Howard/Stein-Hudson Associates, Inc.
CREATIVE SOLUTIONS • EFFECTIVE PARTNERING ®

MEMORANDUM

May 30, 2014

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

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

RE: **MassDOT Highway Division**
Allston I-90 Interchange Improvement Project
2nd Taskforce Meeting
Meeting Notes of May 21, 2014

Overview

On May 21, 2014 the Allston Interchange Improvement Project taskforce held its second meeting. The taskforce is composed of local residents, business owners, transportation and green space advocates as well as representatives of local, state, and federal governments. The purpose of the taskforce is, through the application of members' in-depth local knowledge, to assist and advise MassDOT in developing an implementable design for the reconstruction of the I-90 Allston Interchange, the Allston viaduct and Cambridge Street in the vicinity of the interchange. The chance to reconfigure the interchange has emerged through the opportunities presented by the implementation of All Electric Tolling (AET) and the structural deficiency of the I-90 Allston viaduct. MassDOT sees the project not only an opportunity to improve safety on the Turnpike by straightening it and addressing a structurally deficient bridge, but also to improve safety and connections for all modes of travel in the area around the interchange, particularly along Cambridge Street which has been noted by local residents as dangerous and acting as a barrier between Allston and the Charles River. Another major goal of the Allston Interchange project is to provide the commuter rail conditions necessary for the expansion of South Station and the eventual creation of West Station in the old Beacon Park yard as well as the inauguration of Diesel Multiple Unit (DMU) service along the Grand Junction line from Allston into Cambridge and Somerville.

The purpose of the meeting summarized herein was to provide the taskforce members with a solid grounding in the traffic data, including for bicycles and pedestrians, and site-based physical constraints which have been thus far been driving the consultant team's approach to replacing the existing interchange. Also discussed, based on earlier requests by taskforce members land ownership in the project area and a full listing of study area intersections. These study area intersections go well beyond the immediate bounds of the work zone and will form the basis of the project's traffic study. The second major topic of discussion was the multiple variants of interchange replacement option already looked at by the consultant team. While each of the options discussed falls under the general headings of suburban or urban interchange already discussed, there are multiple variations of each type all with their own unique pros and cons. Based in part of taskforce guidance, new elements were also brought into the discussion including a multi-use pathway[1] which would start somewhere in the vicinity of Lincoln Street and provide a connection to the Paul Dudley White pathway near the Boston University Bridge and a direct connection from the interchange to Soldiers' Field Road for inbound (towards downtown) traffic. Both of these changes are currently possible with all interchange options though it is possible this may change as the options are further detailed. MassDOT understands these connections are community priorities as expressed by the taskforce and will work to integrate them with the project.

[1] This pathway would be for pedestrians and cyclists only.

As with the previous taskforce meeting, the tone of session was generally positive. A major concern for taskforce members is that MassDOT provide a bicycle and pedestrian connection between the area south of the interchange around Boston University and either Cambridge Street and/or the Charles River. Of particular interest is that this connection be made in advance of West Station's eventual construction. While this connection was not shown at the meeting summarized herein, MassDOT is aware that it is of significance to the community and will advance the concepts so as not to preclude its consideration

After seeing the various options already considered, taskforce members requested that the consulting team begin developing some sort of method which could be used to begin comparing the various interchange replacement options to each other on criteria such as ease of creating new bicycle and pedestrian connections, protecting the abutting residential neighborhoods from cut-through traffic, and revitalizing Cambridge Street to name a few based on taskforce input. The project team will work to develop something along these lines and if possible present it at the next taskforce session. The taskforce also discussed traffic volumes in the project area and whether they have grown or shrunk over the past several years. The project team recognizes that within the past several years, traffic volumes around greater Boston have come down, but are projected to continue to rise in minimal increments on major roads like the Massachusetts Turnpike. Calibrating the design for the right level of future traffic growth will be important in developing an interchange design which is neither unduly large nor so small that it induces neighborhood congestion. MassDOT and its project team will continue to fine tune traffic assumptions based on work with the taskforce and the Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS) of the Boston Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) as the project progresses.

Detailed Meeting Minutes[2]

C: Ed Ionata (EI): Good evening everyone; it's good to see you and thank you for coming. I want to begin by reminding everyone that we do have a hard time restriction tonight as we must clear this space by 8:00PM. Our major agenda items tonight are going to be a review of the existing traffic volumes, site constraints both regulatory and physical and we'll end with a review of the detailed interchange concepts. You all have a copy of that in the packets you picked up at the sign-in desk.

A few quick housekeeping items: at our last meeting there was concern voiced that not everyone could hear everything so we will ask you to keep this to a single conversation so nobody misses anything. As we explained before the goal of this taskforce is to arrive at a multimodal transportation alternative for the replacement of the current Allston Interchange. We are generating detailed meeting minutes which will be posted to the project website. All of you should have received a copy of those with the concise summary at the beginning via email, but they will be posted to that project website. At this time, I'd like to ask Nate to give you some details on the website.

A: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis (NCC): Thank you, Ed; we heard from MassDOT that they expect the website to be up and running by the end of this week or sometime next week. DOT has everything we have generated for this process so the site should launch with everything in place in terms of presentations and minutes.

C: EI: So a few more administrative items before we move into the existing traffic items: in terms of existing site conditions what you have seen thus far from the design side of the team are hand sketches using an aerial photograph as a base. Site surveying is underway now which means we don't have an engineering base map yet. All of the concepts we develop will eventually be laid onto the base map which we expect to have sometime in mid-June. In terms of sharing materials with you, everything you see tonight will be posted to the project website just as soon as it is up and available. If you have a real urgent need to get something electronically, we can still email it to you. O.K. so that said, Nate has

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

worked to summarize both the DOT priorities for the project and the priorities we got from this group two weeks ago so we will quickly review those before moving on.

Taskforce and MassDOT Priorities

C: NCC: With so much to cover, I am going to move through this very quickly. This first slide is the same one you saw last time addressing MassDOT priorities for the job. It's divided up into categories: the interchange, Cambridge Street, transit, and the neighborhood. Please just take a moment and look at those so you can remember them when I get to the next slide. Now, as I move to the next slide, you all have the meeting minutes, and in them you can see in your own words, the good, specific priorities you gave us at the last meeting. In making these two slides, I have compressed and summarized what you told us, but rest assured, nothing has been lost. So, taskforce priorities: under the interchange, everyone said to realign the highway; nobody said keep it where it is. You all want to minimize the presence of the interchange. It's an interchange, in a neighborhood and right now it's a neighbor with a very heavy presence. Everyone wants to see safe connections between the interchange and Cambridge Street; right now those connections are not ideal as we all agree. We heard that you want greater permeability across the interchange, right now it really acts as a block to movement through the area and you mentioned context sensitive design. In terms of Cambridge Street, we want safe connections to the interchange, less impact of the interchange on its surroundings, there's a desire to reconfigure local roadway connections to improve safety, improving safety for all modes on Cambridge Street and again, keeping the design context sensitive. With regard to transit, we heard a lot of concern about connecting Cambridge Street to the future site of West Station. As Mike told you all two weeks ago, we're not sure whether we can build West Station as part of this project, but we know the connections are important to the neighborhood and we need to make them as part of this project. In terms of the neighborhood, we heard minimize the construction impacts, the new interchange should not induce cut-through traffic on neighborhood streets, and we want to reconnect Allston to itself and the Charles River. That's of great importance to you, we understand; I don't know if it was our first taskforce meeting or the first public information meeting, but someone said "we're the closest neighborhood to the River, but it feels the furthest away." Now for my last slide: these are some of the places where we can see some overlap between taskforce and DOT. One thing I want to note as I go through these is that many of the individual things you picked out for us, fall under the general heading we on the consultant side call context sensitive design. Places of overlap include improving safety for all modes of travel, realigning the interchange, providing a context sensitive design or broken out into specifics avoiding cut-through traffic, lessening the impact of the interchange and reconnecting Allston to itself and the river, protecting the neighborhood during construction, revitalizing Cambridge Street so it feels like a local street and not just a long approach to the highway, and ensuring accessibility to the future site of West Station. So, with that, I'll turn it back to Ed.

C: Thank you Nate. Tonight you are going to hear more about what is constraining the design. This includes both the site itself and the traffic challenges. As we move forward and look towards the next meeting we are heading in the direction of more detailed alternatives, similar to the ones you have in front of you tonight. We hope by the next meeting you will be able to look at these in more detail and come back to us with your concerns, ideas and considerations. We hope to turn all of these priorities into criteria to analyze and determine which of these alternatives needs to be future developed and which combination of alternatives will yield a preferred alternative that meets as many of the needs as possible. Are there any comments or questions at this point?

Q: Anthony D'Isodoro (AD): I'm sitting for Paul Berkeley tonight and I may be raising an issue which has already been discussed, but is it within the scope of this project to plan for when the job is over? Is there going to be a document that assigns ownership and discusses who will maintain which parcels. There has been substantial community discussion and arguments over foot bridges and cross bridges as to who's responsible for maintaining and cleaning those parcels. I'm wondering if that a legitimate concern of this project and to work this out with the city, MassDOT, Harvard, BU to figure out who is responsible for maintain each parcel.

A: Mark Gravallese (MG): I am Mark Gravallese, district 6 project engineer at MassDOT. I can fully relate to your request after my previous work along Cambridge Street. There has been a lot of discussion with the city and MassDOT regarding who maintains the lighting on these bridges, which organization cleans it and maintains it. MassDOT is responsible for the maintenance of the structures themselves. We are responsible for safe passage underneath them and the structural integrity is also our responsibility. It is my understanding that it is the city's responsibility to maintain the lighting and we will have a discussion with the city to make sure we have that clarified. I think that is a really good point to bring up. Also as you mentioned, a document showing who owns what in terms of parcels would be a very useful document to come out of this project. A project of this magnitude certainly deserves a document like that and we can add that to the work of the project.

C: AD: I have one more quick point to add to that Mark. There is a lot of space parallel to the Turnpike that has a lot of trash, down trees, limbs, and things that end up kicking out onto the highway. I hope that at the end of this project we don't have a fight over who owns what and who's responsible for similar situations if it comes to that. I would like to see a document that comes out of this group that gets all of that discussion out of the way and makes those decisions going forward so that everyone has a clear understanding.

C: MG: MassDOT and the city have a great relationship and we will work these things out similar to how it was done on the Casey Arborway Project where we developed a detailed Operations and Maintenance plan. DCR and the MBTA were involved with that as well.

C: Vineet Gupta (VG): I agree and I think this will be an important issue to address moving forward. In addition to lighting and trash, it is important to know who is responsible for the traffic signals, whether they are linked up to the city's system and whether they are managed by MassDOT.

C: EI: Thank you Vineet. We are now going to shift gears to hear from Mike Hall.

Discussion of Traffic Volumes

C: Mike Hall (MH): Thank you Ed. Again, I am Mike Hall. I work for TetraTech and I will be discussing the traffic volumes in and around the project site with you tonight. I will warn you now; I have a lot of numbers to show you and I want to push through them. If you can, please hold your questions until the end and I will do my best to answer any questions you may have. It may be difficult to digest all of the numbers immediately but again, as Nate and Ed have said, all of this information will be placed on the project website as soon as it is up and running. One of the concerns we heard in the last meeting was that the project area identified in green on this map is the only thing we are looking at. That is not the case. That is where the construction will take place. You can see, there are about 15 orange circles on that map and these represent the intersections we will be looking at in the area. We will look for your comments as to whether certain intersections are less relevant and should be removed and the same goes for an intersection that we do not have that should be added. I want to make it clear to everyone that we are not looking at just the green highlighted area. In addition to these 15 intersections, we will also be looking at the ramps to and from the interchange itself.

I want to start off by showing you some of the daily numbers that we touched briefly on in the last meeting. The traffic volumes east and west of the interchange are anywhere between 140,000 and 150,000 cars a day moving in both directions along the Turnpike. Through the toll plazas are about 110,000 cars a day. As you can see, these are pretty large numbers. In terms of the ramps themselves, this is the eastbound off and westbound on and going towards downtown we have the eastbound on and the westbound off and the U-turn. If you add up all of those volumes that are using the ramps on a daily basis, it's about 60,000 to 70,000 cars a day. That is a huge exchange of volumes happening each day at this interchange. When we are developing a concept design and layout the intersections and roadways, our ideas are driven by what is going on in the peak hour. These volumes are good to know because they are big numbers and help to set the general tenor of things, but I will now get into some AM and PM peak numbers along the ramps and the surrounding streets which really influences the

design. I'm going to start with the AM peak hour heading eastbound which is about 7,100 cars on the turnpike, 5,600 of which continue through the toll plazas towards downtown and 1,500 of which get off at the interchange. In the other direction heading west, it is about 5,400 cars in the AM peak hour and 1,300 of which are getting off at this interchange.

In terms of getting on in the AM peak hour heading west, 1,100 are coming on from Soldiers' Field Road and Cambridge Street in combination with the 4,100 from the previous slide gives us 5,200 cars in the AM peak hour heading west. In terms of inbound volumes, 1,800 cars currently get on in the AM peak hour and head east towards downtown. These numbers will become critical for us later on during construction staging because remember, we have to keep this interchange open during construction. I just want to highlight for you that this will be one of our biggest challenges. Now I will explain the volumes for the PM peak hour. There are 5,200 cars heading eastbound in the PM peak hour and 1,300 of which get off at the interchange. Heading westbound there are 5,900 cars along the Turnpike and about 1,400 use this interchange to get off the highway. In terms of on-ramp volumes heading west there is about 1,500 plus the 4,500 from the previous slide totaling 6,000. Heading inbound during the afternoon, there are about 5,000 cars and 1,600 of which are getting on at this interchange and heading towards Soldiers' Field Road and Cambridge.

The numbers are only one part of the equation. One of the more interesting things I found in the numbers is what happens to those volumes when they get off the ramp and go through the toll plazas. The interesting part is answering the question, where do they go? The next series of slides will show you the AM and PM peak volumes for both the on-ramps and the off-ramps and which direction they are going. For example this is the AM peak hour volumes with the eastbound off-ramp heading in from Route 128. Once that ramp splits, 70% are heading toward Soldiers' Field Road and 30% are using the loop ramp and going back towards Allston. The exact opposite is true for traffic coming out of the city in the. 70% of the traffic is heading down Cambridge Street towards Allston in the morning and 30% is heading towards Soldiers' Field Road and the river. We will be working with the Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS) of the Boston MPO to get some detailed origin/destination data in terms of cars passing through the interchange based on cell phone information. This will give us a better sense of where cars are beginning their trip and where cars are ending their trip. Our initial take on this is that the 70-30 split you saw coming in from the west is mostly characterized by people heading towards employment destinations. I'll use St. Elizabeth's Hospital in Brighton Center. If you were coming in from the west and worked at St. Elizabeth's Hospital, you wouldn't get off here but you're more likely to get off at Newton Corner. This way you won't have to back track and more importantly, you are avoiding the toll. If someone wanted to head to the Longwood Medical Area, you would get off the highway here, cross over the River Street bridge onto Memorial Drive, come down to the Boston University (BU) Bridge, cross over to Mountford Street and take Park Drive to get to the Longwood Medical Area. These are the types of trips we believe are happening and CTPS' data will help confirm that. If you were coming from the east near I-93 and wanted to heading towards the Kendall Square or the MIT area you wouldn't even use the Turnpike. You would most likely find another way to get there and this is why you see so few cars getting off at these exits and doubling back. Anyone who is heading from the east near I-93 and wants to get to New Balance, St. Elizabeth's or Brighton Center it would make sense to get off at the interchange and travel down Cambridge Street.

In terms of getting on the Turnpike in the morning, about 1,300 cars use the ramp on Cambridge Street to access the Turnpike. 70% of the 1,300 are heading east and 30% are heading west. Soldiers' Field Road shows a heavy percentage heading towards the east. I'm going to walk quickly through the PM peaks and again, the percentages are very similar. If you come off from the west, instead of 70-30 in the morning it is 60-40 in the afternoon. Coming in from the east and getting off at the interchange, instead of 70-30, it's 65-35. You can see the patterns are very similar from the morning to the afternoon; it's basically people making the reverse commuter trip. In the afternoon there is an orientation for the cars coming from the Soldiers' Field Road area to the west. We also have some counts along some of the local streets and I don't have time to go through every street tonight but I will touch on some of the main ones. Right now we are showing Cambridge Street, North Harvard and Western Avenue. You can see the hierarchy of streets here becomes clear as the traffic volumes are

processed. The morning peak hour with two directional volumes along Cambridge Street is over 2,000 cars per hour. On North Harvard and Western Avenue it is closer to 650 cars per hour in both directions. We also highlighted Linden Street which is a major connection as I am sure most of you are aware of. If you are coming from Brookline or even the Commonwealth Avenue area and you want to head to the turnpike, this is a shortcut that 550 cars per hour know about.

C: Marc Kadish (MK): Harvard Avenue backs up so much that sometimes people just take Linden Street to avoid the traffic.

A: MH: Exactly. If you're coming from the Fenway or BU area, you hit that street first and it is an easy right turn and then another right turn.

In terms of the afternoon peak hours Cambridge Street is up over 2,500 cars in both directions combined. North Harvard and Western Avenue are more than 800 vehicles per hour compared to the AM peak of 650 cars per hour. We also counted pedestrians and bicycles but before I show you those numbers I want to qualify the numbers you are about to see. The counts were done in late fall, early winter so the numbers you are about to see are particularly low and we do recognize that.

Q: Jessica Robertson (JR): I have a quick question. In terms of exiting the Turnpike did you do counts at the River Street intersections to see how many went straight across the river and how many turned right onto Soldiers' Field Road?

A: MH: Yes we did.

Q: JR: When you put this up online can you add the breakdown numbers of the intersection at River Street and Soldiers' Field Road?

A: MH: Yes, we can do that. I can tell you now that the right turn averages between 500 and 550 cars per hour during both the AM and PM peak hours.

Q: MK: As a quick recap before we go on. If I do the math correctly it is about 70,000 cars going on and 70,000 cars going out. Is that through the toll booth?

A: MH: The 70,000 each way that I previously mentioned was west of the toll plazas. Through the toll plazas is about 110,000.

Q: MK: 110,000 cars a day pass through the tolls?

A: MH: Yes, the mainline toll plazas.

Q: MK: How much is the fee? I have an EZ Pass. Is it a $1.00?

A: JR: It is a $1.25

Q: MK: So it's a $1.25 times 110,000 cars a day or is it 110,000 cars each way?

A: MH: 110,000 cars combined.

Q: MK: So it takes in roughly 40 million a year? I'm not sure if I did the math straight.

A: MH: I don't know, I haven't done the math.

C: MK: When I ask for some trees and flowers down the road, please remember that.

C: MH: Here we have the AM and PM peak bicycle volumes. They are very low and we understand that because they were done in November and the weather was cold. I will say, and we will supplement these numbers with warm weather counts. It would be very interesting for this group to see what the actual bicycle counts are for Cambridge Street. Cambridge Street is one of the more inhospitable bicycle areas that I am aware of. The volumes should be higher but I'm not sure we are going to see volumes like we see along Commonwealth Avenue. Commonwealth Avenue bicycle lanes see well over 100 bicycles per hour. Here are our pedestrian crossing numbers, again, we understand those are very low and we will be supplementing those with warm weather counts. I would like to say that no matter what the counts are MassDOT is committed to having first class pedestrian and bicycle facilities as part of this project. We will provide the necessary bicycle and pedestrian accommodations no matter what the numbers are.

I would like to spend a minute talking about the intersection of Cambridge Street, River Street and Soldiers' Field Road. I want to because there are some lessons here that we can draw upon. We can all agree that this intersection doesn't work. We have been thinking about why it doesn't work and there are several reasons. One of the reasons is that theoretically there are more like three signals rather than one. There are five legs of traffic coming into the intersection. The last complicating factor is the signal phases. There are actually five phases to the signal and I want to quickly run through it for you. First you have the off-ramps, then Cambridge Street, then the hotel exit, next is Soldiers' Field Road, then the eastbound off-ramp which has to clear through all three of those signals and then finally the frontage road. For every signal phase we have three or four seconds of time that is lost. That ends up being 15 seconds for every cycle. We are losing hundreds of seconds per hour because of the layout of the intersection. We know that we have to simplify and untangle this mess. This all comes back to the considerations we need to take and incorporate into the new interchange layout.

The first thing we need to do is simplify the Cambridge Street and Soldiers' Field Road intersection. When I say simplify I mean less legs entering it, less complicated phasing, and simplify it by reducing volumes. This intersection concentrates volume and we want to provide a system that disperses the volumes to the best degree possible.

C: JR: So when you do your bicycle and pedestrian counts around the River Street Bridge, please make sure to get both people who are riding on the street as well as people who are traveling on the bicycle path, particularly those using the path to cross the intersection.

Q: Galen Mook (GM): When you did your bicycle and pedestrian counts, did you also include cyclists riding on the sidewalk? I think it would be important to capture them as well.

C: Matthew Danish (MD): I think another thing that would be important is to look at walking and cycling volumes around the neighborhood during the course of the day and not just during the peak hours. Walking and cycling doesn't really get processed with the same analysis you would do for vehicles. Another thing I am concerned about is when you talk about 2035 traffic volumes and that they will increase. Having them grow violates the Commonwealth's goal of having a zero percent increase in vehicle trips and a tripling of walking, bicycling, and transit trips. It doesn't make sense to talk about growth up front. We don't want that.

Q: David Watson (DW): Do you have historical traffic volumes for this area? Have the numbers been growing?

A: MH: The Commonwealth's planners say that there's about a quarter percent per year increase in volume on the Turnpike.

C: DW: I think you want to look at that assumption very carefully. We've seen volumes actually decreasing in and around metro Boston over the past several years.

A: MH: The numbers around Boston are generally down and I think we have to be careful about assuming growth on local streets. I think that's where you might have very low to no growth but as the economy picks up, we need to remember to think about the long range projection and what the linear average is going to be. We don't want to overestimate, that's a mistake, but it's also a mistake for us to design something that's inappropriate and won't serve the needs of the traveling public to the extent it impacts the neighborhood. Taskforce input on what's going on here in Allston is definitely going to be important as we move forward on this.

C: EI: So, I want to keep moving here and give Chris a chance to present the project constraints, but before I do I wanted to mention that Mike O'Dowd could not be here because a close friend has passed away and he's at the wake. That said, he wanted me to tell all of you that he remains fully committed to the project and he will see you at the next meeting.

Discussion of Project Constraints

C: Chris Calnan (CC): Good evening everyone. At the last meeting, we talked about some of the major constrains associated with the project and got some good comments from all of you in response to that. Tonight I want to go into that a little deeper. We've broken our constraints out into categories and the first of those is operations. During construction we need to maintain local connections and maintain eight lanes on the turnpike for those enormous volumes Mike just explained. We also need to maintain rail service both on the commuter rail mainline and via the Grand Junction. As we think about the design, we also have to think of the final configuration. As Matt Ciborowski explained at our last meeting, the train lines have to stay to the south of the roadway, but we also have to maintain the rail connection to Houghton Chemical. We need to leave room for a future West Station. Whatever our new alignment for I-90 is going to be, it has to provide decent operating speeds, 60-65 miles per hour, and the ramps need to be long enough and at the right grade to allow for safe acceleration and deceleration. We also have to think about the queues where ramp traffic intersects with local streets and providing enough space so that those vehicles don't stretch back onto the mainline of I-90.

When we think about physical constraints, one spot where we will spend some more time in a future meeting is the point where you have the rail lines running under the Allston viaduct between Boston University, Soldiers' Field Road, the bicycle path, the Grand Junction Line and the river. There's a lot going on here and there's really a tightly limited right-of-way. Replacing the viaduct in this area is going to be a real challenge. Clearance over the rail yard is also an issue. We understand from taskforce comments that providing a connection across to the Boston University side is important but there are issues with clearance over the rail lines where we have to provide 18 feet, 6 inches of room and overcome a 20-25 foot elevation difference between the two ends of any connection which keeping an ADA-compliant grade to the structure. That's a real challenge.

In terms of right-of-way, in keeping with MassDOT goals we are trying to minimize how much land we use for this project, but there are some places where we cannot place ramps. If you look at this area between the Turnpike and Cambridge Street which we have covered with a yellow cross-hatch, that is where we cannot put a ramp because in connecting to the street we would either have inadequate room for acceleration/deceleration or have a grade greater than 5%. Another physical constraint is potential sub-surface soil contamination. We expect some to be there and while we don't see it driving the design, we have to be aware of it.

Moving ahead to the regulatory perspective, Soldiers' Field Road is a historic parkway and the entire Charles River Basin has a historic designation. Changes there may lead us into the 4f process. There will need to be treatment of stormwater as the Commonwealth has an increasing focus there so that will be part of the design. There are also fiscal and scheduling constraints. There are currently $160 million budgeted for this project, but we could wind up needing more money than that so you can think of funding as a challenge. Schedule is also a constraint. We need to progress the project fast enough to align with the implementation of AET so that as that project wraps up, MassDOT can switch smoothly over to this one.

C: Bob Sloan (BS): I'm wondering about the railroad tracks and the air rights above them. If there is going to be West Station there will be things built around West Station which will require use of the air rights. I am mostly interested in the air rights above the rail tracks. If you do not preserve the options for development above the rail tracks there will be conflicts in the future. I want to make sure this is something that is considered moving forward. It would also be helpful moving forward if we could have a map for this area with the land use and any further development plans Harvard has for this area.

A: CC: That's a good point. Air rights are certainly something which we will have to continue to address.

Q: Harry Mattison (HM): Are you treating these constraints as ironclad or can they be traded off? If you spend more money on certain things is there less available for something else? For example, you could clean up all the contaminated soil or leave it where it is and spend the money on something else. There are ways to do things that are the simplest, least expensive and then there are more thorough, complicated ways. How is the design team treating this?

A: CC: I would say that some are more hard and fast than others. We know we have to maintain local connections during and after construction. If we take out lanes on the Turnpike, we know we'll have gridlock. In terms of contamination we know we have to address that during construction. We have to work within the budget constraints that have been set up for this project but I will say that some are definitely more hard and fast than others.

C: HM: There are bridge projects happening in our neighborhood that haven't maintained all of those connections. I hope next time we see this there will be more options for tradeoffs to be made. If one connection has to be removed for a certain part of the project but it will help speed up the overall project process, those are the types of tradeoffs that should be made and should be useful to know about.

C: MG: Everyone has their local connections and our goal is to maintain them. However if there is a clear tradeoff that will be beneficial to the project we will certainly come to you all and show you the pros and cons of each option.

Q: JR: I was wondering if there are any Harvard constraints regarding land use and how much of the land will end up getting used?

A: CC: We do have a map towards the end of the presentation showing the ownership and constraints within the project area. As far as the area of impact, easements and constraints, all of that still needs to be figured out.

C: EI: The charge we have from MassDOT right now is to work with you and come up with the best preferred alternative possible. If the preferred alternative involves using more land we are open to that. Our designers are completely free and opened minded to anything that comes out of the taskforce. That said, MassDOT will continue to use the least amount of land needed for this project. We don't have a map that stated we have to stay out of this area or that area.

C: VG: Bob Sloan mentioned the physical and operation constraints earlier and how those will be incorporated into the future designs. There will also be a large amount of constraints and opportunities in terms of the local street network. In many ways, the existing street layout and the addition of new local streets is a major constraint for this project as well. I think that was where Bob was heading with his previous comment.

C: EI: That's a really good point.

C: Nicole Freedman (NF): I want to bring up the fact that this project and the Allston area is almost the size of downtown Boston. There is a huge opportunity to create an entirely new neighborhood and to implement world class transportation infrastructure to go along with it.

A: CC: I'm hoping with the input from the taskforce, that we will be able to help steer some of these alternatives for the new neighborhood and local street network.

C: NF: I'm thinking world-class infrastructure and this could happen with a design contest similar to what would happen at Disney.

C: MG: In terms of the project constraints and moving forward with them, so far what everyone has seen up to this point is two dimensional. We have shown you some cross-sections with some vertical clearance issues. In one of the next upcoming meetings we will come to you with three dimensional graphics and this will help show you some more of the vertical constraints. Connectivity will certainly be a challenge and we understand that. Three dimensional constraints are going to be something that everyone will need to keep in mind.

C: CC: All right, so I want to move us ahead here to discuss the interchange options.

Discussion of Interchange Options

C: MH: My colleague Brian Ackley and I are going to attempt to tag team this discussion. Last time we showed you three very basic concept groups. One of those groups was more of an urban style interchange and it appeared that people liked this one the best. We will continue to carry all three alternatives until one is determined at the sole preferred alternative. Brian and I will now walk you through the alternatives and I will say that we have a few more for the urban style interchange which is also known as group three. We have variations from each of the original three groups and that is what your received in your handout when you came in tonight. As a reminder, in the suburban type interchange we have on-ramps coming in at one location and off-ramps coming in at another location. In the second suburban type interchange we have both on and off-ramps paired at two separate locations.

C: Brian Ackley (BA): We have added a few features to these concepts. The blue lines north of Cambridge Street represent future roadway connections between Cambridge Street and Western Avenue. Our traffic analyses will takes these roadways into consideration. The light blue line with arrows on each end represents a shared-use path that will be designated for use by cyclists and pedestrians. We have also added a link between the interchange and Soldiers' Field Road. This will provide right-in, right-out traffic connections. We are showing some constraints on these aerials that we were not showing before. The orange lines represent the railroad spur line servicing Houghton Chemical and Grand Junction Railroad, both of which must be maintained within the project.

C: MH: In terms of how cars will come in and out, heading from the east you would exit and come up to this intersection from the grade. There is a grade separation that ties into the ramp and comes up to the intersection on Cambridge Street. Thinking back to what I mentioned earlier, this connection has the ability to reduce cars traveling to and from the Double Tree Hotel and eliminate the signal phases needed for that movement right now. In this configuration there are two points of access which creates less concentrated volume. In terms of distribution rates 70% travel west and the other 30% want to head towards the river.

Q: VG: Could you explain what is happening near the river, south of the Double Tree Hotel?

A: MH: This will be a new road that will be built into all of the alternatives with the purpose of taking approximately 550 cars per hour off the ramps and address some of the conflict with the signal phases at the intersection of Cambridge Street and Soldiers' Field Road. A:

Q: Bruce Houghton (BH): Your new connection to Soldiers' Field Road appears to be inbound only? Do you have a plan for an outbound connection?

A: MH: Correct, right now the connection we are showing would be for eastbound traffic to get off the highway and continue east on Soldiers' Field Road.

Q: BH: How does that change things on Cambridge Street in terms of traffic?

A: MG: The assumption would be that some interchange traffic is still going to use Cambridge Street; it's just not as heavily used.

Q: Bill Deignan (BD): You mentioned the Cambridge Street intersection and removing some of the volume from it. Is that also true for the Western Avenue? What impact would the future local connections have on that?

A: MH: These connections shown in blue are future connections to be made by another party. We assume they will be built eventually and we don't want to do anything which would curtail their viability. What we're seeing now is cars coming up Memorial Drive, taking a left, and then another left to get on the highway. With this future connection, they could avoid this intersection. It could be a good relief actually.

Q: HM: Does that mean maybe sometime in the future?

A: MH: We really don't know at this point.

A: MG: We don't own the land. It's developable land and so it's dependent on what happens in the future.

C: HM: That sounds as though you are telling me it's just not within the scope of this project.

A: MH: The Harvard Institutional Master Plan (IMP) talks about making those kinds of connections and we didn't want to ignore that. We don't want to, for example, place an intersection that would be off-set from those connections and damage the potential for making Cambridge Street work a little smoother in the future. It's incumbent on us to try to gather as much information so our design can be as compatible as possible.

A: MG: We don't want to preclude anything; that's one thing we really don't want to do.

Q: GM: In terms of the future connection to Soldiers' Field Road, do you have traffic counts for Soldiers' Field and Memorial Drive and a sense of what the capacity for Soldiers' Field Road is? I'm a little unsure about this; I know we all like the connection to Soldiers' Field and what that could do for Cambridge Street, but I guess we don't want to just shift the problem and overcrowd another road.

A: MH: I know we have data for the intersection of Soldiers' Field Road/Cambridge Street and Memorial Drive/River Street. I'll have to see what we have on Soldiers' Field Road with MassDOT in terms of mainline volumes.

C: GM: I just want to make it clear that we don't want to overburden another road.

A: MH: Sure and remember that these right turns are working in no different from the right turns you currently have coming on from Cambridge Street.

A: MG: And we are coordinating all of this with DCR.

C: MH: O.K. so this is 1D and a little variation, but is still very similar to the last couple of alternatives. There's a little frontage road that siphons traffic off towards Soldiers' Field Road and towards the on-ramps. Other than that it's really similar to some of the other ones.

So, now I want to switch to the second group. This is 2A and of these we only have two and it pairs up the on and off ramps. So for example, at this intersection here, the ramp connection is to and from the east and this intersection has ramps to and from the west. One of the things I wanted to talk with this group about is why we have that distribution that I showed you earlier where have 70% of cars wanting to turn left and go west on Cambridge Street. On the opposite side, you have 70% of the cars wanting to turn left and go east. Now that makes this stretch of Cambridge Street incredibly burdened with trying to handle 70% of the ramp traffic going west and 70% going east. We see this as a significant disadvantage for this option.

Q: BH: I'm a little confused and in need of clarification here about where the proposed shared use path is. Is that something that's in planning or is like the light blue "for construction by others," and what is it expected to accomplish? Is it part of the plan? Is it for bicycles, pedestrians and roller-bladers?

A: MH: The shared use path is part of the plan. A shared use path is just like you said: it's for bicycles, pedestrians and roller-bladers. We're trying to make a connection between Cambridge Street, around Lincoln Street, and the Paul Dudley White Path as far to the east as possible. Where exactly it would connect we don't know yet, but within this project area, we want reserve some space for a shared use path for bicycle and pedestrians.

Q: BH: And it is specifically not for automobiles?

A: MH: Correct. It is specifically not for automobiles. It's not for construction by others. It's part of this project.

All right, I'm going to keep breezing through these number two options. These really have the dedicated right turn lanes with a real suburban feel to them and I want to get to the urban interchange which I know is the one most interests this group. Let me quickly walk you through our option 3's. That's the urban interchange. It's a split diamond configuration. If you're coming from the east and you want to get off there's a ramp that's almost like a frontage road that lets you come up to an intersection and you can take a right to go to Cambridge Street or you can continue on the frontage road to the second signal and you can head right to Cambridge Street. Again, the goal here is to disburse the traffic. Both of these connections to interchange, this road here and this one here are two way connections. Coming in from the west, you would exit, go along the ramp and turn left to Cambridge Street from this intersection or this intersection. Again, we're disbursing the traffic. If someone is coming in from the west towards the river which is the main traffic direction they could come down to the second intersection and stay off of Cambridge Street. We are also showing a potential bus loop which would serve as the connection for transit to the future West Station. 3B is a variation of the previous one.

C: EI: I think you might want to pause and take some questions on the first one.

Q: DW: It's really helpful that you're kind of going through the advantages and disadvantages that you have found associated with the options, but will this all be written down somewhere so we can refer back to it as we're looking at these later?

A: NCC: It's all going into the meeting minutes so that will be posted to the project website soon.

A: MH: We haven't gone through and done a formal advantages/disadvantages listing, I'm really speaking off the cuff a bit. These are things that occurred to me as I was preparing for tonight's presentation.

C: DW: Which is all very helpful, it's just a lot of information to take in all at once.

A: MH: Definitely; we're going to get there with all these alternatives. You're right; it is a lot to process.

C: EI: I know this is a huge download of information and it's important we all have it to start from the same baseline, but something we want to do in our next meeting is to start to pro and con these alternatives.

Some of those pros and cons will come from us and we hope some will come from you. So think of tonight as a download of information, some more important, perhaps some less, that we will use to discuss these options in the future. Eventually we want to come up with a nice crisp list of evaluation criteria to help us decide on our preferred alternative.

C: MH: Also, as we mentioned earlier, this is about demonstrating to you that we are also right at the beginning of this project and that we had thought about more than just the options we shared in our first meeting. Many of the variations are admittedly quite subtle, for example, this one 3B, this makes a connection directly to North Harvard Street rather than making the connection over here.

Q: VG: Mike, if you can go back a moment please, with the option 3A; if I am south of the mainline, how do I connect to the ramp to Cambridge Street?

A: MH: You have two options. If you look at your packets, you will see an S which stands for a signalized intersection. At the first intersection, the driver can turn left or continue straight to the next intersection where they would make the left to Cambridge Street. In this case, the connector road is grade separated to get you to the other side of highway, Vineet, then there would be another signal on the other side of the highway, after which you would go to Cambridge Street. The same is true of the other connection.

C: Brian Ackley (BA): What you're doing is rising in grade so you pass over I-90.

Q: VG: And those slopes are less than 5%, correct?

A: MH: Yes, they are.

Q: BH: I understand that all of these options are vehicular traffic, but all of these different roads have an impact on the proposed railroad station which is for the use all of Allston. I can see how it can easily be accessed by North Allston, but not South Allston. I'm wondering if you could put through onto your maps how people would use this space. I can see the pedestrian pathway here, the shared use path, but in that shared use path there will ultimately be many people moving across undeveloped land and how do they get to the train station? How are you planning for them to access over and under the roadway?

A: MH: In this particular option, they would go over the roadway. That's why we've been talking about ADA-compliant grades so that pedestrians and bicycles can get up over the highway to this elevated roadway in red which gets you into the vicinity of the station.

Q: BH: So on all of these elevated roadways, where you have ramps going over the highway, is a component of those ramps going to be walking and bicycling space?

A: MH: Wherever we can easily make a connection for pedestrians and bicycles to the future West Station we have added and assumed that path. So that means, on some of these options, if you don't see those connections, it means we're still trying to figure out how to make that work. Where it's simple, we've shown it.

C: BH: It would really make me feel comfortable if I could see how humans would get around this. A big, substantial part of balancing the positives and negatives of these options for me is how cyclists and pedestrians access the station. It's very hard for me to balance these without that basic component.

A: BA: I'd like to answer a part of that. These sections of the road, and you saw a profile of this earlier in the presentation, they have a 4.75% profile to them and that's ADA-compliant which means they are for use by all modes. These, we really shouldn't call them ramps, they are more access roads, connector roads and they have sidewalks and accommodations for bicycles, pedestrians..

C: BH: O.K. but if I go back to 2B, 2B only has ramps and I guess that's what I'm asking; when I look at 2B, I see ramps to discharge and access the highway and I assume when you have a high speed traffic ramp that won't be very pleasant for people on bicycles.

A: BA: As we go through the evaluation of these alternatives, that's something, we're going to factor into the discussion.

C: BH: I guess I'd just like to see that be a part of this how all modes would access things and understand how people interact with this. If I'm looking at 2B and I say well there's nothing planned here for me to cross the highway, that's a big negative.

A: MH: Oh, we agree, and that's exactly why we've brought all this to the taskforce. This is the process we need to go through. On some of the suburban type interchanges, group 1, group 2, we see real challenges in making those bicycle and pedestrian connections and we see that as a negative aspect of them. The urban interchange type makes the connection much easier for us. If you don't see a bicycle and pedestrian connection here, it's because we haven't figured it out yet and we may not figure it out. Pedestrian and bicycle connections to West Station are important and if we cannot make them in a given option, then it will drop out.

A: MG: If you compare the 2B option, and the urban interchange with the connector roads, 2B really has more typical interstate kind of access with restricted access where you see the sign with "no horse, no pedestrians, no bicycles, no mopeds, etc.," we're not going to force-feed all those modes into restricted access and as was just noted, that is a downside to the option 2 alternatives. When we have those connector roads, we get better benefits.

C: MH: This next option 3A is a variation on the urban interchange and is sort of a hybrid split diamond. It takes up a bit more space and provides us with two connections to Cambridge Street. It's grade separated and able to provide traffic dispersion.

C: Wayne MacKenzie (WM): Going back to where you had the mixed use path that connects over to the river. Let's say for example that you're on Linden Street and you want to get to the Charles River, that doesn't give you any better access to the river. You have to head west to go back east towards the river. If you could head south on Linden Street towards that bicycle path, that would be helpful.

A: MH: We can provide a connection along this road, as Brian said, it would be a sidewalk and some kind of bicycle accommodation to connect to the mixed use pathway, absolutely. That's a good comment.

A: EI: The mixed use path, in addition to making that direct connection, it also helps to provide connections within Allston itself for bicycles and pedestrians.

C: John Allen (JA): I'm looking at option 3B and some of the other options and I don't see the connection into the Boston University campus area. I seriously hope that cyclists and pedestrians, and perhaps also motor vehicles, will be able to get down to Boston University, the Agannis Arena, and Commonwealth Avenue.

A: MH: It's our intention to provide for bicycle and pedestrian connection in that area, somewhere in the vicinity of Malvern Street or Babcock Street. In terms of vehicles, we may not be able to accomplish it because of the grade differential.

A: MG: Not accounting for those bicycle and pedestrian connections would certainly go against our policy. The station itself is not currently part of this project, but we certainly have to coordinate with the MBTA or otherwise we won't know where to plan for connections.

Q: Community Resident (CR): If I'm in Brighton, in the vicinity of Packard's Corner, if you want to go the ¼ mile to West Station, as a pedestrian, how would you do that?

A: MH: You might come down Malvern Street, maybe Ashford Street or Babcock Street. Some of this is private property so it complicates the picture a bit. As Mark said, we're not designing the station as part

of this project, but I would say that when the station goes in, there would be an ADA-compliant connection somewhere along that frontage, it doesn't have to be a ramp, it could be an elevator.

C: CR: I guess my concern is more about if the station doesn't go in and then for a period, people who want to get out to the river have to walk all the way to Linden Street and all the way back.

Q: HM: I'd like something clarified. At the last meeting, I think Mike O'Dowd said that it wasn't certain whether or not West Station was part of the project and tonight I'm hearing you say that the project does not include West Station, so I think it would be useful, given the multimodal nature of this project and the expectation of a strong commuter rail component, that West Station is totally out, totally not funded, and that we're getting a vacant lot with a chain link fence around it saying "future site of West Station," then it would be good to know that.

A: Matt Ciborowski (MC): The goal for the project team right now is to plan for West Station and to design the interchange, design the pedestrian and bicycle connections, the best way they can to connect to a station at that location. I've got to go back to the MBTA and talk to some folks and express the interest that the taskforce has to have a station at the location. Mark and the rest of the team work for the highway division, but they are multimodal guys, I know they are and I've got to go back to the rail guys and talk more about what the station can and should be. So we're trying to find ways to integrate the station into the planning and the project.

Q: HM: So is there a timeline for that, or are you telling me to forget about it because it's a 10-year process?

A: MC: That's a valid question, but I really don't have an answer right now. I'm going to try to get one, but we are focused on trying to integrate all of the rail stuff into this and making sure it works.

C: EI: I'm going to ask that we get back to the options because it's just going to be a few more minutes.

C: MH: So take a look at option 3E. It's sort of a hybrid of the urban and suburban interchanges. Take a look at 3F, this one is particularly good for the dispersal of traffic with four connections to Cambridge Street. This option does give us good opportunities to connect into West Station; it's a split diamond configuration. This of the Southeast Expressway around Albany Street and how that functions and it would be sort of like this. With that, I want to give it back to Chris for the last slide.

Discussion of Property Ownership

C: CC: O.K. so this map is the property ownership document which I believe was drawn from the South Station Expansion report. This pinkish color is land owned by BU, the green with gray shading is land owned by Harvard and then you have various components, such as coming through the rail area you have easements for the MBTA mainline, the neighborhoods, homes in private hands, and those are delineated with a light green outline. It does give you the idea that most of the land bounded by Cambridge Street and down into this area is Harvard-controlled and further to the south, the big owner is BU. That's pretty much it.

Q: JR: One quick question: I don't understand what the lines going through the middle of things are; if the area on both sides of the lines is all Harvard?

A: CC: Those are all individual parcels, just under the same owner.

C: JR: And now, would you go back to 3F? One question that a few people have brought up is the question of access from Boston University and Allston Village to West Station and the new connector roads. I don't want to see us reliant on the station to make those connections, because if the station isn't part of this project, then there's a period without a bicycle and pedestrian connection and in the future, when there is a station, you don't want cyclists and pedestrians traveling through the station. I'd

really like there to be a connection to the red U-shape[3] for bicycles and pedestrians. It's really a key priority.

Q: EI: So you would like to see that with all of the alternatives?

A: JR: Yes, a new bicycle and pedestrian connection from Allston Village and BU across to Cambridge Street and the BU Bridge area.

C: CC: So one of the things to understand about the ownership map is that some of the public connections we are discussing would have to go over private property. We would have to work with those landowners.

Q: JR: What about a new connection to Babcock Street?

A: CC: A key difficulty there is that the final block of Babcock Street before it stops at the railroad tracks is not public; it's a private way.

Q: AD: So if this taskforce supports a design that could require changes to parcel ownership, can the project spur a land-swap or some similar instrument to accommodate it?

A: EI: This project will definitely have some new easements. Our charge, like with any highway project anywhere in the country is to minimize the impacts we have on private land, but for now, we need to work with the taskforce to figure out the best option for the transportation and then work out the land portion.

Before we go any further, I just wanted to remind people that our next meeting will be June 11th for which we will be back at the Fiorentino Center. If anyone has concerns or issues with the taskforce rules, please let me know.

C: NCC: Without Mike here, we don't want to make any decisions on the timing of our upcoming sessions, but we will let you know once we've reconnected with him.

Q: CR: One of the interesting things about the disbursal of traffic along Cambridge Street and option 3 calls attention to it is Cambridge Street itself and possible peripheral effects on the neighborhood streets. What would your plan be to prevent new cut-through traffic? Some of the options have access roads aligned with Windom Street and others as though you are creating access routes right down our neighborhood streets.

A: MH: It's not our intent to cause new cut-through traffic. We're trying to develop an alignment which minimizes cut-through traffic. If you look at the streets running north from Cambridge, there are already some elements in place to try to prevent it. We will work with the taskforce to look at ways to address cut-through traffic whether its traffic calming, changes in street direction, or where the new roads connect to Cambridge Street. That said, cross-connections on a north-south alignment are one of our charges as we work with the taskforce. We want to minimize traffic on existing residential streets.

C: CR: I would point out the new streets on the old Sears lot listed as not part of our plan, those would create a through-way which the Harvard-Allston taskforce strongly advocated as a solution for several of the problems in the Harvard Master Plan. It also happens to be a privileged solution to some of the problems I see here and I was just wondering if there is some way you could encourage the development of those streets.

Q: EI: So just to paraphrase, you'd like to minimize the amount of traffic that's coming here, here, and here, and put it here?[4]

[3] This is the future West Station connection shown on the plans.

A: CR: Yes, because it's an empty tract of land on which a street has been advocated for quite a long time and occasionally designed and I'm wondering if you push for them to be there and create a connection between Cambridge Street and the northeast and the turnpike so that neighborhood streets can really be exempt from regional traffic.

Q: EI: If those streets were there, would you still want to see access points here?

A: CR: Yes, I think so yes. I'd like to something which takes the traffic out of the neighborhood. Ideally, I'd like to see a privileged road for that traffic that doesn't involve neighborhoods and signals.

C: WM: Pretty much every afternoon, traffic gets off the Turnpike, goes down Cambridge Street and then Linden Street because Cambridge Street is backed up so they go down the end of Western Avenue and down Windom. Every day, they turn down Windom and continue to Hopedale Street and make a U-turn. If Harvard committed to those two blue roads or you made a land-taking to make them it would certainly free up a lot of the traffic.

A: EI: O.K. we're about to be thrown out here, so you get the last comment. Go.

Q: Tad Read (TR): We talked about wanting to accommodate or not preclude the two blue lines, East Drive and Stadium Way and I can't imagine that as the major landowner here, Harvard hasn't been thinking about what they'd like to see in terms of new connections and streets and assuming that's true, at what point in the process does the taskforce get an opportunity to see what they are thinking about so we can see the relationship between Harvard's plans and the new ramp system and how it would be designed?

A: CC: The IMP Harvard has put together stops at Cambridge Street so I don't believe Harvard has anything to share with us in that area.

A: EI: Our understanding is that they have not yet really thought about that area so our charge is to try to not preclude any reasonable street passage in the future.

Next Steps

The next taskforce meeting will be held at **6PM on Wednesday, June 11th at the Fiorentino Community Center.** The Fiorentino Center is at 123 Antwerp Street in Allston.

---

[4] The first set of here's corresponds to the area around Windom Street. The final here corresponds to the "to-be-built-by-others" roads across the old Sears warehouse parcel shown in project maps in dark blue.

Appendix 1: Meeting Attendees

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
John	Allen	Waltham Bicycle Committee
George	Batchelor	MassDOT
Joseph	Beggan	Taskforce
Glen	Berkowitz	Taskforce
Andrew	Bettenelli	Taskforce
Stephen	Bushnell	Taskforce
Nathaniel	Cabral-Curtis	Howard/Stein-Hudson
Chris	Calnan	TetraTech
Craig	Cashman	Taskforce
Jim	Cerbone	MassDOT
Alex	Chase	For Mark Handley
Matt	Ciborowski	MBTA
Ryan	Coholan	MBTA
Paul	Creighton	Allston APAC
James	Curley	Taskforce
John	Cusack	Taskforce
Anthony	D'Isadoro	For Paul Berkeley
Donny	Dailey	MassDOT
Daniel	Daly	Local 103 IBEW
Matthew	Danish	Taskforce
Bill	Deignan	Taskforce
Stacey	Donahoe	MassDOT
Rochelle	Dunne	Taskforce
John	Fallon	MassDOT
Paola	Ferrer	Taskforce
Nicole	Freedman	Taskforce
Nick	Gross	Howard/Stein-Hudson
Vineet	Gupta	Taskforce
Karl	Haglund	DCR
Bruce	Houghton	Taskforce
Ed	Ionata	TetraTech
Marc	Kadish	For Alana Olsen
Rich	Lennox	WSP Sells
Sharon	Long	Community resident
Will	Luzier	Taskforce
Wayne	MacKenzie	Taskforce
Mary	Maguire	Taskforce
Frank	Mahaffy	FXM Associates
Christine	Marini	Boston Police
Carol	Martinez	Community resident
Harry	Mattison	Taskforce
Renny	McKinney	Community Resident
John	McQueen	RTAC Member
Galen	Mook	Taskforce
Meredith	Mooney	For Elizabeth Leary
Tom	Nally	ABC
Tad	Read	Taskforce
Jessica	Robertson	Taskforce

Steve	Silveira	Taskforce
Bob	Sloan	For Wendy Landman
Diane	Tsitos	FXM Associates
David	Watson	Taskforce
John	Wicks	WSP Sells
Tom	Yardley	Taskforce
Jillian	Zywien	Taskforce