MEMORANDUM |

To:	Michael O'Dowd Project Manager	Date:	January 13, 2016
From:	Nick Gross Howard Stein Hudson	HSH Project No.:	2013061.14
Subject:	MassDOT Highway Division Allston I-90 Interchange Improvement Project Task Force Meeting #18 Meeting Notes of December 17, 2015		

Overview

On December 17, 2015 members of the Allston I-90 Interchange Improvement Project team and MassDOT staff associated with the job held the 18th task force meeting. Generally speaking, the task force membership is reflective of the initial task force with the addition of representatives from the Charles River Watershed Association as well as newly seated members in replacement for previously seated organizations.[1] The task force is composed of local residents, business owners, transportation, and green space advocates, as well as representatives of local, state, and federal governments. The purpose of the task force is, through the application of its members' in-depth knowledge, to assist and advise MassDOT in determining a single preferred alternative to be selected by the Secretary of Transportation for documentation in a joint Environmental Assessment and Environmental Impact Report (EIR) document.

The meeting summarized herein was made up of two presentations. The first, presented by Pallavi Mande from the Charles River Watershed Association (CRWA) aimed to outline the organization's vision for the project area with respect to water resiliency, open space, and green infrastructure. The CRWA priorities included enhanced parklands and access to the Charles River, storm water management, planning and design for climate change, and placemaking with the goal of environmental restoration, improving the quality of life for the neighborhood, and creating access to nature in a dense urban core. The presentation was well received by the task force and thought to be appropriately timed with the jumpstart of the placemaking effort. One of the interesting facts which came out of the CRWA section of the meeting is that MassDOT's Option 3K includes less impervious surface area than the existing interchange.

The second and bulkier of the two presentations was led by the Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA) and The Cecil Group. This presentation aimed to address transit, transportation, and placemaking under the umbrella of urban planning and architecture. As outlined by David Grissino representing the BRA,

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

The Cecil Group's scope of services will take the form of two primary phases. The first phase will be to analyze the existing planning effort associated with the I-90 Allston Interchange Improvement Project and provide recommendations to guide the conversation in evaluating the projects three alternatives. This phase will also include the identification of the projects urban design and planning principles as well as an evaluation in the compatibility of the current MassDOT design with placemaking principles and economic opportunities.

The second phase will primarily evaluate the alternative build out scenarios as they relate to each alternative. This phase will address the analysis of a multimodal system and connections to transit as well as the creation of long-term planning framework. In summary, the BRA and The Cecil Group's effort will provide an evaluation of the proposed MassDOT I-90 roadway and transit infrastructure to ensure that it does not preclude a range of successful urban design, economic development, and neighborhood planning outcomes in the future.

The placemaking presentation was well received with the 3D models being thought of as a very useful tool in visualizing the "throat" section alternatives since between the three concepts for the I-90 Allston Interchange; the treatment of this area is the chief difference. Topics of continued concern surrounded the north-south transit connection from Cambridge Street to Commonwealth Avenue, further expansion of the open space along the Charles River, the creation of a street hierarchy framework similar to the Back Bay, and the incorporated of any and all abutting planning studies such as the Guest Street Planning Study. At the conclusion of the meeting it was proposed the placemaking schedule including meeting every other week be put into effective in order to receive meaningful input towards the projects environmental filing tentatively scheduled for some time in June. An email was sent out to the task force requesting individuals level of participation on December 22, 2015 with a response date to opt into the placemaking subcommittee by December 31, 2015.

Agenda

I. Welcome & Introductions

II. Charles River Watershed Association Presentation

III. Boston Redevelopment Authority & Cecil Presentation

IV. Question & Answer

Detailed Meeting Minutes[2]

C: Ed Ionata (EI): Good evening everyone and thank you for coming out. My name is Ed Ionata and I am with TetraTech. Tonight's agenda includes a 15 minutes presentation by Pallavi Mande representing the CRWA followed by a report from the BRA and The Cecil Group. I would like to inform everyone that we have not yet set a date for the next task force meeting. The project team is going to continue to refine the alternatives and we will come back to you at the next task force meeting with a new and improved matrix that we plan to file in the Draft Environmental Notification Forum (DEIR). At this point I'm going to turn it over to Pallavi.

Charles River Watershed Association – Presentation

C: Pallavi Mande (PM): Hi everyone, I'm Pallavi Mande, and I am the director of the Blue Cities Initiative at the CRWA. I requested to present tonight with MassDOT and the BRA in order to outline our thoughts for a vision with respect to water resiliency, open space, and green infrastructure in the project area. The CRWA has been participating in the reconvened task force process and we felt it was a good time to talk about some of the critical issues associated with storm water management as we begin the projects placemaking effort. I will take questions at the end of the presentation.

The historical context of this area is important to consider. Most of this area consisted of marshal and rivers which was eventually filled in and buried. This was a great and necessary step in setting up the framework for an urban city. With that said, we have seen how the past has come to haunt us. Some of the historical context of the land was addressed by the Northeastern University students as part of the Boston Society of Architects (BSA) charrette that took place in September, 2014. Let's not forget that Harvard University's planning and redevelopment of this area goes out 50 years. We feel that there is an opportunity to combine all of the planning initiatives to create one conversation that addresses green infrastructure and the displacement of water.

There have been many conversations of the Allston Esplanade and many people have different visions of what this actually is. A lot of people talk about the concept in ways that are truly visionary. It should also be recognized that there are some very real constraints associated with it. I want to walk you through a comparison of what we looked at in terms of existing infrastructure. This slide [3]shows the comparison of pervious and impervious surface in the Allston-Brighton area. Green shows pervious surfaces and gray shows impervious surfaces. The CRWA feels that the size and investment in transportation infrastructure associated with this project creates a unique opportunity to reduce the amount of impervious cover of this area. Green infrastructure will help us restore the natural hydrology of the area and create opportunities for this project to think about resiliency.

[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.
[3] Slide 6 of the Charles River Watershed Association presentation

Some of you may be thinking, why is this important and the answer is there are serious consequences that are less obvious to most people. Most of the time we talk about flooding but we also have issues associated with ground water. We are working with the BRA and MassDOT to address stormwater management and to take a specific look at the subwatersheds in the study area. The overall goal is to make sure water quality standards are met and we have a number of strategies relating to stormwater that we would like to employ. We believe and we hope you all agree that it makes sense to look at this project from a regional standpoint to address storm water management. We are having similar conversations with the City of Cambridge on the other side of the Charles River as new flooding and climate change data has become available. Placemaking can't just be about buildings, it needs to be about resiliency.

Due to the standard and modern techniques in the practice urban development, there will most likely be consequences to the Charles River. The program I manage at the CRWA is called Blue Cities and we are aiming to reduce the impacts of new development on natural features such as the Charles River. We are looking at green infrastructure on a variety of scales. There was recently a design competition held in Kendal Square that looked at creating a vision for resilient infrastructure and placemaking. We discussed how urban areas and downtowns always have room to integrate green infrastructure and that placemaking opportunities need to be planned ahead of time.

In terms of the CRWA's priorities for the I-90 Allston Interchange Improvement Project we hope to enhance parklands and access to the Charles River, incorporate storm water management via blue-greenways (linear open space corridors) and green streets, plan and design for climate change resilience, and address placemaking with the goal of environmental restoration, improving the quality of life for the neighborhood, and create access to nature in a dense urban core. Thank you for your time, are there any questions?

Q: Wendy Landman (WL): Did you make any calculations about what this project would do in terms of pervious surface compared to what exist? What is the range you are thinking of in terms of green infrastructure?

A: PM: That's the next step for us. The way we evaluated the size of the basin is based on the amount of pervious surface. We're dealing with a large section of open space that needs to be dedicated to handling stormwater.

A: EI: Concept 3K has an overall lower net amount of pavement compared to the existing.

Q: WL: Does that include the proposed streets?

A: EI: Yes, it includes all streets. It doesn't include proposed buildings. We're working out ways to handling the storm water.

C: WL: Thank you.

Boston Redevelopment Authority and The Cecil Group – Presentation

C: Hi everyone, my name is David Grissino. I am an architect, urban designer, and serving as the project manager for the placemaking effort from the BRA. Most of you are familiar with the intention of the BRA placemaking effort which has been described as a three-legged stool; transit, transportation, and placemaking. We have engaged with The Cecil Group and brought them tonight to share where we are at in the process. Before The Cecil Group gets up to give their presentation, I want to lay out the ground work for the placemaking effort. The best place to start is to define what placemaking is and what its role will be. We want to develop a shared methodology of what we are doing, describe the outcomes of work, explain what we are trying to achieve, and how we will use it. Before the next phase of work, we want to ensure that we are asking the right questions and we want to hear your feedback in terms of what we are missing. The last item we want to discuss with you tonight is a schedule and we'll do this at the end of the presentation. We want to figure out a format that makes sense and works best for you.

Now let's talk about placemaking. On a simple level, we want this project area to end up looking like a place that is a Boston place. We are going to focus on the components of placemaking which include open space, connectivity, block size, mix of uses, historical context, and the approach of planning and urban design for future development. A lot of this has been the subject of the Imagine Boston 2030 effort. We have a similar mindset here. Another part of city building is resident input. We need to find a way to engage with all of you in a meaningful way to receive your input. The method we are proposing is very analytical and systematic. We want to continue having conversations with you and other stakeholders so we can hear your recommendations to the effort before the environmental filing. Building up the analytical framework is going to happen slowly. We don't have concrete recommendations yet. When we look at the way we build urban cities we have to understand the patterns of street hierarchy. In particular, this area is going to be a very different place because of the transit infrastructure associated with it.

The Cecil Group's scope has been broken down into two tasks under two phases. The first task you are familiar with. It will be an analysis of the existing planning effort, a background on the task force, and a look at the urban design and principles to guide the conversations in evaluating the alternatives. There is some compatibility with the plan with regards to the placemaking principles now. It's important to know that The Cecil Group has been attending, listening, and has been plugged in to the previous task force meetings. The first phase will encompass task 1 through task 3. As we move into the second phase, we need to make sure we start to look at the alternative build out scenarios. The second phase will encompass task 4 through task 6. We want to make sure we have meaningful input but late spring or early summer.

There are a number of outcomes from the study which we hope to achieve. We have a unique district and a unique process to work through. The outcomes of the study include a detailed urban design and planning analysis, identification of multiple strategies for the future, recommendations for the short term (MEPA filing), recommendations for the long term (2030 and beyond), and develop a tool kit of framework diagrams for future conversations. We have a couple of examples of what this might look like based on other projects we are working on. The first is a plan in South Boston along Dorchester Avenue. As part of that effort we are looking at a range of different open space scenarios, linear parks similar to Commonwealth Avenue, and scattered open space diagrams. We are having a range of conversations and we don't necessarily know where things will end up. The next example is very relative to this project. The Harvard Institutional Master Plan (IMP) is the result of the City of Boston asking Harvard University to provide their 30 year plan. We asked them to look at the area between Western Avenue and Cambridge Street in order to understand their ideas on block size and open space as organizational elements. With that I'm going to turn it over to The Cecil Group to introduce their analysis.

C: Steve Cecil (SC): Hi everyone my name is Steve Cecil; I'm joined tonight by Josh Fiala who also works at The Cecil Group. Tonight we are here to introduce ourselves, talk about the process moving ahead, and discuss the tools we are buildings. Josh will then talk about the analysis that we have been working on. We are hoping to create a fruitful framework that encompasses roads and highways in creating places for the future. The Cecil Group is an urban design and planning consulting firm that has been involved in large district planning for over 20 years. We have teamed with Stantec who will be providing a second set of eyes around the highway and looking at economics as clay to form the mold of the future. Nelson\Nygaard is also assisting us in thinking and looking at the future typology of the street network. We have a well-rounded and complete set of eyes.

Our job is to go underneath the vision and figure out the structure of the principles. When we talk about informed urban design, we don't just take into account the characteristics; we take it all into account. We are now looking at three different alternatives and when we started our work we were only looking at one. We are working to build 3D models for all three alternatives to look at each in better detail. We believe that 3D models will better illustrate the transportation links and both vertically and horizontally. In that regard, I'd like to show you the 3D model we have created for the throat section.

This first image shows the typical "throat" with existing conditions. The next image shows the typical "throat" condition with Concept 3K4. Concept 3K4 shifts Soldiers Field Road (SFR) over and tucks it underneath the I-90 mainline. The next image shows the typical "throat" condition with the A Better City (ABC) Alternative which places everything at-grade. This alternative requires that the edge of the Charles River be reconstructed. The last image shows the typical "throat" condition with the Amateur Planner Alternative. The key scheme of this alternative is to place the rail infrastructure above the highway while keeping the mainline at-grade. The takeaway point with all of this is that this section is very constrained and challenging to do placemaking anywhere.

C: Josh Fiala (JF): Hi everyone, my name is Josh Fiala. You probably noticed that the three alternatives vary significantly in the "throat" section but the vast majority of the district area to the west does not change based on the alternative. There are some constraints around West Station but most of the roadway network remains the same independent of the alternative. The area we are focusing on is the entire project area outside of the "throat" section. The process and technique we are using for our analysis is something we are calling a heat map. The heat map indicates where the key community issues and challenges are located.

I want to start by mentioning that our team has been attending task force meeting and listening to the conversation. We have also looked and read through all of the previous documentation in order to better understand the key issues that have been discussed. Some of the items that come to mind include the integrated of open space throughout the network, share-use path (SUP) connections to the Charles River and beyond, and the quality of West Station as a landmark and transit hub. We know that the at-grade alternatives are a strong interest to everyone in optimizing the constrained "throat" section. We also know of the desire to unite the north neighborhood of Allston to the south and to connect Commonwealth Avenue to Cambridge Street. We've heard that the community would like to deck over the highway and rail yard where possible and to transform Cambridge Street into a vibrant, community street. This has all been translated onto the heat map and highlighted in red[4]. The largest hot spots can be found around West Station, along Cambridge Street and the Charles Rivers edge, as well as the "throat" section.

The vocabulary we are using to build the framework of this future district is broken down into five topic areas. We believe these topics represent the necessary qualities in developing a successful district. These topics include public realm and open space, mobility and connectivity, development potential and flexibility, distinctive place and context sensitive, and energy efficiency and sustainability. The easiest way for us to test these topics was to think about various places that exist. We took the project area to scale and overlaid it near the Prudential Center in the Back Bay. This area includes some of the city's oldest and newest air rights developments and an urban street grid. It also shows a number of land uses and different techniques in knitting the urban fabric.

I want to quickly highlight some of the public realm and open space features within this highlighted area. There are a network of roads and MBTA stations. The highway is missing because of the air rights development and there is a hierarchy of streets. The frontages are supported by development and the tallest sky scrapers are located in this area as well. Within this fabric there are some open spaces including the Trinity Church, Copley Square, the Prudential Center, Back Bay Station, and the Commonwealth Avenue Mall. When we look at the scale and the built out condition it has distinct variations and considerations to an underlying transportation network.

[4] Slide 18 of The Cecil Group | Stantec | Nelson\Nygaard Presentation

When we focus back on the project area in Allston we have the beginnings of a road network which eventually will be leveraged into a new district. We'll discuss how this has been incorporated into our analysis but the point here is that building districts take time. We want to ensure that we are not creating new issues and that we are also not precluding opportunities. At this point I want to walk you through the analysis we have to date. We have flattened each topic area into a composite. Within each topic we will provide a format that will allow us to dive into specific issues. We plan to do this across all five topics which will set us up with a powerful tool for our analysis of the alternatives.

We didn't want to belabor the principle discussion because we know it has been covered in this group. We did however think it was an important bench mark as part of the analysis. We also put forward a list [5]of considerations that are driving the analysis. Each item listed has been pulled from conversations that have occurred in this group over the last few months. We looked at the study area within a .5 mile radius which is often considered the walking distance for transit orientated development. We also looked a ways to access open space and the different types of open space. In general, the types of open space range from pocket parks to neighborhood parks, to community parks, and eventually to regional parks.

C: SC: I should add that we are assuming the blocks will have a much finer grain. For this exercise we are just looking at the land that is left over.

C: JF: The study area needs to have an integrated open space network. We've overlaid access to open space and the ability to connect to open space to more or less show the challenges within the district structure. There are some potential challenges posed by the planned transportation infrastructure. As we get into the project area triangle there are some constraints due to the scale. Some portions of the geometry pose limitations but there is also a descent area for smaller parks and linear parks. I'm going to go faster through the next four topics.

In terms of mobility and connectivity we are looking at street types, pedestrian circulation, and bicycle circulation, transit networks, and vehicular connections. We will be looking at the street typologies from a Complete Streets point of view. Given the location, characteristics, and width of Cambridge Street, it has been identified as a neighborhood connector street based on the City of Boston's complete streets guide. I'm not going to go through all the layers for each but I want to show you the heat map for the mobility and connectivity topic. The infrastructure edge along the Turnpike is a barrier for north-south connections. Any height above grade presents a challenge to overcome for the connections to West Station. We have been investigating ways to provide a transit and vehicular connection over the Beacon Park Yard (BPY). SFR also serves as a barrier to connect to the Charles River.

There are many opportunities to address crossings while establishing iconic features. Moving along to development potential and flexibility, we are working to integrate and strengthen the ability to deck

[5] Slide 30 of The Cecil Group | Stantec | Nelson\Nygaard Presentation

over the highway where possible. We evaluated a full range of building types as well as typical footprint and building sizes. When looking at the heat map you can see that the conditions in the throat and over the main connector roads are the most challenging locations for development. However, the potential for air rights development around the parcel looks strong. Air rights are fundamental in terms of blocks adjacent to the Turnpike. The center of the district seems to be well adaptable for future investigation.

In terms of a distinctive place and context sensitivity we are looking to create a destination with a range of uses and densities, maximize opportunities to extend Boston's urban fabric, and define a network of recognizable places and centers of activity. In terms of our focus of analysis we will be looking at placemaking character, land use and building typologies, block size and geometry, street typologies and transit nodes, as well as elevation of roadways. There is a lot of potential flexibility to integrate the plans of Harvard's expanding campus. The West Station infrastructure is right near a place that as severe placemaking constraints. Air rights development is one potential resolution. The bright side to this is that West Station creates a key opportunity to create a unique place.

The next topic is energy efficiency and sustainability. The key principles with this are to enhance the ability for energy efficiency and sustainable design for the district as well as address anticipated climate change, sea level rise, and infrastructure needs. The focus of this analysis will be on utilities and district-wide infrastructure, solar orientation including shadows, and resiliency as well as flood considerations. We have developed a solar orientation and shadow analysis as well as a 100 year sea level rise climate consideration. The center of the district provides a range of flexible placemaking opportunities whereas the edges of the district are constrained creating some challenges. The overview of the heat map shows that the most challenging areas are associated with transportation infrastructure. There are ways to mitigate this but they will always be the most challenging particularly on the southern edge of the project area. In the center of the district, we see a broad a fair amount of flexibility and a full range of potential placemaking opportunities. We left a good amount of time for discussion. We are looking for feedback from you to help inform our next steps. We are also looking to hear if you think anything is missing. As we move forward with this systematic approach and analysis we will begin plugging in each of the alternatives to this framework.

C: DG: Thank you Josh. I want to open it up to hear your feedback. As Josh said, we want to make sure we aren't missing any key fundamental questions. At the end of the meeting we'd like to discuss how we can continue to keep the ball rolling.

C: David Loutenheizer (DL): I thought the 3D model for the "throat" section was very useful. It's the best I've seen in terms of visualization in understanding that section.

C: DG: We hoped that it would give a better sense of reality beyond the 2D plans.

Q: DL: In the 3D model, does the Turnpike section show the width of the shoulders and four lanes in each direction?

A: JF: We are showing the existing condition. We devised these based on the conceptual analysis from the presentation.

C: DL: One of the key features of this is the Charles River and SFR serves as a barrier to that. When discussing placemaking and the riverfront, I want to suggest widening the parkland and allocating space next to it for development. Is it possible to pull SFR back even more? Decking over SFR in the future will activate the river front.

A: JF: The river's edge continued to show up as a hot spot on our heat maps. It's a good point.

C: WL: When we look at the MassDOT diagram compared to the placemaking heat map diagram it looks like there is a lot more space devoted to the roadway. I want to make sure we understand the relationship between the roadway in each. This analysis is pretty amazing and certainly an interesting approach. I am worried that the diagrams you showed diminish the size of the streets.

A: JF: We have been working with MassDOT's AutoCAD files so I am confident they are accurate.

C: DL: The diagrams struck me because the plans are not just showing the roadway surfaces. When you look at the 3D model it helps show what the scale looks and feels like.

C: WL: It sounded like you are showing the cross section from building face to building face. It looks a lot skinnier on the heat map.

A: SC: The sidewalks are included within the pavement cross section. It also includes the public right-of-way (ROW).

A: JF: The heat map is slightly different and is showing curb-to-curb.

C: WL: As you know I am a big believer in sidewalks. This appears to be expanding the land and shrinking the infrastructure. Overall, the street scale including the sidewalks and the roads are huge. That is my major concern. The scale is too big.

A: DG: I think it will be helpful once we get to a larger scale where we can overlay some of the conditions. It will help isolate development from open space. We'll start to look at scale in more depth to give it more texture.

C: WL: When we're thinking about placemaking in Boston it makes me nervous that the width between the edge of infrastructure to the edge of infrastructure is so wide. We have a really big ROW and we have placing building on each edge. It seems too wide. Thank you.

A: DG: We have begun the process to weave together our work with CSS regarding street typologies. We've shown a lot of diagrams and analogs to different places. We'll continue to integrate them all together.

Q: Margaret Van Deusen (MVD): Have you considered sea level rise in the context of a north-south connection?

A: JF: Our modeling effort shows the Charles River 100 year flood limits coming into the study area as far as East Drive. Those are various sea level rise projections but to answer your question, yes, we are considering sea level rise and long term resiliency.

Q: MVD: Do you have extreme storm data and flooding data?

A: Tad Read (TR): The extreme storm data should be incorporated into the flood data.

A: JF: We don't have strong data on extreme storms. I'm interested in talking with Pallavi to hear more about the CRWA data.

A: SC: We know it is significant and we're tracking that. There are different ways to solve the issue of extreme storms and its effects on building types. The analysis is only sea level rise; it's not the full watershed flooding.

A: JF: Without seal level rise change, there is minimal flooding on the Charles River's edge.

C: PM: We are hoping to incorporate MassDOT's hurricane level data early on into the placemaking study.

Q: Alana Olsen (AO): Thank you for all of this. I found the overlay of the project in the Back Bay to be a very valuable slide. It seems like there are a lot more neighborhood connector roads in the Back Bay compared to the current MassDOT proposal for this project.

A: DG: It's a good point but this area is different and we need to modify our thinking with this project. We have a range of ways in approaching placemaking and organizing cities. We need to figure out how to modify this from a regional infrastructure perspective and thinking about placemaking. We have the opportunity to create the framework for a unique district.

C: AO: There are clearly a lot of challenges. This speaks volumes to the wide varieties and densities of neighborhood scopes. The consideration of value to the neighborhood are a bit disappointing.

A: SC: It's not a simple diagram; there are different developments and different edges. We want to discuss the underlying principles with your further. It's fascinating to think about building on top of the rail and highway. We think those conversations are worth talking about.

C: Harry Mattison (HM): Thank you Dave, Steve, and Josh for this presentation. When you stated that Cambridge Street is a neighborhood connector are you taking that as a fact based on its classification today? You're correct; it is a neighborhood connector today.

A: JF: Yes. If you read through the definition of a neighborhood connector in the *Boston Complete Streets Guide* it is identical. It doesn't necessarily differentiate between the proposed designs either. We were thinking more about it from a differentiating hierarchy of streets perspective within the proposed district.

C: HM: My point is that a bunch of us are hoping you will reconsider Cambridge Street as being a neighborhood connector. We want a residential street and we are aspiring for more residential streets in the future. We don't want the classification to be a downtown street, we want more mixed use and more residential. We're looking for a street hierarchy and progression away from the neighborhood to the highway. Right now there is no transition at all from Seattle Street to Cambridge Street. There isn't a single six lane street in the Back Bay except the Turnpike.[6] As you move from Bolyston Street, to Newbury Street, to Beacon Street it becomes more residential. Marlborough Street feels like you are out in the suburbs. We would like to this hierarchy as you move away from the Turnpike for this project.

A: JF: We're going to work within this context to think about how we can do that.

C: Jason Desrosier (JD): Hi my name is Jason Desroiser and I am representing the Allston-Brighton Community Development Corporation (ABCDC). This is a good piece of planning. The entire area around the BPY needs to be looked at with an intensive planning lens. There are over 1,000 new units going in around the Guest Street corridor and there is a comprehensive planning effort happening there as well. Development cannot happen in a piecemeal fashion. I'm familiar with the Dorchester Avenue work and I think it's great. There are several neighborhoods that need to be tied into this including Hopedale, Lower Allston, and The Gap. All of these neighborhoods need to be integrated into the BPY.

[6] It is worth noting that in Option 3K4, only one intersection along the entire length of Cambridge Street has a 6-lane cross section. The remaining crossings on Cambridge Street are four travel lanes with a left turning bay at each intersection. This is in keeping with other Allston Streets such as Brighton Avenue at Harvard Street.

A: DG: You're right. There are a lot of areas around the City that could benefit from a corridor wide approach like the Dorchester Avenue work. Some of what you mentioned is beyond the scope of what we can do now for this project mostly due to time constraints. In regards to your second point, the thinking extends much further than the boundary lines we are showing. We are thinking about the neighborhood and context in the same way Harvard thought about their IMP.

C: Galen Mook (GM): Thank you for the presentation, it's enlightening to see where everyone's heads are at. I want to echo some of the points made by Jason from the ABCDC in looking beyond the dashed lines. You're missing some components to this. Is the Linden Street corridor being addressed as part of this scope? It's crucial that this corridor is looked both from MassDOT and the City's perspective. The Franklin Street footbridge also doesn't appear to be on the map either. Maybe replacing the Franklin Street footbridge is enough but we may need another bridge. We've been seeing a lot of detail on the "throat" section and West Station. We haven't seen as much detail on the western edge of the project area need Harvard Avenue and Cambridge Street.

A: DG: You're right and we need to continue to spend time to dovetail our effort into the work with Etty from the Urban Design Lab. It's all the same place and there are a number of different focuses for each team. We need to continue to overlap our efforts.

C: GM: As you continue to work with your models, please consider how the traffic is effected at the bridge points.

C: AO: There is a lot of anticipated future development in the Guest Street corridor. It would be useful in aligning the footbridge up by way of Braintree Street to incorporate that connection.

C: GM: The work on the western edge of this project needs to flow seamlessly with the Guest Street corridor plans.

A: DG: We're on the same page. One of my favorite diagrams we have at the BRA overlays all the different planning efforts happening in the City. Guest Street, Harvard, Boston University (BU), and Holton Street are all part of our thinking. This entire area as a whole is very much in our minds.

C: GM: A lot of this depends on the models you draw out.

C: TR: In the interest in time, I'd like to take 10-15 minutes to talk about the next steps for this effort with The Cecil Group.

C: WL: I have one last comment. You started with a list of issues and community principles. We need to put this list on the diagram in order to point out places of significance. It concerns we that we are investing hundreds of millions of dollars and we haven't addressed the open space networks and expanded river front. We keep seeing SFR in the same place. We need to think more expansively

about what this investment means. Moving SFR over a little bit isn't adequate. I want to encourage the urban design team to look further into that. It would be a missed opportunity if we ended up only expanded the river front by 20 feet. Your diagrams need to show the transit connection from Cambridge Street to Commonwealth Avenue. I don't think it's a debate in the broader community that this transit connection needs to happen. People need to be able to take a bus from Harvard to BU without haven't to go down Harvard Avenue.

A: DG: We are going to look at open space along the Charles River as a district wide organizational principle. The location and elevation of the connection points north-south are still being worked out. We're mindful of the desire.

C: WL: There are somethings its okay to push out and say it's a long way off but the transit connection is not one of them. When we cut the ribbon for this project the north-south transit connection needs to be there. It shouldn't be passed off for the future. We want all want West Station to be a success and it is at the core of transit orientated development; if it's not part of this then the project will fail.

C: Stefanie Seskin (SS): There are a lot of public health impacts and I didn't see much on air quality, noise, and prevention of injury. Those are impacts that we feel should be included in placemaking and help to inspire the physical environment. It would be helpful to include those in your impact analysis.

C: DG: Thank you Stefanie, I agree. We've been meeting once a month and if specific people are more interested in the placemaking component of this we would be happy to meet more regularly. We're hoping to reach a point of meaningful input by March. Right now I'm imaging that we will be meeting every two weeks. Does that sound like something people would be willing to do?

C: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis (NCC): I would be happy to send an email to everyone to hear their response if you are unsure tonight.

C: TR: The proposal I am hearing is that an email will be sent to everyone asking if they would like to opt in to the additional meetings. Another option is to have meetings with the entire task force every two weeks in addition to the regular task force meetings.

C: DG: The reason we are pushing this tight timeline is because we have a lot of ground to cover in a short period.

C: NCC: We'll be sure to detour around the Allston Civic Association or ABCDC meetings.

C: AO: The ABCDC is missing from the task force membership and I would encourage that they be included in the placemaking subcommittee.

C: DG: We will consider the membership open.

C: Tom Nally (TN): I'd like to make a suggestion. If certain people are interested in specific topics it would be useful to update the group prior to the meeting to know what the discussion points are going to be. That way someone could opt out to a specific meeting.

C: Jessica Robertson (JR): I'd like to request that some of the meetings occur during the day.

A: DG: That sounds fine.

C: HM: I think it's useful for this to work in parallel with the existing process if we're trying to reach a March deadline. Access to West Station from the south is a very important issue that needs to be addressed. The Charles River edge and SFR don't have a lot to do with how bicycles and pedestrians go from Commonwealth Avenue to West Station. With this process zoom in on specific connections or is that too far in the weeds? It would be nice if you could acknowledge that we've been thinking about that in detail for a long time.

C: PM: When we're talking about planning in this area, Harvard and BU are missing from the big picture on a systematic level. Then we can focus more on the details of the infrastructure.

C: HM: Figuring out the system and the infrastructure are equally important.

Q: GM: How much involvement can we expect from MassDOT, Harvard, and CSS in this placemaking process?

A: DG: We meet regularly as a team with the BRA, BTD, Harvard, and MassDOT. We are not working in isolation by any means.

Q: Name Not Given (NNG): Could decking happen any earlier? Maybe Harvard could fund it for their benefit?

A: DG: That is beyond the scope of what we are doing here. How and when air right development potential occurs is yet to be determined. We're just working to ensure it can happen in the future. Are we going to recommend that decking occurs now? No. There are a range of outcomes on the table. There is a city building component to this that we haven't seen since we talked about the Seaport district in the late 1990's.

C: JR: I'd like to thank you all for this analysis; it's great to see something that is so data driven. I think it would be useful to look at the precedence of how issues like this have been solved in other places around the country and the world. Matt Danish sent our group an email about a bicycle path next to a highway with an amazing sound barrier. It makes the highway seem like it's not there.

C: SC: It's a good point, thank you Jessica.

Q: WL: There was a meeting in Cambridge last week for this project. I'm interested to hear what happen. Could anyone give us a five minute summary?

A: MOD: Bill Deignan from the City of Cambridge asked that we provide a quick presentation of the public information meeting we did at the Jackson Mann Community Center back on December 8, 2015. The purpose of the meeting was to receive feedback on the most recent plans from the City of Cambridge and the resident in the Cambridgeport neighborhood. There were four topics that came up. The first was traffic during and after construction on Cambridge Street, Memorial Drive, and River Street. The second was noise. This was a big issue both during and post construction. The third was air quality. The fourth was the idea of green space on the oppose side of Magazine Beach.

A: WL: Thank you Mike.

Q: GM: Will there be a set of minutes from that meeting?

A: NCC: Yes.

C: JR: If you could send those around that would be much appreciated.

A: NCC: We'll get it posted on the project website.

C: MOD: Thank you everyone for coming out tonight. We'll see you all in the New Year.

Next Steps

While the next task force meeting has yet to be schedule, the next BRA placemaking meeting is scheduled to be held on January 11, 2016. All task force and BRA placemaking meetings are open to the public.

Appendix 1: Meeting Attendees

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Jorge	Briones	Task Force Member
Nathaniel	Cabral-Curtis	HSH
Chris	Calnan	TetraTech
Steve	Cecil	The Cecil Group
Tony	D'Isidoro	Task Force Member
Jason	Desrosier	ABCDC
Joseph	DiFazio	Boston University
Joshua	Fiala	The Cecil Group
Dan	Gastler	Community Member
Jim	Gillooly	Task Force Member
Anna	Greenfield	Skanska
David	Grissino	Task Force Member
Nick	Gross	HSH
Karl	Haglund	Task Force Member
Ed	Ionata	TetraTech
Jim	Keller	TetraTech
Robert J.	La Tremouille	FOWG
Wendy	Landman	Task Force Member
Elizabeth	Leary	Task Force Member
Oscar	Lopez	Task Force Member
David	Loutzenheiser	Task Force Member
Amy	Mahler	Task Force Member
Clancy	Main	Task Force Member
Pallavi	Mande	Task Force Member
Harry	Mattison	Task Force Member
Galen	Mook	Task Force Member
Tom	Nally	Task Force Member
Mike	O'Dowd	MassDOT
Ari	Ofsevit	Task Force Member
Alana	Olsen	Task Force Member
Tad	Read	Task Force Member
Matt	Robare	Allston-Brighton TAB

Jessica	Robertson	Task Force Member
Stefanie	Seskin	Task Force Member
Steve	Silveira	Task Force Member
Margaret	Van Deusen	Task Force Member

Appendix 2: Flip-chart Notes