



September 15, 2014

To: Mike O'Dowd
Allston I-90 Interchange Improvement Project
Project Manager

From: Nathaniel Curtis
Howard/Stein-Hudson
Public Involvement Specialist

RE: **MassDOT Highway Division**
Allston I-90 Interchange Improvement Project
7th Taskforce Meeting
Meeting Notes of September 3, 2014

Overview

On September 3, 2014 the Allston Interchange Improvement Project taskforce held its seventh meeting. The taskforce 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 taskforce is, through the application of members' in-depth local knowledge, to assist and advise MassDOT in developing an implementable design for the reconstruction of the I-90 Allston Interchange, the Allston viaduct and Cambridge Street in the vicinity of the interchange. The chance to reconfigure the interchange has emerged through the opportunities presented by the implementation of All Electric Tolling (AET) and the structural deficiency of the I-90 Allston viaduct. MassDOT sees the project not only as an opportunity to improve safety and connections for all modes of travel in the area around the interchange, particularly along Cambridge Street which has been noted by local resident as dangerous and acting as a barrier between Allston and the Charles River. Another major goal of the Allston Interchange project is to provide the commuter rail conditions necessary for the expansion of South Station and the eventual creation of West Station in the old Beacon Park Yard as well as the inauguration of Diesel Multiple Unit (DMU) service along the Grand Junction line from Allston to Cambridge and Somerville. While the agency has not yet secured the funding to build the rebuilt interchange, MassDOT is actively seeking to secure funding and will continue to plan for the station as part of the project.

The topic of the meeting summarized herein was traffic operations under the various interchange replacement options currently under analysis by the taskforce and project team. This traffic analysis consists of two parts: a regional scale analysis conducted by the Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS) of the Boston Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) and a local level analysis by the consultant team. As the CTPS regional analysis develops over the next few months, it will be used to further calibrate the local level analysis. The CTPS analysis is partly based on the Travel Demand Model (TDM) which provides a consistent basis for analyzing the project through multiple settings and outcomes. The TDM incorporates data based on geography, time periods and land use and identifies transit, walking, cycling, and vehicular movements. The basis and role of CTPS' participation in this project was presented by Scott Peterson. This information is presented on page 3.

Following the presentation by CTPS, the project team presented their own initial traffic findings regarding the options currently under review for replacement of the interchange. This local level analysis focused primarily on the intersections along Cambridge Street and how the project can both calm this roadway, making it friendlier for cyclists and pedestrians while still processing traffic effectively to protect residential streets from new cut-through activity. Generally speaking, the work on local traffic was positively received by the taskforce with several individuals expressing their appreciation for the amount of work put in by the consultant team. Of particular interest were the north and south parallel roadways along Cambridge Street to help cut down on the width of Cambridge Street and the number of turning lanes required to get

acceptable levels of service (LOS) and manage queuing at intersections. Several taskforce members noted their preference for Cambridge Street and a potential southern parallel roadway to be two-way streets. They suggested this would be safer for cyclists, foster better conditions for transit bus riders, and generally create a more urban feel for Cambridge Street. In some instances, proponents of this idea seemed to be leaning towards the proposition that a wider, two-way roadway would be preferable to a one-way roadway *even if* the one-way street could be narrower. The project team will need to continue to investigate this idea as the traffic modeling goes forward. Additionally, taskforce members also asked the project team to continue to focus on calming traffic on Cambridge Street and the streets approaching West Station, and for vehicles the Turnpike mainline, to make these spaces as welcoming as possible for pedestrians. Another request made by taskforce members was for profiles of approach streets to West Station with comparable grades on other existing roadways to help them understand what walking on these roads will be like after construction has been completed.

Detailed Meeting Minutes¹

Opening Remarks

C: Ed Ionata (EI): Good evening, I'm Ed Ionata from TetraTech. Tonight we are going to start off per usual with some taskforce administrative items. At this point you should all have the minutes from the last taskforce session. If you have any specific questions or comments regarding the minutes please send them to Nate Curtis via email. You've all seen the project flow chart before and right now we are somewhere between meetings 6 and 7. Joe Freeman has received your responses to the selection criteria and he will discuss how that is being handled at the end of tonight's presentation. Tonight will be primarily focused on traffic. As we move forward to the next taskforce meeting we will be presenting on 2 or 3 alternatives that we think respond to the selection criteria and show how they meet all of the various shared goals that we talked about in previous taskforce sessions. These goals include improving safety for all modes, realigning I-90, contact sensitive design, lessen the impacts of the interchange, avoid inducing cut-through traffic, reconnect sections of Allston to each other and the river, protect the neighborhood, create a new vibrant Cambridge Street, and provide safe accessibility to West Station.

For any folks that were not here last time, let me just underscore that West Station is now being included in the analysis of this project and will be part of the filing for the joint environmental document. Tonight we have the Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS) to present on the regional traffic study and Mike Hall to present on the preliminary traffic results which are also included in the large packet you received at the sign-in table. Mike O'Dowd will now discuss some of the intergovernmental meetings that have taken place outside of the taskforce sessions.

C: Mike O'Dowd (MOD): We really appreciate the turnout today at the CSX Beacon Park Yard for the site walk. Unfortunately CSX could only provide the 1:00pm time slot so I apologize for those who could not attend and for those who did attend; I hope you were able to get something out of it. When we get into the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) phase we will have another site walk for those who missed today and who like to attend. As Ed mentioned, we have been meeting with the City of Boston. This taskforce requested we continue to coordinate with the City and we are doing just that. We have been receiving some very good suggestions from Jim Gillooly, Kairos Shen, and their teams. We've also had meetings with the Massachusetts Bay Transit Authority (MBTA) design team relative to West Station and the location of the platforms. A couple weeks ago we had a bicycle ride through the Allston neighborhood that came out of a request from Galen Mook who wanted to show me some of the concerns he and the cycling community have relative to what we're proposing. We have heard loud and clear from the start that there is a concern as to how we can best integrate an interchange into the neighborhood and the bicycle ride really helped our understanding of how we can best accomplish that.

¹ 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.

- Q: Wendy Landman (WL): I know Kairos has heard from the Boston Society of Architects (BSA). The BSA is putting on a design charrette and I was wondering if you could talk a bit about the plan or if there is a plan to have the results of the charrette brought into the taskforce.
- A: MOD: To my knowledge I believe the charrette is being conducted from September 16 to September 18. MassDOT is not committed to having anyone attended that on behalf of this particular project. I will need to clear it with our Administrator and Secretary to see if they want representation there but at this point, there will be nobody from this design team or myself attending.²
- C: WL: I was wondering if the work of the charrette would be useful to the project team because there are not going to be any taskforce members participating in the charrette. It would be great to have a brief presentation to what they come up with to the entire taskforce.
- A: MOD: That's a good point.
- C: El: First up we'll have Scott Peterson from CTPS.
- C: MOD: While Scott is getting set up, I want to make sure you are all getting the information out about the upcoming Public Information meeting that will be held on September 18 at 6:30pm at the Jackson Mann Community Center in Allston. You will be seeing advertisements in the local newspapers, email blasts from the government delivery system, and I ask that you please tell your neighbors to come out and attend.

Briefing on the Role of CTPS by Scott Peterson

- C: Scott Peterson (SP): Good evening everyone my name is Scott Peterson. I work for the CTPS planning staff and I am the director of technical services. The CTPS is the support staff to the Boston Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO). We have been asked to assist in this project because we maintain tools that can help inform decision making for stakeholders and the project team. The focus of this presentation is to give you some background as to what those tools are and why we're involved. Some of the goals of my presentation tonight will be to explain what the Boston MPO is and explain what the Travel Demand Model (TDM) is. There are many pieces that feed into the model and therefore different types of outputs that come out of the model based on the analysis we're doing.

The MPO is a federally mandated organization that covers eastern Massachusetts, examines air quality and establishes equitable funding for transportation project across the region. These investments are multimodal and we typically look at transit, highway, and non-motorized modes when performing an analysis. There are several documents over which we have responsibility. The first is the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) which is about short term improvements; we also look at the Long Range Transportation Improvement Plan (LRTP). The LRTP has an air quality component and we often work to understand what the LRTP is compared to the TIP. The MPO was created in 1962 and I have been using the TDM for at least 20 years now. The MPO is governed by federal mandates so the land use assumptions and transportation investments that are included in it are set forth in the LRTIP which is a financially constrained document. The LRTP is an important piece to the puzzle because a lot of the assumptions that get used in the document get carried forward into other projects and project analysis. This is where the TDM becomes very important because it provides a consistent basis for analysis for this project and many others. The Federal Transit Authority (FTA) reviews our model sets and they generally receive a lot of scrutiny.

I'm now going to review on some of the terms relating to the TDM. I'm going to touch on geography, the time periods, and the land use which is an extremely important component because it identifies transit, walk, vehicular, and bicycle trip making. I will discuss the transportation assumptions that are

² A member of MassDOT's legal team ultimately did attend the BSA charette on behalf of the agency.

enabling people to travel from point A to B. I will then cover the types of data sets, sets of the model, and how the model works. The basic unit of analysis is something called the Transportation Analysis Zone (TAZ). Our model covers the 164 communities of eastern Massachusetts. Within those 164 communities there are 2,727 transportation analysis zones. Those zones identify how much trip making is occurring to and from that location and the map on the left gives you a resolution of those zones. Just to give you an idea of the Allston area, there are roughly 17 TAZ's. In general the denser the area and the more trips occurring, the smaller the TAZ's are. Our model is broken up into 4 time periods; the AM peak hour, PM peak hour, mid-day and nighttime.

In terms of land use, for every TAZ in the area we have an estimate of how many people live there, how many households there are, and employment. There are 3 different employment types which are broken down from different codes which represent sectors of the economy. The next graphic shows our levels of geography and that in 2012 the model had 4.5 million people. Our MPO transportation plan land use assumption shows that this number will be growing to 4.8 million. The transportation network includes all the major roadways from the larger freeways to the arterial collectors. In terms of transit systems, we have all modes of local transportation covered and we also have a strong representation of the walking and cycling network that feeds into our model.

Many different data sets go into this including census data, household survey data, traffic counts, tolling information, and pedestrian and bicycle counts. It's important for us to understand if the network is changed, how people's paths and behaviors change in the roadway system. This project is coming at a time when we have new datasets and technology that is recently available. The 3 main datasets that will be used to help calibrate the model in this particular project will be traffic counts, turning movement counts, and INRIX speed data which is derived from cellphone use. Another piece of information that we are just beginning to use is the Airsage traffic flow data. The Airsage data helps us understand the desired vehicle trips and where people want to go, it also saves us a lot of time from having to send someone out in the field and record left-hand turns and right-hand turns at certain intersections. This information along with the traffic counts and turning movements feeds into the TDM and helps us understand how our data matches to real world data.

At this point I've discussed the background of the model and I'm going to move onto the flowchart quickly and I'll take any questions you have at the end of the presentation. As I mentioned earlier the socio-economic data from TAZ feeds into two different models. The first is the vehicle ownership model and the second is retail development. The end result is a number of transportation trips that end up getting assigned to the transportation system which then assigns processes and finds the best paths for travel. When you complete the entire process you end up with a lot of output data. There is also a large analysis of air quality based on travel speeds and the production of emissions. There are three components to the air quality analysis which include construction activity, land use changes, and time savings. That concludes the overview of the modeling process.

I would like to finish by saying that the model is a tool and it does not get the final say. At my office we will never say, "The model made me do it." The model is used to set the stage and we as professionals use our judgment to take it to the next step. It is a combination of the model and the analysis of interpreting the results. Upon running the transportation analysis for the alternatives we will be examining the Level of Service (LOS) rating for each intersection. The secondary analysis will include looking at the regional traffic flow, transit use, and whether changing the layout of the Massachusetts Turnpike at this interchange creates traffic spill over outside of the project area. As you are all aware the project team is working to identify 2 preferred alternatives. Once the project team and taskforce reach 2 preferred alternatives we'll be able to look at each alternative in more detail. For the next steps we are currently working with Harvard and trying to get a better understanding of the future land use plans and assumptions. We will first be producing the no-build model which creates a picture of future conditions by projecting future traffic volumes onto today's roadway network. In essence, the no-build is what happens if we do nothing. By late fall or early winter we'll be prepared to assist the project team on any alternatives that are anticipated to be advanced and that come out of the conclusion of the taskforce. Thank you all for holding your questions.

- Q: WL: Can you talk about the background growth that CTPS is assuming and more generally the overall anticipated background growth for the region?
- A: SP: As I mentioned before the population and employment assumptions for 2035 are the primary generator of trips for both the highway side and the transit side. This also drives the land use assumptions
- C: WL: I don't mean the land use.
- C: SP: Well the land use growth drives the amount of growth that is reflected on the roadways.
- Q: WL: My concern is that traditionally, the model has been based on the assumption that if there is growth in jobs there is also a growth in vehicular use. Massachusetts has adopted a mode shift goal aiming to triple the number of trips made by walking and cycling and reduce the number of vehicular trips. Have you adjusted the model so it is no longer based on old assumptions and considers the mode shift goals put forward by GreenDOT?
- A: SP: If the transportation infrastructure is built out with more sidewalks and bicycle lanes the model is sensitive to seeing that change. All of the assumptions are from the last regional transportation plan which showed that the non-motorized mode was growing faster than the motorized mode. I don't believe it was tripling, but it was increasing at a high rate.
- C: WL: I'm trying to understand how you're refreshing the model and taking into account the new framework and mode shift goal.
- A: SP: The land use question revolves around two parts. The first is growth and the second is where the growth is occurring. The Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) which helps supply all of the land use information has made an effort to help focus the growth in the downtown centers. Transportation infrastructure is just one part of the equation and land use is another significant part. The household survey was completed in 2012. It includes a trip diary and measures socio-economic, demographic, and income levels. It tries to answer the question of why someone may choose to walk or drive or ride a bicycle. There are a lot of variables that drive individual and lifestyle choices.
- Q: Glen Berkowitz (GB): If I understand correctly it sounds like you are modeling for the next 20 years. Could you talk about the percentage of annual growth on I-90 in Allston that your model is anticipating over those 20 years?
- A: SP: We don't have an assumption of growth to start off. People try to find the best path from point A to point B. If there is employment growth west of Allston we do not assume a growth rate on I-90 because people choose to take the best and quickest route which is not always I-90.
- Q: GB: I don't think I asked my question correctly. When you looked at the results of the model, what was the annual growth rate in terms of a percentage and annual percentage? I'm looking for a number with a percentage sign.
- A: SP: I would be happy to share that with you. We just finished the base year. Our 2035 model run for this study will be completed hopefully by next month. I can't tell you what the growth factor is because I haven't seen those numbers but I can get you the base year numbers if you'd like them.
- C: GB: I assumed since you are showing us the model for 2035 that you had the 2035 numbers.
- A: El: When Mike Hall gets up he'll explain the handouts which are a little different than what Scott just showed you. I think that will help answer your question.

- C: Matthew Danish (MD): You may not like what I have to say, but I am very skeptical of modeling in general. I think that what you are essentially trying to do is predict 21 years into the future. I remember 21 years ago in 1993 I was using Gopher to access information and the World Wide Web was just being invented. Looking back I don't think I could have possibly imagined that the cell phone in my hand would be 1,000 times more powerful than what I had in front of me on that desk. To think that you can predict the future in 20 years from now for anything is completely ridiculous. I think the best way forward is to try to pick what we want to see and make the changes that go in that direction. We want to see healthy transportation and so does MassDOT. We don't need to predict that, but we need to make it happen. I appreciate the work you've done, but this is very abstract. Without real equations that we can pick apart we can't really understand your model and the assumptions it is producing.
- A: SP: I respect your concern, but as I mentioned at the beginning of my presentation, the model does not get the final say. I have a lot of documentation of the different steps we go through that I didn't show tonight because I didn't want to overload you all with survey data. It is an open process and if you want I can share the equations and data with you.
- C: Fred Salvucci (FS): One of the significant elements being planned here is a shift to All Electronic Tolling (AET) and to straighten the highway. The VMT analysis is likely to show that if VMT goes up, air quality worsens. The reality is that a shift to AET should reduce the number of Vehicle Hours Traveled (VHT) and improve air quality. It would be unfortunate to go through all of this, plug it into the model, and have it tell us not to do this because air quality would be worse. I think there may need to be a sensitivity analysis that looks at VHT. One essential assumption will be how much, by way of public transit improvements, are integrated into the model. When the Turnpike was built, it destroyed a very good commuter rail system and stunted growth along this corridor. I'm hoping you will include at least one alternative that shows DMU service with a lot of stops restored. Part of the purpose and needs statement for this project should not only be to fix the road but to fix the problem we made years ago. Wendy's point of tripling the mode share of walking and bicycling should be one of the driving points in decision making. The mode share decisions tend to be made early on in the process when really the mode share is actually an outcome. The only way to understand it is to do an analysis of what the state policy makers hope to achieve by tripling the mode share by 2035. I'm not expecting an answer, I am expressing hope. I understand you have a limited amount of time and I respect the work you've done and that CTPS has done in this very brief amount of time you have had.
- A: SP: In terms of the air quality piece I agree with you completely and I may have misspoken. We use a program that considers speed in relation to emissions and different roadway types. If the overall speed increases the emission levels drop. In terms of transit options I'm looking for the project team to provide any input relative to the long range transportation plan of the area. We are looking to calibrate the mode, we don't want to over forecast traffic growth.
- Q: Tad Read (TR): At what point in this process can we see modeling and all the assumptions?
- A: SP: I'm hoping we will have the results of the base year by the end of this month. I'm hoping we will have the results of 2035 within a month after that.
- Q: TR: At what point are we expecting to make a decision?
- A: El: That is a good segue way into the next presentation. Mike Hall is going to present the preliminary traffic modeling and screening process in order to select a preferred alternative. It is a pretty long presentation and at the end we will pass out a score sheet for you to take and compare the alternatives.

Local Traffic Modeling

- C: Mike Hall (MH): Good evening everyone I'm Mike Hall. In advance of having the CTPS modeling numbers to analyze and understand in greater depth we've gone ahead as part of the taskforce process and developed our own set of numbers as a screening tool. To answer the questions about what was

assumed, we did assume a quarter percent growth rate on the highway. You may remember 3 or 4 meetings ago we presented an overview of alternatives 3F, 3G, and 3H. One thing that we didn't have when we presented those alternatives was a traffic analysis based on our preliminary numbers and that is what I will be presenting tonight. Before we dive into the presentation I want to briefly tell you about the handout in front of you and how it's organized. The first page is a bullet summary of design features. The next sheet is the basic layout of the alternatives and the next graphic is the same alignment but shows the configuration of the lanes at each of the intersections based off of our traffic analysis. The next two graphics show the alignment grades and key traffic metrics that come out of our micro-simulation models. The micro-simulation model is different from the model that Scott was referring to in his presentation. Scott is looking at the regional model and we are looking on a micro-scale at the individual intersections within the study area. You will find the Level of Service (LOS) ratings as letters in circles from A through F. These are just like the letter grades on a school report card, but a key difference is that for an urban intersection, during the peak hours, a D is still considered acceptable.

We are also showing the AM and PM calculated queue lengths. Orange represents the average queue and blue represents the 95th percentile queue. You will notice at some intersections there is a star. That is where we analyzed specific pedestrian movements and crossings. We have a number of challenges to address at the intersections along Cambridge Street. Today we have 65,000 to 67,000 cars coming off the Turnpike through the interchange which equates to roughly 5,000 to 6,000 cars per hour. One of the primary elements of this project is to remove the grade separation. The Boston Transportation Department (BTD) has a design criterion that says if the turning volume is greater than 250 cars per hour the intersection should have exclusive pedestrian phasing.

Q: El: Could you explain what an exclusive pedestrian phase is.

A: MH: There are exclusive pedestrian phases and there are concurrent pedestrian phases. When I refer to an exclusive pedestrian phase that means all approaches to the intersection stop and pedestrian cross at all the crosswalks. Another big challenge we've had to make things work are the right turning movements from Cambridge Street onto the highway. We don't want to have a free right turn because of the potential increasing number of pedestrians and bicyclist on the south side of Cambridge Street. Our plan is control all right turns. As I talk about the alternatives you can follow along with your handouts. I'll start with the design elements followed by highway connections and then highlight some of the key operational elements.

Q: Jessica Robertson (JR): I have a quick question. I'm wondering what the diagonal lines are on the map?

A: MH: If the queue of one intersection went all the way back to the previous intersection we are representing that with the black hashed line marking.

Q: JR: Is it safe to assume that because there is no bicycle or pedestrian accommodations mentioned that you want us to specifically focus on traffic?

A: MH: Correct. We've omitted the bicycle and pedestrian accommodations on these graphics so you can focus on the traffic element. With any and all of the alternatives I am confident that we will make the pedestrian and bicycle accommodations work.

Q: JR: Okay and my last question is, do you have or can you share next time the current LOS at the same intersections you are showing tonight?

A: MH: Yes, I have a graphic at the end that shows some of the existing LOS and we can certainly get you the rest of that data.

C: JR: Thanks.

C: MH: I have a lot of material to cover so when I refer to operations I am going to show the PM conditions on the screen. If there's an AM problem that is not showing up in the PM I've highlighted it. I'm going to start with option 3F-1. In this alternative there will be 4 connections to Cambridge Street and a new connection to Soldiers Field Road.

Q: Joe Orfant (JO): Is that a direct connection to Cambridge Street or is that connection to the proposed service road?

A: MH: It is a connection to the proposed service road. In this alternative we have grade separated east and westbound ramps. The best example I can think of what that may look like is on the southeast expressway at the Massachusetts Avenue connector. Access to West Station will be a one-way loop and both eastbound and westbound access to the Turnpike will have 2 ramps. In order to make this alternative work the roadway layout will require 2 left turning lanes.

Q: JR: Is that a through movement at the intersection of Soldiers Field Road and River Street?

A: MH: We are bringing the cars down the service road because of the operational problems that exist there today. We are adding a westbound off-ramp connection at North Harvard Street which complicates the phasing at that intersection because of the additional traffic approach. In 3F-2, we are adding a new connection to replicate the grade separated connection that exist today on Cambridge Street. In order to help the operational issues we are adding a parallel road south of Genzyme which will serve as a one-way and reduces the left-turn movements at the intersections along Cambridge Street.

Q: BD: It appears that you are not assuming any traffic on East Drive and Stadium Way in your analysis, is that true?

A: MH: At this point we are not because they are proposed by others. The parallel connector road helps the cross-section width and operations throughout Cambridge Street.

Q: JO: Am I seeing an at-grade crossing over the railroad spur at the new ramp crossing to Soldiers Field Road?

A: MH: Yes.

C: JO: Thanks for clarifying.

C: MH: In option 3F-3 we've kept the parallel road north of Cambridge Street and we are adding an additional parallel road south of Cambridge Street in an effort to minimize the cross-section on Cambridge Street. In this example the alignment on Cambridge Street would be a one-way westbound and the parallel road would be a one-way eastbound. The connecting roads to and from the Turnpike will be two-way which simplifies operations and pedestrian crossings. We are having some queuing issues along Cambridge Street in this alternative, specifically eastbound Cambridge Street spilling out onto the ramp. That's the overview of 3F. I'm going to go quickly through 3G and 3H because they showed less promise to us. We wanted to show them to you anyway because we felt and have heard from the taskforce that you would like to see everything.

Option 3F has 4 connection points along Cambridge Street. Option 3G and 3H have 3 connections to Cambridge Street and also the connection to Soldiers Field Road. 3F has a very large cross-section which created some operational issues and difficult pedestrian crossings. The connection to West Station is at one spot with a similar looping pattern to 3F. In terms of operations on 3G-1, we will need a double left or a double right in order to make the layout function properly. I'm just showing the operational issues for the 3G options. 3G-3 functions the best compared to 3G-1 and 3G-2 but we are still having operational issues. 3H is very similar to 3G, it also has 3 connection points and a connection

point to Soldiers Field Road. We are splitting the ramps just like the 3F and 3G and will have grade separated connections. 3H basically ends up being a 3-level interchange. Some of the traffic stays below, some ducks underneath the highway and there is also some traffic above making the loop to West Station.

Q: Kairos Shen (KS): In both these cases the elevated and at-grade ramps along with the access ramps are being improved. On 3H-1 it looks like one of the parallel ramps is at-grade and one is elevated. In the drawing it shows a yellow one-way ramp and a blue elevated two-way ramp. Is that correct?

A: MH: Blue is two-way and it is providing access back and forth to West Station.

C: KS: The issue there is that you have a parallel roadway at-grade and you also have a ramp for the traffic coming west and that is getting off to connect to Soldiers Field Road. The issue is that you have both highway access point's at-grade and the elevated levels. It should be one or the other.

A: MH: I agree with you, it is a challenge and as you can see we've flagged it.

C: KS: Okay, thanks.

C: MH: The westbound off-ramp connects at Cambridge Street at one location. The concentration of volume at that location will cause problems because of the limited access. We have heavy volumes on the eastbound lanes and heavy volumes on that will require a double right turn lane. The LOS is good but still has some long queues on 3H-1. Option 3H-2 adds a parallel road from intersection to intersection along Cambridge Street. Again we have double left turns as a result of the operational issues along Cambridge Street. Overall we think the one-way pair system works generally well.

Option 3I is basically a variation of Option 3F. For Option 3I we've split the westbound on and off-ramps and we've created a new connection between Sorrento Street and North Harvard Street for the westbound off-ramp. Instead of 4 connections as I described with 3F, 3I has 5 connections. We are still providing the connection to Soldiers Field Road, there will still be the grade separation and there will still be access to West Station. The highway access is virtually the same as 3F with two places to get on both east and west. In terms of LOS and operations, everything for 3I is a LOS D or better however there is some queuing on Cambridge Street in the PM peak heading eastbound. Jessica asked earlier about the existing PM conditions, here they are.

Q: Bruce Houghton (BH): I'm wondering where the toll booths will be and if your model accommodates for the tolls and people going around them?

A: MH: As I understand it there are no toll plazas, only gantries. There will be one east of here located near the interchange and the Commonwealth Avenue overpass, and there will be one at the western edge of the project area near Everett Street.

Q: BH: So you can't use the off ramps to avoid the tolls?

A: MOD: No, that wouldn't be possible.

C: MH: We took a first crack of rating each of the options and once this is posted I encourage you all to go through and rate each option. What we have here is a traffic centric matrix and right now we are trying to weed out the options that don't work from a traffic perspective. Eventually, the option that floats to the top will have the best traffic operations balanced with the consideration of the neighborhood environmental needs. We've called out some of the particular key intersections and the operational levels. All of the options have connectivity to West Station although it's not as good in Option 3H because of the higher level.

- Q: Vineet Gupta (VG): Thank you. I think that the presentation shows the generalization and broader ideas of building additional roads comparable to Cambridge Street and the benefit of reducing the overall cross-sections. The question I have is, have you thought about this street network being built in the 5, 10, 20 or 25 years? If so, do you see it all being built at once or in multiple stages? If Option 3I is selected is MassDOT going to build the entire street network? In reality this will only work if you build the entire network.
- A: MH: That is a good question. If the 2 parallel roads were two-way there may be phasing in terms of construction that would occur. That decision has not yet been made but I think the parallel roads are a no-brainer. If we want to shift traffic off of Cambridge Street and reduce the cross-sections the only way to do that is to build the parallel roads.
- C: VG: I agree and I think we need to think this through a bit more. I have heard this compared to the Seaport District and what we don't want are long service roads taking up the landscape and pushing developers out.
- Q: MD: How are you modeling 21 years from now? My criticisms from earlier apply again. Are you including Stadium Way and East Drive in your model?
- A: MH: No, we haven't included them because it is proposed by others.
- C: MD: This entire system won't work unless those roads are built. I appreciate the narrowing of the cross-section but when you go to a one-way pair you're hurting the idea of creating a neighborhood main street. People who ride the bus want to be able to get off and get back on the bus to go in the same route they came in. One-way pairs are highly non-optimal and the idea of additional parallel streets should be two-way with smaller cross-sections. We were thinking that Cambridge Street would remain a two-way street. I am very concerned that this will become another speedway with cars where we don't have safe pedestrian and bicycle use accommodations.
- A: MH: When we presented our ideas of Cambridge Street a few taskforce sessions ago we heard loud and clear from all of you that you did not want a seven lane cross-section so we went back to the drawing board and brainstormed ideas on how to reduce it. What we are showing you now is an example of a narrower Cambridge Street cross-section that also has adequately functioning traffic operations. In order to do that we will need to provide some sort of parallel road to shift some of the operations off of Cambridge Street.
- C: KS: We have heard a lot of talk about East Drive and Stadium Way. My question is not whether they get built or whether we imagine these roads to be two-way all the way down to Cambridge Street or if only the shorter portion of those roadways becomes two-way.
- A: MH: I don't think we can have that in this particular lay out.
- Q: KS: Are you saying that it needs to be one-way?
- A: MH: In the interim, yes but in the future it could be two-way.
- C: KS: In terms of the second parallel road you showed, is there a physical dimension or minimum distance that you see this road having? Can you get the dimension as small as a Commonwealth Avenue right-of-way such as 75 or 80 feet? There are urban design implications of what you can do and how you can conceive a roadway.
- A: MH: I think that we're going to need roughly 250 feet. I can't speak for the highway division, but I see that as an interim condition.
- C: KS: As often as possible, I would encourage you to try for two-way access roads.

- A: MH: That is certainly something we can look at.
- Q: KS: All of the West Station access roads are shown as part of a ramp system. Is there a way to separate the ramps so that it would simplify the eastbound off-ramp conditions?
- A: MH: There may be, but we have set this up so people and cars can access West Station across from Seattle Street.
- Q: KS: In order to get pedestrians up over the mainline, I'm asking that if you disaggregate the pair, do you think you'll get a more useable secondary roadway system? Is it critical that you provide access to West Station for buses?
- A: MH: In our analysis we are assuming that there will be buses getting off the highway and getting back on the highway. If West Station becomes a true transit hub like North Station or South Station there could be intercity buses, express buses, Harvard shuttles, and MBTA buses.
- C: BD: Kairos and Matthew both touched on East Drive and Stadium Way. I think it would be really important to see an analysis of what that will look like and whether there is a difference of a road running down the middle. I agree with Matt that one-way pairs are not desired. It appears to be elevated and I'm wondering how high it is elevated.
- C: MH: It's not elevated in terms of structure, its fill.
- Q: BD: What are you using for signal timing? Is it consistent throughout the corridor? Could you touch on that briefly?
- A: MH: We are assuming that the pedestrian signal will need to be between 90 and 110 seconds. In terms of the fill structure it will be 12 feet at the highest point.
- C: Joe Beggan (JB): I like that you're creating a framework in this area. In order to bring facilities in and establish that framework you need to start considering parcels and what the appropriate parcel size is. I think it's worth looking at a 3rd option of a complete set of a two-way Cambridge Street without the convening streets next to it. In terms of the neighborhood process and transit connections I think you should start to establish a framework that looks at improving conditions along the River's edge. One of the biggest challenges of the project is going to be the planning of the street network, not the location of the ramps. I think it's important to have the ramps end as close to the highway as possible in order to answer the issue of the bone structure and connector roads. I think tonight has been a good discussion and you've brought the discussion a few steps forward. I agree that the connections to Cambridge Street, East Drive and Stadium Way are important but I think it is more important that we don't bring traffic onto the local streets near Seattle Street.
- C: JR: Thank you Joe. One thing I wanted to quickly address is my concern that not all of your traffic signal calculations are including two-way bicycle and pedestrian traffic. Even on one-way streets it should be included.
- C: MH: We are looking to receive big picture feedback, we are very confident that we can make the pedestrian and bicycle accommodations work.
- C: JR: I don't understand why the entire eastbound side of Cambridge Street is above grade. I understand why the north and south connections are but in Option 3I-2 Cambridge Street is above grade.
- A: MH: Part of the reason is so we can reach the elevated point and have a less than 5 percent rise getting there.

- Q: JR: For the next round it would be helpful for us to have a note that tells us exactly how much above grade certain roadways are. I have a question relating to the mainline. It seems that certain options have different lengths of fill. I'm wondering why that is because some seem to widely vary.
- A: Chris Calnan (CC): The best way to answer that would be to describe how Option H is different from Options F, G, and I in the sense that I-90 mainline stays high. In Option H the mainline stays at a mid-level so the ramps can go underneath I-90. All the other options have the ramps coming off the viaduct and crossing over the mainline.
- Q: JR: When you are modeling the intersections, a number of the options have turns where the frontage road becomes a connecting street with big swooping non-controlled turns. My question is: if we ask to make a certain turn a right angled turn in order to slow down traffic, is that going to blow up your traffic modeling and LOS?
- A: MH: It has the potential to do that, but there are a number of other elements that would need to be considered in order to make the determination. We could tighten up the radius if needed but it's hard to gauge.
- C: JR: I wanted to finish by saying that one of our highest priorities is to slow down the traffic on our neighborhood streets.
- C: WL: If West Station is going to become a significant transit hub it looks like all the alternatives have access to the station on long ramps over the railroad tracks. If we want West Station to be a successful transit hub we need to think of how people are going to get there on foot. Humans don't want to walk 300 feet on any ramps. If we are investing in transit we should also be thinking about how people get to the station on foot. People are not walking on ramps at North and South Station. We should be considering air-rights and how the streets are going to feel like streets.
- C: MH: It is certainly a challenge but either way we have to go over the highway or under the highway.
- C: WL: Access is always going to have to go over the railroad tracks too. If we are going to do it the right way we need to think about it now. Thank you.
- C: Galen Mook (GM): I'm going to play off Wendy's last point and the comparison of the bus system to South Station and some of the ramps that the Big Dig created that now cut off South Boston from the rest of the City. When you're looking and designing the frontage roads I encourage you not to use the Albany Street model of what was built around I-93. It looks like 3I and 3G have different number of lanes on the mainline compared to 3H and 3F.
- C: MH: On either side of the road there are 4 lanes and through the interchange we are dropping a lane.
- Q: GM: Does that mean you are reducing the footprint of the existing mainline?
- A: MH: I think it is about the same.
- C: GM: It looks like there won't be a hard merge like there is today, is that correct?
- A: MH: Yes, it cuts down the frictional line.
- C: GB: It's obvious you did a lot of homework and I wanted to thank you for that. I have two questions. The first is regarding 3I-2, between the Cambridge Street eastbound and the Cambridge Street westbound you are creating 12 different signalized intersections in an area that only has 3 today. My question is can you think about any opportunities to reduce the number of signalized intersections?

- A: MH: Yes, we are looking at ways to reduce the number of signalized intersections but we are also trying to reduce the vehicular speeds through the neighborhood and signals help to do that. If we can we are happy to eliminate any unneeded signals.
- C: JO: I wanted to follow up on Jessica's point. At the next meeting it would be useful to show selected roadways and their profiles so we can talk about the differences between 3 percent and 5 percent grades but also to have some of the existing road grade percentages such as Everett Street so we have something to compare to.
- C: MH: I think we can do something like that.
- C: FS: I wanted to go back to the point Kairos and a lot of people have made. Not be a stereotype of myself, but if you depressed the road just a little and lower the profile of I-90 all of this comes down and all of the grades get more reasonable. I understand the constructability issues but I would like to see the viaduct at-grade as quickly as possible heading east to west. I recommended using the same clearance dimensions for the BU Bridge and the Grand Junction line. If the mainline gets down to grade as fast as possible that would be a big improvement. I think it's at least worth exploring to see what it does to the profiles and useful for the taskforce to understand why.
- A: CC: We are looking at coming up from under Commonwealth Avenue and in concepts F, G, and I we are going back down as quick as we can which is roughly a 4 percent mainline grade.
- C: FS: I appreciate, that but I'm going to push you a bit further. One of the reasons why the Grand Junction succeeds heading westbound is because there is very limited headroom under the BU Bridge. The clearance is not standard and I'm wondering if you can use that same clearance even though it is not standard.
- A: CC: We are using the same clearance.
- C: FS: Oh, O.K. then. Well, that's great.
- C: JO: I want to start by saying that this has been an exceptional presentation with an overwhelming amount of data. Naturally I'm looking at the north and south connections to Soldiers Field Road and the frontage road. I am concerned about the acceleration rate heading southbound and what that does to potentially make Soldiers Field Road a great barrier to the BU area and the river.
- C: CC: I would say that we would have to work out the details of how that all merges. I would also like to say that we don't see that precluding or interrupting the ideas we did present about shifting Soldiers Field Road under the viaduct.
- C: JO: I'm referring to Kairos idea of moving Soldiers Field Road west of the viaduct and further inland to create a larger esplanade area. I wanted to make sure that you will be looking at the acceleration lane and how it functions safely.
- A: MH: From a traffic perspective I think it comes down to taking what is there today and shifting it south. I believe it is substandard today so we will be striving to make it a little bit safer. I certainly don't see it becoming any wider or longer.
- C: GB: I just Googled "maximum grade for highways" and it seems pretty obvious that certain design speeds and change the maximum grades. We have heard you talk about the desired design speed for the mainline and tonight you've talked about maximum grades. If you use a lower design speed you can use different grades that are steeper than 3 or 4 percent. I think it would be useful to show us the grades at the design speed of 65mph and then show us the grades based on a lower design speed.

Q: MD: I wanted to thank Mike and the team for the CSX tour today. I learned that the MBTA has certain railroad track design configurations that may dictate certain service levels. Wendy mentioned earlier that people are not going to want to walk to a station if it feels like it is in a waste land and I would say that people also don't want to walk to a station if there is not good service there. I think we should be aiming to have service at West Station every 15 minutes or better. Could you have someone from the MBTA come into the next taskforce session and talk about their planned service levels?

A: MOD: Yes that won't be a problem. Matt Ciborowski has a good handle on this stuff and he can come in and discuss this further in detail.

C: Joe Freeman (JF): I'm going to pass out the revised selection matrix and screening criteria. There are 5 pages and we hope that you will review the criteria by the next meeting so we can discuss the results. This isn't for discussion tonight, I just want to hand it out and that will be the end for this evening. We'll see you all on the 18th.

Next Steps

The next taskforce meeting will be held at **6PM on Wednesday, October 1st at the Fiorentino Community Center**. The Fiorentino Community Center is located at 123 Antwerp Street in Allston. The second public information meeting will take place at **6:30PM on September 18th at the Jackson-Mann Community Center**.

Appendix 1: Meeting Attendees

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Dennis	Baker	HNTB
Joseph	Beggan	Taskforce Member
Glen	Berkowitz	Taskforce Member
Craig	Cashman	Taskforce Member
Mark	Ciommo	Taskforce Member
James	Curley	Taskforce Member
Anthony	D'Isidoro	Taskforce Member
Donny	Dailey	MassDOT
Matthew	Danish	Taskforce Member
Bill	Deignan	Taskforce Member
Carolyn	Diviacchi	Resident
John	Fallon	MassDOT
James	Gillooly	Taskforce Member
Vineet	Gupta	Taskforce Member
Mark	Handley	Taskforce Member
Kevin	Honan	Taskforce Member
Bruce	Houghton	Taskforce Member
Ed	Ionata	TetraTech
Marc	Kadish	Taskforce Member
Grace	King	CTPS
Wendy	Landman	Taskforce Member
Elizabeth	Leary	Taskforce Member
Will	Luzier	Taskforce Member
Frank	Mahady	FXM Associates
Fred	Maloney	Resident
Harry	Mattison	Taskforce Member
Ian	McKinnon	TetraTech
Galen	Mook	Taskforce Member
Tom	Nally	Taskforce Member
Paul	Nelson	Taskforce Member
Alana	Olsen	Taskforce Member
Soni	Pataryay	TetraTech
Scott	Peterson	CTPS
Tad	Read	Taskforce Member
Tad	Read	Taskforce Member
Jessica	Robertson	Taskforce Member
Fred	Salvucci	Harvard University
Andrew	Schlenker	MassDOT
Zachary	Shedlock	MassArt
Kairos	Shen	BRA
Steve	Silveira	Taskforce Member
Anthony	Toppi	Resident
Dianne	Tsitsos	FXM Associates
Mike	Welsh	Resident
Peter	Welsh	Resident

Appendix 2: Meeting Flipcharts³

Flip-Chart 1:

Q: BSA is here, they are putting on Charrette. Plan for overlap (Wendy really wants it)?

A: The BSA is being conducted 16th – 18th, DOT not committed, being cleared with Secretary and Administrator.

Q: Can you talk about background growth for the region?

A: Population and employment are the drivers for 2035. Land use drives the growth on trips.

Q: How do the mode shift goals of MassDOT and the State get built into the CTPS model? Are you tripling transit trips?

A: If transportation infrastructure is built at different rates then the model responsive to it. The current model is showing transit and walking growth.

Flip-Chart 2:

Q: If you assume more sidewalks mean more pedestrian trips, that is not accurate. Concern that population growth does not equal more auto trips.

A: If growth is happening where population and jobs together then MAPC will focus growth to areas where transit there, that's in here. Summary of households is from 2012, so recent covers income, vehicle, ownership, etc. That is reflected in the CTPS model.

C: Because you are looking at regional highways and local trips, the regional highway should reflect policy, concern over just supplying more vehicle capacity.

Q: You are modeling for 2035, relative to traffic, what is your growth assumption?

Flip-Chart 3:

A: We don't assume growth coming first. Growth in employment doesn't equal growth on I-90.

Q: What is the percentage of annual growth based on model?

A: Just finished base year. We should have future growth in October.

A: We have rough numbers.

C: Very skeptical of models, trying to predict future. In 1993 web just being invented to say you can predict future is silly. Best way forward is to say what we want and then shape it. Without equations it's hard to understand.

A: Respect your concern, the model is not the final say. We have lots of documentation on the steps. We can give you survey, equations and assumptions.

³ To increase accessibility to this document for the visually impaired, transcriptions of the meeting flipcharts have been presented rather than photographs of the charts produced at the meeting. Images of these charts have been made and may be had upon request.

Flip-Chart 4:

C: Use air quality and Vehicle Miles Traveled. Shift to all electronic tolling and straightening. All electronic tolling will reduce Vehicle Hours Traveled and better air quality. Be supportive to Vehicle Hours Traveled and Vehicle Miles Traveled on air quality most useful thing from models is alternatives and types of public transportation to put in. Turnpike killed off good commuter rail along corridor. Include one alternative with diesel multiple unit service with stops back and service to Route 128 that will help analysis. Hoping part of the purpose and need should be commuter rail. If you don't constrain capacity, machine will project higher volumes than can be processed. Build this in to avoid imaginary numbers. Want capacity constrained analysis. Mode shift decision comes in early. Do the analysis using more than one mode share including government policy on mode shift. Expect you will get at this respect CTPS.

Flip-Chart 5:

A: Air quality analysis includes sensitivity to Vehicle Hours Traveled. Project team will input on transect. Model calibrated to existing volumes. We will be sensitive to this.

Q: When will we see modeling assumptions?

A: Current by end of September, build in October.

Q: And when do we make decision?

A: Good segue to Mike Hall on screening level criteria to pick analysis.

Q: On maps, some queuing in diagonal lines.

A: Black hatches are overlapping queues.

Q: Is it safe to assume bicycles and pedestrians left off for clarity?

A: Yes, tonight is about traffic weeding. Can get pedestrians and bicycles in to all of these.

Q: Can you give us current level of service?

A: Got PM at the end. Can share AM with you. PM is typically worse.

Flip-Chart 6:

Q: Does direct connection to Soldiers Field Road go into service road?

A: Correct, we won't put people into fast moving mainline directly.

Q: On 3F is that a through intersection?

A: Yes, grade separation goes away so big right turn volumes.

Q: You have no volume on East Drive or Stadium Way?

A: Connector is by us, roads by others.

Q: Is at-grade road over Houghton spur?

A: Yes (note: idea is to coordinate with night-time movement of transit).

Q: So in 3H1, there are parallel ramps, one elevated, and one at-grade?

A: Blue is 2-way provided for West Station.

Q: So you have highway access at-grade and elevated?

A: Yes, a challenge that's why we flagged it.

Flip-Chart 7:

Q: Where is the toll? Does modeling account for tolls?

A: No plaza. Gantries built interchange and Cambridge Street and Everett Street.

Q: So no way to go around tolls?

A: No, ramps don't do that.

Q: Thank you. Presentation shows that if you build parallel to Cambridge Street, big benefit on cross-sections. Great in terms of neighborhood street network. If you think about this over 20 years, all at once or phased over years. Would MassDOT build parallel roads?

A: If parallel roads are 2-way, some phasing possible, 1-way equals harder. Road off Soldiers Field Road seems a no brainer. Parallel to Cambridge Street is a bigger decision.

Flip-Chart 8:

C: Just need to think this through in terms of South Boston. In the end CTPS will drive lane configurations.

Q: How are you modeling 25 years from now? Are Stadium Way and East Drive in (no)? They need to be there.

A: Outlet from Soldiers Field Road helps.

C: Appreciate narrowing cross-section, 2-ways good for buses and businesses. Like 2-way Cambridge Street, smaller, with East Drive and Stadium Way concerned speedway for cars.

A: Pedestrian, bicycle, and buses in this. Neighborhood impacts in. Heard your on narrower Cambridge Street 2-way equals more lanes than 1-way to accommodate lefts. 2-way equals 3-10 total lanes 1-way equals 5-7 lanes.

Q: (Ed) Does adding exit from Soldiers Field Road, would adding full Stadium Way make it better?

Q: Always talked of East Drive and Stadium Way envision them as 2-way to Cambridge Street is that a degrade of level of service?

A: In 3I-1, in can't be. Once it goes all the way then sure.

Q: Physical dimension of Cambridge Street between parallel roads, is there minimum dimension to make sure traffic works. Can you get to 75-80 feet or 200 feet? Urban design implications.

A: I feel we'd need around 200 feet to make it work.

Q: In 3I alternative, you show 2nd bunch of Cambridge Street as 1-way. Can you make the short section between D's a 20way to give 2-ways to Soldiers Field Road (note: city width vs. narrow access road)?

A: Can look at it. Piece will get wider.

Flip-Chart 10

Q: Is there a way to disaggregate Station access road highway access ramps? To simplify eastbound off-ramps.

A: Need to think on it. Some of this is about providing pedestrian access.

C: To get pedestrians above mainline, say you are 35-40 feet up. Not ideal for pedestrians, can you pair pedestrians with bus access? Is it critical to have highway access for buses? Might give more normative conditions.

A: In our analysis assumes buses off pike to West Station and back to highway. Names West Station equals South or North Station. Giving good access in and out.

C: Kairos says elevation pet peeve. Wants to lower ramps as much as possible.

C: Would like to see analysis of East Drive and Stadium Way. Agree with Matt on 1-way pairs. How high are parallel roads? How much higher as compared to Cambridge Street? What cost trimmings?

Flip-Chart 11

A: Assuming 100-100 cyclist, parallel road 10-11 feet higher than Cambridge Street at highest.

C: What I like is the framework that separates the traffic. Good to start looking at parcels. Good to look at third option with 1-way pairs. Will be iterative process. Another challenge will be to make these streets and not ramps. This is a good bone structure. Like the connector road north of Cambridge Street.

A: This is a direction we are going. CTPS modeling will include this.

C: Got to think about protection for Seattle Street and Sorrento Street.

C: Not sure if all signals include 2-way bicycle and pedestrians on 1-way. Needs to be included/

A: Not there yet. This is about traffic and parallel roads. Can make pedestrian and bicycles work.

Flip-Chart 12

Q: On 3I-2 why is Cambridge Street Bridge parallel all above grade?

A: Part is to get up to connector road. About 5% ADA.

Q: For next round of drawing, note about how much grade. Mainline has different fill lengths.

A: Option H is different from F,G, I because I-90 stays higher to build ramps under I-90. Others have ramps over.

Q: When you model intersections there are swooping non-controlled turns, want to get away from that. 3G-1, connecting road has wide turns with no signal. Please get more slowing without blowing up level of service?

A: We hear you. Other elements in 3G not working.

C: In 3I as well.

A: Can tighten radii up , probably tight already.

Flip-Chart 13

Q: If West Station becomes transit hub, all access via long, lonely bridges from the north. If we want West Station to be successful, need to make it nice pathway to Station. Request to invest in transit, need to think about foot access. Think about ways to make streets more like city streets.

A: Fair enough. It's a challenge. Always over, under some way.

Q: Playing off Wendy's point. Big Dig tunnel ramps cut off Southie. Don't encourage walking and cycling. Don't lean on Albany Street. Not a neighborhood. I and G different numbers of lanes on I-90 in F and H? Correct.

A: On either side it's 4 lanes and 3 lanes in the interchange just like today/

Q: So how does merge happen?

A: Not a hard merge. Lane adds in, less friction.

Flip-Chart 14

C: Mike, good homework. On 3I-2, if Cambridge Street Bridge halves create 12 signals where there are 3 today. Can you think of options to reduce number of signals? On 3I-2 where 3 lanes on I-90 is then 10 feet breakdown lanes.

A: Yes and yes. Happy to look at fewer intersections. Right turning equals slower traffic.

C: Good to reflect roadway profile comparable to 2-3% or 4-5% grades in neighborhood.

A: Agreed.

C: Point about grades on cross streets, not to be stereotype of impact, if you lower I-90 everything comes down. Full depression out but if you bring down viaduct as quickly as possible helps things. Make profile up and down over railroad tracks. Maybe scrape down 5 feet get mainline down as quick as possible, see if it's worth it.

Flip-Chart 15

A: On profile, have to get over rail. In F, G and I, mainline chops at 4% as fast as possible so roads can be as low as possible.

C: Appreciate that. Push a little further. Grand Junction Line has continued headroom.

A: Using same clearance which is less than standard.

C: Great presentation. Concerned about acceleration onto Soldiers Field Road and widening of park on Charles River.

A: Still need more detail. Doesn't preclude Soldiers Field Road shift over.

C: What about Kairos' idea for area around Double Tree?

A: Were just shifting this south, not going to be much wider.

C: Still good option to create more park.

Flip-Chart 16

Q: Just googled maximum grade on interstate, we've asked you about grades with lower speeds equals steeper grades. Useful to show what things look like with 65mph versus lower design speed and grades.

A: Thank you.

C: Thank you. Would like service on MBTA every 15 minutes. Want MBTA into taskforce meeting.

A: Won't be a problem; will have Matt Ciborowski.

Appendix 3: Received Emails – Please See the Following Page

Hi Nate-

I will try to make this. Thanks.

From: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis [<mailto:ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, September 02, 2014 1:07 PM

To: Nick Gross

Cc: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis; O'Dowd, Michael (DOT); Ed Ionata

Subject: I-90 Allston Interchange Improvement Project Taskforce Meeting Agenda

Good Afternoon Taskforce Members,

I hope this note finds you well and having had an enjoyable long weekend.

Tomorrow, we have a full day of Allston Interchange Improvement lined up for all of you. First, a reminder to backstop Ed's email of Friday afternoon: our friends at MassDOT have secured us a site visit in the Beacon Park Yard. For anyone who can make the **1:00PM start time**, please come to the entrance of the rail yard at Lincoln Street. As Ed noted, we did try for a time closer to our meeting, but the time is based on what we could get from CSX. Attached, you will find an aerial photograph showing you where to go if you are not familiar with the area.

At our usual 6:00PM start time, we have our taskforce session meeting at the Fiorentino Center. Your agenda is attached. Minutes will be forwarded shortly under separate cover.

Regards & Good Wishes,

-Nate

Nate,

I appreciate the efforts of the MassDOT team to respond to these comment and questions.

For the following items, I would characterize your response as "MassDOT does not have an answer yet". Therefore, could you provide me with an approximate date when MassDOT expects to be able to answer each of these questions? If a date is not available, could you indicate if the question will be answered in the ENF?

1. Shared Use Path (a.k.a. People's Pike)
 1. At the eastern end of this path, where will it cross Soldiers Field Road to meet the Dr. Paul Dudley White bike path?
 2. At the western end of this path, how will it connect to both Cambridge Street and also continue under the Cambridge Street overpass to reach the intersection of Lincoln Street and Franklin Street?
 3. What is the cross-sectional allocation of space for cyclists, pedestrians, landscaping, lighting, and street furniture?
2. Which design options would require the reconstruction of the Cambridge Street overpass between Lincoln St and Harvard Ave?
3. Franklin Street pedestrian overpass
 1. What are MassDOT's plans to reconstruct this overpass
 2. If the associated Cambridge St overpass is rebuilt
 3. If the associated Cambridge St overpass is not rebuilt
 4. Through what process and on what schedule will this new pedestrian overpass be designed?
4. The structure that will support the bus access loop for West Station that is proposed to travel above the train storage yard
5. How to address Mass Pike-related quality of life issues on Lincoln Street
6. Proposed roadway (by others) - When will the roads with this designation be constructed?
7. Plans to mitigate the noise and air pollution impacts of the highway and railyard with sound barrier walls, tree planting, and other solutions.
8. Comparative analysis of the concepts presented by Glen Berkowitz on June 25 and those presented by MassDOT on June 11
9. A feasible scenario for vehicles travelling from the Western Ave Bridge and Soldiers Field Road onto the Mass Pike that will not produce unacceptable trafficjams

Additionally, I would like to ask the follow-up questions below:

1. What are the height clearances in the Pru tunnel? What is achieved by complying with current Federal highway and rail design policy for clearances when less than 2 miles to the east the road does not comply with current policy for clearances
2. Will MassDOT evaluate the performance of the 3 lane configuration currently in place to test the assumption that "Four lanes are needed to effectively accommodate the interchange operations in the final configuration"? Also, how is the assumption that four lanes are needed consistent with State and City goals to reduce vehicular mode share?
3. Regarding Soldiers Field Road between the viaduct and Doubletree, what I was trying to ask is for MassDOT to draw a dimensioned line on a map showing the viaduct end of the viaduct, the hotel, and the tightest turns that would be safe to have on Soldiers Field Road based on a reasonable design speed. Is MassDOT willing to provide such a graphic and associated measurement of the acreage of new parkland?
4. Please provide the analysis that led to MassDOT rejecting a full or partial depression of the mainline highway
5. Regarding vehicle travel on Babcock and/or Malvern Street, avoiding additional traffic on to neighborhood streets is one of many items that has been noted as important by the taskforce. Improving

community connectivity and reducing traffic on Cambridge Street have also been noted as important by the taskforce. Therefore, to help MassDOT and the taskforce achieve the proper balance between these goals, I would like to request again that MassDOT design and analyze how one or both of these extended roads can include cars and/or bus service.

6. Please describe in more detail how the "project is being carefully planned and designed for flexibility of future land uses by the owner."
7. What is the expected completion date for the separate project to implement All Electronic Tolling at the eastern and western edges of the Allston Interchange project area?
8. How many rail tracks over the Grand Junction Bridge are planned?

>> If a new road is being built south of the DoubleTree and connecting to Soldiers Field Road inbound, how should the frontage road in front of Genzyme and the ramps and underpass at the River Street bridge be reconsidered?

I was trying to comment that if the new highway changes how drivers get on the Pike near Genzyme and Cambridge Street, the current traffic patterns will change for cars that today are exiting Soldiers Field Road outbound at the River Street Bridge and using the frontage road in front of Genzyme. Therefore, how should these roads and intersections be modified?



Regards
Harry Mattison

Hi Mike, Ed, and Nate,

Thanks so much for organizing this site visit. I was hoping to be able to make it but unfortunately with the earlier time I can't carve out enough time to get to Allston and back again. However I'm extremely grateful for the time we spent together two weeks ago on the bike ride and site visit, and I hope everyone today can get as much out of it as I did.

Thanks again and see you this evening,
Jessica

On 29 August 2014 16:45, Ionata, Edward <ed.ionata@tetrattech.com> wrote:

Edward Ionata | Senior Vice President

Direct [+1 \(508\)903-2476](tel:+15089032476) | Business [+1 \(508\) 903-2000](tel:+15089032000) | Mobile [+1 401-474-7463](tel:+14014747463) | ed.ionata@tetrattech.com

Tetra Tech | Complex World, Clear Solutions™

Engineering and Consulting Services | One Grant St., Framingham, MA 01701 | tetrattech.com Please consider the environment before printing. [Read More.](#)

This message, including any attachments, may include privileged, confidential and/or inside information. Any distribution or use of this communication by anyone other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender by replying to this message and then delete it from your system.

From: Ionata, Edward

Sent: Friday, August 29, 2014 4:24 PM

To: joseph_beggan@harvard.edu; LSA (glen@livablestreets.info); andrew.betinelli@masenate.gov; william.brownsberger@masenate.gov; stephen.bushnell@state.ma.us; craig.cashman@state.ma.us; mark.ciommo@cityofboston.gov; nick.clemons@mail.house.gov; james.curley@mahouse.com; bdeignan@cambridgema.gov; sal.didomenico@masenate.gov; rdimino@abettercity.org; briandoherty@metrobuildingtrades.com; nicole.freedman@boston.gov; James.Gillooly@cityofboston.gov; vineet.gupta@cityofboston.gov; mark.handleley@boston.gov; kevin.honan@mahouse.gov; bhoughton@houghton.com; sxiones@mbta.com; john.laadt@boston.gov; wlandman@walkboston.org; erleary@bu.edu; dloutzenheiser@mapc.org; mmaguire@aaasne.com; michael.moran@mahouse.com; Tom Nally (tnally@abettercity.org); pnelson@masco.harvard.edu; alana@allstonvillage.com; joe.orfant@state.ma.us; jpourbaix@cimass.org; srasmussen@cambridge.gov; john.read.BRA@cityofboston.gov; sjsilveira@mlstrategies.com; david@massbike.org; kevin.wright@dot.gov; izywien@mass-trucking.org

Cc: O'Dowd, Michael (DOT) <michael.o'dowd@state.ma.us> (michael.o'dowd@state.ma.us); Calnan, Chris; Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis <ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com> (ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com)

Subject: Site Visit - Allston Interchange Task Force, September 3rd

Dear Task Force Members:

A site visit to the Allston Interchange rail yard area has been arranged for next **Wednesday, September 3, at 1:00**. The visit will begin at the Lincoln Street entrance. As discussed at the last Task Force meeting, we

attempted to schedule the visit just prior to our meeting next Wednesday, but had to schedule earlier in the day in order to have the proper CSX personnel present for access and safety. Please wear sturdy shoes and clothing suited for the weather.

Please let me know if you have any questions,

Ed

Edward Ionata | Senior Vice President

Direct [+1 \(508\)903-2476](tel:+15089032476) | Business [+1 \(508\) 903-2000](tel:+15089032000) | Mobile [+1 401-474-7463](tel:+14014747463) | ed.ionata@tetrattech.com

Tetra Tech | Complex World, Clear Solutions™

Engineering and Consulting Services | One Grant St., Framingham, MA 01701 | tetrattech.com Please consider the environment before printing. [Read More.](#)

This message, including any attachments, may include privileged, confidential and/or inside information. Any distribution or use of this communication by anyone other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender by replying to this message and then delete it from your system.

Nate

Is there parking in the railyard or do I need to find parking along Cambridge Street ?

Thanks

Elizabeth

From: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis [<mailto:ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com>]

Sent: Tuesday, September 02, 2014 1:07 PM

To: Nick Gross

Cc: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis; O'Dowd, Michael (DOT); Ed Ionata

Subject: I-90 Allston Interchange Improvement Project Taskforce Meeting Agenda

Good Afternoon Taskforce Members,

I hope this note finds you well and having had an enjoyable long weekend.

Tomorrow, we have a full day of Allston Interchange Improvement lined up for all of you. First, a reminder to backstop Ed's email of Friday afternoon: our friends at MassDOT have secured us a site visit in the Beacon Park Yard. For anyone who can make the **1:00PM start time**, please come to the entrance of the rail yard at Lincoln Street. As Ed noted, we did try for a time closer to our meeting, but the time is based on what we could get from CSX. Attached, you will find an aerial photograph showing you where to go if you are not familiar with the area.

At our usual 6:00PM start time, we have our taskforce session meeting at the Fiorentino Center. Your agenda is attached. Minutes will be forwarded shortly under separate cover.

Regards & Good Wishes,

-Nate

Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis

Transportation Planner, Public Involvement Specialist, Associate

Howard/Stein-Hudson Associates, Inc.

11 Beacon Street, Suite 1010

Boston, MA 02108

direct: 617.348.3336 **main:** 617-482-7080

www.hshassoc.com

- Transportation Planning
- Traffic Engineering
- Civil Engineering
- Public Involvement/Strategic Planning

Please Note Our New Address

Thanks

From: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis [<mailto:ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, September 03, 2014 10:17 AM

To: Leary, Elizabeth

Subject: RE: I-90 Allston Interchange Improvement Project Taskforce Meeting Agenda

Good Morning Elizabeth,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good day. I'm not entirely sure about whether or not they will allow you to park in the rail yard. I think the safe bet would be to park on Lincoln Street and then cross Cambridge Street at the Lincoln Street signal. Also, just a tip: wear some sturdy shoes. Even though the rail yard is generally out of commission, there will likely be lots of gravel (ballast) laying around, discarded spikes etc.

Regards & Good Wishes,
-Nate

From: Leary, Elizabeth [<mailto:erleary@bu.edu>]
Sent: Wednesday, September 03, 2014 10:10 AM
To: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis; Nick Gross
Subject: RE: I-90 Allston Interchange Improvement Project Taskforce Meeting Agenda

Nate
Is there parking in the railyard or do I need to find parking along Cambridge Street ?
Thanks
Elizabeth

From: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis [<mailto:ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, September 02, 2014 1:07 PM
To: Nick Gross
Cc: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis; O'Dowd, Michael (DOT); Ed Ionata
Subject: I-90 Allston Interchange Improvement Project Taskforce Meeting Agenda

Good Afternoon Taskforce Members,

I hope this note finds you well and having had an enjoyable long weekend.

Tomorrow, we have a full day of Allston Interchange Improvement lined up for all of you. First, a reminder to backstop Ed's email of Friday afternoon: our friends at MassDOT have secured us a site visit in the Beacon Park Yard. For anyone who can make the **1:00PM start time**, please come to the entrance of the rail yard at Lincoln Street. As Ed noted, we did try for a time closer to our meeting, but the time is based on what we could get from CSX. Attached, you will find an aerial photograph showing you where to go if you are not familiar with the area.

At our usual 6:00PM start time, we have our taskforce session meeting at the Fiorentino Center. Your agenda is attached. Minutes will be forwarded shortly under separate cover.

Regards & Good Wishes,
-Nate

Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis
Transportation Planner, Public Involvement Specialist, Associate
Howard/Stein-Hudson Associates, Inc.
11 Beacon Street, Suite 1010
Boston, MA 02108
direct: 617.348.3336 **main:** 617-482-7080

www.hshassoc.com

- Transportation Planning
- Traffic Engineering
- Civil Engineering
- Public Involvement/Strategic Planning

Please Note Our New Address

Good Morning Harry,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good day. I am in receipt of your note and will get to work digging up some answers.

Regards & Good Wishes,
-Nate

Hi Nate,

I am writing to follow up the email below that you sent on August 12. In that email you stated "With regard to your inquiry for an updated draft of the purpose and need statement, we will be glad to provide you with one of those between our next taskforce meeting on Wednesday 8/13 and the session following it on Wednesday 9/3."

Could you let me know when the Purpose and Need Statement will be available for review by the members of the task force?

Thanks
Harry

Good Morning Harry,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good day. I'm in receipt of your note and will make inquiries of the appropriate team members. We have already begun processing your follow-up question email of yesterday afternoon.

Regards & Good Wishes,
-Nate

Hi Nate,

Good meeting last night!

Nate, I forgot to pick up the revised evaluation criteria. Could I trouble you to send me that?

Thanks!

Tad

John (Tad) Read, Senior Planner III, AICP

Columbia Point Master Plan | Mt. Vernon Street Redesign

Urban Ring | South Station Master Plan

Urban Agriculture Rezoning | Allston Interchange Task Force

North Allston Community Wide Plan (Transportation) |

Accelerated Bridge Repair Program (Charles River)

Boston Redevelopment Authority

One City Hall Square, 9th Floor

Boston, Massachusetts 02201-1007

T 617.918.4264

F 617.367.6087

e-mail: john.read@boston.gov

bostonredevelopmentauthority.org

Good Morning Ed,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good day. Could you please help me make this happen for Tad?

Regards & Good Wishes,
-Nate

From: John Read [<mailto:john.read@boston.gov>]
Sent: Thursday, September 04, 2014 10:17 AM
To: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis
Subject: Revised Evaluation Criteria

Hi Nate,

Good meeting last night!

Nate, I forgot to pick up the revised evaluation criteria. Could I trouble you to send me that?

Thanks!

Tad

John (Tad) Read, Senior Planner III, AICP

Columbia Point Master Plan | Mt. Vernon Street Redesign

Urban Ring | South Station Master Plan

Urban Agriculture Rezoning | Allston Interchange Task Force

North Allston Community Wide Plan (Transportation) |

Accelerated Bridge Repair Program (Charles River)

Boston Redevelopment Authority

One City Hall Square, 9th Floor

Boston, Massachusetts 02201-1007

T 617.918.4264

F 617.367.6087

e-mail: john.read@boston.gov

bostonredevelopmentauthority.org

Sorry I had to leave early last night -- there was a nine-alarm fire in Allston I had to cover.

As a result, I didn't get the name of the man making the presentation on the rough traffic analysis for MassDoT. Mike somebody. I was wondering if you could give me his last name.

Thanks,

Matt Robare

Good Morning Matthew,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good day. That was Mike Hall who made the traffic presentation.

Regards & Good Wishes,
-Nate

From: Matthew Robare [<mailto:mmrobare@gmail.com>]
Sent: Thursday, September 04, 2014 12:19 PM
To: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis
Subject: Allston Task Force Meeting #7

Sorry I had to leave early last night -- there was a nine-alarm fire in Allston I had to cover.

As a result, I didn't get the name of the man making the presentation on the rough traffic analysis for MassDoT. Mike somebody. I was wondering if you could give me his last name.

Thanks,

Matt Robare

Nate:

What an amazing day. The temperature is perfect, the sky is blue, the air seems, well, like its sweet. Oh my!

I'd like to get PDF's of both the presentations and handouts from last night's Task Force meeting, as I'm getting several requests to go over them with others such as colleagues within LivableStreets.

Can you help us get access to them today or tomorrow?

Glen B.

Good Afternoon Glen,

This note clearly finds you well and having a good day. Excellent. You should be in receipt of the two presentations given at last night's session as that went out to the taskforce just about 20 minutes ago. Am I right that in addition to that you would like a digital version of the handout provided to taskforce members last night?

Regards & Good Wishes,
-Nate

-----Original Message-----

From: Glen Berkowitz [<mailto:glen@livablestreets.info>]
Sent: Thursday, September 04, 2014 12:46 PM
To: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis
Cc: Ed Ionata
Subject: PDF's....

Nate:

What an amazing day. The temperature is perfect, the sky is blue, the air seems, well, like its sweet. Oh my!

I'd like to get PDF's of both the presentations and handouts from last night's Task Force meeting, as I'm getting several requests to go over them with others such as colleagues within LivableStreets.

Can you help us get access to them today or tomorrow?

Glen B.

Nate:

A thank you and a yes.

Thanks for sending out those two PDFs.

Yes, I would like to get a PDF of the "matrix" that was handed out at tail end last night.

Glen

=====

On Sep 4, 2014, at 12:58 PM, Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis <ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com> wrote:

Good Afternoon Glen,

This note clearly finds you well and having a good day. Excellent. You should be in receipt of the two presentations given at last night's session as that went out to the taskforce just about 20 minutes ago. Am I right that in addition to that you would like a digital version of the handout provided to taskforce members last night?

Regards & Good Wishes,
-Nate

-----Original Message-----

From: Glen Berkowitz [<mailto:glen@livablestreets.info>]

Sent: Thursday, September 04, 2014 12:46 PM

To: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis

Cc: Ed Ionata

Subject: PDF's....

Nate:

What an amazing day. The temperature is perfect, the sky is blue, the air seems, well, like its sweet. Oh my!

I'd like to get PDF's of both the presentations and handouts from last night's Task Force meeting, as I'm getting several requests to go over them with others such as colleagues within LivableStreets.

Can you help us get access to them today or tomorrow?

Glen B.

Good Afternoon Ed,

Can we make the rest of this happen for Glen? He already has the two PowerPoints, but needs the revised matrix as a digital document.

Regards & Good Wishes,
-Nate

-----Original Message-----

From: Glen Berkowitz [<mailto:glen@livablestreets.info>]
Sent: Thursday, September 04, 2014 1:07 PM
To: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis
Cc: Ed Ionata
Subject: Re: PDF's....

Nate:

A thank you and a yes.

Thanks for sending out those two PDFs.

Yes, I would like to get a PDF of the "matrix" that was handed out at tail end last night.

Glen

=====

On Sep 4, 2014, at 12:58 PM, Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis <ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com> wrote:

Good Afternoon Glen,

This note clearly finds you well and having a good day. Excellent. You should be in receipt of the two presentations given at last night's session as that went out to the taskforce just about 20 minutes ago. Am I right that in addition to that you would like a digital version of the handout provided to taskforce members last night?

Regards & Good Wishes,
-Nate

-----Original Message-----

From: Glen Berkowitz [<mailto:glen@livablestreets.info>]
Sent: Thursday, September 04, 2014 12:46 PM
To: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis
Cc: Ed Ionata
Subject: PDF's....

Nate:

What an amazing day. The temperature is perfect, the sky is blue, the air seems, well, like its sweet. Oh my!

I'd like to get PDF's of both the presentations and handouts from last night's Task Force meeting, as I'm getting several requests to go over them with others such as colleagues within LivableStreets.

Can you help us get access to them today or tomorrow?

Glen B.

Hello everyone;

I'm so sorry I had to run out of the meeting last night. The Harvard Terrace fire directly impacted a number of businesses in the main streets district and I needed to be there to offer my support. I am very sorry to have missed the presentations and while a few task force members tried to loop me in I feel a little behind (and kind of lost). Would it be ok if I reviewed the presentations and then directed my questions to you all?

Best,

Alana

On Thu, Sep 4, 2014 at 12:30 PM, Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis <ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com> wrote:

Good Afternoon Taskforce Members,

I hope this note finds you all well and having a good day. Thank you all for a productive session last night. Attached, for your records, please find the two presentations give at yesterday's meeting. These will migrate to MassDOT's project website over the next week.

Regards & Good Wishes,

-Nate

Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis

Transportation Planner, Public Involvement Specialist, Associate

Howard/Stein-Hudson Associates, Inc.

11 Beacon Street, Suite 1010
Boston, MA 02108

direct: [617.348.3336](tel:617.348.3336) **main:** [617-482-7080](tel:617-482-7080)

www.hshassoc.com

- Transportation Planning
- Traffic Engineering
- Civil Engineering
- Public Involvement/Strategic Planning

Good Afternoon Alana,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good day. We of course understand that you had some special circumstances last night. While your apology is appreciated as a mark of taking your taskforce membership seriously, it's not required given that you were responding to a fire which sent seven people to the hospital.

Unless Ed or Mike (copied) have objections, I suggest you review the materials and then direct your questions to me. I will provide answers to those which I can and help shepherd those I can't to the right members of the taskforce team. Would that work for you?

Regards & Good Wishes,
-Nate

From: Alana Olsen [<mailto:alana@allstonvillage.com>]
Sent: Thursday, September 04, 2014 2:30 PM
To: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis
Cc: Nick Gross; Ed Ionata; O'Dowd, Michael (DOT)
Subject: Re: I-90 Allston Interchange Improvement Project Meeting Materials

Hello everyone;

I'm so sorry I had to run out of the meeting last night. The Harvard Terrace fire directly impacted a number of businesses in the main streets district and I needed to be there to offer my support. I am very sorry to have missed the presentations and while a few task force members tried to loop me in I feel a little behind (and kind of lost). Would it be ok if I reviewed the presentations and then directed my questions to you all?

Best,

Alana

On Thu, Sep 4, 2014 at 12:30 PM, Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis <ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com> wrote:

Good Afternoon Taskforce Members,

I hope this note finds you all well and having a good day. Thank you all for a productive session last night. Attached, for your records, please find the two presentations give at yesterday's meeting. These will migrate to MassDOT's project website over the next week.

Regards & Good Wishes,

-Nate

Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis

Transportation Planner, Public Involvement Specialist, Associate

Howard/Stein-Hudson Associates, Inc.
11 Beacon Street, Suite 1010
Boston, MA 02108

direct: [617.348.3336](tel:617.348.3336) **main:** [617-482-7080](tel:617-482-7080)

www.hshassoc.com

- Transportation Planning
- Traffic Engineering
- Civil Engineering
- Public Involvement/Strategic Planning

Thank you! I'll be in touch.

On Thu, Sep 4, 2014 at 2:48 PM, Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis <ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com> wrote:

Good Afternoon Alana,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good day. We of course understand that you had some special circumstances last night. While your apology is appreciated as a mark of taking your taskforce membership seriously, it's not required given that you were responding to a fire which sent seven people to the hospital.

Unless Ed or Mike (copied) have objections, I suggest you review the materials and then direct your questions to me. I will provide answers to those which I can and help shepherd those I can't to the right members of the taskforce team. Would that work for you?

Regards & Good Wishes,

-Nate

Good Afternoon All,

I hope this note finds everyone well and having a good day.

Apropos of last night's discussion regarding the timing of our next taskforce session, the Wednesday 9/24 date has been scratched. We have replaced it with the following Wednesday, October 1st. The session following the 1st of October will be on Wednesday, October 15th. The 6:00PM start time and location at the Fiorentino Center, 123 Antwerp Street, are all still as they were.

By now all of you should have the two PowerPoint presentations given at last night's meeting. If anyone did not receive those, please let me know and I'll get you a copy directly.

Regards & Good Wishes,
-Nate

Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis

Transportation Planner, Public Involvement Specialist, Associate

Howard/Stein-Hudson Associates, Inc.

11 Beacon Street, Suite 1010

Boston, MA 02108

direct: 617.348.3336 **main:** 617-482-7080

www.hshassoc.com

- Transportation Planning
- Traffic Engineering
- Civil Engineering
- Public Involvement/Strategic Planning

Please Note Our New Address

Attached is a pdf of the Evaluation Criteria.

Edward Ionata | Senior Vice President

Direct +1 (508)903-2476 | Business +1 (508) 903-2000 | Mobile +1 401-474-7463 | ed.ionata@tetrattech.com

Tetra Tech | Complex World, Clear Solutions™

Engineering and Consulting Services | One Grant St., Framingham, MA 01701 | tetrattech.com Please consider the environment before printing. [Read More.](#)

This message, including any attachments, may include privileged, confidential and/or inside information. Any distribution or use of this communication by anyone other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender by replying to this message and then delete it from your system.

From: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis [<mailto:ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com>]

Sent: Thursday, September 04, 2014 10:17 AM

To: Ionata, Edward

Cc: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis; john.read.bra@cityofboston.gov

Subject: FW: Revised Evaluation Criteria

Good Morning Ed,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good day. Could you please help me make this happen for Tad?

Regards & Good Wishes,

-Nate

From: John Read [<mailto:john.read@boston.gov>]

Sent: Thursday, September 04, 2014 10:17 AM

To: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis

Subject: Revised Evaluation Criteria

Hi Nate,

Good meeting last night!

Nate, I forgot to pick up the revised evaluation criteria. Could I trouble you to send me that?

Thanks!

Tad

John (Tad) Read, Senior Planner III, AICP

Columbia Point Master Plan | Mt. Vernon Street Redesign

Urban Ring | South Station Master Plan

Urban Agriculture Rezoning | Allston Interchange Task Force

North Allston Community Wide Plan (Transportation) |

Accelerated Bridge Repair Program (Charles River)

Boston Redevelopment Authority

One City Hall Square, 9th Floor

Boston, Massachusetts 02201-1007

T 617.918.4264

F 617.367.6087

e-mail: john.read@boston.gov

bostonredevelopmentauthority.org

I believe Glen is looking for both the evaluation criteria matrix and the handout package that went along with Mike Hall's PowerPoint presentation. Attached to this response is a pdf of the evaluation matrix. I will shortly send a pdf of the handout package that has been reduced to be about 11 MB - Glen, hopefully your e-mail can accommodate this size.

Also, to clarify an earlier response, Mike Hall is Senior Project Manager at Tetra Tech.

Best,

Ed

Edward Ionata | Senior Vice President

Direct +1 (508)903-2476 | Business +1 (508) 903-2000 | Mobile +1 401-474-7463 | ed.ionata@tetrattech.com

Tetra Tech | Complex World, Clear Solutions

Engineering and Consulting Services | One Grant St., Framingham, MA 01701 | [tetrattech.com](http://www.tetrattech.com)

Please consider the environment before printing. Read More. [<http://www.tetrattech.com/sustainability>]

This message, including any attachments, may include privileged, confidential and/or inside information. Any distribution or use of this communication by anyone other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender by replying to this message and then delete it from your system.

-----Original Message-----

From: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis [<mailto:ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com>]

Sent: Thursday, September 04, 2014 1:05 PM

To: Glen Berkowitz

Cc: Ionata, Edward; Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis

Subject: RE: PDF's....

Good Afternoon Ed,

Can we make the rest of this happen for Glen? He already has the two PowerPoints, but needs the revised matrix as a digital document.

Regards & Good Wishes,

-Nate

-----Original Message-----

From: Glen Berkowitz [<mailto:glen@livablestreets.info>]

Sent: Thursday, September 04, 2014 1:07 PM

To: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis

Cc: Ed Ionata

Subject: Re: PDF's....

Nate:

A thank you and a yes.

Thanks for sending out those two PDFs.

Yes, I would like to get a PDF of the "matrix" that was handed out at tail end last night.

Glen

=====

On Sep 4, 2014, at 12:58 PM, Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis <ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com> wrote:

Good Afternoon Glen,

This note clearly finds you well and having a good day. Excellent. You should be in receipt of the two presentations given at last night's session as that went out to the taskforce just about 20 minutes ago. Am I right that in addition to that you would like a digital version of the handout provided to taskforce members last night?

Regards & Good Wishes,
-Nate

-----Original Message-----

From: Glen Berkowitz [<mailto:glen@livablestreets.info>]

Sent: Thursday, September 04, 2014 12:46 PM

To: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis

Cc: Ed Ionata

Subject: PDF's....

Nate:

What an amazing day. The temperature is perfect, the sky is blue, the air seems, well, like its sweet. Oh my!

I'd like to get PDF's of both the presentations and handouts from last night's Task Force meeting, as I'm getting several requests to go over them with others such as colleagues within LivableStreets.

Can you help us get access to them today or tomorrow?

Glen B.

Glen - Attached is a compressed version of the handout package from last night. At full resolution, the entire package is about 125 MB. This compressed version is very readable, but if you would like particular pages at higher resolution, just let me know.

Ed

Edward Ionata | Senior Vice President

Direct +1 (508)903-2476 | Business +1 (508) 903-2000 | Mobile +1 401-474-7463 | ed.ionata@tetrattech.com

Tetra Tech | Complex World, Clear Solutions™

Engineering and Consulting Services | One Grant St., Framingham, MA 01701 | tetrattech.com Please consider the environment before printing. [Read More.](#)

This message, including any attachments, may include privileged, confidential and/or inside information. Any distribution or use of this communication by anyone other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender by replying to this message and then delete it from your system.

Thanks to you all.

Glen

=====

On Sep 4, 2014, at 4:02 PM, "Ionata, Edward" <ed.ionata@tetrattech.com> wrote:

I believe Glen is looking for both the evaluation criteria matrix and the handout package that went along with Mike Hall's PowerPoint presentation. Attached to this response is a pdf of the evaluation matrix. I will shortly send a pdf of the handout package that has been reduced to be about 11 MB - Glen, hopefully your e-mail can accommodate this size.

Also, to clarify an earlier response, Mike Hall is Senior Project Manager at Tetra Tech.

Best,

Ed

Edward Ionata | Senior Vice President

Direct +1 (508)903-2476 | Business +1 (508) 903-2000 | Mobile +1 401-474-7463 | ed.ionata@tetrattech.com

Tetra Tech | Complex World, Clear Solutions

Engineering and Consulting Services | One Grant St., Framingham, MA 01701 | tetrattech.com

Please consider the environment before printing. Read More. [<http://www.tetrattech.com/sustainability>]

This message, including any attachments, may include privileged, confidential and/or inside information. Any distribution or use of this communication by anyone other than the intended recipient is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the sender by replying to this message and then delete it from your system.

-----Original Message-----

From: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis [<mailto:ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com>]

Sent: Thursday, September 04, 2014 1:05 PM

To: Glen Berkowitz

Cc: Ionata, Edward; Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis

Subject: RE: PDF's....

Good Afternoon Ed,

Can we make the rest of this happen for Glen? He already has the two PowerPoints, but needs the revised matrix as a digital document.

Regards & Good Wishes,

-Nate

-----Original Message-----

From: Glen Berkowitz [<mailto:glen@livablestreets.info>]

Sent: Thursday, September 04, 2014 1:07 PM

To: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis
Cc: Ed Ionata
Subject: Re: PDF's....

Nate:

A thank you and a yes.

Thanks for sending out those two PDFs.

Yes, I would like to get a PDF of the "matrix" that was handed out at tail end last night.

Glen

=====

On Sep 4, 2014, at 12:58 PM, Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis <ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com> wrote:

Good Afternoon Glen,

This note clearly finds you well and having a good day. Excellent. You should be in receipt of the two presentations given at last night's session as that went out to the taskforce just about 20 minutes ago. Am I right that in addition to that you would like a digital version of the handout provided to taskforce members last night?

Regards & Good Wishes,
-Nate

-----Original Message-----

From: Glen Berkowitz [<mailto:glen@livablestreets.info>]
Sent: Thursday, September 04, 2014 12:46 PM
To: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis
Cc: Ed Ionata
Subject: PDF's....

Nate:

What an amazing day. The temperature is perfect, the sky is blue, the air seems, well, like its sweet. Oh my!

I'd like to get PDF's of both the presentations and handouts from last night's Task Force meeting, as I'm getting several requests to go over them with others such as colleagues within LivableStreets.

Can you help us get access to them today or tomorrow?

Glen B.
<Alts Analysis Criteria Comments - edits incorporated 082714.pdf>
Nate:

I have heard concerns from several directions about the conflict between the scheduled Allston Interchange public meeting on September 18 at Jackson/Mann and the BSA charrette on the Allston Interchange scheduled on the same night as the

project meeting. Is there any flexibility in rescheduling the public meeting at this point? I expect that rescheduling would make lots of people happier.

Thanks.

Tom

Thomas J. Nally
Planning Director
A Better City
33 Broad Street, Suite 300
Boston, Massachusetts 02109
Phone: 617-502-6243
Fax: 617-502-6236
tnally@abettercity.org
www.abettercity.org

Nate:

Thanks for your response. Scheduling can be difficult, and some conflicts are inevitable. Let's hope that we can avoid them in the future.

Tom

Thomas J. Nally
Planning Director
A Better City
33 Broad Street, Suite 300
Boston, Massachusetts 02109
Phone: 617-502-6243
Fax: 617-502-6236
tnally@abettercity.org
www.abettercity.org

From: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis [<mailto:ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com>]
Sent: Friday, September 05, 2014 10:57 AM
To: Tom Nally
Subject: RE: Meeting Conflicts

Good Morning Tom,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good day. I understand that some folks have concerns about the public information overlapping with the second evening of the BSA charette. There are a few reasons why our inclination is at this time to move ahead as planned which are as follows:

- As you no doubt know from working in this field, there are things going on every night in the City and trying to get the perfect night is close to impossible.
- Likewise, as you saw earlier this week, if we try for the following week, that of 9/15, we are going to run into trouble with Rosh Hashanah so we'd be looking at the week of 9/29 – assuming we could get it.
- The Jackson-Mann is the logical facility in which to hold meetings for this project, but it is used for a great many other things during the course of any given week. Without knowing their schedule off the top of my head, abandoning the 18th could cause the public information meeting's date to drift significantly and as you have seen in the taskforce there is a desire to get back out to the broader public and take the temperature, so to speak, as we start to get towards making some decisions.
- Lastly, there is the issue that some notifications regarding this meeting have already appeared in public, particularly on the MassDOT website and the *El Planetta* Spanish language newspaper. Walking the meeting back at this point would cause confusion which could be misinterpreted as an effort to hold down turnout which as you are aware is not our intent in the slightest.

For those reasons, we are really trying to hang on to the 18th. If you have further questions or concerns, please feel free to give me a call at 617-482-7080 x236.

Regards & Good Wishes,
-Nate

From: Tom Nally [<mailto:tnally@abettercity.org>]

Sent: Friday, September 05, 2014 10:22 AM

To: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis

Subject: Meeting Conflicts

Nate:

I have heard concerns from several directions about the conflict between the scheduled Allston Interchange public meeting on September 18 at Jackson/Mann and the BSA charrette on the Allston Interchange scheduled on the same night as the project meeting. Is there any flexibility in rescheduling the public meeting at this point? I expect that rescheduling would make lots of people happier.

Thanks.

Tom

Thomas J. Nally

Planning Director

A Better City

33 Broad Street, Suite 300

Boston, Massachusetts 02109

Phone: 617-502-6243

Fax: 617-502-6236

tnally@abettercity.org

www.abettercity.org

Good Morning Nate,

I am writing again to follow up on your August 12 commitment to provide the Purpose and Need Statement by September 3. Today is September 8 and MassDOT has not provided this document or any update as to when it will be available and rationale for this delay.

I would appreciate an update as soon as feasible.

Thank you
Harry

Good Afternoon Harry,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good day. I've chatted with Mike and we should be able to provide you with a timeline by close of business tomorrow. We are also in progress on your follow-up email from last week.

Regards & Good Wishes,
-Nate

Hi Nate-

Do you have a pdf (as small a file as possible) of the handouts from last meeting for us to discuss internally. I would also like to set up a meeting sometime later this month you a few project staff to come to Cambridge and sit down with our technical staff. Could we look at something the week of the 22nd? Thanks.

From: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis [<mailto:ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com>]

Sent: Thursday, August 14, 2014 3:30 PM

To: Nick Gross

Cc: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis; O'Dowd, Michael (DOT); Ed Ionata

Subject: Allston Interchange Improvement Project Requested Materials

Good Afternoon All,

I hope this note finds everyone well and having a good day. As a number of you have asked to have a copy of yesterday's PowerPoint presentation, I am glad to be able to offer it to you attached to this email complete with slides from the BRA – thank you, Tad Read. A version of this will also be making its way to the project website over the next week or so.

Regards & Good Wishes,

-Nate

Hi Nate-

Yes, the Traffic package. Right now the 24th at 11 or 4 PM work for us. Thanks.

From: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis [<mailto:ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com>]

Sent: Wednesday, September 10, 2014 10:18 AM

To: Deignan, Bill

Cc: O'Dowd, Michael (DOT)

Subject: RE: Allston Interchange Improvement Project Requested Materials

Good Morning Bill,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good day. The week of the 22nd is now a little cleaner than it was since we shunted the taskforce session to the 1st of October. I imagine that will work. Maybe we could shoot for the 24th. I'll make some inquiries and find out what works for the team and get back to you. With regard to the handouts, I assume you mean the traffic package, correct?

Regards & Good Wishes,

-Nate

Hi Nate and Michael-

Both Susanne Rasmussen and I have other public meetings that we need to attend on Sept 23rd. Is there someone from your team who can attend this Cambridgeport Neighbors meeting and do a short presentation so that the neighborhood is getting correct information? Thanks.

From: Bill August [<mailto:billaugust@epsteinandaugust.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, September 10, 2014 11:23 AM
To: 'Steven Miller'; Rasmussen, Susanne; Dash, Stuart; Deignan, Bill
Cc: 'Olivia Fiske'
Subject: plz recommend third party speaker re Mass Pike

Hi all. Can you recommend someone else for us to invite re MassPike update (someone at DOT? some other planning group or nonprofit or other knowledgeable person) for Sept 23. Separately from the speaker, if there are any anticipated impacts on traffic going into Cambridgeport, could you please informally contact me and let me know as that is one of the major underlying concerns and we feel need to be sure any such impacts are clearly and timely communicated to the neighborhood association. We need to take it up Sept 23 as our neighborhood has not really had an update on this (to my knowledge) in Cport since b4 the summer. As always, thank you for all your public service. Copying Olivia Fiske, Board member who is in the lead on agenda. Also, Stuart, who is coming re Master Plan issue/update?

Bill August, Esq,
Epstein & August, LLP
101 Arch Street, 9th Floor
Boston, MA 02110

tel. 617-951-9909
billaugust@epsteinandaugust.com

The information contained in this transmission may contain privileged and confidential information. With respect to client communications use of this transmission is intended only for the use of the person(s) named above and with respect to such communications you are hereby notified that if you are not the intended recipient, any review, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this communication is strictly prohibited.

Good Afternoon Bill,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good day. Apropos of the telephone message I just left you, here is the first half of the traffic package. The second will be along shortly.

Regards & Good wishes,
-Nate

Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis

Transportation Planner, Public Involvement Specialist, Associate

Howard/Stein-Hudson Associates, Inc.

11 Beacon Street, Suite 1010

Boston, MA 02108

direct: 617.348.3336 **main:** 617-482-7080

www.hshassoc.com

- Transportation Planning
- Traffic Engineering
- Civil Engineering
- Public Involvement/Strategic Planning

Please Note Our New Address

Hi Mike-

The CNA regular monthly meeting is on the 23rd and not easily moved to the 24th which is why they are looking for someone else to come to their meeting. Susanne and I are already at meetings that night. I could look into changing our internal meeting to the 23rd if that helps but won't work the other way around. If you are out, is someone else, like Ed, available? Thanks.

Hi all. Can you recommend someone else for us to invite re MassPike update (someone at DOT? some other planning group or nonprofit or other knowledgeable person) for Sept 23. Separately from the speaker, if there are any anticipated impacts on traffic going into Cambridgeport, could you please informally contact me and let me know as that is one of the major underlying concerns and we feel need to be sure any such impacts are clearly and timely communicated to the neighborhood association. We need to take it up Sept 23 as our neighborhood has not really had an update on this (to my knowledge) in Cport since b4 the summer. As always, thank you for all your public service. Copying Olivia Fiske, Board member who is in the lead on agenda. Also, Stuart, who is coming re Master Plan issue/update?

Bill August, Esq,
Epstein & August, LLP
101 Arch Street, 9th Floor
Boston, MA 02110

tel. 617-951-9909
billaugust@epsteinandaugust.com

From: O'Dowd, Michael (DOT) [<mailto:michael.o'dowd@state.ma.us>]
Sent: Wednesday, September 10, 2014 4:04 PM
To: 'Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis'; Ed Ionata
Cc: Deignan, Bill
Subject: RE: Meeting Requests from the City of Cambridge

The CNA request had been sent to me previously but I did not respond. OOPS

If possible it would be better to combine both and the 24th works better for me as I may be out of the office on 23rd.

Thanks
Mike O

From: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis [<mailto:ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, September 10, 2014 12:37 PM
To: O'Dowd, Michael (DOT); Ed Ionata
Cc: wdeignan@cambridgema.gov
Subject: Meeting Requests from the City of Cambridge

Good Afternoon All,

I hope this note finds everyone well and having a good day. I have two requests from taskforce member Bill Deignan representing the City of Cambridge. They are as follows:

1. Can we make staff available for a coordination session with City staff on 9/24 at either 11AM or 4PM?
2. Can we make staff available to make a brief presentation on progress on the evening 9/23 to the Cambridgeport Neighborhood Association?

I can make HSH public involvement staff available on both dates. Ed, can you investigate the availability at TT? Bill, I am working on reducing the size of the requested packet such that your email system will accept it. It should be over soon.

Regards & Good Wishes,
-Nate

Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis

Transportation Planner, Public Involvement Specialist, Associate

Howard/Stein-Hudson Associates, Inc.

11 Beacon Street, Suite 1010

Boston, MA 02108

direct: 617.348.3336 **main:** 617-482-7080

www.hshassoc.com

- Transportation Planning
- Traffic Engineering
- Civil Engineering
- Public Involvement/Strategic Planning

Please Note Our New Address

Hi Michael,

Hard to believe that fall in in the air. When we met close to a month ago on August 14th you asked me to give some thought to how get ped/bike bridges up and over the rial lines and Soldiers Field Road. Sorry for taking awhile to get back to you on this conundrum. I dug into this assignment relying on the fairly sketchy information that is available online. A blind man feeling the lumps and bumps of an oddly shaped camel is how I felt. I got just enough of a handle on the issues to be able to suggest a strategy worth exploring potentially. Take a look at the attached PDF, let me know what I got wrong and maybe right, and pass it along to your designers if you think they could use a nudge in this direction. Its hot off the press. This was a lot more fun than fund raising for my park project upriver.

All my best,

Herb

Good Morning Herb,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good day. Not only is fall in the air, at the rate we are going, it's going to be winter coats by next month. It was mighty cold putting my wife's kit into her auto at 7AM this morning. We're in receipt of your note and appreciate the in-put. I'll forward it on to the design team and will look forward to seeing you at our public information meeting on the 18th.

Regards & Good Wishes,
-Nate

Thanks for pass that input along Nate. Getting up and over the tracks is going to be very challenging but it can be done I think. I'll look forward to what the pros come up with.

Herb

On Sep 15, 2014, at 9:27 AM, Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis wrote:

Good Morning Herb,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good day. Not only is fall in the air, at the rate we are going, it's going to be winter coats by next month. It was mighty cold putting my wife's kit into her auto at 7AM this morning. We're in receipt of your note and appreciate the in-put. I'll forward it on to the design team and will look forward to seeing you at our public information meeting on the 18th.

Regards & Good Wishes,
-Nate

From: Herbert Nolan [<mailto:herbnolan@solomonfoundation.org>]
Sent: Friday, September 12, 2014 4:49 PM
To: Michael O'Dowd
Cc: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis
Subject: Input on the pedestrian bridge(s) for I-90 Allston

Hi Michael,

Hard to believe that fall in in the air. When we met close to a month ago on August 14th you asked me to give some thought to how get ped/bike bridges up and over the rial lines and Soldiers Field Road. Sorry for taking awhile to get back to you on this conundrum. I dug into this assignment relying on the fairly sketchy information that is available online. A blind man feeling the lumps and bumps of an oddly shaped camel is how I felt. I got just enough of a handle on the issues to be able to suggest a strategy worth exploring potentially. Take a look at the attached PDF, let me know what I got wrong and maybe right, and pass it along to your designers if you think they could use a nudge in this direction. Its hot off the press. This was a lot more fun than fund raising for my park project upriver.

All my best,

Herb

Hello Folks,

I want to make you aware that there is **NO** "Allston/Brighton area" as you state in your information. ('through the Allston/Brighton area') The proper identification of our two communities is Allston **AND** Brighton, or Allston **OR** Brighton. For your purposes it is **ALLSTON** since you are doing nothing in Brighton. Please give us the credit we deserve.

Allston has been a separate and autonomous community since 1868. Please bring your information forward the 146 years Allston has been on its own. Your bastardization of Allston is infuriating and in no way acceptable to those of use who have lived in Allston for many, many decades. Please, in the future, give our community the respect and dignity it deserves instead of lazily failing to properly identify our two communities as two **separate** entities.

Your misrepresentation is offensive and ignorant. As the DOT, you are well advised to properly identify the area you are developing which is **ONLY** in Allston. Insulting and demeaning our community is not making you any friends in Allston and only reinforces the community resentment you face here.

We are **not** part of Brighton. We are in no way anything like Brighton and we do not like it when out of lack of knowledge people like you attempt to unify two distinct communities that were separated and have become even more dissimilar for the last 146 years.

We were named for the Father of American Romantic painting, Washington Allston, not Washington Allston/Brighton. Allston is the only community in America named for an artist and we are darn proud of that and our community. Please get on the ball. We will thank you for your immediate attention to this matter.

Very truly yours,

Renny McKinney
Coordinator

Hi Nate and Mike-

Any news on someone coming to speak to CNA on Sept 23?

From: Bill August [<mailto:billaugust@epsteinandaugust.com>]
Sent: Monday, September 15, 2014 9:17 PM
To: Deignan, Bill; 'Steven Miller'
Cc: Rasmussen, Susanne; Dash, Stuart; 'Olivia Fiske'
Subject: RE: plz recommend third party speaker re Mass Pike

Bill, Any DOT movement on speaker at neighborhood association? Need to finalize our agenda and outreach, so just checkin in. Thanks! Bill August

From: Deignan, Bill [<mailto:wdeignan@cambridgema.gov>]
Sent: Thursday, September 11, 2014 9:15 AM
To: Bill August; 'Steven Miller'
Cc: Rasmussen, Susanne; Dash, Stuart; 'Olivia Fiske'
Subject: RE: plz recommend third party speaker re Mass Pike

I have requested that someone from the MassDOT team come to speak about the status of the project. The project manager is not available that night but they are checking to see if someone else can attend and give a short presentation on the status of the project. I'll let you know when I hear something. Thanks.

From: Bill August [<mailto:billaugust@epsteinandaugust.com>]
Sent: Thursday, September 11, 2014 7:09 AM
To: 'Steven Miller'
Cc: Rasmussen, Susanne; Dash, Stuart; Deignan, Bill; 'Olivia Fiske'
Subject: RE: plz recommend third party speaker re Mass Pike

Thank you Steve! (and all) Bill

Bill August, Esq.
Epstein & August, LLP
101 Arch Street, 9th Floor
Boston, MA 02110

Tel. 617.951.9909
billaugust@epsteinandaugust.com

The information contained in this transmission may contain privileged and confidential information. With respect to client communications use of this transmission is intended only for the use of the person(s) named above and with respect to such communications you are hereby notified that if you are not the intended recipient, any review, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this communication is strictly prohibited.

From: Steven Miller [<mailto:semiller48@gmail.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, September 10, 2014 9:00 PM
To: Bill August
Cc: Susanne Rasmussen /Camb; sdash@cambridgema.gov; Deignan, Bill; Olivia Fiske
Subject: Re: plz recommend third party speaker re Mass Pike

Bill:

I'm reaching out to see if I can find someone to come talk.

Key points (IMHO) are that CNA should be actively supporting the Allston community because the community's demands to: (1) create a direct connection from the Pike exits to Storrow will reduce congestion at the bridges and adjacent intersections; (2) move Storrow further away from the river will reduce noise and pollution; (3) create an across-the-river ped/bike path and connections from the Grand Junction corridor to BU-Harvard-Allston will reduce need for car travel and make it much safer for non-motorized people to go back & forth; (4) improve Cambridge St will make the connecting routes much better; (5) improve the Pike exit/entrance structural design will reduce the wait Camb. people now have getting from the Pike back to their homes.

Steve

Steven E. Miller
Executive Director, Healthy Weight Initiative, HSPH, Dept. of Nutrition
Board of Directors, LivableStreets Alliance
cell: 617-686-1050
["The Public Way: Transportation, Health, and Livable Communities"](#)

On Wed, Sep 10, 2014 at 11:22 AM, Bill August <billaugust@epsteinandaugust.com> wrote:

Hi all. Can you recommend someone else for us to invite re MassPike update (someone at DOT? some other planning group or nonprofit or other knowledgeable person) for Sept 23. Separately from the speaker, if there are any anticipated impacts on traffic going into Cambridgeport, could you please informally contact me and let me know as that is one of the major underlying concerns and we feel need to be sure any such impacts are clearly and timely communicated to the neighborhood association. We need to take it up Sept 23 as our neighborhood has not really had an update on this (to my knowledge) in Cport since b4 the summer. As always, thank you for all your public service. Copying Olivia Fiske, Board member who is in the lead on agenda.

Also, Stuart, who is coming re Master Plan issue/update?

Bill August, Esq,
Epstein & August, LLP
101 Arch Street, 9th Floor
Boston, MA 02110

tel. [617-951-9909](tel:617-951-9909)
billaugust@epsteinandaugust.com

Good Morning Bill,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good morning. Thank you for your reminder note. This is on my list of things to attempt to nail down in advance of the meeting on 9/18. I'll remind the team and try to be back to you today.

Regards & Good Wishes,
-Nate

Hi Mike, Ed and Nate-

I wanted to be in touch to set up a meeting with you and your team and Cambridge staff to review alternatives and discuss a range of turnpike access and traffic operational issues. I have booked a tentative time with our team for Sept 29th at 1PM here. Can this work for you?

We met yesterday internally to review the alternatives generally and had some comments and questions for you to consider in the meantime:

- In doing your traffic analysis, did you include the signals on Memorial Drive at River and Western, and look at the potential of a coordinated 90 second cycle for the four signals at River and Western, on each side of the river? Based on analysis done during the River and Western Bridge designs, this would allow for some improvements to coordination of this signal system benefiting vehicles and also create shorter wait times for path users.
- In bringing vehicles across the Western Ave bridge from Cambridge, it would be ideal if the bridge could be cleared during each cycle to create room for queuing on the bridge during the next cycle.
- We want to re-emphasize our belief that multiple access points to the Turnpike from Western Ave and Soldiers Field Road would be useful to all modes and also reduce the number of vehicles going through the SFR/Cambridge St intersection, helping to reduce the cycle length.
- The location of a crossing for cyclists and pedestrians to BU should inform where connecting streets are placed leading to Cambridge Street as this will be an important connection for the Allston neighborhood and Harvard.
- Your analysis should also identify priority bicycle and pedestrian connections, such as the one to BU. Green line stops on Commonwealth Avenue should also be shown wherever possible.
- It has been mentioned at our meetings that all roads will have bicycle facilities and cycle tracks on more major streets which we fully support. Having cycle tracks will have an impact on signal timing, especially for turning cyclists, and this should be accounted for in your analysis. Bicycle signals should be included to facilitate turns.
- Options with one-way pairs of streets are less attractive in trying to create a neighborhood and also create difficulties in terms of bicycle access, unless two-way facilities are built on each one way street, which can create local access issues.
- Raising streets above the grade of parcels should be avoided or at least minimized wherever possible.
- We would like to see more detail about how connections for a multi-use path and rail will be made to the Grand Junction in Cambridge.

As analysis continues and options are narrowed, as I assume you are starting to do, we are also looking forward to seeing more about potential noise impacts to lower Cambridgeport and ability of the project to narrow the Turnpike cross-section, move it away from Soldiers Field Road, and create the ability to move SFR to create additional parkland.

Thank you for reviewing these issues so we can have further discussion at our meeting. Please confirm that this date and time work.

Bill

Hi. Thank you. Please coordinate with our clerk who handles the agenda, Olivia Fiske, who I am copying here. IN the interim Steve Miller lined up someone from Allston neighborhood association to speak too (Jessica Robertson). Olivia's tel. # is 617 354 3066). I think it will be ideal to have both Jessica and DOT. Best regards, Bill August

From: Deignan, Bill [<mailto:wdeignan@cambridgema.gov>]
Sent: Wednesday, September 17, 2014 10:56 AM
To: Bill August
Cc: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis
Subject: RE: plz recommend third party speaker re Mass Pike

Hi Bill-

MassDOT will be sending one or more people to your CAN meeting on the 23rd to talk about the I-90 project. Copied here is Nate Cabral-Curtis who will coordinate with you on the details. Thanks and have a great meeting.

From: Bill August [<mailto:billaugust@epsteinandaugust.com>]
Sent: Tuesday, September 16, 2014 8:26 AM
To: 'Steven Miller'
Cc: Deignan, Bill; Rasmussen, Susanne; Dash, Stuart; 'Olivia Fiske'
Subject: RE: plz recommend third party speaker re Mass Pike

Thanks Steve! Much appreciated as always. Our next meeting is not for another 2 months and there is some sentiment on our Board that we need to try to get info out on this while things are cooking and not wait a whole 2 months. We could schedule another meeting for next month but that does not seem to be in the cards at the moment, which is why we are so eager to get someone scheduled for Sept. 23. What other independent non-government organizations are following and active in this? Bill

From: Steven Miller [<mailto:semiller48@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, September 15, 2014 9:21 PM
To: Bill August
Cc: Deignan, Bill; Rasmussen, Susanne; Dash, Stuart; Olivia Fiske
Subject: Re: plz recommend third party speaker re Mass Pike

Bil Augustl:

I'm down to one last possible person from the Allston community group to speak that evening. I hope to hear from her tonight or first thing in the AM.

It would be a lot easier if you could postpone this topic for a month!

Steve

Steven E. Miller
Executive Director, Healthy Weight Initiative, HSPH, Dept. of Nutrition
Board of Directors, LivableStreets Alliance
cell: 617-686-1050
["The Public Way: Transportation, Health, and Livable Communities"](#)

On Mon, Sep 15, 2014 at 9:17 PM, Bill August <billaugust@epsteinandaugust.com> wrote:

Bill, Any DOT movement on speaker at neighborhood association? Need to finalize our agenda and outreach, so just checkin in. Thanks! Bill August

From: Deignan, Bill [mailto:wdeignan@cambridgema.gov]
Sent: Thursday, September 11, 2014 9:15 AM
To: Bill August; 'Steven Miller'
Cc: Rasmussen, Susanne; Dash, Stuart; 'Olivia Fiske'

Subject: RE: plz recommend third party speaker re Mass Pike

I have requested that someone from the MassDOT team come to speak about the status of the project. The project manager is not available that night but they are checking to see if someone else can attend and give a short presentation on the status of the project. I'll let you know when I hear something. Thanks.

From: Bill August [mailto:billaugust@epsteinandaugust.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 11, 2014 7:09 AM
To: 'Steven Miller'
Cc: Rasmussen, Susanne; Dash, Stuart; Deignan, Bill; 'Olivia Fiske'
Subject: RE: plz recommend third party speaker re Mass Pike

Thank you Steve! (and all) Bill

Bill August, Esq.
Epstein & August, LLP
101 Arch Street, 9th Floor
Boston, MA 02110

Tel. [617.951.9909](tel:617.951.9909)
billaugust@epsteinandaugust.com

The information contained in this transmission may contain privileged and confidential information. With respect to client communications use of this transmission is intended only for the use of the person(s) named above and with respect to such communications you are hereby notified that if you are not the intended recipient, any review, dissemination, distribution or duplication of this communication is strictly prohibited.

From: Steven Miller [mailto:semiller48@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 10, 2014 9:00 PM
To: Bill August

Cc: Susanne Rasmussen /Camb; sdash@cambridgema.gov; Deignan, Bill; Olivia Fiske
Subject: Re: plz recommend third party speaker re Mass Pike

Bill:

I'm reaching out to see if I can find someone to come talk.

Key points (IMHO) are that CNA should be actively supporting the Allston community because the community's demands to: (1) create a direct connection from the Pike exits to Storrow will reduce congestion at the bridges and adjacent intersections; (2) move Storrow further away from the river will reduce noise and pollution; (3) create an across-the-river ped/bike path and connections from the Grand Junction corridor to BU-Harvard-Allston will reduce need for car travel and make it much safer for non-motorized people to go back & forth; (4) improve Cambridge St will make the connecting routes much better; (5) improve the Pike exit/entrance structural design will reduce the wait Camb. people now have getting from the Pike back to their homes.

Steve

Steven E. Miller
Executive Director, Healthy Weight Initiative, HSPH, Dept. of Nutrition
Board of Directors, LivableStreets Alliance
cell: [617-686-1050](tel:617-686-1050)
["The Public Way: Transportation, Health, and Livable Communities"](#)

On Wed, Sep 10, 2014 at 11:22 AM, Bill August <billaugust@epsteinandaugust.com> wrote:

Hi all. Can you recommend someone else for us to invite re MassPike update (someone at DOT? some other planning group or nonprofit or other knowledgeable person) for Sept 23. Separately from the speaker, if there are any anticipated impacts on traffic going into Cambridgeport, could you please informally contact me and let me know as that is one of the major underlying concerns and we feel need to be sure any such impacts are clearly and timely communicated to the neighborhood association. We need to take it up Sept 23 as our neighborhood has not really had an update on this (to my knowledge) in Cport since b4 the summer. As always, thank you for all your public service. Copying Olivia Fiske, Board member who is in the lead on agenda.

Also, Stuart, who is coming re Master Plan issue/update?

Bill August, Esq,
Epstein & August, LLP
101 Arch Street, 9th Floor
Boston, MA 02110

tel. [617-951-9909](tel:617-951-9909)
billaugust@epsteinandaugust.com

Good Afternoon Renny,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good day. Thank you for your recent note regarding the I-90 Allston Interchange Improvement project. In some of our conversations during the taskforce meetings earlier this spring, I might have recounted to you that under my planning degree is a history major and as such I definitely appreciated your comments regarding Washington Allston. I have heard it said by several authorities, including the chief librarian of the Massachusetts Historical Society, Peter Drummey, that Allston is the only community in the USA named for a painter, so wanting to maintain this signal honor is appropriate. Likewise, in response to some of the points you make in your email, MassDOT and its project team is fully aware that Allston and Brighton are two neighborhoods, with their own zipcodes, and that the Allston Interchange (Exit 18 from the Massachusetts Turnpike) is in fact fully resident in Allston hence the project's name the I-90 Allston Interchange Improvement Project.

Those things said, once we move beyond the strict definition of where the interchange is located, then it becomes appropriate to speak of Brighton as well since the interchange is less than a mile from the border of 02134 (Allston) and 02135 (Brighton) on Everett Street, and just over a mile at another point along the border on Guest Street. Wikipedia, a bit of a joke in poor taste when I was in school at the 12 years ago, but now a well-respected authority on many points, particularly those cultural, talks about Allston/Brighton as two “interlocking” neighborhoods of Boston, but if you don't care to take their word for it, there are many other options from which to choose including the City of Boston, which offers an Allston-Brighton resident parking sticker, the *Allston-Brighton TAB* newspaper, the Allston-Brighton Community Development Corporation (CDC), and the Brighton-Allston Historical Society which flips the usual equation on its head. I am sure that none of those organizations intend any insult to either Allston or Brighton with their naming conventions and neither do we. From our perspective, the use of the term Allston/Brighton serves as an indication to both us as a project team and to the larger community around the project that we recognize that what we do at an interchange in Allston will have impacts on neighboring areas.

I hope all of this helps to lay some of your concerns to rest. Should you have any questions or concerns, please don't hesitate to be in touch by telephone or email. Otherwise, I look forward to seeing you at our public information meeting on the 18th.

Regards & Good Wishes,
-Nate

Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis

Transportation Planner, Public Involvement Specialist, Associate

Howard/Stein-Hudson Associates, Inc.

11 Beacon Street, Suite 1010

Boston, MA 02108

direct: 617.348.3336 **main:** 617-482-7080

www.hshassoc.com

- Transportation Planning
- Traffic Engineering
- Civil Engineering
- Public Involvement/Strategic Planning

Bill Deignan (since there are two Bills), and Nate, could one of you give me the name of the individual who will be speaking? I'd like to coordinate with him directly.
Olivia

From: Bill August [<mailto:billaugust@epsteinandaugust.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, September 17, 2014 11:11 AM
To: 'Deignan, Bill'
Cc: 'Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis'; 'olivia fiske'
Subject: RE: plz recommend third party speaker re Mass Pike

Hi. Thank you. Please coordinate with our clerk who handles the agenda, Olivia Fiske, who I am copying here. IN the interim Steve Miller lined up someone from Allston neighborhood association to speak too (Jessica Robertson). Olivia's tel. # is 617 354 3066). I think it will be ideal to have both Jessica and DOT. Best regards,
Bill August

Good Afternoon All,

I hope this note finds everyone well and having a good day. Olivia and I have spoken by telephone. The loop is closed and we will see each other in the community room of the LBJ apartments at 6:15 on the 23rd.

Regards & Good Wishes,
-Nate

From: Olivia Fiske [<mailto:fiskeolivia@gmail.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, September 17, 2014 2:35 PM
To: 'Bill August'; 'Deignan, Bill'
Cc: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis
Subject: RE: plz recommend third party speaker re Mass Pike

Bill Deignan (since there are two Bills), and Nate, could one of you give me the name of the individual who will be speaking? I'd like to coordinate with him directly.
Olivia

Thanks Nate.

From: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis [<mailto:ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com>]
Sent: Wednesday, September 17, 2014 3:17 PM
To: Olivia Fiske; 'Bill August'; Deignan, Bill
Cc: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis
Subject: RE: plz recommend third party speaker re Mass Pike

Good Afternoon All,

I hope this note finds everyone well and having a good day. Olivia and I have spoken by telephone. The loop is closed and we will see each other in the community room of the LBJ apartments at 6:15 on the 23rd.

Regards & Good Wishes,
-Nate

Good Afternoon Harry,

As noted in my prior email, here is part two of the response to your inquiry. This note addresses your request for a copy of the purpose and need statement. You will find a copy attached. That said, before you plow ahead and begin reviewing this document, I do want to take a moment and give you a sense of what you are getting with the purpose and need statement. A Purpose and Need Statement is a requirement of the NEPA environmental process and is a standard section within a NEPA document. It identifies, in a brief and concise format, why a project is being undertaken and what it is to achieve. I don't know if you remember college biology, but the purpose and need can be likened to the abstract you wrote up as part of preparing your lab report. Put another way, think of the purpose and need statement as the 50,000 foot view of the project. In the purpose and need statement, you will find things like enhance the infrastructure to support alternative (or non-motorized) modes of transportation within the project area." You will not find statements along the lines of "provide a shared-used pathway from the corner Lincoln Street and Eric Road to a point along the Paul Dudley White bicycle path 120 feet east of Houghton Chemical. At no point will the shared use pathway be less than 16 feet in width." You will find statements such as "provide the infrastructure to support construction of West Station and future commuter rail services." You will not find statements like "a space of 11 feet by 36 feet should be reserved for public art in the entry area of the station." Statements that the project will comply with specific policies and programs or conform to broad goals are addressed in other sections of the NEPA document.

I provide you with this framing because the NEPA process isn't something that the average citizen goes through on a regular basis and the whole thing can feel confusing. Before I conclude, and in that spirit, I would note two more things: one, the level of specificity you see here is normal for a project of this size and complexity and two, just because you don't see something in the Purpose and Need Statement doesn't mean it is lost or won't be accomplished by the project, it's just not something that rises to the 50,000 foot level. That said, your document is attached and I hope you find it helpful. We look forward to seeing you this evening.

Regards & Good Wishes,
-Nate

Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis

Transportation Planner, Public Involvement Specialist, Associate

Howard/Stein-Hudson Associates, Inc.

11 Beacon Street, Suite 1010

Boston, MA 02108

direct: 617.348.3336 **main:** 617-482-7080

www.hshassoc.com

- Transportation Planning
- Traffic Engineering
- Civil Engineering
- Public Involvement/Strategic Planning

Please Note Our New Address

Good Afternoon Harry,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good day. I'm sure I will see you at this evening's public information meeting, but before I do, I wanted to make sure you had answers to your most recent batch of questions. I will also send you the purpose and need statement under separate cover just so everything is cut and dry.

First of all, thank you for your appreciation of our efforts. Your characterization of some of our earlier responses as "MassDOT does not have an answer yet," is a bit of a generalization, but it serves as a reasonable shorthand if you also bear in the mind that it covers more nuanced versions of the same statement such as "MassDOT thinks it has an answer, but isn't sure its constructible yet and is double-checking it," or "MassDOT wouldn't typically have an answer to this question until further into the design." So, with that said, let me get into your questions. As you requested, I have tried to give you a sense as to when in our process your questions would be answered. I have set your questions and my answers off in a different font for clarity.

1. Shared Use Path (a.k.a. People's Pike)

- A. At the eastern end of this path, where will it cross Soldiers Field Road to meet the Dr. Paul Dudley White bike path?

In the current phase of the project, MassDOT has committed to the creation of a shared use pathway from the vicinity of Lincoln Street to the Paul Dudley White pathway. Since all options for replacement of the interchange allow creation of the shared use path, the exact touchdown point of the pathway would be decided during the 25% design of the project which would come after the current phase comes to an end. Generally speaking, it will be placed in an alignment that is conducive for the safety of the pedestrians, and cyclists that cross over and the motorists that pass beneath it.

- B. At the western end of this path, how will it connect to both Cambridge Street and also continue under the Cambridge Street overpass to reach the intersection of Lincoln Street and Franklin Street?

Again, the exact touchdown point would be decided in the 25% design phase of the project. The current commitment of MassDOT for this phase of the project is to create a shared-use pathway from the area around Lincoln Street down to the river. We understand that the preference is for such a path to be entirely free of crossings by automotive traffic; however that will need to be evaluated within the overall context of urban environment that the interchange is being built within.

- C. What is the cross-sectional allocation of space for cyclists, pedestrians, landscaping, lighting, and street furniture?

This one is a two-part question. The cross-sectional allocation of space for cyclists and pedestrians would be answered in the 25% design phase as would how much space is allocated for things like lighting, benches, water fountains etc. The appearance and type of lighting, benches, water fountains etc. is typically considered beyond 25% design and really develops between 75% and final design.

2. Which design options would require the reconstruction of the Cambridge Street overpass between Lincoln St and Harvard Ave?

We would know the answer to this question by the end of the current phase and it would be discussed in the ENF. The design team is currently looking into this issue and it is multi-variable dependent on design speeds, interchange geometry, the number and location of ramp connections required, as well as refined traffic analysis of each of the remaining concepts.

3. Franklin Street pedestrian overpass
 1. What are MassDOT's plans to reconstruct this overpass
 2. If the associated Cambridge St overpass is rebuilt
 3. If the associated Cambridge St overpass is not rebuilt
 4. Through what process and on what schedule will this new pedestrian overpass be designed?

In the current stage of design, MassDOT has committed to reconstructing this pedestrian overpass as part of the overall Allston Interchange Improvement project. The volumes of commuters using it indicate a real need for improvement. We will be able to address the interaction between the Cambridge Street and Franklin Street overpasses in the ENF and will really get a solid understanding of the new pedestrian bridge's dimensions, touch-down points etc. during the 25% design phase.

4. The structure that will support the bus access loop for West Station that is proposed to travel above the train storage yard.

Here, I assume you mean the appearance of the structure, how wide it would be, how it would be supported. If that is correct, then those elements would be addressed during the 25% design stage.

5. How to address Mass Pike-related quality of life issues on Lincoln Street

MassDOT context sensitive design approach always strives to avoid or minimize impacts on existing neighborhoods, including their quality of life, however, if the new project touches Lincoln Street in such a manner that it for example contributes new noise impacts, then appropriate steps will be taken to address those impacts. Information on this would be provided in the ENF.

6. Proposed roadway (by others) - When will the roads with this designation be constructed?

If the roadways remain under the designation of "by others" then there's really no way to say. I know this is probably the last thing you want to hear, but it's the truth. As I believe Mike made clear to you in his prior reply, if a "roadway by others" is determined to be a project requirement to get the interchange to work effectively, then MassDOT will pull it into the project.

7. Plans to mitigate the noise and air pollution impacts of the highway and railyard with sound barrier walls, tree planting, and other solutions.

This is a multi-part answer. The need for noise and air quality impact analysis will be identified in the ENF and appropriate mitigations sketched out in future environmental documentation. If, for example, a noise wall were found to be needed the design would evolve further in the 25% phase. Further down the line, in the 75% design phase, there would be discussions of what material the wall might be faced in, whether it could be given a vegetative cladding etc.

8. Comparative analysis of the concepts presented by Glen Berkowitz on June 25 and those presented by MassDOT on June 11.

As with suggestions by any community or task force member, the design team will consider as the project advances Glen's suggestion for a temporary viaduct as part of the reconstruction of the viaduct section of the Turnpike and other elements presented on the 25th.

9. A feasible scenario for vehicles travelling from the Western Ave Bridge and Soldiers Field Road onto the Mass Pike that will not produce unacceptable traffic jams.

The term "unacceptable" needs a little definition since left by itself it can be a bit subjective. Your unacceptable may be O.K. to me and vice-versa and what was acceptable Tuesday might be unacceptable Wednesday when you're running late for a meeting. Generally speaking, acceptable in traffic engineering parlance means a level of delay at signals which is appropriate to the location in question, a rural intersection for example has a lower expected length of delay than one in a city, and effective processing of queues at signals such that they do not stretch back into other signals during peak hour operations. You began to see this information during the meeting on September 3rd. Additional information will be provided in future environmental filings (EA/EIR) and you can expect to see traffic refinements through 25% design. Subtle changes to things like signal timing and phasing will continue all the way through 75% design.

And now some answers for your follow-up questions

1. What are the height clearances in the Pru tunnel? What is achieved by complying with current Federal highway and rail design policy for clearances when less than 2 miles to the east the road does not comply with current policy for clearances.

The clearance at the Prudential Tunnel for road is 14'-3" and for rail is 16'-9". The difference is really one without a distinction. It's not as though the clearances at the rebuilt Allston Interchange would allow something dramatically higher than would be allowed by the Prudential Tunnel. Moreover the point is one about modernization of infrastructure over time. My house was built in 1936. If I was going to put on an addition, I would use insulated walls, storm windows, and GFI plugs. I wouldn't match the old single pane window in the living room that leaks heat like a sieve or the old two prong plugs which won't take a modern device just because the rest of the house has those items in it. The same principle is at work on Allston. You build to current standards, not the old standards elsewhere on the property.

2. Will MassDOT evaluate the performance of the 3 lane configuration currently in place to test the assumption that "Four lanes are needed to effectively accommodate the interchange operations in the final configuration"? Also, how is the assumption that four lanes are needed consistent with State and City goals to reduce vehicular mode share?

A tech memo is currently being worked on by the design team and will be provided in the ENF that will address this very point. MassDOT is looking at the current 6-lane operations to see how they work as part of this process. Generally speaking, I will note that the press response has been very unfavorable and we've had some nasty emails about the lane reduction. That said, the maintenance of the current 8 lane configuration (4 inbound and 4 outbound) is in keeping with City and State goals regarding mode shift in that no new capacity is being built. At some point, the number of cars that 8 lanes can carry is reached and someone who wants to drive has to either drive on another road, drive at another time, or change how they commute. A solution out of keeping with mode shift would be to suggest that to accommodate future needs, we need to take homes and businesses to get the Turnpike to be 10 lanes wide in Allston and I can assure you nobody is proposing that. Lastly, MassDOT is deeply concerned about protecting local streets in Allston from new cut-through traffic. If we create an interchange which fails to process traffic effectively, folks will look for a way around the blockage and the way around is in part through the neighborhood.

3. Regarding Soldiers Field Road between the viaduct and Doubletree, what I was trying to ask is for MassDOT to draw a dimensioned line on a map showing the viaduct end of the viaduct, the hotel, and the

tightest turns that would be safe to have on Soldiers Field Road based on a reasonable design speed. Is MassDOT willing to provide such a graphic and associated measurement of the acreage of new parkland?

This is something that can and likely will be done as a part of this project. A full accounting of just how much parkland can be created anew depends on which option or variant thereof shared with you at the August taskforce meeting turns out to be safe and constructible. The project team will be evaluating this further as we advance beyond the filing of the ENF. Also remember that shifting of Soldiers' Field Road will work equally well with any of the interchange options under consideration.

4. Please provide the analysis that led to MassDOT rejecting a full or partial depression of the mainline highway.

A formal analysis is not available but this concept was vetted as we reviewed and prepared other design alternatives. The idea of a boat section or tunnel is not practical given the existing constraints currently imposed on this project. One thing I would note is that GreenDOT policies contain a reference to avoiding the creation of highway structures where pumps are required to control flooding of the roadway. A boat-section would require such pumps.

5. Regarding vehicle travel on Babcock and/or Malvern Street, avoiding additional traffic on to neighborhood streets is one of many items that has been noted as important by the taskforce. Improving community connectivity and reducing traffic on Cambridge Street have also been noted as important by the taskforce. Therefore, to help MassDOT and the taskforce achieve the proper balance between these goals, I would like to request again that MassDOT design and analyze how one or both of these extended roads can include cars and/or bus service.

The concept of allowing new vehicular traffic to fully traverse Babcock Street or Malvern Street to Cambridge Street is considered by MassDOT, the City, and BU to be a non-starter. The chief reason for this is that the viaduct structures needed to land cars, trucks, buses, etc. on either Babcock or Malvern would need to remain on an elevated structure back into the neighborhood to an extent that it may significantly disrupt the quality of life in that neighborhood. Bicycle and pedestrian accommodations can be provided on much lighter structures and in some cases elevators could be mixed with ramps to help keep the access point on land already in use for transportation purposes. Vehicular connection(s) would also introduce significant traffic challenges at Packard's corner.

6. Please describe in more detail how the "project is being carefully planned and designed for flexibility of future land uses by the owner."

All of the designs currently under consideration seek to minimize the amount of space taken up by transportation assets leaving flexibility for development yet still providing for acceptable levels of traffic operations. Roadway grades, widths, etc. will be acceptable for use by all road-legal vehicles allowing for deliveries by trucks. Planning for West Station and improvements to bicycle/pedestrian access on Cambridge Street and elsewhere in the project will allow for a wide range of land uses, not just those which lend themselves to access by motor vehicles. Intersections are generally being spaced to allow driveways to come out at locations which will not conflict with signals.

7. What is the expected completion date for the separate project to implement All Electronic Tolling at the eastern and western edges of the Allston Interchange project area?

It is currently projected that AET will come on line in the summer of 2016.

8. How many rail tracks over the Grand Junction Bridge are planned?

The Grand Junction Bridge currently has one rail track on it. Our project's only interaction with Grand Junction is that we have to keep that one rail track open at all times throughout construction and ensure that the connections to that one rail track are functionally as they are today.

9. If a new road is being built south of the DoubleTree and connecting to Soldiers Field Road inbound, how should the frontage road in front of Genzyme and the ramps and underpass at the River Street bridge be reconsidered?

No modifications of the Soldier's Field Road underpass are planned as part of this project, however, as you may recall from the second taskforce meeting, simplification of the Cambridge Street/River Street/SFR intersection is part of this project. Since a goal of this project is to flatten Cambridge Street in the area of the DoubleTree Hotel, providing an easier connection for cyclists and pedestrians to the river and Cambridge the two movements you depict with your red arrows cease to exist and would be handled elsewhere along Cambridge Street. You saw these new connections at the meeting on September 3rd and they will continue to evolve as the project advances.

Regards & Good Wishes,
-Nate

Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis

Transportation Planner, Public Involvement Specialist, Associate

Howard/Stein-Hudson Associates, Inc.

11 Beacon Street, Suite 1010

Boston, MA 02108

direct: 617.348.3336 **main:** 617-482-7080

www.hshassoc.com

- Transportation Planning
- Traffic Engineering
- Civil Engineering
- Public Involvement/Strategic Planning

Please Note Our New Address