MEMORANDUM |

To:	Michael O'Dowd Project Manager	Date:	January 21, 2016
From:	Elizabeth Flanagan Howard Stein Hudson	HSH Project No.:	2013061.14
Subject:	MassDOT Highway Division Allston I-90 Interchange Improvement Project Place-making Subcommittee #2 Meeting Notes of January 20, 2016		

Overview

On January 20th, 2016 members of the Allston I-90 Interchange Improvement Project Team and MassDOT staff associated with the job held the second place-making subcommittee meeting. Generally speaking, the place-making subcommittee is comprised of members of the task force in addition to consultants from the Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA) and the Cecil Group.[1] The purpose of the place-making subcommittee is, through the application of its members' in-depth knowledge, to assist and advise the BRA, and Cecil Group to ensure that the transportation options developed by MassDOT do not impinge on the City of Boston or Harvard University's future ability to create a unique district in the Beacon Park Yard parcel which, among other things, allows effective property development, respects and harmonizes with the adjoining neighborhoods of Allston, and provides an open space/public realm system which ties Allston to its riverfront.

The purpose of the meeting summarized herein was for the BRA and Cecil Group to continue the place-making discussion on the topic of mobility and connectivity. The BRA and Cecil Group began with a brief presentation of street and block grid typologies, followed by open dialogue with the entire group. Three main typologies for thinking about connectivity through the street grid and blocks were described. First, a consistent grid system, akin to South Boston, would provide greater flexibility for mobility choices and future development. However, in this project, the irregular shapes of parcels and layout of major infrastructures make this option challenging. The second concept is a hierarchical approach, in which a street or streets are the focal point, such as Cambridge Street, coupled with a tertiary system of secondary roadways. This option was compared to the Back Bay. Finally, a disconnected system, similar to the Southwest Corridor Park, would create a system where vehicle connections do not necessarily all align or connect through blocks, creating some connections which are exclusive to pedestrians and cyclists.

[1] A listing of task force membership can be found at: http://www.massdot.state.ma.us/highway/HighlightedProjects/AllstonI90InterchangeImprovementProject/TaskForceMembers.aspx

Concerns about traffic modeling were raised, regarding whether the models can reflect future impacts of improved transit and whether this might lead to overbuilding of the roadway infrastructure. In addition there were questions about whether commercial truck traffic is taken into account separately in the modeling, given the specific peak times of deliveries.

The other major concern raised during the meeting was that the number of lanes on major axis through the project area remains too wide. One analogy used throughout the meeting was the image of a fire hose funneling traffic along one or two major routes. The idea of dispersing traffic rather than merely moving the nozzle of the hose was touched upon. It is worth noting that one of the goals of MassDOT and its consultant team from the beginning of the project has been to provide an interchange type which disperses traffic rather than concentrating it at two outlets onto Cambridge Street as does today's configuration.

Other key conversations focused on the implications of where the limited access line would fall between Cambridge Street and I-90 and how its position would impact north-south connections locally and regionally. Also of note was a revived interest in Cambridge Street and Cambridge Street South as a one-way pair. This option would allow both streets to be narrower, but was originally dismissed by taskforce membership as bad for transit buses. Likewise, and particularly apropos of the upcoming BRA meeting on February 3rd, the one-way pair may have property development implications. Task force members were pleased that the place-making consultants had incorporated feedback from the last meeting about the importance of the Charles Riverfront Park and connections to the park and hoped that similar care would be taken in the current discussion of connectivity. A final place-making working session will be held on February 3rd which will focus on development and quality of open spaces.

Detailed Meeting Minutes[2]

Dave Grissino (DG): Thanks for coming out to our second place-making meeting. I'm David Grissino with the BRA. We're going to do a couple of different things tonight. First a summary of what we took away from our meeting last time and then I'll turn it over to Steve and Josh to talk about the mobility and connectivity topics.

We heard a lot about this last time and it is becoming more and more a part of our thinking: we're thinking about this entire area and all the various things happening in and around this area and how this area impacts our thinking and MassDOT's project. We're continuing to build our understanding.

Last time, we talked about the importance of an expanded river park and open spaces that would connect to and support that river front. Throughout the process of the last couple of years and talking through the details, we've maintained this but we want to communicate what we've taken away last

[2] 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.

week. This expanded river front area—we came into this last week thinking it might be one of a series of different types of open space organizers—what we took away is that it should be a part of all of them. It is the center piece of thinking about open spaces. It is a regional resource and an existing resource available to you on day one. Everything we explore moving forward will have this as a central point.

The second piece we took away from last week was not just the open spaces themselves but your ability to get to them. Not just along the river but existing and future assets such as the Harvard Greenway in the IMP and the future research campus build out. This is just a diagram, not overlaying on the existing geometries; that's intentional. We'll get to that point when we get into alternatives analysis.

But we are recognizing that there is a structure here; the open space and river. As we look at different open space ideas, all of those ideas will build on top of this concept structure. We'll look at what it means to have a focal point at the middle of this crossroads of the district as part of the system. It could operate as part of the utilities system, like the Greenway does, as much as an open space resource for storm water management. So we want to think of open space at many levels at this major cross road of east west and north south directions. Similarly, we could distribute the open space system and cluster those spaces. Steve had examples from other places that you can see one from the other. We'll look at ideas that build on the major north south axis.

Last time we brought 6 or 7 open space types and we have brought these 3 back as ones we thought were important. The third one is the linear open space system. Along these two major lines we would have more continuous bands of open space. They would be interrupted by the street grid but provide the ability to have a more robust street canopy and can be used to construct open space. This is just how we're beginning to think about the outcomes of our meeting from you. We realize how important the river front is to you and how we can use the circulation for east-west and north-south. This is incomplete because we haven't had the conversation of mobility, transit, and bike mobility and the third meeting will be on block structure. All of those will go together, building on this structure. We heard you and I want to give you a sense of how we'll use the outcomes from these meetings.

These are a couple of other diagrams. The themes are the same. We knew from the start that a multimodal system of paths is needed connecting different recourses in the area, neighborhoods to river, neighborhoods to each other, institutions to institutions; we want to use those to structure conversations about development in February. Mobility and transit will absolutely be a part of those conversations. I'll leave it to Steve and Josh to talk more about that.

We have a number of people here from the BRA who will be participating in future meetings. In addition to Tad and myself we have Doug, who is a transportation specialist at the BRA, Jill Zick, our staff landscape architect; and many of you know Gerald Autler who is a senior planner and project manager who has worked with Harvard's Institution Master Plan and other efforts. These are people who know the geography and topics well. I will turn it over

C: Harry Mattison (HM): I want to say thanks; that was great. It feels wonderful to be heard so well and feel like we're on the same page.

C: Steve Cecil (SC): We'll be talking about connectivity from the standpoint of place-making. You all have been talking a lot from a transportation perspective, how we move and the kinds of streets paths you use that are place-making. They set the stage for other things. There has been an appropriate focus on primary connectors between the highways, local streets and transit; there will be a secondary system that hasn't emerged yet. It's a much richer brew so we have to think about how that's going to fit into place-making as well. Josh is going to walk through rebuilding the logic before going into alternative ways of thinking about street grid, transportation, connectivity and place-making.

C: Josh Fiala (JF): Thanks Steve. We're trying to pack a lot into this presentation but I'll go quickly so we can get to a conversation about space and mobility quickly. The major considerations are what are we connecting and what are the aspects of that, but also what are the characteristics of street widths and the hierarchy that evolves from it. We're trying to parse things together thinking about present and future design considerations. And finally cross section.

What are we connecting? The major issues we've heard again and again are pedestrian/bicycle connectivity to the Charles River, multi-modal connectivity focused around West Station, connections from Soldier's Field Road and I-90 and the traffic implications, and the connections between north and south Allston. They are complicated connections from a regional perspective, local perspective and more neighborhood perspective with features in places that people are trying to get to and through the system.

C: SC: Again, this is that ½ mile walking radius we're showing which is such a useful reference for understanding how far the average pedestrian is willing to go.

C: JF: Looking again at connectivity to the Charles River with a focus on the Cambridge Street Bridge and the flyover pedestrian connection a little bit further down Soldier's Field Road. There's a gap between those two which we could explore for potential additional connections relating back to that open space conversation we had. There are also some potential options to follow the Grand Junction Bridge and create connections there that are explored in the alternatives.

This is from a bicycle circulation standpoint. In terms of multimodal connectivity around West Station, the bus routes right now skirt the study area on Cambridge Street, Brighton Ave. and Commonwealth Ave, the Green Line making connections across from our study area south, bus connectivity across towards Malvern Street, making that connection from a citywide transportation perspective. How that multimodal activity relates north to Harvard Allston campus with some Stadium Way options which were recently submitted to the City on the November 15th status report.

C: DG: Let me explain a little bit about what that is. As part of Harvard University's IMP, there was a requirement to advance the thinking about Stadium Way within two years of the approval of the IMP. Those two years was up in November of 2015; the requirement was to have a complete 25% design for

Stadium Way so we could start to get an understanding of the thinking and how we were going to be implementing that.

The report from Harvard filled the requirement and introduced a number of alternatives shown here, envisioning different ways to think about Stadium Way. It is causing several people to think about what Stadium Way is and what it means within the district but also within the Allston area. There were a number of concepts put forward in that report. The report I believe is available on the BRA's website. It basically walks through some cross sections and ways of thinking about street hierarchy- not just Stadium Way but other areas within the district. They have a relationship to the transit and transportation concepts. Those roads as connectors through the district will work well from a pedestrian/bicycle perspective but their character and the nature of them is something we'll want to continue to talk about.

C: JF: Thanks David. Here we're looking at the connection between Soldier's Field Road and I-90, which has impacts on pedestrian, bicycle and vehicles, especially during the AM/PM peaks. Here we're highlighting the inbound from I-90 to Soldier's Field Road movements both east and westbound have implications on the roadway network and also leaving from Soldier's Field Road to I-90 both eastbound and westbound. One of the aspects once we start thinking about how a hierarchy could be introduced to the system is focusing highway access potentially onto or away from Cambridge Street. Thinking about how that street is used; connections between Soldiers' Field Road and I-90 in their current locations and a focus on eastbound travel. One thing that could be explored is a westbound entrance into the study area as a potential bypass to Cambridge Street. That would obviously have pretty broad ranging implications on the design of the study area but there might be worthwhile to think about.

Connectivity between north and south Allston neighborhoods and from west to east depending on the pedestrian bridge design and then connections to West Station on Malvern, Babcock and Agganis Way. There might be some potential to explore about the gap between the rhythm of those connections and future air rights development.

Shifting gears and using the nomenclature of typologies, we have some similar typologies to think about for street and block types. This is a conversation about street characteristics and widths. The design of the current widths have been driven up by traffic and engineering to solve issues of traffic flows and movements. From a place-making district perspective, more of a top-down approach, there can be a subsequent system wide basis and approach that we'll go through applied on top of that system.

This is a slide we presented in December about street types that can be identified following Complete Streets guidelines in Boston. We're looking at the surrounding context of Complete Streets and street types. I'll get into it a little more on Cambridge Street, but looking at system wide block types, this is a similar matrix of pros and cons. The three main types are consistent grid and block system for the streets themselves and the blocks themselves to gives flexibility in choice for mobility and development; the hierarchical approach putting a focus on Cambridge Street or others and then a series of secondary

tertiary streets; and then maybe a focus on a street or streets that maybe has one east-west connector and one north-south connector.

There are examples across the city; the South Boston neighborhood fabric is quite consistent, the Back Bay has good hierarchy between Commonwealth Ave and the various other streets, in the South End Tremont street is a good focal street. There are also disconnected types, akin to the North End or more suburban contexts; they have connections that don't go through blocks or align at intersections. That may or may not be valid in this context. Another option is really a secondary system of mobility for bicycles and pedestrians using a greenway or other grid system laid over top of the vehicular system.

From a diagrammatic perspective, we've taken each of those types for a test drive. This is from a district-wide perspective, to think about how that type wants to be organizing the streets, both those that exist and have yet to be designed. How can all those roadways, current and future, contribute to a more consistent grid type?

C: SC: There's differentiation of uses but you're trying to get everything balanced. From a transportation standpoint there are challenges associated with that but from an urban design standpoint, for example Portland Oregon, everything is very regular. A level playing field creates interesting network. That's one way to start thinking about those secondary streets; how are we going to get balance?

C: JF: You can see here that it begins to break down into more consistent blocks but there are the conflicting geometries of Cambridge Street and the alignment of I-90 and West Station that will lead to some incongruities in the blocks. That's as opposed to other approaches like a hierarchical approach, focusing on Cambridge Street. The east connector, Stadium Way, and the west connector, Seattle Street have the main north- south connections and then of course Cambridge Street South.

There would be a tertiary set of street which would be built in the future that further break up the blocks, naturally falling in the hierarchy at a lower level. This is probably similar to what the design will be.

The third option is the focal street or streets. If we look at Cambridge Street and Cambridge Street South as the major east-west connectors and then also looking at a street, like Stadium way, as a north-south connector that would connect Cambridge Street and Cambridge Street South. All the other streets would take on new characteristics from those focal streets.

The disconnected type we did test out but at this block scale, it's likely that there will want to be connecting streets at the secondary level. There might be interstitial connections in smaller blocks with access into a parking structure or development site, but aren't going all the way through the block. As an overall district it seemed like a bit of a nonstarter.

C: SC: There are areas of Boston that look like this.

C: DG: I cringed when I saw this too but then you think of the South West Corridor Park, it's a very successful pedestrian and bicycle connector through the South End coming up into the Back Bay. It's successful because all those streets actually are discontinuous through that section. There may be some logic to balancing street connectivity with other modes. The system goes from Dartmouth Street and a couple of blocks over to Massachusetts Ave. It's something to weigh in the alternative analysis is to weigh the benefits of those different mobility systems. There may be places where it might make sense to have some discontinuity to have continuity for other modes.

C: JF: There can be almost a hybrid between street type/block type and an open space type. You're connecting a secondary system of pedestrian or bicycle ways that overlay and maybe have their own logic independent of the street network.

Looking through those lenses, we're trying to think about an overall district logic which is relative to the design there today. We're looking at the function of streets, number of vehicular lanes, the curb to curb distances, and how that might relate to these typologies. They might shrink or grow. If you look at overall lanes, in this case five lanes—a turn lane and two travel lanes in each direction—and compare that as a street type to the neighborhood street types in the guidelines. If we're looking at the sidewalk zone measured from the sidewalk to the property line there are about 14 feet compared to preferred Complete Streets guideline of 15.6. It's relatively consistent to Complete Streets guidelines. There are 11 foot lanes today but depending on intricacies of volume, there are some places they could go to 10 feet.

Looking at other street locations- we just picked a spot on each to show you. It's a little easier to understand pedestrian experience with these than from a plan view. When buildings come up on either side it's a reasonable pedestrian/cycling environment. We can refer back to any of these as we move on.

A couple more slides and then your feedback.

Crossings and intersection connections are a major part of the pedestrian/bicycle experience. We're looking at each main intersection in study area and trying to understand the through-lanes, turning lanes and where they are allocated. In this case, we understand that left turn lanes are pretty universally allowed throughout the study area. If certain streets want to be more enhanced for through movements at certain locations, left turn lanes at certain locations may be able to be removed.

We're also looking at the transition from highway to the city street network and access to parcels adjacent to them. Looking down the line, we're coming to understand that 3K-1 has no interstitial connecting streets. Then in 3K-2 and 3K-3, Cambridge Street South was included but more northerly aligned. Where it sits with 3K-4 it can be at this location. That means south of that line, those parcels would have to be accessed by Cambridge Street South rather than highway system. From place-making perspective it's advantageous to move that line as close to the highway for the access to those properties.

C: Tad Read (TR): What that means is that for 3K-4, the street closest to the turnpike is the point at which the streets go from being on ramps and subject to federal limited access requirements, where there can't be cross streets, and then beyond they can have cross streets. It has implications for curb cuts and the character of the street.

C: SC: From a highway perspective, you can't have people backing onto the highway. The highway doesn't shut down because of the local street system.

C: TR: How many of you have heard of the Complete Streets guidelines? All the city departments two or three years ago went through a process to develop and adopt the Complete Streets guidelines. The idea is to say that streets are intended for all users, not just cars, cyclists or pedestrians. They were designed with the idea of activating the edges of the streets. This leads us to the notion of a complete street. These are guidelines for a wide variety of streets based on streets we already have and good urban design standards. We now use the guidelines to judge street design.

Q: Jessica Roberts (JR): I want to make sure we're clear - south of Cambridge Street South there would be no curb cuts allowed? All of those parcels would have to be accessed off of Cambridge Street South and not off those streets that travel north and south?

A: Michael O'Dowd (MOD): Yes.

Q: JR: But you would be allowed to have bicycle and sidewalk access?

A: MOD: Yes.

C: JR: I don't know if you're planning to go into this later, but that has a big impact on development potential of the parcels.

C: SC: That will be the next step. It's access by vehicles that's the challenge.

C: DG: We're also seeing places were a single access point can serve two sides of the block such as the new City Target on Boylston Street in the Fenway. Depending on the uses; there might be certain uses that don't make sense there. We'll start to look at that.

C: JR: Surface any other restrictions besides curb cuts that would apply to those areas.

Q: Galen Mook (GM): Like could you have crosswalks? In Allston where we have the on ramps, things become a freeway pretty quickly. You have a sidewalk and a bus stop and then it turns into a freeway.

Q: JR: If you have buildings on both sides of the street with doorways, the distance between intersections, if you're not allowed to have crosswalk, could preclude type of development we want.

Q: DG: Can we have a crosswalk between two sides of the street that is technically limited access?

A: MOD: For the sake of example, think of option 3K4. You could place a crosswalk on the north side of those intersections, but not the south. Your bicycle and pedestrian connects could still go along the sides of those roadways.

C: JR: For that reason, the 3K-2 or 3K-3 are totally unacceptable. Because then you have a huge distance without any way to cross the street between that midpoint and the turnpike.

C: MOD: We see that.

Q: HM: How does that restriction apply to the parcel in the lower right-most corner if the section of South Cambridge Street there is an on ramp to Soldier's Field Road? Would there be able to be curb cuts right there?

A: DG: There's one being shown right now to Beacon Park Yard. I don't know if that's still considered restricted access or not.

C: Chris Calnan (CC): Depending on the development, those things could still be worked out.

C: SC: This is what we'll be looking at. Does it preclude development, challenge development or is it not a big deal? There could be adjustments but we have to figure that out.

C: DG: Just a little further down, the Double Tree Hotel doesn't have limited access but turning movements are restricted. It hasn't precluded their development but there are restrictions.

C: JF: I have a few more slides but we're already getting into good conversations.

I think it's important to go back to the throat alternatives for our conversation of open space and connectivity. The flexibility of Soldier's Field Road and the enhancement of riverfront park; the condition where I-90 is raised on the viaduct has benefits for sure. The same considerations would be made more complicated in the ABC alternative. The elevated rail Amateur Planner concept has better connectivity benefits by allowing that connection over Grand Junction for bicycles and pedestrians on the elevated structure, the People's Pike idea.

Hopefully we can introduce the conversation more cleanly than last time. What are your priorities of connectivity? Last week's conversation pointed us in a good direction for the alternatives discussion.

C: DG: So we're opening it up to any thoughts. Where we need to start to go with this? Some of the things we're starting to think about are looking back to the conversation about open space. Now we're talking about street systems and secondary streets. They have implications on how we structure open space.

Do you have any initial thoughts about street types? Ultimately, some will make sense and some won't. It's important to talk about them all and get your feedback. We need to think not just here in this geography but also expanding beyond the district. Think about people coming to the city on bike and foot and moving from place to place: Barry's corner to the Greenway to BU. Moving through a city is

moving from one memorable place to another. As we begin the think about north-south connections, we need to understand the desire lines; primary vs. secondary. What is the importance of different sites?

C: Tom Nally (TN): The comments we made on environmental form included requests to consider how to maintain the urban ring connections through this area. There is a way is could work with the viaduct; we haven't figured it out yet with an at-grade grade. In terms of connecting between Harvard, Longwood Medical, connecting via this area to other parts of Cambridge, we need to figure out a way that buses in the future can pass through the area. I don't have any particular suggestions but we'd like to see you try and work through that. It's an important future connection and we want to make sure it's not precluded by anything we decide today.

C: Bruce Houghton (BH): Most of the context of the discussion has been in the Allston/Brighton area to be developed. When you're talking about place-making, it's a place that's going to be here; it's a transportation logistics center. For instance, that's Harvard Square, Porter Square, even Chicago- that's why Chicago exists.

As Tom just said, I think you have to draw in the context the north-south connection to a logistic center, which is your place, and how that interacts with Commonwealth Ave and the structures along there, certainly BU. It is going to be station. It is going to be where people can pass through. It may be an area where you spot open space and park because usually in a logistic center there's an attractive area, not just a station- maybe small amounts of retail or something like that. I think there's a place in the middle of this development. How does it all relate to each other as a functional place?

C: GM: I'm going to pick up that track. Regarding the north-south concept, last week we prepared a handout and I'll send them around again. The concept is that we have a lot of stuff to the north and south, Harvard Square, potentially connections to Belmont and Cambridge to the north. We're really good at getting people to West Station via the highway or Cambridge Street but what about people moving through. I don't think we have an answer but I think we should be probing it with the most eyes and minds.

What will be West Station's throughput and how will that be modeled? I'm concerned that we're not modeling transit in our transportation models in the same way we're incorporating traffic. Will there be fewer cars or more? What does that mean for the number of lanes? What if there's bus rapid transit? We don't want 6 lanes of freeway on Cambridge Street. Just to bring up a couple points: we should take a hard look at north-south connections and model in where transit will impact traffic and how that plays in to street size. If Stadium Way has bus rapid transit from Harvard Square to West Station, how will that impact traffic? Without that knowledge, we can't have a good idea of street scape.

C: SC: There are transportation experts here but this is one of the things we call a step function. A few cars might make no difference but removing 2,000 cars, the impact becomes non-linear. When you have connectivity, it's going to change people's patterns and habits. It's hard to guess how that's going to work.

C: DG: Just so I understand, the arrows on the handout are desire lines; those are transit lines?

C: GM: Those are things that don't exist today; it could be whatever we're looking at. Considering all the traffic has to go on Cambridge Street to get to Harvard Ave if they're going north-south, think of where all those vehicles are going? Right now they're funneled into one specific intersection and overpass. Right now we're only modeling bikes and pedestrians but there aren't any counts for that. But what would it look like with cars and trucks? It's a regional concept; not just for the neighborhood. What would it look like if we added another interchange on Beacon Street?

C: Ari Ofsevit (AO): I agree with Galen, there are regional transit pathways to look at: the east-west, from the west suburbs I-90 corridor to Kendall Square. That's what the DMU proposes but it could even be a bus. Rather than having people go downtown to Red Line which is over capacity. The other thing is the north-south connection. If you live in the north-west suburbs and take the train to Porter, to get to BU or the LMA is a multi-stage ride.

Looking at the bicycle/pedestrian connections: the length of some of the connections and how they go from the river as an amenity and transit corridor to West Station and BU area, if you're a pedestrian and it's a half mile detour to go over a bridge, for a car that might takes a few minutes but for pedestrians and bikes that's a big detour; so drawing straighter lines. One idea is looking at the pros and cons of the ABC at-grade proposal and move the pathway along the river above grade so you can have a connection from Agganis Way to the river, creating a straight line. So really looking at different ways to have connections for bikes and pedestrians be as short and simple as possible.

C: No Name Given (NNG): I have yet to hear much conversation about commercial traffic. Storrow Drive is almost all commercial for Brighton, Allston, Brookline, up to Route 9, down to Kenmore, Fenway, and Longwood. All that truck traffic is coming off of Cambridge Street and Harvard Ave. then inbound to some smaller degree along Linden Street to get back to Cambridge Street. Almost every truck for a two mile radius has to come up Harvard Avenue. There must be some options to shunt truck traffic from the Mass Pike coming off onto the service areas over to Fenway, Kenmore, and Longwood, and alleviate that Harvard Avenue traffic. It's is only going to get worse. Trucks are unbelievable as it is. I'm concerned about that. Hasn't been a topic but I think it needs to looked at as a different class of traffic because it's just certain times of day and causes problems.

Q: DG: Thinking about that issue moving forward, there are air quality and dimensional issues when we think of access. In terms of the modeling, is there a distinction drawn between vehicle types?

A: CC: In CTPS model? Yes.

C: DG: We can try and understand this better and we have the data. We have some homework.

C: NNG: I appreciate hearing that. It's often overlooked but it's a huge area with one central road.

C: John Allen (JA): I haven't seen modeling of bicycle travel times and the affect at intersections. We need to move bicycles off the street onto something that's next to the sidewalk. That will make travel between intersections more pleasant and possibly safer. If you get to a 6 lane intersection and then you have to cross multiple of those, the delays add up.

Ari has a plan for a direct connection from West Station to the east; I've heard other people commenting on that. I would hope that there is a grade separated crossing of these streets, also to the east, and some attention to north-south travel, so you don't have the repeated delays. What is the bicycle supposed to do? Swerve across 3 lanes of traffic to make a left turn? What does a bicycle box do? That's not a safe way to make a left turn. You have to make a double move or make a turn like a vehicle, which many bicycles aren't comfortable doing. I think bicycle travel, rather than just strips, needs attention. You can't get counts because this is new but you can look at travel times and convenience. I don't think the designs I've seen address that aside from Ari's.

C: DG: One of the things we'll be looking at is more streets. With the size of the blocks now, subdivision will be necessary. We'll continue to subdivide in the north-south and east-west directions. Arguably they will be smaller intersections because of the smaller scale. If we were to have an effort to minimize width in a direction, is there a preference? Maybe there's no clear answer. But as we begin to think about secondary streets, this is an example of how discontinuous streets could be a benefit.

Q: HM: The first thing to deal with is that the primary streets are too wide. Are there any 7 lane sections? Cambridge Street?

A: NNG: There are no sections with 7 lanes.

C: HM: Even 5 and 6 lane roads, we've been saying for months from a place-making standpoint that they're a disaster. Who wants to walk or bike across them? Even if you say it's Complete Streets with a sidewalk and furniture zone, if there are 6 lanes of traffic it's no good. If the solution is to find other ways to get drivers where they're trying to go or mode shift or why do people have to take Cambridge Street to Harvard Avenue, it just doesn't make any sense. So before we start talking about secondary streets that Harvard might be going to build in 20 years we have to deal with the big issue now. If you go to the Back Bay, people say Beacon Street is overbuilt but Beacon Street is not 5 lanes wide, Boylston isn't 5 lanes wide. Only Massachusetts Ave. is 5 lanes. Here we are with 5 lanes, it's just not right.

C: JF: Just to that last point, Massachusetts Ave. for most of its distance through Boston is actually exactly this cross section of the illustration of Cambridge Street. This is the condition of Massachusetts Ave. in many locations.

C: HM: It's not 6 lanes as you cross the bridge from Cambridge certainly. I think people would say the section of Massachusetts Ave. by MIT and Kendall is a whole lot nicer an environment than Massachusetts Ave. as you get down to Boston Medical. What part would you rather walk along?

C: JF: I live on Massachusetts Ave. in the South End and I think it's perfectly nice.

Q: HM: You like that better than MIT and Central? Really?

C: SC: There's an interstate highway connected to major regional traffic. There's a fire hose basically feeding into the area. There is a tradeoff we have to come to grips with.

C: JR: this is a fundamental issue we've been fighting with for years. We have serious doubts of the traffic modeling and the transit impact. We don't know if we should be prioritizing transit improvements to try and shape a lower projection. We don't want to take a model as truth handed down from on high. You are new to the team so I'll say it again. This task force was created after the community got mobilized because Cambridge Street is an unlivable street. Today it is 6 lanes and in certain locations it has been narrowed because not all of those lanes were being used. Even that street is so unacceptable to the community that we mobilized and created this task force.

We are representing the community. I can't go back to my neighbors and say we spent 5 years going to bi-weekly meetings and came back with the same exact thing. Many people find 5 or 6 lanes an unacceptable solution. We are trying to find a solution to have narrower streets without creating a traffic Armageddon. We don't think having 5 or 6 lanes will even solve the traffic issues because we still have 3 lanes on the bridges and 2 lanes on Harvard Ave. Where are those cars going to go? There's a lot of background on the lanes.

C: Pallavi Mande (PM): I want to pick up on traffic modeling. What we believe this process is supposed to do is make this a place, not a traffic management tool. It should take back streets that haven't even been designed yet. We want these to be streets that people want to live along. That being said, I think if we could start with prioritizing bicycle/pedestrian desire lines, maybe even over where the cars want to go, and have that granular discussion of what those streets want to be, then we can see the hierarchy of currents streets. Restoring an historic parkway is different from trying to take back a neighborhood street.

That ties back to Tad's comment that Complete Streets tries to go beyond all modes. It tries to address what a city street can be. Greenscape and green streets elements I think have to be a given in everything we do from now. The desire lines need to start from the neighborhood. Not all bike/pedestrian paths have to or can be equal. We're talking about commuting or riding in the park; we need to understand how those decisions are going to be impacting how the hierarchy then gets evaluated. I would ask that that kind of thinking about existing context and hierarchical evaluations happen, and what we want to see happen.

C: Barbara Jacobson (BJ): With wide streets, regardless of whether it's a Complete Streets with sidewalks and crosswalks, it's so easy to go fast on those streets because of the peripheral vision on the sides. One image you showed was crossing 5 or 6 lanes; that could be treacherous. We should prioritize the more vulnerable users first and ensure that transit is integrated into these discussions.

C: Carol Ride-Martinez (CRM): It's hard to talk about this when we don't know the land uses and densities. For me, I think this is an area that could carry a decent amount of density. We'll hopefully be building. I don't want to see these become highways but I do think we should talk about streets that can carry density. Although it's hard to think about street grid without knowing what we want to build, we need to keep that in mind.

C: DG: That's understandable. We'll put all the pieces back together again. We've talked about Cambridge Street; maybe the width will be the same but the character will be completely different. It's a one-sided street. One-sided streets are inherently less successful. It's a one-sided street down by an irregular shape and use. Compare that to sections of Massachusetts Ave. There are dimensions and then there are qualitative. The aspect ratios, what it feels like to be on the street, are very different.

C: CRM: As I envision this neighborhood, it does handle density. For that, we will need wide streets but not driving like a cut through highway. How do we figure that out? I hope we do bring it back together again so we can look at this all together.

C: DG: We'll look at the range of options and figure out where we need to have an impact.

C: Karl Haglund (KH): This handout that we received on desire lines is unfortunately all too accurate in showing that the new riverfront park coming to a sharp point at the River Street Bridge. It want to make an attractive park that people might want to use as a park and also along the river, especially at the most dangerous part which is at River Street, I would hope that would be looked at as a part of the creation of the park and not for some future project.

C: PM: One piece we couldn't get to last time with sustainable section of open space, which I hope we'll bring that back, is if we did examine climate change scenarios it will quickly become apparent that this section is at risk for flooding, as are other section. It could use some open space to absorb flooding in the future.

C: GM: I want to apply your fire hose analogy. The Cambridge Street/Harvard Ave. intersection is atrocious because there is no pressure valve. People who live on the other side of the funnel, everything gets channeled into it. But if we poke holes into the fire hose; put some smaller hoses- I'm not a plumber. If we don't touch Harvard Ave. and Cambridge Street, if we don't touch the bridge or look at anything new, we won't solve the major issues that the traffic is funneled into a few intersections. It ruins the park and ruins our neighborhood. I am wary to say anything about adding traffic to surrounding streets but we're in a reality that if we don't have another way out we won't see it get better.

C: SC: Distributive systems distribute rather than moving the end of the fire hose.

C: GM: So let's figure out where the water is trying to go.

C: AO: Going back to context sensitivity or road widths, it looks like this road would have 6 11 foot lanes and a median so that would be around 75 feet? Having looked at the widths of roads just a second ago at other roads in the Back Bay, Massachusetts Ave is 60 feet wide; Beacon and Boylston are 48 feet wide. Newbury, Harvard, Dartmouth are in the 38-48 range.

I think Back Bay has a pretty good balance. We could argue that Beacon doesn't need 3 lanes we can look at that as context. When we look at the Seaport, it has arguably been built for vehicles and now has traffic jams. Look at building something like Back Bay with a lot of ramps and through put. Minor streets in the 36-40 foot range; maybe some up to 60 for major roads. On Massachusetts Ave that 60 includes travel lanes, parking and bike lanes. Let's try and keep things at 60 or less; ideally, streets would mostly in the 48 foot range.

C: DG: As part of our study, we cannot re-engineer the roads. What we can do is try to understand all these concepts together so we can develop our recommendations. The outcome of this study is going to be a set of recommendations and insights allowing us as an agency to be a part of the process and suggest things as we move forwards. I see people shaking their heads, you know. But I want to reiterate that. We should also try to look at what we have on that page and understand it as a part of those alternatives.

C: HM: What does re-engineer the roads mean? We're not expecting you to run CTPS models or any of that stuff. But I hope the BRA, the BTD, the City will strongly join us from a place-making, safety, vision zero standpoint, that having 60-70 foot wide roads is just the wrong thing to do.

C: DG: We can use this whole process help build a picture of what the implications are. We can show the picture that's not just about the transportation but all the other things that come along with it.

C: Richard Parr (RP): At the end of this process, it would be great if we determine that these widths don't work for the kind of development, neighborhood and place-making we want to see and therefore we need to do something about it. From our perspective, that would be a positive outcome. I know you're dealing with the hand you've been dealt. But if in your professional opinion these things are serious impediments to what we want to see, that's something we would want to hear from you.

C: DG: I would hate to have the outcome of our work be at an impasse. We need to understand it in more complexity. We can talk about modifying all these things, but if then the interchange or the regional piece doesn't work, I don't want our work to not having meaning because one fundamental part of this project is ensuring that the transportation is working at a regional level.

Q: HM: Work for who?

C: JR: There are different ways to design the interchange. We hope you'll actually have opinions and not just add a lot of things to the discussion. We want the city to say these are the ways 3K-4 serves and does not serve our goals and then work together to move forward.

C: SC: I think that's our charge. We're not just looking at the modeling. Some of it is asking the right questions of the modeling from a place-making and community perspective and do what if. We can go back to the modeling and look at it from that perspective but we have to as the right questions.

We want to make sure that the kinds of questions and recommendations lead to a good outcome. We're trying to be smart about it. From a place-making standpoint, it's important to understand we'll have a variety of types. It's a network. There is a fire hose problem at one end but it seems to use there are a lot of options. That has to be brought to the table. It could never be solved through the equations of transportation circulation. I think we're on the right track.

C: Jim Gillooly (JG): From our perspective, everyone wants South Cambridge Street to be as close to the turnpike as possible. The shorter stretches of road are, the more they have to do in a shorter distance. The shorter you make them, the more lanes you need to get them through that intersection in the time they have. One of the thoughts we have discussed is whether there's a way to connect east and west bound traffic closer to highway. That would have huge implications for the width and capacity of Cambridge Street.

There are so many moving parts; it's hard to resolve how wide a street needs to be today because we're still figuring out what each part has to manage. Some principles we'll be using is whether it does what it needs to do, is at as wide as it needs to be but not wider, does it create problems for the adjacent neighbors. We're going to be looking at how these roads and making more connections so Harvard and Cambridge Street don't have to do everything. We want to make sure the whole design is sensitive. These are great inputs but we're not at a point where we can say let's take a lane off tonight.

C: JR: There are different outcomes and impacts and the problem solving approach you're talking about is great. You're talking about what other moving pieces we can move. That's exactly what we should all be doing; not taking anything as a given but looking for solutions.

C: HM: A lot of our comment letters tried to suggest specific changes. I would love if MassDOT or this team would engage us in these discussions. What if Stadium Way was built all the way through Harvard? Today to get off the turnpike to get to Harvard Square, you have to take a connector road to a one way road to North Harvard Street, over the Anderson Bridge to Harvard Square. It doesn't work well and it's bad for the neighborhood. If you could stay on Stadium Way, that's a lot less people. Can we model that? If you took a Soldiers' Field Road outbound connection to the turnpike outbound, now that's a lot less fewer people taking Cambridge Street than the turnpike connector. Without asking your team to do extensive traffic modeling, could they at least pass a smell test to see if they provide better routes for drivers and better neighborhoods?

C: GM: We talked several months ago about looking at one-way streets.

C: DG: Those are the diagrams. Those are those plans for 3K-2/3K-3. That had a number of impacts including limited access.

C: GM: We could change limited access- I imagine that would be a discussion with the state? But we're talking about skinnier streets and intersections. How does that impact on traffic and circulation?

C: SC: That's a very logical sequence. That's why a lot of cities went to one-way streets. There are a lot of interesting intersection implications. Left hand turn channels widen everything. The more choices you have in some cases you can start to simplify things. But it's a whole network; it's complicated. The good thing about all the iterations is that there's almost always an iteration that we can poke.

C: GM: To Jim's point about all the moving parts. If we can alleviate a lot of traffic going from Soldier's Field Road to Cambridge Street, we could have a skinnier Cambridge Street. We're already doing a lot to pull traffic off Harvard via Stadium Way. My convoluted way of discussing it is to find where people are going and find ways to get there with the easiest connections. That might mean adding new off ramps, new streets. Many moving parts but I might advocate again for one way option. Now that we've seen you're really proposing 80 foot widths, let's back pedal a little.

C: JF: The implications will show in next meeting when we look at development of parcels and other considerations. If you have to go all the way around the study area to get to a parcel that will have impacts.

Q: JR: Do the models include Stadium Way and East Drive being built all the way to Western Avenue or not?

A: MOD: Yes they did.

C: PM: There was a window when MassDOT was going to introduce the conversation on resiliency and that window closed and we started with this process. The last thing we want to do is end with that conversation. I encourage you to start the development potential conversation with resiliency first. How deep are we going to be in water? If we could combine that with the next session, that would be helpful.

C: DG: There's a piece in the scope about district energy as well. We'll have to look at that again. Open space systems, district energy, storm water management, there are a number of things we can revisit. They feather in.

C: RP: I wanted to compliment something I liked in the typology section. There was a green line that ran parallel to the street; it was not connected to any street. That's the closest thing I can think of to be a People's Pike which has been talked about a lot. I like the idea that it might be possible to have something not necessarily connected to a street. At intersections it's probably also easier but possibly creates midblock challenges for cars. That served the desire line we've been thinking about in the neighborhood for a long time.

C: DG: Since day one, we've been talking about what's going to be there for the community when the MassDOT project is complete. We can talk about concepts that are immediate and those that are part of the full realization/build out. A concept like that probably has greater viability over time. But what

would it look like day one? We need to talk about both. We've heard clearly that it needs to work right away. Maybe it works differently in 10 years- places usually do. The beginning result may not be the end result.

Q: HM: Why does South Cambridge Street curve?

A: DG: There's some logic to it. If you look at the line where limited access ends, there is some benefit to get it as close to the on ramp. It's where the highway ends and the city streets begin. We want to hug as tight as possible.

C: MOD: Yes.

C: TN: It's a trade-off. If there was more space, there's more storage space for the vehicles so the widths could be narrower.

C: SC: It's an irregular shape. This is one of the diagrams that emerge easily for traffic reasons. Whether that's the right answer? But it's an easy thing to develop.

C: DG: We'll start to think about how dimensions inform how these blocks ultimately work- there might some tweaking and fine turning. There might be alignment fine tuning.

C: HM: the reason I ask is from a place-making standpoint. If we think about view corridors and this great new park along the river, it seems strange that there's no place I can stand and see that great new park on the river. We've talked about views to the public garden or other locations where you can see the great thing in the distance.

C: JG: I don't imagine you'll be able to see a great distance because you'll be at ground level.

C: JR: Right now if you're on Cambridge Street you can see the skyline. But if you're down on ground level looking down a straight street you'll still be able to see the river and the skyline.

C: HM: Those roads are elevated anyway. South Cambridge Street you're already 20 feet up above grade. Putting it out as a question, if we are trying to make this great accessible route for people to get to the river it seems strange you're not looking across to see anything but corners of buildings.

Back to street widths, we talked about north south bus connections. I want to reiterate that what's equally important to a lot of us, the basic litmus test, is it creating a connection from Cambridge Street to Commonwealth Ave. that a bus can do that little piece of the urban bring. Tom started us off there at the beginning. It's essential for West Station to work for a huge variety of reasons. You reflected on take home points from the last meeting; I hope you'll do that again. There's an incredible need for connection to Commonwealth Ave for a bus route: urban design and public safety and all the reasons for having 5 and 6 lane roads. If those are the take ways tonight then we've had a great meeting.

C: DG: In some ways, we've assumed as part of our thinking that MassDOT will be thinking about that.

C: GM: Comparing neighborhoods for typologies, I would recommend looking at surrounding neighborhoods, some are like a semi-grid. I don't know why they exist but it's great. It's kind of nice that people get lost and people don't know where the roads take them. It could be interesting. I think we point to the Seaport a lot as a failure of what could have happened. Some of it is that is the same boxes. I like my neighborhood because it feels homey.

C: PM: One reason they have curves is because of the marshes and river, where they use to be. If we want to revisit how this neighborhood grew that's something that could guide how it's built.

C: DG: Next meeting, February 3rd, same place, same time. Probably same process- we'll reflect on this meeting and how we distilled and repacked those thoughts. One thing is that I will not be here in the room. I am leaving the agency next week; that's why we have some other people here. I think Ta will be the most logical point of contact. I wanted to thank you for the opportunity to work with a number of you in Allston over the last few years.

Next Steps

The next task force meeting will be held at 5:00 PM on Wednesday, February 3rd, 2016 at the Fiorentino Community Center located at 123 Antwerp Street, Allston. This session will again feature the BRA and its consultant, the Cecil Group, as the featured guest speaker on place-making. DOT and elements of its team will be there to answer any transportation questions which arise and document the meeting, however, the presentation made and focus of discussion will be on the BRA place-making effort.

All task force sessions are open to the public.

Appendix 1: Meeting Attendees

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Harris	Band	Task Force Member
Jorge	Briones	Task Force Member
Nathaniel	Cabral-Curtis	HSH
Chris	Calnan	TetraTech
Bill	Conroy	BTD
Anthony	D'Isidoro	Task Force Member
Elizabeth	Flanagan	HSH
Jim	Gillooly	Task Force Member
David	Grissino	Task Force Member
Karl	Haglund	Task Force Member
Bruce	Houghton	Task Force Member
Barbara	Jacobson	Task Force Member
Oscar	Lopez	Task Force Member
Amy	Mahler	Task Force Member
Clancy	Main	Task Force Member
Pallavi	Mande	Task Force Member
Harry	Mattison	Task Force Member
Tom	Nally	Task Force Member
Mike	O'Dowd	MassDOT
Ari	Ofsevit	Task Force Member
Richard	Parr	Task Force Member
Tad	Read	Task Force Member
Jessica	Robertson	Task Force Member
Fred	Salvucci	Community Member
Bob	Sloan	WalkBoston