



August 19, 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**  
**6<sup>th</sup> Taskforce Meeting**  
**Meeting Notes of August 13, 2014**

## Overview

On August 13, 2014 the Allston Interchange Improvement Project taskforce held its sixth 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 meeting summarized herein began with an announcement by Boston Transportation Department (BTD) Commissioner Gillooly regarding near-term safety improvements for Cambridge Street. These improvements are being conducted jointly between BTD and MassDOT. This announcement was positively received, however there was a request from a taskforce member that BTD directly engage residents once the road safety audit (RSA) for Cambridge Street had been completed. A presentation was also given by the Boston Redevelopment Authority's (BRA) Kairos Shen regarding ongoing coordination between the City and MassDOT. Likewise well-received, the BRA presentation outlined this City agency's goal for the project, delineated previous planning studies in the area, and a vision for what the local street network and block size in the interchange parcel, beyond what would be constructed by the MassDOT project. Of particular significance in the BRA commentary was the agency's request that MassDOT continue to develop the concept currently represented by option 3F, particularly analyzing the idea of a high mainline for the Massachusetts Turnpike with low access roads connecting to it, and its concurrence with the MassDOT team that while bicycle and pedestrian connections to West Station and Cambridge Street from the area around Boston University are appropriate, vehicular connections are not as out of keeping with the taskforce's direction to protect neighborhood streets from new traffic.

Also discussed was the evolving evaluation criteria regarding which there was still some confusion on the part of taskforce membership. Of particular concern were items important to the taskforce which had been provided as "double barreled" evaluation criteria. A good example of this is the criterion offered by a

taskforce member which linked a traffic free shared-used path from Lincoln Street to the Paul Dudley White path on the Charles River with the construction of a bicycle link to Cambridge over the Grand Junction Line Bridge. The shared use path from Lincoln Street to the river *is a part of the Allston Interchange Improvement Project*; however the Grand Junction Connection is beyond the project's scope. A revision to the evaluation criteria will be made to provide additional clarification regarding such double-barreled criteria as well as items which are of significance to both MassDOT and the taskforce, such as landscape treatments and providing spaces for public art, but which are appropriate to the design phase which will commence *after* a preferred alternative for replacing the interchange has been selected for environmental review.

The meeting's last topic was the continued investigation of the shifting of Soldiers' Field Road to provide additional parkland along the Charles River. Two approaches to this taskforce goal are under investigation by MassDOT's team at this time. One pushes Soldiers' Field Road south right to the existing fence line and creates a modest amount of new parkland. The second, more extreme option, pushes all of Soldiers' Field Road eastbound under the I-90 viaduct and creates an additional 6 feet of parkland width, but included substantial engineering challenges including the positioning of support piers in the median of the parkway and the potential relocation of an 8-foot diameter sewer line. Generally speaking, the taskforce appreciated the effort with regard to Soldiers' Field Road and requested that the agency and its design team continue their efforts in this area. It is worth noting that a relocated Soldiers Field Road *will work equally well with all interchange options currently under analysis*. As such, while the design team will continue to work on this aspect of the project, some of the detail associated will likely be held until the design phase.

---

## Detailed Meeting Minutes<sup>1</sup>

### Opening Remarks

- C: Ed Ionata (EI): Good evening and welcome everyone to the 6<sup>th</sup> taskforce meeting. I'm Ed Ionata with TetraTech. Tonight we are going to drive through a lengthy agenda so if people could hold their questions until the end of each portion of the presentation it would be greatly appreciated. First we are going to review tonight's agenda. We have some taskforce administration updates to cover. We'll take a look at the project flow chart followed by Mike O'Dowd's update regarding the meeting with the City. After that we'll have Kairos Shen come up and show you the City's conceptual plan for the interchange. After Kairos we'll have Joe Freedman up to discuss the selection criteria and finally we'll give you an update on Soldiers Field Road. Before any of that happens I want to first have Commissioner Gillooly come up to discuss the unfortunate pedestrian accident that occurred on Cambridge Street on the night of the last taskforce meeting.
- C: Jim Gillooly (JG): Thank you Ed. I'm Jim Gillooly with the Boston Transportation Department (BTD). When the Cambridge Street improvement project meetings were taking place we heard loud and clear from the public that there was a major concern over safety along the Cambridge Street corridor. I'm happy to announce that within 2 to 3 weeks we will be putting in new crosswalks. We will be installing rectangular rapid flashing beacons and also be laying down new striping in order to reduce the on-ramps widths to I-90 from two lanes to one lane. We believe this will reduce the risk of cars passing one another while getting onto I-90 and as a result reduce the risk of pedestrian and vehicular conflict. We have been working on a pavement marking plan from Union Square all the way to the River which will include bicycle lanes in each direction. We have been working on this plan for some time now and we believe that the residents of Allston do not need to and should not have to wait until the new Cambridge Street gets built for immediate improvements. There are two things that will be happening very soon. The first is a safety audit that will be handled in coordination with MassDOT. The safety audit will begin in early September and we will then revisit our restriping plans as fast as possible. Our goal is to have the restriping done before it becomes too cold. Some of the pavement markings will be on State owned

---

<sup>1</sup> Herein "C" stands for comment, "Q" for question and "A" for answer. For a list of attendees, please see Appendix 1. For copies of meeting flipcharts, please see Appendix 2.

property and some will be on City owned property. I want to emphasize that this system will work as one and we should give a thanks to MassDOT for proposing the safety audit. Thank you.

- A: Harry Mattison (HM): Thank you for the update Commissioner. It is wonderful to hear that there is coordination happening between MassDOT and the City. I'm wondering if a group of residents can be part of that collaboration. I ask because we want real safety improvements and not just pavement markings, it has to be more than just paint on the ground.
- C: JG: I would be perfectly happy to sit down and have that conversation once we get through the safety audit.
- C: El: Thank you Commissioner. We have a few taskforce administrative items to cover. The minutes are out and they are lengthy. If you have any questions or concerns about the minutes the best thing to do is email Nate. In terms of the project flow chart and where we are, tonight is the 6<sup>th</sup> taskforce meeting. We will looking at comments relating to the selection criteria, we will review some of the responses on how the criteria is being incorporated and as we go forward we will get more detail on the remaining alternatives in order to narrow the range of alternatives. I wanted to restate the purpose of the project because some people have been asking about it. The purpose of the project is to assemble a taskforce team that is convened by MassDOT to provide stakeholder input on the broad range of issues affecting interchange design. The input will affect MassDOT's decisions regarding the development of implementable alternatives, selection of a preferred alternative, and the details of design.

I think most of you are familiar with MassDOT's priorities but in case you haven't seen them in a while they are shown here. We really want to focus more on a broader scale of the conceptual design alternatives. We have a good set of taskforce priorities and a lot of MassDOT's priorities and the taskforce priorities overlap. We have been making good progress on that. Some of you may feel like it has been frustrating up to this point but we have been looking at all the detail that goes into analyzing these alternatives and we think we are moving in the right direction. At the last taskforce meeting there was a lot of discussion about a meeting taking place outside of the taskforce between the City and MassDOT. Your project manager Mike O'Dowd will now come up and tell you about that meeting.

#### *Review of MassDOT/City Meeting*

- C: Mike O'Dowd (MOD): Good evening everyone. I hope you enjoyed your three week vacation from the taskforce. The meeting minutes have just been posted. I apologize for the delay, I have been out of the office this past week and they have been waiting on my approval to be posted. There was a lot of discussion and interest from this group that MassDOT needed to sit down with the Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA), BTD, and also to coordinate with the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA). Administrator Frank DePaola and I sat down with Kairos Shen from the BRA and Commissioner Gillooly from BTD to discuss the partnership and working relationship moving forward. There are a lot of shared priorities that I think we haven't been able to communicate as clearly as we should. I think it's important to note that the City has made it clear that they share these priorities as well. We've met twice with the City and since the last taskforce meeting they've had the opportunity to review all the alternatives and concepts we've presented to you. After our discussion, Kairos and the BRA asked if they could present some of their ideas, suggestions, and considerations to the taskforce which is going to happen tonight.

I should note that we have also sat down with the Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) and they have reflected an interest and desire to improve the space along Soldiers Field Road. One of the goals of this project is to find a way to bring pedestrians and cyclist from the Lincoln Street neighborhood to the Paul Dudley White Path. Most of you haven't seen how we are trying to address that because there has been too much focus on the interchange itself and not enough on the neighborhood. It was important for us when we started this project and it has become more important to us as we've moved through the process that we want to build an interchange that connects the neighborhood but also satisfies the needs, goals and objectives of the project. At the end of the day this

is a transportation project with an interchange that handles 150,000 people driving through it a day. We need to make sure we can successfully move all the users through this area without creating any hardships.

Our role for this project is not to dictate what Beacon CSX Rail Yard is going to look like. Our role is to make sure the parcel is flexible for future development while taking into account our traffic analysis that the Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS) is working on. It's important to note that the City will be keeping us on track as we are going through this process. Another item is the MBTA and West Station. We sat down with the planning department at the MBTA and we are working with them to get a better understanding of where the platform and station structure will be located. Meetings with the MBTA will continue for us regularly for several months so when we develop our environmental plans it will reflect the coordination we have ongoing. We'll get you your north-south connectors, we'll be able to provide accessibility to West Station, and we'll also be able to make sure we provide a connection to Cambridge Street from any future development that occurs in the Beacon Park Yard.

In regards to the MBTA, I made their interest in this project quite clear at the first meeting. The MBTA has a strong desire to be able to provide more service to commuter rail passengers because we are increasing transit service. With that said, CSX no longer uses the rail yard for any storage, rail operations or freight operations. The MBTA has expressed a desire and need to start moving their commuter rail cars into that area to provide service on other parts of the network. I get a lot of news articles and emails sent to me every day. Many of you have probably heard or experienced the lane closure put into effect by MassDOT on the turnpike. In some instances it's not going too well, especially if you're sitting in it. MassDOT has a lot of work planned in this area over the next few years. There is barrier work near the Boston University area; there is substructure work at the Commonwealth Avenue Bridge as well as the replacement of the superstructure of the Commonwealth Avenue Bridge. The reason I bring this up is because MassDOT will be using the CSX yard to store materials for these projects so if you see an increase in activity happening there it's not directly related to this project.

Before I end I wanted to bring up something that I had been thinking a lot about. With a show of hands, how many of you have had the opportunity to actually walk through the Beacon Park Yard? Would it be of any interest to you to set up a time about an hour before the next taskforce meeting to walk you through and show you some of the constraints and restrictions that we've been trying to convey through our PowerPoints?<sup>2</sup>

Q: Jessica Robertson (JR): Can we also take you on a bicycle ride to show you what we have to deal with as local cyclists?

A: MOD: Sure. I'm comfortable riding a bicycle so if that's what you want I'm happy to do it.

Q: Galen Mook (GM): When we do our site walk can we make it longer than an hour so we can walk all the way down to the viaduct? It's pretty big.

A: MOD: The reason I am trying to limit it to roughly an hour is because I'm mindful that a lot of you are working. If I set it up at 4:00PM we may have a second crew of taskforce members arriving closer to 5:00PM.

Q: Anthony D'Isadoro (AD): I have a few questions and I apologize if I'm getting ahead of the presentation. Harry brought to my attention the idea of some of the construction staging happening down near the Pratt Street area. I would hope and recommend that at some point before that happens you come in front of the Allston Civic Association to discuss the specifics of that. Construction management and mitigation is something that is extremely important to the community, especially where all the trucks are going.

---

<sup>2</sup> Here the majority of taskforce members agreed through a show of hands that a site walk through the CSX Beacon Park Yard would be of interest.

- A: MOD: That's a good point. We've talked about it internally and unfortunately it's been something that has slipped through the cracks in discussing with you. I think it was brought up at the last taskforce meeting of having a second public information meeting. That's something that we said we would do very early on and I think we need to attack that right after this taskforce meeting.
- Q: AD: Thanks for that Mike. It may be addressed in your presentation but I'm also interested to know the point in which the collaboration between the River properties of Boston University and Harvard University come into play. They both have an Institutional Master Plans (IMPs), when will those be discussed?
- C: El: That's an excellent segue to the presentation.
- C: Wayne Mackenzie (WM): Before we dive into the presentation I wanted to recommend adding another item to the list of taskforce priorities and that is the idea of toll abatement for Allston residents similar to what residents of East Boston and Chelsea have for the tunnels and Tobin Bridge. I mentioned it earlier but I wanted to state it again for the record so it is not lost. I think there should be a discount toll program.
- C: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis (NCC): I've got it written down multiple times, Wayne, it is not lost.

*Boston Redevelopment Authority Presentation – Kairos Shen*

- C: Thank you Mike and good evening everyone. I am Karis Shen and I'm the Director of Planning at the BRA. I've been asked to give the taskforce an update on the conversations we've had with MassDOT in collaboration with BTDA and the BRA. I want to give you a sense of the direction the City is heading in and also tell you how we are reviewing and evaluating the plans show to the taskforce. We've taken a step back and have been looking at the project from a higher altitude to avoid getting stuck on all the micro details that the taskforce has been addressing of late. The first half of the presentation targets distilling city building principles and good construction principles. The second half of the presentation addresses the alternatives that have been produced by the engineering team and I'll discuss which ones we believe hold the most promise. I have a one page handout which is a summary of the City's official letter to MassDOT commenting on the alternatives.

The most important thing to understand is the locale of what we've been talking about. The first question addresses the fact that there has been a lot of planning in and around the project area. Boston University has a master plan that was approved by the BRA and adopted by the City last year. The core principle of the plan is to use Commonwealth Avenue as the central corridor for east-west movement while also providing connectivity to the river. Many of you and the BRA have spent the past years focusing on Western Avenue and Cambridge Street. We are anticipating a new street network in this area including important connector roadways like Stadium Way. Charlesview has been the newest addition to this area and Harvard will continue developing this area within the next 10 years. The Guest Street master plan is also something that is very important. The creation of a new commuter rail station associated with Everett Street and creating new city blocks where none exist today is all in Harvard's plan. Here is an example of a more detailed section of Cambridge Street. The most important principle is a strong connection to the surround areas and to the river. The solid lines represent vehicular roadways and the dotted lines represent pedestrian and bicycle connections. Improving pinch points is critical in the location of Cambridge Street in terms of constructability and feasibility. Part of the importance placed on Cambridge Street is a result of the desired connection of Cambridge and Western Village while sustaining the potential of development on both sides. Having parallel and alternative connections is critical in creating a sense of place and increasing real estate value. Depending on where the access road to the turnpike is placed you can create a series of blocks that are more familiar to people who live in this area. 300-400 foot blocks are odd shaped parcels. We've been finding that roughly 160 by 400 feet long is more traditional and familiar to residents living in a city like this one.

West Station has taken several different locations over the past few taskforce meetings, some more to the east and some more west than what we are showing. Vehicular access to West Station is something that will have to be addressed by either going over or under the turnpike. Boston University's master plan identifies uses and was approved by the BRA but at the time we did not anticipate the creation of West Station. We see the most appropriate location of West Station being as far east as possible. We've done some further analysis with all the schemes presented and we believe that Alternative 3F is the most appropriate. We encourage the project team to expand on alternatives similar to 3F including Alternative 3F itself. There is a sectional problem because of the topography of the land and its uncertainty. There are limited options to deal with this issue. We can put the mainline low, and go over it, with the connecting roadways, or we can elevate the mainline and go underneath it. There are trade-offs to both. We want to see that study and we want to see how the topography works with the access road system. Another reason we are in favor of Alternative 3F compared to Alternative 3G is because it leaves more space for developable properties adjacent to the River. It also gives us the opportunity to realign Soldiers Field Road.

- Q: Bruce Houghton (BH): When you look at this, the major problem is the intersection between the railroad yard and where you are trying to create a new neighborhood. It is important to note how those roads intersect and where they pinch. There's an assumption here that the land height of the rail yard remains the same. I'm wondering what it would look like and whether it would work to raise the land. Is that possible?
- A: KS: Our study suggests that one of the key focuses of what our work will be is to understand the section and how much grade change will occur. If we can isolate the grade change to one block then we could use the buildings as a way of creating the definition of the streets. I think the other suggestion is that we should think about this similar to North Point. The problem with North Point is this; the roadway systems needed buildings in order to complete the urban street system because otherwise it is unhospitable. In terms of land development, we can accept it but we don't want North Point to be a waste land until there is development. There is a notion here that as we build up the access roads some component of the grade should be made accessible even before buildings show up. The point is what types of topographical infrastructure needs to be included in order to provide access to the road system and to the transit system. We are asking MassDOT to investigate the idea of keeping this all at 2% grade so you can have the continuous grade closest to the highway as possible. There are tradeoffs to this such as having the mainline elevated throughout and I should mention that we hope to model this in three-dimension. The point is we don't want to wait 50 years from now when Harvard finally builds a building here and then figure out that you can actually walk there.
- Q: BH: You do have quite a large distance between Cambridge Street. Is there blue where the highway starts to pitch?
- A: KS: Yes, this is an example of Alternative 3F. We've suggested the idea of switching and testing different alternatives here to find out what grade solution works best.
- Q: BH: Would it be possible to grade the rail yard with the grade of the highway? It seems like that would reduce a good amount of the transitional conflict.
- A: MOD: That is one of reasons for our ongoing coordination with the MBTA.
- C: BH: I'm not thinking of the south side as much but more of the north side. The north side will have the ramps and the discharge of the highway. Whether it's a ramp or a berm it conflicts with the livability of the neighborhood. My idea is to raise the entire property to eliminate the grade conflict.
- A: KS: We agree with that and I think the task of filling up and smoothing out the grade at the time when MassDOT finishes their work is an interesting idea. If you take North Point for example, the advantage of being able to take the surface elements and fill it up eliminates the advantage of building near the turnpike. This is why we need to start planning this area now because if we know where the main



pedestrian corridors are going to be we can plan for a more gradual slope and more pedestrian friendly accommodations. As the state does more technical analysis we will be testing the results against each of the alternatives.

- C: El: The message has been received by the design team, not only to look at the grade transition but also to look at the elevation or de-elevation of the mainline.
- Q: AD: I'd like to go back to my original question to wrap this all up. The goal is to put in a transportation infrastructure and then collaboratively work with the land owners to develop these parcels. How do you envision that process working in order to get to that point? How does that collaboration work between Harvard and Boston University?
- A: KS: We've met with both Harvard and Boston University and told them that we have been able to sit down with MassDOT and provide the City's input on the project. There is certainly a lot of discussion about the principles we are pushing for being consistent with Harvard's master plan. Our approach at the BRA is that we know there are real estate discussions happening with Harvard, Boston University, and MassDOT. There are many smart ways for accounting for infrastructure that may be built. Commissioner Gillooly and I have both said that when this project is done the system works with the minimum required connections but with the most reasonable and appropriate number of connections. Whose responsibility it is to provide those connections needs to be discussed but we first have to agree on an alternative that achieve the basic principles and goals of the taskforce.
- C: El: Our design team's goal is to come up with alternative that doesn't preclude development as much as possible.
- Q: JR: This is a question for Mike and his team. We've talked about two options, one being the highway at grade and the connectors going over and the other vise-versa. I understand we've eliminated the idea of having the highway in a trench for the viaduct portion but have you looked at having the highway in a trench for the part where the connections across the rail yard will be happening? It seems to me that it would solve a lot of the berm and elevation problems.
- A: MOD: A lot of what we are trying to do can be achieved without having to do that. We're looking at a number of different options that provide access to West Station but also the opportunities for pedestrians and cyclist to get there in the least disruptive way between Cambridge Street and the neighborhood. It took several hours between us and the City but the fact that we're down to two alternatives that the City feels strongly about is a huge accomplishment.
- Q: JR: Can we look at having the mainline in a trench?
- A: MOD: Not the mainline.
- C: JR: I would like to see some kind of line on this diagram that says, "If this is the height of the viaduct, this is the point moving west where we get back to at grade."
- A: MOD: This is all the more reason why I want to take you out there to see it all in person.
- C: HM: We don't want to go look at the viaduct, what we're asking for is a cross-sectional study that shows this is the proposed height of the viaduct and why.
- A: MOD: I understand that.
- C: HM: We want to understand the maximum amount of slope, what you consider to be the required height of the viaduct, and the point at which it reaches at grade.

- A: MOD: We've looked at a number of different options and we're happy to show them to you. We will make sure that gets communicated to you at future taskforce meetings so you have a better understanding of what that cross-section will look like.
- C: KS: I'd like to make a suggestion. We will continue to work with MassDOT and when we get the topographical information we can then model it in 3D and test the different options. The notion of depressing the mainline is difficult because we still want to cross over the train tracks. The Boston Center for the Arts (BCA) will be holding a design charrette focusing on the Beacon Park Yard for a better understanding of the various elements that existing there today. There are certain options and ideas that need to be tested quicker than others and the charrette will be the place to do that.
- C: JR: That sounds great. I'm not opposed to having MassDOT and the City narrow down the number of options. I do think it is important for us to say that many of the taskforce ideas are not included in the two options the alternatives have been narrowed down to. We still have to have some way in bringing up those ideas and investigating those ideas.
- C: Fred Salvucci (FS): I want to go back to the original point Mike made which is that we're working with a tight timeline. We can be thinking of this with 5 different options but it would be more beneficial to look at less. It's impossible to explore what the taskforce is interested in talking about if we keep getting hung up on the smaller design details. Save that for the engineers. We want to get to one core option for Allston and focus in on that. Once we get to one alternative more options can come from that. This may best be resolved with a paper vote. I think it's important to let Mike focus on one primary option.
- A: El: Except for doing some initial traffic analysis we've stopped working on the suburban interchange options. Most of our work now is focused on the alternatives Kairos showed and the next step the way I understand it is to look at the grades to confirm if we can have the connecting streets at grade.
- C: KS: I must have missed something because Tad is waving at me.
- C: Tad Read (TR): I also think it's worth mention another core principle which the City has for this project. This area is growing significantly and we know that the Red Line and the Green Line in their current configuration won't be able to serve this area. With the increased demand for transit usage some form of bus rapid transit is most likely to occur. One of the other principles that we should look at accommodating is bus rapid transit through this area.
- A: KS: I agree and I think the point is that there is a need to anticipate future transit capacity. We do know that this project's scope does not include bus rapid transit but we need to come clean with the MBTA and have a discussion around connecting routes and new job centers because we need to make sure people can get there. We want to add Diesel Multiple Unit (DMU) service to this area. I believe the Mayor's housing plan is now officially out and it is most important for us to figure out how we are going to transport the people who are working in this area to and from it.
- C: HM: I think one of the major sticking points is when we talk about what the project is not going to preclude versus what is really going to happen as part of this project. Tad mentioned we want to have bus rapid transit and there have been discussions about Stadium Way being the route for that. We don't know if Harvard is going to build Stadium Way in the next 5 years or 30 years. In this drawing Stadium Way doesn't connect to West Station and it certainly doesn't connect to Commonwealth Avenue. This all comes back to the goals of the project. Are the goals of the project to enable bus rapid transit to connect Western Avenue and Commonwealth Avenue?
- A: MOD: We have made the goals of the project very clear multiple times. The Purpose and Needs statement is something different. As far as the objectives and goals of the project bus rapid transit is not one of them. If there is an opportunity for us to develop an alternative that doesn't preclude bus rapid transit then that's fine.



- C: HM: I'm just wondering what kind of connectivity between Western Avenue and Commonwealth Avenue we are trying to create.
- A: KS: One of the things we are concerned about is that we don't think vehicular traffic or bus rapid transit traffic through the Boston University west campus area is appropriate. I know that there were a number of urban ring studies of which the City was a part. It is the responsibility of the City to figure out bus rapid transit connections and it is the City's responsibility to make sure we are planning for it now. It's a very good question and it's part of the City's agenda even if it's not part of the Commonwealth's agenda for this particular project.
- C: HM: While we're talking I think we should look at relocating Soldiers Field Road north of the viaduct.
- A: KS: Yes and we think it should be studied. We also think that the surface road should be pushed as far away from the river as possible so shifting Soldiers Field Road in the future is not precluded.
- C: El: Thank you Kairos. We are now going to have Joe Freeman up to walk you through the selection criteria.

#### *Discussion of the Selection Criteria*

- C: Joe Freeman (JF): Good even everyone I'm Joe Freeman with TetraTech. You should all have the 6 page matrix in front of you. We received a lot of comments since the last taskforce meeting and I want to emphasize again that the screening criteria is at the heart of what we will need to go through for the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA). It is a requirement that we go through the process of selecting a preferred alternative. We can't have criteria that are so specific that it restricts the range of alternatives we are able to present so there is a need for both specificity and generality. As I mentioned we have received a number of comments and we have grouped these comments into broader categories including multi-modal connectivity, community cohesion, future land use, open space, interstate and highway design standards and a purpose and needs statement. We intend to cover the purpose and need at a future meeting. Part of the reason why we do not have a purpose and needs statement to give you now is because the scope of the project has changed since we started in April. We spent a couple of hours looking at the comments and broke them down into three categories. A: Comment is relevant to the criteria and will be incorporated B: Comment is very specific and should be dealt with in a design exercise C: Comment is not within the project scope. That doesn't mean it can't be addressed, it just means it won't be incorporated into the project scope.
- Q: BH: I'm misunderstanding something here. When you say it's not within the scope of the I-90 Interchange Project I'm confused because you've already said you are working with Mass Transit, the BRA, and the City. Does that mean MassDOT won't look at it but the City or the BRA will? On the paper it gets a C. It looks like everything that is important to the neighborhood here gets a C.
- A: JF: I will take exception to everything expect that there are very specific items called out and therefore generally received a C. You heard Mike and Kairos talk about it earlier; MassDOT cannot create a future street grid but they can accommodate for one.
- C: BH: It's a very fine line to understand. From the neighborhood and communities point of view C tends to be the most important things here and you're never going to get the approval without those being addressed whether they're technically in the scope of the I-90 Interchange Project or not. They are important items for the I-90 Interchange Project to successfully go through.
- C: VG: I thought it might be useful to mention something and I may be wrong. The grading that you're doing here may only be needed for the context. A technical analysis is a lot for each alternative when we are just trying to get to the environmental document.

- C: Mark Gravalles (MG): Let's take a look at item 9. When we read and interpreted that comment we thought that it could be applied to the new neighborhood, existing neighborhood, and make everything more multi-modal. All of Cambridge Street, all of the new connections to Cambridge Street, and all of the new connections to West Station will be multi-modal and designed with the consideration of pedestrians and cyclist. The way we interpreted this comment was that it was outside the project scope and more directed towards the future unbuilt neighborhood. That is how a comment like that gets a C.
- C: JF: We want to have criteria, look at each alternative through the criteria, narrow them down to a reasonable number, and then do a detailed analysis of the remaining alternatives. These issues are not going to be lost.
- C: Alana Olsen (AO): Could you explain the difference between E and C?
- C: MG: E is directed towards the 25% design and within the scope. C is outside the scope of the project.
- C: El: The B's are not differentiators among the different alternatives. They're all elements of design that are equally applied. Narrowing the viaduct or design details to Cambridge Street are not elements that give you a definitive factor. As Fred mentioned earlier, we need to step back in order to allow us to focus more on the concepts. Items we have coded as B can be engineered into any of the selection criteria.
- C: Glen Berkowitz (GB): I hope you don't expect us to look at this in 15 minutes and decide whether or not we agree or disagree with you. I'd like to talk about 3 items. The first is 2C on page 2. The comment given says we would like a people's pike multiuse path connecting to two different locations but in your note you didn't refer to two connections, you just said it's not within the project scope. Your answer actually could be read that you think the people's pike connecting Allston to the Paul Dudley White Path is not within your scope and I hope you're not saying that.
- A: JF: We are not. It's the connection across to Cambridge that is not within the scope.
- C: GB: Your note doesn't say that.
- A: JF: Well the comment says "a connection to Cambridge."
- C: GB: But you have a C on the code, you don't have an A/C.
- A: MG: That was something we talked about; whether we should do A/C's or B/C's.
- C: GB: You're asking for feedback and I'm giving it to you. Next is item 6E on page 4. As we sit here today you have never once shared with us traffic volumes or a traffic analysis of any of the preferred alternatives. We have no idea of whether or not what you're proposing for the intersection of Cambridge Street and the unnamed intersection, I'll call it the surface intersection, and it's probably one of the most important intersections of the entire project. We have no idea if it will blow up or not if Stadium Way exist or doesn't exist. There is no way we should be saying Stadium Way is a C and not in the project scope today if we're truly trying to be fair and say that we are trying to develop the best project that we can.
- A: JF: I don't disagree. We're looking at the network as a whole, not just that location but other signalized intersections as well.
- C: GB: Maybe I should be clearer in my comment to you right now. It's wrong to list a C on this document for this item.
- A: Chris Calnan (CC): Our reasoning for listing it as a C on this document is because it read "must build." We are evaluating it and we don't have a problem doing so.

- C: GB: I have a problem with your problem because I don't know whether Cambridge Street will blow up at this unnamed intersection unless someone builds it as contemporaneously with the new interchange. I don't know but I do know you've shown us sections of Cambridge Street and said, "We don't know there may be a single left turn and a wider median, or two left turns." I don't even think you know that intersection is going to operate. I think many people in the room agree including myself that Stadium Way should be kept alive as part of the discussion of this project.
- A: JF: We don't disagree. If this is going to be part of the selection criteria and remember, we look at each criteria and assess the alternative. Is it positive, neutral, negative or does it not meet the criteria. With the criteria worded this way that does not include the construction of the roads it would be negative.
- C: Wendy Landman (WL): I think everyone agrees and the City has expressed that you could have an alternative that has three left turn lanes and therefore would not need Stadium Way but that's not preferred. If you promise to look at alternatives that only have one left turn lane with or without Stadium Way and they work that's great.
- A: JF: Please keep in mind that we are required to go through this process.
- C: GB: My last comment is regarding item 6J on page 5. At the first taskforce meeting I was led to believe that you were building the new AET gantries as part of this project. I then asked the question of where they would be located because they weren't shown in the drawings. The answer I remember hearing was that someone else is going to build the gantries and that one will be built at the western edge of Mike's project and the other will be located at the eastern edge of Mike's project. I haven't heard anything about toll gantries since then. A number of us were talking that today, the interchange design is agnostic. When I'm on I-90 eastbound and I want to go downtown it's agnostic from a toll perspective of whether I want to bail off and take Soldiers Field Road or I stay on the turnpike, it cost me the same amount of money. It's possible with the placement of the new gantries that it will no longer be agnostic. That's why we wrote the comment. The fact that you responded with no answer doesn't satisfy. Ask anyone in Newton or Wellesley if people will travel to avoid paying a 50cent toll, it's not a minor issue. Until you're ready to teach us more I'm not okay agreeing that toll gantries are a C.
- A: George Batchelor (GBT): I think there is a bit of a misunderstanding here. Just because it is not in the scope of this project doesn't mean it's not happening. It means it is within another project scope. It's a valid concern that you bring up but it has not been part of the decision process within this project.
- C: GB: I'm not ready to agree with you because I can see a different interchange design that brings the on-ramp traffic heading eastbound in a way that had its own gantry. I would design that interchange differently as a possible solution to making sure the tolling is agnostic.
- Q: GBT: If I understand you correctly your concern is over the position and placement of the gantry system?
- C: GB: I can't separate toll and gantry systems as part of the interchange design. I hope we all agree that we don't want to send 1,000 cars an hour bailing off on I-90 eastbound and ending up on Soldiers Field Road.
- C: MG: I can get you the project team's information that will be responsible for installing the AET.
- Q: HM: What was the public process for that project?
- A: MG: It will be the same as all Design Build MassDOT public processes. There was a state-wide public process for AET which took place last summer.
- Q: HM: I wanted to thank you for responding to our comments. There's one main point that I want to ask. How is the engineering speed of the freeway not included in the freeway design?

Q: GB: What speed are you currently designing the highway for?

A: MOD: 65mph.

Q: GB: Are you allowed to design this I-90 mainline with a lower design speed?

A: MOD: You know the answer to that, of course we can. We are striving to reach a design speed that is consistent with the rest of the turnpike speeds west of here. Wendy had mentioned that a quarter of a mile east of here it drops down significantly.

C: JR: We would prefer a highway design speed in the selection criteria that would be lower.

Q: MOD: That brings up a great point. Do you think the alternative concepts will change significantly with a lower design speed?

A: GB: Absolutely.

C: HM: This is where we rely on your expertise to explain to us the difference and actually work with us to say, "If it was 50mph this is what we could do." For you to ask us what we think would happen with a lower design speed is totally unfair and it's not how the dynamic should be.

A: JG: I want to make sure that I understand this correctly. Anything that has been listed as an A is being proposed as a list of criteria. As Fred mentioned earlier, anyone of the alternatives can and will be developed further to reach the goals that we are all striving to reach. I would like to see the B's and the C's disappear. No matter which option is selected there should be a robust debate about the design criteria and then we can debate about design speeds.

C: JR: We don't know if things like design speed effects how long the frontage roads need to be. I think the use of the phrase "not within project scope" was incredibly unfortunate because there are plenty of things on this list that are within the project scope. It sounds like you are just trying to say it is not within the selection criteria scope.

C: GM: That is actually what my second comment was. I noticed that you have the advocacy organizations comments but you didn't have the residents. I also want to make the note that you didn't give any input publicly regarding comments from Harvard or Boston University. I'm curious as to what is important to them and why that is not presented here. I also think the use of A, B, and C implies that C is something that you are not going to care about. What I think we should do is exactly what Commissioner Gillooly's suggested and we understand that it is crucially important to get the paper work done but you should also take B and C and ask how that represents the neighborhood. Once you figure that out then you implement that into every single option to ensure none get left out. My last point is that we are a multimodal project but we should also be a multi-jurisdictional project. When you say connections to Cambridge are not important to this scope, go tell that to the people who are going to be working, living, and getting off the train here.

A: EI: Understood and I think we all have a little homework to do following Jim's suggestion and that is this. We'll take a look at the A's and decide whether or not the A's are enough to select a conceptual alternative. Let's put that on the agenda for the first part of the discussion at the next taskforce meeting. In the meantime I think there's some refining and redefining this criterion.

Q: Name not given (NNG): Is this all to happening so you can go and look at the environmental impact on the surrounding neighborhood correct?

C: JF: If by that you mean it's going to be part of the environmental notification we'll submit within the scope of the Environmental Impact Report (EIR), no. What you are talking about would be filed as part of

the EIR documentation. When we file the Environmental Notification Form (ENF) it will be much broader, it will have all the alternatives that we've presented, it will describe the process that we've gone through and that is required to out for public comment.

- C: NNG: If you flip to page 4 I got really confused about the North Harvard Street, Sorrento Street and Seattle Street neighborhood area in terms of our the surface roads and ramps dump out traffic. If you look at 6F it reads, "Ensure that the new connector streets do not feed directly into the existing neighborhoods and instead new highway entrances should only connect to Stadium Way and East Drive." How can you do that if you can ensure us that it's going to be built? You have it down as an A.
- A: El: That's a good question.
- C: FS: Going back to what you have for homework. It would be useful to run through the list of selection criteria and identify why certain items get tossed out and why certain items survive. It's contrary to your interest in getting to a minimal number of options because you're making it more confusing and expecting people to sign off on things they don't feel comfortable doing. When you go through the screening mechanism you should explain exactly what your narrowing it down to and why. That way you can eventually get to a small number of alternatives and be able to focus on them specifically. I suggest providing this information before the next meeting.
- A: El: I think that sounds fine and I think that would enable us to focus more strongly on a couple of alternatives.
- C: FS: There may be an option that is acceptable at 50mph but not at 65mph. This all reminds me of the Central Artery fight. If you can get to a better outcome with a design speed of 50mph then it should remain on the table.
- A: El: We're taking this all in, we're going to come back knowing what we know now and improve on it. We're pushing for a small group of alternatives and if we can get to that point we can move away from the 2D plans and focus more on what we need to be focusing on.
- C: Joe Orfant (JO): It seems to me that there are two different conversations going on here. I hear some folks concern that the project has limits; it has a beginning and it has an end. People are also saying that certain items that are not being incorporated are critically important to the future of the neighborhood but also to the roadways.
- C: El: Thanks Joe. With that we're going to shift to Soldiers Field Road. The intent here is to give you an update and show you the engineering constraints we are facing.

#### *Discussion of Shifting Soldiers' Field Road*

- C: Rich Lenox (RL): Good evening, I'm Rich Lenox with WSP. I'm here to give you an update on Soldiers Field Road. Mike mentioned that we had a meeting a few weeks ago with DCR's Joe Orfant to discuss potentially shifting Soldiers Field Road to the south in order to create more parkland. I want to talk about a couple of concepts and how much we can actually shift Soldiers Field Road. The first slide shown here is a view of the existing conditions. Highlighted in gray are the existing roadways, highlighted in light green is the existing Paul Dudley White Path, and highlighted in blue are the existing rail lines. On the east side we have the Grand Junction crossing over Soldiers Field Road. As the track turns parallel to the I-90 mainline it also has to get under the viaduct. Hopefully we'll be able to get out to the site at the next meeting because this is a significant constraint that is difficult to show through a PowerPoint slide.

From the west side we have the connection to Houghton Chemical that needs to be maintained. The Houghton rail line runs very close to Soldiers Field Road but as you move further west there is the geometric opportunity to shift the line a little bit. We've indicated that potential shift with a red dashed

line. We have a couple of options that we will present tonight. Shown in yellow is where the relocated Soldiers Field Road will be. Shaded in pink and shown between the relocated road and the Paul Dudley White path is additional space that could potentially be created. Under this scenario we would push both eastbound lanes under the viaduct as far as we can. Shown in dark blue is the proposed Shared-Use Path (SUP) that we are representing as 20 feet wide. The SUP would connect to the Paul Dudley White Path at the I-90 bend heading west. I should note that with this concept we would be relocating the columns, the median would have to become wider, and we would have to further evaluate sight lines and distance.

- Q: JR: I have a question regarding the viaduct supports. The current structure seems to have large beams with vertical structures on the ends; a lot of the Big Dig structures have one large beam in the middle and a Y shaped structure at the top. Which type of structure are you thinking of using for the new viaduct?
- A: RL: We are going to be using a similar design structure as to what is there now, the second options would be something more or else what you referenced to as being the Big Dig type of structure.
- C: JR: Ok.
- C: RL: This slide is an enlargement of the area and where the touchdown points of the SUP will be located. The second alternative...<sup>3</sup>
- Q: GB: Could you go back before we go on. If you look at the bottom of the page left of the words "Draft Concept" you see edge of existing viaduct and above that you see proposed edge of relocating I-90. The proposed edge looks to me to be around 26 feet closer to the River. When I first heard you say this option will put Soldiers Field Road under the viaduct I thought you meant the new viaduct that was no closer to the River than the existing viaduct. Is it true that you are putting Soldiers Field Road under the viaduct but the viaduct is actually closer to the River than the existing viaduct that is out there today?
- A: RL: We've illustrated the line work associated with option 3G and in this case the general location of the alignment orientation of I-93 for any of the options wouldn't be much different for any part of this stretch of the viaduct.
- A: El: We are showing the viaduct as widened to permit the installation of safe shoulders.
- Q: WL: In terms of the criteria we discussed before and the comments you received, where does the wider viaduct with breakdown lanes fit into your evaluation criteria? If we have a 65mph design speed versus a 50mph design speed doesn't that make a difference?
- A: CC: I want to point out that MassDOT is striving to provide four lanes in each direction with full shoulder widths on the outside lanes. Whether the design speeds are 40mph or 65 mph it will not change the width of the viaduct.
- C: WL: I don't understand why shoulders are needed because east and west of here there are none. Are we going to see a noise analysis of the new viaduct that is going to be closer to the River?
- A: CC: Yes we are. I think you heard Mark early say that MassDOT is investigating shoulders west of the interchange on I-90.
- C: MG: Where ever there isn't a shoulder of the extension west MassDOT is investigating and looking at implementing shoulders to create a much safer situation.

---

<sup>3</sup> Here, Glen interrupted Rich.



- Q: HM: Is the width of the viaduct constrained here? It's hard to understand if it is the rail tracks, the Boston University property, the viaduct supports, or all of it?
- A: RL: It's really all of it. We've brought the southern edge of the viaduct right up to the Boston University property. It's a subtle difference than what we had shown you before. From that point it is the desired MassDOT cross-section.
- Q: HM: If the viaduct is 115 feet compared to 130 feet, does that mean we could gain 15 more feet of parkland?
- A: RL: It's not exactly a one-to-one tradeoff like that because of the geometry of Soldiers Field Road.
- C: HM: This feels a bit like MassDOT is working with certain things that you've accepted as concrete for example a four lane mainline highway with shoulders. For a large number of people on the taskforce we are happy to talk about it but it's not a decision that's has been made or accepted. We would like to understand why because you've narrowed the turnpike to three lanes just east of here. If we could have a three lane viaduct in each direction how would that affect all of this? We would like to see that analysis done instead of an unwritten, unexplained, unquestioned item.
- C: CC: We have four lanes east of the project and we have four lanes west of the project.
- C: Carol O'Hare (COH): I'm from Cambridge and we only have one Cambridge representative on the taskforce and he doesn't talk. I wanted touch on the fact that you just suggested that you want to have eight lanes on the mainline and that the new viaduct will be higher which means more noise impacts to Cambridge.
- A: MG: We are not adding lanes to the highway, there are eight lanes out there today and there will be eight lanes in the future.
- A: MOD: We are not adding capacity on the turnpike; we are only trying to make it safer.
- Q: GM: I think Harry has a good point. You are trained to have as much capacity as possible along this stretch. We want to see if there is a way to evaluate what would happen if you took capacity away. Right now you have the real time data and we would like to see you take some of your engineering resources to find out what happens with a six lane freeway. My question is, are you able to take a little bit of your engineering expertise and do an analysis of a six lane highway profile compared to an eight lane?
- A: MG: We can certain discuss that after the meeting.
- C: GB: I want to point out one last thing on the drawing. You have the SUP and the path connection to the Paul Dudley White Path shown in dark blue between 8-10 feet in width. We don't think a SUP for pedestrians and cyclist should be 8-10 feet, we think it should be more like 20 feet wide. I wanted to point out that what you've drawn is half the width of what we feel is the correct width.
- C: RL: There is certainly some flexibility with the width of the SUP.
- C: GB: The SUP needs to be 20 feet wide. What we don't want to have is an 8-10 foot SUP with bicycles and pedestrians conflicting with each other. We want to quadruple the number of pedestrians and cyclist along the path.
- C: RL: That is definitely some we can enhance as we move forward and further develop the alternatives. The second option we are showing in terms of shifting Soldiers Field Road is to cantilever over Soldiers Field Road which would eliminate the need to create a wider median. Without having to get the entire

barrel under the viaduct it may provide a little more flexibility with some of the geometry of Soldiers Field Road.

Q: JO: Can you explain between the two options how you are actually creating the additional space?

A: RL: In first option we are pushing the state highway layout line over as far as we can.

C: GB: I would like to say no; you're widening the highway. For us to say we want to push Soldiers Field Road under the highway to create more space along the River and then you say, "Yes, we're doing that," you're actually not because you're widening the highway. It's the most amazing catch22.

Q: KS: Glen, what is more important? If there is new additional parkland along the river isn't that the most important part? In this scenario there is still more parkland and available use of parkland closer to the river. In both cases Soldiers Field Road has more parkland.

A: GB: Yes, that is a good thing but what you just said we could do tomorrow without any money. You didn't point out that the new viaduct is closer to the River. You could go out there today and gain 19 feet and not ever touch the existing viaduct.

C: KS: I agree with you and I'm not sure if the second statement is clear in the drawings. In the new redesigned layout of the highway I'm not sure you can actually tuck the relocated rail line under the viaduct to create enough room for Soldiers Field Road. We should continue to ask the questions but also review their alternatives.

C: JO: We've been asking for a model for a while, I don't think this is final by any means but I think it would be useful to have a model. I agree, there have to be discussions about the width of the viaduct. I think we now need to have a fruitful discussion on how these things work.

Q: David Loutzenheiser (DL): How does the alignment of the Houghton Chemical track in the current two options effect the relocation of Soldiers Field Road and additional park space?

A: RL: Geometrically there is some extra space but it is beyond the layout of this project.

C: DL: My point is you've done a great job starting this process and showing us that park space can be gained with the potential of adding the 20-25 feet of the viaduct. I think it is great and we should continue to discuss it.

Q: Bill Deignan (BD): It terms of the final width and location of the viaduct can you explain why option 2 has a smaller amount of parkland?

A: RL: There are more construction challenges with option 2.

Q: HM: I want to echo Joe's point; there is a lot of great stuff here and it's nice to see that you are trying to add more parkland. The question I have is can option 2 be eliminated? I don't see why anyone would prefer it over option 1. Is it possible to develop an option that continues to develop parkland all the way up to the Double Tree?

A: MG: The reason why we showed two options is because option 1 has not been flushed out yet. There is a very large sewer line that has to be relocated along the length of the River so we cannot just eliminate options without considering certain constraints. We didn't want to tell you it's a gold star and that it's good to go, we wanted to tell you that it is an option. We know option 2 is a lot more constructive because there are no columns in the middle of Soldiers Field Road which eliminates the issue of sight lines and sight distance.

Q: HM: At the next meeting could there be more of a definitive answer if option one is actually feasible?

- A: MG: I think so and keep in mind that this fits with all the interchange alternatives. These are typically design details that get worked in around the 25% and 75% design stage.
- C: HM: Well our understanding is that this taskforce is done in two months and then we don't know what happens. To say that we are not in any rush to finish this and thank you taskforce for your service doesn't seem to work to well.
- C: MG: There is an entire public process that will happen just like every project we have. A lot of what we continue to hear are design details which we have not reached yet.
- C: BH: I think what Harry is saying and it's been mentioned before is that MassDOT has put a definitive ending to the taskforce which is creating tension. There will be important issues that need to be addressed after the completion of the taskforce. The taskforce and the community want a longer time for input and to see how this plays out. It may not be what you need for your technical requirements but it is obvious that people like Glen and Harry have strong feelings towards how this plays out. To have you give us a time constraint and say there is an end date is difficult.
- A: MOD: That is a fair request and we will act on it. We have discussed whether keeping a group of this size or reducing the group may be beneficial. I agree that the comfort level would be increased.
- C: HM: Our concern is that you're not going to fight for every inch of parkland you can create. Our concern is that you're going to say we are trying to create an 8 lane viaduct, with shoulders and a 150 foot width so all these cars can drive into Boston. We are looking at this as a vital recreational corridor for cycling commuters, pedestrians, and joggers who have a different set of priorities. When you say we'll have a 25% design public hearing and you can stand up and give your public testimony is not the level of public participation we would hope to have.
- C: JO: I'd like you to keep both options on the table. I think it's too early in the discussion to eliminate any option for Soldiers Field Road.
- C: HM: I would like to see a further explanation of the relocation of the Houghton Chemical line where you're not constrained by the viaduct.
- C: NCC: Harry has asked for all of your email addresses. Is everyone ok with me handing those out?
- C: MG: It may be better to ask this through an email.
- C: NCC: Email me if it is okay to share your email.
- C: El: The next taskforce meeting will be September 3rd, here at the Fiorentino Community Center.
- 

## ***Next Steps***

The next taskforce meeting will be held at **6PM on Wednesday, September 3 at the Fiorentino Community Center**. The Fiorentino Community Center is located at 123 Antwerp Street in Allston. A public information meeting has been tentatively slated for September 18<sup>th</sup> at the Jackson-Mann Community Center. The following taskforce session will take place on September 24<sup>th</sup>. At the time of this writing, MassDOT is still coordinating with CSX regarding a taskforce site visit.

## Appendix 1: Meeting Attendees<sup>4</sup>

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Joseph	Beggan	Taskforce Member
Glen	Berkowitz	Taskforce Member
Andrew	Bettinelli	Taskforce Member
Steve	Bushnell	Taskforce Member
Craig	Cashman	Taskforce Member
Jim	Curley	Taskforce Member
John	Cusack	Taskforce Member
Matthew	Danish	Taskforce Member
Bill	Deignan	Taskforce Member
Anthony	D'Isadoro	Taskforce Member
Paola	Ferrer	Taskforce Member
Nicole	Freedman	Taskforce Member
James	Gillooly	Taskforce Member
Anabela	Gomes	Taskforce Member
Vineet	Gupta	Taskforce Member
Mark	Handley	Taskforce Member
Bruce	Houghton	Taskforce Member
Marc	Kadish	Taskforce Member
John	Laadt	Taskforce Member
Wendy	Landman	Taskforce Member
Elizabeth	Leary	Taskforce Member
David	Loutzenheiser	Taskforce Member
Will	Luzier	Taskforce Member
Wayne	Mackenzie	Taskforce Member
Harry	Mattison	Taskforce Member
Galen	Mook	Taskforce Member
Tom	Nally	Taskforce Member
Paul	Nelson	Taskforce Member
Alana	Olsen	Taskforce Member
Joe	Orfant	Taskforce Member
Tad	Read	Taskforce Member
Jessica	Robertson	Taskforce Member
Steve	Silveira	Taskforce Member
David	Watson	Taskforce Member
Jim	Cerbone	MassDOT
Matt	Robare	Allston/Brighton TAB
Sharon	Long	Resident
David	Elsen	Resident
Anne	McKinnon	Resident
Kairos	Shen	BRA
Fred	Salvucci	Harvard University

<sup>4</sup> One of the two attendance sheets that are provided at all taskforce meetings was taken by an individual not tied to either MassDOT or its project team. The removed attendance sheet included additional residents and stakeholders who are not listed on the attendance list provided above.

## Appendix 2: Meeting Flipcharts – Please See the Following Page

Q) Thank you for update and  
Coordination, can residents be  
part of RSA for real safety improvements

A) Can report back on the RSA

Q) Interested in site visit? (yes)  
↳ MOD O.K. w/ going on a bike  
probably not @ site walk

Q) What about construction staging?  
Will you come before Allston Civic  
re that issue?

A) Need to attack next public info  
meeting and bring in Allston Civic etc.

Q) Interested in when collaboration b/t  
BU Campus and Harvard processes

A) Good Sequen.



C) Don't want resident toll priority (2)  
lost.

Q) When you look @ this, intersection  
b/t Station, neighborhood + highway is  
issue. Assumption that RR stays down  
+ highway up. Property will be offices,  
not homes, nearest TPKE where elevation  
conflict is, can you bump up land  
permeable w/o 30' wall.

A) Key BRA focus will be understanding  
grade change. If 1 block / 300'  
deep, perhaps O.K. Think about  
this like North Point, need to create  
a space that isn't waste land until  
development. Want to create hospitable  
topography and keep cyclists/peds @ grade  
grade runs -- to railroad foll -- bridge

C) Long distance from H'way to C-bridge .. ③

A) Suggested switching and testing different grades.

Q) Can you start grading RR yard?

A) Need to coordinate that w/ MBTA as storage of trains starting soon

C) BH wants to start over on the C-bridge St side now. Gradual rather than hitting bermed wall.

A) BRA wants to be smart about this. Not set up issue of having to remove dirt later. This is why need to start planning streets now. Can possibly leave some grade issues to future developers

Q) Goal here is to put in transpo to work w/ developers. How does the collaboration work w/ Harvard + BU now? May want to ask H + BU for stuff now

A) DOT, BRA + Universities meeting. Bu ④  
has north side of Pike options  
want to ensure guiding principles  
align. BRA may take firm stand w/  
universities to build things (Stadium Way)  
as down payment on future development  
permits. Want to make # of reasonable  
& appropriate connections, but need model  
1st.

Q) Talked about highway @ grade and up, but  
what about highway in a trench on  
RR yard section?

A) Can achieve much w/o that. We want to  
ease things for buses, peds, bikes. Been  
able to get down to 2 city-like alt  
moving forward can hone in on it.  
Can't go from trench to viaduct. Too much  
grade for that. Will try to drop as  
fast as possible. Can we get this on map (yes)



C) Want to see height of viaduct and 5  
fastest you can get back to grade.

A) Message board will show you X-section

A) BRA will model this in 3D working  
w/ DOT. Don't want cyclists + ped  
going up-down-up-down. Need to be  
able to get over RR tracks. BSA to  
do Charlotte. BRA notes always some  
trade-offs.

C) Not opposed to narrowing down options. ~~For~~  
What about uncluded ideas. Need to  
investigate them.

C) This is very complex. Can't think on this  
really w/ 15 options + 45 subs. Important  
to do this. Engineers can't follow wasted  
options. Good to get rid of waste +  
then work on variants of good stuff

⑥

A) Suburban opts gone. Will look @ depressing mainline, how much space is needed. Need to look @ grades

C) 1 more principle. Area will grow, will need more transit. BRA principle is looking @ future BRT.

A) Need to anticipate future transit. City + MBTA need to coordinate. Framingham line isn't quite enough, need to bring in DMU's, need to connect housing + job

A) RE Harry's question. BRA doesn't think vehicles or BRT penetrating BU West Campus is appropriate due to neighborhood. Want an easy transfer. More a criteria than a must. Good question on city agenda.

C) Thank you for suggesting SFR get moved

A) We will look @ it.

Q) Not with I-90 int project, when you (7) talk about neighborhood, but you have been working w/ BRA. You agree to work w/ Boston on concerns, it seems that everything important to hood is C.

A) Not everything. DOT cannot do future street grid. We won't preclude it.

C) Unless you do the C's, you won't get approval of the project.

A) Let us walk thru a C or 2

C) Grading is with view of environmental process. It has less to do w/ what you want.

A) Item 9, land use is parcel development + making it more TOD + Bike. All of those things are in the process. We can't plan for unbuilt community.



A) These criteria are about getting to a set of alternatives. Many of these won't be lost. ~~Es~~ ⑨

A) A lot of B's are not differentiators, they are things that can be equally applied. Don't determine b/t concepts. B's can be engineered into any alt. A's are for choosing among general concepts.

Q) I hope you are not looking for approval in 15 mins. (No) Re: 2C, the comment to you was split people's pike. Your answer can be read as People's Pike But in (It's the connection to Cambridge) (we can split comments, tried to keep your comments intact. GE on pg 4, as we sit here today, you have never given us traffic projections, have no idea if proposed intersections will work. Need to focus on if things blow up or not. ~~It~~ We can't say if ~~Stadium~~ <sup>war is</sup> C

A) We see this under general analysis. (9)

A) We have a problem saying must build it.  
We are happy to analyze it.

C) I infer that you don't know traffic. Stadium way needs to stay in.

A) Don't want to have a criteria that reads that no Stadium Way is always negative. Wouldn't like this it does that.

C) You could have an alt w/ 3 left turn lane turn that's not acceptable.

A) Keep in mind we need to get thru MEPA/NEPA defense.

C) At 1st taskforce meeting led to believe we would build gantries, I have heard about this since. Right now interchange is agnostic from tolling perspective. Possible it ceases to be agnostic. Whether a B or A not sure. People will travel to avoid paying 50 cents. Not willing to have it as C.

A) C can mean belongs to other project. (10)  
Where gunties are don't come into this selection.

C) Not ready to agree or disagree.

A) Guntiny position + entrance consequence are linked don't want to have cars backing off onto SFR

A) I can speak w/ you afterwards. There was a public process for AET all last summer

Q) I want an SFR update. Thank you for responding, how is engineering freeway spec not in this?

A) The specific speed isn't what we are limiting ourselves on this

Q) Can you go lower than 65?

A) Trying to design in alignment w/ the rest of the pike west of here.



Q) But do you think of design would change if we changed speed? ⑪

A) Henry says not fair to ask us back

Q) him looking @ this and A's apply to all alts, you can take any option + celebrate speed. This is alts, criteria. I want to see A's alone + see if they are enough to pick design.

C) Some of these things we don't know if they impact design speed changes. Not within scope is unfortunate, they are in scope, ~~that~~ ~~are~~

C) Didn't get public input from Hannah and Bo. Use of A, B + C is tough. When you present this back to us and say C's aren't important, let's get Jim's A list and then incorporate them back into the options. We are multimodal project should be multidirectional too. We should not have our criteria presented as C.

A) O.K. will go home and check if (12)  
A list is enough to suggest alt. Joe  
will revise the matrix. We will refine  
and push back out.

Q) When you talk about MEPA/NEPA review  
how will this be used?

A) This is not in the ENF, in the ETR

C) Part of this is doing least harm. Windsor  
Neighborhood of Concern to me GE vs. GF  
don't agree. (good point) Don't decimate  
neighborhood.

A) Conceivable that the turns could only  
be left/right.

C) Run thru list and ID what is tossed  
and what survives. Putting people around  
the table in position of accepting unacceptable  
definitions. You won't achieve your goal ID the  
narrowing down. This mechanism in the way of  
this process.

A) And then that gets us to straw person <sup>(13)</sup>  
objectives.

C) A So much design speed ought to be  
on table.

Q) So if we apply criteria and get  
short list + see if the features are  
right, it will get us off over detailed  
process.

C) 2 conversations  $\Rightarrow$  job has limits (o.k.) but  
then there are crucial things that project  
will respond to in some way

Q) Current viaduct is tubed, could we  
do hammer head piers?

A) Have 2 options, one is cantilever, one  
is tubed w/ girder across 2 vert  
elements



Q) Can't read it from here, @ bottom right you <sup>(14)</sup> see proposed vs. current edge and proposed is closer, is it true you are showing this as under width viaduct.

A) Shown line work associated w/ 36, wouldn't be much different than w/ other options

Q) Criteria we discussed before are just our comments, where is your criteria in the matrix, particularly re design speed.

A) DOT is striving to provide 6 lane viaduct w/ full shoulders. Design speed won't change width.

C) This piece will be wider. Will you analyze noise impacts?

A) Yes we will. And we are looking to add shoulders.

Q) What constrains viaduct width?

A) Viaduct is all the way south. Rest is DOT cross section

Q) What do we gain for narrowed viaduct <sub>1 foot</sub>? Not

(15)  
C) This feels like going back to criteria. DOT has accepted some things as religion. Want to understand this. Narrowed to 3-lane and we want to know if this is viable as opposed to unwritten rule.

C) You suggested this is a fact accompli that highway will be taller and wider.

A) Not increasing lanes 8 today, 8 tomorrow.

A) Not adding any more lanes this is for current. We are not increasing highway.

C) You are trained to get the most capacity, can you evaluate 6-lane freeway.

C) Looks like dark blue is scaled 8-10 ft wide. Livable Streets feels we need more space. Cyclist nearly ran me over. If you're not ready to accept 21' then it's OK, but this gets back into SFR discussion and gets back into viaduct width (should use path outlet to be 20 ft).

A) We have some flexibility there.

Q) Can you explain how you shift SFR

(16)

A) With D<sub>1</sub>, there is a thin red line where we push over to existing 1<sup>st</sup> line of Columns

C) Glen wants to dissent + say no. We are just widening h'way

C) SFR goes under the h'way

C) But Glen, this is more actual parkland and available and that's good. SFR is becoming new parkland (good?) many agree.

A) 19 feet isn't trivial, you could get 19 feet today. ~~Not~~

A) Not sure if this is clear in drawings, but vertical structure is designed to max land space. Also assumes relocated RR line. City says progress being made. Let's review this in relation to expanded h'way + Constructability.

C) DCR says they have started the discussion in the right way. Don't play games w/ this

Q Curious about Houghton Chemical line geometry. (17)

A) Can be nudged but eats into space for other uses.

C) Think you have done a good job starting but want to keep pushing this

Q) Given that we want to maximize parkland, why is O<sub>2</sub> smaller

A) More challenges w/ columns in median lots & engineering them.

C) Lots of great stuff here. Like the parkland & footbridge. Can O<sub>2</sub> just go away, don't understand RR line right next to SFR. Can you go all the way to double track?

A) Limitations w/ OI that we have not addressed yet Sight distance + Sewer. May not be good to go.

Q) Can we see more next time?

A) Maybe, doesn't get to big choice

C) Harry really wants to see it

### **Appendix 3: Received Emails – Please See the Following Page**



Nate,

Thank you for your kind offer. We would be happy to come by your office at 10 AM on Thursday, drink some good coffee, and explore the relationship of the future Allston I-90 Interchange to the parklands and river. I assume you will have specialists available to answer questions and think things through with us. We need to more fully understand the transportation constraints and opportunities before we can advocate responsibly for any particular scenario. Given that fact, we'd like to hold off on sharing our slides with the Task Force on Wednesday night. (see attached)

We are looking forward to sitting down with members of the design team.

All my best,

Herb Nolan

On Aug 11, 2014, at 3:52 PM, Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis wrote:

Good Afternoon Mr. Nolan,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good day. I understand from your emails to my project manager, Mike O'Dowd, that you would like to meet with the team to talk about the Allston Interchange effort. We are happy to have a chat with you about where we are with the project and your ideas.

Would you be able to get together sometime on the morning of the 14<sup>th</sup>? We would be happy to come to your offices on Boylston Street or if you wish, my own firm, Howard/Stein-Hudson, could offer you the use of our conference room and all the coffee you can consume. Does 10AM work? 10:30? To make matters of scheduling easier, please feel free to call me at 617-482-7080 x236.

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](http://www.hshassoc.com)**

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

**Please Note Our New Address**



Good Afternoon Herb,

Thank you so much for your return note. I'm looking forward to seeing you on the 14<sup>th</sup> at 10AM. I spoke with Mike O'Dowd this morning and based on that conversation, it appears that we will be meeting at MassDOT's offices in the environmental conference room. The environmental conference room is in Room 4260, 4<sup>th</sup> floor, at 10 Park Plaza. Mike is copied so he can let me know if I've misspoken on any of that.

Margo, please do give me best regards to your ED, Kate Fichter. Kate and I are both members of the Casey Arborway design team and went through quite a bit together.

Regards & Good Wishes,  
-Nate

**From:** Herbert Nolan [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 11, 2014 5:23 PM  
**To:** Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis  
**Cc:** Michael O'Dowd; Margo Newman  
**Subject:** Re: Meeting with the Esplanade Association

Nate,

Thank you for your kind offer. We would be happy to come by your office at 10 AM on Thursday, drink some good coffee, and explore the relationship of the future Allston I-90 Interchange to the parklands and river. I assume you will have specialists available to answer questions and think things through with us. We need to more fully understand the transportation constraints and opportunities before we can advocate responsibly for any particular scenario. Given that fact, we'd like to hold off on sharing our slides with the Task Force on Wednesday night. (see attached)

We are looking forward to sitting down with members of the design team.

All my best,

Herb Nolan

On Aug 11, 2014, at 3:52 PM, Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis wrote:

Good Afternoon Mr. Nolan,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good day. I understand from your emails to my project manager, Mike O'Dowd, that you would like to meet with the team to talk about the

Allston Interchange effort. We are happy to have a chat with you about where we are with the project and your ideas.

Would you be able to get together sometime on the morning of the 14<sup>th</sup>? We would be happy to come to your offices on Boylston Street or if you wish, my own firm, Howard/Stein-Hudson, could offer you the use of our conference room and all the coffee you can consume. Does 10AM work? 10:30? To make matters of scheduling easier, please feel free to call me at 617-482-7080 x236.

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](http://www.hshassoc.com)**

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

**Please Note Our New Address**

Nate,

1. On August 5 (one week ago) I requested "MassDOT's **current** version of the "Purpose and Need" statement for the Mass Pike project". While I appreciate your offer to send me an **updated** draft between 8/14 and 9/3, that is not what I asked for. Can you provide me with the current Purpose and Need statement by the end of business today?
2. Because you have chosen not to allocate time on agenda for a presentation of my model, I will discretely set it up in the hallway and be available before and after the meeting to discuss it with anyone interested.

Harry

On Tue, Aug 12, 2014 at 2:30 PM, Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis <[ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com](mailto:ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com)> wrote:

Good Afternoon Harry,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good day. I know you have several inquiries pending with us and I'm glad to be able to give you some answers on all three.

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. Likewise, the project team is working on providing a reply to your questions and comments document email, sent July 25<sup>th</sup> and we anticipate providing you with answers during the same 8/13 to 9/3 timeframe.

On the topic of your request to present your renderings to the taskforce, we have a full agenda for tomorrow night, but we are working on pulling together a design meeting to address requests such as this. If you would like to be a part of that, please see me, Mike, or Ed tomorrow 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](tel:617.348.3336) **main:** [617-482-7080](tel:617-482-7080)

**[www.hshassoc.com](http://www.hshassoc.com)**

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

**Please Note Our New Address**

Hi Nate,

Margo, has a doctors appointment conflict at 10AM. Is there any chance this can be pushed to noon or after? We are both flexible around lunch and early afternoon. If not, I can still make the 10 AM but Margo will have to take a pass.

Herb

On Aug 12, 2014, at 2:13 PM, Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis wrote:

Good Afternoon Herb,

Thank you so much for your return note. I'm looking forward to seeing you on the 14<sup>th</sup> at 10AM. I spoke with Mike O'Dowd this morning and based on that conversation, it appears that we will be meeting at MassDOT's offices in the environmental conference room. The environmental conference room is in Room 4260, 4<sup>th</sup> floor, at 10 Park Plaza. Mike is copied so he can let me know if I've misspoken on any of that.

Margo, please do give me best regards to your ED, Kate Fichter. Kate and I are both members of the Casey Arborway design team and went through quite a bit together.

Regards & Good Wishes,  
-Nate

**From:** Herbert Nolan [mailto:[h.nolan@mass.gov](#)]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 11, 2014 5:23 PM  
**To:** Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis  
**Cc:** Michael O'Dowd; Margo Newman  
**Subject:** Re: Meeting with the Esplanade Association

Nate,

Thank you for your kind offer. We would be happy to come by your office at 10 AM on Thursday, drink some good coffee, and explore the relationship of the future Allston I-90 Interchange to the parklands and river. I assume you will have specialists available to answer questions and think things through with us. We need to more fully understand the transportation constraints and opportunities before we can advocate responsibly for any particular scenario. Given that fact, we'd like to hold off on sharing our slides with the Task Force on Wednesday night. (see attached)

We are looking forward to sitting down with members of the design team.

All my best,

Herb Nolan

On Aug 11, 2014, at 3:52 PM, Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis wrote:

Good Afternoon Mr. Nolan,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good day. I understand from your emails to my project manager, Mike O'Dowd, that you would like to meet with the team to talk about the Allston Interchange effort. We are happy to have a chat with you about where we are with the project and your ideas.

Would you be able to get together sometime on the morning of the 14<sup>th</sup>? We would be happy to come to your offices on Boylston Street or if you wish, my own firm, Howard/Stein-Hudson, could offer you the use of our conference room and all the coffee you can consume. Does 10AM work? 10:30? To make matters of scheduling easier, please feel free to call me at 617-482-7080 x236.

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](http://www.hshassoc.com)**

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

**Please Note Our New Address**



Good Afternoon Herb,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good afternoon. I think that given the DOT and team folks involved in setting up this session, we would like to hold 10AM if at all possible. Perhaps the Esplanade Association ED, Kate Fichter could attend since she is deeply familiar with MassDOT.

Regards & Good Wishes,  
-Nate

**From:** Herbert Nolan [[mailto:h\[REDACTED\]](mailto:h[REDACTED])]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 12, 2014 4:14 PM  
**To:** Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis  
**Cc:** Michael O'Dowd  
**Subject:** Re: Meeting with the Esplanade Association

Hi Nate,

Margo, has a doctors appointment conflict at 10AM. Is there any chance this can be pushed to noon or after? We are both flexible around lunch and early afternoon. If not, I can still make the 10 AM but Margo will have to take a pass.

Herb

On Aug 12, 2014, at 2:13 PM, Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis wrote:

Good Afternoon Herb,

Thank you so much for your return note. I'm looking forward to seeing you on the 14<sup>th</sup> at 10AM. I spoke with Mike O'Dowd this morning and based on that conversation, it appears that we will be meeting at MassDOT's offices in the environmental conference room. The environmental conference room is in Room 4260, 4<sup>th</sup> floor, at 10 Park Plaza. Mike is copied so he can let me know if I've misspoken on any of that.

Margo, please do give me best regards to your ED, Kate Fichter. Kate and I are both members of the Casey Arborway design team and went through quite a bit together.

Regards & Good Wishes,  
-Nate

**From:** Herbert Nolan [[mailto:h\[REDACTED\]](mailto:h[REDACTED])]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 11, 2014 5:23 PM  
**To:** Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis  
**Cc:** Michael O'Dowd; Margo Newman  
**Subject:** Re: Meeting with the Esplanade Association

Nate,

Thank you for your kind offer. We would be happy to come by your office at 10 AM on Thursday, drink some good coffee, and explore the relationship of the future Allston I-90 Interchange to the parklands and river. I assume you will have specialists available to answer questions and think things through with us. We need to more fully understand the transportation constraints and opportunities before we can advocate responsibly for any particular scenario. Given that fact, we'd like to hold off on sharing our slides with the Task Force on Wednesday night. (see attached)

We are looking forward to sitting down with members of the design team.

All my best,

Herb Nolan

On Aug 11, 2014, at 3:52 PM, Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis wrote:

Good Afternoon Mr. Nolan,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good day. I understand from your emails to my project manager, Mike O'Dowd, that you would like to meet with the team to talk about the Allston Interchange effort. We are happy to have a chat with you about where we are with the project and your ideas.

Would you be able to get together sometime on the morning of the 14<sup>th</sup>? We would be happy to come to your offices on Boylston Street or if you wish, my own firm, Howard/Stein-Hudson, could offer you the use of our conference room and all the coffee you can consume. Does 10AM work? 10:30? To make matters of scheduling easier, please feel free to call me at 617-482-7080 x236.

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](http://www.hshassoc.com)**

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

**Please Note Our New Address**

I suspected moving the time would be difficult. I asked Kate earlier but she can't be involved in any MassDOT advocacy for a period of time after leaving state employment. Margo may be able to find a board member to cover for her and, if not, I will brief her after the meeting.

See you on Thursday, at 10.

Herb

Good Afternoon Herb,

Thank you so much for your understanding. We'll see you and whatever crew you can muster at 10AM.

Regards & Thanks,  
-Nate

Good Afternoon Harry,

Thank you for your reply. With regard to a set up in the hallway outside the meeting room, we have no problem with you doing that. As a courtesy to our hosts, you might check with them regarding setting up your display such that it does not disrupt circulation in the building. As someone who books and uses a lot of spaces like the Fiorentino there can be sensitivities around things in hallways and fire codes. Maybe not in this case at 123 Antwerp Street, but I've always found it good to ask.

In terms of the purpose and need statement, I have spoken with a number of our project team members and the consensus is that the purpose and need statement as it currently stands is too much an uncooked cake to be sent out for review just yet. We have articulated some reasons and aims for the project: one good spot to look is slide 10 of the May 7<sup>th</sup> presentation available from the project website and the other is the bullet points which run from the bottom of page 3 to the top of page 4 in the draft alternatives screening methodology document which we shared with you via email on Friday August 1<sup>st</sup>. If based on those bullets, you wish to give us some suggested language for a purpose and need statement, we would welcome it, and as noted before, we will provide you with a draft for your review between tomorrow night's session and that in early September.

Regards & Good Wishes,  
-Nate

**From:** Harry Mattison [[mailto:h\[REDACTED\]](mailto:h[REDACTED])]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 12, 2014 3:19 PM  
**To:** Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis  
**Cc:** Ed Ionata; Michael O'Dowd  
**Subject:** Re: Regarding Your Inquiries to the I-90 Allston Interchange Improvement Project

Nate,

1. On August 5 (one week ago) I requested "MassDOT's **current** version of the "Purpose and Need" statement for the Mass Pike project". While I appreciate your offer to send me an **updated** draft between 8/14 and 9/3, that is not what I asked for. Can you provide me with the current Purpose and Need statement by the end of business today?
2. Because you have chosen not to allocate time on agenda for a presentation of my model, I will discretely set it up in the hallway and be available before and after the meeting to discuss it with anyone interested.

Harry

On Tue, Aug 12, 2014 at 2:30 PM, Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis <[ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com](mailto:ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com)> wrote:

Good Afternoon Harry,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good day. I know you have several inquiries pending with us and I'm glad to be able to give you some answers on all three.

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. Likewise, the project team is working on providing a reply to your questions and comments document email, sent July 25<sup>th</sup> and we anticipate providing you with answers during the same 8/13 to 9/3 timeframe.

On the topic of your request to present your renderings to the taskforce, we have a full agenda for tomorrow night, but we are working on pulling together a design meeting to address requests such as this. If you would like to be a part of that, please see me, Mike, or Ed tomorrow 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](tel:617.348.3336) **main:** [617-482-7080](tel:617-482-7080)

**[www.hshassoc.com](http://www.hshassoc.com)**

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



**Please Note Our New Address**

Nate,

Thank you for the update. I had no idea that 10 months after the project was announced that the purpose and need statement would be too much an uncooked cake to be sent out for review. Regarding some suggested language for a purpose and need statement, I would offer these 7 core principles that were suggested by several members of the Task Force in our August 6 letter.

Sincerely,  
Harry Mattison

1. Safety: for all users. Including, as applicable, pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users and drivers on the new

Cambridge Street, local streets, local pedestrian bridges, People's Pike multiuse path, relocated Soldier's Field

Road, commuter and other rail mass transit lines and station(s), and I90 mainline highway and related on/off ramps

and service roads.

2. Connectivity: Reconnect two halves of Allston divided by Pike, by creating access over the project area between

Packard's Corner and North Allston; connect Allston to the Charles River via a redesigned Cambridge Street, and a

People's Pike multiuse path connecting to the Paul Dudley White path and to Cambridge via the Grand Junction.

3. Multimodalism: Build West Station(s) to serve existing and future neighborhood; design Cambridge Street, new

street grid, and new People's Pike multiuse path using worldclass Complete Streets principles, with separate cycle

tracks and treelined sidewalks.

4. Land Use: Design project for land uses consistent with city and regional housing, economic development, and

transportation goals.

5. Open Space: Preserve and expand public open space, including widening parkland along the Charles River;

explore new open space within land opened by project; address inequities described in the City of Boston Open

Space Plan , which notes that AllstonBrighton has 5 acres of protected open space per 1,000 residents, compared to

a citywide ratio of 7.5 acres per 1,000 residents.

6. Quality of Life & Environmental Justice: Improve conditions for residents most impacted by I90 and adhere to

applicable environmental justice policies

7. Support MassDOT's GreenDOT and Mode Shift Goals: Reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions; support

smart growth development; triple the number of trips taken by walking, biking and transit.

On Tue, Aug 12, 2014 at 5:28 PM, Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis <[ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com](mailto:ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com)> wrote:

Good Afternoon Harry,

Thank you for your reply. With regard to a set up in the hallway outside the meeting room, we have no problem with you doing that. As a courtesy to our hosts, you might check with them regarding setting up your display such that it does not disrupt circulation in the building. As someone who books and uses a lot of spaces like the Fiorentino there can be sensitivities around things in hallways and fire codes. Maybe not in this case at 123 Antwerp Street, but I've always found it good to ask.

In terms of the purpose and need statement, I have spoken with a number of our project team members and the consensus is that the purpose and need statement as it currently stands is too much an uncooked cake to be sent out for review just yet. We have articulated some reasons and aims for the project: one good spot to look is slide 10 of the May 7<sup>th</sup> presentation available from the project website and the other is the bullet points which run from the bottom of page 3 to the top of page 4 in the draft alternatives screening methodology document which we shared with

you via email on Friday August 1<sup>st</sup>. If based on those bullets, you wish to give us some suggested language for a purpose and need statement, we would welcome it, and as noted before, we will provide you with a draft for your review between tomorrow night's session and that in early September.

Regards & Good Wishes,

-Nate

**From:** Harry Mattison [mailto:[harry.mattison@hshassoc.com](mailto:harry.mattison@hshassoc.com)]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 12, 2014 3:19 PM  
**To:** Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis  
**Cc:** Ed Ionata; Michael O'Dowd  
**Subject:** Re: Regarding Your Inquiries to the I-90 Allston Interchange Improvement Project

Nate,

1. On August 5 (one week ago) I requested "MassDOT's **current** version of the "Purpose and Need" statement for the Mass Pike project". While I appreciate your offer to send me an **updated** draft between 8/14 and 9/3, that is not what I asked for. Can you provide me with the current Purpose and Need statement by the end of business today?
2. Because you have chosen not to allocate time on agenda for a presentation of my model, I will discretely set it up in the hallway and be available before and after the meeting to discuss it with anyone interested.

Harry

On Tue, Aug 12, 2014 at 2:30 PM, Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis <[ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com](mailto:ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com)> wrote:

Good Afternoon Harry,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good day. I know you have several inquiries pending with us and I'm glad to be able to give you some answers on all three.

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. Likewise, the project team is working on providing a reply to your questions and comments document email, sent July 25<sup>th</sup> and we anticipate providing you with answers during the same 8/13 to 9/3 timeframe.

On the topic of your request to present your renderings to the taskforce, we have a full agenda for tomorrow night, but we are working on pulling together a design meeting to address requests such as this. If you would like to be a part of that, please see me, Mike, or Ed tomorrow 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](tel:617.348.3336) **main:** [617-482-7080](tel:617-482-7080)

**[www.hshassoc.com](http://www.hshassoc.com)**

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

**Please Note Our New Address**

Good Morning Harry,

Thank you for sending these along. I'll make sure this is passed to the right members of the project team. See you this evening.

Regards & Good Wishes,  
-Nate

**From:** Harry Mattison [[mailto:](#) [REDACTED]]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 12, 2014 6:42 PM  
**To:** Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis  
**Cc:** Ed Ionata; Michael O'Dowd  
**Subject:** Re: Regarding Your Inquiries to the I-90 Allston Interchange Improvement Project

Nate,

Thank you for the update. I had no idea that 10 months after the project was announced that the purpose and need statement would be too much an uncooked cake to be sent out for review. Regarding some suggested language for a purpose and need statement, I would offer these 7 core principles that were suggested by several members of the Task Force in our August 6 letter.

Sincerely,  
Harry Mattison

1. Safety: for all users. Including, as applicable, pedestrians, bicyclists, transit users and drivers on the new

Cambridge Street, local streets, local pedestrian bridges, People's Pike multiuse path, relocated Soldier's Field

Road, commuter and other rail mass transit lines and station(s), and I90 mainline highway and related on/off ramps

and service roads.

2. Connectivity: Reconnect two halves of Allston divided by Pike, by creating access over the project area between

Packard's Corner and North Allston; connect Allston to the Charles River via a redesigned Cambridge Street, and a

People's Pike multiuse path connecting to the Paul Dudley White path and to Cambridge via the Grand Junction.



3. Multimodalism: Build West Station(s) to serve existing and future neighborhood; design Cambridge Street, new

street grid, and new People's Pike multiuse path using worldclass Complete Streets principles, with separate cycle

tracks and treelined sidewalks.

4. Land Use: Design project for land uses consistent with city and regional housing, economic development, and

transportation goals.

5. Open Space: Preserve and expand public open space, including widening parkland along the Charles River;

explore new open space within land opened by project; address inequities described in the City of Boston Open

Space Plan , which notes that AllstonBrighton has 5 acres of protected open space per 1,000 residents, compared to

a citywide ratio of 7.5 acres per 1,000 residents.

6. Quality of Life & Environmental Justice: Improve conditions for residents most impacted by I90 and adhere to

applicable environmental justice policies

7. Support MassDOT's GreenDOT and Mode Shift Goals: Reduce greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions; support

smart growth development; triple the number of trips taken by walking, biking and transit.

On Tue, Aug 12, 2014 at 5:28 PM, Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis <[ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com](mailto:ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com)> wrote:

Good Afternoon Harry,

Thank you for your reply. With regard to a set up in the hallway outside the meeting room, we have no problem with you doing that. As a courtesy to our hosts, you might check with them regarding setting up your display such that it does not disrupt circulation in the building. As someone who books and uses a lot of spaces like the Fiorentino there can be sensitivities around things in hallways and fire codes. Maybe not in this case at 123 Antwerp Street, but I've always found it good to ask.

In terms of the purpose and need statement, I have spoken with a number of our project team members and the consensus is that the purpose and need statement as it currently stands is too much an uncooked cake to be sent out for review just yet. We have articulated some reasons and aims for the project: one good spot to look is slide 10 of the May 7<sup>th</sup> presentation available from the project website and the other is the bullet points which run from the bottom of page 3 to the top of page 4 in the draft alternatives screening methodology document which we shared with you via email on Friday August 1<sup>st</sup>. If based on those bullets, you wish to give us some suggested language for a purpose and need statement, we would welcome it, and as noted before, we will provide you with a draft for your review between tomorrow night's session and that in early September.

Regards & Good Wishes,

-Nate

**From:** Harry Mattison [mailto:[h](#)]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, August 12, 2014 3:19 PM  
**To:** Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis  
**Cc:** Ed Ionata; Michael O'Dowd  
**Subject:** Re: Regarding Your Inquiries to the I-90 Allston Interchange Improvement Project

Nate,

1. On August 5 (one week ago) I requested "MassDOT's **current** version of the "Purpose and Need" statement for the Mass Pike project". While I appreciate your offer to send me an **updated** draft between 8/14 and 9/3, that is not what I asked for. Can you provide me with the current Purpose and Need statement by the end of business today?
2. Because you have chosen not to allocate time on agenda for a presentation of my model, I will discretely set it up in the hallway and be available before and after the meeting to discuss it with anyone interested.

Harry

On Tue, Aug 12, 2014 at 2:30 PM, Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis <[ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com](mailto:ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com)> wrote:

Good Afternoon Harry,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good day. I know you have several inquiries pending with us and I'm glad to be able to give you some answers on all three.

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. Likewise, the project team is working on providing a reply to your questions and comments document email, sent July 25<sup>th</sup> and we anticipate providing you with answers during the same 8/13 to 9/3 timeframe.

On the topic of your request to present your renderings to the taskforce, we have a full agenda for tomorrow night, but we are working on pulling together a design meeting to address requests such as this. If you would like to be a part of that, please see me, Mike, or Ed tomorrow 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](tel:617.348.3336) **main:** [617-482-7080](tel:617-482-7080)

**[www.hshassoc.com](http://www.hshassoc.com)**

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

**Please Note Our New Address**

Good Morning All,

I hope this note finds everyone well and enjoying this sunshiny morning; a significant improvement on yesterday's murk. Thank you all for another productive session last night. Based on a request from one of our taskforce members, I am issuing the following email notification prior to distributing everyone's email addresses to Harry per his request:

If you **do not** write to me by the start of business on Monday the 18<sup>th</sup> of August your email address will be distributed. If you are comfortable with the distribution, **you do not need to take any action**. If anyone has questions or concerns, please feel free to be in touch.

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](http://www.hshassoc.com)**

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

**Please Note Our New Address**

Good morning Nate,

There have been multiple requests that the material from last night's Taskforce meeting, including the BRA presentation, be posted to the MassDOT website as soon as possible. Can you give me a sense of what the timetable is for getting everything uploaded? I am happy to send out the BRA portion to the Taskforce directly, but would only do so if deemed appropriate by your team. Please advise.

Kind regards,

--

David L. Grissino AIA, LEED AP

Senior Architect/Urban Designer | Boston Redevelopment Authority

One City Hall Square | Boston, MA | 02201 | t: 617-918-4436

web: <http://www.bostonredevelopmentauthority.org>

news: <http://www.bostonredevelopmentauthoritynews.org>



Nate

Could I get a copy of the presentation from last evening. I noticed it isn't on the web yet.

Thanks

elizabeth

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

**Sent:** Thursday, August 14, 2014 8:59 AM

**To:** Nick Gross

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

**Subject:** Taskforce Email Addresses

**Importance:** High

Good Morning All,

I hope this note finds everyone well and enjoying this sunny morning; a significant improvement on yesterday's murk. Thank you all for another productive session last night. Based on a request from one of our taskforce members, I am issuing the following email notification prior to distributing everyone's email addresses to Harry per his request:

If you **do not** write to me by the start of business on Monday the 18<sup>th</sup> of August your email address will be distributed. If you are comfortable with the distribution, **you do not need to take any action**. If anyone has questions or concerns, please feel free to be in touch.

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](http://www.hshassoc.com)**

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

**Please Note Our New Address**

Hi Nate,

Go ahead and share my email address. Also, it would be great if you could post the schedule flow chart on the MassDOT project website, and/or send around a pdf to the Task Force.

Thanks,  
Jessica

On 14 August 2014 08:59, Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis <[ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com](mailto:ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com)> wrote:

Good Morning All,

I hope this note finds everyone well and enjoying this sunshiny morning; a significant improvement on yesterday's murk. Thank you all for another productive session last night. Based on a request from one of our taskforce members, I am issuing the following email notification prior to distributing everyone's email addresses to Harry per his request:

If you **do not** write to me by the start of business on Monday the 18<sup>th</sup> of August your email address will be distributed. If you are comfortable with the distribution, **you do not need to take any action**. If anyone has questions or concerns, please feel free to be in touch.

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)

Hi Nate,

Many thanks to you and the team for putting together the materials for last night's meeting. Since I am playing catch up on the project I have a few follow-up requests.

1. Can you keep Sarah Hamilton on the email list for the project ([shamilton@masco.harvard.edu](mailto:shamilton@masco.harvard.edu))? She is interested in attending the meetings and receiving the materials.
2. Can you send me an electronic versions of the interchange alternatives, both the suburban ones and the "Option 3" series?
3. Can you send me the materials you have on the concept developed by Glen Berkowitz at the June 25<sup>th</sup> Task Force meeting?

If it is easier, I would be happy to download the materials from the project website if they will be posted there.

Thank you,  
-Paul

Paul Nelson  
Senior Transportation Planner, Area Planning and Development

**MASCO** | CELEBRATING **41** YEARS OF SERVICE

375 Longwood Avenue

Boston, MA 02215

T: 617.632.2778

F: 617.632.2779

[pnelson@masco.harvard.edu](mailto:pnelson@masco.harvard.edu)

[www.masco.org](http://www.masco.org)

My email is a public record so no worries.

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

**Sent:** Thursday, August 14, 2014 8:59 AM

**To:** Nick Gross

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

**Subject:** Taskforce Email Addresses

**Importance:** High

Good Morning All,

I hope this note finds everyone well and enjoying this sunshiny morning; a significant improvement on yesterday's murk. Thank you all for another productive session last night. Based on a request from one of our taskforce members, I am issuing the following email notification prior to distributing everyone's email addresses to Harry per his request:

If you **do not** write to me by the start of business on Monday the 18<sup>th</sup> of August your email address will be distributed. If you are comfortable with the distribution, **you do not need to take any action**. If anyone has questions or concerns, please feel free to be in touch.

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](http://www.hshassoc.com)**

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

**Please Note Our New Address**

Hi Michael-

I just wanted to be in touch after last night's meeting when you mentioned further public meetings in the fall. At the appropriate time, we would want to have another meeting in Cambridge and try to get more neighborhood attendance, so maybe having a meeting somewhere in Cambridgeport. I know that Carol O'Hare is not the only person there concerned about noise reduction and construction impacts.

Given that we have not yet gotten to choosing a concept to refine yet, I assume that we may have a few more un-scheduled meetings of the steering committee. It may also make sense to have a smaller meeting with other Cambridge officials once you have a firmer concept and some traffic analysis completed. I am copying Sue Clippinger here, Director of Traffic, Parking and Transportation who may attend one or more of the future Steering Committee meetings, and would be also very interested in seeing the concept and traffic analysis in a smaller meeting. Let me know when this would make sense.

It was very exciting to see the concepts last night which moved Soldiers Field Road, enlarged the parkland and improved the possibilities of multi-modal connections through the neighborhood and to the Grand Junction to Cambridge. Hopefully even more can be done in this respect as well as keeping the viaduct away from the river. Thanks again for going through all of this.

Best,  
Bill

Good Afternoon David,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good day. Thank you for your efforts last night. While it will likely take a few days, think middle of next week, to get the PowerPoint presentation to the project website, we certainly could PDF a version and get it out to the taskforce sooner since we do not have to make it ADA-compliant for their personal use. Before I do that, let me just double check with my PM to make sure it's all O.K. I don't see any issue, but it's always nice to ask.

Regards & Good Wishes,  
-Nate

**From:** David Grissino [<mailto:david.grissino@boston.gov>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 14, 2014 10:12 AM  
**To:** Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis  
**Cc:** Harry Mattison; John Read  
**Subject:** Last night's presentation

Good morning Nate,

There have been multiple requests that the material from last night's Taskforce meeting, including the BRA presentation, be posted to the MassDOT website as soon as possible. Can you give me a sense of what the timetable is for getting everything uploaded? I am happy to send out the BRA portion to the Taskforce directly, but would only do so if deemed appropriate by your team. Please advise.

Kind regards,

--

David L. Grissino AIA, LEED AP

Senior Architect/Urban Designer | Boston Redevelopment Authority

One City Hall Square | Boston, MA | 02201 | t: 617-918-4436

web: <http://www.bostonredevelopmentauthority.org>

news: <http://www.bostonredevelopmentauthoritynews.org>



Thank you for the reminder, Jessica. I will need to get the flowchart from TetraTech so it could be a day or two, but this is definitely on my list.

Regards & Thanks,  
-Nate

**From:** Jessica Robertson [<mailto:> [REDACTED]]  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 14, 2014 10:25 AM  
**To:** Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis  
**Subject:** Re: Taskforce Email Addresses

Hi Nate,  
Go ahead and share my email address. Also, it would be great if you could post the schedule flow chart on the MassDOT project website, and/or send around a pdf to the Task Force.

Thanks,  
Jessica

On 14 August 2014 08:59, Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis <[ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com](mailto:ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com)> wrote:

Good Morning All,

I hope this note finds everyone well and enjoying this sunshiny morning; a significant improvement on yesterday's murk. Thank you all for another productive session last night. Based on a request from one of our taskforce members, I am issuing the following email notification prior to distributing everyone's email addresses to Harry per his request:

If you **do not** write to me by the start of business on Monday the 18<sup>th</sup> of August your email address will be distributed. If you are comfortable with the distribution, **you do not need to take any action**. If anyone has questions or concerns, please feel free to be in touch.

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](http://www.hshassoc.com)**

Good Afternoon Elizabeth,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good day. Getting presentations to the project website takes a few days as we have to make them ADA-compliant for a DOT-site. That's a bit of surgery and takes some time. However, we can send out a copy of the PDF for use by the taskforce. I'm in the process of writing to Mike to get authorization to go ahead and do just that.

Regards & Good Wishes,  
-Nate

**From:** Leary, Elizabeth [<mailto:erleary@bu.edu>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 14, 2014 10:23 AM  
**To:** Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis  
**Subject:** RE: Taskforce Email Addresses

Nate  
Could I get a copy of the presentation from last evening. I noticed it isn't on the web yet.  
Thanks  
elizabeth

**From:** Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis [<mailto:ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 14, 2014 8:59 AM  
**To:** Nick Gross  
**Cc:** Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis; O'Dowd, Michael (DOT); Ed Ionata  
**Subject:** Taskforce Email Addresses  
**Importance:** High

Good Morning All,

I hope this note finds everyone well and enjoying this sunshiny morning; a significant improvement on yesterday's murk. Thank you all for another productive session last night. Based on a request from one of our taskforce members, I am issuing the following email notification prior to distributing everyone's email addresses to Harry per his request:

If you **do not** write to me by the start of business on Monday the 18<sup>th</sup> of August your email address will be distributed. If you are comfortable with the distribution, **you do not need to take any action**. If anyone has questions or concerns, please feel free to be in touch.

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](http://www.hshassoc.com)**

Thank you Nate. The version I left on the laptop was a PDF, so it should be straightforward to upload. Please keep me posted.

David

On Thu, Aug 14, 2014 at 12:51 PM, Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis <[ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com](mailto:ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com)> wrote:

Good Afternoon David,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good day. Thank you for your efforts last night. While it will likely take a few days, think middle of next week, to get the PowerPoint presentation to the project website, we certainly could PDF a version and get it out to the taskforce sooner since we do not have to make it ADA-compliant for their personal use. Before I do that, let me just double check with my PM to make sure it's all O.K. I don't see any issue, but it's always nice to ask.

Regards & Good Wishes,

-Nate

**From:** David Grissino [mailto:[david.grissino@boston.gov](mailto:david.grissino@boston.gov)]  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 14, 2014 10:12 AM  
**To:** Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis  
**Cc:** Harry Mattison; John Read  
**Subject:** Last night's presentation

Good morning Nate,

There have been multiple requests that the material from last night's Taskforce meeting, including the BRA presentation, be posted to the MassDOT website as soon as possible. Can you give me a sense of what the timetable is for getting everything uploaded? I am happy to send out the BRA portion to the Taskforce directly, but would only do so if deemed appropriate by your team. Please advise.

Kind regards,

--

David L. Grissino AIA, LEED AP

Senior Architect/Urban Designer | Boston Redevelopment Authority

One City Hall Square | Boston, MA | 02201 | t: [617-918-4436](tel:617-918-4436)

web: <http://www.bostonredevelopmentauthority.org>

news: <http://www.bostonredevelopmentauthoritynews.org>

Good Afternoon Bill,

Thanks for your note; we're in receipt and I imagine a more detailed answer will be forthcoming from Mike.

Regards & Good Wishes,  
-Nate

**From:** Deignan, Bill [<mailto:wdeignan@cambridgema.gov>]

**Sent:** Thursday, August 14, 2014 12:40 PM

**To:** O'Dowd, Michael (DOT)

**Cc:** Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis; Clippinger, Sue

**Subject:** next steps

Hi Michael-

I just wanted to be in touch after last night's meeting when you mentioned further public meetings in the fall. At the appropriate time, we would want to have another meeting in Cambridge and try to get more neighborhood attendance, so maybe having a meeting somewhere in Cambridgeport. I know that Carol O'Hare is not the only person there concerned about noise reduction and construction impacts.

Given that we have not yet gotten to choosing a concept to refine yet, I assume that we may have a few more un-scheduled meetings of the steering committee. It may also make sense to have a smaller meeting with other Cambridge officials once you have a firmer concept and some traffic analysis completed. I am copying Sue Clippinger here, Director of Traffic, Parking and Transportation who may attend one or more of the future Steering Committee meetings, and would be also very interested in seeing the concept and traffic analysis in a smaller meeting. Let me know when this would make sense.

It was very exciting to see the concepts last night which moved Soldiers Field Road, enlarged the parkland and improved the possibilities of multi-modal connections through the neighborhood and to the Grand Junction to Cambridge. Hopefully even more can be done in this respect as well as keeping the viaduct away from the river. Thanks again for going through all of this.

Best,  
Bill



This is Matt Robare with The Allston Brighton Tab.

Can you send me the slides Kairos used in his presentation last night?

Thank you,

Matt

Monday morning.

On Thu, Aug 14, 2014 at 1:20 PM, Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis <[ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com](mailto:ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com)> wrote:

Matthew,

I hope you're well and having a good day. I'm in the midst of obtaining permission from my PM on this request. What's your cut-off?

Regards & Good Wishes,

-Nate

**From:** Matthew Robare [mailto: ]  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 14, 2014 1:16 PM  
**To:** Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis  
**Subject:** Allston Interchange Task Force

This is Matt Robare with The Allston Brighton Tab.

Can you send me the slides Kairos used in his presentation last night?

Thank you,

Matt

Good Afternoon Paul,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good day. As you were good enough to bullet your questions, I will respond in kind:

1. We will put Sarah Hamilton on our courtesy listing for the taskforce. Nick, would you please put her in the same field of the database as folks like Jim Cerbone and Stacey Donahoe.
2. For the urban and suburban interchange options, take a look at [https://www.massdot.state.ma.us/Portals/8/docs/HighlightedProjects/AllstonInterchange/taskPresentation\\_050714.pdf](https://www.massdot.state.ma.us/Portals/8/docs/HighlightedProjects/AllstonInterchange/taskPresentation_050714.pdf) and <https://www.massdot.state.ma.us/Portals/8/docs/HighlightedProjects/AllstonInterchange/taskPresentation052114.pdf>. That will give you a sense of the range of options when the suburban interchange was still more in the running. By now it's pretty much the urban family with variants.
3. For a copy of Glen's presentation, please see [https://www.massdot.state.ma.us/Portals/8/docs/HighlightedProjects/AllstonInterchange/advisoryPresentation\\_062514.pdf](https://www.massdot.state.ma.us/Portals/8/docs/HighlightedProjects/AllstonInterchange/advisoryPresentation_062514.pdf).

It's nice to see you again. I wish you lots of luck at MASCO. They are a nice outfit.

Regards & Good Wishes,  
-Nate

**From:** Paul Nelson [<mailto:pnelson@masco.harvard.edu>]  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 14, 2014 10:44 AM  
**To:** Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis  
**Subject:** Allston Interchange TF Follow-up

Hi Nate,

Many thanks to you and the team for putting together the materials for last night's meeting. Since I am playing catch up on the project I have a few follow-up requests.

4. Can you keep Sarah Hamilton on the email list for the project ([shamilton@masco.harvard.edu](mailto:shamilton@masco.harvard.edu))? She is interested in attending the meetings and receiving the materials.
5. Can you send me an electronic versions of the interchange alternatives, both the suburban ones and the "Option 3" series?
6. Can you send me the materials you have on the concept developed by Glen Berkowitz at the June 25<sup>th</sup> Task Force meeting?

If it is easier, I would be happy to download the materials from the project website if they will be posted there.

Thank you,  
-Paul

Paul Nelson  
Senior Transportation Planner, Area Planning and Development

**MASCO** | CELEBRATING **41** YEARS OF SERVICE

375 Longwood Avenue

Boston, MA 02215

T: 617.632.2778

F: 617.632.2779

[pnelson@masco.harvard.edu](mailto:pnelson@masco.harvard.edu)

[www.masco.org](http://www.masco.org)

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

**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](http://www.hshassoc.com)**

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

**Please Note Our New Address**

Awesome. Thanks, Nate.

Glen

=====

On Aug 14, 2014, at 3:29 PM, Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis <[ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com](mailto:ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com)> wrote:

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

**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](http://www.hshassoc.com)**

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

**Please Note Our New Address**

<8-13\_14-task\_force\_meeting\_6\_FINAL\_for\_email.pdf>

Thanks Nate.

I also have a call in to Tad to thank him as well. I tried to explain the concept to Rick this morning using the original 3F plan. Good to see the BRA material. I appreciate your fast turn around on the request.

Tom

**Thomas J. Nally**  
Planning Director  
**A Better City**  
33 Broad Street, Suite 300  
Boston, Massachusetts 02109



[tnally@abettercity.org](mailto:tnally@abettercity.org)  
[www.abettercity.org](http://www.abettercity.org)

**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

**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](http://www.hshassoc.com)



Nate

Could you confirm for me that the next meeting is on the 27<sup>th</sup>?

Thanks

Joe

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

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 13, 2014 9:50 AM

**To:** Nick Gross; Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis

**Cc:** Michael O'Dowd; Ed Ionata; Jim Cerbone; Stacey Donahoe

**Subject:** Allston Interchange Improvement Project Meeting Minutes

Good Morning All,

I hope this rainy day finds you all well and keeping dry. Attached, you will find the minutes of our last meeting for your review. I look forward to seeing everyone this evening. As usual, we will begin at 6PM in the Fiorentino Center at 123 Antwerp Street in Allston. I am personally crossing my fingers and toes, for all those taskforce members who come by bicycle that the news is correct and that the rain will be gone by 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](http://www.hshassoc.com)**

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

**Please Note Our New Address**

Hi Joe,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good day. As it so happens, the meeting is on the 3<sup>rd</sup> of September. We had been looking at the 27<sup>th</sup> of August a few weeks ago, but we've now lighted on the 3<sup>rd</sup> as providing adequate time for the project team to incorporate taskforce input. So, if you wanted to get away the week before Labor Day, you are free to go for it with a clean conscience.

Regards & Good Wishes,  
-Nate.

**From:** Beggan, Joseph G [[mailto:joseph\\_beggan@harvard.edu](mailto:joseph_beggan@harvard.edu)]  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 14, 2014 4:58 PM  
**To:** Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis  
**Subject:** RE: Allston Interchange Improvement Project Meeting Minutes

Nate

Could you confirm for me that the next meeting is on the 27<sup>th</sup>?

Thanks

Joe

**From:** Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis [<mailto:ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com>]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, August 13, 2014 9:50 AM  
**To:** Nick Gross; Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis  
**Cc:** Michael O'Dowd; Ed Ionata; Jim Cerbone; Stacey Donahoe  
**Subject:** Allston Interchange Improvement Project Meeting Minutes

Good Morning All,

I hope this rainy day finds you all well and keeping dry. Attached, you will find the minutes of our last meeting for your review. I look forward to seeing everyone this evening. As usual, we will begin at 6PM in the Fiorentino Center at 123 Antwerp Street in Allston. I am personally crossing my fingers and toes, for all those taskforce members who come by bicycle that the news is correct and that the rain will be gone by 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](http://www.hshassoc.com)**

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

**Please Note Our New Address**

Can you send me a copy of last meeting's "matrix" by e-mail?

Thanks,  
Matt

On Thu, Aug 14, 2014 at 3:29 PM, Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis <[ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com](mailto:ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com)> wrote:

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

**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](http://www.hshassoc.com)**

Good Afternoon Matt,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good day. I don't actually have that in my possession, but will write off to the right member of the project team and get one for you.

Regards & Good Wishes,  
-Nate

**From:** Matthew Danish [[mailto:m\[REDACTED\]](mailto:m[REDACTED])]  
**Sent:** Friday, August 15, 2014 10:52 AM  
**To:** Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis  
**Subject:** Re: Allston Interchange Improvement Project Requested Materials

Can you send me a copy of last meeting's "matrix" by e-mail?

Thanks,  
Matt

On Thu, Aug 14, 2014 at 3:29 PM, Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis <[ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com](mailto:ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com)> wrote:

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

Thanks, Nate.

Matt

On Thu, Aug 14, 2014 at 3:24 PM, Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis <[ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com](mailto:ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com)> wrote:

Good Afternoon Matthew,

Your requested file is attached.

Regards & Good Wishes,

-Nate

**From:** Matthew Robare [mailto:[m\[REDACTED\]](mailto:m[REDACTED])]  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 14, 2014 1:24 PM  
**To:** Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis  
**Subject:** Re: Allston Interchange Task Force

Monday morning.

On Thu, Aug 14, 2014 at 1:20 PM, Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis <[ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com](mailto:ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com)> wrote:

Matthew,

I hope you're well and having a good day. I'm in the midst of obtaining permission from my PM on this request. What's your cut-off?

Regards & Good Wishes,

-Nate

**From:** Matthew Robare [mailto: [REDACTED]]  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 14, 2014 1:16 PM  
**To:** Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis  
**Subject:** Allston Interchange Task Force

This is Matt Robare with The Allston Brighton Tab.

Can you send me the slides Kairos used in his presentation last night?

Thank you,

Matt



Hi Nate,

After reflecting on this week's Task Force meeting, I felt we got caught up in discussions that were misguided, ill timed and distracted the Task Force from the value added work we need to get done.

For example, members of the Task Force insisting on a design speed of 50 mph and a six lane highway without understanding the consequences of such a design.

I understand the selection of a particular design speed is influenced by the following: the functional classification of the highway, the character of the terrain, the density and character of adjacent land uses, the traffic volumes expected to use the highway and the economic and environmental considerations.

Therefore, a design that justifies an eight lane highway with shoulders and a sixty-five mph design speed as MassDOT is proposing must be presented in the context of the considerations mentioned above, as well as your rationale for the peak hour level of service you propose. In addition to address members of the Task Force who want to see a six lane highway with a design speed of 50 mph, a presentation is required to detail the consequences of such a design.

I would recommend that in order to build trust and transparency and to point us in the right direction, that the Task Force adopt a high level set of guiding principles which then could be parceled out to sub groups in order to develop greater specificity. This exercise would prevent scope creep and keep us all focused on the matters at hand.

I have put together an initial list which would be subject to amendment before a vote of the members.

Tony D'Isidoro

## Allston I-90 Interchange Improvement Project

### Guiding Principles

Adequate design speeds for freeway, arterial highways, collector and local roads to accommodate current and anticipated future traffic demands.

Reasonable and cost effective peak hour level of service (amount of congestion) for freeway, arterial highways, collector and local roads.

Increase safety and accessibility for all modes including improved intersection treatments at

each intersection.

Coordinate the transportation system with the land uses so that people can choose to reduce their reliance on the automobile by living closer to work, living or working close to transit, and living in pedestrian and bicycle friendly areas, i.e., trails and sidewalks.

Design roadways such that they maximize the flexibility for future land use and access to parcels from multiple places throughout the district.

Provide multi-modal connectivity for existing neighborhoods to the Charles River, from Packard's Corner to North Allston and to surrounding areas.

Build West Station and provide multi-modal access.

Incorporate all electronic tolling.

A high quality and user-friendly pedestrian and cycle environment. This should apply throughout the project area and in connections to adjoining areas.

Improve conditions for residents impacted by I-90 including climate change, air quality, noise, water quality, soil quality, biodiversity and land taking.

Negotiate a statement of understanding between the various stakeholders managing the new transportation infrastructure in terms of future construction, ongoing maintenance and cleaning.

Public and private stakeholders should make every effort to ensure that whenever possible, partnerships can be formed with MassDOT that would enhance current transportation planning and provide additional benefits to the community.

Reclaim as much open and public space as possible.

An integrated approach to landscape design will be expected. This includes coordinating the overall layout, access, railings, hard landscaping, lighting services, street furniture and surface materials.

New development at entrance points to the area should be distinctive and memorable emphasizing a 'sense of arrival' and assisting people to orientate themselves.

The use of public art to reinforce a sense of place should be encouraged throughout the area.

Development should seek to enhance safety, security and surveillance and minimize opportunities for crime and anti-social behavior.

08/17/2014

Good Morning Matt,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good start to the week. Attached, you will find the matrix document you requested. As you will recall from our meeting last week, this document is under revision, but this is what was presented.

Regards & Good Wishes,  
-Nate

**From:** Matthew Danish [mailto:[\[REDACTED\]](#)]  
**Sent:** Friday, August 15, 2014 10:52 AM  
**To:** Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis  
**Subject:** Re: Allston Interchange Improvement Project Requested Materials

Can you send me a copy of last meeting's "matrix" by e-mail?

Thanks,  
Matt

On Thu, Aug 14, 2014 at 3:29 PM, Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis <[ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com](mailto:ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com)> wrote:

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

**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](http://www.hshassoc.com)**

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

**Please Note Our New Address**

Good Afternoon Anthony,

Thank you for your note. I'm in receipt and I'll try to get you a response within a few days.

Regards & Good Wishes,  
-Nate

**From:** Anthony D'Isidoro [[mailto:\[REDACTED\]](mailto:[REDACTED])]

**Sent:** Sunday, August 17, 2014 5:35 PM

**To:** Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis

**Cc:** Michael O'Dowd; Ed Ionata; Nick Gross; Jim Cerbone; [diane.madden@state.ma.us](mailto:diane.madden@state.ma.us); Roper, Stephen (DOT); Stacey Donahoe

**Subject:** Recommendation

Hi Nate,

After reflecting on this week's Task Force meeting, I felt we got caught up in discussions that were misguided, ill timed and distracted the Task Force from the value added work we need to get done.

For example, members of the Task Force insisting on a design speed of 50 mph and a six lane highway without understanding the consequences of such a design.

I understand the selection of a particular design speed is influenced by the following: the functional classification of the highway, the character of the terrain, the density and character of adjacent land uses, the traffic volumes expected to use the highway and the economic and environmental considerations.

Therefore, a design that justifies an eight lane highway with shoulders and a sixty-five mph design speed as MassDOT is proposing must be presented in the context of the considerations mentioned above, as well as your rationale for the peak hour level of service you propose. In addition to address members of the Task Force who want to see a six lane highway with a design speed of 50 mph, a presentation is required to detail the consequences of such a design.

I would recommend that in order to build trust and transparency and to point us in the right direction, that the Task Force adopt a high level set of guiding principles which then could be parceled out to sub groups in order to develop greater specificity. This exercise would prevent scope creep and keep us all focused on the matters at hand.

I have put together an initial list which would be subject to amendment before a vote of the members.

Tony D'Isidoro

# Allston I-90 Interchange Improvement Project

## Guiding Principles

Adequate design speeds for freeway, arterial highways, collector and local roads to accommodate current and anticipated future traffic demands.

Reasonable and cost effective peak hour level of service (amount of congestion) for freeway, arterial highways, collector and local roads.

Increase safety and accessibility for all modes including improved intersection treatments at each intersection.

Coordinate the transportation system with the land uses so that people can choose to reduce their reliance on the automobile by living closer to work, living or working close to transit, and living in pedestrian and bicycle friendly areas, i.e., trails and sidewalks.

Design roadways such that they maximize the flexibility for future land use and access to parcels from multiple places throughout the district.

Provide multi-modal connectivity for existing neighborhoods to the Charles River, from Packard's Corner to North Allston and to surrounding areas.

Build West Station and provide multi-modal access.

Incorporate all electronic tolling.

A high quality and user-friendly pedestrian and cycle environment. This should apply throughout the project area and in connections to adjoining areas.

Improve conditions for residents impacted by I-90 including climate change, air quality, noise, water quality, soil quality, biodiversity and land taking.

Negotiate a statement of understanding between the various stakeholders managing the new transportation infrastructure in terms of future construction, ongoing maintenance and cleaning.

Public and private stakeholders should make every effort to ensure that whenever possible, partnerships can be formed with MassDOT that would enhance current transportation planning and provide additional benefits to the community.

Reclaim as much open and public space as possible.

An integrated approach to landscape design will be expected. This includes coordinating the overall layout, access, railings, hard landscaping, lighting services, street furniture and surface materials.

New development at entrance points to the area should be distinctive and memorable emphasizing a 'sense of arrival' and assisting people to orientate themselves.

The use of public art to reinforce a sense of place should be encouraged throughout the area.

Development should seek to enhance safety, security and surveillance and minimize opportunities for crime and anti-social behavior.

08/17/2014



Hi Nate,

Could you send to all members of the Task Force the email addresses associated with your August 14 email below?

Thanks  
Harry

On Thu, Aug 14, 2014 at 8:59 AM, Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis <[ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com](mailto:ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com)> wrote:

Good Morning All,

I hope this note finds everyone well and enjoying this sunshiny morning; a significant improvement on yesterday's murk. Thank you all for another productive session last night. Based on a request from one of our taskforce members, I am issuing the following email notification prior to distributing everyone's email addresses to Harry per his request:

If you **do not** write to me by the start of business on Monday the 18<sup>th</sup> of August your email address will be distributed. If you are comfortable with the distribution, **you do not need to take any action**. If anyone has questions or concerns, please feel free to be in touch.

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](http://www.hshassoc.com)**

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

**Please Note Our New Address**

Hi Harry,

Nate has reminded me of your request to release the e-mail addresses of each of the task force members from our last TF meeting. I do recall of your initial request a while back to which I responded no. So following this second request I did confer with MassDOT legal counsel. Direction was given to me by legal counsel that we are not to release the personal contact information of individual task force members. We can however release the professional contact information of task force members, as they are participating as representatives of an organization and therefore there is no privacy related issues.

With that said, I am allowing Nate to provide you with those e-mail addresses of the organization/elected representatives.

Thanks  
Mike O'D

Hi Bill,

I think it's about time I got back to you. Thank you for your recent inquiry and your attendance at last week's TF meeting. As we met with Cambridge residents back in May, I can certainly see the utility of having another session somewhere in Cambridge, perhaps the City Council Chamber again or possibly the Morse School, as we move along in our process. From a Cambridge perspective, it seems to me based on the comments we have received, that top-of-mind concerns for folks on that side of the river will be traffic and noise. If that's correct, and I invite you to help me add to that list, we should probably hold off on coming to Cambridge until we have our list of concepts shortlisted and perhaps initiated a noise study and some initial traffic information.

As to a meeting with Cambridge's traffic group, we have met with BTM, and there's no reason we couldn't meet with your team as well. It might be worth doing that one sooner so that thoughts from your traffic staff can help to inform the modeling being done by our team. Would sometime between September 3 and September 18 work for you? I suggest those dates because of our next TF meeting on 9/3 and our next Public Information meeting on September 18 at the Jackson Mann Community Center in Allston, by which time I am optimistic that there will be a shortlist of concepts.

Lastly, with regard to the proposed shifting of Soldiers' Field Road, we continue to work on making that part of the project as good as it can be within the timeframe and budget associated with the project. You, perhaps of all taskforce members, can understand some of the constructability, cost, and permitting issues associated with the more extreme of the possible approaches, but we are committed to investigating this aspect of the project fully and chasing down every angle given how important it is to the Allston community.

If you have any other questions don't hesitate to call.

Thanks  
Mike O'D

**From:** Deignan, Bill [<mailto:wdeignan@cambridgema.gov>]

**Sent:** Thursday, August 14, 2014 12:40 PM

**To:** O'Dowd, Michael (DOT)

**Cc:** Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis; Clippinger, Sue

**Subject:** next steps

Hi Michael-

I just wanted to be in touch after last night's meeting when you mentioned further public meetings in the fall. At the appropriate time, we would want to have another meeting in Cambridge and try to get more neighborhood attendance, so maybe having a meeting somewhere in Cambridgeport. I know that Carol O'Hare is not the only person there concerned about noise reduction and construction impacts.

Given that we have not yet gotten to choosing a concept to refine yet, I assume that we may have a few more un-scheduled meetings of the steering committee. It may also make sense to have a smaller meeting with other Cambridge officials once you have a firmer concept and some traffic analysis completed. I am copying Sue Clippinger here, Director of Traffic, Parking and Transportation who may attend one or more of the future Steering Committee meetings, and would be also very interested in seeing the concept and traffic analysis in a smaller meeting. Let me know when this would make sense.

It was very exciting to see the concepts last night which moved Soldiers Field Road, enlarged the parkland and improved the possibilities of multi-modal connections through the neighborhood and to the Grand Junction to Cambridge. Hopefully even more can be done in this respect as well as keeping the viaduct away from the river. Thanks again for going through all of this.

Best,  
Bill

Mike,

Please see attached. I would appreciate an email confirming your receipt of the attached letter.

Harry

On Thu, Aug 21, 2014 at 2:47 PM, O'Dowd, Michael (DOT) <[michael.o'dowd@state.ma.us](mailto:michael.o'dowd@state.ma.us)> wrote:

Hi Harry,

Nate has reminded me of your request to release the e-mail addresses of each of the task force members from our last TF meeting. I do recall of your initial request a while back to which I responded no. So following this second request I did confer with MassDOT legal counsel. Direction was given to me by legal counsel that we are not to release the personal contact information of individual task force members. We can however release the professional contact information of task force members, as they are participating as representatives of an organization and therefore there is no privacy related issues.

With that said, I am allowing Nate to provide you with those e-mail addresses of the organization/elected representatives.

Thanks

Mike O'D

Harry Mattison  
28 Mansfield St  
Allston, MA 02134-

1433

August 22, 2014

Michael O'Dowd Project Manager Highway Division MassDOT 10 Park Plaza Boston, MA  
02116

Delivery by Adobe PDF via email to michael.o'dowd@state.ma.us

Subject: Request for Contact Information of I-90 Allston Task Force Members

Dear Mr. O'Dowd:

I am receipt of your email to me dated August 21, 2014 at 2:47:57 PM on the above referenced subject. I appreciate receiving that latest response to my several attempts to obtain, simply: the name of each Task Force member and the email address (corporate, organizational, private, or otherwise) that they have provided to MassDOT for Task Force contact purposes.

I ask you, one last time, for a copy of those names and contact email address of my colleagues.

In your email to me sent earlier today as referenced above, you stated that: "[d]irection was given to me by legal counsel that we are not to release the personal contact information of individual task force members." If you again refuse to honor this request on that basis, please provide me with copy of such guidance that you received from legal counsel.

In addition, can you please provide me the name and contact info that your Division of MassDOT prefers be used to receive "Freedom of Information Act" (so-called) requests including, but not limited to, under the Massachusetts Public Records Law (M. G. L. Chapter 66, Section 10).

If I don't hear from the two of you by COB this Monday, August 25, 2014, then I will presume you continue to refuse to help me obtain the requested two documents directly from you.

Harry Mattison

Good Morning Harry,

I am in receipt of your letter and will forward to the appropriate personnel.

Thanks,  
Mike

**From:** Harry Mattison [[mailto:h\[REDACTED\]](mailto:h[REDACTED])]  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 21, 2014 5:12 PM  
**To:** O'Dowd, Michael (DOT)  
**Cc:** Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis ([ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com](mailto:ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com))  
**Subject:** Re: Task Force members

Mike,

Please see attached. I would appreciate an email confirming your receipt of the attached letter.

Harry

On Thu, Aug 21, 2014 at 2:47 PM, O'Dowd, Michael (DOT) <[michael.o'dowd@state.ma.us](mailto:michael.o'dowd@state.ma.us)> wrote:

Hi Harry,

Nate has reminded me of your request to release the e-mail addresses of each of the task force members from our last TF meeting. I do recall of your initial request a while back to which I responded no. So following this second request I did confer with MassDOT legal counsel. Direction was given to me by legal counsel that we are not to release the personal contact information of individual task force members. We can however release the professional contact information of task force members, as they are participating as representatives of an organization and therefore there is no privacy related issues.

With that said, I am allowing Nate to provide you with those e-mail addresses of the organization/elected representatives.

Thanks

Mike O'D



Good Morning Nate,

Hope you are having a beautiful day and looking forward to the start of one of our last summer weekends in just a few hours from now. It certainly has been a lovely August, though there was a bit of rain here in Allston last night. Was it wet at your home this morning?

Regarding your August 14 email below in which you gave Task Force members the opportunity to opt-out of having their email addresses shared:

I am writing to request the names of all people who replied to your August 14 email asking to opt-out of this email address distribution. To be clear, I am not asking for the email addresses of these people, only their names.

Best Wishes,  
Harry

On Thu, Aug 14, 2014 at 8:59 AM, Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis <[ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com](mailto:ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com)> wrote:

Good Morning All,

I hope this note finds everyone well and enjoying this sunshiny morning; a significant improvement on yesterday's murk. Thank you all for another productive session last night. Based on a request from one of our taskforce members, I am issuing the following email notification prior to distributing everyone's email addresses to Harry per his request:

If you **do not** write to me by the start of business on Monday the 18<sup>th</sup> of August your email address will be distributed. If you are comfortable with the distribution, **you do not need to take any action**. If anyone has questions or concerns, please feel free to be in touch.

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](http://www.hshassoc.com)**

Good Morning Harry,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good day. As it so happens, there was a bit of rain on my wife's auto when I packed her work bag into it this morning so I supposed we must have had an early sprinkle. It has been a pretty nice month although according to the news I hear it's supposed to get warm and muggy next week. Just in time for the kids to have to go back to school. I always feel bad for them on those toasty school buses.

On the business end of things, I have attached here per your request and Mike's instructions a contact list for members of the taskforce who are either elected officials, representatives of professional organizations such as ABC or AAA of Southern New England, and members of governmental bodies like the MBTA.

On the topic of who chose to opt out of having their email shared, we had nobody request that their data be kept private. The only reason the personal data is not being shared is because of the direction of MassDOT legal about which I understand you have requested clarification from Mike.

Have a good weekend; I hear Sunday is to be the pick of pack with plenty of sunshine.

Regards & Good Wishes,  
-Nate

**From:** Harry Mattison [[mailto:h\[REDACTED\]](mailto:h[REDACTED])]  
**Sent:** Friday, August 22, 2014 9:44 AM  
**To:** Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis  
**Cc:** Nick Gross; O'Dowd, Michael (DOT); Ed Ionata  
**Subject:** Re: Taskforce Email Addresses

Good Morning Nate,

Hope you are having a beautiful day and looking forward to the start of one of our last summer weekends in just a few hours from now. It certainly has been a lovely August, though there was a bit of rain here in Allston last night. Was it wet at your home this morning?

Regarding your August 14 email below in which you gave Task Force members the opportunity to opt-out of having their email addresses shared:

I am writing to request the names of all people who replied to your August 14 email asking to opt-out of this email address distribution. To be clear, I am not asking for the email addresses of these people, only their names.

Best Wishes,  
Harry

On Thu, Aug 14, 2014 at 8:59 AM, Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis <[ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com](mailto:ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com)> wrote:

Good Morning All,

I hope this note finds everyone well and enjoying this sunshiny morning; a significant improvement on yesterday's murk. Thank you all for another productive session last night. Based on a request from one of our taskforce members, I am issuing the following email notification prior to distributing everyone's email addresses to Harry per his request:

If you **do not** write to me by the start of business on Monday the 18<sup>th</sup> of August your email address will be distributed. If you are comfortable with the distribution, **you do not need to take any action**. If anyone has questions or concerns, please feel free to be in touch.

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](http://www.hshassoc.com)**

Beggan	Joseph	Harvard University	<a href="mailto:joseph_beggan@harvard.edu">joseph_beggan@harvard.edu</a>
Berkowitz	Glen	Livable Streets	<a href="mailto:glen@livablestreets.info">glen@livablestreets.info</a>
Bettinelli	Andrew	Office of Senator Brownsberger	<a href="mailto:andrew.bettinelli@masenate.gov">andrew.bettinelli@masenate.gov</a>
Brownsberger	Will	Senator	<a href="mailto:william.brownsberger@masenate.gov">william.brownsberger@masenate.gov</a>
Bushnell	Steve	Office of Senator DiDomenico	<a href="mailto:stephen.bushnell@state.ma.us">stephen.bushnell@state.ma.us</a>
Cashman	Craig	Office of Representative Moran	<a href="mailto:craig.cashman@state.ma.us">craig.cashman@state.ma.us</a>
Ciommo	Mark	City Councilor	<a href="mailto:mark.ciommo@cityofboston.gov">mark.ciommo@cityofboston.gov</a>
Clemons	Nick	Office of Congressman Kennedy	<a href="mailto:nick.clemons@mail.house.gov">nick.clemons@mail.house.gov</a>
Curley	Jim	Office of Representative Honan	<a href="mailto:james.curley@mahouse.gov">james.curley@mahouse.gov</a>
Deignan	Bill	City of Cambridge	<a href="mailto:bdeignan@cambridgema.gov">bdeignan@cambridgema.gov</a>
DiDomenico	Sal	Senator	<a href="mailto:sal.didomenico@masenate.gov">sal.didomenico@masenate.gov</a>
Dimino	Richard	A Better City	<a href="mailto:rdimino@abettercity.org">rdimino@abettercity.org</a>
Doherty	Brian	Boston Building Trades Council	<a href="mailto:briandoherty@metrobuiltstrades.com">briandoherty@metrobuiltstrades.com</a>
Freedman	Nicole	Boston Bikes	<a href="mailto:nicole.freedman@boston.gov">nicole.freedman@boston.gov</a>
Gillooly	James	Boston Transportation Department	<a href="mailto:james.gillooly@cityofboston.gov">james.gillooly@cityofboston.gov</a>
Gupta	Vineet	Boston Transportation Department	<a href="mailto:vineet.gupta@cityofboston.gov">vineet.gupta@cityofboston.gov</a>
Handley	Mark	Office of City Councilor Ciommo	<a href="mailto:mark.handley@boston.gov">mark.handley@boston.gov</a>
Honan	Kevin	Representative	<a href="mailto:kevin.honan@mahouse.gov">kevin.honan@mahouse.gov</a>
Houghton	Bruce	Houghton Chemical	<a href="mailto:bhoughton@houghton.com">bhoughton@houghton.com</a>
Jones	Stephen	MBTA	<a href="mailto:ssjones@mbta.com">ssjones@mbta.com</a>
Laadt	John	Mayor's Office of Neighborhood Services	<a href="mailto:john.laadt@boston.gov">john.laadt@boston.gov</a>
Landman	Wendy	Walk Boston	<a href="mailto:wlandman@walkboston.org">wlandman@walkboston.org</a>
Leary	Elizabeth	Boston University	<a href="mailto:erleary@bu.edu">erleary@bu.edu</a>

Loutzenheiser	David	Metropolitan Area Planning Council	<a href="mailto:dloutzenheiser@mapc.org">dloutzenheiser@mapc.org</a>
Maguire	Mary	Triple AAA	<a href="mailto:mmaguire@aaa-ne.com">mmaguire@aaa-ne.com</a>
Moran	Michael	Representative	<a href="mailto:michael.moran@mahouse.gov">michael.moran@mahouse.gov</a>
Nally	Tom	A Better City	<a href="mailto:tnally@abettercity.org">tnally@abettercity.org</a>
Nelson	Paul	MASCO	<a href="mailto:pnelson@masco.harvard.edu">pnelson@masco.harvard.edu</a>
Olsen	Alana	Allston Village Main Streets	<a href="mailto:alana@allstonvillage.com">alana@allstonvillage.com</a>
Orlant	Joe	Department of Conservation and Recreation	<a href="mailto:joe.orlant@state.ma.us">joe.orlant@state.ma.us</a>
Pourbaix	John	Construction Industries of Massachusetts	<a href="mailto:jpourbaix@cimass.org">jpourbaix@cimass.org</a>
Rasmussen	Susanne	City of Cambridge	<a href="mailto:srasmussen@cambridgema.gov">srasmussen@cambridgema.gov</a>
Read	Tad	Boston Redevelopment Authority	<a href="mailto:john.read.bra@cityofboston.gov">john.read.bra@cityofboston.gov</a>
Silveira	Steve	Boston University	<a href="mailto:sjsilveira@mlstrategies.com">sjsilveira@mlstrategies.com</a>
Watson	David	MassBike	<a href="mailto:david@massbike.org">david@massbike.org</a>
Wright	Kevin	Federal Highway Administration	<a href="mailto:kevin.wright@dot.gov">kevin.wright@dot.gov</a>
Zywien	Jillian	Mass Motor Association	<a href="mailto:jzywien@mass-trucking.org">jzywien@mass-trucking.org</a>

Good Afternoon Anthony,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good day. Thank you for your note and more generally your gentlemanly presence on the taskforce first as a substitute and now a fully-fledged member. I can certainly appreciate your concerns regarding the pacing and direction of taskforce discussion. I don't know how many taskforces you have sat on, but I've staffed many over both my career as a consultant to the non-profit sector and the transportation field, and what you saw the other night is by no means untypical of what often happens in such processes. Group members often fixate on a given idea and it becomes a major topic of discussion. How much you let a taskforce have its head, so to speak, is always a balancing act for any moderator: push for the agenda too little and you get nothing done, push for it too hard and you run the risk of appearing unwilling to consider things important to the group. From my own perspective, I would say Ed has been doing a solid job of stewarding us along and while it may appear hard to see at times, we are making progress.

In terms of the discussion of a six-lane viaduct versus an eight-lane viaduct, a meeting regarding traffic is something we are looking at holding within the next session or two. While MassDOT certainly sees improvements to Cambridge Street and the Paul Dudley White pathway as important along with creating the conditions for West Station and its access by all modes, the centerpiece of the project is the I-90 viaduct and its abutting interchange. Ensuring that they work is paramount since if they don't, there will be a detriment to the neighborhood as frustrated drivers bail off the highway and seek alternate routes through Allston and damage to Turnpike users who should be able to use their highway with a degree of confidence in its operation. Please do rest assured that traffic is top of mind for us and that we'll walk you through it soon.

With regard to some guiding principles, I'd refer you back to slide 4 of the presentation available at

<https://www.massdot.state.ma.us/Portals/8/docs/HighlightedProjects/AllstonInterchange/taskPresentation052114.pdf>. These are the points of overlap between DOT and community goals for the project and generally speaking, these are the principles the agency has been following in designing the project and integrating taskforce and resident input. In addition, having recently gone through some significant effort in assisting the group working on the latest draft for the evaluation criteria, I can tell you that those criteria generally can be clustered under the elements listed on the PowerPoint slide mentioned above. One thing I have noted during this process is that often, MassDOT and the community say the same thing with slightly different language. Let me give you some examples based on your own suggested principles. I list them in pairs with yours on top:

- Adequate design speeds for freeway, arterial highways, collector and local roads to accommodate current and anticipated future traffic demands.
- Basically, no different. MassDOT and its design team are in complete agreement with you on this and might even phrase it similarly. A major effort associated with this project, and one we will share with you, is modeling of future traffic conditions by the Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS) of the Boston MPO.
- Reasonable and cost effective peak hour level of service (amount of congestion) for freeway, arterial highways, collector and local roads.

- See my previous response and add to it that not only will we look at level of service (LOS) for cars, but also for bicycles and pedestrians. Protecting your local roads is of particular importance to MassDOT. Nobody wants to induce cut-through traffic on your streets because our interchange isn't working right.
- Increase safety and accessibility for all modes including improved intersection treatments at each intersection.
- Agreed. That's definitely already a part of our thinking as I hope you saw when you looked at our initial proposal for Cambridge Street. I would hasten to note that the exact refinements for how we accomplish that will be worked out in the design phase of this project which begins after we select an interchange option for the environmental process, but the principle is agreed to and held by DOT as well. In keeping with our GreenDOT principles, we see bicycle and pedestrian safety and comfort improvements on Cambridge Street as an integral part of this project.
- Coordinate the transportation system with the land uses so that people can choose to reduce their reliance on the automobile by living closer to work, living or working close to transit, and living in pedestrian and bicycle friendly areas, i.e., trails and sidewalks.
- MassDOT's purview is transportation. As such, we can really only address transportation issues. We are attacking automobile dependency in this project through incorporation of the shared use path the community wants to see, proposing cycle tracks on Cambridge Street, and planning for West Station. This is in keeping with our agency's mode shift goal of pushing transportation consumers to make more of their trips by cycling, walking, or transit. However, we cannot dictate the uses of the land inside the interchange parcel outside of those areas used for transportation. This is why we are working with the BRA to ensure that our transportation decisions do not undermine future flexibility in land use decisions.
- Design roadways such that they maximize the flexibility for future land use and access to parcels from multiple places throughout the district.
- Agreed with the clarification that because our project does not directly address future structures, we cannot be entirely sure about the placement of doors, loading docks etc., but maximum flexibility of future land use is one of our team's guiding principles.
- Build West Station and provide multi-modal access.
- Right now, our project includes planning for and designing West Station. We are committed to designing bicycle and pedestrian access to the station from the Boston University side, and full access for all modes from the Cambridge Street side as you heard at the taskforce session on the evening of 8/13.
- Incorporate all electronic tolling.
- AET is being implemented by another existing MassDOT project as Mark Gravalles mentioned at the taskforce session last week. That said, our project is coordinated with that one and we are planning our interchange as all-electric if you will.
- Public and private stakeholders should make every effort to ensure that whenever possible, partnerships can be formed with MassDOT that would enhance current transportation planning and provide additional benefits to the community.
- MassDOT regularly considers public private partnerships in the interest of advancing the needs of its customer base.
- A high quality and user-friendly pedestrian and cycle environment. This should apply throughout the project area and in connections to adjoining areas.
- Agreed and see my above reply regarding Cambridge Street and the shared use pathway. Providing rational and safe connections to abutting infrastructure, particularly bicycle and pedestrian is always a goal of MassDOT on any project.
- Improve conditions for residents impacted by I-90 including climate change, air quality, noise, water quality, soil quality, biodiversity and land taking.

- We will conduct a full environmental study for this project through the MEPA/NEPA process. Certainly, we are committed to making things no worse than they are today. As with any MassDOT project, we seek to minimize land takings.
- Negotiate a statement of understanding between the various stakeholders managing the new transportation infrastructure in terms of future construction, ongoing maintenance and cleaning.
- I recall you asking this question back during taskforce meeting #2. As Mark Gravalles and Vineet Gupta explained that evening, such MOU's or MOA's are now becoming increasingly common between MassDOT, the City of Boston, and DCR where the agencies jurisdictions overlap or intersect. That said, the negotiation of that document would take place close to the end of the design process once the end results of our project are clearly visible and the lines sharply drawn. This isn't forgotten and you can expect to see it happen, but probably not until sometime in 2016/17. As you can imagine, a final design is needed before we declare who will care for what.
- Reclaim as much open and public space as possible.
- This is one where we are in alignment generally speaking, but MassDOT flips the equation on its head since it's a transportation agency. Our goal is to use as little land as possible to build a transportation system which is safe and effective allowing the community to use more of it for the uses they see as appropriate for their neighborhood.
- An integrated approach to landscape design will be expected. This includes coordinating the overall layout, access, railings, hard landscaping, lighting services, street furniture and surface materials.
- New development at entrance points to the area should be distinctive and memorable emphasizing a 'sense of arrival' and assisting people to orientate themselves.
- The use of public art to reinforce a sense of place should be encouraged throughout the area.
- Development should seek to enhance safety, security and surveillance and minimize opportunities for crime and anti-social behavior.
- These bullets fall partially within DOT's bailiwick for this project. When it comes to the sections of the project that MassDOT will undertake, the interchange and its approaches, Cambridge Street, the shared-use pathway MassDOT will address landscaping and materials issues. However, these concerns are typically addressed once the 25% design level has been reached and are looked at even more thoroughly after the 75% design level has been reached. The idea of creating gateway spaces through landscaping and materials also comes during these later phases of design. MassDOT can certainly provide spaces for public art and in some cases even installs footings for future pieces, however, the agency itself does not get into the business of casting sculptures, painting murals etc. Again, that's a design detail for a much later date, however, if you have specific ideas, please give them to me. I give you my word that they won't get lost. Creating good records of the projects on which I work is my bread and butter so I can assure you they will make it into the later stages of design if you give them to me now. Lastly, in terms of how future developments are set up, that's a land use question and is between the community, BRA, and the property owner. In terms of the roadways, DOT will work to ensure they are safe and friendly for all modes. Likewise, we will look to ensure that we are not creating spaces, for example a dark corner under a bridge without lighting, where shady dealings would feel at home.

So, all of this is to say that your principles and those of MassDOT are not far off at all. In fact, I am personally quite pleased looking at the above list to see just how close the lists on with a few exceptions. I hope that as you look all of this over, it gives you an increased measure of comfort as well. If you need anything further, please don't hesitate to be in touch by telephone or email.



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](http://www.hshassoc.com)**

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

**Please Note Our New Address**

Hi Nate,

I know we talked about a potential tour of the Beacon Park Yards the afternoon before the next meeting. Was there any luck in getting permission for that?

Thanks,  
-Paul

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

**Sent:** Tuesday, August 26, 2014 5:07 PM

**To:** Nick Gross

**Cc:** Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis; O'Dowd, Michael (DOT); Ed Ionata; [donny.dailey@state.ma.us](mailto:donny.dailey@state.ma.us)

**Subject:** Allston Interchange Improvement Project Taskforce Session Reminder

Good Afternoon All,

I hope this note finds everyone well and not saddened too much the approaching end of summer.

A few of you have contacted me requesting a reminder regarding the upcoming date of our next taskforce session. As was noted at our meeting on 8/13, our upcoming meeting will be on Wednesday, September 3<sup>rd</sup>. That's a week from tomorrow. We will convene in the Fiorentino Center at the usual 6PM time. An agenda and the minutes of 8/13 will follow 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](http://www.hshassoc.com)**

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

**Please Note Our New Address**

Hi Nate,

Thank you for your response.

I will see you at the next task force meeting.

Tony D'Isidoro

Good Morning Paul,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good day. Mike is in fact working on getting that tour set up although at last count I understand CSX was dragging its heels a bit. Let me inquire and I'll see if I can get you some more information.

Regards & Good Wishes,  
-Nate

**From:** Paul Nelson [<mailto:pnelson@masco.harvard.edu>]

**Sent:** Wednesday, August 27, 2014 8:14 AM

**To:** Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis

**Subject:** RE: Allston Interchange Improvement Project Taskforce Session Reminder

Hi Nate,

I know we talked about a potential tour of the Beacon Park Yards the afternoon before the next meeting. Was there any luck in getting permission for that?

Thanks,  
-Paul

Hi Nate,

Thanks for the reminder about the meeting on September 3rd. Unfortunately, I have a conflict that evening and will not be able to attend. In my place, I'd like to have Carol Martinez participate as my proxy. She is copied here and looks forward to taking part in the conversation.

best,  
paola

On Tue, Aug 26, 2014 at 5:07 PM, Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis <[ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com](mailto:ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com)> wrote:

Good Afternoon All,

I hope this note finds everyone well and not saddened too much the approaching end of summer.

A few of you have contacted me requesting a reminder regarding the upcoming date of our next taskforce session. As was noted at our meeting on 8/13, our upcoming meeting will be on Wednesday, September 3<sup>rd</sup>. That's a week from tomorrow. We will convene in the Fiorentino Center at the usual 6PM time. An agenda and the minutes of 8/13 will follow 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](tel:617.348.3336) **main:** [617-482-7080](tel:617-482-7080)

**[www.hshassoc.com](http://www.hshassoc.com)**

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

**Please Note Our New Address**

Good Afternoon Carol and Paola,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good day. Carol, when you come into the meeting, please stop by and see me at the sign-in desk. I will check you in and give you any materials we are providing that evening. Paola, thanks for keeping me in the loop.

Regards & Good Wishes,  
-Nate

Hi All,

Thanks again for joining the bike ride last week. (Nate, can you please forward to George?). I had a great time.

Here's a GoogleMap of the (winding) route we took: <https://goo.gl/maps/2G1b9>

I thought the ride was illuminating on several fronts, and I gained a lot of insight as to the challenges and limitations with the project, esp regarding ramp heights, viaduct expansion and construction phasing, Harvard's involvement and the crucial need for Stadium Way, general traffic mitigation, and I feel I have a better sense of some of the tough questions Mike is asking himself and his team.

Feel free to get back to any of us with particular issues, concerns, or particularly sticky problems you're wrestling with -- for example should the bike path go through tunnels vs. over intersections. (my opinion is, fewer intersections will make it safer for more novice bikers, which is exactly who we want to attract to the river pathway).

I'm sure we'll be discussing the ride for a while, but I do want to point out one question Mike asked that stuck with me: do we really need the Mansfield St stairs/ramp if we'd have a much better Franklin St Footbridge? And to that the answer is resoundingly YES, those stairs/ramp serve a distinct part of the neighborhood, and if we're going to reconnect the two neighborhoods, we need MORE rather than fewer access points, we need as many crossings as possible to take us up and over Cambridge St and the Pike.

I hope we all got a sense of how the Pike really cuts through Allston, separating the two Franklin Streets, only to be accessed with steep bridges with inadequate sidewalks and dangerous sight lines.

And how the street scape of N. Harvard St and Windom St, including Hooker Park, differ from Cambridge Street. We are very concerned this project will bring higher capacity roads through our neighborhood, we feel the need to preserve North Allston from turning into a through-way. A top priority is our quiet, residential streets.

And, for your inspiration, I'm attaching the photo I have on my desktop that brings the beauty of the rail yard into focus. The photo was taken by local-ish resident Craig Collins.

Thanks again, truly, for taking the time to relate to us on two-wheels.

Best,  
Galen

ps. See you on 9/3. Perhaps you can discuss your thoughts on the bike ride in the opening remarks?





Thanks Galen, that is a great photo.

We appreciated the ride through your neighborhood and bringing attention to some of your concerns and interests including the best cycle path between Lincoln Street and Soldiers Field Road being the most direct and least interrupted. I do think the site visit does help shed light on some of the complexities we face with trying to meet all goals of the task force members. We strive to strike a balance.

I am still trying to coordinate with CSX and schedule a time for the September 3<sup>rd</sup> site visit for the TF members. I am hopeful I will have it done by tomorrow and send out an invite.

Thanks

Mike O

Good Afternoon Harry,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good day. As you will recall, a while back you sent the project team a broad-ranging email entitled “Comments, Questions, and Observations about the Allston I-90 Interchange Improvement Project.” Over the past several weeks, the project team has been working to provide you with answers to the many “comments, questions, and observations,” contained in the original note and I wanted to get them to you in advance of tomorrow’s site walk, which I hope you will be able to attend, and taskforce session. Your questions and the answers provided follow below. For ease of reading, answers are provided in bold-face.

Regards & Good Wishes,  
-Nate

1. Design standards
  - a. What clearance heights are being used for:
    - i. Vehicles on the Mass Pike - A minimum vertical clearance of **14’ 6” from road surface to any overhead structure**
    - ii. Rail – A minimum vertical clearance of **18’ 6” from top of rail to any overhead structure.**
  - b. If these standards differ from the constraints imposed by the existing Mass Pike tunnel under the Prudential, please explain the rationale for such differences – **MassDOT is seeking to comply with current Federal highway and rail design policy and will explore potential exceptions if design criteria cannot be met while balancing the overall needs of the project and avoiding creating constraints for future potential improvements in adjacent portions of the highway and rail system.**
  - c. What is the maximum allowable incline slope for the mainline highway –**The recommended maximum is 4% Slope**
2. 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? - **The precise location is being explored through the development of the alternatives that have been presented and will be refined through the design process. It is affected by the final location of Soldiers Field Road and the structural elements of the I-90 viaduct and will be the topic of ongoing development and discussion. The goal is to achieve a shared use path connection meeting or exceeding AASHTO, NACTO, AAB and other applicable standards.**
  - 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? – **Similar to the eastern end of the path, the**

**western connection is affected by the development of the alternatives and the final location and configuration of Cambridge Street.**

- c. What is the cross-sectional allocation of space for cyclists, pedestrians, landscaping, lighting, and street furniture? - **Cross-sectional allocation is not yet determined and is dependent upon context sensitivity. The project is in the pre-25% design stage and working towards environmental permitting. Cross-sectional allocation is a design detail to be worked out between 25% and final design. The cross-section will take into consideration the MassDOT PDDG, complete streets, modern multi-modal design details, & the Healthy Transportation Policy.**

3. Soldiers Field Road

- a. Can two lanes of Soldiers Field Road be moved under the Mass Pike viaduct? - **Two conceptual studies for moving Soldiers Field Road to accommodate the proposed staging and replacement of the existing I-90 viaduct and interchange (one exploring moving partially under the proposed viaduct and one exploring moving completely below the viaduct) have been presented to the Task Force. Final determination will require significant engineering study. The need for moving Soldiers Field Road will evolve out of the interchange alternatives remaining under consideration and will undergo similar selection criteria evaluation.**

How many acres of new parkland between Soldiers Field Road and the Charles River would this create? – **Further engineering study is required to confirm the final location of the viaduct, interchange roadways, and Soldiers Field Road before an estimate of how much land space will exist between Soldiers Field Road and the Charles River.**

- b. Please explain the geometric constraints regarding moving Soldiers Field Road away from the river to create new parkland between the DoubleTree Hotel and Mass Pike viaduct. – **The geometric constraints include the location of existing and proposed structural columns required for the viaduct, the roadway geometry required for Soldiers Field Road, and the requirement to minimize utilizing private property without demonstrated need.**
  - i. What is the maximum number of acres of new parkland that can be created while also having safe roadway geometry? – **See Response to Item 3.**
  - ii. What is the path of a relocated Soldiers Field Road that achieves this maximum amount of parkland – **See Response to Item 3.**

- c. 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? –**Please clarify the question.**

#### 4. Tolling

- a. In what locations is it possible to place toll gantries?
- b. In each of the options currently being evaluated by MassDOT, where are the gantries located?
- c. In what additional locations could gantries be located (such as, but not limited to, the entrance to

Soldiers Field Road) to help achieve project goals such as:

- i. Safety

i

i.

C

o

n

n

e

c

ti

v

it

y

ii

i.

Q

u

a

li

t

y

o

f

L  
if  
e  
i  
v  
.

G  
r  
e  
e  
n  
D  
O  
T

**A separate MassDOT project is providing the evaluation, design and implementation of the All Electronic Tolling (AET) system. The locations of the tolling gantries are located at the eastern and western edges of the Allston Interchange project area approximately at Franklin Street and Commonwealth Avenue and are not in conflict with Soldiers Field Road. Beyond creating the opportunity to remove the existing Allston toll lanes and booths, the AET project does not directly impact the concepts under consideration for the Allston Interchange.**

5. Number of travel lanes on mainline Turnpike and viaduct
  - a. MassDOT analysis suggests that during replacement of the Commonwealth Avenue deck over the Turnpike, the three lanes remaining open in the peak hour should be able to accommodate the volume without additional congestion. Therefore, why would more than 3 lanes be needed for the mainline Turnpike and viaduct being rebuilt as part of this project? - **Traffic analysis of the temporary three-lane configuration in use during Commonwealth Avenue construction indicates that additional congestion will occur – a situation that is unavoidable during necessary construction activities. Four lanes are needed to effectively accommodate the interchange operations in the final configuration.**

6. Cambridge Street

- a. Which design options would require the reconstruction of the overpass between Lincoln St and Harvard Ave? - **Continuing engineering and traffic analysis will determine the extent of Cambridge Street overpass reconstruction.**
- b. What are the pros and cons of a planted median on Cambridge Street east of Lincoln St? - **Briefly stated the Cons are greater use of right of way, longer crosswalks, and greater maintenance and the Pros are additional green space, a larger divider between traffic lanes, break in the expanse of pavement, and safer left turn lane pockets.**
- c. What is MassDOT's definition of "worldclass bicycle accommodations"? – MassDOT seeks to achieve "worldclass" transportation facilities for all of its users whether they be cyclists, pedestrians, motor vehicle operators, or transit riders. Bicycle access must safely and effectively accommodate all levels of cyclists from novice to expert and attract new users.  
**The term "world class" is not typically used by MassDOT. For an understanding of the standards to which we adhere when designing new bicycle facilities, please see the response to question 2a.**

7. Franklin Street pedestrian overpass

- a. What are MassDOT's plans to reconstruct this overpass
  - i. If the associated Cambridge St overpass is rebuilt
  - ii. If the associated Cambridge St overpass is not rebuilt
- b. Through what process and on what schedule will this new pedestrian overpass be designed?

**The Multi-Modal Allston Interchange Project is evaluating pedestrian and bicycle connections and alignments between North Allston and Allston Village and the project will include improved pedestrian and bicycle connections that are integrated with the concepts under consideration.**

8. Access to the Mass Pike

- a. Please describe 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

**Preliminary traffic analyses for the remaining alternatives are under preparation and will be presented to the Task Force, including an explanation of traffic performance at the Western Avenue Bridge intersection.**

9. Threedimensional information and visualization of the proposed options a. For all options currently being evaluated please provide:

i. Threedimensional animated, interactive visaulizations comparable to what can be created with <http://www.citiesinmotion2.com/> showing movement of all modes of travel

ii. Crosssection views at all intersections

**Cross sectional drawings of the alternatives remaining in consideration are being developed. Once the range of alternatives is narrowed to a preferred alternative or alternatives, a 3 dimensional computer model will be developed to assist in the final evaluation and design of the preferred alternative.**

10. To ensure that future development is being properly considered, please show at least two scenarios for how a full buildout would integrate with each option. **MassDOT seeks to preserve future development flexibility for the privately-held properties encompassing the Allston Interchange, while minimizing the extent of right-of-way use. The final development configuration of these properties is subject to the owner's plans and regulated by Commonwealth and City of Boston agencies.**

11. Viaduct

a. Please provide a comparative analysis of the concepts presented by Glen Berkowitz on June

25 and those presented by MassDOT on June 11 including but not limited to:

i. Cost

ii. Safety during construction

iii. Quality of completed highway

iv. Compatibility with relocating Soldiers Field Road to increase parkland

**Glen Berkowitz, representing the Livable Streets Alliance, provided a detailed explanation of alternative viaduct concepts for MassDOT and the design team in a separate workshop meeting. The design team is considering his concepts in the development of the alternatives. As noted in the Task Force, the final design and width of the viaduct will be equally applied to all of the alternatives remaining in consideration, and optimizing viaduct design will continue beyond the selection of a preferred alternative.**

12. Train Storage Yard

a. Please note that the Task Force has not endorsed having Allston be home to this facility – **So Noted.**

b. Please describe the structure that will support the bus access loop for West Station that is proposed to travel above the train storage yard – **Conceptual development is underway and the structure is likely to be a combination of viaducts and embankments to support a future West Station construction. .**

i. What would be required (both physically and financially) to extend this structure so that the proposed storage yard, if built, could be decked over to:

1. Create public greenspace above the rail yard and/or

2. Allow future construction of buildings above the rail storage yard ii. How many acres of parkland or developable land would this create?

**The Allston Interchange project is being carefully planned and designed to accommodate multi-modal transportation uses while accounting for flexibility of future land uses by the owner.**

13. Rail access to Houghton Chemical

a. Can this be moved west (away from the river) so as to be compatible with the relocation of

Soldiers Field Road?

b. How will this rail line intersect with active roadways?

**Coordination with the MBTA Rail Yard design team is underway and there may be some flexibility in adjusting the Houghton Chemical rail line. Roadway crossings could be achieved with at-grade crossings due to the limited use of the rail line. Any adjustment of the rail line would require sensitivity to right-of-way impacts.**

14. Connections from the south

a. Current design options from MassDOT show extension of Malvern St and Babcock St. Please show how one or both of these extended roads can include cars.

b. Current options show an extension of Malvern Street that deadends at West Station. Please show how this road can extend to Cambridge Street

**Connections to Malvern and Babcock Streets are being considered solely for pedestrians and bicycles. The design of the Interchange seeks to avoid introducing traffic on to neighborhood streets as has been noted as important by the taskforce. Pedestrian and bicycle connections between Cambridge Street to and through West Station to Malvern and Babcock Streets may require the use of elevators or ramp-ways, depending on the selected interchange alternative.**

15. Grand Junction Trail

a. Please show how the proposed shared use path can connect to the Cambridge banks of the

Charles River via the Grand Junction railroad bridge or a new bridge

**This project will not preclude the opportunity for a future shared use path that can connect to the Cambridge banks of the Charles River.**

16. Neighborhood impacts & Quality of life

a. All options move the mainline highway closer to the Pratt and Ashford Street neighborhood, create a new rail facility, and West Station. Please explain your



plans to mitigate the associated noise and air pollution impacts with sound barrier walls, tree planting, and other solutions.

**A proposed West Station's impacts will be analyzed in detail in future environmental review filing beginning with an Environmental Notification Form to be filed on the Allston Interchange project. Development of the station concept is ongoing and will include an analysis of noise and air quality impact. While the location of West Station affects the interchange concepts under consideration, the design details of the station can be equally applied under all of the various concepts.**

- b. The quality of life on Lincoln Street has suffered since the Mass Pike was built because of the impacts of the highway. How can this be addressed as part of this project? **The purpose of the Task Force is to inform and advise MassDOT on important community and stakeholder issues affecting the development of an implementable design for the Allston interchange, taking full advantage of the Task Force member's local knowledge and expertise.**

17. Mainline highway (between viaduct and Cambridge Street)

- a. What portion of this highway be partially or fully depressed? Doing so would reduce its impact on the community, increase community cohesion, and improve connectivity over the highway. **The concept of depressing the mainline has undergone a similar evaluation of criteria as other alternatives and determined to be impracticable within the current constraints.**
- b. What is the height of the water table in this area? **It is approximately at the elevation of the Charles River. Investigations are underway to determine precise local elevations**
- c. The most recently published MassDOT options (3G and 3H) show a road leading from the mainline highway to Sorrento Street. Sorrento is a small, residential, street that dead-ends at the Hooker-Sorrento Playground that seems ill-suited to an alignment with a major new road. **The Sorrento Street intersection concept is driven by the available distance between intersections and the desire to limit the addition of more intersections and does not necessitate reopening Sorrento Street for vehicular through movements**

18. Proposed roadway (by others)

- a. When will the roads with this designation be constructed? **The results of ongoing traffic analysis may indicate that roadways designated "by others" will be necessary for acceptable functioning of some interchange alternatives and, if selected, could be constructed by the property owner or become part of the project constructed by MassDOT.**

19. Please provide the date, time, and list of all attendees for all meetings between MassDOT (and its consultants) and employees and consultants of the Boston 2024 Organizing Committee.

**The design team for this project has not participated in any discussions with the Boston 2024 Organizing Committee.**

**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](http://www.hshassoc.com)

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

**Please Note Our New Address**