

From: Alan Gordon [<mailto:axyzgordon@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, February 04, 2018 2:39 PM
To: Strysky, Alexander (EEA)
Cc: advocacy@thecharles.org
Subject: Comments on the MassDOT I-90 Interchange Reconstruction Project

Dear Secretary Beaton,

I am writing to you about the Mass Pike reconstruction project. While the email below is text that is suggested to me by the Charles River Conservancy, I feel strongly about this. I have lived in the Boston area for the last 35 years. I went to college in Cambridge, and often walked and ran along the river. I have lived in Cambridge after college, and now live in Newton. I have worked in Cambridge for the last 15 years, and often drive on the Pike, walk along the river, cross the river, bike along the river path, etc. The opportunity you have not ONLY to improve travel on the Pike by car, but ALSO to improve the entire area through better planning and implementation is significant. This is truly an opportunity that you should not overlook and it would be unfortunate if you missed it.

The reconstruction of the Mass Pike in Allston will define our region for decades to come. There must be major transformations of Massachusetts' transportation system to make it far more climate-friendly, socially equitable, and suited to the 21st century economy, and Allston must show a bold commitment to these changes. Unfortunately, the project as currently proposed in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) fails to do so. I therefore ask that you require MassDOT to submit a Supplemental DEIR to address these deficiencies and study the items described below.

Under the Global Warming Solutions Act, Massachusetts must cut its greenhouse gas emissions by 25% below 1990 emissions levels by 2020 and at least an 80% reduction by 2050. I appreciate that in 2017 you and MassDOT Secretary Pollack held a series of listening sessions to discuss reducing greenhouse gas emissions from the transportation sector. While the Allston DEIR is an improvement over the existing dreadful conditions, it recreates an outdated 20th-century car-centered transportation system incompatible with such a reduction in emissions. AGO-1

The DEIR is also inconsistent with the City of Boston's Imagine Boston 2030 and Go Boston 2030 plans and the Boston Planning and Redevelopment Agency's I-90 Allston Placemaking Study. AGO-2 While it is commendable that the MBTA is in the process of launching a Commuter Rail Vision Study, it is unacceptable that MassDOT's Allston DEIR perpetuates out-dated thinking (using valuable acres of urban land for rail layup) while it should instead support better mid-day service, construction of West Station in the first phase, and steps to move forward with passenger service on the Grand Junction. AGO3-5

What the Allston I-90 must do is create a 21st-century network of transit by bus, rail, and bike that also dramatically improves active transportation in the Charles River Parklands. I ask that you require MassDOT to submit a Supplemental DEIR to address these issues:

1. Build West Station with two-track service in the first phase of the project AGO-6
2. Rebuild the highway at-grade in the "throat" using the A Better City (ABC) concept AGO-7
3. Study how separate paths for biking and walking can be provided in the entire section of Charles AGO-8

River Parkland from the River Street Bridge to the BU Bridge, including the "throat," for all viaduct and at-grade options. This study should include consideration of a boardwalk (both temporarily during construction and as a permanent structure) and the use of fill, and how to mitigate impacts on the river by restoring today's degraded bank into a "living shoreline" of native vegetation. Consider how this can be done both as part of the I-90 project or in a subsequent project. AGO-9

4. Construct new footbridges near Agganis Way and Amory Street that cross over the highway and link Commonwealth Ave in Boston and Brookline to the Charles River parkland to further encourage commutes by bike AGO-10

5. Reduce the number of lanes in streets throughout the proposed urban grid to create a safer environment more conducive to walking and biking. AGO-11

6. Introduce new North-South bus routes that cross over the highway and connect North Allston and Commonwealth Ave, and by extension Harvard Square and Longwood. AGO-12

7. Fully evaluate the possibility of shifting the rail lines away from the abutting homes and creating an at-grade, off-road walk/bike path from the Regina Pizzeria end of Harvard Ave to West Station AGO-13

and over the at-grade highway to the Charles River. A simple barrier wall is insufficient mitigation for the Environmental Justice community that is so heavily burdened by the air pollution, noise pollution, and vibration impacts of the highway and rail. AGO-14

8. Study how to upgrade the Grand Junction railroad linking West Station, Kendall Sq. and North Station, and enhance the Grand Junction Bridge to become a walk/bike connection between the Charles River parkland in Cambridge and Boston. AGO-15

9. Evaluate increasing off-peak commuter rail service between Worcester and Boston-obviating the need to build a layover area to store idle trains in Allston. AGO-16

Sincerely,

Alan Gordon
47 Caroline Park
Newton, MA 02468

From: Anne Trecker [<mailto:annetrecker@gmail.com>]

Sent: Sunday, February 04, 2018 3:53 PM

To: Strysky, Alexander (EEA)

Subject: Support for funding public transportation component of repairs to the MASS PIKE.

To MASSDOT:

Matthew Beaton, Secretary of Energy & Environmental Affairs
c/o Alex Strysky, EEA # 15278

alexander.strysky@state.ma.us

Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs (EEA)

100 Cambridge St., Suite 900 (9th Floor)

Attn: MEPA Office

Boston MA, 02114

Dear Mr. Beaton & Mr. Strysky,

We write to you in strong support of fully funding the construction of the proposed West Station in the first phase of the Mass Pike reconstruction in the Beacon Park Yards. Simultaneous improvements in access for pedestrian, bicycle and public transport should accompany any major highway improvement such as I-90 in Allston. Traffic all over our region has become increasingly congested and this can result in diminishing economic prospects for us all. Merely improving highway transport will result in more pass through traffic, but will not enrich our region. We need to make it easier for large numbers of people to travel within our metropolitan area so that commutes can be shortened and productivity throughout our region can be increased. We need to improve the availability, efficiency and connectivity of rail and bus service. AT-1

West Station should serve as a multi-modal hub. For example, we strongly support new public transit services via West Station joining destination stations such as Longwood, Harvard Square, Kendall Square, and Ruggles. This could include bus rapid transit and light rail along existing corridors. We also strongly support improved access for pedestrians and bicyclists, including safer crosswalks and easier ways to cross large roadways at this location. We encourage you to build on the example set in the residential neighborhoods of Lower Allston which have benefited greatly from the new Boston Landing Rail station where ridership has already exceeded expectations. AT-2

We, your neighbors in the Greater Boston Metropolitan Area, will oppose plans that limit our communities to being mere traffic corridors, and will strongly support MASSDOT's efforts to improve the quality of life for all of us who live in this great urban region. We strongly urge you to incorporate pedestrian, bicycle,

and public transportation improvements in the first phase of Mass Pike highway improvements. It is time to move beyond 1950's highway solutions and move on to comprehensive mass, pedestrian and bicycle transit for the 21st century. Collectively, this will also help decrease green house gas emissions and increase opportunities for healthful activities in cleaner air in this new neighborhood.

Anne Trecker

Brookline Town Meeting Member Precinct 6

From: [Carolyn Goodwin](#)
To: [Strysky, Alexander \(EEA\)](#)
Cc: james.cerrbone@state.ma.us
Subject: Allston I 90 interchange
Date: Sunday, February 04, 2018 5:41:59 PM

Dear Mr. Strysky:

I write to express my strong opposition to the proposed Malvern Street bridge for vehicular traffic and to urge you to reject any plan that has cars and busses either exiting Malvern Street or Babcock Street.

CGO-1

I live in North Brookline and work on Commonwealth Ave., and am certain that the increased estimated 15,000-20,000 cars /day to access Commonwealth Avenue via Packard's Corner would create massive traffic back-up, increased pollution and present a danger to the thousands of pedestrians, including BU students, who pass through every day.

Further, these additional vehicles will pass through area streets, negatively impacting neighborhoods by bringing in high levels of traffic leading to increased noise, pollution and high levels of speed. In the past several years traffic has greatly increased in North Brookline and in the area near Packard's Corner, which has already led to cars moving at high speeds through quiet streets. I walk to work and cross Babcock Street each day during the morning and evening rush hour commute. Already there is significant traffic and this proposed Malvern St. bridge would further exacerbate the congestion.

CGO-2
CGO-3
CGO-4

Once again, I urge you to reject any plan that has cars and busses either exiting Malvern Street or Babcock Street.

Thank you for your consideration.

Best,
Carolyn Goodwin
47 Manchester Road
Brookline MA 02446

From: Cosmin Ioan [<mailto:cosminioan@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, February 04, 2018 5:13 PM
To: Strysky, Alexander (EEA)
Cc: advocacy@thecharles.org
Subject: I-90 Allston, EEA #15278

Dear Secretary Beaton,

The reconstruction of the Mass Pike in Allston will define our region for decades to come. There must be major transformations of Massachusetts' transportation system to make it far more climate-friendly, socially equitable, and suited to the 21st century economy, and Allston must show a bold commitment to these changes. Unfortunately, the project as currently proposed in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) fails to do so. I therefore ask that you require MassDOT to submit a Supplemental DEIR to address these deficiencies and study the items described below.

Under the Global Warming Solutions Act, Massachusetts must cut its greenhouse gas emissions by 25% below 1990 emissions levels by 2020 and at least an 80% reduction by 2050. I appreciate that in 2017 you and MassDOT Secretary Pollack held a series of listening sessions to discuss reducing greenhouse gas emissions from the transportation sector. While the Allston DEIR is an improvement over the existing dreadful conditions, it recreates an outdated 20th-century car-centered transportation system incompatible with such a reduction in emissions. COI-1

The DEIR is also inconsistent with the City of Boston's Imagine Boston 2030 and Go Boston 2030 plans and the Boston Planning and Redevelopment Agency's I-90 Allston Placemaking Study. COI-2
While it is commendable that the MBTA is in the process of launching a Commuter Rail Vision Study, it is unacceptable that MassDOT's Allston DEIR perpetuates out-dated thinking (using valuable acres of urban land for rail layup) while it should instead support better mid-day service, construction of West Station in the first phase, and steps to move forward with passenger service on the Grand Junction. COI-3-5

What the Allston I-90 must do is create a 21st-century network of transit by bus, rail, and bike that also dramatically improves active transportation in the Charles River Parklands. I ask that you require MassDOT to submit a Supplemental DEIR to address these issues:

1. Build West Station with two-track service in the first phase of the project COI-6
2. Rebuild the highway at-grade in the "throat" using the A Better City (ABC) concept COI-7
3. Study how separate paths for biking and walking can be provided in the entire section of Charles River Parkland from the River Street Bridge to the BU Bridge, including the "throat," for all viaduct and at-grade options. This study should include consideration of a boardwalk (both temporarily during construction and as a permanent structure) and the use of fill, and how to mitigate impacts on the river by restoring today's degraded bank into a "living shoreline" of native vegetation. Consider how this can be done both as part of the I-90 project or in a subsequent project. COI-8
4. Construct new footbridges near Agganis Way and Amory Street that cross over the highway and link Commonwealth Ave in Boston and Brookline to the Charles River parkland to further encourage commutes by bike. COI-9

Other additional issues you may want to include:

5. Reduce the number of lanes in streets throughout the proposed urban grid to create a safer environment more conducive to walking and biking. COI-10
6. Introduce new North-South bus routes that cross over the highway and connect North Allston and Commonwealth Ave, and by extension Harvard Square and Longwood. COI-11
7. Fully evaluate the possibility of shifting the rail lines away from the abutting homes and creating an at-grade, off-road walk/bike path from the Regina Pizzeria end of Harvard Ave to West Station and over the at-grade highway to the Charles River. A simple barrier wall is insufficient mitigation for the Environmental Justice community that is so heavily burdened by the air pollution, noise pollution, and vibration impacts of the highway and rail. COI-12
COI-13
COI-14
8. Study how to upgrade the Grand Junction railroad linking West Station, Kendall Sq. and North Station, and enhance the Grand Junction Bridge to become a walk/bike connection between the Charles River parkland in Cambridge and Boston. COI-15
9. Evaluate increasing off-peak commuter rail service between Worcester and Boston-obviating the need to build a layover area to store idle trains in Allston. COI-16

Sincerely,
Cosmin Ioan
4 Richard Way
Littleton, MA 01460

From: Judith Antonelli [<mailto:scorpio1952@earthlink.net>]
Sent: Sunday, February 04, 2018 11:12 PM
To: Cerbone, James (DOT)
Subject: I-90 project

I have received information that this project "will send 15,000 to 20,000 additional cars across a new Malvern Street Bridge into North Brookline, sending cars onto Babcock, Pleasant, and St. Paul Streets on their way to the Longwood Medical Area and other points south. This volume of new traffic threatens to overwhelm North Brookline's neighborhoods." JAN-1

I am a 65-year-old woman with stage 4 cancer who lives in a condominium in Coolidge Corner, right in the midst of the three streets mentioned above. ***Please do not let my neighborhood get flooded with lots of new traffic!*** It is bad enough as it is. I need my peace and quiet, what little is left. There is already a town project underway to build a hotel and a condominium building behind where I live, including making a through street behind my building that will bring a new flood of traffic to John Street. ENOUGH ALREADY!

Please don't turn Brookline into Manhattan! Save our space! Let us breathe! Let us see the sunlight and experience silence on the streets a good part of the time!

Sincerely,

Judith Antonelli
29 Green Street #2
Brookline, MA 02446-3301
(617) 734-4245
scorpio1952@earthlink.net (main)
judithant52@gmail.com (alternate)

From: Linda Rosen [<mailto:lindarosen@comcast.net>]
Sent: Sunday, February 04, 2018 7:06 AM
To: Cerbone, James (DOT)
Subject: I 90 Redesign

Dear Mr. Cerbone,

My name is Linda Rosen and I live on Babcock Street in Brookline. I attended a meeting about the I 90 redesign last week and am horrified to learn that there may be an additional 15 to 20K cars (and possible buses) on my street and the surrounding streets if a Malvern Street bridge is constructed from the West Station area.

Obviously you know that Babcock Street is a 25 mph road with one lane in each direction, parking on one side and a soon to be bike sharrow on the other. The street cannot possibly handle the increase in traffic that would be caused by the proposed Malvern St changes. Babcock St in Brookline is a local road with a primary school at one end with many driveways needing access.

LRO-1

I understand that Harvard wants better accesses to the medical area, but I hope that one of the proposals that does not increase traffic to the levels proposed by the Malvern St. changes can be implemented.

Thank you,

Linda Rosen

Linda Rosen
lindarosen@comcast.net

From: Lisa Evans [<mailto:starslisa@gmail.com>]

Sent: Sunday, February 04, 2018 8:58 AM

To: Strysky, Alexander (EEA); Alan Wright

Subject: Bike paths please along Charles River

Dear Mr. Atrysky:

We look forward to improved bike access to the paths along the Charles River. I use this route to commute and a safe path is important. It also greatly helps with tourism to the City.

Sincerely,

Lisa Evans and Tim Smith
10 Weld Street Roslindale MA

Sent: Sunday, February 04, 2018 7:51 PM

To: Strysky, Alexander (EEA)

Cc: comments@walkboston.org

Subject: I-90 Allston, EEA # 15278

I am writing in support of the Walk Boston and Charles River Conservency ideas about making the cycling and pedestrian areas along the river be a priority in the work being done in Alston. Cycling and walking are vital to many people, and each infrastructure change that supports these activities allows more people to partake. MB-1

We have to do this, please support the ideas that they are proposing.

Macky Buck
Cambridge MA

From: [Rhoda Goodwin](#)
To: [Stryisky, Alexander \(EEA\)](#)
Cc: James.Cerrbone@state.ma.us
Subject: Allston I-90 interchange
Date: Sunday, February 04, 2018 4:52:29 PM

Dear Mr. Stryisky,

I am a resident of North Brookline writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed Malvern Street bridge for vehicular traffic. The estimate of an additional 15,000-20,000 cars/day to access Commonwealth Avenue via Packard's Corner would be untenable. RHG-1

At present, with new bike lanes on Commonwealth Avenue, traffic is more often than not, significantly backed up. In addition to automobiles, there are busses (MBTA busses to Kenmore, B.U. shuttles, busses for clubs along Commonwealth Ave. etc.) Certainly the neighborhood streets of North Brookline can not handle any additional traffic, nor can Harvard Street and Coolidge Corner.

A bridge at Malvern Street for pedestrians and bicycles makes sense, but not busses,, which would eventually lead to automobiles, is unworkable. Commonwealth Avenue already has more vehicular traffic that it can accommodate.

Also, I anticipate more cars in North Brookline with plans for additional housing , including 40B proposals.

I urge you to reject any plan that has cars and busses exiting at either Malvern Street or Babcock Street for reasons above, as well as the environmental impact for now and for the future.. RHG-1 con't

Thank you very much

Sincerely yours,
Rhoda Goodwin
47 Manchester Road
Brookline MA 02446

From: Ryan Christman [<mailto:ryanchristman@gmail.com>]

Sent: Sunday, February 04, 2018 6:10 PM

To: Strysky, Alexander (EEA)

Cc: comments@walkboston.org

Subject: EEA No. 15278 - I90 Allston

Dear Secretary Beaton,

The current plans for the Mass Pike in Allston per the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) represent too much of a "business as usual" approach to mobility that forgets lessons we have painstakingly learned over the years. The present DEIR is inconsistent with the City of Boston's Imagine Boston 2030 and Go Boston 2030 plans and the Boston Planning and Redevelopment Agency's I-90 Allston Placemaking Study. The Allston I-90 project needs to help foster modern transportation by bus, rail, and bike, not just automobiles. RC-1

Thus, I ask that you require MassDOT to submit a Supplemental DEIR to address the items below.

Build West Station with two-track service in the first phase of the project RC-2

Rebuild the highway at-grade in the "throat" using the A Better City (ABC) concept RC-3

Reduce the number of lanes in streets throughout the proposed urban grid to create a safer environment more conducive to walking and biking. RC-4

Study how separate paths for biking and walking can be provided in the entire section of Charles River Parkland from the River Street Bridge to the BU Bridge, including the "throat", for all viaduct and at-grade options. This study should include consideration of a boardwalk (both temporarily during construction and as a permanent structure) and the use of fill, and how to mitigate impacts on the river by restoring today's degraded bank into a "living shoreline" of native vegetation. RC-5
RC-6

Construct new footbridges near Agganis Way and Amory Street that cross over the highway and link Commonwealth Ave in Boston and Brookline to the Charles River parkland to further encourage commutes by bike. RC-7

Introduce new North-South bus routes that cross over the highway and connect North Allston and Commonwealth Ave, and by extension Harvard Square and Longwood. RC-8

Fully evaluate the possibility of shifting the rail lines away from the abutting homes and creating an at-grade, off-road walk/bike path from the Regina Pizzeria end of Harvard Ave to West Station and over the at-grade highway to the Charles River. A simple barrier wall is insufficient mitigation for the Environmental Justice community that is so heavily burdened by the air pollution, noise pollution, and vibration impacts of the highway and rail. RC-9 & 10

Study how to upgrade the Grand Junction railroad linking West Station, Kendall Sq. and North Station, and enhance the Grand Junction Bridge to become a walk/bike connection between the Charles River parkland in Cambridge and Boston. RC-11

Evaluate increasing off-peak commuter rail service between Worcester and Boston—obviating the need to build a layover area to store idle trains in Allston. RC-12

Some of the items above have the potential to save on both construction time and overall cost that could be used for other items. I am confident that you will find broad based support for a vision that incorporates these elements, and the citizens of Boston will be grateful for generations to come.

Sincerely,

-Ryan Christman
103 Charles Street
Boston, MA 02114

From: Sam Balto [<mailto:sambalto@gmail.com>]

Sent: Sunday, February 04, 2018 1:43 PM

To: Strysky, Alexander (EEA)

Cc: comments@walkboston.org

Subject: I-90 Allston, EEA # 15278

Hi,

I am concerned to hear that MassDOT does not have a plan for the bike and pedestrian path along Soldier Field Rd. As a Boston resident I would to have safe and health connections to other parts of the city and outside. I prefer to bike and this park of the bike path can be very congested and unpleasant to ride.

I would like for you to consider improving the bike and pedestrian paths with this project. We must improve for all modes of transportation not just cars.

WalkBoston and The Charles River Conservancy have been working with designers at Sasaki and I think these are great solutions. I used to live in Portland, Oregon and I loved the bike path by the water.

SBALTO-1

Thank you!!

Sam Balto
37 Copeland St #2
Roxbury, MA 02119

From: Seth Rubin [<mailto:seth.b.rubin@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, February 04, 2018 5:55 PM
To: Strysky, Alexander (EEA)
Cc: comments@walkboston.org
Subject: EEA No. 15278 - I90 Allston

Hello Mr. Strysky and Secretary Beaton,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the I90 Allston project. I attended several community meetings on this project over the last few years including some at the Jackson/Mann school in Allston. Early on there had been impressive talk about using this project as an opportunity to reduce the impact of the pike on the neighborhood and improve alternative options that would reduce demand for cars to use the pike. Chief among these was the creation of West Station, along with connective routes primarily for buses with restricted automobile access.

Recently there was talk of West Station being pushed out to 2040, which most of its knowledgeable supporters view as equivalent to never. Thankfully Harvard, which stands to benefit from the creation of West Station, has offered to increase its funding. Not to restate the details which are far better known on your end, but I just hope that the creation of West Station is considered as an urgent priority and not something to put on the back burner. SRUBIN-1

With all the talk about global warming and how badly this will affect much of Boston, it is extremely shortsighted to be pouring \$1 billion into the rebuilding of a highway and possibly expanding it. We should be incentivizing people to travel by other means than a personal, noisy, polluting vehicle. If a significant investment were made in the T, including West Station, it would make a huge difference on the region's contribution to green house gases. Additionally proposals to turn the riverside walks into a larger and more aesthetically pleasing space would be great, as well as providing more bicycling infrastructure to allow people to travel such as between the Longwood Medical Area and Harvard Square or between Brookline and Brighton to Cambridge more generally in more of a direct route than is possible today.

Suggestions to lower the viaduct to ground level would save a lot of construction costs and would make it much more feasible to reconnect communities on opposite sides of the pike via walking or bike paths. I applaud organizations like the People's Pike, Livable Streets, Walk Boston and Charles River Conservancy for their efforts to make these options more well known and well thought out, and hope that transportation planners at Mass DOT can take a larger view on this project. SRUBIN-2

Sincerely,
Seth Rubin
69 Verndale St.
Brookline

From: Steve Engler [<mailto:steve.engler@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, February 04, 2018 9:39 AM
To: Strysky, Alexander (EEA)
Cc: advocacy@thecharles.org
Subject: I-90 Improvement Project

Dear Secretary Beaton,

The reconstruction of the Mass Pike in Allston will define our region for decades to come. There must be major transformations of Massachusetts' transportation system to make it far more climate-friendly, socially equitable, and suited to the 21st century economy, and Allston must show a bold commitment to these changes. Unfortunately, the project as currently proposed in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) fails to do so. I therefore ask that you require MassDOT to submit a Supplemental DEIR to address these deficiencies and study the items described below.

Under the Global Warming Solutions Act, Massachusetts must cut its greenhouse gas emissions by 25% below 1990 emissions levels by 2020 and at least an 80% reduction by 2050. I appreciate SENG-1 that in 2017 you and MassDOT Secretary Pollack held a series of listening sessions to discuss reducing greenhouse gas emissions from the transportation sector. While the Allston DEIR is an improvement over the existing dreadful conditions, it recreates an outdated 20th-century car-centered transportation system incompatible with such a reduction in emissions.

The DEIR is also inconsistent with the City of Boston's Imagine Boston 2030 and Go Boston 2030 SENG-2 plans and the Boston Planning and Redevelopment Agency's I-90 Allston Placemaking Study. While it is commendable that the MBTA is in the process of launching a Commuter Rail Vision Study, it is unacceptable that MassDOT's Allston DEIR perpetuates out-dated thinking (using valuable acres of urban land for rail layup) while it should instead support better mid-day service, construction of West Station in the first phase, and steps to move forward with passenger service on the Grand SENG3-5 Junction.

What the Allston I-90 must do is create a 21st-century network of transit by bus, rail, and bike that also dramatically improves active transportation in the Charles River Parklands. I ask that you require MassDOT to submit a Supplemental DEIR to address these issues:

1. Build West Station with two-track service in the first phase of the project SENG 6 -10
2. Rebuild the highway at-grade in the "throat" using the A Better City (ABC) concept
3. Study how separate paths for biking and walking can be provided in the entire section of Charles River Parkland from the River Street Bridge to the BU Bridge, including the "throat," for all viaduct and at-grade options. This study should include consideration of a boardwalk (both temporarily during construction and as a permanent structure) and the use of fill, and how to mitigate impacts on the river by restoring today's degraded bank into a "living shoreline" of native vegetation. Consider how this can be done both as part of the I-90 project or in a subsequent project.
4. Construct new footbridges near Agganis Way and Amory Street that cross over the highway and link Commonwealth Ave in Boston and Brookline to the Charles River parkland to further encourage commutes by bike.

Steven Engler
65 Bay State Road
Belmont, MA 02478

From: Susan Turner [<mailto:suetnr7@gmail.com>]
Sent: Sunday, February 04, 2018 10:25 PM
To: Strysky, Alexander (EEA)
Subject: Mass. Turnpike in Allston

This petition is meant for Secretary Beaton, so I hope you will see that he gets it! I did sign John McDougall's petition, but I decided to write myself as well. I feel very strongly that we need to be future oriented - and mass transit has to be the primary mode of transportation.

Susan Turner
182 Magazine St. #2
Cambridge, MA 02139

PETITION: 21st-CENTURY TRANSPORTATION FOR ALLSTON

To Secretary Matthew Beaton,
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs, Attn: MEPA Office
Alexander Strysky, EEA#15278
100 Cambridge St., #900, Boston MA 02114
alexander.strysky@state.ma.us
Copy to james.cerbone@state.ma.us

Over the next 15-20 years, there must be major transformations of Massachusetts' transportation system, to make it far more climate-friendly, socially equitable, and suited to the 21st-century economy.

Under the Global Warming Solutions Act, Massachusetts must cut its greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by at least 45% below 1990 levels by 2030. In the transportation sector, progress in meeting this goal has been minimal. An average subway train emits over 4 times fewer GHG per passenger-mile than an average single-occupant car. Diesel-hauled commuter-rail trains emit about 3 times fewer GHG.

We appreciate that the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for rebuilding the Mass. Pike and Allston area is more bike- and pedestrian-friendly than previous plans. But basically, the road and transit portions of the DEIR recreate an outdated 20th-century car-centered transportation network.

Instead, there must be a 21st-century network. Most crucially, West Station on the Worcester commuter-rail line must be built at once, and passenger service there started immediately. If costs are a concern, construct only minimal amenities at West Station.

ST-1

Other essential features of a **truly regional** transportation system include the following, which must also be parts of the revised DEIR.

1. Rebuild the Mass. Turnpike at ground level, and build new bridges over it linking Boston and Brookline to Cambridge and the Charles River parkland. ST-2
2. Introduce new North-South bus routes using the new bridges, using electric buses as soon as possible. ST-3

3. Upgrade the Grand Junction railroad linking the West Station, Kendall Sq. and North Station, and on it run multiple-unit—preferably electric—passenger trains. ST-4
4. Outside the rush hour, introduce hourly off-peak trains between Worcester and Boston—obviating the need to store trains near West Station. ST-5

From: Tamara Hurioglu [mailto:tamara_hurioglu@yahoo.com]
Sent: Sunday, February 04, 2018 10:04 PM
To: Strysky, Alexander (EEA); Cerbone, James (DOT)
Subject: North Brookline I90 - safety concerns

Dear Alexander and James,

I live between pleasant street and St Paul street and selected to live in this area so I would not need to use a car. I walk to the stores, to the T, to my school and to my 2 children school which is Edward Devotion. I walk to exercise, I walk and enjoy my community. My children walk to the park, to the library and to their favorite store in the area. My husband bikes to his work at North Eastern University.

I am very concerned by the proposed plan as it will increase traffic in my street and the area. I am very scared that we will no longer be safe walking in our neighborhood.

Please understand that north Brookline is a neighborhood with many children walking to school, many elderly that are still independent and are walking around to keep their independence and many more people who have opted to live here so they can avoid highways of cars.

With the current traffic on St Paul street, it is already extremely dangerous to cross this section near Parkman and Brown street. Cars just speed down slope to catch the green light. **With even more traffic, there will be no safe place for people.**

TH-1

Please re-consider your plan and reduce, not increase, traffic increase in this neighborhood which is our home.

Thank you

Tamara Hurioglu

66 Parkman Street #3, Brookline, MA 02446

From: Alisa Plazonja [<mailto:alisa.plazonja@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, February 05, 2018 8:29 PM
To: Strysky, Alexander (EEA); Cerbone, James (DOT)
Subject: Proposed I90 Allston Interchange

I am writing to express my concerns about and opposition to the current plans to potentially move the Mass Pike Allston exit to Malvern Street. The proposed change would funnel a dangerous and insupportable volume of traffic through residential streets that are already at capacity, rendering our neighborhood unsafe for pedestrians and cyclists. AP-1

North Brookline is a densely populated residential area with the type of heavy pedestrian traffic that one would expect in an urban area. Residents rely on walking and bicycling as a primary means of transportation within the neighborhood, and in particular, to travel to Coolidge Corner or to catch the B or C lines of the T.

In particular, Babcock Street, with its proximity to the Devotion School, and St. Paul Street, with its Rose Garden park, are used heavily by children. The neighborhood as a whole also has many elderly residents whose slower pace of movement make them particularly vulnerable to motor vehicles. In addition to the immediate risk that a surge in traffic would pose to pedestrians and cyclists, all residents would be subjected to increased air pollution from vehicle exhaust. AP-2

Pedestrians and cars do not mix well, and pedestrians and cars that are in a rush to cut through on their way to somewhere else are an even worse combination. It would be dangerous, inappropriate and irresponsible to route high volumes of pass-through traffic through our neighborhood. I therefore ask the state to produce a plan that does not involve funneling highway traffic through our North Brookline residential neighborhoods.

Thank you.

Alisa Plazonja
152 Naples Rd.
Brookline, MA 02446

From: [Arthur Strang](#)
To: [Stryisky, Alexander \(EEA\)](#)
Cc: advocacy@thecharles.org
Subject: COMMENTS: I-90 Alston rebuild and Harvard Land Swap
Date: Monday, February 05, 2018 5:32:17 PM

Dear MASSDOT:

- 1) It has not been successfully shown that the land swap with Harvard is a fair deal for the public. Land with a river view over a Parkway is far more valuable than into and over the Mass Pike. What is the cost of taking the Harvard property and later selling the riverside property? AS2-1
- 2) It has not been successfully shown that there is no legal basis for funding much of the work with bonds supported by tolls. AS2-2
- 3) It has not been successfully shown that the existential demands of the future, created in part by climate change, are successfully dealt with or even approached, by a replacement of road facilities unaccompanied by substantial increases in the capacity of facilities of rail, biking, walking, and bus lanes to move more commuters over the fixed streets, roads, parkways, and the Mass pike. Where was the substantial discussion and analyses of bus lanes on the Mass Pike? AS2-3
AS2-4
- 4) it has not been successfully shown that rebuilding the past serves our future.

Sincerely,
Arthur Strang
60 Fresh Pond Parkway
Cambridge, MA 02138
617-547-4158
arthurstrang@msn.com



Town of Brookline

Massachusetts

Department of Public Works

Engineering & Transportation Division

RECEIVED
FEB 9 2018
MEPA

TRANSPORTATION BOARD

JOSHUA SAFER, CHAIRMAN
PAMELA ZELNICK, VICE CHAIRMAN
CHRISTOPHER DEMPSEY
SCOTT ENGLANDER
JONATHAN KAPUST, PE
ALI TALI, PE

February 5, 2018

Alex Strysky
MEPA Office
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs
100 Cambridge Street, 9th Floor
Boston, MA 02114

Re: EEA No. 15278

Dear Mr. Strysky,

The Town of Brookline, acting through its Transportation Board and advised by its Bicycle Advisory Committee, its Pedestrian Advisory Committee and its Public Transportation Advisory Committee, has reviewed the findings of the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) for the I-90 Interchange project in Allston. We offer the following comments.

The DEIR has substantial significance for Brookline.

The I-90 project provides the transportation underpinnings of a very large development that will ultimately house thousands of workers and residents in an area in Allston that is only three city blocks from Brookline's north boundary. The project will be a major influence on Brookline's northern precinct residents and businesses, offering new transportation options and affecting commuting patterns for all modes – motor vehicle, transit, walking and cycling. It can also dramatically impact Brookline's ability to access Charles River facilities.

Overall, the DEIR is deficient in multi-modal analysis.

The DEIR for the I-90 project, purportedly a multi-modal effort, emphasizes highways, minimizes mitigation efforts, downgrades and postpones transit improvements for many years and inadequately accommodates commuting and active transportation on pedestrian and bicycle paths that are separated from one another. A correction of these deficiencies should be asked of MassDOT, which is a multi-modal agency with responsibilities not being met in this description of this project.

Deficiencies of the DEIR

The major DEIR deficiencies are several-fold:

333 Washington Street • Brookline, Massachusetts 02445-6863
Telephone: (617) 730-2177 Facsimile: (617) 264-6450

- It fails to address the fact that I-90 and the rail lines stand as a major barrier between Brookline, much of Allston, Cambridge, and the Charles River.
- The proposed density of the project, and the resulting analysis contained in the DEIR, are deficient given the parcel size and the density of similar projects within the City of Boston or conducted by Harvard University.
- There is insufficient attention to the need for a network of safe and effective bicycle and pedestrian pathways and access.
- Transit, which should be vital to the region, is receiving woefully inadequate attention and investment in Phase I – and not just by deferring West Station development.
- There is insufficient mitigation, both of construction impact and long-term impact, from the completed project.

These deficiencies and proposed actions to address them are discussed more fully below.

1. I-90 and the rail lines form a mile-long barrier to transit, pedestrian, and bike access between Brookline, Allston, Cambridge and the Charles River.

Numerous ideas for addressing this situation have been put forward before. Unfortunately, the DEIR postpones all of these improvements and they are not included in the proposed Phase I work. West Station—and the bus, pedestrian, and bike access routes serving it—span the barrier, but are postponed until as late as 2040, with no commitment to fund them.

Why it matters:

- a) This barrier limits travel mode choice, and imposes a traffic burden. Brookline will have new mobility opportunities if the project area can be made more accessible through permeable routes serving foot, bicycle and bus transit access across this barrier. Though this problem was created decades ago by the highway viaduct, the current project has a responsibility to mitigate rather than perpetuate it.
- b) With better access across the barrier, Brookline residents would have direct access to the proposed new development in the project area as well as economic and recreational destinations to the north of the site and not be required to travel around this extensive barrier to reach it.
- c) West Station would be available for direct access from Brookline residents. (See discussion of West Station below)
- d) The barrier is a major cause of what is currently extremely poor crosstown bus service, inadequate to meet today's needs. (See discussion of crosstown bus access below).
- e) The Charles River Esplanade and paths provide a tremendous recreational, open space, and active transportation resource nearly on Brookline's boundary. Yet, because of the barrier, the section of the Charles River in the vicinity of the project is inaccessible to Brookline residents. The project offers the potential to solve this problem, in particular if the viaduct is removed and replaced with at-grade facilities.
- f) Along the Charles River, reconstruction of the Turnpike and Soldiers Field Road affords an opportunity to pursue more adequate commuter and active transportation paths that serve the public better and more safely than the existing facilities.

What to do about it:

- a) We urge MassDOT to include pedestrian and bicycle access across the Turnpike/rail barrier from Brookline to reach the West Station site, the area of the new development north of the project, and the Charles River, by constructing the proposed connections at Babcock Street and at Malvern Street, in Phase I of the project. BDPW-1a
- b) Not including a transit crossing at Malvern Street, in the vicinity of the future West Station, in Phase I of the project means that transit service through the area with connections to economic and recreational destination points to the north of the site that serve Brookline will not be feasible for decades to come.
- c) Including a bus crossing in the vicinity of West Station in Phase I of the project has the potential to reduce its cost; with bus through-service, the costly elevated bus concourse structure for bus storage and loading could become unnecessary. BDPW-1b
- d) Roadway access to and through the Turnpike/rail line barrier should be limited to transit, pedestrians and bicycles only. MassDOT has stated that signage and pavement markings alone will not prohibit private vehicles from traveling through the site and therefore they have not committed to transit access via Malvern Street and the DEIR leaves unsettled the issue of all-vehicle access. North Brookline neighborhoods, as MassDOT analysis shows, could experience severe traffic impacts if general automobile travel is allowed on a new roadway between Brookline and the I-90 interchange. Crossings of the barrier should discourage unnecessary reliance on private vehicles, with their ensuing consequences for congestion, emissions and noise pollution. Therefore, MassDOT, as part of the Phase 1 design, should be required to look beyond pavement markings and signage and explore a combination of techniques used in other communities, including hydraulic bollards, enforcement cameras, etc. in possible conjunction with the MBTA's existing bus communication system to prevent general vehicle access while allowing for pedestrian, bicycle, and bus-access only access. BDPW-1c

2. A true multi-modal project must provide access to and improve bicycle and pedestrian paths on the north side of the barrier

- a) Paths connecting to barrier crossings should lead directly to the West Station site, proposed for a location convenient to Babcock and Malvern Street crossings, for high-quality intermodal connections between major transit, walking, and bike routes. Elevated crossings over the Turnpike/rail barrier to make new connections to Commonwealth Avenue and Brookline would link Brookline into the regional network of commuter and recreational paths that converge along the river, providing substantial and attractive services to inner city urban residents. BDPW-2a
- b) Street-side paths should lead to the Charles River from the barrier crossings via a heavily landscaped wide sidewalk and bike path paralleling new South Cambridge Street.
- c) A safer, off-road route has been outlined by Harvard University as a new path along the south edge of the project (between Cambridge Street and West Station and parallel to Wadsworth Street) in front of the high wall proposed to mitigate noise/vibration impacts. This route could reach Agganis Way and connect with a proposed pedestrian/bicycle bridge over the Turnpike, parkway and rail lines to the Charles River waterfront paths. This route is based on the "Flip alternative" for both an interim and a permanent West Station described in the DEIR. BDPW-2b

- d) Designs should be adjusted so that all non-motorized facilities – specifically the Charles River Paul Dudley White paths, the proposed Peoples Pike, and all bridges crossing over the rail and I-90 barrier – have separate foot and cycle paths, each separated from vehicular traffic, to accommodate high volumes of users safely.
- e) The existing bicycle and pedestrian path along the river is narrow and unsafe for users and has no modern replacement in the DEIR. It is too narrow to handle current peak bike and pedestrian traffic, and users of the path contend with high-speed traffic passing by a few feet away. To create options, the highway viaduct should be demolished and the resulting roadway planned to include two wide riverside paths to improve safety and capacity. If sufficient width to widen and separate the paths cannot be found by reducing the roadway width, it may be worth considering using space that is now in the shallows of the river for this purpose, because the resulting environmental benefit may well outweigh any possible detriment. BDPW-2d
- f) The DEIR relies too heavily on street-adjacent sidewalks and bicycle paths to provide a network of routes for commuting and active transportation purposes. Opportunities for off-road pedestrian and bicycle paths as main stems of a network should be maximized, as in the proposals for the path along the noise wall at Wadsworth Street and proposals for building new capacity by separating bicycle and pedestrian paths along the river. Planning for a path network should be a major responsibility of a multi-modal agency and should never be minimized as has happened in this DEIR. BDPW-2e

3. Transit needs a more prominent role in a multi-modal project

- a) Transit must be included in this project, which is widely touted as a multi-modal project. The DEIR defers transit planning, construction and implementation until an undetermined future time – beyond Phase I of highway development. 3a
- b) Notwithstanding the “chicken-egg” difficulty in accurately forecasting potential demand for transit, MassDOT’s default should be to provide for mass transit access from all possible directions in order to foster transit-focused rather than car-dependent development. To do otherwise is to ignore MassDOT’s responsibility to encompass all modes, accommodate clear trends in urban mobility preferences and land use density, and fulfill its role in enabling the Commonwealth to meet its statutory CO2 reduction obligations under the Global Warming Solutions Act. 3b
- c) Building transit into this project should be regarded as an important mechanism for mitigating the overall emissions impacts of any increased vehicle traffic that the I-90 viaduct and on/off ramp reconstruction will allow, as well as during-construction impacts.
- d) Financial and forecasting constraints should not prevent MassDOT from taking a transit-oriented approach to this project. Lack of programmed funding for building out West Station as a truly multi-modal transportation hub, including rail as well as bus, should not be a barrier to providing the “bones” of transit access in Phase I, which should include, at minimum, building an interim/temporary multi-route bus stop, pedestrian and bicycle connections and bus-only roadway access that takes advantage of the new connection to be built at Malvern Street.
- e) The potential importance of new transit for Allston and Brookline residents has not been adequately considered in the DEIR. 3c

4. West Station construction should not be delayed

- a) Phase I of the project includes neither an interim nor a permanent West Station, deferring it until after 2040 with no commitment to fund or construct. At a minimum, an “interim” 4a
West Station, able to host connecting bus services and paths, should be constructed as part of Phase I of the project, to provide service well before 2040. The costs to build Yawkey station (\$15.7 million) and Boston Landing station (\$20 million) are indicative of the economic feasibility of including a minimal/interim version of West Station in Phase I of the project.
- b) The station is needed by current residents—including those in Brookline—not just future riders. Rail service at West Station would offer wholly new opportunities for Brookline residents going to Downtown Boston and Kendall Square, because many live within one-half mile of the station (a typical catchment area for riders of rail transit). It would also offer new opportunities for employees and customers of businesses in North Brookline to get to those businesses.
- c) The DEIR presents a transit demand analysis for year 2040 (Appendix L) to justify 4b
 delaying West Station until Phase II or Phase III. We believe that analysis is flawed, given the admitted fact that Boston Landing station ridership has already exceeded MassDOT’s projections without the area being fully developed, and significantly underestimates near- and long-term demand as a result.
- d) The DEIR transit demand analysis assumes a West Station with various configurations of vehicle connections, but none of them include a north-south bus-only through connection, 4c
 which would offer significantly greater intermodal connectivity (and likely ridership) than any of the modeled configurations.¹
- e) The study area is exceedingly small, dominated by the Harvard-owned area yet to be developed in the north of the project area (currently empty), without including any area at 4d
 all to the south of West Station and the commuter rail tracks, and with West Station on the edge of the area rather than in the middle. Other than the limited future development on the Harvard land, the analysis appears to assume, outside the small study area, that no new development (and associated ridership) would be induced by the introduction of West Station. Finally, the model’s assumptions about bus mode share appear to be based on current values for an area that is poorly-served by bus service.
- f) The projected transit demand (scenario with bus-only Stadium Way connection) is 270 4e
 new daily commuter rail and 2,300 bus boardings, compared to the No Build scenario. This value is so low as to stretch credulity.² According to MassDOT, similar analysis for Boston Landing using the same model vastly under-predicted demand at that station, even with the station-adjacent development only 50 percent complete.
- g) The original Mass Pike project eliminated three rail stations serving Allston and Brighton, while preserving multiple closely-spaced rail stations in less densely populated suburbs (e.g., Newton and Wellesley), constituting a significant environmental injustice. The historical elimination of rail options in Allston, Brighton, and Brookline increased our

¹ The vehicle connection scenarios assumed are: 1) no direct bus connections, and no vehicle connection to Commonwealth Ave., 2) all-vehicle through-connection to Commonwealth Ave with bus connections at West Station, and 3) bus-only connection to Stadium Way, with no vehicle connection to Commonwealth Ave.

Scenario 2 includes north-south buses, but daily boardings for rail and bus are significantly lower under this scenario than for the others, with (inexplicably) no West Station boardings at all for Kendall or LMA shuttles.

² A member of the MBTA Fiscal and Management Control Board stated publicly that the estimates were not believable. <https://commonwealthmagazine.org/back-story/west-station-vs-boston-landing/>

communities' automobile-dependence, with the negative impacts we are well-familiar with. A failure to include West Station in Phase I of the project will cause new real estate development in the area to be automobile-oriented, perpetuating these negative impacts and the associated environmental injustice for decades to come.

- h) Projected ridership on connecting buses is significant, but includes very limited bus connections. The shuttle connections at or near West Station that were analyzed are all very limited. Continuous north-south crosstown buses are most feasible with a bus-only connection to and through West Station (see crosstown bus access, below). The DEIR, inexplicably, did not include that option. 4f
- i) West Station with a web of bus routes can significantly help mitigate negative impacts from the construction of the highways on this site during and after construction by shifting would-be drivers to bus and rail.

5. The commuter rail car layover facility plan should be revised

- a) Four tracks are proposed as part of a commuter rail layover facility at the project site, but MassDOT is proposing to first build four layover tracks in Phase I, to add four more at a later date, then remove four and build the final four at a different location sometime after 2040. This seems financially wasteful and potentially difficult to execute, reportedly makes it much more difficult to construct West Station (even an interim facility) in Phase I, and has local environmental implications. Moreover, the need for this many layover tracks is predicated upon perpetuation of the existing low-frequency mid-day commuter rail service. 5a
- b) Predicating the build-out of West Station in Phase III upon the ability to relocate four commuter rail layover tracks may set up the West Station concept for failure, given how difficult it has proven to be to get communities to accept new layover areas and change MBTA operations. The correct number of layover tracks for supporting Worcester commuter rail line and other nearby system needs should be built into these plans as permanent.
- c) Currently, layover tracks are needed because most commuter rail trains from Worcester to Boston lay over in Boston until the evening rush hour rather than return to Worcester for mid-day service, which currently runs at two-hour intervals. The high capital cost of building and relocating the layover tracks—and the value of the real estate they occupy—should be weighed against the operating cost of a potential layover alternative: running trains more frequently throughout the day between Worcester and Boston—even if only temporarily during construction. In addition to potentially reducing construction cost and facilitating earlier construction of West Station, more frequent daytime service between Boston and Worcester—the second-largest city in New England—could transform the service from commuter rail to regional rail, with potentially significant economic benefits for the region.
- d) The DEIR states that commuter locomotive idling will be limited to 30 minutes, per state law and as required by the 2010 EPA/MBTA consent decree, by providing shore power stations for each locomotive. In practice, per-locomotive idling is likely to be of longer duration during cold weather, maintenance activities, and service disruptions. Also, the cumulative noise and emissions impacts of locomotives coming and going, shutting down and starting up, some at the same time but also at a variety of times of day and night, is likely to pose a burden to neighbors. Careful layout planning and strict operational oversight will be necessary to minimize emissions and conflict.

6. Crosstown bus access to and through the West Station area, with connections to rail transit at West Station, is essential and must be included in Phase I.

- a) A long-discussed projected north-south crosstown bus route between Harvard Square and the Longwood Medical Area, connected to West Station as a major stop, is omitted from the DEIR. Better MBTA crosstown bus service north-south is needed through the area proposed for West Station. This new service should be included in Phase I of this project to link Brookline via new transit and pedestrian/bicycle routes to the Longwood Medical Area and Roxbury to the south and Harvard/Porter Square and Somerville to the north. Without including in Phase 1 a dedicated busway providing direct crosstown bus service through West Station, we would expect motor vehicle traffic to increase (relative to a scenario with such service) in north Brookline and beyond, with negative impacts on our community. 6a
- b) Crosstown bus service through this area cannot be provided without the proposed crossing at Malvern Street. The DEIR postpones this connection until 2040 without explanation. 6b
- c) Access for buses to and through the West Station area would allow for supplementing and/or modifying existing MBTA bus service to meet current and near-future demand, as well as potential future demand generated by new residents, businesses and institutions in project area.
- d) The 66 bus route is one of the most heavily used MBTA bus lines, and currently acts as something of an urban ring, connecting six radial T lines: Silver, Green E, D, C, and B, and Red. Nevertheless—because of the barrier posed by the I-90 viaduct, its path is circuitous; the 66 is regularly over capacity, and the route it travels is congested with motor vehicle traffic. If busway access could be built through the project site from Commonwealth Ave to Cambridge St in Allston (and points beyond), new bus service could potentially address the considerable unmet demand for mobility between Brookline and Cambridge. Such a route could potentially reduce lengthy transit times between Brookline (and the Longwood Medical Area) and Harvard Square by roughly 50 percent. 6c
- e) A crosstown route would traverse Commonwealth Avenue and Park Drive, serving Brookline residents living along its northern boundary. Connections to Commonwealth Avenue and crossing the barrier posed by the Turnpike via a combination of Malvern/Gardner/Babcock and Commonwealth Ave. appear unchanged from MassDOT's December 2016 public presentation. Brookline commented favorably at that time and is still supportive of this route as it seems to provide the smoothest, most direct access with the fewest adverse impacts. Brookline was also open to exploring with Boston University potential routing via Agganis Way. Boston University announced at a public meeting that they support bus-only access through their campus to West Station and beyond.
- f) New circumferential MBTA bus routes such as the proposed crosstown bus route could relieve pressure on the Green Line, now used by many for commuting indirectly through Boston to Cambridge. Without such routes, CTPS estimates that riders will experience serious delays due to overcrowding in the Central Subway tunnel (and almost certainly along the aboveground branches as well).
- g) Brookline and Longwood Transportation Management Association (TMA) staff have discussed the value of a one-seat bus ride between Longwood and Harvard, and this new service appears to mesh well with BU planning for its West Campus.

7. Planning for bus services connecting on local streets to and through the West Station/ Beacon Yards area should be addressed in the DEIR.

- a) With or without West Station, improved bus transit is necessary to serve existing needs in the neighborhoods surrounding the project area, even without the new development made possible by the highway realignment.
- b) The Route 66 bus, the only MBTA bus that travels through Brookline to Allston and Cambridge, is overcrowded, delayed and circuitous, and is predicted by the Boston MPO's Central Transportation Planning Staff to go farther beyond capacity in coming years. A new crosstown bus route could relieve some of the crowding on this bus route.
- c) The Route 47 bus travels east of Brookline but is accessible to some Brookline residents and employers for commuting to Longwood and Central Square. This route should be included in analysis of service to West Station.
- d) The DEIR cites a CTPS forecast of high boarding counts at West Station in the 2040 design year with even a very limited number of bus feeder services from limited locations.
- e) Proliferation of private shuttle buses whose ridership restricted by the operator to certain groups (employees, residents, etc.) could cause unnecessary traffic and congestion on the new roadway if they operate under capacity or if there are simply too many operators. MassDOT and the Boston MPO should work with local TMAs to encourage cooperation among businesses, institutions and property managers to consolidate shuttle services and maximize ridership on each trip via the new connections across the Turnpike/rail barrier (i.e. Malvern Street).
- f) MassDOT should also work with MBTA service planning staff to propose new MBTA bus routes through the West Station area that might replace current and anticipated private shuttle services, serving a broader ridership more efficiently. ^{7a}

8. Rather than replacing the existing highway viaduct with a new one, an "at-grade" option ^{8a} should be pursued.

- a) The viaduct extends only through the 'throat' portion of the project area. Options for the throat include placing all transportation facilities at grade and removing the existing viaduct.
- b) The existing viaduct can be seen from Brookline and has long formed an effective wall between Commonwealth Avenue and the Charles River. It remains a visual barrier if it is simply rebuilt.
- c) According to the DEIR, the existing viaduct is obsolete and can only be rebuilt with great expense and a long and disruptive construction period.
- d) With the viaduct gone, new opportunities would open for access from Brookline. View corridors and new access routes would open up to connect with the river. The viaduct would no longer preclude the possibility of two new pedestrian/bicycle bridges over the Turnpike/rail barrier to the riverside paths. These bridges—which become possible with an "at-grade" option—would improve access to the Charles River where a regional network of existing and proposed paths converge from the north, west and east.
- e) Rebuilding the viaduct is far more expensive than just taking it down, and according to the DEIR, the Commonwealth could save over \$107,000,000 with an at-grade improvement. The expenses of long-term maintenance of the viaduct are not included in the DEIR; at the current expenditure of \$800,000 per year, the long-term costs could reach \$40,000,000 over the next 50 years. These savings are significant. Some of the savings could be devoted

to new pedestrian bicycle bridges spanning the highway from the West Station vicinity to the river.

9. The DEIR proposed mitigation is insufficient.

- a) The size of the 100-acre project site would suggest that the project would include many improvements that could be considered to be mitigation. So large a project would seem to have many potential locations for mitigation efforts designed to minimize the environmental impacts of the highway on surrounding neighborhoods. However, the project calls only for the following insufficient mitigation: 9a
- A 0.93-1.16-acre park (adjacent to a rebuilt Soldiers Field Road) along a half-mile of the river just north of the throat, 155 feet wide at the midpoint.
 - A new pedestrian bridge to replace the existing Franklin Street overpass.
 - A tree-lined South Cambridge Street.
 - Several noise walls – one on Pratt Street, one at BU's Nickerson Field.
- b) Mitigation in Phase I for the highway impacts should include:
- Construction of West Station, including a commuter rail stop and a bus terminal.
 - Bus and shuttle access for crosstown service, including the connection between the West Station bus terminal and Commonwealth Avenue via the crossing at Malvern Street.
 - North-south bicycle and pedestrian access, including the crossings to Brookline at Babcock Street and one at Malvern Street.
 - As an element of removing the viaduct, provision for bicycle and pedestrian connections from West Station and near the Boston University Bridge to connect Brookline over the Turnpike/rail barrier to the Paul Dudley White riverside path.

The Transportation Board appreciates the opportunity to comment on the DEIR for the i90 Interchange Project.

Sincerely,



Joshua Safer
Chairman – Brookline Transportation Board

CC: Neil Wishinsky, Chair – Brookline Select Board
Melvin Kleckner, Town Administrator – Town of Brookline
Andrew M. Pappastergion, Commissioner – Brookline Department of Public Works
Alison Steinfeld, Director - Brookline Planning and Economic Development Department
Peter M. Ditto, Director – Engineering & Transportation Division
Todd M. Kirrane, Transportation Administrator - Engineering & Transportation Division
Kara Brewton, Economic Development Director – Town of Brookline
James Cerbone, MassDOT Highway Division
Transportation Board Advisory Committee Chairs

333 Washington Street • Brookline, Massachusetts 02445-6863
Telephone: (617) 730-2177 Facsimile: (617) 264-6450

From: Deborah Galef [<mailto:drgalef@gmail.com>]

Sent: Monday, February 05, 2018 10:02 PM

To: Strysky, Alexander (EEA)

Cc: Cara Seiderman; Hanafin, Greg

Subject: I-90 interchange plans

The Cambridge Pedestrian Committee would like to submit the following comments:

-- We are very pleased with the enhanced multi-use path along the river. Providing more greenery as well as a wider path will make the area much more attractive as well as considerably safer.

-- The pedestrian path should be separated, wherever feasible, from the bike path. CPED-1

-- Transit must be emphasized. It is ludicrous for the public to wait for over 20 years for a West Station to be constructed and all of the transit benefits put into place. They are needed right now and are crucial to this vital project. CPED-2

Debby Galef
Chair, Cambridge Pedestrian Committee

From: Carol Greenwood [<mailto:cgnunu@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, February 05, 2018 2:35 PM
To: Strysky, Alexander (EEA)
Cc: Cerbone, James (DOT); joseph.boncore@masenate.gov; jay.livingstone@mahouse.gov
Subject: I-90

Matthew Beaton, Secretary of Energy & Environmental Affairs

Executive Office of Energy & Environmental Affairs

Attn: MEPA Office

Alex Strysky, EEA, No. 15278

100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900

Boston MA 02114

Dear Secretary Beaton:

I am writing to you, and copying James Cerbone at MassDOT, in support of the January 24, 2018 CG -see HD
submittal made by Henrietta Davis, community representative to the I-90 Task Force, in response to
the DEIR for I-90.

The size and scope of this project is huge and will have a large impact on Cambridge residents—especially those of us who live in the Central Square area— both during and after construction. ***I am including at the bottom of this letter the 12 key Requests for Action or Further Study put forth by Henrietta Davis, and this is to let you know that I AM IN FULL SUPPORT OF THE CONCERNS SHE HAS RAISED.***

I live in a short block of Kinnaird St that runs perpendicular between River St & Western Ave, and I believe the MOST CRITICAL issues among Henrietta's points are:

- 1) **implementation of the transit/planning component to occur AT THE BEGINNING OF THE PROJECT.** CG-1
Given the positive impacts this will have on the immediate surroundings, the potential for economic development of as well as the potential for people who live further outside Boston and Cambridge, to put this step at the end of the project seems irrational.
- 2) **RETAIN the right-turn-only exit to River St from Soldiers Field Rd by keeping one lane as an exit ramp.** CG-2
This will allow the other lane to accommodate an improved better bike/pedestrian. The area under consideration is pretty small—an additional lane of bike/pedestrian access is not meaningful enough to merit the loss of an exit directly onto River

St. I believe this compromise offers a very workable solution to a need for both additional green space and a direct access exit.

- 3) **A comprehensive (and workable!) plan to mitigate the noise, disruption and increased traffic to the Cambridge side of the River.** CG-3
Cambridgeport and Riverside are extremely dense neighborhoods with large traffic volumes, especially at rush hours. For a project of this length and scope, these neighborhoods deserve thorough consideration on ways to minimize what will (understatedly) be a “challenge”.
- 4) **Keep turnpike roadways consistent with existing width.** CG-4

Thank you for your consideration of these extremely important concerns.

Sincerely,

Carol Greenwood

10A Kinnaird Street

Cambridge, MA 02139

CC: James Cerbone, Environmental Services Division, MassDOT

Henrietta Davis Key Requests for Action or Further Study:

- Transit and Multi-Modal Planning – implement now, not in 2040.
- West Station – implement as part of first phase of I-90.
- Grand Junction Rail Bridge over Soldiers Field Road – reconstruct as part of I-90 Project.
- Right-Turn-Only Exit to River Street from Soldiers Field Road – retain a narrow one-lane exit ramp, designed with improved pedestrian/bicycle path.
- Underpass under River Street Bridge for Pedestrians, Joggers, and Cyclists – support as part of future River Street Bridge reconstruction project.
- Cambridge Access to/from the Turnpike – study expected travel times and develop acceptable traffic management plans.
- Noise – develop effective noise barriers and other features to reduce existing harmful noise impacts from Turnpike on Cambridgeport, Riverside and Magazine Beach Park.

- “Throat,” – develop new, comprehensive alternative that reduces current noise levels, is visually attractive from Cambridge, and has positive impact on Paul Dudley White Path.
- Width of Turnpike – reconstruct to be as narrow as possible; do not build wider travel lanes and wide shoulders that do not exist in any other parts of the Turnpike between Route 128 and the Prudential Tunnel.
- Parkland and Paul Dudley White Path – design the riverfront to enhance this world-class environmental resource, increasingly used for both commuting and recreation.
- Construction Mitigation and Project Compensation – develop detailed action plan to mitigate impacts from years of aggravation and disruption, reduce construction noise, and effectively manage expected heavier traffic on Memorial Drive, Western Avenue, Massachusetts Avenue, the many bridges over the Charles River, and Cambridgeport and Riverside neighborhood streets.
- Pathways on Cambridge side of Charles River – improve to accommodate increased use while Paul Dudley White Path is closed during construction.

From: Carro Halpin [<mailto:chalpin92@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, February 05, 2018 9:52 AM
To: Strysky, Alexander (EEA)
Cc: comments@walkboston.org
Subject: I-90 Allston, EEA # 15278

Dear Secretary Beaton,

As a daily commuter from Oak Square in Brighton to Downtown Crossing - I felt it was important I send this email. Eight months out of the year I commute via bike on the Charles River Bike Path which I love dearly - but I know firsthand the improvements that need to be made for everyone's safety and enjoyment.

The reconstruction of the Mass Pike in Allston will define our region for decades to come. There must be major transformations of Massachusetts' transportation system to make it far more climate-friendly, socially equitable, and suited to the 21st century economy, and Allston must show a bold commitment to these changes. Unfortunately, the project as currently proposed in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) fails to do so. I therefore ask that you require MassDOT to submit a Supplemental DEIR to address these deficiencies and study the items described below.

Under the Global Warming Solutions Act, Massachusetts must cut its greenhouse gas emissions by 25% below 1990 emissions levels by 2020 and at least an 80% reduction by 2050. I appreciate that in 2017 you and MassDOT Secretary Pollack held a series of listening sessions to discuss reducing greenhouse gas emissions from the transportation sector. While the Allston DEIR is an improvement over the existing dreadful conditions, it recreates an outdated 20th-century car-centered transportation system incompatible with such a reduction in emissions.

CHAL-1

The DEIR is also inconsistent with the City of Boston's Imagine Boston 2030 and Go Boston 2030 plans and the Boston Planning and Redevelopment Agency's I-90 Allston Placemaking Study. While it is commendable that the MBTA is in the process of launching a Commuter Rail Vision Study, it is unacceptable that MassDOT's Allston DEIR perpetuates out-dating thinking (using valuable acres of urban land for rail layup) while it should instead support better mid-day service, construction of West Station in the first phase, and steps to move forward with passenger service on the Grand Junction.

CHAL-2

CHAL 3-5

What the Allston I-90 must do is create a 21st-century network of transit by bus, rail, and bike that also dramatically improves active transportation in the Charles River Parklands. I ask that you require MassDOT to submit a Supplemental DEIR to address these issues:

1. Build West Station with two-track service in the first phase of the project CHAL-6
2. Rebuild the highway at-grade in the "throat" using the A Better City (ABC) concept CHAL-7
3. Reduce the number of lanes in streets throughout the proposed urban grid to create a safer environment more conducive to walking and biking. CHAL-8

4. Study how separate paths for biking and walking can be provided in the entire CHAL-9
section of Charles River Parkland from the River Street Bridge to the BU Bridge,
including the "throat", for all viaduct and at-grade options. This study should
include consideration of a boardwalk (both temporarily during construction and as
a permanent structure) and the use of fill, and how to mitigate impacts on the CHAL-10
river by restoring today's degraded bank into a "living shoreline" of native
vegetation. Consider how this can be done both as part of the I-90 project or in a
subsequent project.
5. Construct new footbridges near Agganis Way and Amory Street that cross over the
highway and link Commonwealth Ave in Boston and Brookline to the Charles River CHAL-11
parkland to further encourage commutes by bike.
6. Introduce new North-South bus routes that cross over the highway and connect
North Allston and Commonwealth Ave, and by extension Harvard Square and CHAL-12
Longwood.
7. Fully evaluate the possibility of shifting the rail lines away from the abutting CHAL-13
homes and creating an at-grade, off-road walk/bike path from the Regina Pizzeria
end of Harvard Ave to West Station and over the at-grade highway to the Charles
River. A simple barrier wall is insufficient mitigation for the Environmental Justice
community that is so heavily burdened by the air pollution, noise pollution, and CHAL-14
vibration impacts of the highway and rail.
8. Study how to upgrade the Grand Junction railroad linking West Station, Kendall
Sq. and North Station, and enhance the Grand Junction Bridge to become a CHAL-15
walk/bike connection between the Charles River parkland in Cambridge and
Boston.
9. Evaluate increasing off-peak commuter rail service between Worcester and CHAL-16
Boston—obviating the need to build a layover area to store idle trains in Allston.

Sincerely,

Carro Halpin

357 Faneuil St. #4

Brighton, MA 02135

--

Carro Halpin

774.258.0743

@carrohalpin

From: Cathy Kaplan [<mailto:ckaplan@kaplanconstructs.com>]

Sent: Monday, February 05, 2018 5:17 PM

To: Cerbone, James (DOT); Strycky, Alexander (EEA)

Subject: Opposed to Malvern Street vehicular bridge

Dear Sir;

One of the Alternatives proposed for the new I-90 Mass Pike Interchange will send 15,000 to 20,000 additional cars across a new Malvern Street Bridge into North Brookline onto Babcock, Pleasant and St. Paul Streets on their way to the Longwood Medical Area and other points south. I am concerned about greatly increased traffic on local neighborhood streets, in a dense residential neighborhood with a large number of elderly and school-age pedestrians and many cyclists. I CKAP-1
oppose vehicular access via a widened Malvern Street bridge.

Thank you for your consideration. Cathy Kaplan, 95 Babcock Street, Brookline 02446

From: Franziska Amacher [<mailto:fran@amacher-associates.net>]
Sent: Monday, February 05, 2018 3:10 PM
To: comments@walkboston.org; Strysky, Alexander (EEA)
Subject: Alston I-90 interchange

I like both your proposals although there may be budgetary implications. I slightly prefer the resilient soft edge.

I would advise to look at a third option with floating in the river which gives you a very close connection to the water and would be less costly than the other two. It is also more resilient with river level changes during big storms. Something like that is built in the "Schanzengraben" in Zurich.

https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A_www.tripadvisor.com_Attraction-5FReview-2Dg188113-2Dd314479-2DReviews-2DSchanzengraben-5FCanal-2DZurich.html-23photos-3Bgeo-3D188113-26detail-3D314479-26ff-3D109169296-26albumViewMode-3Dhero-26aggregationId-3D101-26albumid-3D101-26baseMediaId-3D109169296-26thumbnailMinWidth-3D50-26cnt-3D30-26offset-3D-2D1-26filter-3D7-26autoplay-3D&d=DwIGaQ&c=IDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWLOQWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=mJIUKpqhRk5lfrl4usD8iBZ3S6BKBEKmhEMOwsMWH0&m=Em_Na3JUpiSwAPzPMDmuG1GnwowmsNLsV1flc-f8lCI&s=N1QoZp_y06KOk5U5_3iVpB7-pUiVBgBEFqtbr8C2BMA&e=

Current knowledge about urban design, resiliency and public health, certainly does not support taking care of car traffic and not to have pedestrians and bike facilities be the first priority.

Why should cars be more important than people who live enough closely near by that they walk or bike and don't produce tons of pollution and reduce congestion by choosing to walk/bike rather than drive with walking and biking having each their own path.

Franziska Amacher FAIA LEED NCARB WBE

AMACHER & ASSOCIATES Architects

237 Mount Auburn Street

Cambridge, MA 02138

617 354 8707

www.amacher-associates.net

From: Ian Schneider [<mailto:ischneid@mit.edu>]
Sent: Monday, February 05, 2018 4:32 PM
To: Strysky, Alexander (EEA)
Subject: RE: I-90 Reconstruction Concerns

Dear Mr. Strysky,

Thank you very much for your response. In addition to reiterating my support for transit oriented development, as described in my comments below, I also wanted to express my support for walking/biking and transit developments related to the Grand Junction Corridor. I support the Grand Junction Path project very much, and I am very interested in the possibility of the Grand Junction Urban Rail Project. I recently learned that the Allston Interchange project could impact the viability of these projects or help spur their development. IS2-1

I work in Kendall Square in Cambridge. The Grand Junction Path (and rail transit along this corridor) would simplify my trips to/from Allston. A major highway project will not.

I hope you will work to ensure that a walk/bike path connection will be designed to connect the planned Allston walk/bike path to the Grand Junction Path in Cambridge, as an important (but comparatively inexpensive) part of the Allston Interchange Project.

IS2-2

I hope you will also be careful to consider rail possibilities in the Grand Junction Corridor for links between West Station, Kendall, and downtown Boston.

Please take a bold and people-focused approach to new development in Allston, focusing on walk, bike, and transit opportunities, instead of simply expanding traffic infrastructure and urban air pollution.

Please share my comments with Matthew Beaton as well. Thank you for all of your hard work on this project

Warmest Regards,
Ian

Ian Schneider
PhD Student, Institute for Data, Systems, and Society, MIT
Research Assistant, EECS, MIT
<http://www.mit.edu/~ischneid/>
(914) 584-9139

From: Strysky, Alexander (ENV) [alexander.strysky@state.ma.us]
Sent: Friday, January 26, 2018 8:53 AM
To: Ian Schneider
Subject: Re: I-90 Reconstruction Concerns

Ian- Thank you for your comments.

Alex Strysky

From: Ian Schneider <ischneid@mit.edu>
Sent: Wednesday, January 24, 2018 2:59 PM
To: Strysky, Alexander (EEA)
Subject: I-90 Reconstruction Concerns

Dear My Strysky,

I am writing to share my concerns about the proposed Allston I-90 reconstruction project. Please share my concerns with your office and with the Secretary.

For Boston to grow and to become a more livable city while meeting its climate goals, we need to invest ***now*** in better public transit.

The current highway project is likely to increase vehicle traffic in Allston, clog our city with smog, and make it a less enjoyable place to live and work. While it might reduce vehicular travel times in the short-run, those benefits will disappear as more people choose to drive, causing traffic again on I-90 and compounding traffic problems in nearby neighborhoods.

The Seaport feels desolate and soul-less, and it is a shame to think that upper Allston might turn out the same way, except with a giant elevated highway running right next to it.

I ask you instead to support reconstruction in Allston area that priorities walking, public transportation, and biking.

I hope you'll consider a project that includes:

- Prioritizing construction of West Station with improved transit connections to Cambridge and to Downtown Boston
- A protected bus connection to enhance North/South mobility through that corridor.
- Small, local streets, that are bike friendly and that more easily connect areas above and below the highway.

Sincerely,
Ian Schneider

PhD Candidate, MIT
32 Vassar St - Suite D740
Cambridge, MA 02139

From: James C.S. Liu [<mailto:jimbob@macconnect.com>]
Sent: Monday, February 05, 2018 12:13 AM
To: Strysky, Alexander (EEA)
Cc: advocacy@thecharles.org
Subject: feedback on the Allston I-90 Interchange Reconstruction Project

Dear Secretary Beaton,

The reconstruction of the Mass Pike in Allston will help to define the Boston region for decades to come. There must be major transformations of Massachusetts' transportation system to make it far more climate-friendly, socially equitable, and suited to the 21st century economy, and Allston must show a bold commitment to these changes. Unfortunately, the project as currently proposed in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) fails to do so. I therefore ask that you require MassDOT to submit a Supplemental DEIR to address these deficiencies and study the items described below.

Under the Global Warming Solutions Act, Massachusetts must cut its greenhouse gas emissions by 25% below 1990 emissions levels by 2020 and at least an 80% reduction by 2050. I appreciate that in 2017 you and MassDOT Secretary Pollack held a series of listening sessions to discuss reducing greenhouse gas emissions from the transportation sector. While the Allston DEIR is an improvement over the existing dreadful conditions, it recreates an outdated 20th-century car-centered transportation system incompatible with such a reduction in emissions.

JL-1

The DEIR is also inconsistent with the City of Boston's Imagine Boston 2030 and Go Boston 2030 plans and the Boston Planning and Redevelopment Agency's I-90 Allston Placemaking Study. While it is commendable that the MBTA is in the process of launching a Commuter Rail Vision Study, it is unacceptable that MassDOT's Allston DEIR perpetuates out-dated thinking (using valuable acres of urban land for rail layup) while it should instead support better mid-day service, construction of West Station in the first phase, and steps to move forward with passenger service on the Grand Junction.

JL-2

JL-3-5

What the Allston I-90 must do is create a 21st-century network of transit by bus, rail, and bike that also dramatically improves active transportation in the Charles River Parklands. I ask that you require MassDOT to submit a Supplemental DEIR to address these issues:

1. Build West Station with two-track service in the first phase of the project
2. Rebuild the highway at-grade in the "throat" using the A Better City (ABC) concept
3. Study how separate paths for biking and walking can be provided in the entire section of Charles River Parkland from the River Street Bridge to the BU Bridge, including the "throat," for all viaduct and at-grade options. This study should include consideration of a boardwalk (both temporarily during construction and as a permanent structure) and the use of fill, and how to mitigate impacts on the river by restoring today's degraded bank into a "living shoreline" of native vegetation. Consider how this can be done both as part of the I-90 project or in a subsequent project.
4. Construct new footbridges near Agganis Way and Amory Street that cross over the highway and link Commonwealth Ave in Boston and Brookline to the Charles River parkland to further encourage commutes by bike.
5. Reduce the number of lanes in streets throughout the proposed urban grid to create a safer environment more conducive to walking and biking.
6. Introduce new North-South bus routes that cross over the highway and connect North Allston and Commonwealth Ave, and by extension Harvard Square and Longwood.

JL-6

JL-7

JL-8

JL-9

JL-10

JL-11

JL-12

7. Fully evaluate the possibility of shifting the rail lines away from the abutting homes and creating an at-grade, off-road walk/bike path from the Regina Pizzeria end of Harvard Ave to West Station and over the at-grade highway to the Charles River. A simple barrier wall is insufficient mitigation for the Environmental Justice community that is so heavily burdened by the air pollution, noise pollution, and vibration impacts of the highway and rail. JL-13
8. Study how to upgrade the Grand Junction railroad linking West Station, Kendall Sq. and North Station, and enhance the Grand Junction Bridge to become a walk/bike connection between the Charles River parkland in Cambridge and Boston. JL-14
9. Evaluate increasing off-peak commuter rail service between Worcester and Boston-obviating the need to build a layover area to store idle trains in Allston. JL-16

Sincerely,

James C.S. Liu

44 Pemberton Street, Cambridge, MA

----- /James C.S. Liu | e-mail:

<<mailto:jimbob@macconnect.com>>

Cambridge, MA | web: <https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.jamescsliu.com_&d=DwIFAg&c=IDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=mJIUKpqhRk5lfrl4usD8iBZ3S6BKBEKmhEMOwsMWH0&m=YU8jueR_RMbhQ0A17GA4WVg6WqOb7yx5XJc5a3L87Ps&s=UJr5_NC4QKtBoi8PQq-alzMH3HM-U_X_xrha6zKYKY&e=>

"Nemo enim fere saltat sobrius, nisi forte insanit."

(No one dances while sober, unless he is insane.)

-- Marcus Tullius Cicero, Pro Murena (Ch. vi, sec. 13).

From: Ken Kaplan [<mailto:KKaplan@kaplanconstructs.com>]

Sent: Monday, February 05, 2018 5:08 PM

To: Strysky, Alexander (EEA); Cerbone, James (DOT)

Subject: Opposition to Proposed Malvern St. Bridge

One of the Alternatives proposed for the new I-90 Mass Pike Interchange will send 15,000 to 20,000 additional cars across a new Malvern Street Bridge into North Brookline and then onto Babcock, Pleasant and St. Paul Streets on their way to the Longwood Medical Area and other points south. We are concerned about greatly increased traffic on local neighborhood streets, in a dense residential neighborhood with a large number of elderly and school-age pedestrians and many cyclists. We oppose vehicular access via a widened Malvern Street bridge.

KKAP-1

Ken Kaplan
95 Babcock Street
Brookline, MA 02446

From: Ken Pierce [<mailto:kpierce@mit.edu>]

Sent: Monday, February 05, 2018 9:03 AM

To: Strysky, Alexander (EEA)

Cc: advocacy@thecharles.org

Subject: provide separate paths for biking and walking as part of Mass Pike/Allston reconstruction project

Dear Secretary Beaton,

I have followed with interest the plans for reconstruction of the Mass Pike in Allston. As you well know, this reconstruction must be carefully thought out. There must be major transformations of Massachusetts' transportation system to make it far more climate-friendly, socially equitable, and suited to the 21st century economy, and Allston must show a bold commitment to these changes.

Unfortunately, the project as currently proposed in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) fails to offer such transformations. While the Allston DEIR is an improvement over the existing dreadful conditions, it recreates an outdated 20th-century car-centered transportation system incompatible with such a reduction in emissions. The DEIR is also inconsistent with the City of Boston's Imagine Boston 2030 and Go Boston 2030 plans and the Boston Planning and Redevelopment Agency's I-90 Allston Placemaking Study. KP2-1
KP2-2

While it is commendable that the MBTA is in the process of launching a Commuter Rail Vision Study, it is unacceptable that MassDOT's Allston DEIR perpetuates out-dated thinking (using valuable acres of urban land for rail layout); it should instead support better mid-day service, construction of West Station in the first phase, and steps to move forward with passenger service on the Grand Junction. The Allston I-90 should create a 21st-century network of transit by bus, rail, and bike that also dramatically improves active transportation in the Charles River Parklands. The currently-proposed plan doesn't do that. KP2 3-5

Please require MassDOT to submit a Supplemental DEIR to address these issues, which have been raised by the Charles River Conservancy and other advocacy groups:

1. Find a way to provide separate paths for biking and walking in the entire section of Charles River Parkland from the River Street Bridge to the BU Bridge, including the "throat". This might be a boardwalk (both temporarily during construction and as a permanent structure) or the use of fill. Also find a way to mitigate effects on the river by restoring today's degraded bank into a "living shoreline" of native vegetation. This could be done both as part of the I-90 project or in a subsequent project, but it should be done without delay to make the riverfront more accessible and welcoming to pedestrians and cyclists. KP2-6
KP2-7
2. Build West Station with two-track service in the first phase of the project. KP2-8
3. Rebuild the highway at-grade in the "throat" using the A Better City (ABC) concept. KP2-9
4. Construct new footbridges near Agganis Way and Amory Street that cross over the highway and link Commonwealth Ave in Boston and Brookline to the Charles River parkland to further encourage commutes by bike. KP2-10

Sincerely,

Ken Pierce
284 Harvard St.
Cambridge MA 02139

From: Matthew Jennings [<mailto:matthewrobertjennings@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, February 05, 2018 8:51 AM
To: Strysky, Alexander (EEA)
Cc: advocacy@thecharles.org
Subject: Re: Current I-90 Reconstruction Draft Environmental Impact Report Deficiencies

Dear Secretary Beaton,

The reconstruction of the Mass Pike in Allston will define our region for decades to come. There must be major transformations of Massachusetts' transportation system to make it far more climate-friendly, socially equitable, and suited to the 21st century economy, and Allston must show a bold commitment to these changes. Unfortunately, the project as currently proposed in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) fails to do so. I therefore ask that you require MassDOT to submit a Supplemental DEIR to address these deficiencies and study the items described below.

Under the Global Warming Solutions Act, Massachusetts must cut its greenhouse gas emissions by 25% below 1990 emissions levels by 2020 and at least an 80% reduction by 2050. I appreciate that in 2017 you and MassDOT Secretary Pollack held a series of listening sessions to discuss reducing greenhouse gas emissions from the transportation sector. While the Allston DEIR is an improvement over the existing dreadful conditions, it recreates an outdated 20th-century car-centered transportation system incompatible with such a reduction in emissions. MJ-1

The DEIR is also inconsistent with the City of Boston's Imagine Boston 2030 and Go Boston 2030 plans and the Boston Planning and Redevelopment Agency's I-90 Allston Placemaking Study. While it is commendable that the MBTA is in the process of launching a Commuter Rail Vision Study, it is unacceptable that MassDOT's Allston DEIR perpetuates outdated thinking (using valuable acres of urban land for rail layup) while it should instead support better mid-day service, construction of West Station in the first phase, and steps to move forward with passenger service on the Grand Junction. MJ-2 MJ 3-5

What the Allston I-90 must do is create a 21st-century network of transit by bus, rail, and bike that also dramatically improves active transportation in the Charles River Parklands. I ask that you require MassDOT to submit a Supplemental DEIR to address these issues:

1. Build West Station with two-track service in the first phase of the project MJ 6-9
2. Rebuild the highway at-grade in the "throat" using the A Better City (ABC) concept
3. Study how separate paths for biking and walking can be provided in the entire section of Charles River Parkland from the River Street Bridge to the BU Bridge, including the "throat," for all viaduct and at-grade options. This study should include consideration of a boardwalk (both temporarily during construction and as a permanent structure) and the use of fill, and how to mitigate impacts on the river by restoring today's degraded bank into a "living shoreline" of native vegetation. Consider how this can be done both as part of the I-90 project or in a subsequent project.
4. Construct new footbridges near Agganis Way and Amory Street that cross over the highway and link Commonwealth Ave in Boston and Brookline to the Charles River parkland to further encourage commutes by bike. As a Boston University employee and student, it is stifling to have the Charles River be so close,

but so relatively inaccessible. This river is one of the jewels of our region, and should be accessible by all.

Sincerely,
Matthew Jennings
139 Robbins St. #2
Waltham, MA 02453

From: Melissa Meek [<mailto:meek.melissa.l@gmail.com>]
Sent: Monday, February 05, 2018 9:22 AM
To: Strysky, Alexander (EEA)
Subject: Comments on current DEIR

Secretary Matthew Beaton,
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs, Attn: MEPA Office
Alexander Strysky, EEA#15278
[100 Cambridge St., #900, Boston MA 02114](mailto:alexander.strysky@state.ma.us)
alexander.strysky@state.ma.us

Dear Secretary Beaton,

The reconstruction of the Mass Pike in Allston will define our region for decades to come. There must be major transformations of Massachusetts' transportation system to make it far more climate-friendly, socially equitable, and suited to the 21st century economy, and Allston must show a bold commitment to these changes. Unfortunately, the project as currently proposed in the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) fails to do so. I therefore ask that you require MassDOT to submit a Supplemental DEIR to address these deficiencies and study the items described below.

Under the Global Warming Solutions Act, Massachusetts must cut its greenhouse gas emissions by 25% below 1990 emissions levels by 2020 and at least an 80% reduction by 2050. I appreciate that in 2017 you and MassDOT Secretary Pollack held a series of listening sessions to discuss reducing greenhouse gas emissions from the transportation sector. While the Allston DEIR is an improvement over the existing dreadful conditions, it recreates an outdated 20th-century car-centered transportation system incompatible with such a reduction in emissions.

MMEEEK-1

The DEIR is also inconsistent with the City of Boston's Imagine Boston 2030 and Go Boston 2030 plans and the Boston Planning and Redevelopment Agency's I-90 Allston Placemaking Study.

MMEEEK-2

What the Allston I-90 must do is create a 21st-century network of transit by bus, rail, and bike that also dramatically improves active transportation in the Charles River Parklands. I ask that you require MassDOT to submit a Supplemental DEIR to address these issues:

1. Build West Station with two-track service in the first phase of the project
2. Rebuild the highway at-grade in the "throat" using the A Better City (ABC) concept
3. Reduce the number of lanes in streets throughout the proposed urban grid to create a safer environment more conducive to walking and biking.
4. Study how separate paths for biking and walking can be provided in the entire section of Charles River Parkland from the River Street Bridge to the BU Bridge, including the "throat", for all viaduct and at-grade options. This study should include consideration of a boardwalk (both temporarily during construction and as a permanent structure) and the use of fill, and how to mitigate impacts on the river by restoring today's degraded bank into a "living shoreline" of native vegetation.

MMEEEK3- 10

Consider how this can be done both as part of the I-90 project or in a subsequent project. ****This is especially important to me, as my husband and I frequently bike, walk, and run on this section of the bike path, and that is a very dangerous section of the pathway for all users.***

5. Construct new footbridges near Agganis Way and Amory Street that cross over the highway and link Commonwealth Ave in Boston and Brookline to the Charles River parkland to further encourage commutes by bike.
6. Introduce new North-South bus routes that cross over the highway and connect North Allston and Commonwealth Ave, and by extension Harvard Square and Longwood.
7. Fully evaluate the possibility of shifting the rail lines away from the abutting homes and creating an at-grade, off-road walk/bike path from the Regina Pizzeria end of Harvard Ave to West Station and over the at-grade highway to the Charles River. A simple barrier wall is insufficient mitigation for the Environmental Justice community that is so heavily burdened by the air pollution, noise pollution, and vibration impacts of the highway and rail.
8. Study how to upgrade the Grand Junction railroad linking West Station, Kendall Sq. and North Station, and enhance the Grand Junction Bridge to become a walk/bike connection between the Charles River parkland in Cambridge and Boston.
9. Evaluate increasing off-peak commuter rail service between Worcester and Boston—obviating the need to build a layover area to store idle trains in Allston.

Sincerely,

Melissa Meek

14 Mead St., Apt. 1
Allston, MA 02134