

---

To: Michael O'Dowd  
Project Manager

Date: November 23, 2015

From: Nick Gross  
Howard Stein Hudson

HSH Project No.: 2013061.14

Subject: MassDOT Highway Division  
Allston I-90 Interchange Improvement Project  
Task Force Meeting #16  
Meeting Notes of November 19, 2015

---

## Overview

On November 17, 2015 members of the Allston I-90 Interchange Improvement Project team and MassDOT staff associated with the job held the 16<sup>th</sup> 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.<sup>1</sup> 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.

Similar to the format of the task force meeting held on October 15, 2015, the task force meeting summarized herein took the form of a work shop style with breakout tables allowing for more detailed interactions between task force members and the consultant team. The four breakout tables included *Rail and Transit*, *Pedestrian Bridges*, *Urban Design*, and *Bicycle Facilities and Intersection Treatments*. Groups rotated every 25 minutes until each table had been covered by all task force members. It should be noted that task force members were given the opportunity to remain seated at any given table if they had a particular interest in the topic presented.

In summary, there were a number of common themes during the report back session that were relevant to all four breakout tables. These themes included the idea that the intersections and lane widths were too wide and would contribute to unsafe crossings for bicycles and pedestrians throughout the project area. Additional common themes included creating more green space along the Charles River, including safe and

---

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

accessible bicycle and pedestrian access to West Station, and the idea of creating a hierarchy of streets to determine what types of non-motorized facilities should be given priority to be addressed chronologically.

Specific items for each breakout table including *Key Characteristics, Opportunities, Challenges, Top Features, and Suggestions and Comments* can be found under the Break-out Results tab located on page 3.

At the end of the report backs there was a general feeling of frustration conveyed but a number of task force members that MassDOT and the project team are too focused on items such as train facilities and rail yard specifics and less focused on the community concerns and neighborhood impacts. It was stressed by additional task force members that MassDOT and the project team have not addressed issues that have been voiced over several months such as a north-south transit connection over the Beacon Park Yard (BPY), DMU service at West Station, and increasing open space along the Charles River. In order to address some of the concerns regarding width of roadways and intersections, it was suggested to create an ongoing graph of acreage of asphalt within the project area to compare existing concepts and concepts as they develop. It was also suggested that with the development of the cost estimate for the MassDOT concepts that the two at-grade concepts be evaluated under the same estimate.

## *Agenda*

- I. Opening Remarks
  
- II. Break-out Sessions
  - i. Rail and Transit
  - ii. Pedestrian Bridges
  - iii. Urban Design
  - iv. Bicycle Facilities and Intersection Treatments
  
- III. Reporting Out from Break-out Sessions

## **Detailed Meeting Minutes<sup>2</sup>**

---

C: Ed Ionata (EI): Good evening everyone and thanks for coming tonight. My name is Ed Ionata and I am with TetraTech. The next task force meeting will be held on Wednesday December 2, 2015 in this room. At that session we will hear a report on the evaluation of the at-grade alternatives from HNTB. There will also be a presentation on the MassDOT 3K alternative. On December 8, 2015 there is going

---

<sup>2</sup> 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.

to be a public information meeting at the Jackson Mann Community Center. The public information meeting will be a general review of all that happened since our last public information meeting. On December 17, 2015 we will have another task force meeting here at the Fiorentino Community Center. The place-making consultants from the Cecil Group, working with the BRA, will be at that session. CSS is with us tonight and they will also be at the session on December 17. The Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA) consultants have been attending our task force sessions and are also with us tonight. The format of tonight's October 15, 2015. We are going to rotate tables every 25 minutes. If you would like to stay at a table longer, feel free to do so. There will be a recorder at each table and they will report out to the group at the end of our session tonight.

## *Break-out Results*

### **RAIL & TRANIST**

#### **Key characteristics:**

- Beacon Park Yard is being designed to accommodate a minimum of 14 rail consists, each consisting of a locomotive and 9 cars.
- A covered pit track and train deicing facility using hot water only will also be provided.
- Locomotive plug-in stations to keep engines warm overnight to reduce locomotive idling and compressed air will be provided via pipes to reduce truck traffic to and from the yard.
- The project team is currently looking at access to the eastern end of the yard from the connector streets between Cambridge Street and the highway.
- The number of parking spaces proposed for the BPY has been reduced with the expectation crews will board in Worcester. This allows additional green space and other permeable surfaces to be worked into the yard to enhance groundwater recharge and filtration.
- Down-lighting will be used to prevent light pollution in the surrounding neighborhood.
- The project team can technically lower the tracks through West Station a maximum of twelve inches, but is not proposing this due to resiliency concerns associated with climate change and sea level rise. The yard cannot be lowered further than it already has due to a combination of factors:
  - Presence of the Salt Creek Culvert and a large diameter sanitary sewer.
  - Switches into and out of the yard
  - Undercutting of bridges
  - Overall resiliency in case of water level rise. It is worth noting that the Salt Creek Culvert drains most of Brookline and is taxed by today's heavy rain falls.

**Opportunities:**

- The pedestrian and bicycle connection from Agganis Way to West Station would be wide enough to carry bicycles and pedestrians or potentially transit vehicles. Theoretically, this structure would already be heavy enough to carry a piece of snow removal machinery; therefore it should likewise be able to hold a transit vehicle. This connection should be investigated further for transit. Likewise it is worth noting:
  - If transit vehicles are placed on the Agganis Way connection, only enough width is available for their use. Bicycles and pedestrians would be removed from the structure.
  - All bicycle and pedestrian connections on the project will need to be kept clear of snow and should be constructed with this in mind.

**Challenges:**

- High-and-wide freight trains need to be able to travel through the station area. CSX has rights to move this type of freight over this line and MassDOT cannot unilaterally move to extinguish these rights which are controlled and mandated by the Federal government. Accommodating high-and-wide freight is not MassDOT choosing to prioritize freight rail over passenger rail, but merely complying with existing rights and federal regulations. One option is to build the northern-most platform at West Station slightly narrower to accommodate this freight service. Another is to create a flexible platform edge as is used in Connecticut on MetroNorth lines. A third is to build the platform to a full width to accommodate future DMU service and run high-and-wide freight through the yard. A consequence of this would be need to move an MBTA train to accommodate a high-and-wide move.
- Salt Creek and large sewer line serve as significant constraints to further lowering the rail yard.

**Top Features:****Suggestion & Comments**

- Concern about height of structures in rail yard precluding future decking potential. Harvard has not said no to the dimensions of these structures, approximately 22-24 feet high, but they have not endorsed them either.
- It was asked what the value of having a third track at West Station would be if DMU service would not be immediately inaugurated. This allows commuter trains to make up time on their schedules or allows a Worcester express to bypass a local train. In short, this would be extremely useful to existing service.
- Ensure that lights for yard security do not hamper community sleep.
- Develop and evaluate transit connections from West Station to points west and south (Kendall Square, Longwood Medical Area)

- CWRA requests that the MassDOT team continue to look to maximize collection and treatment of storm water on site.
- The stair and elevator combination on Babcock Street needs to be made obvious and attractive to passengers seeking to transfer off the Green Line along Commonwealth Avenue.
- It was asked whether the plan was to build West Station all at once. While funding is not identified at this time, environmental documentation is being prepared to advance the whole project as a unified job.
- It was asked how a two-track GJL would not be precluded by this design. Two tracks will approach GJL and merge into one at a switch below the viaduct.
- There was a question as to the grade of the Malvern Street shared use connection (3.5%) and whether there was a precedent for a bicycle path this steep in Boston. The well-liked South Bank Bridge at the end of the Charles River is actually steeper.

---

## PEDESTRIAN BRIDGES

### **Key characteristics:**

- 3 viable pedestrian bridge options presented for Franklin Street footbridge
- Most favorable Franklin Street Bridge option in similar footprint as existing

### **Opportunities:**

- Consider the Mansfield Street stairs and ramp facility when designing the new Franklin Street footbridge.

### **Challenges:**

- Ramp geometry should be considered to avoid switchbacks
- Obstructions including rail, utilities, geometry
- Franklin Street footbridge is located within a historic district
- Personal safety on Franklin Street and Soldiers Field Road footbridges
- Rail tracks are really close to people's home and increase noise pollution

### **Top Features:**

- Footbridges should be iconic structures
- Urban Design should consider connections into neighborhoods
- Accommodate bicycles, pedestrians, and American's with Disabilities Act

### **Suggestions & Comments:**

- Create a conceptual embankment to minimize pedestrian and bicycle conflicts
- Shift Soldiers Field Road alignment 40' west to provide more space to land the footbridge
- Consider pre-development treatment such as a "sense of place" in the form of a park

- “T” alignment at Soldiers Field Road end
- Create a true Esplanade
- Bus stop on Cambridge Street near Franklin Street footbridge should be relocated (unsafe)
- Create an iconic bridge commemorating Boston’s response to the Marathon Bombing.
- Build a cable-stayed bridge
- Would a new bridge offset from Franklin Street miss the desire line of the users?
- Incorporate Linden Street into bicycle and pedestrian analysis
- Is it possible to make Braintree Street one-way?
- Coordinate with Boston Transportation Department regarding crossings at either end of pedestrian bridges
- Restore the Franklin Street tunnel under the railroad tracks
- Maximize open space along the Charles River
- Create an sightseeing “overlook” on the east side of any footbridge

---

## URBAN DESIGN

### **Key Characteristics:**

- Greenway on Cambridge Street South
- Pedestrian and bicycle bridge over East Drive
- Not precluding future development by the landowner

### **Opportunities:**

- Future development potential over Beacon Park Yard
- Build small streets first and larger street network second
- Enhance the “Peoples Pike” along Cambridge Street South

### **Challenges:**

- Too many lanes, 4-5 lanes too much
- Medians may preclude access to future development with left-turning movements
- Stadium Way and Seattle Street will be heavily trafficked by cars and create future conflicts with pedestrian and bicycles
- Needed access across Beacon Park Yard for vehicles
- Intersections are too large
- Pedestrian bridge over East Drive to Soldiers Field Road cuts up river front parcel

### **Top Features:**

- Streets north of Cambridge Street South will be “city type” streets
- Stadium Way and Seattle Street will be elevated
- East Drive will be at-grade

### **Suggestions & Comments**

- Potential for bicycle and pedestrian connections over Beacon Park Yard to become transit connections
  - Create a hierarchy of streets – service, arterial, neighborhood
  - Incremental approach to development
  - Separated bike facilities on Cambridge Street and Cambridge Street South
  - Deck over Beacon Park Yard for noise pollution and future development opportunities
- 

## **BICYCLE FACILITIES & INTERSECTION TREATMENTS**

### **Key Characteristics:**

- Two-way features on north side of Cambridge Street South to avoid conflict with vehicles accessing West Station
- Access and Americans with Disabilities Act compliance
- Cyclist are always yielding to pedestrians with spacing between modes
- Hierarchy of uses and facility types
- Bicycles turning next to vehicles is a conflict
- Separated bike lanes are present on all major spines
- Avoid conflicts with vehicles turning onto major streets

### **Opportunities:**

- Bicycle facilities should include porous pavement
- Flexibility for future development well received
- Buffered space can become parking or wider sidewalks as development occurs

### **Challenges:**

- Snow clearing
- Transitions from separated path to on-street facility
- How will new bicycle facilities tie into existing network?
- Tighten up intersections, too much space between elements when vehicles turning
- Crossing widths too large

### **Top Features:**

- 

### **Suggestions & Comments:**

- Widen bike lanes by 8”

## *Report outs from Recordors*

C: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis (NCC): Hi everyone. I am Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis with Howard Stein Hudson. I will be reporting on the rail and transit table. Mark Shamon with VHB provided us with an update on the development of West Station and the rail yard. We looked at a Beacon Park Yard (BPY) that is planned to accommodate a minimum of 14 rail consist and 9 cars. There will be a pit track and de-icing station by hot water as well as a car wash. The wheel truing facility remains in the same place as it was previously shown. There will be the ability for locomotives to plug in during the winter months to stay warm. We discussed that the amount of parking happening in the BPY will be reduced due to crew changes occurring elsewhere.

We had a very long discussion with each group regarding on the northern most platforms of West Station. It was thought that the platform should be thinner to accommodate high and wide freight which CSX has the rights to operate over that line. People were concerned that what was shown wouldn't be the best for future DMU service. We were asked to look at lowering the rail yard. Mark explained that we can get about 12" lower on the train tracks through the station but not in the rail yard because of the location of switches. There is also the issue of the Salt Creek and a major sewer pipe approximately 7' below the top of the yard which is another major constraint. In our last session, we spent time talking about the various bicycle and pedestrian connections to and from the station. It was expressed that all of the bicycle facilities must have enough strength to support a snow clearing vehicles.

C: EI: Thanks Nate. Alison Limais up next with pedestrian bridges.

Q: Glen Berkowitz (GB): If some of us feel that the presenter did a wonderful job but left a couple of key items out, when would the opportunity present itself to add those items to the discussion?

A: EI: Right now is a good time.

C: Galen Mook (GM): The last point about snow clearance relates to the Harry Agganis Way Path connection to West Station. That idea stemmed from a conversation that if snow clearing vehicles can be supported it would be likely that transit buses could be supported as well.

C: GB: I would like to add that at one-fourth of the four sessions, we learned that in order for two tracks over the Grand Junction Bridge to become functional, it would require that the Grand Junction Line Overpass over Soldiers Field Road (SFR) would need to be rebuilt. I wanted to highlight that because we never heard that before. All of the HNTB comments critiqued the at-grade concepts for having to rebuild that same overpass.

A: EI: Thank you Glen.

C: Harry Mattison (HM): A lot of the design aspects of West Station that are important to the community such as access for all modes of transportation are not changing month-to-month. We made the same comments about accessing West Station by foot and bicycle a month ago. Tonight we heard about compressed air and hot water for washing buses. We care about how people are getting to the station and how it will impact transit orientated development. We care about future DMU service to connect Kendall Square, Allston, and North Station. We're not getting anywhere on those topics. Instead we're talking about changing sparkplugs on a train.

C: EI: Understood. Let's move to Alison at the pedestrian bridge table.

C: Alison Lema (AL): Hi everyone, my name is Alison Lema and I am with TetraTech. I will be conducting the engineering for the pedestrian bridges on this job. This is my first task force meeting and I enjoyed hearing all of your feedback. Etty Epadmodipoetro from Urban Ideas Lab presented 3 different viable solutions for the Franklin Street footbridge. The alternative most people were interested in shows the pedestrian bridge in a similar footprint that exists today. We discussed the constraints with existing utilities and we received a lot of good comments specifically to avoid switchbacks. It should be noted that there was general consensus that what we showed was a good concept from an urban design standpoint.

We heard that the bus stop on Cambridge Street across from the Franklin Street footbridge is in a location that is extremely dangerous and difficult to access. The top driver of our discussions and as explained by Etty was to create a bridge that is more iconic than what exist today. In terms of opportunities we were asked if it would be possible to make Braintree Street a one-way. We also heard that there is an extreme desire for bicycles and pedestrians to cross from the Franklin Street footbridge over Cambridge Street to Linden Street. MassDOT reminded us that this area falls within a historic district and we will need to consider that as we move forward from an impact perspective. We talked a bit about personal safety on both the Franklin Street footbridge and the future footbridge over SFR. Etty brought sheets that can be drawn on so if you didn't give us any comments, please feel free to take a sheet and submit it to us later on.

C: EI: Thanks Alison.

C: Pallivi Mande (PM): I would like to add that we discussed the opportunities to connect to the Charles River.

C: AL: That's a good point. The task force's desire is to push SFR as far west as possible to expand the green space along the riverfront.

C: EI: Thank you both. Let's move onto Liz Flanagan for a summary of the bicycle facilities and intersection treatments.

C: Liz Flanagan (LF): Hi everyone, my name is Liz Flanagan and I am with Howard Stein Hudson. Lou Rabito joined us tonight and provided everyone with an overview of the new MassDOT Separated Bike Lane Planning and Design Guide. We spent some time going through the elements of the guidelines and discussed how it will be incorporated into this project. We looked at two different intersection examples. The first was the intersection at Cambridge Street South and Seattle Street and the second was the intersection of Cambridge Street and Seattle Street.

In discussing the treatments at these intersections, we also discussed how storm water would be managed. The larger discussion surrounded the idea of creating a place that people feel comfortable biking in. We discussed how American with Disability Act (ADA) facilities would need to be incorporated with the bicycle facilities and the MassDOT Separated Bike Lane Planning and Design Guide outlines how to address that issue. We talked a bit about bicycle signals and what intersections may warrant them. We heard from the task force that the major east-west spine is Cambridge Street South and the major north-south spine is Seattle Street. It was considered by many task force members that these priority streets should be placed at the upper hierarchy of bicycle facility treatments. It was suggested that a two-way separated bike lane be placed on the north side of Cambridge Street South which is currently being shown on option 3K.

One of the main opportunities with new development is the potential for different types of buffers. The current plan on Cambridge Street South is to create a 5' buffer. This can be used for on-street cyclist or as development occurs, may be turned into new sidewalks or parking. An overarching theme was that bicycles and pedestrian are separated as often as possible and that all intersection should be protected at all new streets. The width of the crossings for pedestrians was a concern by a number of task force members as well as the number of lanes.

C: EI: Thank you Liz. Are there any additional comments?

C: George Batchelor (GB): I am going to cover for Nick Gross as he is typing. We covered the urban design table presented by Deneen and Skip from CSS. The first item we looked at was the separated bicycle and pedestrian bridge over East Drive and SFR. We talked a bit about the connections to that bridge from the north and the west. From an urban design perspective, we talked more about not precluding development potential rather than what development may occur. We looked at a scenario which provided a landscaped median in the middle of Cambridge Street South. Skip reminded us that if there is a landscaped median that it will preclude certain types of turns in and out of future parcels.

Skip walked us through the column alignments and how development over the rail yard could be feasible at some point in the future. In terms of feedback, we were asked to provide a hierarchy of

streets which would be used to prioritize and focus on specific streets for future meetings. We were also asked to look at putting separated bike lanes on both sides of all streets.

In general, we heard that being flexible in order to not preclude anything was good but we should be providing more of a vision. We were asked to make the “Peoples Pike” more than what it is currently shown as. We also heard that the roadways and intersections are too wide. We heard from a few task force members that the earth berm approach to the bicycle and pedestrian bridge over SFR and East Drive may be cutting up the waterfront parcel. We were asked if there was any way to get vehicles across BPY similar to what Galen mentioned earlier.

- C: PM: I'd like to make a comment on what was referred to as the vision. We heard more about maximizing the potential for future development and parcel size. We want to talk more about a vision for a place that the community can benefit from with connections to the Charles River.
- C: Jessica Robertson (JR): Skip mentioned earlier that the total amount of developable area is approximately 22 acres. Bob Sloan from WalkBoston also made a calculation of total acreage for all roadways for before and after this project. 22 acres struck me as a very small number for the entire 90 acre area. It would be really interesting as we go forward if you could develop a running tally for acres of asphalt to compare existing and future conditions.
- C: Wendy Landman (WL): It is also extremely important to provide transit access across BPY to make the needed north-south connections. A north-south transit connection is essential in making West Station a useable transit hub. We didn't talk about it because it wasn't shown on the drawings. It's missing from the drawings. We need to continue to bring it up so that the idea is not lost.
- C: Ken Kruckemeyer (KK): I'd like to voice my dissatisfaction of the report backs. It seems you are primarily saying what you folks agreed you would say before the presentation. All of us have already heard what you reported back on. Instead of reiterating what has already been said, it would be better to concentrate and more accurately respect the comments by the citizens who came out here tonight. If you were to take those issues seriously we would find out because next time we could determine if you were listening or not. I'm worried that you are feeling that you've made your point, you listened, you made comments, and you're continuing forward. There have been a lot of concerns raised that have not been addressed.
- C: EI: If there is something we missed you can always email us or speak up now.
- C: KK: That shouldn't be our responsibility. That should be the responsibility of the people who are being paid to be here. It shouldn't be up to us to go back and redo it again.
- C: HM: I'd like to echo some of the comments about the rail and the fundamental expectations of the neighborhood to continue to support this project. On the subject of open space and design, I think there

has been a very clear expectation from day one that this project would include significant new usable open space along the Charles River and in the core of the project area. We're not seeing that yet. We saw ideas that were shown as potentials for new green space decades after which would be provided by someone else. I think that is misleading because it's not part of this project. I hope when we come back and get into the details of the design, we see MassDOT committed to creating parkland and not just the streets.

C: PM: I look forward to having the discussion about urban design and talking about a place that everyone can feel good about.

C: HM: Instead of talking about what you're not going to preclude, maybe you we can talk about what we're actually going to do.

C: GM: I think you are precluding some things that are crucial to this project and those are the multimodal aspects. You're precluding DMU's with the design of the station. You're telling us that you can probably build it in later but it's a cost thing.

C: Mark Shamon (MS): We're constrained by space.

C: HM: If you have space for a layover area you should be able to make space for what the neighborhood wants.

C: GM: I want to make the point that if this is not a multimodal project where DMU's are at the forefront of how the train station will function, why are we building a layover yard for services that won't benefit the neighborhood? Why are we the parking lot for the trains if it won't benefit the neighborhood? A new connection that does not exist now will benefit us. By economic and rational standards of MassDOT, we need to make a north-south transit connection happen. If you're not going to build the station to address this purpose, then I see it as a failure. This is the opportunity to get us across the Grand Junction and get us north-south. Thank you for your time.

C: EI: Thank you Galen. I think most people picked up ABC's response to the HNTB comments from the previous task force meeting. If you didn't there are more copies available. Tom would you like to add anything?

A: Tom Nally (TN): If you look at the document you'll see the format is comments on the comments. In a number of places we have suggested additional studies that we believe would be helpful to better answer some of the outstanding questions.

C: EI: Thank you Tom. The next meeting is on December 2, 2015. It will be a traditional presentation format meeting. We will cover an evaluation of the at-grade solutions as well as a discussion of Concept 3K. On December 8, 2015 we will have a public information meeting at the Jackson Mann

Community Center. On December 17, 2015 we will be back here for a task force meeting on place making with the BRA and CSS.

C: Mike O'Dowd (MOD): Thank you everyone for participating in the meeting and discussion tonight.

Q: HM: Will the meeting on December 2, 2015 be a verdict about the viaduct stuff? What is the timetable for that study?

A: EI: I don't think I would call it a verdict. It is HNTB's report on the at-grade concepts.

A: MOD: HNTB's report will be based on the desire to consider the overall cost associated with the comparison of 3J and 3K.

Q: JR: Are those all going to be apples to apples comparisons?

A: MOD: Yes. HNTB is developing their own cost estimates.

Q: JR: I understand there are a lot of assumptions that go into that. I'm concerned that the same assumptions are being made for each evaluation. Can we see the line item budget?

A: MOD: Sure; at such time as it's appropriate to provide one.

C: GM: If there is a combination of all three, it would be nice to have a line item to compare them side-by-side.

Q: GB: Mike, did you just say that HNTB has provided cost estimates for the Ari plan, ABC alternative, and 3K?

A: MOD: No. HNTB has not provided cost estimates for the MassDOT 3K concepts. The Tetra Tech teams that developed the MassDOT alternatives would be responsible for their cost estimates.

C: GB: When I heard Jessica say apples to apples comparison I interpreted it as the same group providing a cost estimate for all 3.

C: JR: We want to see how each assumption was made side-by-side as a comparison.

C: GB: I think there are many people who think the cost estimate should be done for all 3 plans by the same entity. Do most people on the task force agree with that? *[yes]* Okay great, how do we make that happen?

A: MOD: It won't be addressed at the December 2, 2015 task force meeting. We would need additional time.

C: GB: That would infer that this is the first time you've heard of this. We know it's been mentioned to you and we've sent you documents requesting it for 2 months.

Q: HM: Is the meeting on December 2, 2015 another stage in a process that we don't know when it actual ends?

A: MOD: Let's allow HNTB to answer an independent assessment. Let's allow that process to continue to play out so they can advance their review. The point of the December 2, 2015 task force meeting will be a continuation of that process.

Q: HM: Can you provide us with a schedule or timeline for the completion of their study?

A: MOD: I want to allow the process to take its course.

C: PM: I'd like to make a request. I'm wondering if we can have some discussion of climate change and a possible flooding scenario. If you could couple that information with this process it would be very useful. Thank you.

A: EI: We should have the information by the next meeting. Thank you everyone for coming out. We'll see you on December 2, 2015.

## ***Next Steps***

---

The next task force meeting will be held at 6:00 PM on Wednesday, December 2, 2015 at the Fiorentino Community Center located at 123 Antwerp Street, Allston. All task force sessions are open to the public. On Tuesday, December 8 at 6:30 PM, the project team will hold a public information meeting at the Jackson Mann Community Center.

## Appendix 1: Meeting Attendees

---

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Dennis	Baker	HNTB
George	Batchelor	MassDOT
Glen	Berkowitz	ABC Consultant
Jorge	Briones	Task Force Member
William	Brownsberger	Task Force Member
Nathaniel	Cabral-Curtis	Howard Stein Hudson
Chris	Calnan	TetraTech
Jim	Cerbone	MassDOT
Anthony	D'Isidoro	Task Force Member
Bill	Deignan	Task Force Member
Paola	Ferrer	Task Force Member
Josh	Fiala	The Cecil Group
Kate	Fichter	MassDOT
Elizabeth	Flanagan	Howard Stein Hudson
James	Gillooly	Task Force Member
Astrid	Glynn	MassDOT
Anna	Greenfield	Skanska
David	Grissino	Task Force Member
Nick	Gross	Howard Stein Hudson
Karl	Haglund	Task Force Member
Bruce	Houghton	Task Force Member
Ed	Ionata	TetraTech
Barbara	Jacobson	Task Force Member
Marc	Kadish	Task Force Member
Ken	Kruckemeyer	LSA
Wendy	Landman	Task Force Member
Robert J.	LaTremouille	Friends of the White Greese
Elizabeth	Leary	Task Force Member
David	Loutzenheiser	Task Force Member
Erik	Maki	TetraTech
Pallavi	Mande	Task Force Member
Christine	Marini	BPD

Harry	Mattison	Task Force Member
Galen	Mook	Task Force Member
Susan	Myers	HJ/StepOne
Tom	Nally	Task Force Member
Paul	Nelson	Task Force Member
Mike	O'Dowd	MassDOT
Ari	Ofsevit	Task Force Member
Rich	Parr	Task Force Member
Richard	Parr	Task Force Member
Lou	Rabito	MassDOT
John	Read	Task Force Member
Jessica	Robertson	Task Force Member
Jason	Ross	VHB
Gunjan	Rustagi	CRWA
Apratim	Sahay	CRWA
Mark	Shamon	VHB
Steve	Silveira	Task Force Member
Bob	Sloan	WalkBoston
Kevin	Wright	Task Force Member