Amateur Planner* and

therefore has been called the Amateur Planner Scheme. The idea with the Amateur Planner Scheme is to flip the mainline and the rail facilities so that the rail facilities are elevated and the mainline is at-grade.

After we refined the drawings and engineered these alternatives we then tried to figure out how we could build them. We didn't have time to optimize the construction schemes; our goal was to confirm that each alternative was constructible. We also took a stab at looking at the relative cost differences between the three alternatives. One of the things that is important to understand is the location of change between each alternative. The major change that occurs between each concept happens in the narrow section which is referred to as the "throat section." The area of the interchange itself is for the most part the same for all three alternatives.

We focused on the throat area for Concept 3K and some of the main features are represented with the follow color scheme. Red represents a bridge structure, yellow represents at-grade, and blue represents a retain fill. The main feature of the 3K series through the "throat section" is that the mainline is elevated on a viaduct in a similar configuration to what exist today. All of the rail road facilities are underneath the viaduct, at-grade, including the Worcester, Grand Junction, and Houghton Chemical Line. One of the features of this concept that should be noted is that this concept shifts SFR closer to the viaduct in an effort to make more parkland along the Charles River. Another important feature of the Concept 3K is that it is matching the number of lanes that exist today with the addition of shoulders. The existing cross section has no shoulders and this scheme adds shoulders on each side.

The goal of the ABC Concept is to get the mainline at-grade through the "throat section" while keeping the rail facilities at-grade as well. In order to do this, the Grand Junction Line comes up over the existing rail bridge over SFR and continues up on a fill structure. It would then cross over on the Turnpike on a viaduct structure and touch back down to grade as quickly as possible. The Houghton Chemical Line would split off and go underneath the Turnpike creating a required retain fill structure. Access to the layover facility would go underneath that retain fill section as well. Due to the constrained width in this section, the ABC Concept actually fills in a little bit of the Charles River to fit everything at-grade. One of the nice features about this concept is that it makes future air rights development easier than the other schemes. A key note to this concept is that it does not provide the additional shoulders that Concept 3K provides. The idea with the ABC Concept was to match the existing cross section that exists today. There are river impacts with this scheme including some fill and some shadowing due to the cantilevered multiuse path. The mainline of the Turnpike would also be placed on historic DCR parkland creating some permitting hurdles.

The Amateur Planner Concept is a little bit different in the "throat section." The idea is to put the rail facilities on a viaduct and the mainline at-grade. The Grand Junction Line would come up on a retained fill structure over the westbound roadway and continue over the eastbound roadway on an elevated viaduct. Heading west it would begin descending on a retain fill structure to West Station. The big advantage of this concept is that the viaduct would be narrower and lower because of the

difference in required clearance. As the Grand Junction Line is elevated and the Worcester Line is at-grade, the Grand Junction Line eventually has to clear the yard lead track which is extremely challenging in terms of clearance. In order to make this geometry work, we have to depress the Worcester Line and push the platforms for West Station to the west. One of the benefits to this concept is that the Grand Junction Line would touch down in the middle of West Station for future urban rail service and cross platform connections. I should also note that this concept has an additional SUP path to West Station on the elevated viaduct parallel to the rail road. The overall advantage with this scheme is a narrower and lower viaduct through the "throat section." It also manages to accommodate all of the transportation modes without filling in the Charles River. The environmental impacts associated with this concept also shift the Turnpike onto historic DCR parkland.

Initially we were asked to do an evaluation of the two alternatives on their own merit. Inevitably, once we did that everyone wanted to see a comparison with the other alternatives. With that said we boiled down the significant points and created an evaluation matrix showing all three alternatives. I should note that this table simply represents HNTB's thoughts on the alternatives. This matrix won't be used going forward; it was our way of presenting our findings to-date.

The first element is the highway cross section. Both of the at-grade concepts call for retaining the substandard existing roadway width. The MassDOT 3K Concept will still be substandard but improves it by adding some shoulder width. The second item is the Worcester Line. All three alternatives provide for two tracks for the Worcester Line in the future. The two at-grade concepts require depressing the grade of the Worcester Line and creating a boat section. The MassDOT 3K Concept is very similar to what exists. With regard to the Grand Junction Line, all three concepts accommodate two tracks in the future. The ABC Concept does that with a small flyover and the Amateur Planner Concept does it with a viaduct. The MassDOT 3K Concept is basically what exists today. In regards to the Houghton Chemical Connection, the ABC Concept has an underpass through the retained fill structure, the Amateur Planner Concept has a spur that comes off the viaduct, and the MassDOT 3K Concept is all at-grade.

The next item is the West Station platforms. The Amateur Planner Concept requires us to shift the platforms to the west by approximately 260 feet.[2] Both the ABC and MassDOT 3K Concepts keep the platform where it is proposed. In terms of rail operations both the ABC and MassDOT 3K Concepts accommodate all operational movements while the Amateur Planner Concept has some impacts. The next item is the impacts to the Worcester Line during construction. All of the concepts will impact service during construction but the two at-grade concepts will require us to construct a "shoe fly" to shift the track to a temporary location. The Grand Junction Line is also impacted. For the two at-grade concepts we believe there will be relatively long closures to this track. The MassDOT 3K Concept only appears to have short term impacts for a few weeks.

[2] This shift would place the rail station closer to homes on Pratt and Ashford Streets.

In order to construct either of the at-grade alternatives we believe that the Paul Dudley White Path will be closed for some duration of time. The ABC Concept would be approximately six months and the Amateur Planner would be approximately five years. The MassDOT 3K Concept would not require any closure to the PDWP. In terms of a preliminary cost estimate, we are at less than 5% of a design so it is difficult. We took a stab at the cost with a focus on the delta and relative comparison. Our assessment based on the information we have to-date is that the ABC Concept would be the cheapest, the Amateur Planner would be more expensive, and the MassDOT Concept 3K would be in the middle. The last two items relate to the environmental process. It's a preliminary assessment and represents HNTB's opinion. In the environmental process you have to be able to demonstrate that you are selecting the least harmful, feasible, and prudent alternative. With that said, it appears to us that both of the at-grade concepts will not be the apparent least harmful, feasible, and prudent alternative. The MassDOT 3K Concept has the least amount of impact. Similar to the Charles River impacts associated with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the Wetlands Protection Act (WPA) you have to demonstrate that you are selecting the least environmentally damaging, prudent alternative. It appears to us that this would be the MassDOT 3K Concept.

C: MOD: Thank you Dennis. As you all know we have been working with the City of Boston and the idea placemaking has become a key element with this project. David Grissino is here from the BRA to outline some of the ongoing groundwork in looking at placemaking opportunities for this project.

Discussion of the BRA process

C: David Grissino (DG): Hi everyone, my name is David Grissino and I am an architect and urban designer with the BRA. I don't have any slides but I would like to update you on what was first mentioned at the public information meeting back in June. This entire process is like a three legged stool. One leg is [roadway] transportation, one leg is transit, and the other leg is placemaking. The simplest way to clarify what we mean by placemaking is to understand what it will feel like to be here and what this new district has the opportunity to become. This effort is very important to Mayor Walsh, the City of Boston, and Harvard University.

Immediately following the June meeting we put together a request for proposal (RFP) and issued it in August. We had a number of responses from high quality firms and began interviewing them in September. We selected the Cecil Group based on their experience working with us in Allston and entered into a contract with them in October. They have been integrated into the task force process and working to get up to speed with all the on goings of the project. The outcome of this effort is not going to be a Master Plan; it's too early for that. Our effort is to ensure this process does not preclude a range of potential urban design planning outcomes in the future. All of the themes that we've heard from the public and from the task force will form the lens that we look through for this area.

Our first big effort will take place next week at the December 17 task force meeting. If you would like to learn more about what a placemaking effort is I would encourage you to come to that meeting. Our

goal is to make sure that by March, we have significant input. Ultimately we're going to try to better understand all three alternatives and figure out which elements from each alternative are the best. Our time table is aggressive and that's why we are very interested in getting as much input as we can over the next couple of months. With that, I'm going to hand it off to Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis to discuss more of the task force process.

C: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis (NCC): Thank you David. I'm going to run through this in an accelerated fashion. We've had 17 task force sessions, periodic public information meetings, and we will continue to meet as the project moves forward. We are still attempting to hit our anticipated construction date of late 2018. At this point I would like to leave the contact information slide up and invite folks up to talk who have signed up. We'll give members of the general public the first bite of the apple. Are there any Elected Officials who would like to speak? I am also going to try to hold folks remarks down to two minutes so everyone has a chance to speak.

Question & Answer

C: John Ramos (JR): My name is Jon Ramos. I want to talk about the Franklin Street footbridge. You presented a couple of options for the location of that structure and it seems like the option closest to the existing locations could potentially prevent cycling infrastructure as it comes from the east on Cambridge Street. I am worried about the switch back at Regina Pizzeria. My general comment is that the plan still has the feeling of being overbuilt. I worry that we are going to lose what makes Boston feel like Boston with the wide boulevards you've shown. It feels like every new road being built is for high capacity. My concern is that we are going to lose our identity and end up with Houston-sized roads. My last comment addresses Cambridge Street. Where Cambridge Street South meets Cambridge Street is creates an awkward angle. I know there will be separated bike lanes but it stills looks like the kind of move you would do when you are entering or exiting a highway. It encourages high-speed traffic. I encourage you to look at more right-angled intersections.

C: NCC: Thank you Jon. We just began our work with the footbridges so there will be a lot more work with that. In terms of the area ending up like Houston, we have David Grissino and the BRA working to ensure this area does not end up like Houston. Our goal is to not build any more roads than what is needed. We've also discussed the intersection of Cambridge Street and Cambridge Street South and will continue to discuss it as we move forward; we know it is a concern.

C: JR: Thank you. Please try to keep the block structure as small as possible. Buildings on a typical Boston block are not as far apart from one side of the street to the other. When I look at this, there are 7 lanes between each side of the street. The buildings don't feel connected.

C: NCC: Thank you Jon.

C: Renata von Tscharner (RvT): My name is Renatta Von Tscharner and I am with the Charles River Conservancy (CRC). I'm delighted that you are continuing to use two terms over and over again. The first is "context sensitive design" and the second is "placemaking". I'm happy to hear this from the City of Boston, the BRA, and your team. This is not about getting through the area, it's about being there. In this context, placemaking is not just a place where people live but it is a place along the Charles River. It's a place that has the potential to be a memorable place. I would like to see increased green space along the Charles River. It will increase the development potential of that area. I also think it is wonderful that you are carrying the two alternative designs forward too. It shows that we are all moving in the right direction.

C: Brent Whalen (BW): My name is Brent Whalen. The complexities of this are a bit overwhelming. I live in North Allston and my sense is that Concept 3K has now realigned some of the connectors from the on and off ramps to the Turnpike. This is a great step forward if I'm correct is what I think you're showing.

A: NCC: You are correct.

C: BW: Great. It also looks like Seattle Street is a one-way to access the Turnpike. That would be disastrous for the people on Seattle Street and it would also invite a cut through by way of North Harvard Street, Hopedale Street, to Seattle Street. I fear that you are inviting a cut through and I want to alert people to that possibility. I see the plan is getting better but that is still my concern from the North Allston point of view. From the point of view from someone who has commuted their entire life on the Paul Dudley White Path, I'm concerned that in the best case, it looks like the narrow path near the viaduct will remain the same or get worse as it is crowded by an overhead structure that is wider. I don't see the reason to add shoulders to the viaduct on the mainline. The Paul Dudley White Path may get worse from the proximity of the viaduct but it may get a lot worse if it is cantilevered over the water. I feel that the path will be less attractive than what it is now. The Allston Esplanade idea claims a wider place along the Charles River further north to enhance recreation and create a place or park.

A: NCC: Thank you Brent. MassDOT and TetraTech are aware of the residential cut through issue. We are also working with the City of Boston to ensure that those cut through desire lines will not be convenient. This is something we talked about with the task force early on and we are holding it as a high priority. In terms of your cantilevering concern, the only place this would occur would be over the drivers on SFR. By shifting SFR closer to BU, we are actually creating more green space along the Charles River.

C: Abby Brown (AB): Hi, my name is Abby Brown. This is my first meeting and I wanted to point out a couple of things regarding the Franklin Street footbridge. Right now when you are exiting the footbridge to get onto Cambridge Street it is very dangerous. I want to encourage you to look at the

dismount of that bridge and how people get on and off with connections to new bicycle facilities. I also encourage you to look at the footbridge from a safety point of view, especially for a woman alone late at night.

A: NCC: The BRA has spoken with us regarding the neighborhood side of the Franklin Street footbridge and the dangers there. The woman who is leading the design of the Franklin Street footbridge is also very aware of the safety concerns.

C: AB: I understand you are preserving some of the parkland but I would like you to consider that a park with a rumbling highway on either side of you is not very enjoyable as parkland.

C: John Dempsey (JD): My name is John Dempsey and I live in Brookline Village. My concern is that there is not bus transit access to West Station from the Commonwealth Avenue side. My second comment is that the bicycle path from Harry Agganis Way would be better suited to connect via St. Paul Street. St. Paul Street to Buick Street is the desire line rather than Pleasant Street to Harry Agganis Way. Thank you.

C: Rebecca Albrecht (RA): My name is Rebecca Albrecht and I live on Naples Road in Brookline. I've been advocating for a crosswalk at Naples Road to Alcorn Street for a long time. Naples Road is a thoroughfare for cyclist and it is a strong desire line. I'm wondering if you could consider moving the connection from Malvern Street to West Alcorn Street.

C: NCC: Thank you Rebecca.

C: Robert La Tremouille (RLT): My name is Robert La Tremouille. I have a lot of experience with environmental transportation work in Cambridge and around the Charles River. I like the MassDOT proposal. The MassDOT 3K Concept is significantly improving the transportation situation on Cambridge Street and SFR. You are creating an access to SFR from the Grand Junction area for cars. By adding the ramps, you are taking a lot of traffic off of the Cambridge Street and SFR intersection. I think that is an excellent idea. My second comment is an environmental one. If the ABC Concept was to go through, it would destroy the river bank along the Charles River. The Amateur Planner Concept fits in with the DCR proposal to destroy hundreds of trees along the Charles Rivers edge. The lovely People's Pike may be helping Boston but it is destroying Cambridge.

A: NCC: Thank you Bob. We recognize each scheme has its own positives and negatives.

C: Steve Bercu (SB): My name is Steve Bercu, I am a Cambridge resident, and I serve on the board of the Boston Cyclist Union (BCU). I would like to echo the observation that the MassDOT Concept seems to be an overbuilt set of new roadways. I encourage you to look for ways to put road diets into effect and create a more livable scale. I am also concerned that this could end up looking like a Houston type neighborhood. I saw some good accommodations for people walking and biking along the Charles River

but I didn't see any good accommodations for people who want to simply hangout and enjoy the space along river. Thank you.

A: NCC: Thank you Steve. I think we should avoid being down on Houston too much, you never know when there could be a Texan in the audience. We have presentations posted on the project website that address traffic in detail. We are not just paving because we love pavement.

Q: Matt Carty (MC): My name is Matt Carty. I want to thank MassDOT and the team for all their hard work and for refining the plan since last time we met. I'm having trouble seeing the lane width on SFR in the proposed concept. Does it say 12'?

A: CC: We are not changing the lane widths on SFR. We're just shifting the roadway.

Q: MC: I think it would be an opportunity lost to not reduce the lane widths to 11'. One thing the Amateur Planner Concept does is eliminates the steep grades on the highway which reduces a lot of greenhouse gases. When we look at the total cost of ownership, not just construction cost, it makes a significant difference. Are you looking at changes in grades relating to greenhouse gases as environmental issues as part of this project?

A: MOD: Yes.

C: MC: Thank you, that is good to hear.

C: John S. Allen (JSA): My name is John S. Allen and I am a member of the Waltham Bicycle Committee, a board member of the Charles River Wheelman and Bicycle Club, and I am a former resident of North Allston. Could you please show slide 19. My concern is that the People's Pike has been removed. If you are traveling from the North Allston neighborhood to the Charles River you have to cross five intersections. The concept seems to be that if you put all the bicycles on one side you solve the problem. Bicycle crashes occur at intersections much more than anywhere else. The delays for bicycles will also be substantial. If bicycles can be convinced to wait for the traffic signals, it will double their travel time. You have the opportunity to build a new neighborhood completely from scratch with a grade separated path along the Turnpike. This has been proposed by Ari Ofsevit and the People's Pike. I am pleased with the improvements at the Franklin Street footbridge especially the option for Braintree Street. I am also pleased with the new ideas that have gone into West Station. I've been accused of being a hardcore road bicyclist and that's why I'm not in favor of the cycle tracks. This is about safety and convenience of travel. There are cases in which cycle tracks work but I think in this case you are asking too much of bicyclist by the way of intersection hazards. Thank you very much.

C: Bram Peterson (BP): My name is Bram Peterson and I am a BU student. From the perspective of BU students who live in Brookline I think extending the pedestrian pathway one block further from Pleasant Street to Buick Street make a big difference. The Harry Agganis Way intersection is clunky.

In terms of the alternative solutions, the ABC Concept looked at more of the at-grade solutions and the BRA mentioned the long term planning process. If we don't build an at-grade solution for the viaduct section now, it's going to be really hard or impossible to do it in the future. If we could get the roadway at-grade and place bicycles and pedestrians over, it would greatly increase the ease for commuters that use that area.

A: NCC: Thank you Bram. We have some very strong bicycle advocates as part of our Task Force. They have voiced their concerns with particular intersections relating to conflicts with cars. Our goal is to use the new MassDOT *Separated Bike Lane and Planning Design Guide* to treat those intersections. Bicycle safety is at the top of the list for us. Nick Gross, my assistant rides his bicycle from Lower Allston to our office in Beacon Hill every day and regularly reminds me of this.

C: Mitch Heineman (MH): I would like to echo what a few other people said. Harry Agganis Way is a very awkward crossing. The crossing over West Station works great if you're coming westbound and heading north by bicycle. If you are heading southbound, the Harry Agganis Way to Pleasant Street connection is very bad. Babcock Street would be a great connection. Malvern Street would be very dangerous for people heading south to Packard's Corner. Increasing bicycle traffic on Malvern Street is not a good idea. Separated bicycle signalization would help address some of the intersection problems as well.

A: NCC: We are looking at separated bicycle signalization as part of this project.

Q: Christian Newes (CN): When will West Station be completed? Will it be completed in the next few years?

A: NCC: It is a difficult question because identifying funding for each component to this project is something that is still being worked on. We are currently advancing the entire thing as one project. I would not expect to see West Station advance any sooner than the other components of the project. We are planning it all as a single unit.

C: CN: Rome wasn't built in a day.

A: NCC: If it was we would have hired their contractor.

Q: CN: Do you think the north-south rail link will happen? If so, when will it happen?

A: NCC: It is a bit outside of our scope, but I would like to see it done.

C: CN: Thank you.

Q: Joe Difazio (JD): My name is Joe Difazio. I have two questions. Besides future decking, what are the pros of having the Turnpike at-grade? My second question is what type of development is anticipated for this new area?

A: NCC: In terms of having the Turnpike at-grade, it does create a better view shed. One of the things that is tough about this project is that even when the Turnpike is lowered, other elements still need to remain high. A lower Turnpike also may create more convenient connections which is one of the reasons MassDOT has committed to continue evaluating it. In terms of future developments, that is a question between the landowner (Harvard) and the BRA. Our goal as the MassDOT team is to not dictate what that development will be but rather to maximize the range of successful opportunities that can come out of what we are constructing.

C: Larry Lebowitz (LL): My name is Larry Lebowitz. I am a relatively new transplant to Boston after spending the last 30 years in Dallas, Texas *[laughter]*. I would like to say that after living here for four years, Boston is superior to Dallas in many ways. One exception however is moving around by car. The traffic here is much worse by comparison; Cambridge Street is really terrible. I'm concerned that if you increase the volume of traffic onto the Cambridge Street Bridge over the Turnpike it could make things even worse. The obvious solution in my opinion is the car connection over the BPY at Malvern Street. I would like to voice my support for that idea. I would like to close by saying that this is the first one of these meetings I've ever attended and I find it extraordinary to see the amount of work, thought, and care that has gone into this. I want to thank you and the project team for all the work you've done.

C: NCC: You are very welcome. You will be happy to know that the north-south vehicular connection you spoke of is being analyzed as part of the MEPA certificate associated with this project.

C: Ken Kruckemeyer (KK): Hi my name is Ken Kruckemeyer. I am a board member of the LivableStreets Alliance and a Boston resident. I would like to start by quoting Dennis Baker who said that all three schemes are very feasible. With that said, I would like to suggest that your task is not to choose one concept but to put the best of all three alternatives together and create a fourth alternative. It seems to me that in the process analyzing all three concepts, you're going to see that the Amateur Planner and the ABC Concepts rise to the top when it comes to construction staging. The big picture here is that the entire project is still far from sufficient. The placemaking slide is the key to determining how the new street network will work as a hierarchy. It is important that the streets that will be filled with traffic will not be the same roads that are being used by bicycles and pedestrians. In creating a hierarchy of streets, we can then make streets that are truly pleasant for non-motorized users. West Station also has a long ways to go. Right now, West Station primarily has bus drop-off access. It needs to be easy to walk and bike to as well. I think it is important that West Station be developed from a different perspective; it needs to be a real place. Placemaking should start at West Station. Thank you.

C: Ari Ofsevit (AO): My name is Ari Ofsevit, I am a Cambridge resident, and create of the Amateur Planner Concept. I think it's great that we are having this discussion and that MassDOT is carrying the two additional concepts forward. There are benefits to each concept and we need to have a strong discussion of what we are going to do to get the best from all three. Thank you for this forum and I look forward to working with you further in the upcoming weeks and beyond.

C: NCC: Thank you Ari.

C: Fred Salvucci (FS): My name's Fred Salvucci. I mostly want to say thank you to MassDOT and the project team. This project is looking a lot better since the last time you presented to the public. I think this needs a 3D model for people to really understand the complicated engineering and geometry of this. Secretary Stephanie Pollack deserves a big thank you for advancing all three alternatives into the environmental process. There are two issues that haven't been talked about as much. The first is the need for rail transit and the second is the constructability issue. The Allston-Brighton area is suffering from terrible congestion now due to a very bad decision that was made 50 years ago when the Turnpike was built. We've been living with a single commuter rail track since the stations in Allston and Brighton were removed. This has created a situation where a lot more people have to be in their cars. This is our chance to get serious rail service into the western corridor with two tracks. I think it's very important that your model includes the addition of a two track commuter rail service. We're building something that is going to be here for at least 50 years. The streets you are designing are more like Houston than Boston. It's because you design the streets based on the amount of traffic the model tells you. The problem is that models are dumb. Models do what you tell them. If you don't tell the model that there are two extra tracks that are carrying people on trains, it won't consider it.

My second point relates to the process during construction which includes the process of how the rail gets built. Today you can get in and out of the site because of the tunnel access off of Cambridge Street. It is important that the sequence of how West Station and the layover yard get built. You suspect you will need access via Malvern Street during construction as well as afterwards. Long before West Station is operational, this layover yard is going to be a construction site. I think it is going to need more access than what you are showing. I am a big fan of the at-grade alternatives and I think the further analysis will show that the at-grade option through the throat will be the best way to construct this. It was mentioned earlier that all of the alternatives are relatively the same once you get west of Harry Agganis Way. In truth, Ari's plan allows for lower grades throughout the entire West Station area. Thank you for the time, this is really great work.

C: Marc Ebuna (ME): My name is Marc Ebuna and I am with TransitMatters. I'm getting a number of comments from folks on our board via Twitter. We are slightly discouraged but also hopeful for north-south bus service by way of Malvern Street. I recognize that certain property owners in that area are opposed of that. We are very support of having transit connectivity through West Station and allowing any of the urban ring services to improve connectivity.

A: NCC: We are looking at a bus connection on Malvern Street. We have been scoped to do that through the MEPA certificate.

Q: ME: TransitMatters prefers Ari's plan particularly. One of the key benefits of Ari's plan is that it keeps Grand Junction service conflict free from the Worcester Line service. We also would like to see prioritized bus lanes. I just came back from Chicago and they are removing two lanes to place a protected cycle track with island bus stops. Is the rearrangement of bus routes being scoped as part of this project?

A: MOD: Not at present.

C: ME: We would love to see that as part of the present scope and in conjunction with any service that is going through West Station.

C: NCC: Thank you Marc. At this time, I am going to begin calling up task force members who would like to comment or ask questions.

C: Tom Nally (TN): My name is Tom Nally and I am representing ABC. ABC has advocated for as many transportation elements as possible to be placed at-grade for as long of a distance as possible. Our goal with this is to lower the bridges, support future economic development, and most importantly, to reduce the cost. We believe that the configuration we developed will help reduce the construction and lifecycle cost of the project. As a point of clarification, we don't believe it is necessary to fill in the Charles River as part of our plan. We would like to see the water sheet remain at the same width it is today. We are proposing a vertical wall at the river's edge which would not encroach on the water sheet. We are also proposing to cantilever over the water and not in the water. We are very pleased that MassDOT has decided to carry both the ABC and Amateur Planner Concepts along with the MassDOT concept. Thank you.

C: Rich Parr (RP): Hi my name is Rich Parr, I am a task force member, and I live on Bagnal Street in Lower Allston. I want to thank project team and MassDOT, particularly the higher level staff as MassDOT for the decision to carry the three options forward. It allows us more time to work and refine each option to create the best option possible. I think there is an opportunity to reach consensus on a single preferred at-grade alternative. At the same time, we have spent a lot of time talking about "throat section" for each of these alternatives and there are a lot of other issues that are still on the table. I am glad to see you are studying a vehicular and transit connection on Malvern Street. Let us help you to develop and refine the alternatives further, thank you.

C: Harry Mattison (HM): My name is Harry Mattison. I want to thank Mike and the MassDOT team for all the progress we made in 2015. In 2016, I hope that we will have a lot more focus on the neighborhood issues. We haven't spent enough time talking about how this project makes your life better if you live on Wadsworth, Pratt, Linden, or Hopedale Street. I think we need to get back to those

types of issues. It's great to talk about land use but we need to spend a lot more time thinking about something more than a wall in someone's backyard as noise mitigation. We need to spend more time discussing the real quality of life solutions such as decking over the rail yard or decking over the Turnpike. This project is great for people who want to drive on the Turnpike from Worcester to their job in the Boston but it needs to be great for people who live in this neighborhood. Thank you.

C: Alana Olsen (AOL): Hello everyone, my name is Alana Olsen. I am the executive director of Allston Village Main Streets which is a small non-profit which works to support community and economic development in Allston Village. I want to echo some of the comments made by Harry and Rich. First off I want to say thank you. We've made incredible progress with a focus in the "throat" area. Unfortunately, the progress in the "throat" area is not the real progress that we need to see in order to justify the fact that you are placing the Turnpike closer to people's homes. There has been no consideration of a new north-south connection; we haven't seen any results from any studies discussing that connection. People need to be able to walk across Linden Street. There has been no discussion of how we are going to reduce the traffic impacts in the existing neighborhood. We've spent so much time talking about reducing the traffic impacts for a future neighborhood. This project will not be seen as a successful unless it mitigates the serious impacts of the Turnpike that exist today. I understand that you are studying a new north-south connection but you need to also be improving the existing connections such as the Franklin Street footbridge. Some additional issues that have already been touched on include traffic impacts specifically commercial traffic. Harvard Avenue is a very narrow street and commercial traffic exits the Turnpike and uses Harvard Avenue. Harvard Avenue is so narrow that it only has sharrows on one side of the street. I would like us to get to a point where we begin making commitments to mitigate these types of situations. Thank you.

C: Galen Mook (GM): Hello, my name is Galen Mook. I want to say thank you for the folks who have been working on this and the higher ups at MassDOT for making the decision to continue evaluating all three alternatives. I won't repeat what Alana just said but I will second it. The detriment of the Turnpike is well beyond the north side of the Turnpike. Every tractor-trailer that exits at the Allston interchange and is heading southbound uses Harvard Avenue. The scope is too small if it ends at the Cambridge Street and Harvard Avenue intersection. The fact that the scope doesn't touch any of the bridges across the Charles River and doesn't make a connection north-south is also a problem. We have a much better plan compared to the last public information meeting. You are doing a really good job. However, you aren't tackling the choke points. If the bridges that were supposed to be built four years ago aren't touch we are going to be stuck with crappy traffic. Decking around West Station would be very nice and contribute to a nice place. I don't think the project team understands what it is going to feel like to come off a bicycle path and hit the first stop light of post Turnpike traffic. I don't think Malvern Street is going to be the solution to a north-south connection either. It could be a solution but it won't be the solution. It is going to dump more traffic into Packard's Corner which is already a mess. I want to encourage you to look at a connection on Harry Agganis Way or Babcock Street. I want to finish by commenting that John S. Allen seemed to be supportive of a separated bicycle path. That was amazing. He is totally right, it's not going to be pleasant to ride here. We are not going to get the 8 to

80 year old crowd riding here if you have to cross five intersections. At the next public information meeting let's front load the bicycle and pedestrian conversation and then we can figure out the construction staging after. Thank you, we really appreciate it.

C: Jessica Robertson (JRO): Hi, I'm Jessica Robertson, I'm a task force member, and I live in North Allston. There are two things I would like to raise. The first is that I would like to second the Allston not Houston idea. We've had this conversation many times about the traffic models. The fact is that we don't care. The model is going to say one thing and it is too big. The traffic that exists today is on narrower streets than what is being proposed. It sucks but people live through it. The reason that most of us got involved in this process is being we were mobilized by Cambridge Street and how terrible it is as a place for people to live. You're proposing an entire street grid of new, wider Cambridge Streets. That is unacceptable. I can't be a member of the task force and go back to the community and then them that this was the best we could do. The other thing I wanted to say was that we have six lanes of traffic on the existing Turnpike; not eight. It's very miserable for people coming inbound but it's actually working just fine for people going outbound. We have a lot of very good data on traffic counts and speeds. Something that should be added to the mix immediately is a seven lane mainline in the "throat" section. Thank you.

C: NCC: Thank you everyone for staying so late. Happy holidays.

Next Steps

The next task force session is scheduled for 6PM on December 17, 2015 at the Fiorentino Community Center. The Fiorentino Community Center is located at 123 Antwerp Street in Allston. All task force sessions are open to the public.

Appendix 1: Meeting Attendees

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Thomas	Adamien	Community Member
Rebecca	Albrecht	Community Member
John S.	Allen	Waltham Bicycle Committee
Dennis	Baker	HNTB
George	Batchelor	MassDOT
Joe	Beggan	Task Force Member
Steve	Bercu	BCU
Jacques	Bignet	Community Member
Scott	Bosworth	MassDOT
Eric	Brass	Community Member
Abby	Brown	Community Member
Preston	Buehrer	Community Member
Nathaniel	Cabral-Curtis	Howard Stein Hudson
Matthew	Cadwallader	Community Member
Chris	Calnan	TetraTech
Daniela	Cardenas	BCU
Cynthia	Carleo	Geocomp.
Kathryn	Carlson	LSA
Matt	Carty	Community Member
Kuok	Chiang	MassDOT D6
Kin	Chow	Community Member
Henry	Cohen	Community Member
Dennen	Crosby	CSS
Paul	Culeighton	APAC
Donny	Daily	MassDOT Gov Affairs
Jake	Dempsey	Community Member
John	Dempsey	Community Member
Jeff	Dietrich	LSA
Joe	DiFazio	Community Member
Stacey	Donahoe	MassDOT
Courtney	Dwyer	MassDOT D6
Marc	Ebuna	TransitMatters

Serge	Fedorovsky	Community Member
Paola	Ferrer	Task Force Member
Jonathan	Fertig	DotBike
Lorenz	Finison	CRW
Jake	Friedland	Daily Free Press
Richard	Fries	MassBike
Heather	Fuller	VHB
Dan	Gastler	Community Member
Jim	Gillooly	Task Force Member
Arcady	Goldmints-Orlor	TransitMatters
David-Marc	Goldstein	Community Member
Anna	Greenfield	Skanska
Patrick	Greenwell	Community Member
Joe	Grilli	HNTB
David	Grissino	BRA
Nick	Gross	Howard Stein Hudson
Jena	Guinn	Community Member
Jasmine	Guinta	Community Member
Karl	Haglund	Task Force Member
Leslie	Haines	Parsons
David	Hall	Community Member
Libby	Hanna	Community Member
Jerry	Harrison	Parsons
Gabriela	Hauser	Community Member
Mike	Hauser	Pedego Boston
Mitch	Heineman	Community Member
Greg	Hum	Community Member
Ed	Ionata	TetraTech
Doug	Johnson	BCU
Scott	Johnston	Community Member
James	Keller	TetraTech
Erin	Kenuha	MassDOT
Jon	Kraft	Community Member
David	Kroup	Community Member
Ken	Kruckemeyer	LSA
John	Laadt	City of Boston

Wendy	Landman	Task Force Member
Joanne	LaPlant	BAIA
Paul	Larrabee	Community Member
Robert	LaTremouille	FOWG
Elizabeth	Leary	Task Force Member
Larry	Lebowitz	Community Member
Oscar	Lopez	Task Force Member
Amy	Mahler	Task Force Member
Clany	Main	Task Force Member
Erik	Maki	TetraTech
Carol	Martinez	Task Force Member
Harry	Mattison	Task Force Member
Galen	Mook	Task Force Member
Thomas	Nally	Task Force Member
Paul	Nelson	Task Force Member
Christian	Newes	Community Member
Mike	O'Dowd	MassDOT
Ari	Ofsevit	Task Force Member
Alana	Olsen	Task Force Member
Rich	Parr	Task Force Member
Joan	Pasquale	PCB6, Inc.
Bram	Peterson	BU Student
Ian	Phillips	Community Member
Jon	Ramos	SouthieBikes
Matt	Robare	Allston/Brighton TAB
Jessica	Robertson	Task Force Member
Fred	Salvucci	Community Member
John	Sanzone	Community Member
Stefaine	Seskin	Task Force Member
Mark	Shamon	VHB
Zachary	Shedlock	Community Member
Bob	Sloane	WalkBoston
Skip	Smallridge	CSS
Karen	Smith	Community Member
Mark	Stewart	LSA
Loren	Stolow	Community Member

Arthur	Strang	Community Member
Abby	Swaine	Brookline Public Transportation Advisory Committee
Tony	Timperes	Community Member
Pedro	Villanuera	Community Member
Renata	Von Tscharner	CRC
Chris	Wagner	Community Member
Al	Wallis	Community Member
Emma	Walters	Task Force Member
Gene	Wayne	Community Member
Dustin	Weigl	Community Member
Brent	Whelan	Community Member
Bill	Whitman	Community Member
Andreas	Wolfe	MassBike
Kevin	Wright	Task Force Member
Sheila	Yancy	MassDOT
Joseph	Zina	Community Member