MEMORANDUM |

To:	Michael O'Dowd Project Manager	Date:	November 3, 2015
From:	Liz Flanagan Howard Stein Hudson	HSH Project No.:	2013061.14
Subject:	MassDOT Highway Division Allston I-90 Interchange Improvement Project Task force Meeting #15 Meeting Notes of October 29, 2015		

Overview

On October 29, 2015 members of the Allston I-90 Interchange Improvement task force, project team and MassDOT staff associated with the job held the 15th 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.

An official agenda for this meeting was not produced as it focused primarily on work in break-out groups. Similar to the September 17th and October 15th task force meetings, the goal of the meeting summarized herein was to provide task force members and the I-90 Allston Improvement Project team the opportunity to learn the details and implications of the two at-grade concepts advanced by Ari Ofsevit and A better City. It also afforded the opportunity for MassDOT to present the ongoing evolution of Option 3K. The meeting began with a brief welcome and introduction by Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis laying out how the session would work and how long attendees would have at each break-out station. The introduction was followed by a brief presentation discussing environmental permitting and noise as these issues are applicable to all of the concepts currently under review for this project.

Joe Grilli of HNTB presented a flow chart to explain the federal environmental permitting process, as this typically controls timelines. State reviews and permits, such as MEPA, Chapter 91, and the Wetlands Protection Act also apply. The flowchart showed the relationship of Section 106 of the National Historic

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

Preservation Act (which protects historic properties), with Section 4(f) of the U.S. DOT Act (which protects historic properties, publicly owned parklands, and certain other resources), and with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (which requires federal agencies conduct an environmental review under many categories such as air quality, noise, etc.). Project changes made to historic Charles River Basin and Soldier's Field Road by the replacement of the interchange must go through a Section 106 historic review. If there is an adverse effect found during historic review, the project will need to demonstrate that it has taken every prudent and feasible step to avoid or minimize the impact before moving on to a discussion of mitigations with the Massachusetts Historic Commission (MHC). Typically, the greater the effect is, the longer the permitting discussion which involves MHC, MassDOT, consulting parties along with the lead federal agency (FHWA and/or FTA). If there is a finding of an adverse effect, an individual Section 4(f) review must be conducted to determine if the project demonstrates that the least harmful, feasible and prudent option has been selected. This process can take up to 18 months. The section 106 and 4(f) reviews must be completed before completing the (National Environmental Protection Act) NEPA review, planned as the preparation and submittal of an Environmental Assessment (EA). The next step is for the EA to undergo public review and comment. If it is found that there are no significant impacts, a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) will conclude the assessment process. If a FONSI is not determined, a higher level of documentation, an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) must be prepared. In both cases the project must demonstrate that the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative (LEDPA) has been selected. NEPA clearance is a requirement for the Corps of Engineers to ultimately issue a Section 404 permit under Clean Water Act for impacts to 'waters of the United States." The Section 404 process can take from 2-12 months, depending on the project impact and level of permit required.

Next, Jason Ross of VHB spoke about noise mitigation and permitting. For this project, Federal Highway Authority guidelines will be followed because of the changes to road and rail infrastructure. Noise assessments are conducted at residential locations with outdoor areas, as well as parks, trails, dorms, and schools to determine if people would be annoyed by existing or changes in noise. For this project, locations for assessment would likely include Nickerson Field, nearby dorms, the Boston University Colleges of Fine Arts and General Studies, the Charles River, and Magazine Beach. MassDOT noise assessments are conducted during peak commuting hours, while Federal Highway Authority assessments are also carried out at night, with an additional penalty for night time noise. Any mitigation efforts meet specific guidelines to ensure that FHWA and state funds are well spent. Any noise barriers must be feasible, reasonable and cost-effective. Jason pointed out that under current conditions, the viaduct carrying I-90 helps to buffer areas adjacent to it from the noise of the vehicles on the highway; an elevation maintained in Option 3K. The at-grade options would both have a different and somewhat noisier profile since more traffic would be placed adjacent to the Paul Dudley White bicycle path. The plan proposed by Ari Ofevit would elevate trains which are considered noisier than highway traffic.

Following these informational presentations, task force members began the break-out groups. Four tables were provided for task force members to circulate between to hear details about the different project options and have questions answered by the project team. HNBT, Tetra Tech, and MassDOT all had representatives present to facilitate discussion, focusing on the implications of pursuing each given option.

The task force members divided themselves among the four stations to discuss the following topics: the Allston Turnpike At-Grade option advanced by Ari Ofsevit; the I-90 Grounding Feasibility Study option advanced by A Better City; the 3K4 option advanced by MassDOT; and a table for questions about environmental and noise mitigation processes and permitting.

The meeting concluded with reporting back by Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis, Elizabeth Flanagan and Galen Allis of Howard Stein Hudson for each of the three project option tables. Each recorder gave a summary of key characteristics of the project option and then went through the main themes, questions and concerns that arose during the break-out group sessions, as summarized in the text below.

Detailed Meeting Minutes[2]

Break-out Results

MassDOT Option 3K4

The discussion of the 3K4 option was facilitated by members of the TetraTech project team. The project team began each break-out session with a brief presentation to cover key characteristics of the project and their implications. Key characteristics of the 3K4 option, as presented at this meeting, are summarized below.

Key characteristics:

Swapping the relative heights of Stadium Way and East Drive would create a more natural elevation towards the center of the Beacon Park Yard parcel. The area along the river would also become flatter as a consequence of this change.

Cambridge Street south is pushed as close to the mainline of I-90 as possible while still allowing adequate queueing space for traffic departing the highway under a variant of 3K, known as 3K-4. This allows a more direct bicycle and pedestrian connection from the Charles River, into the Beacon Park Yard parcel, and from there into the Allston neighborhood. A long pedestrian bridge that provided this connection under previous options is eliminated under 3K.

Option 3K still presents opportunities to shift Soldiers' Field Road (SFR) away from the river's edge expanding the parkland around the Paul Dudley White Path.

[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.

The project team considers 3K to be a constructible option which achieves many of the goals outlined by the community and MassDOT. The project team's traffic engineers are confident that it can handle projected traffic effectively. Challenges associated with the option are primarily associated with minimizing roadway cross-sections to shorten crossing distances and providing strong bicycle and pedestrian connections both to West Station and the river from the Allston neighborhoods to the north and south of the project area.

Also presented during the discussion of Option 3K were some initial thoughts by CSS regarding providing greenways between the Allston neighborhood and the river to help tighten the area's connection to its premier open space and early ideas by Urban Ideas Lab regarding the Franklin Street pedestrian bridge both in terms of providing an instinctive connection across the turnpike and opportunities for place-making associated with the new structure.

Discussion:

Following the background presentation, the discussion was opened up for task force and community member questions and feedback.

Q: The project team was asked about whether there would be changes to the amount of green space.

A: Green space would be similar to what was available under option 3J since the viaduct would be kept elevated and Soldier's Field Road could be relocated.

Q: The project team was asked to speak to whether Houghton Chemical would remain at its current location.

A: Houghton Chemical would remain and the project team is looking into shifting a road to eliminate one grade crossing and have a pedestrian bridge going over the rail line.

Q: David Grissino of the Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA) wanted to know where the limited access would begin, thinking ahead to the next layer of block subdivision.

C: The project team stated that discussions with Harvard are just starting and the 3K4 option could allow the limited access line to come down to the south side of Cambridge Street south. However, the DOT would want to control the ramps and highway.

Q: The project team was asked to explain the reasoning behind the positioning of Cambridge Street south.

A: Pushing Cambridge Street south as close as possible to the highway allows for better pedestrian and bicycle connections and eliminates the need for a long pedestrian bridge present in earlier iterations. The position of Cambridge Street south in Option 3K4 also maintains adequate queuing space for vehicles exiting I-90. It is worth noting that most participants expressed approval for this position of Cambridge Street south.

Q: The project team was asked whether their analysis considered not only traffic going through the interchange but also future traffic volumes that will eventually head to Harvard's development on the parcel.

A: Harvard land use projections were included in the CTPS model, along with other traffic sources for the highway and neighborhood.

Q: The project team was asked to speak to what the greatest challenges on Option 3K4 would be.

A: While the project team is comfortable with the 3K4 highway and rail design, the big challenges will be ensuring that the neighborhood also is comfortable with the design option by trying to get the streets leading to West Station as flat and narrow as possible and providing connections for bicyclists and pedestrians.

Q: The project team was asked when the BRA place-making study would come into the process.

A: The BRA is waiting until MassDOT selects an option, either 3K or a continued evolution of it or one of the at-grade concepts, before beginning the deeper analysis process.

Q: There was concern that with the yard elevation, wheel truing would not be accommodated.

A: The project team affirmed that wheel truing would still be accommodated. They are also looking into noise barriers along Ashford Street and on the station. Additionally, the rail lines will be going to welded rail, the track will be straightened, and there will be greasing stations at both ends of the yard, all of which will minimize noise impacts.

Q: A task force member inquired if there could be a bus route on Agganis Way.

A: The project team is looking at a bus connection for Malvern Street because of more conducive grades and less impact on Boston University. CTPS is studying this option at present.

C: Concern was expressed over connections to neighborhood streets, particularly Seattle Street and the introduction of cut-through traffic onto these local streets. The project team is aware of this issue and will take steps to address it as the design progresses.

C: Pallavi Mande of the Charles River Watershed Association (CRWA) indicated that she would like to see more consideration taken for storm water management and flooding. CRWA suggested using open space to store and manage storm water. The group's representative further stated that it has been working with the Allston community and that green storm water management and increased open space is something area residents would very much like to see implemented as part of the job.

After comments and questions had been addressed, each session heard a brief introduction of creative footbridge design options from Etty Padmodipoetro of Urban Idea Lab. The 14 to 16 foot wide bridge would connect the two halves of Franklin Street and should give a sense of joy and celebration. Etty discussed

trying to incorporate smooth switchbacks for bicycles. The bridge could include some seating and has the opportunity for organic place-making. Etty stated that there will be lots of development in the area with old industrial buildings being replaced. As such, there is a need to look at tightening connections into the community and at either end of the footbridge. Accessibility for those with mobility impairments or with strollers and the need to be mindful of safety at Franklin Street were discussed and recognized as important design elements.

A concept was presented by Skip Smallridge and Deneen Crosby of CSS for a major green 2-way cycle track connection on Cambridge Street with gentle grades of 1-2% and only 4 intersections between Cambridge Street and the river. There would be a visual focus on parks.

Q: Deneen and Skip were asked why linear parks were being emphasized, rather than blocks.

A: It was explained that the parks don't necessarily have to be linear but the concept seeks to maximize flexibility for future development and tie the neighborhood to river.

Q: The project team was asked if MassDOT intends to build some of the park elements.

A: It was clarified that MassDOT would build elements within the project corridor, while landowners would address internal areas.

Q: Clarification was requested if the elements presented by Skip and Deneen are transferable to the other options.

A: Some would likely work with the I-90 Grounding Feasibility Study but some elements would be more challenged with the Allston Turnpike At-Grade option.

Q: A task force member described the 3K option as "beautiful" but wanted to know more about how the design option can tighten bicycle/pedestrian connections between the river and the area around Ashford Street.

A: Deneen replied that this would need to be looked at further in terms of accommodations and design in light of the challenges associated with further reducing the grades on the Seattle Street connector given the fixed height of West Station and the short distance between the station and Cambridge Street.

C: The pedestrian bridge option F presented by Etty received praise but it was noted that it would likely require an elevator to be ADA compliant.

C: Interest was expressed in a green corridor to the river with small parks used to terminate sight lines.

C: There was continued discussion about bicycle and pedestrian connections. A conversation began on how to improve the intersection of East Drive and Cambridge Street south, stemming from concern that cyclists and motorists are both coming off routes where the other mode is excluded and then coming together again at this point. A suggestion was made that overpasses or underpasses could be provided

for cyclists to bypass the intersection as well as other intersections near the highway. However, since the area north of the highway is not yet developed, Deneen expressed concern that tunnels in the undeveloped area could create an unsafely insolated environment. Task force member Galen Mook stated that option 3K4 seems more natural from the perspective of bicycle routing and the grades for non-motorized modes would need to be tackled.

Allston Turnpike At-Grade

Advanced by Ari Ofsevit

The Allston Turnpike At-Grade option discussion was facilitated by members of the HNTB project team charged with an independent evaluation of the two at-grade concepts. The goal of the independent evaluation is for HNTB to try to engineer each concept into a prudent, feasible, and constructible alternative without reference to the limitations imposed by MassDOT design criteria on the option currently being advanced by TetraTech: Option 3K.

In pursuit of developing a buildable design, two changes had been made to the concept by the consulting team since the task force meeting on October 15th: the option is now shown with the 3K4 option interchange as it was determined that this design element works better with the At-Grade design; the vehicle access to the rail yard, which was previously shown going under the turnpike will now be a ramp coming down from the Seattle St. overpass bridge over the turnpike.

Key Characteristics:

The Allston Turnpike At-Grade option is characterized by an at-grade highway and an elevated rail structure. The viaduct will include a shared-use path for pedestrian and cyclists. Houghton Chemical would remain accessible via a spur. This option allows for a straighter alignment of the Turnpike.

In order for the concept to work geometrically, the Grand Junction line is elevated over the turnpike while the Worcester line is depressed coming into the West Station to cross under Grand Junction. The Worcester line platforms at West Station are also shifted to the west.

The Allston Turnpike At-Grade option also tries to maintain existing parkland but does not extend over or into the Charles River, as the I-90 Grounding Feasibility Study does.

The project team gave a brief presentation at the beginning of each session to explain the major implications for the option.

The implications discussed for the highway aspects of the option dealt with the limited space available, resulting in narrow shoulders and medians. This constriction means there would be limited space for signage, lighting, or snow removal. It would also require unconventional drainage systems and would not

provide space for disabled vehicles in a breakdown lane. Additionally, the highway construction would require that the existing pump and electrical sub-stations be relocated.

The project team next presented a number of considerations regarding the construction of the rail for the at-grade project option. One of the most significant implications of the design is the steep slopes required to make the rail fit within all existing constraints. The curvature of the Grand Junction line coming south-west into West Station would limit train speeds to 10-20mph. The combination of steep track profile grades and sharp curvature will also effect performance and safety, and increase maintenance costs. The rail configuration, particularly the difference in elevation between the Grand Junction and Worcester lines, limits operational flexibility and complicates movements between South Station and the Boston Engine Terminal (BET). In addition, it forces the Grand Junction line to backtrack to access the rail yard and limits transfer options between lines.

Additional impacts would include increased noise and maintenance concerns. The Worcester line platforms need to be shifted to the west, placing them closer to residences and increasing residential noise. The new structures would impact the Salt Creek culvert and potentially the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority (MWRA) water line. In order to have Worcester and Grand Junction both enter West Station, the Worcester line would need to be depressed for clearance. This configuration results in a very narrow cross section with barriers, and does not allow for vehicular access alongside the line for maintenance. Depressing the Worcester line also brings its tracks down to or below the ground water table, requiring additional pumping for drainage.

A final implication of the rail design for future development is the bridge and fill needed to bring Grand Junction up over I-90 would be very difficult to change if there was a desire to expand rail services in the future. It is worth noting that a major documented goal of the task force is for the Interchange Improvement Project not to limit the ability to expand future rail operations, particularly DMU service from Allston to Cambridge and ultimately North Station via the Grand Junction Line.

The project team also presented environmental implications. The proposed option would remove existing shoreline vegetation with no room for a new landscaped riverbank. Shifting I-90 onto historic parkland would result in a higher likelihood of an adverse effect finding. In order to be permitted, the project will be required to demonstrate that it has the least harm feasible and a prudent alternative. This range of consequences is highly likely to lead to an extended environmental review at the end of which, success is by no means guaranteed.

To wrap up the informational presentation, the project team discussed construction staging. The narrowest section of the project, the area under the I-90 viaduct and adjacent to Soldiers Field Road, referred to as the 'throat,' is a limiting factor for much of the project design. Due to the complex nature of construction staging for this project option, long term closures of Grand Junction and the Paul Dudley White path are anticipated. Finally, the construction of the Worcester line would be very complex due to the space constraints and the amount of excavation work required.

Discussion:

After the presentation of changes to and implications of the project option, the discussion was opened up for questions and commentary, summarized below:

C: During the first session, a task force member, who prefaced their statement by saying they were not able to attend the previous task force meeting, expressed concerned that the presentation seemed to focused solely on challenges and issues with the project option, rather than discussing the merits. They also expressed concern that some of the discussion points focused on whether future development potential would be limited and hoped that instead the plan would focus on making conditions better for the existing community.

A: Project team members reminded the discussion group that the previous task force meeting had been spent on discussing the relative merits of each project option. They also stated that they were not trying to present a negative view of the option but wanted to specifically talk about the implications and processes that would have to be addressed. It was also pointed out that a significant amount of work was done to make the project option geometrically feasible and that most of the points presented were maintenance and operation issues as well as potential future constraints imposed by the design.

Q: During the third discussion session, a task force member expressed concern that the project option was being discounted based on assumptions that potential rail development would be difficult rather than focusing on the option's benefits for the existing community.

A: The project team responded that they are presenting project implications. They are still working to make this option the best it can be but want people to be aware that future rail development would be made more difficult because of the sharp curve, steep grades and the amount of fill used to create the structure to bring rail lines over the highway. There are also impacts to current rail service due to the speed restrictions and maintenance/operational challenges.

Q: There was concern that the bicycle and pedestrian path along the river is too narrow at the throat and the project team was asked if it is possible to widen this element of the design.

A: Project team members responded that it is a very constricted space and the area left for shoulders and shy distances is already substandard. In addition, this option does not attempt to extend the Paul Dudley White path over or into the Charles River; doing so would result in an extremely challenging permitting process.

Q: Two task force members wanted to know whether climate change, severe weather events, and resiliency had been taken into consideration and whether analysis had been completed to determine sea-level rise. There was concern that an at-grade option might be a non-started because of potential future flooding events.

A: Project team members responded that while they had not conducted this type of analysis, it would be worth speaking to Jim Cerbone to answer environmental questions. A representative from MassDOT agreed that this is an important conversation to have and noted that there is already a pumping station for the rail lines. The representative wondered how much water is already being pumped and how much more would be handled in the future if an option were implemented which under normal conditions would already require additional pumping for drainage

Q: The project team was asked to speak on how staging and mitigation weigh into the design process.

A: Project team members responded that staging and mitigation are extremely important during the design stage, especially with a project as complex and with as many constraints as this one. It was then clarified that some of these staging and mitigation consequences would be consistent across the three concepts under discussion while others are unique to each option.

C: There was a request made to investigate the possibility of vehicle access for a bus route parallel to the People's Pike on the viaduct.

Q: A task force member wanted to get the project team's opinion of whether there would be an option to extend the Worcester line platforms to the east, rather than to the west, to avoid bringing the platforms closer to residences.

A: The project team agreed that it could be possible with further investigation but would be very difficult because it would make the distance the rail has to change elevation coming in to West Station from the east even shorter, thereby leading to a steeper grade which trains would need to climb and descend and the associated operational challenges.

Q: A discussion on the Worcester line began about the limited shoulder space with no room for a parallel access road, increased maintenance times, and limited transfer options between lines. There was some question of why access to the rail yard is important, resulting from the discussion of why the elevation difference between Grand Junction and Worcester is a significant challenge to the project option.

A: The commuter rail needs to have access to the yard for maintenance and redistribution of trains during off-peak hours. Under this scheme, the Grand Junction line has to bypass the yard's eastern end, return to grade and then back into the western entrance of the yard. There is no eastern access to the rail yard. This presents a challenge and potential stumbling block to future DMU operations on the Grand Junction Line.

The I-90 Grounding Feasibility Study option discussion was facilitated by members of the HNTB project team charged with an independent evaluation of the two at-grade concepts. The goal of the independent evaluation is for HNTB to try to engineer each concept into a prudent, feasible, and constructible alternative without reference to the limitations imposed by MassDOT design criteria on the option currently being advanced by TetraTech: Option 3K.

To that end, the following changes to the previous design were presented: an improved connection to Houghton Chemical; the highway lowered to grade at the west side of the project area; the project tied in to MassDOT 3K4 version interchange. Key characteristics of the I-90 Grounding Feasibility Study option, as presented at this meeting, are summarized below.

Key Characteristics:

The I-90 Grounding Feasibility Study option is characterized by an at-grade turnpike and rail. This configuration continues through the throat section. To accommodate the at-grade infrastructure,a rail flyover is required over the highway to connect the Grand Junction Railroad with the Worcester Commuter Rail Line at a four-track section leading in to West Station.

Because of the constricted space resulting from keeping the turnpike and rail at-grade, this option pushes the Paul Dudley White path it and a portion of Soldiers Field Road to the north over the Charles River. In order to provide a connection to Houghton Chemical, the design has been revised to include a 1,400 foot long and 25 foot tall "hump" in the profile to carry I-90 over a Houghton Chemical spur and a MBTA Layover Facility access road. The hump in I-90 would be supported by large retaining walls. Approximately 1,100 feet of I-90 would be at grade between West Station and Commonwealth Avenue. The project team also noted approximately 1,500 feet of commuter rail tracks along the BU property would need to be depressed in order to provide the Houghton Chemical connection.

The project team gave a brief presentation at the beginning of each session to explain the major implications for the option. As with the Allston Turnpike At-Grade option, a major consequence of the design would be limited shoulder and median widths on the highway, resulting in limited space for signage, lighting and snow removal. It would also require unconventional drainage systems, relocation of existing pump and substations, and would not provide space for disabled vehicles in a breakdown lane. For rail, the project team stated that having four tracks with minimum distances between the lines would present long-term maintenance challenges thereby leading to delays in service or slower service overall. The project team did note that the rail configuration would provide proper rail connections between the Worcester Line, the Grand Junction Line, and the MBTA Layover Facility.

This option does have associated historic and environmental impacts, including shifting I-90 onto historic parkland, and shifting Soldiers Field Road and the Paul Dudley White path into wetland and river areas, affecting 820 feet of river bank. In order to achieve required environmental permits, this option would need to demonstrate it is the least harm feasible and prudent alternative and the least environmentally damaging alternative.

This option would require complex construction staging, particularly along the Worcester line. The Grand Junction line would likely need to be closed for a significant amount of time; possibly as long as two years.

Discussion:

C: There were a series of technical clarifications about the width of the Paul Dudley White path, elevations, widths at the narrowest point and clearance for rail.

Q: Details were requested regarding north-south pedestrian and bicycle connections and it was stated that increasing access to the river is important to the community.

A: The project team agreed that this is something to explore further.

C: There was discussion about how the design removes the viaduct but will be replaced with a flyover and long wall and whether this design is even feasible without shoulders.

A: The project team responded that it should be physically possible but would not be considered a desirable design to advance further given the associated limitations.

Q: Concern was expressed over whether the rail service could be maintained during construction.

A: The project team responded that it could be possible but that the task force needs to recognize that it would be challenging again potentially leading to slower service during construction.

Q: The project team was asked to clarify how much would the train be slowed due to new design.

A: The project team estimated that there would be limited impact.

Q: The project team was asked to speak to the cost differences between options.

A: Elevated structures are generally more costly, though modern viaducts are nowhere near as costly to care for as structures built in the 1960's. The next step would be to consider construction and life cycle costs.

C: There was discussion about the possibility of changing some of the bicycle/pedestrian connections; specifically, better connections from Ashford Street to the river. There was also concern about the grades of bicycle/pedestrian paths.

C: There was a comment made that the elevations being discussed in this project option likely would not be approved, requiring a change in grades.

Q: With regard to noise on the north side of project, there was concern if there would be enough room for mitigation efforts.

A: The project team responded that this is a good question for the representative available to answer noise questions but that there is limited space.

C: In terms of creating park access and green spaces, there was concern that not enough was being done. A more visionary approach was expected and a hope that the design would implement an esplanade vision.

C: Concern was expressed at the lack of storm water management, flooding analysis and project resiliency.

C: Concern was expressed that the current design would limit development potential of Houghton Chemical parcel.[3]

Q: A discussion began regarding Soldier's Field Road and whether it is possible to push Soldier's Field Road further south to create more park space. The discussion revolved around the pinch point, which would shorten the off-ramp; if angled up, this change would encroach into the river. One option is to continue straight with five lanes, which would angle towards the river. The second option is a sharper curve after the initial curve which would result in slower speeds on Soldier's Field Road. It would be difficult to move the pinch point because it would shorten queue lengths, which is not endorsed. It was also suggested that the 3K-3 highway had wide shoulders on either side of the highway that could be reduced, but HNTB representatives did not endorse this idea as being safe or desirable.

Q: Clarification was requested regarding the 820 foot environmental impact presented as a project option impact.

A: The project team responded that this number is the length of riverbank that will be encroached upon. The existing vegetation adjacent to the bicycle/pedestrian path would be removed with this at-grade option.

Q: There was general concern if the implications of choosing this project option would present insurmountable challenges, to the point where the project is not feasible.

A: The project team responded that they are mainly discussing the throat section of the plan. This area would be addressed with multiple agencies, and what their reactions to the proposal would be would be speculation, However, this project option will impact more 4(f) (historic and parkland) property and other environmental resources so it will need to demonstrate that it is the least harm feasible and prudent alternative and least environmentally damaging.

[3] It is worth noting that Bruce Houghton is a member of the I-90 Allston Interchange Improvement Task Force. As he has declared his intention to remain in business on the site and eventually pass the business to his daughter, MassDOT has been operating under the assumption that his access by road and rail must be maintained during and after construction. Taking this property for development *is not* part of the agency's agenda for this job.

Q: The project team was asked if the highway could be at grade with the rail going over top.

A: This option was considered but the current project option geometry works better. The project team did not find that it was geometrically feasible with four tracks and Houghton Chemical at-grade.

Next Steps

The next task force meeting will be held at 6:00 PM on Thursday, November 19 at the Fiorentino Community Center. The Fiorentino Community Center is located at 123 Antwerp Street in Allston. All task force sessions are open to the public.

Appendix 1: Meeting Attendees

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Dennis	Baker	HNTB
George	Batchelor	MassDOT`
Joseph	Beggan	Office of Senator Brownsberger
Glen	Berkowitz	A Better City
Jorge	Briones	MBTA
Chris	Calnan	Tetra Tech
Jim	Cerbone	MassDOT
Bill	Conroy	City of Boston
Deneen	Crosby	CSS
Bill	Deignan	City of Cambridge
Ralph	DeNisco	Nelson/Nygaard
Stacey	Donahoe	MassDOT
John	Fallon	MassDOT
Paola	Ferrer	Allston Resident
Tony	Gouveia	HNTB
Joe	Grilli	HNTB
David	Grissino	BRA
Joshua	Grzegorzewski	FWHA
Karl	Haglund	Department of Conservation and Recreation
Bruce	Houghton	Houghton Chemical
Ed	Ionata	Tetra Tech
Barbara	Jacobson	MassBike
Jonathan	Kapust	HNTB
Ken	Kruckemeyer	Livable Streets Alliance
Wendy	Landman	Walk Boston
Robert	LaTremouille	Friends of the White Geese
Elizabeth	Leary	Boston University
David	Loutzenheiser	Metropolitan Area Planning Council
Amy	Mahler	Mayor's Office of

		Neighborhood Services
Clancy	Main	Office of Councilor Ciommo
Pallavi	Mande	Charles River Watershed Association
Galen	Mook	Allston Resident
Alan	Mountjoy	Allston Resident
Tom	Nally	A Better City
Alana	Olsen	Allston Village Main Streets
Etty	Padmodipoetro	Urban Ideas Lab
Tad	Read	BRA
Jessica	Robertson	Allston Resident
Jason	Ross	VHB
Lara	Seiderman	Cambridge CD
Mark	Shamon	VHB
Steve	Silveira	Boston University
Skip	Smallridge	CSS