Overview

On July 15, 2015 members of the Allston I-90 Interchange Improvement Project team and MassDOT staff associated with the job held the 11th task force meeting kicking off the second iteration of this group's operation. 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 resident, 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 purpose of the meeting summarized herein was to introduce new members to each other and to ensure that all of them would begin their work with the same knowledge of the project history to date. As part of the design phase for the project, MassDOT announced that the project will be moving forward with some added strength on its consultant team. In part in response to the previous task force's request, MassDOT added new team members including VHB, Urban Ideas Lab, and Crosby Schlessinger Smallrdige (CSS) to further assist in the development of West Station, motorized and non-motorized bridge infrastructure, as well as urban design elements. For this phase of the task force there will be a rotating meeting schedule focusing on 3 different elements of the project: highway and interchange, rail and transit, and community place making. All members of the task force and community are allowed to attend all meetings; however, reminder notifications of the meetings will contain verbiage addressing what topic will be discussed. As part of the community place making element, the Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA) will be working in partnership with MassDOT to deal with issues of land use and place-making in those area of the Beacon Park Yard parcel which are not part of the transportation right-of-way and will eventually be occupied by non-transportation uses.

The overarching theme of the meeting was one of concern. Taskforce members had mixed reactions to data presented showing growth in traffic volumes on the Massachusetts Turnpike and projected growth in volumes on the ramps leading to and from Cambridge Street as a result of development in Beacon Park Yard and elsewhere in adjoining areas. Some taskforce members stated flatly their disagreement with the data as presented. Others agreed with the data, but questioned whether MassDOT was doing enough to contain traffic growth rather than passively accommodating it. It is worth noting here that the project team has incorporated a very aggressive increase in transit mode share into their projections of future traffic volumes.

---

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

Another topic discussed was funding for the project. While MassDOT remains committed to advancing the design of the project as whole, how it will be funded for construction remains unclear at this time. There is a possibility that it will need to be staged in some fashion. It was acknowledged that the project has funding for the viaduct and highway infrastructure only. It was also acknowledged that the MBTA has committed to a State of Good Repair and therefore a $200 million dollar project may be in question resulting in a multiple phased project. It was suggested by Senator Brownsberger that the task force should work to carve out specific items that are priorities and ones that would be accomplished in the first phase if phasing was required.

Detailed Meeting Minutes[2]

C: Ed Ionata (EI): Good evening everyone my name is Ed Ionata. I will be working to facilitate this task force along with the team that MassDOT has assembled. We are going to go around the room for introductions. Many of you have been here before but I know there are a few new task force members. Tonight we are going to cover some topics that are partially new, partially old, and partially a review in order to get everyone on the same page. We are going to provide an update on the traffic analysis. We'll then provide an update on West Station and the Beacon Park Yards. We'll wrap up by discussing the overview of the future process. We'll pause for 15 minutes at the end of each technical presentation for questions. At the end we'll have an open discussion. At this point I would like to go around the room for introductions.

Task Force Introductions

C: Will Luzier (WL): I'm Will Luzier. I've been an Allston resident for 15 years.

C: Paul Nelson (PN): My name is Paul Nelson. I am a senior transportation planner at MASCO.

C: Tom Nally: I'm Tom Nally. I am with A Better City (ABC).

C: Anthony D'Isidoro (AD): I'm Tony D'Isidoro. I sit on the board of the Allston Civic Association (ACA) and the Allston/Brighton Community Development Corporation (ABCDC).

C: Bill Deignan (BD): I'm Bill Deignan with the City of Cambridge community development department.

---

[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.

C: Galen Mook (GM): I'm Galen Mook. I am a local resident.

C: Jessica Robertson (JR): My name is Jessica Robertson. Some of you may know me from my day job at the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) and I wanted to clarify that I am here as an Allston resident.

C: Joseph Beggan (JB): I'm Joseph Beggan. I am with Harvard University.

C: Harris Band (HB): I'm Harris Band. I am with Harvard University.

C: Sean Macaluso (SM): I'm Sean Macaluso with the Office of Senator DiDomenico.

C: Oscar Lopez (OL): I'm Oscar Lopez with the Office of State Representative Honan.

C: Paula Ferrer (PF): I'm Paula Ferrer. I'm an Allston resident. Some of you may know me from the Joseph M. Smith Community Health Center. I would like to clarify that I am here in the capacity of a resident.

C: Matthew Danish (MD): I'm Matthew Danish. I am an Allston resident.

C: Andrew Bettinelli (AB): I'm Andrew Bettinelli with the Office of Senator Brownsberger.

C: Jim Gillooly (JG): I'm Jim Gillooly. I am a former Allston resident and current Deputy Commissioner at the Boston Transportation Department (BTD).

C: Margaret Van Deusen (MVD): I'm Margarget Van Deusen with the Charles River Watershed Association. I will be tag-teaming with Pallavi Mande who is our Blue Cities Director.

C: Jorge Briones (JB): I'm Jorge Briones with Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) design and construction.

C: Kevin Wright (KW): I'm Kevin Wright with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA).

C: Steve Silveria (SS): I'm Steve Silveria with Boston University.

C: Elizabeth Leary (ER): I'm Elizabeth Leary with Boston University.

C: David Gerstle (DG): I'm David Gerstle. I am filling in for Jackie Douglas with LivableStreets.

C: David Grissino (DG): I'm David Grissino. I am a senior architect and design with the Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA). I am here representing Tad Read tonight who is out of the country.

C: Michael O'Dowd (MOD): I'm Mike O'Dowd with MassDOT. Welcome back everybody.

Detailed Meeting Minutes

C: EI: Thanks everyone. Part of the discussion in the first 10 task force meetings was to focus more on community place making and urban design. I'm going to turn it over to Mike to introduce the new place making and urban design resources we have on the team.

Introduction of New Consultant Team Members

C: MOD: Thank you Ed. There are a few new faces but I think we are all familiar with each other. Despite what I said at the conclusion of the last task force, we have all 50 members back to participate. We were very successful last year in identifying a preferred concept to file in the Environmental Notification Form (ENF). I have no doubt that we'll be able to do the same in identifying a single preferred alternative that we will move forward with into a joint document of a draft environmental impact report (DEIR) and Environmental Assessment (EA). When we broke up in the fall of last year, the Secretary of the executive office of energy and environmental affairs (EOEEA) had scoped the elements that we needed to evaluate the impacts and assessments on in order to move forward into the EIR. We will be moving forward with a joint document that will address all elements of the project. Dave Mohler is our director of planning at MassDOT. Those of you who attended the public information meeting on June 17th will remember Dave. The idea is to advance this project under one joint environmental document. That is going to encompass the highway and interchange elements as well as West Station, the commuter rail layover, the place making aspects, and all of the other elements that we have committed to you. We want this task force to assist MassDOT in identifying and informing the Secretary as to the preferred alternative that best represents all of the shared priorities that we worked to achieve last year. The more conversations we have and the more information we exchange will help provide the best outcome to the Secretary. That is our statement of purpose.

The Highway and interchange, West Station and the layover yard, and the place making concepts could all be considered an independent utility. However we are evaluating them as one because we realize the importance of an interrelated function. One thing I want to point out is the fact that all of the project elements are likely to have different funding sources. This was brought to the public's attention of June 17 at the Jackson Mann Community Center. I want to make this clear because as funding becomes available it may necessitate the need for MassDOT

to start looking at phasing this construction. While each component of the job could be constructed independently but we will continue to look at the overall design as a whole.

The shared priorities we worked so hard on last year do a great job highlighting the work that was done by this group last year. Improving the safety for all modes including walking, cycling, driving, and transit is the number one goal. Realigning I-90 with the idea of all electronic tolling (AET) coming online in the fall of 2016 was another. With any of the concepts we develop we are trying to achieve a context sensitive design by lessening the impact of the interchange on the neighborhood, avoid inducing cut-through traffic, and reconnecting the parts of Allston back together. We want to protect the neighborhood during construction, create a more vibrant Cambridge Street, and increase accessibility to transit and the future West Station.

There were a number of recommendations that you all brought to our attention. One of them was relative to the design of West Station. VHB is the design lead for West Station and they will be working in conjunction with our highway team. We have also enlisted the services of Patrick Engineering and Michael Baker International to assist in developing the criteria that we will be working towards relative to West Station. Another concern you had was the multimodal aspect and the non-motorized uses. For this reason we have added CSS. CSS is an urban design team that many of you may have had experiences with in other areas of the city. They will be working with us to ensure that any concept we advance forward will consider architecture, landscape architecture, as well as the urban design potential of this parcel. Identifying a flexible concept that can incorporate any future design element by the land owner is critical. For the structural and bridge architecture we have enlisted the services of Urban Ideas Lab. We have representatives from both of those groups here tonight and they will speak to you a little bit more about what they do.

We see this project having 3 separate and very important components to the overall project. From the transportation side there is the highway, interchange, and street connections down to Cambridge Street, as well as Soldiers Field Road. I'll continue to address that. The two other components will be co-chaired by representatives of MassDOT and the BRA. The first component will be place making which will be co-chaired by Dave Mohler with MassDOT and Dave Grissino with the BRA. The second component includes the rail and layover facilities. Chairing this group will be Astrid Glynn. You're all welcome to attend all of the sub-group committees. The invitations that went out to you over the last couple weeks asked that you respond to us to whether you have a specific area of interest. Most of you responded that you wanted to be involved in all of them and that's fine. I'm now going to introduce Astrid Glynn.

C: Astrid Glynn (AG): Thank you Mike and good evening. I want to quickly review the issues that we have pulled out to date. The list you see in front of you reflects a lot of hard work. Two items on the list you've already heard Mike talk about. These include bicycle and pedestrian access

and the integration with community place making concepts. Particular to this list we have various very important functional issues. The first is the track configuration. This means getting the train through the station and making sure it fits into the overall network. The second is the yard facilities and operations. This is less attractive but very important in ensuring the system works properly. Integrating the interchange design will be one of the important and challenging items of this multimodal project. We don't often thing about buses going through a train station but the buses going to this train station will be an important part to how we feed passengers throughout all parts of the network. This list should keep us busy for a while.

C: MOD: Thank you Astrid. I'd like to introduce Dave Mohler who will cover the community place making component.

C: David Mohler (DM): Hi everybody. I'm David Mohler, director of planning at MassDOT. If you need to reach me you can do so at david.mohler@state.ma.us or you can call me at (857) 368-8865. There will be 100 acres of undeveloped land created by this project. The City of Boston is going to lead a process in determining what that place should look like. We want to make West Station a neighborhood transit facility and do our best to make it accessible for pedestrians and cyclist. All of that will be discussed in detail at our place making sub group. We are co-chairs but I expect David Grissino will take a lot of the lead because he works for the City. MassDOT is just the enabler and David is the planner.

C: DG: It's true. This is a very important project for the BRA and the Mayor of Boston. MassDOT has asked us to work collaboratively with them on the place making aspect of this project. I would like to report that tomorrow night at the BRA board meeting I will be requesting authorization to issue a request for proposal (RFP) on a place making process for this area. We are working with the Harvard and MassDOT to determine the extent and limits of a study in which we can do. We recognize that in addition to the Image Boston 2030 process that is happening now this is an opportunity to look at this area in a comprehensive and full scale neighborhood planning effort. Our responsibility right now in the scope is to analyze the work that has been done to date and understand it as the beginning of a neighborhood. We want to make sure the current project does not preclude a range of very successful urban design and planning outcomes for the future. Once we secure a consultant I think we'll be able to get into the meat of the matter and work robustly with all of you who are interested.

C: MOD: Thank you David. This task force is going to have an important role in coordinating all of these components. My understanding is that you would all like to participate in the subgroups. I think it's safe to say that we will be meeting every 4 weeks on average. There is going to be a huge time investment on your part. We are looking at place making as the lead off subgroup based on importance. That session will most likely happen on August 19 right here. The second

subgroup session will be the highway and interchange followed by the rail and transit subgroup session. To assist us with the place making we brought on the services of CSS.

C: Skip Smallridge (SS): Hi everyone, I'm Skip Smallridge. I'm here with my colleague Deneen Crosby. Our third partner is Carole Schlessinger. Carole is not with us tonight however the 3 of us have been working together for about 30 years. In the last 12 years we have had our own company called CSS and before that we were with a company called Wallace Floyd Associates. During that period we had a lot of experience working on projects that involved land use, transportation, and urban design in the City of Boston. Some of these projects include the Big Dig, the Green Line Extension, Neponset River Greenway, and many other smaller plazas, park, and streetscape jobs in Boston. I've also worked on about 25 intermodal center projects that tied into transit orientated developed. In the past few years we've worked on a number of master plans within the City of Boston including Colombia Point which has been approved by the BRA and North Station which involved a lot of consideration of air rights.

C: Deneen Crosby (DC): Hello, I'm Dennen Crosby. I am a landscape architect and as Skip said we have been working together for almost 35 years now. We do a lot of work in the metropolitan area including park work like the Rose Kennedy Greenway. We also do a lot of work on smaller neighborhood parks. We have been doing a lot of street projects in the City of Boston which includes complete street guidelines. Our Colombia Point design includes cycle tracks, sidewalks, rain gardens, and way-findings signage. We've also worked on greenway park designs along the Neponset River and Mystic River. Our role on this project is to look at the future development potential and flexibility. Some of the things we will be looking into are open space opportunities, neighborhood connections to West Station, Commonwealth Avenue, the Charles River, and other parts of the neighborhood. There are some wide streets as part of this project so we will be looking at ways to make that feel more comfortable. There will be plenty of place making opportunities and we will be coordinating all of this with the BRA.

C: MOD: Thank you Skip and Deneen. I would now like to introduce Etty with the Urban Ideas Lab. Etty and I have worked on several successful projects together and I am looking forward to working together once again.

C: Etty Padmodipoetro (EP): Thank you Mike. My name is Etty Padmodipetro and I am with Urban Ideas Lab. I am an architect and urban designer with a background in transit and transportation infrastructure. I've worked on bridges for over 20 years. I want to talk about 2 local projects. The first is the Wonderland pedestrian bridge. This bridge was done quickly with a lot of input from the City of Boston, stakeholders, and the community. The bridge was designed based on urban design and place making principles. The second project is the Lechmere Station which will be similar to West Station. It has an extremely complicated viaduct and rail track system. On this project we tried to single out a place making and urban design

principle in terms of access and connections. My role in this project is to work on the pedestrian and bicycle connections. I will be supporting CSS on the urban design and place making effort as well as the general highway architecture.

C: MOD: Thank you Etty. Tonight there is going to be a focus on traffic. When we broke up last fall there were a lot of questions internally and publicly relative to the modeling and traffic. The Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS) had a major role is that effort. Tonight, we have 2 members of the traffic modeling team here from CTPS. Once Mike Hall finishes we'll take questions on the traffic.

Discussion of New Traffic Data

C: Mike Hall (MH): Thanks Mike and thank you everyone. It's good to be back and I see a lot of familiar faces. It's been a while since we presented traffic and there are some new members so I want to cover some of the material that was presented at the public meeting. When we last met MassDOT was filing the ENF with a preferred concept called 3J. Within 3J we had 3 options including 3J-1, 3J-2, and 3J-3. All of the 3J concepts are based on an urban interchange style. In all concepts the mainline gets realigned and the on and off-ramps are parallel to the highway. All 3 concepts have north-south connector roads and in the case of 3J-1 Cambridge Street remains a two-way street. Concept 3J-2 has a similar alignment and there is a parallel Cambridge Street South that is constructed. In this concept, Cambridge Street is a one-way westbound and Cambridge Street South is one-way eastbound. In concept 3J-3 the main difference is that Cambridge Street and Cambridge Street South are both two-way roads. Last August we started talking about the factors that influence the roadway lane requirements. The main factor is traffic volumes. Another is the elimination of grade separation. In the 3J concepts we are trying to eliminate as much grade separation as possible and make it more pedestrian friendly. We will be controlling the right turns in all concepts for safety but this also has a consequence. We will be incorporating exclusive pedestrian phases because of the high volumes of highway traffic. That is going to cut into the green time for cars. As we go forward we will explore further into bicycle signals.

I want to take about some of the assumptions that went into the CTPS model. There are 3 basic assumptions. The first is land use, the second is transit, and the third is the highway. CTPS was given population and employment data from MAPC for the future year of 2035. The other part of the land use assumption was based on estimates from Harvard University on anticipated growth within the IMP area. Harvard has a 10 year IMP that they recently completed. This doesn't include 2025 to 2035 which is out build year. CTPS assumed the same growth based on the 10 year plan. The last consideration is Beacon Park Yards. We consulted with Harvard and based on that land area as a proportion of the IMP there is about 70 percent of developable land.

All of this translates to 3 million square feet in the IMP area and 4 million square feet in the Beacon Park Yards by 2035.

On the transit side, the modeling assumed a West Station in its currently proposed location. It assumed the station will have commuter rail service, some form of urban rail service, and bus service. The model also assumed the Boston Landing Station, Green Line Extension, and the Fairmont line improvements. We are trying to be as aggressive as possible for the transit assumptions. In terms of assumptions that went into the model regarding traffic, it included AET and the Allston Interchange improvements. That covers what was going into the model.

The I-90 mainline through the Allston area carries about 140,000 to 150,000 cars per day. More importantly are the 67,000 cars getting on and off the interchange. We looked back as far as 2002 at traffic volumes along the mainline in both directions and since 2002 traffic has been growing by about 1.2 percent per year. There has been talk about VMT going down and that happen between 2007 and 2010. This coincides with the economic crisis. As the economy has started to come back you can see the volumes growing again. We compared those volumes with occupied commercial space in Boston. As commercial space increased, traffic volumes increased. This gives us a good sense of what has been going on historically. We've taken this one step further to look at the ramps. This first graphs shows the eastbound off-ramp. In general, it is a positive growth. Traffic on this ramp is going by .7 percent per year. The next is the westbound off-ramp which is .1 percent per year. The eastbound on-ramp is about 1.1 percent per year and the westbound on-ramp is about 1.4 percent per year.

The traffic is growing in this area because of its geographic location. The interchange is 3.5 miles from Newton Corner and 2.5 from Copley Square. There are a lot of communities that use this as the access and egress point. It's also a major access and egress point for employment centers. This interchange serves Kendall Square, MIT, Harvard Square, Boston University, MGH, the Longwood Medical Area (LMA), and St. Elizabeth's Hospital. Those places are critical to the region's economy. In terms of who is using the interchange we have been drilling into the data from CTPS to determine what is regional and what is local. We broke this down to the Harvard IMP area, Beacon Park Yards, and an area within a mile drive. Everything outside of the mile radius we are considering regional. In the 2035 a.m. we are seeing that 59 percent of traffic is regional. In the future p.m. peak hour we have similar splits. Regional traffic is about 63 percent. The key take away from the mode split based on existing conditions to future conditions is that the transit share is going up and the auto share is going down. When we look further out to 2035 the overall growth rate on the eastbound off-ramp averages out to be 1 percent per year. The westbound off-ramp is significantly greater with a 2.5 percent increase. The eastbound on-ramp has a 1.6 percent increase and the westbound on-ramp is approximately 2 percent per year. In terms of moving forward, we have been asked by Harvard to switch East Drive and Stadium Way so that East Drive is low and Stadium Way is high. We are also going

to look at an option that has a vehicular connection to Commonwealth Avenue. The 3 bullet take away is that this interchange has a local and regional function, the historic traffic trends are increasing, and finally, the most important take away is that West Station will be effective in getting a mode shift. With that I am going to open it up to questions.

Traffic Question & Answer

Q: JR: I have a couple clarifying questions. Am I correct in thinking the intersection analysis and number of lanes is being done based on the peak hour capacity?

A: MH: Yes.

Q: JR: The traffic volumes you showed us are average daily volumes. Can you show us the overtime traffic flow rates for the peak hour?

A: MH: We are working on that and when I come back we will show that.

Q: JR: Okay. Are those similar trends?

A: MH: In some cases they are, yes. We are happy to show that information.

C: JR: We have made a case about our disagreements based on the last 5 years of traffic. I am not convinced why the trend is increasing. I understand there is a lot of development going on and there has been a lot of development going on already.

A: MH: The future data that was fed to CTPS from MAPC is still showing growth.

C: JR: As you have more growth you have more density which means more people can walk to more places.

A: MH: The model considered that. There will definitely be a lot of bicycle and walking trips. Unless Beacon Park Yards has zero parking there is likely to be an increase in traffic.

C: JR: Traffic has been going down in places like Kendall Square.

C: AD: Maybe some of the focus should be on mode shift. I think we should look into developing a set of strategies that would result in mode shift.

A: MH: The model is showing a healthy mode shift but maybe we can do better.

Q: JR: Does the model take into account traffic congestion on the rest of the network?

A: MH: Yes, the model does take that into account.

Q: JR: What about when cars get off the highway and they want to go to Central Square? The sizes of those roads are not changing and those roads are already backed up. Is that accounted for?

A: MH: I believe it is but I will confirm that.

Q: AD: Is the way to deal with this more highways or a better design?

A: MH: Despite the numbers, we are working as hard as we can to keep the intersections and cross-sections as narrow as possible. We understand that this is a regional and community project. If people can't get off at this interchange they are going to get off at Newton Corner and come down Western Avenue.

C: WL: I have two questions. It seems to me that this project is pointing out the inflection point that we are at in the Boston area. You are continuing to use an ever growing rate. By my quick calculations you are going to increase the number of cars that get off the highway from 67,000 to about 100,000 per day. If we carry it out further it will just increase more. We know that if we build roads they will fill up with cars. The question to MassDOT, the City of Boston, to Harvard, to Boston University, and to the neighborhood is what are we doing here? Why are we trying to figure out how to dump more cars into this neighborhood as the future of Boston? This is not the direction that any of the agencies are talking about as a policy direction. When cars get off the highway they are going to fill up the streets. We know and we have been talking about it statewide that we need to do something different. You have answered the question that has been asked of you. The question is more for David Grisinno and David Mohler. Is the idea to take as many cars as possible and put them into the neighborhood? Is this really what we want to do here? Look at a place like Kendall Square which has had huge job growth and lower traffic. It is going to cost a billion dollars to finish this interchange. We can do a lot more with that money.

A: MH: I think the most important thing is that roads don't create traffic, land use does.

C: WL: That's not true. That is incredibility incorrect. How do you explain Kendall Square?

C: MH: The road itself does not generate traffic. It is generated by land use.

C: JR: It is a system of interconnect incentives and disincentives. The harder it is to drive your car the more likely you will be to choose to live closer to your job or to choose an alternative mode. The size of the road makes a huge difference. When we take down an overpass or do a lane diet, you'll see and we've seen that traffic is fine.

C: MD: I want to get into a few details of your slides. The first thing I want to talk about is avoiding intrusion into the neighborhood. Adding 20,000 cars is one of the largest intrusions possible. When you design a system that is going to accommodate 20,000 cars I don't know where they are going to go. What you should be doing is picking up ways to meter or avoid increased traffic. We should be designing an interchange that avoids this increase. Your projection is a threat to us. I also wanted to go back to a few specific slides and talk about the detail. Could you go back to one of the slides that show the growth on the mainline? This is not a surprise to me. I've seen this data before from the traffic counts that are made public. What I find interesting is that while there has been growth on the mainline the local streets have been decreasing. I am much more concerned about the traffic getting off the mainline rather than the traffic going through. Could you please go to the eastbound off-ramp slide? You derived a positive growth per year from this chart but that's not what I see. If you came to us last year and showed us this same chart you would of concluded an average decrease. This is representative of a flat growth because there is a limitation of how many cars can get through the eastbound off-ramp. It can't grow in a way that you have projected.

C: MH: With any projection there are going to be ups and downs.

C: MD: What is your confidence in saying that this graph derives a positive growth? If I was doing a regression line I don't think I would come up with the same numbers that you did.

C: MH: I'm trying to keep it simple. It is an average growth rate. The point is that it is growing.

C: MD: No, it's not growing. It's flat. That is why I asked you to do a statistical analysis and come back with numbers that show the slope of the line and what the regression coefficient is. All you did was picked the last point and first point and said there is a positive slope there. If you came to us in the fall you wouldn't have had a positive growth.

C: MH: You're right, I would not have but we want to use the latest data.

C: MD: My point is that this is more representative of a flat growth rate. I had a few other questions about the model itself. The model may have simplifying assumptions that I am very concerned about and which do not reflect reality.

C: EI: It is understood. We are going to dive into this is much more detail on the focus session on the highway and interchange. We need to get onto the rest of the presentation. We could talk about this for hours. Let's take one more.

Q: AO: You mentioned mode share shift and the increase of transit. Was that interest local or regional? I ask because I think we should be using West Station as a place to catalyze people from a regional perspective. I'm not sure if I read the numbers correctly but more than half of the people coming through my neighborhood everyday aren't going near my neighborhood. Pollution, congestion, and noise are all major issues.

A: MH: The people going through our neighborhood who don't live there speaks to regional percentage going through the interchange. In terms of mode shift we are showing the area covered by the Harvard IMP and the Beacon Park Yards. When we come back next time we will show the transit captures.

C: AO: What I'm trying to say is that I want someone who lives in Worcester to take the train to West Station and then get on a bus or another train in order to get to their work.

C: AD: I think Alana is trying to ask if we can incorporate regional transportation planning of other projects that could have a positive impact on this project.

C: AO: I appreciate what you are saying but I think I said what I meant to say. Can get regional traffic on the train and off the highway? Can we make West Station more vibrant?

Q: GM: I have a quick point. In terms of clarifying the numbers are you able to distinguish between single occupancy vehicles, commercial vehicles, and tractor-trailers?

A: MH: We can distinguish cars from trucks. We can also identify HOV's.

C: GM: That would be helpful for when we breakout into sub groups. I'm also wondering if the closing of CSX caused more of these numbers to increase because tractor-trailers have to be trucked in from Worcester. Does the removal of a 12 track train yard increase the on-ramp or off-ramp usage? We can't get to the trucks on transit but we may be able to increase the single occupancy vehicles to transit.

C: EI: Thank you Galen. We are going to cover a lot more detail during the highway and interchange session.

Discussion of West Station

C: Mark Shamon (MS): Thanks Ed. My name is Mark Shamon. I am a project manager with VHB. We will be responsible for the transit, rail, and design elements for the project. We now have our highway architects and urban planners on board but we still have a ways to go to determine what this is going to look like. We have several different elements that are part of the rail and transit design. The first is Beacon Park Yards. There is an intent and need for layover tracks that was identified in the South Station Expansion (SSX) DEIR. The plan is to get 14-18 consist for layover tracks. We are also looking at running repairs. This is a location that suites itself for a pit track, car wash, crew quarters, and a wheel truing facility. The second item is West Station. West Station evolved out of the public and task force sessions. We are looking at a station that accommodations multimodal and commuter rail use as well as a future urban rail service. Many of you have probably heard that Governor Baker has halted the DMU idea that was moving forward. However our plans still include consideration of DMU's because we are looking out 75 years. The last item is maintaining a branch to Houghton Chemical as well as access to Grand Junction.

The Beacon Park Yards will include layover tracks for 14-18 consists, a sheltered pit track, wheel truing facility, car wash, crew quarters, and power substations. We are planning to have our pit track and car wash as one long facility. We are also looking at some of the storm water considerations. We are looking at infiltration, pervious paving, and ways to reduce storm water runoff into the Charles River. We also have an emergency access point off of Babcock Street. East of the Beacon Park Yard we have the viaduct. All of the tracks coming out of the yard except for the southernmost track will eventually be able to get across the Grand Junction. As part of the DEIR we are preparing two alternative analyses. One will be for Beacon Park Yards and one will be for West Station. We are going to have to make some evaluation to determine a preferred alternative.

Let's move onto West Station. We are looking at having 2 platforms with 3 to 4 revenue service tracks. Based on the ongoing analysis we are thinking 3 of the tracks will be passenger tracks and the fourth will serve for freight. It will however be built to a passenger track standard. The platforms will be long and wide. This is important for safety when entering and exiting the train cars. We are looking at 2 points of pedestrian and bicycle access from the north and the south. As we heard last time there was a strong interest in ensuring that at least once of these access points is a non-dismount entrance or exit. We will be providing vehicular access for MBTA buses and shuttles. The thought is that there will be frequent bus service someday in the future. As you have heard before we are not providing any parking facilities.

In terms of proximity to adjacent stations, West Station is located between Boston Landing Station and Yawkey Station. As it stands now the Boston Landing Station is .8 miles away to the west and Yawkey Station is 1.3 miles to the east. I've heard talk about putting a station where the old station was at Cambridge Street. It isn't technically feasible if we are going to try

to build the station that has been talked and include 2 platforms and 4 passenger service tracks. The other issue is that the station would only be .4 miles apart from the Boston Landing Station. We are providing 6 feet of clearance from any fixed object on the platforms; this way people can get by each other without having to walk on the tactile warning strip. We will have 2 escalators, elevators, and stairs. Each platform will have 3 points of entry and exit.

We have looked at a number of potential access points for pedestrian and bicycles and we have a few leading candidates. We're thinking that we'll have some sort of access point from the west along Malvern Street. A full ramp system doesn't really work at this location. The only thing that does work is a switchback ramp type system. What we're looking at now is a ramp that starts on Ashford Street at the end of Malvern Street and goes up to the mezzanine area about the platform. The existing grade at the end of Babcock Street is even lower than it is at Malvern Street. Given the ADA requirements we couldn't get there with a straight ramp. The last place we are looking at is Buick Street or Harry Agganis Way. The idea is for a ramp to come up at a gentle slope without any turnaround loops. This ramp has some potential to provide a non-dismount access point. From Malvern Street we are looking at a ramp that respects the existing property at 76 Ashford Street. The ramp is about 12 feet wide which is fairly generous. On Babcock Street there will be sidewalk improvements and we will have a stairway and elevator system at this access point. This location will also have an emergency vehicular access point. At Agganis Way and Buick Street we have an access point at the end of Buick Street. This is a long straight path and we see this as a non-dismount path. We think that we can get a 16 foot wide path which would allow for separation between bicyclist and pedestrians.

We're looking at a couple of different station options in terms of height, number of levels, and how the roadway would operate above. The first example is showing a one-way station loop. This animation shows how the buses would move through the station. We're also looking at a two-way loop. In the 2 way option cars can enter from the east in addition to the west. One of the things we understand is important to the community is to allow patrons to by-pass the station area through a mezzanine level below without having to enter the station. That is made available with a 3 level station. Our 2 level station provides for all of the convergence of cars, pedestrians, and cyclist all at the top level. We are planning to put canopies over the bus loop which has been requested by the MBTA. In the short term we are looking to add solar panels to generate some of the energy that will be used in the station. The 3 level station is more or less the same with the exception that we don't have to mix the patrons in with motorized users. The mezzanine level offers the opportunity to add some bicycle parking as well.

There are many factors that drive the height of the station beyond the 2 versus 3 level concepts. The viaduct, highway, bridge, and track elements all have to be coordinated. The viaduct must provide clearance for the yard tracks. The I-90 profile must climb to reach the viaduct elevation. The East Drive Connector Bridge must climb over I-90 and the access loop road elevation is tied

to the bridge elevation. The bottom line is that the height of West Station is largely driven by the height of the eastern intersection. When comparing the 2 level station versus a 3 level station, overall we can shave about 5 feet off in comparison. There are pros and cons to both options. The MBTA would like to make the mezzanine level a place for people. As I mentioned before we have the evaluation criteria we have to complete for the alternatives analysis. I mentioned the criteria for the Beacon Park Yards and we'll have to do the same for West Station. In terms of West Station criteria for the neighborhood we want it to be accessible by people of all abilities. We need to ensure the connectedness to the neighborhood and customers as well as the limits of the right-of-way and private impacts. We are looking at 24 hour pedestrian and bicycle access around the station, minimizing air, noise, and light pollution, as well as incorporating urban design elements within and around the station. That covers my portion of the presentation. I will now open it up to questions.

C: MD: I have questions that were not answered in the previous section.

C: MS: I think there will be an opportunity to answer those questions at another session in more detail.

C: MD: I will be unable to attend the focus group on that. I also want to say that I hope everyone else has a chance to ask their questions because it has been an extremely long presentation. As part of a task force I would imagine that a main part of this would be to provide input.

C: MS: Of course.

Q: MD: My question relating to West Station is what is the estimated ballpark cost?

A: MS: Just looking at the staging we think it is around $75 million.

Q: MD: $75 million covers the layover yard and the station?

A: MS: No. The layover facility adds about $100 million.

Q: MD: Okay. It sounds like we are in the ballpark of $200 million. In the past we heard that Harvard and the State would contribute thirds. That was seen as $7 million each. Are they still chipping in a third?

A: MOD: That is still being worked out. Initially we were looking at a station similar to Yawkey Station. When we coordinated with the MBTA and received feedback from the public, the desire is to have a station that is more than Yawkey Station. The scope increase brings a cost increase.

A: DM: There is no agreement to contribute a third of $75 million dollars.

Q: MD: In the past there were documents that said the estimated entire cost of the project was $260 million. What does the $260 million pay for? Does it pay for just the viaduct or the supporting roads?

A: MOD: It pays for all of the viaduct, realignment of I-90, and the interconnecting roadways to Cambridge Street. The remainder was a composite of the rail station and the rail layover yard.

Q: MD: Would you say it is safe to assume now that the price is closer to $500 million?

A: MOD: It was always my projection that we were in excess of $460 million for the whole project.

Q: MD: This cost is much more than the funding that has been identified which I believe was $160 million. The MEPA scope asked you to talk about the other option of the railroad infrastructure. The only part that needs to cross over the highway is the Grand Junction link. I guess something needs to be worked out with Houghton Chemical as well. It would be a lot cheaper to take the very large viaduct and put that on the ground while putting the much smaller rail and Grand Junction on a viaduct above the highway. The MEPA scope asked you to talk about that. Has this been considered? I believe the cost would be $100 million cheaper. Not mention it would open the possibilities of air rights for development by Harvard and Boston University.

A: MOD: We have looked at various considerations for depressing the highway and bringing the rail lines over. We also looked into bringing the roadway to an at-grade scheme while maintain the service ability of the rail. We also looked at how we were going to construct it. I'm not sure where you got your cost estimate from. We'll look at it further as we start to develop the DEIR.

C: MD: Constructing any viaduct is a lot more expensive than not.

C: MOD: It really depends on how you stage it and its constructability. We'll look into it further but our initial look when we filed the ENF found that there were no savings and more risk.

C: JR: We looked back at the presentation that was given about a year ago. What you presented to us was an alternative that had the highway at-grade and all 4 of the rail lines above grade. The elevation of the Worcester line was the issue. I think Matt is talking about having a 2 track Worcester line at-grade and the Grand Junction line elevated.

C: MOD: I'd have to look back at that presentation. We also have to incorporate Houghton Chemical's operations. There are a lot of things that have been asked for and to be accounted for in all of the alternatives.

C: MD: When you go back and look at this could you please consider that you will be able to reduce the height of all the structures.

Q: Senator William Brownsberger (SWB): I'm Senator William Brownsberger. I have 2 questions. Could you talk a little more about the DMU's and where that stands?

A: MS: I think it has been published by my understanding is that the DMU study has been halted. I think the procurement is still out there.

Q: SWB: Does that mean that bids are still going to be put out there or not?

A: AG: One of the things we did in the one year capital improvement program (CIP) compared to the 5 year CIP was to separate the issue of what we need to do in the first year. The question of DMU's more properly belongs in the 5 year CIP and that is where I think public debate will occur. Right now we are focusing on keeping the technology we have functional.

Q: SWB: I am totally all for state of repair and I think it's a great focus. I want to be clear about where we are. The DMU's are on ice and they will not be at the bid in October. Is that correct?

A: AG: The DMU's will be a topic in the 5 year CIP.

C: SWB: Okay, thank you for that clarification. I want to say something about the funding and Matt raised it. We have half a billion dollars here. We all need to grapple with those comments. We have funding in place for the viaduct. We have the MBTA that is committed to the state of good repair. A $200 million project at the time when the MBTA is focused on the state of good repair is a big question mark. We also have a lot of place making stuff which depends on what Harvard wants to do. We know they have a lazy time horizon for that. One of the questions that we as a task force need to wrap our minds around is, the assumption that this is going to get phased over a couple of decades. What we are really talking about here, what we are designing, and what we are envisioning is going to happen over the course of our lives. One of the things we really need to focus on is to carve out some things that we want to make sure happen as part A. If part A is going to be the viaduct which it will have to be, what else do we want to make sure is part of A? It's probably not going to be West Station. Let's prepare ourselves. Can we incorporate the bicycle and pedestrian accommodations? I'm throwing this out there to the whole group. I'm not trying to redirect the process. I'm trying to take the opportunity that Matt raised with his question about $500 million. We need to think about phasing and we need to think about priorities in that phasing.

C: AD: I think that is very fair. I had sent an email to Nate and Mike asking to be more transparent in terms of financials. Just as you said, we may have to prioritize elements of the design. It would be extremely helpful to the group to start attaching numbers to the elements. That way we can take an intelligent look at them and start prioritizing them. The first number we saw was $160 million and we had no idea what that included. I learned a lot from Matt's questions about the cost of West Station. For this phase of the project we should have the financials and elements of the design more transparent. If we are forced to prioritize we can do a good job knowing what is available, how much it will cost, and what should come first.

C: SWB: The question of how much money is available is not a question this group knows the answer to. It's somewhat of our job to sort of what is realistic to fight for as part of phase 1. That's what the legislative delegation is for. We need to talk with Representative Honan, Representative Moran and Senator DiDomenico about doing that. That is a process we will have to work with over the next 12 months. I don't think this group knows the numbers yet. We are competing with projects all over the state. There are other people asking for things all over the state. We need to be aware of that reality. I think that we should start giving this group some feedback as to how this all logically fits together. We also need to consider how things mechanically fit together. The sooner we can articulate some numbers and concepts around that the sooner we can put our shoulders to the task of support.

C: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis (NCC): Tony, since you put me on the spot in front of an important elected official. Mike did provide me with some information and I will provide it back to you.

Q: Carol Ridge-Martinez (CDM): It sounds like the only funding in place is the widening of the Massachusetts Turnpike and replacing the viaduct. It's that right?

A: MOD: We don't even have money set aside for the scope of that work. We need to look at how to prioritize each of these elements as the Senator said. We still have to look at the overall picture of how this will all fit together. I do want to underscore that our plans are not about widening the Turnpike. We would like to add shoulders for safety. We are not adding more lanes.

C: CDM: The outcome piece of this for Allston and Brighton is that we are going to have 50 percent more cars into our neighborhood. I want that clarified. I don't think we understand that. With the widening of the highway it is going to contribute to 50% more cars from the mainline into our neighborhood? Is that correct? That's not good. We are in a neighborhood that is in the beginning of a very large development boom. This is going to bring lots of cars.

A: MOD: We are not adding 50 percent more cars to the neighborhood. There is an increase.

Q: CDM: Can we get those numbers? I know there are arguments against the numbers and what the reality of the numbers is. I want to know the number of cars coming into our neighborhood.

A: MOD: Understood. You are going to get more of that information in great detail in the subgroups.

Q: CDM: The community development corporation (CDC) owns a decent amount of property in the gap neighborhood. Even if you don't build West Station you're still going to have to store all the cars. Could you go back to the map and show me in relation to Pratt Street where that is going to go?

A: EI: To your first point, please consider that this entire project including West Station is all included in the single document of an ENF. At the end of this there will be a Secretary certificate. In all likelihood that process will tie all of the elements together. It would be rare to get a successful DEIR done that doesn't provide some sort of schedule. It's tied together because the impacts are tied together. There is a process there to protect these projects getting divided into little pieces.

C: CDM: I understand you have to make the Turnpike safe. You don't have to widen it though.

C: MOD: We don't have to increase the number of travel lanes and we're not.

C: PF: I would like to express a point that is my largest concern. The genesis of this project was specifically concerns about the structural safety of the highway infrastructure. It took a bunch of neighbors to mobilize the entire community to actually get an acknowledgement for the improvement of the facilities overall in a way that acknowledged that this is a neighborhood. It took a lot of effort on our part for this project to encompass and improve our livability. My concern is because you approached this project with a specific concern of the viaduct fill find myself back where were started. The priority will then be to accommodate a bunch of cars and my streets won't be walkable or livable. It's discerning to me that we're now going to have to determine priorities. I understand why we have to. I don't want to lose sight of the fact that this is still a neighborhood that got screwed up in the 1960's by some lousy planning. I understand the presenter's point that the viaduct is trying to meet the needs of the local community and the region but I see that a lot of this data is being manipulated in a way to justify the expansion of the highway infrastructure. I know what it feels like to walk and ride my bicycle on these streets. If we are going to develop new opportunities you have to look at other metropolitan cities. You don't need a car to live in a city. We are creating a self-fulfilling prophecy that enables infrastructure that promotes that.

C: MOD: Before any of you leave tonight I want to make sure you get a copy of the handouts that we did not hand out earlier.

C: GM: I have a train specific comment. I also want to say thanks Senator Brownsberger's for bringing us back to reality. The context of your statement paints this in a different light. Even if the money's not here we need to figure out what this is going to look like. My question is with regards to the height of station. The height of the station is dependent on the intersection of East Drive and the bus loop?

A: MS: Yes. It's all connected. The train has to get under the viaduct, the roadway has to reach the viaduct, the bridge has to get over the roadway; there all on top of each other.

C: GM: I know you are looking at switching East Drive further west which I'm assuming is because the viaduct is lower at that point.

A: MS: To answer your question the answer is yes. The further west everything goes, the lower the station could be. It's still a steep slope.

Q: GM: Can I charge you guys with having defined numbers as to the heights of what that will be? Right now you have it pretty well boiled down to a 5 foot difference between 2 levels and 3 levels. The profile of those ramps is my largest concern in relation to making this place accessible.

A: MS: Yes. The way it is laid out now the 3 level station provides for a lower ramp system. The buses still have to come up.

C: JR: That's the point. Then our neighborhood has bus streets that go up 10 feet. This whole issue of the height of the streets is something we've been saying for a long time. Can I make a request?

A: MOD: Sure.

Q: JR: Can you stop working on all of these plans and spend all of your time trying to figure that out. Then we make the decision on which alternative is better.

Q: AO: Can we get traffic counts on existing intersections too?

A: MOD: We can honor all requests. A lot of the concerns and questions relative to the switch between East Drive and Stadium Drive are driven by the results of the CTPS model. We're still working through that. When we go through these more focused sessions we'll be able to walk you through all of the information.

C: JR: That's great. We have tons of people spending a lot of time doing complex engineering and design for a station that may not be where we want it to be. I'm concerned that we are going further into more detail on an alternative that is not actually the best alternative.

A: MOD: We don't see a major change or shift in the location of West Station. West Station was one of the first things that dictated how everything else was going to be evaluated. Until we identify the locations of those platforms and where they best fit relative to rail operations and to the neighborhood that is what drives the rest of it. The impact is going to be how to manage the traffic and the bicycle and pedestrian movements through the station.

C: JR: I would like to change the order to work on answering questions that relate to neighborhood priorities. I think we need to make those decisions as soon as possible.

C: JB: I think Jessica is talking about one of the key issues and that is the importance of air rights. Eventually this rail yard will be covered. We don't know when that will be but we want to make sure it is economically feasible. The intersections are a big deal.

C: AG: Joe, I think you're pointing out one of the benefits to the fact that so many people want to be involved in more than one group. If there was a silver bullet we wouldn't have to spend as much time. It's good that everyone is interested in the highway and the rail operations.

C: EI: I'm going to take one minute and then we'll go back to questions. The next meeting will focus on community place making. The tentative meeting date for that is August 19. A few folks have contacted different consultants on the team for process informational request. It would be much appreciated if you could send that to Nate, myself, or Mike. We promise to get the right information to you. The website is still active and all of this information will make it on there. We have a handout showing increase VMT and we also have a handout of the task force ground rules.

C: MOD: We also have a memo from the Secretary.

C: EI: My last point is that we are still aiming for an environmental filing in mid-2016. At this point I'll open it back up to a discussion.

C: WL: As it is currently configured, West Station won't serve the LMA or Back Bay because buses can't get there. The designs we've seen so far don't acknowledge that it may make sense to have transit access from the south. We know Boston University doesn't want it but there are long term issues here. Maybe this is an issue for Astrid.

A: AG: That door style pattern is one that we've struggled with for many years. At this point and consistent with the Senators remarks regarding prioritizing we may be talking about illustrating what could be compared to planning for what has been talked about for an DEIR. It is a very important need but I'm not sure all of it can fit within this process.

Q: WL: Does that mean that the station within the DEIR will only have access from one direction? There won't be transit access across the yard to Commonwealth Avenue?

A: AG: Do you mean the Grand Junction?

C: WL: No. I'm talking about a bus connection.

A: DM: The answer is that we do not yet know the answer to there being an alternative in the DEIR that has north-south bus connection. We don't know if it works and we don't know its impacts. That doesn't mean that it's not going to happen. We don't know yet. This is also going to be impacted by some of the work by the place making effort. This isn't an issue that is off the table.

C: JR: This needs to be on the table. You need to have the pros and cons for each different option. Those discussions need to happen here as opposed to you doing it amongst yourselves.

C: DG: There is a due diligence issue here. Through the BRA process we can understand what the issues are with new connections. Malvern Street is extremely narrow and Babcock Street is very steep. There are a lot of issues that we need to iron out. To my knowledge we have even studied the viability of these connections yet. We can do that as part of the place making exercise. At a base level we need to understand what the opportunities might be.

C: JR: I think that's great and I'm super excited about the BRA study but you're not tasked with designing any of the other streets. MassDOT could be doing this.

C: WL: Essentially this planning is going to allow the highway to pump vehicles into the neighborhood. The mode share for the land area around the station is actually good. The mode share for the region and the rest of the traffic is not so great. One way to influence that is to take the cars that are getting off at the interchange and allow this new station to serve them. If there is no transit action between their work places and this station they are not going to use it. There are difficult engineering questions everywhere but bus connections to the south is not one of them.

C: DL: The presentation on West Station was really interesting. You mentioned the breakout groups and subcommittees. I think the most effective way for this to work is to sit down at a table in smaller groups and go through the options.

C: Friends Know (FK): I live on Babcock Street and this building has been there for over 40 years. Boston University took out community. They will do anything to acquire land including lying to the zoning board. Now we have no community left. We are the best tenets in Boston. I've seen Boston University triple its size and now we get murders and a groper. The station would be located at Buick Street. We want to be zoned properly again.

Q: MD: I have several questions that I won't be able to ask and it's okay if you can't answer them now. For the modeling effort, what is the service levels assumed for the bus station? What are the frequencies of the trains and buses? With regards to the modeling of the highway and interchange, what did you assume to be the toll prices? Did you consider different prices such as higher or lower? Did you consider demand based tolling? If volumes increase at a certain time it would be a dynamic toll. Have you considered other transportation demand management techniques in your model such as parking cash-out or parking freezes? When you talk about traffic levels increasing with development what's your function with regards to density? Is it monotonically increasing? Are you saying that whenever you have more density you have more cars? As we know from real life situations that's not true. As density reaches a certain point, traffic generated can actually decrease. I would like to know those assumptions. I also would like to know the equation for the ramps. You talked about phasing and how it may cause certain things to be delayed. As we know from the Big Dig we have things that have been delayed for over 30 years. The project is that a lot of projections, models, and policies are based around the idea that we have West Station in place by 2035. If that's not true how does it affect everything. Right now you have a large bus terminal planned. I think it is a great design but maybe all it needs to be is a bus stop. It reduces all the decking and heavy concrete level. That could reduce cost significantly. I also would request that you look at the Grand Junction line above the highway. Besides the Grand Junction are there any other reasons why the highway could not be closer to ground level? Is the Grand Junction the only thing that is preventing that from happening? If it is possible what are the benefits of putting the highway at-grade in terms of cost, place making, abutters, and general neighborhood. Any answers would be appreciated.

A: MS: We are developing service plans to determine what the start of the service may be in 2020. The first draft of that study will be done around September 1, 2015. It will include commuter, urban rail, and increases in the Amtrak service.

C: MD: Great, I look forward to seeing that. They already made a model and I'm curious what the model assumes. That must have been developed before you did you service plan.

C: MS: We haven't developed a model yet. CTPS had done something.

C: EI: It sounds like you want to hear about the future trends and inputs of the CTPS model.

C: Bruce Kaplan (BK): We assumed a rather aggressive trend. I know the 66 bus was diverting and serving West Station. We had assumed DMU service in addition to the commuter rail service.

Q: MD: What was the frequency?

A: BK: It was 20 minutes.

Q: MD: Where there any new bus routes?

A: BK: No.

Q: WL: So the buses came into the station and then exited on the same side?

A: BK: Yes.

C: WL: It sounds like it adds a lot of time to the route.

Q: MD: How would they get to the LMA from the station?

A: BK: They would stay on the south side.

A: EI: I have a quick answer. The model doesn't consider varying toll rates.

Q: MD: Could dynamic tolling be added to the study to control the traffic so that it doesn't overwhelm the neighborhood. That would be interesting.

C: Glen Berkowitz (GB): Since the last task force Matt has been accepted to do post graduate work in England. Is it true that your team is paying for Matt's tuition?

C: EI: We will see you all on August 19.

Next Steps

The next task force session will be held at 6PM on Wednesday, August 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.