MEMORANDUM

To:	Mike O'Dowd MassDOT Project Manager	Date: November 28, 2018	
From:	Jeff Dietrich Howard Stein Hudson	HSH Project No.:	2013061.14
Subject:	MassDOT Allston I-90 Task Force Meeting #32 Meeting Notes of October 24, 2018		

Overview

On October 24, 2018, members of the Allston I-90 Interchange Improvement Project team and associated MassDOT staff held the 32nd Task Force meeting for the job. The Task Force 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 group is, through the application of its members' in-depth knowledge, to assist and advise MassDOT in determining a single preferred alternative to be selected by the Secretary of Transportation for documentation in a joint Environmental Assessment and Environmental Impact Report (EIR) document.

This was the first meeting between the project team which wrote the project's Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) and the Task Force since November 30, 2017, when that document was introduced to the group. During the intervening time, there was a 72-day comment period, extended twice, on the DEIR, and a scope issued by the Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs MEPA unit to provide MassDOT's team with a scope for a Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR). Likewise, during this time, an Independent Review Team (IRT) has been operating to provide an outside review of the work the project team has done on the section of the project known as "the Throat".

While the actions of the IRT are not finalized at the time of this writing, the ongoing deterioration of the existing Allston Viaduct require that MassDOT continue with efforts to advance the project for documentation through the FEIR so that the job can move towards preparation of a design/build package. The purpose of this Task Force meeting was to introduce its members to:

- A revised street gird for the Beacon Park Yard, developed jointly between the project team and Harvard University which will be used for traffic modeling in the FEIR;
- Discuss the possibility of retaining the exit from Soldiers Field Road to the River Street Bridge, this had been presented as fully removed in the DEIR, but subject to significant negative comment from Cambridgeport residents on that document; and,
- Provide the group with a thorough accounting of bicycle and pedestrian treatments for the project, bicycle signals, protected intersections etc., which will comply with the City of Boston and MassDOT's complete streets guidelines.

The proposed changes to the street grid aim to keep regional traffic on Soldiers' Field Road as long as possible when seeking to access the Turnpike. Coming from Boston, the concept proposed in the DEIR already does this, but the FEIR street grid proposes the elimination of North Connector Road, constructing Hotel Lane, constructing a new two-way roadway "Stadium Road Connector" and the elimination of the West Connector Road. Shifting the regional traffic would allow places like this Seattle/ Cambridge Street South /Cambridge Street area to carry less traffic and have a greater neighborhood feel.[1] Task Force members encouraged Harvard to think about the connections to the greenway and their open space plan as part of the street grid. Jim Keller, of Tetra Tech outlined the goals of addressing existing deficiencies, strengthening neighborhood connections and adding new bicycle and pedestrian connections to enhance mode choices as well as the Soldiers Field Road outbound ramp to River Street. The tone of the discussion was positive with Task Force members expressing gratitude for the collaboration necessary to meet the project goals and the needs of the residents of surrounding neighborhoods. Task Force members reminded the project team to think of transit connections, the design of the pedestrian bridges, the width of paths both on streets and the Paul Dudley White Path, future ownership of greenway path connections and flood elevations. The task force will next meet on November 14th.

Agenda

I. Welcome & Opening Remarks 3
II. Presentation and Discussion 4

[1] North Connector Road will still be required during construction to remove the bridge on Cambridge Street closest to the Charles River and reconstruct this section of Cambridge Street at-grade.

Detailed Meeting Minutes[2]

Welcome & Opening Remarks

C: Mike O'Dowd, *MassDOT:* Good evening everyone, welcome, and thank you for coming. I'm sure that many of you have heard of the ongoing work of the Independent Review Team in the Throat. Tonight, we are only talking about the area outside the Throat and the preferred alternative street network, which we all worked so hard to develop. There have been some refinements made over the last several months. We want to share those with you tonight and get some feedback, since there is always such a good exchange and good dialogue in this group. Some of those refinements have been brought to us by Harvard University to help support what they see as their future land development within the region and how it all is supportive and interactive with the Enterprise Resource Campus and the work they have going on in the North Parcel. Some of this work is also an extension of what Chris' team has been working on to get all the modes to interact successfully within the street grid and at the intersections. There are quite a few intersections, so it is important for all of us to find a way for pedestrians, cyclists, motorists, trucks, and everyone else can be in harmony at the intersections. Let's face it, there are too many instances where we see cyclists and pedestrians coming into conflict with vehicles. We want to avoid that. We are going to present a few things tonight to get thoughts and go on from there.

C: Glen Berkowitz, *A Better City*: To throw it out there, there are two of the key issues on this topic that I hope the team will address tonight. The first one is the size of the intersections. I hope we don't need to wait for Jessica to ask for the 90th time and that you are prepared to talk about it. Secondly, the pedestrian connections at Malvern Street. I don't think we've ever seen a drawing/profile that would show how it would happen. I don't think there's one in the DEIR (Draft Environmental Impact Report). I'm hoping you will be able to cover that tonight.

A: Mike O'Dowd: Those are good points. One thing we're showing tonight, is – based upon the traffic analysis that was in the DEIR. Since then, the dates of the counts which were done in 2012, 2013, and 2014. Since the filing of the DEIR and scope we received from Secretary Beaton of EEA, we performed additional counts. CTPS is developing a new model to replace the outdated model, incorporating all modes as well as the new motor vehicles counts. We're not making commitments about whether reductions could be made in street crossings, but CTPS is just about ready to get started on their work. They've been holding off because MAPC is generating

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

all-new demographics that need to be incorporated into the new model, including housing, employment, growth, economic development, land use, and new permitting and projects that have been permitted. MAPC will feed this information to CTPS to incorporate into the new model. There will be a lot of information shared tonight, there will be no commitments made about lane widths or shoulder widths or things like that. But we're feeling comfortable, based on our best understanding that we don't anticipate significant amount of change with the new CTPS model. But I can't say for sure, nor was Secretary Pollack prepared to say for sure.

C: Glen Berkowitz: Just to be clear, all of us want to make sure these intersections work really well.

C: Mike O'Dowd: Agreed.

C: Glen Berkowitz: My point in raising it is I hope you proactively address the issue since the topic tonight is the street grid, because it was one of the two key outstanding issues for the last nine months. Jessica, I didn't mean to speak for you, but people have been wondering whether the number of lanes presented are required. Secondly, regarding the key pedestrian connection at Malvern Street, I'm hopeful you'll show us some detail we haven't seen yet. I know many of us are hoping that is being created.

A: Mike O'Dowd: Okay, I appreciate that.

C: Chris Calnan, *Tetra Tech*: Thanks, Mike. I think Mike has given a lot of the highlights. To kick us off tonight, Joe has a presentation for the street grid. The genesis for this is that Harvard had generated their formal comments and were filed with the DEIR. We've been working with Harvard to look at their ideas, so Joe will step us through that.

This sets the stage for us to take a closer look at what gets analyzed by CTPS. We're encouraged, it looks promising—but we need to confirm with CTPS. We'll take a deeper dive into the Complete Streets work; you can see some of the graphic boards in the back for a closeup of that. The team has been looking closely at how to do protected intersections for pedestrians and cyclists; we have some information to share. The last topic issue is the Soldiers Field Road off-ramp to River Street and Cambridge Street. Similar to the street grid discussion, we received lots of comments to look at alternatives for that maneuver. The DEIR closed the entire ramp and repurposed that area for bikes and pedestrians. We're now looking as well at a partial ramp closure that would close the left turns while retaining the right turn. The team is looking at this now; like Mike said, no decisions have been made yet, we are looking for feedback. With that, I am going to turn it over to Joe.

Presentation and Discussion

REVISED STREET GRID FOR FEIR ANALYSIS

C: Joe Beggan, *Harvard University:* Thanks Chris. Hi all, I'm Joe Beggan. I'm that boisterous person that sits in the corner—some of you probably haven't heard my voice before. What I want to present tonight is some street grid refinements that we had proposed in our comments to MassDOT. We've gone through a technical review and have some promising results, which is why Tetra Tech and MassDOT wanted to bring me out here tonight.

I think folks are familiar with the street grid layout. If you remember some of the earlier versions and even what's out there today, it's a very complex interchange. Versions were looked at that were more highway-oriented. This street grid, as it's presented today, emerged from the Task Force process. Essentially it is tricking a street grid into handling regional interchange movement of traffic. At the same time, it's a new district in the city, and there's a balance that we are all interested in seeing between vehicular traffic flow, bicycle/pedestrian mobility, and other modes that are in the area. We've been looking at ways to further enhance this roadway network.

I'm working off a diagrammatic representation rather than the full layouts. Here are the streets: Cambridge Street cutting diagonally, then the east/west streets, Cambridge Street South, Hotel Lane, North Connector Road, and then continuing with the series of cleverly-named streets, West Connector, Seattle Street, Stadium Way, Cattle Drive and East Drive in the north/south direction. This is basically the grid –the highway ramps, the westbound off-ramp ramps, down at the surface level. Seattle Street and Cattle Drive both pass up and over, ramping up to the plateau to the south. Then the Eastbound off-ramp tying in to Seattle Street at a raised level with a connector road tying into Cattle Drive with an on-ramp here. We've been working on this for a while, but I think it is worth a quick refresher on what is going over and under: the Highway Connector Road is down low, and these other streets rise up so that Cambridge Street South is half or two-thirds of the way up from Cambridge Street.

Here are the comments that Harvard raised on the DEIR – key sections are highlighted. When these were offered we were in the process of looking at our Enterprise Research campus, becoming a bit smarter about what that area is and looking at placemaking, urban design in that zone. One thing that came out of that deep dive was that streets like the North Connector were becoming formative elements of the new district, meant for regional connections. We thought it would make sense to use Hotel Lane to pull traffic further south and look at Stadium Way more seriously as a connector and get rid of West Connector to pull traffic east. That idea is to get the

regional traffic flow further away from the emerging district and the neighborhood. That was our starting point in discussions with MassDOT and the Secretary.

We spent time looking at this to achieve better balance to leverage reductions in street widths, improvements to bicycle/pedestrian crossings, ways to leverage improvements for this greenway direct connection from East Drive to Paul Dudley White but you are crossing five streets along the way. Thinking about this more broadly, could you make some improvements there. Also, we wanted to get a better balance of service needs and access that may come into being, not needing to rely on driveways across the street to improve pedestrian realm. The area looks pretty filled with streets at this point, so can we bake in better flexibility so that sub-district or areas can emerge, and street layouts can be responsive. All that within the context of maintaining consistency with the DEIR traffic analysis that was done. Essentially, the idea is accepting DEIR traffic numbers and rearranging the flows – it's not shifting traffic across the river or north, it is managing the flow within the area.

These slides go through what we saw as one of the key flows driving our concerns: Westbound flow crossing Western Avenue or getting off at Soldiers Field Road coming to the on-ramps to head on I-90 Westbound. The two connectors at West Connector Road and East Drive allow you to get onto Surface Road or Lincoln Street Extension and then get onto I-90. We noted in the data that the movement from Westbound off-ramp from Soldiers Field Road to I- 90 Westbound consumed a lot of capacity at this location. Even today, traffic is making that move. This off-ramp is at the eastern end of Cambridge Street South, so traffic is taking a left to head out. That starts to fill this bucket, and as a result, traffic that is looking to come from the bridge is making a diagonal move. It is a significant flow: 45% of flows in AM/PM peaks are heading to West Connector. That has a cascading effect—traffic finding whatever path it can through a grid system. Grid systems enable that bobbing and weaving to get to your destination. This underlies some of our concerns with traffic operations. This is further complicated by the close proximity of the intersections. Some of them are 200-250' from street to street at the closest. That's about the distance between these two streets outside here. It's not a particularly long distance. Travel lanes tend to get added into that type of a system to contain the queues.

The first idea was eliminating the North Connector and beefing up Hotel Lane to give traffic another route. It gets part of the way but clearly doesn't get you were you want to be. You still have traffic making zig-zag moves through the grid. In this case, you would have two-lane capacity on Hotel Lane to number 3 here, with the extension from Cattle to Stadium Way, but then it is filtering its way through.

Part two was to get rid of West Connector, and tie Stadium Way into Lincoln Street connector and I-90. This provides a more direct path, not to say all traffic, some would still zig zag, but it gives a stronger connection with simpler movement. Traffic doesn't hit a light until #2 (Lincoln Street Connector). Also takes advantage of grade changes – Seattle and Cattle both rise up to Cambridge Street and rise up to connect to the highway. This idea is to take Stadium from this Hotel Lane connection, and bring it down underneath Cambridge Street South, eliminating an intersection.

One other potential benefit here is that in the current layout where Stadium hits Cambridge Street South there are movements trying to get north – whether to Western Avenue via Stadium, that are exiting and taking a left through complicated Cambridge Street South/East Drive intersection and then moving up Stadium, this connection would allow that to happen more directly and relieve some traffic.

To summarize the changes: the elimination of North Connector and West Connector, extension of Hotel Lane with putting Stadium Way at grade with Cambridge Street South passing over, and the connection of the Lincoln Street Connector ultimately leading to the I-90 Westbound on ramp.

The next set of slides talk about the opportunities this may allow. Mike and Chris have both mentioned, this still needs to go through the CTPS model. But here's what we see: because traffic reoriented itself, it creates the opportunity to eliminate a westbound travel lane between Stadium and North Harvard Street on Cambridge Street and on Cambridge Street South between Cattle and North Harvard which shortens the crossing distances. On the greenway, it creates two fewer crossings than there would be out there under the DEIR grid. There might be local streets here in the future, but not feeding the highway. It simplifies traffic signals, gives better intersection spacing. We could also extend Hotel Lane through to Seattle to provide a connection which is an opportunity for some of the important North/South bus connections, this might be a way to do those. The Cambridge Street improvements provides this opportunity as well. We think it bakes in some flexibility for those bus connections that people really want to see, in this scenario, this could happen more easily.

In terms of land use benefits: this proposal starts to enable some better placemaking and urban design opportunities by reducing regional traffic and keeping it on the edge of the district, allowing places like this Seattle/ Cambridge Street South /Cambridge Street area to define themselves as a neighborhood or sub-district. Lower Stadium Way also creates opportunities for service access off that roadway, we would like to explore further. But lowering service access

frees up parcel edges to be "break-free." Also promising, is the idea of relieving Cambridge Street South constraints by simplifying or flattening the grade of Cambridge Street South. Stadium Way could be opened or built over to allow more continuous street edge along Cambridge Street South. It is worth further exploration. Thanks all for your time. Go Sox.

Q: Chris Calnan: Any comments so far? The next step is to get some feedback to incorporate this into the CTPS modeling.

A: Jim Gilooly, *Boston Transportation Department*: Two points stick out for me. When we first started designing, I was concerned about Soldiers Field Road and the I-90 intersection which was very compact, had been pulled quite a bit apart. We got to this point through discussion to get the Soldiers Field Road off-ramps closer to I-90, which was a good step. At first blush without seeing any analysis, getting exiting traffic from Soldiers Field Road down to Hotel Lane looks encouraging to me. Second, every time I talk about this street grid with our chief traffic-signal expert, he reminds me about the problems with short blocks. Eliminating signalized intersections will make him happy.

Q: Tom Nally, *A Better City*: What might the impacts be of putting traffic through Cambridge Street and Soldiers Field Road at the surface to get to Hotel Lane? The road to the north of that was supposed to reduce the traffic in that intersection.

A: Joe Beggan: That was developed before this connection was in place- Soldiers Field Road off-ramps—was in place. Earlier 3k4 versions brought that alignment in. That was responding to the Cambridge/ Soldiers Field Road intersection. If that's happening down at Cambridge Street South, the load is out of Cambridge Street. You'll also see the former Sears warehouse pad out there today, and the alignment was created to avoid that pad. Taking a step back, if we're pulling traffic south, this north connection can change once that pad is gone. The load lessened at Cambridge Street helps that.

Q: Bill Deignan, *City of Cambridge*: So, is that traffic going to Hotel Lane missing going under the River Street intersection?

A: Joe Beggan: No, it will be coming through on the surface.

Q. Bill Deignan: How will that function with more traffic on it?

A: Joe Beggan: There will be less traffic in that intersection, because the westbound off-ramp is further south.

A: Chris Calnan: The signal operations at River Street/Cambridge Street are way different than what's there today. The proposed signal will be simplified, and function differently than it does today due to fewer turning movements.

Q: Bill Deignan: I think it is interesting to look at, we need to evaluate further, but that Western Avenue to the Turnpike line is important to Cambridge. The North Connector was attractive to not get traffic into the intersections. Did you also say no signals at Hotel Lane?

A: Joe Beggan: Yes, as you pass the hotel, you'd hit the first light at East Drive and Hotel Lane. Then three signals on Hotel Lane.

C: Jessica Robertson, *Allston resident:* I think these are some great suggestions and I really like the idea of keeping regional traffic on Soldiers Field Road as much as possible. I think the River Street intersection would be simplified, as you said, so additional volumes straight through doesn't seem like an issue but obviously that will be modeled. I am more concerned about more traffic filtering through the streets that go east/west including Cambridge Street. If we're expecting Western Avenue to use the North Connector, they'll be on Cambridge Street. Cambridge Street is a major bicycle/pedestrian/bus road, whereas Soldiers Field Road isn't. I would much rather have traffic on Soldiers Field Road.

C: Henrietta Davis, *Cambridgeport resident*: I'm concerned about taking it away from what is happening here to what is happening on the other side of the river. I got onto this task force because I thought that the off-ramps for Cambridge worked, even though it was crowded. I can't read this presentation quickly enough but I'm sure Bill will analyze it to see what the capacity is as right now Western Avenue sometime gets backed up to Central Square as people are trying to enter the Turnpike. The BU Bridge/Commonwealth Avenue changes have backed traffic up to Pearl Street. Cambridge neighborhood streets are connected to the river crossings intimately. I am very concerned about that. People want to go four directions: Boston to Cambridge, into Boston, Westbound leaving Cambridge, and coming from the west back to Cambridge. I want to make sure that this analysis will take into account expected projected traffic for all those movements. I've been worried from the get-go that it would end up on city streets. It sounds like you're saying city streets will be further constrained so it may be even harder to get off the Turnpike. The unintended consequence may be people getting off I-90 in Brighton to get to Cambridge as they can't deal with the intersection and the time that is going to be allocated to it. Harvard is in Cambridge and Boston. I don't know if the movement from Harvard's interests from getting different directions are reflected here.

C: Joe Beggan: To get to North Connector from Western Avenue bridge, you take a left turn. Instead, we're saying you can come straight – left across the bridge, then straight through to Hotel Lane. As far as off-bound traffic from the Turnpike, this doesn't affect the East Drive connection. We think net positive, since traffic may have otherwise used that connection to come over to Cattle or Stadium can now continue straight or turn right. That's what the future modeling will need to prove, but those are the positive ideas we're seeing. Like I said originally, we're dealing with the modeled traffic so not diverting more to the other side of the river or to any of the other Boston neighborhoods.

C: Henrietta Davis: These issues are what gave rise to the interest of keeping the Soldiers Field Road off-ramp onto River Street. If resulting traffic pattern makes it more difficult to get to Cambridge from I-90, you could still use Soldiers Field Road. To lose both of those by not feeling comfortable is very concerning. I don't know who's protecting that value. I'm not saying it should be you, but I don't know who really is.

A: Joe Beggan: You are not losing the westbound I-90 connection.

C: Mike O'Dowd: Jim Keller will present a potential to maintain that right-turn as well.

C: Henrietta Davis: But the Turnpike connections are still issues. I don't understand the presentation well enough to know how this makes an impact on that.

C: Joe Beggan: I feel need to be clear about the I-90 connections. This westbound off-ramp connects to East Drive and then connects to Cambridge Street. In our option and the DEIR, the connection is the same. The Turnpike connection from Western Avenue to River Street Bridge is the same. The only thing that changes is the, we think helpful, possibility that traffic that would otherwise use Western Avenue from this off-ramp will not use this, which should provide some relief on that street. There is a potential reduction in delay

C: Glen Berkowitz: A couple of points. I was interpreting Henrietta's question about confusion about the information presented and overlaying the possible loss of the Soldiers Field Road westbound off ramp right turn too River Street to Cambridge loss depicted in DEIR.

C: Henrietta Davis: Not just that, Glen, also the Turnpike origins and destinations.

C: Glen Berkowitz: On the sheet in front of us, I see the right-turn from Soldiers Field Road Westbound to taking a right turn onto River Street, I just wanted to point that out. Jim will talk more about it, apparently.

So, Joe, on the summary slide: my initial response is, almost every conversation I've had with you guys, you've not only been looking out for your own property interests but also the community interests as well. Thinking about that, I want to offer a few things from that perspective. If I were to read into something about the color scheme, when I look at 3K-4, North Connector Road was to be built by MassDOT, Hotel Lane to be built by "others" meaning you guys. On the sheet that is in front of us, I don't see North Connector. I now see Hotel Lane is no longer colored orange, would that be built by MassDOT now?

A: Chris Calnan: Correct.

C: Glen Berkowitz: I want to offer some positive commentary about the intersection that just took me 35 minutes to get through, though that was in World Series circumstances. One of the best parts about the 3K series as a whole is that folks coming from Soldiers Field Road no longer have to go through Cambridge Street and River Street. On the other hand, one of the challenging aspects is that the opposite is no longer true for people coming from Kendall and Harvard into the roadway system. Today there's a free right turn – I don't have to use the signal on Cambridge Street to get onto the highway system. That's one of the best parts of the current intersection. Anytime I'm north of the Charles River, I can use that free right. I've thought that the challenging piece of this design is now I have to use a signal. It was a free-right onto North Connector Road before as shown in DEIR, and I always thought the benefit of that was relieving pressure on Cambridge/River and relieved pressure on the first three blocks of Cambridge Street. I have nothing definitive to offer up other than it is an intuitive challenge that the team has to prove to us, that you could delete something that was previously described as reliving pressure from Cambridge/River and that we'll still be okay. One thing that's always been undefined is when the "built by others" actually get built. The sheet in front of us still shows those north connections and I'm not sure when they're built, whether they're open to the public or restricted.

A: Joe Beggan: I'll start with the last comment. At a minimum we saw those streets as private ways open to public traffic. The public would be able to use them and drive on them. The sequence is probably dictated by ERC (Enterprise Research Campus) development and build-out. Currently we're looking closely at Cattle Drive probably first, or maybe East Drive depending on development. Those would be built out along with the district as it develops.

Q: Pallavi Mande, *Charles River Watershed Association*: Thank you for those diagrams. They help clarify the suggestions especially regarding the grade changes. The problem I was having figuring this out was with the scale. How does the Greenway connect to the new park? I'm interested in why the Greenway assumes a linear width of half the width of the street, as

opposed to wide open space that we were hoping to see as a neighborhood connection through the park. Can you provide any more detail? It may be complicated without a graphic. Secondly, when eliminating North Connector Road—I recall from ERC vaguely—I don't understand how open space connections will work; I know it's not all planned and designed yet. Since you talked about urban design and public space. Those layers are completely missing right now for me to make an educated decision or provide input on the streets—I understand a lot of us are transportation engineers and I'm sure you'll figure out a way to handle traffic, but those of us involved from an urban design/placemaking standpoint are having a hard time understanding how this place will feel and look, and how the existing neighborhood will be able to make it their own.

A: Chris Calnan: That green line is really a schematic – he's focusing on the streets. The connections to the Paul Dudley White don't change in this scenario, he's showing eliminating signalized intersections. The path experiences less delay. Isn't meant to be what the path looks like or how wide. Jim will show more about that, but this isn't meant to represent the path.

C: Joe Beggan: We share the concern about how the connections work. We've talked about a promenade coming down Cattle Drive. The open space system needs to be developed. The idea here is to give us more flexibility about where those could go rather than having to respond to a regional roadway. We felt this gave additional flexibility for local streets, paths, parks, greater than what was shown in the DEIR.

Q: Pallavi Mande: Thanks, very helpful. From a timing perspective, like Glen said, if there are open space connections that will flow, is that something we can be discussing in the near-term? Or is that still happening for the ERC on its own and for this section on its own?

A: Joe Beggan: They will be knit together. I don't know if there is a timeline attached to that, but they'll knit together. We want to do this in a systemic way, creating a hierarchy.

Q: Jack Wofford: *Cambridge resident*: From Cambridge perspective, could you track through a movement for traffic from JFK Street coming down from Harvard Square, heading to the Pike? Say we're going to Logan; how do we do that? Are you assuming all traffic on Soldiers Field Road and Hotel, or would some use 'backdoor' through East and Cattle or Stadium?

A: Joe Beggan: From Harvard to Airport, you'd get on the Red Line and then the Silver Line. I couldn't resist, thanks Jack; but if someone does decide to drive or use a shared ride because they don't own a car, there would be a couple of options. You would work your way over to Memorial Drive by DeWolfe, come across Western, then you want to get down to Eastbound on-ramp. You could come down Western Avenue, come down Cattle Drive; you could use Hotel Lane to Cattle

Drive. If you chose to come across Anderson Memorial Bridge and come down North Harvard Street (depending on timeframe) could take a left on Stadium, then over to Cattle.

Q: **Jack Wofford:** Do you have any guesses to split, who would use which?

A: **Joe Beggan**: Not off top of my head but that will be baked into the analysis. You could also take a left onto Soldiers Field Road, then exit and use Cattle Drive, which a lot of people might do. I don't know the split but we're assuming a mix. The analysis isn't assuming that everybody getting of Soldiers Field Road Southbound or everyone coming across Western is headed down Soldiers Field Road. Depending on the character of these streets, we'd have to strike that balance. They're not there to accommodate every move, they could accommodate traffic, but there's a sense of priority to other modes.

Q: **Jack Wofford**: People coming from Kendall, for example, what would they do? Same thing?

A: **Joe Beggan**: One option would be down Hotel Lane then Stadium Way, then Westbound. They would probably work their way over to Stadium Way.

C: **Jack Wofford**: Those are congested now.

A: **Joe Beggan**: This won't be congestion free. Nature and traffic abhor a vacuum—we want it to be manageable for traffic to flow through at 20mph or less, doing it safely relatively to other people coexisting on streets. It is not intended to be high-speed thoroughfare but to accommodate things in a rational way.

C: **Jack Wofford**: Right after Governor Sargent killed most of the highway, I was invited to ASCE, the title of my talk was "The Creative Use of Congestion" like stopping Route 2 at Alewife to get people onto the T.

A: **Joe Beggan**: You also don't want congestion to promulgate other congestion. We want to keep it contained so that the other parts of the system work and you don't cause gridlock. We want to keep streets the right width as there are going to be a lot of pedestrians out there as the area gets built out over time.

C: **Chris Calnan**: Everyone, we do have some other material to cover tonight.

C: **Jessica Robertson**: To add to Henrietta's comment, those issues we've been talking about is why West Station and Grand Junction are so important. Many of us around the table are

fighting for transit connections because Cambridge streets aren't getting bigger. They won't have places to go outside here, so we can't expand capacity here because there's nowhere for it to go.

C: Henrietta Davis: The traffic that exists now, it's probably going to be more, probably not less, but the traffic there now needs to be able to get through. The situation now goes from going from 0 signals to 5 traffic signals for that movement. Delay is from nothing to going through a street grid with traffic signals. The question is (I don't know analysis), if that helps back up the existing traffic, which is already constrained, unless people won't use that route at all. But people in Cambridge think they have access to the Turnpike and would not like to think they no longer have effective access because it's too delayed.

C: Jessica Robertson: I don't think that those intersections will back up onto Cambridge Streets. Allston residents will be breathing all those emissions, not Cambridge. Back to Glen's point, I like the idea of keeping everyone on Soldiers Field Road, but the question is how do we do that? I don't think the issue is the Cambridge Street/River Street intersection, because that will be simplified. What are the strategies? Lastly, you've done so much work on the transportation side, but it would be great to have parallel thinking we can participate on about the open space plan.

A: Joe Beggan: I don't have a direct answer, but it will have to be addressed in the future. You've all been through the processes we've had about how the open space and path networks could be developed, but that's been focusing mostly to the north. How that ties in to take advantage of the assets that here are important.

Q: Jessica Robertson: That's great, but my question was about keeping people on Soldiers Field Road.

A: Joe Beggan: That I don't have an answer to but that's a good point, and I think it speaks to the designs up at Western Avenue. There are some natural hydraulics at play at Western Avenue, but there isn't infinite capacity. It needs to be looked at further, it is a great point.

C: Galen Mook, *MassBike*: This is great. Joe, thank you for bringing this. It shows that you're interpreting the public comments and trying your damnedest to make a nicer shade of lipstick (knowing this isn't necessarily a pig). We've been saying we need fewer lanes at the intersections, we need better crossings on the pathways, we need smaller streets for a long time and we're seeing movement in that direction for the first time. I'm very encouraged by that. Having only two intersections here helps with creating that connection. I want to mention that it is not yet what we're trying to conceive of as the People's Pike. That's not an acceptable off-street connection from Allston to the river. If you're from Ashford Street or Brookline, before you were

crossing 24 lanes of traffic to get to the river, now you're crossing 21 lanes of traffic. Removing one intersection is really only a marginal difference in terms of the safety for bicycles and pedestrians getting to major destination points of the river. It is definitely a step in the right direction, but we need to do more – that's a comment to the whole team, not just you, Joe. Question, do you know the clearance at Stadium?

A: Jim Keller, Tetra Tech: Probably about 20'. The street on the top is about 20' over the street on the bottom.

C: Galen Mook: Going forward, I assume these slides will be publicly available on the DOT website. I would request that you also do a 3D, or from the ground view what it will look like slope wise starting from Ashford St-.

C: Jess Robertson: Just a section showing the different elevations of Seattle and East Drive.

Q: Galen Mook: Just a slice, to help us understand the differences. Now the question from that, does Stadium Way underneath have clearance for box streets, buses and if not, could you do limited access there and channel truck traffic to other streets?

A: Joe Beggan: It would have the clearance, since it's connecting into the on-ramp for the interstate system, so it would have the proper clearances for buses and trucks.

C: Galen Mook: So that would make Cambridge Street South at least a certain height to avoid a boat section.

A: Jim Keller: For drainage, correct.

C: Galen Mook: You're running the model again, I know – please throw in what a bus priority would look like on some of these streets. It might take until Harvard builds out the rest of the street grid but if some of these lanes could be devoted to buses or mixed-use with bicycles, it looks like you are fiddling, and I'd like to see some transit modeling.

A: Mike O'Dowd: We've been discussing that with the City.

C: Galen Mook: Excellent, thanks. We just haven't seen it yet. Last comment, lots of fiddling with the east and northern half, but it all still funnels down into Harvard Avenue and Cambridge Street. No solutions to the funnel because the scope of this process is 5' short of that intersection. Just saying that it would be nice if a lot of this sort of thought, playing with the puzzle pieces, could also extend out into Allston Village. Not saying I have an answer but wanted to include it.

C: Joe Beggan: I just also want to extend a shout out to Tetra Tech and Mike O'Dowd about evaluating all these. It wasn't just me though I appreciate the complement. It was a collaborative and rigorous process.

C: Galen Mook: Thank you all, then as having that collaboration is super important and we trust the work. Thank you.

Q: David Loutzenheiser: ***Metropolitan Area Planning Council****:* Why have we not seen modeling of roundabouts? They eliminate signals, smooth traffic flow, provide one-lane crossings for bicycle/pedestrians, and can reduce travel lanes?

A: Chris Calnan: It's probably been 4 years since we've looked at those. If you think about the area and the urban street grid, the signals are the conventional system we have. Roundabouts have to be the right location and context; early on we said that that's not the right context here. It's not that we didn't look at them. When we start a project like this everything is on the table—we looked at divergent diamonds—that one didn't have any traction. I'm also not sure the City would want a bunch of roundabouts through the grid.

C: David Loutzenheiser: I see a scenario where signals are at the larger flows, and then roundabouts at the smaller streets.

A: Chris Calnan: These are the initial streets. Harvard has been clear there will be other minor streets as the development gets built out maybe the future developments could use those roundabouts, as Harvard builds. This is not all the streets that will be out there when we are all said and done.

Q: Galen Mook: Is the flip, the Cambridge Street Bypass, ever going to be included?

A: Mike O'Dowd: Not this evening, but we are looking at it.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: For a long time, we've had approaching the River Street intersection from north or west, a single right-turn lane onto Cambridge Street. In that context, the North Connector was always easy to digest as an easy way to get to parkway or highway without a right turn onto Cambridge Street. Totally with you on the notion that it'd be nice not to have the North Connector. Going back to the question, can you guys give us a guess at the dates? Joe, best guess for whichever of the three streets is coming first?

A: Chris Calnan: Mike O'Dowd just stepped out, but we're talking 2025-2026 for the initial phase.

A: Joe Beggan: I think we're in the same timeframe, but I can't say if it will coincide with opening day. But we hope to have action along Western Avenue on that timeframe.

C: Chris Calnan: Jim Keller is next to talk about pedestrian/bicycle and Soldiers Field Road out-bound.

BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN ACCOMMODATIONS

C: Jim Keller: The idea tonight is to discuss some design updates about pedestrian/bicycle and Complete Streets throughout the area. The MEPA scope includes increasing the level of design for these uses. The concept graphics for DEIR were consistent with what we've been showing for a couple of years. The sidewalks, the bicycle lanes, and the streets were generic facilities. We had put one fuller intersection into the DEIR to add a Complete Streets design to it, but we've now done that for the full grid and you can see that in the boards at the back.

The goal of the facilities is strengthening connectivity to the neighborhoods to try to improve them, design is in accordance with Separated Bicycle Lane (SBL) Design Guide – newer than 2006 MassDOT Project Development Guide that started things towards bicycle/pedestrians. In 2010 the GreenDOT policy came out with goals including to triple cyclists and pedestrians in the state by 2030. As that progressed they developed the Healthy Transportation. Directives. Every MassDOT project has a requirement to provide facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians now, meaning that now we have facilities building on each other. That's the overall trend. Then there's the SBL Guide, the NACTO design guide, and Boston Complete Streets design guide. For our design, we're using SBL Guide and Boston Complete Streets.

Some of the goals are addressing the Franklin Street pedestrian bridge and other ADA issues; addressing difficulty for cyclists today (I don't use it like you all do but I can imagine how difficult it is to traverse at present); it is extremely important for this project to address these issues. Additionally, we are looking to strengthen neighborhood links at the new connections to the south for pedestrians. This is all outside of the throat—understand that whichever variation you're looking at there are different opportunities to connect to the grid.

For a regional context, new connections for cyclists and pedestrians include Cambridge to Brookline via the improved Franklin Street Bridge, and then the grid will be created as well with connections. Cambridge Street to Commonwealth Avenue via West Station, Malvern Street and Babcock Street-two new pedestrian bridges that have been laid out. Lower Allston to Charles River, what we are calling the Greenway but it's the north side of the separated bicycle facility with pedestrian access to get that main connection to the new Esplanade along the river. As well as enhancing and constructing separated bicycle facilities at all the major intersections on

Cambridge Street. As well, as Joe was just talking about, improvements to the street grid creating additional connections.

We showed these major connections in the DEIR: Franklin Street pedestrian bridge, Malvern Street, Babcock Street, the Paul Dudley White at River, Cambridge Street South to Paul Dudley White path. We went through a few rounds on Franklin Street to improve the existing ramp; currently we need to take the Ace Ticket building to put it where we want it. Here are possible bridge types again as a refresher. Malvern Street is next, here's what it looks like looking toward West Station. Here's a rendering of a pedestrian bridge; it is not showing a potential transit connection.

Q: **Glen Berkowitz**: On Malvern Street, does that happen in 2026 or 2040?

A: **Jim Keller:** Currently this is base-build, so 2025-26.

Q: **Bill Deignan:** This shows bicycle/pedestrian connection. Given the number of transit comments, are you still looking at that?

A: **Jim Keller**: It is scoped to look at it, and we will look at it.

Q: **Bill Deignan:** Why is it still just showing bicycle/pedestrian connections?

A: **Jim Keller:** This is currently in the preferred alternative. As part of MEPA scope, we were instructed to look at a transit connection.

C: **Bill Deignan:** It doesn't feel like you're giving that a look if you're showing that image currently on the screen.

A: **Chris Calnan:** We're going to have a different meeting specifically about that transit connection. That's for a future meeting.

C: **Jessica Robertson:** We've been asking for a bus connection there for 5 years. It's not that hard to show us two versions of that slide showing preferred alternative in DEIR and what's preferred by everyone else. Here's a rendering as a gesture of good faith that you are actually looking at it.

A: **Mike O'Dowd**: We are looking at it, Jess.

C: **Jim Keller:** Here is the Cambridge Street South connection to the future esplanade and the Paul Dudley White Path. This would be a reconstruction of Cambridge Street with enhanced,

protected intersections and bicycle accommodations throughout the corridor. This represents the main connection to the river, Lower Allston, Cambridge Street South as well as if you were down on the Commonwealth Avenue area. To access this, you'd go down Malvern or Babcock Streets to Cambridge Street South.

Most of what we have shown you tonight is in the Complete Streets review. We're using both SBL and Boston Complete Streets and we are under City of Boston jurisdiction. There will be additional reviews before full-level design. Working towards the FEIR level, we've gotten deeper into it. The goal of protected intersections is to have a lower stress network for bicycles/pedestrians. 60% of people are interested in but concerned about using a bicycle—part of that GreenDOT policy, one major goal to triple the use of bicycles and pedestrian trips and a big piece of this is Complete Streets. All modes are accommodated, slowing down vehicles, and not prioritizing one mode over another. Also, we will provide ADA compliant facilities everywhere. Bicycle and pedestrian signals will be used where they make sense to make continuous movement easier, and adaptive signals as warranted.

Leading bicycle and pedestrian intervals will be used to give bicycles and pedestrians a head-start before traffic. With what Joe presented, we've been working for the past 4-5 months on revising the street grid. It's important to remove a couple of intersections and the impacts on bicycles and pedestrians are significant. Understanding it's not fully uninhibited flow, but that's where we're at. The handout is a key-plan, showing a color-scheme for the treatment types on each street. A given street with a given color has a cross-section aligned with that color to give you an idea of what it would look like.

Q: **Bob Sloane, Walk Boston**: The handout shows the Babcock Street path, but at one point the path extended to Agganis Way. Is that no longer the case?

A: **Jim Keller:** Way, way back, at one point it did. Through the refinement process, it was determined that Babcock Street would be the best terminus for the path. Mark or Mike, do you remember the specifics?

A: **Mike O'Dowd**: Through lots of discussions back and forth with Boston University, including Agganis concerns; we also looked at the structure and the length it would have to run from the bus concourse at West Station down to Agganis Way. There were also concerns about whether we could make an accessible pedestrian way from Babcock Street. It is a lot more convenient to Green Line access to get it at Malvern and Babcock streets, so to try to bring bicycle and pedestrian traffic down from West Station to the Green Line, it seemed to be more convenient at

Babcock. Mark and his team at VHB tried to get that in with the least amount of structure and provide another convenient crossing opportunity.

C: Galen Mook: It doesn't have to be one or the other. I agree Babcock is the desire line. But don't 2 out of the 3 throat options include an Agganis crossover to connect to Paul Dudley White? Don't preclude it because President Brown doesn't like it. If we think of it as a network, the benefit of two of those three throat options is that connection. I would argue that you make both and show both.

A: Jim Keller: There's also a pinch here with the ramp and the property line. But it would make sense to look at that further if that throat connection existed.

Q: Guus Driessen, *Brookline Transportation Board:* At Malvern Street, what does the cross-section look like? Are we separating bicycles from pedestrians?

A: Jim Keller: Because of constraints to maintain access to 76 Ashford in order to keep the building whole, this connection is narrower than we'd like it to be. It still meets minimum requirements for a shared use path—12' or so, but vehicles would need a wider ramp.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: What's the grade from Malvern up to the first commuter rail track?

A: Mark Shamon, *VHB*: About 3.5%.

C: No Name Given: I work for the company that just purchased 76 Ashford, so I'm not on the Task Force but want to chime in. We are a developer and we are looking to develop the site. We are hoping to do something that works with the neighborhood and if there were an expanded pathway, we are hoping to work with people on that. If we got some support from the community for more height and less parking, which would be hurt by a lessened first floor, that would be great. We're trying to be in the conversation about how to make this more useful rather than just fitting things in around the existing building. There will be a new building there.

C: Glen Berkowitz: and then if you also add that you're looking forward to being transit-oriented development.

A: No Name Given: Absolutely.

C: Jessica Robertson: That's why the bus connection is important. I'll go on record that I'm okay with more height and less parking.

Q: Anthony (Tony) D'Isidoro, *Allston Civic Association*: The latest plan would be taking Ace ticket building for Franklin? We in the Allston community have been very successful as of late fighting the construction of new billboards along the Turnpike. We lost one right there because it was converting an existing billboard to digital, and the city vote took place a long time ago. I guess we lost because there's a one-sided digital billboard there now. Is there any chance that based on the configuration of the pedestrian Franklin Street bridge that the bridge would need to take that billboard down? It backs right up to the building and it looks ridiculous. I made the case when I testified in front of Outdoor Advertising and I made it clear all the reasons about why we don't want more billboards. Is there any incompatibility with having a structure so close to what you're trying to build there?

A: Mike O'Dowd: Before we get ahead of ourselves, this is a concept. We can't dictate whether any acquisition would take place until we finish MEPA documents. The MEPA document is still in flux right now. The FEIR is still a year out. It would be presumptuous of us to say this is what will happen. One thing we haven't shown here even though it would be the most direct route, we've looked at incorporating a new structure similar to where the current one is. I've spoken to the family about the ownership of that building. We're showing what we think is desirable and seems to be the ideal location for that structure, which is why we're showing it there.

Q: Tony D'Isidoro: Is there any chance from now until then that the footbridge has to move a few feet west?

Q: Jessica Robertson: While that is a good location for that pedestrian bridge, the number of switchbacks isn't great. As part of the flip conversation, having a longer path underneath the current underpass, are you looking at that?

A: Mike O'Dowd: Yes, that's a component of the flip conversation and is under evaluation. That will be a topic at another meeting.

C: Jessica Robertson: It will be great at that meeting to go back and revive the option that is closer to the current alignment with fewer switchbacks. I take footbridges every day and switchbacks aren't fun for anyone and technically you're not supposed to ride your bicycle up a footbridge,

C: Jim Keller: The street t-ing into Western Avenue has a similar thing, and it's immediately apparent that it's not too fun. It's wide enough to traverse but is it the best way to do it?

C: Galen Mook: In Austin, TX, there's a great spiral. And it's fun to ride, too.

Q: **Jessica Robertson**: Did you look at a spiral configuration?

A: **Jim Keller**: I did, early on. We did not see it as feasible since folks are not used to them here.

C: **Jessica Robertson**: It would be good to look at them as those remove the conflict points about tight corners. And with lower clearances of pedestrian/bicycle bridges, you might be able to squeeze it in.

A: **Jim Keller**: I think the footprint gets bigger, just diameter wise, but we'll take another look at it. As part of this tonight I'll not that we are getting ready to reengage Etty about a few of these options.

C: **Pallavi Mande:** You reference Boston Complete Streets, but I didn't see any mention of Green Streets, which is a big part of the Complete Streets manual. I say that partly because I helped write it. If you are prescribing to the performance standards it would be a good piece to incorporate into these sections.

C: **Jim Keller**: Those are schematics, they don't deal with drainage. You're saying in the Boston Complete Streets Guide?

C: **Pallavi Mande:** There's an entire section on green space so that would be a good piece to incorporate**.** The second piece, I'm curious about the connection between the greenway and the park pathways. It's hard for me to understand how that works, and what is MassDOT building, what will DCR own?

A: **Jim Keller**: Ownership - as far as maintenance? I'm not clear on that.

C: **Pallavi Mande:** But it is really important to understand that DCR needs to understand stewardship. That's why I bring it up now because as some point we have to talk about it.

C: **Glen Berkowitz**: One comment about the pedestrian bridge; Mike, through your leadership on the Longfellow Bridge project, working with the City and DCR, you've all reminded us that you can design and finance a gorgeous, esthetically pleasing pedestrian bridge. We haven't talked much about that yet. Let's replicate that excellent work.

A: **Mike O'Dowd**: There is a whole list of designers that curse my name because it's the most complicated structure they've ever had to structurally detail. It's beautiful, but they did not care for its construction.

C: Glen Berkowitz: Those people are greatly outweighed by the 100xthousands who applaud that bridge.

Q: Bob Sloane: Is the year before filing the FEIR a change?

A: Mike O'Dowd: We're pushing for the summer of next year. The Secretary knows that. And your involvement will continue throughout. I think Secretary was quite clear on that when you met last week.

C: Galen Mook: This is great, really encouraging to see MassDOT incorporating Complete Streets and protected bicycle lanes. You are on the right track. If we had had this conversation 10 years ago, none of this would have been conceivable. It almost makes me want to delay the project more just to see how much better it can get. I think some bicycle movements are going to wind up being accommodated on the south side of Cambridge Street I think some bicycle/pedestrian movements on Cambridge Street that are accommodated on the south side. I expect that you'd get a lot of "salmoning" (wrong way cyclists) on the Cambridge Street overpass, since there's a two-way facility further east. Especially if you don't fix Harvard Avenue intersection, you're probably going to see people salmon. You should maybe consider incorporating that into the width of the pathway 6.5' won't accommodate wrong-way traffic. Especially if there are people on those bicycle lanes who are can-collectors with shopping carts. Even though you are using Complete Streets standards, Allston's particular needs may not work with those design guidelines.

C: Jim Keller: Of course, not all is guide-driven, some of it will be common sense approach. Intersections don't always fit cookie-cutter designs like North Harvard which is why we showed it. It's not the prettiest intersection as far as getting everything in there but as a first-pass we feel good; maybe some lanes could adjust as some of the CTPS modeling and changes happen. As far as you're saying, are you saying a two-way on the south side?

C: Galen Mook: If there's room for a two-way, yes.

C: Jim Keller: This was designed quite a while back and is what we are using but if it needs another look, we can do that.

C: Galen Mook: I'll take a closer look, too. Just a concern that came to me as the way traffic moves today. Folks illegally cross that overpass to access Linden Street.

C: Glen Berkowitz: There was supposed to be the reconstruction of Cambridge Street overpass, including a new crossing.

A: Jim Keller: That's shown with an RRFB on the plan.

C: Galen Mook: Oh, great, you should expect a lot of crossing traffic there.

C: Tony D'Isidoro: As you know, the City is doing a mobility study for Allston/Brighton. All this new infrastructure that's being built as part of the I-90 project, I'm now thinking about the existing infrastructure feeding into it. These established streets, for example Lincoln Street, North Harvard Street, maybe should be an area of focus for the mobility study, to look at the streets that are out there, to assess improvements that may need to be made to those existing streets to tie into the new infrastructure.

A: Jim Gilooly: I'll take that back, thank you.

C: Jim Keller: One of the biggest things here is that this is new construction. Many variables go into laying out a complete streets system. This is a tremendous opportunity because it's new construction. With those existing roads, it gets a little trickier as there is limited right of way. We have plenty of ROW available, which has been a huge boon. Retrofitting is happening all over the place and there are definitely enhancements that the City could look at.

C: Tony D'Isidoro: Let me give a plumbing analogy: if you have an old pipe and a new pipe, you need to put something in the middle to make them fit, you do as much as you can do make them fit.

C: Jim Keller: Essentially, the whole grid is laid out as a first-pass. Some of the major intersections are back on the wall for you to look at. We want to take a few minutes on Soldiers Field Road.

C: Glen Berkowitz: Just one last thing, if you don't mind. More than 90% of what I'm about to say is meant to be a compliment. This is fantastic stuff, there are some details to focus in on another time, but it's great. Candidly and honestly, on page 4, I can't believe that at the same time we're talking about closing the North Connector and making Hotel Lane more robust, why in 2026, would we want to open an on-street bicycle lane instead of a separated lane? Why would we do any green—it's either a dollar-sign from building or right-of-way, so why would be do this?

A: Jim Keller: Like I said, this is first pass. It could be that the whole grid gets separation, this was an attempt at a hierarchy.

A: Chris Calnan: This is also an older idea from before the Hotel Lane idea came up. This graphic hasn't caught up to that.

A: Jim Keller: Currently from a hierarchy perspective, this is how we see it. There's no reason we couldn't enhance further if we get comments like yours.

Q: Jessica Robertson: On the last block of Stadium Way they're marked as no bicycle/pedestrian access – obviously they won't be going to the highway, but they might want to go to those parcels. Can we get bicycles/pedestrians on those streets as well?

A: Jim Keller: If a building got put in there, they'd completely change that to get accessible pedestrian and bicycle facilities. But in opening year, there'd be no reason to get down there.

Q: Jessica Robertson: Legally there are restrictions on legal highway ramps and where you can have curb-cuts, where are those?

A: Mike O'Dowd: Those lines haven't been drawn.

A: Jim Keller: I would assume that the developer would want to ensure access.

Q: Galen Mook: Is that an ownership issue between city and state ownership?

A: Mike O'Dowd: Yes, it is.

C: Glen Berkowitz: There's a graphic in the DEIR that shows proposed ownership distribution, too.

C: Jessica Robertson: I think we're all hoping highway ramps end at intersections and the city streets begin at intersections, so you could have sidewalks and bicycle facilities.

RIVER STREET RIGHT TURN TO CAMBRIDGEPORT

C: Jim Keller: A lot of this was in DEIR, but it is being refreshed because of the number of comments we received from Cambridge regarding full removal of the outbound ramp. What went into the DEIR was the complete removal of the outbound ramp and replaced with a street-grid route. The dashed line is the current route to Cambridge Street and I-90 that would be removed. The new route would come up on the new Soldiers Field Road outbound ramp, connect with Cambridge Street South and then on to the highway, westbound and then eastbound via Cattle Drive and then up to River Street via the street grid. That adds three signals but coordinates them. The old River Street route to Cambridge is shown in the dashed line. The benefits of the

full ramp removal allow for a 16' wide Paul Dudley White at narrowest, versus 8' today, and additional 18' of open space. This benefits the approximate 2000 path users per day. In terms of impacted vehicles that use that ramp, for a.m. peak: 336 cars, 11% of total intersection volumes and p.m. peak 723 cars, 20% of PM. Under the DEIR approach, these would all be removed and sent along a new route to River Street – 800' longer, added 3 signals but with similar delay to today at peak hour due to of the number of cycles during the peak hours and one of the pedestrian crossings increasing the wait time. The DEIR approach would be safer through the removal of bicycle/pedestrian/vehicle conflicts.

Based on comments from Cambridgeport residents strongly objecting to the DEIR approach, we have taken a fresh look at a partial ramp which would remove left turns and leave the through/right turn movement. This means the Dudley White Path would be 12' at its narrowest point and there would still be a conflict between turning vehicles and cyclists/pedestrians though certainly less than today. To go back to Glen's point about the North Connector, some of that capacity retention is largely due to removing those left-turns. The progression of adding the Cambridge Street South ramp connections from Soldiers Field Road, that opened the door to revising the grid.

Here are some cross-sections: with full removal you get enhancement the whole way where the ramp is today. So, A at the narrowest point, is 18' of open space and 16' of Paul Dudley White path. It also allows you to hold separate treadways for longer. If you keep the ramp as a through/right only, you can get 12' for each path and some open space, you could divvy it up differently though. At the very narrowest, you have a 12' shared use path with a barrier next to a 17' ramp to accommodate an emergency vehicle passing one that has broken down. That's the gist of it.

C: Glen Berkowitz: Two points. First, what was shown in DEIR didn't limit us to 16' wide path approaching River Street and 18' wide.

A: Jim Keller: This doesn't limit us either.

C: Glen Berkowitz: But you wouldn't know that from the images you just showed as the images show 16' and 18'. What it allowed was the possibility for separate paths to come all the way up to the intersection so that in the future, we could accommodate separate paths to the west as well. But that would be precluded if is ramp put back. Second, the cross-section that says Soldiers Field Road Westbound, is that the "Joe Beggan underpass" about to dive underneath River Street, or is it the existing Soldiers Field Road?

A: Jim Keller: That shows existing.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: If the vertical clearance is there to allow it, could you do something to make it not a zero-sum game? I get the 17' lane. Can you cantilever some part of that over Soldiers Field Road WB, partially, so that you could not preclude wider and separate paths all the way to the intersection? That would avoid zero-sum game between Cambridgeport and the bicycle-pedestrian people.

A: Jim Keller: Not a bad idea but I don't think you have the vertical clearance. But we'll look at it to make sure.

C: Glen Berkowitz: The purple is newly lowering of the road, so it may be possible to design it to avoid that zero-sum game between the Cambridge people and the Paul Dudley White entrance.

C: Jack Wofford: There has been some sketch-planning in Cambridge would shorten that off-ramp as well. You could have dual pathways for a longer way.

A: Chris Calnan: Even in this scenario, you could extend that dual path a bit longer, too.

C: Glen Berkowitz: That is like saying you are going to have a 4 lane wide I-90 Eastbound but just for this small stretch is going to narrow to 2 lanes wide. You wouldn't contemplate that for the highway, of course. The IRT report talks about multiple treadways shows up all over the place in every variant in the throat, as they listened to people and came up with a new concept. So why not doing it here as well? It seems like it might be possible to do, to consider.

Q: Pallavi Mande: To follow up on that, I understand that the purple is a different elevation—the underpass. Is it possible at all to show a cross-section of where the ramps come up and how they intersect with the development parcels in terms of elevation? I'm having a hard time envisioning how the landscape meets the river without the development parcels. Secondly, at some point, we have to talk about flood elevations. The hotel site, from what I remember the graphics shown, is the most vulnerable to inundation. Please, can we have a conversation about flood impacts and vulnerability soon before the infrastructure is baked. Is it possible next meeting?

A: Mike O'Dowd: Not next meeting, probably, but soon. The November 14 meeting is supposed to be an IRT meeting—we definitely can't have it then.

C: Pallavi Mande: I tried having a flood discussion with the IRT team and they said we have nothing to do with it. I'm talking to the other team now because the IRT told me to talk to you.

Q: **Jessica Robertson**: Can you go through the signal phasing and how bicycles/pedestrians cross River Street in the two options? You said it would be a two-phase intersection, which means non-exclusive so who are they sharing it with?

A: **Chris Calnan:** In full ramp removal, two phases for vehicles and a third phase for exclusive pedestrian crossing. Moving to the partial, you still have two primary vehicular phases, but the exclusive turns to a concurrent right-turn from the ramp. That's where you introduce that right-turn conflict. So, it really is a three-phase intersection.

C: **Jessica Robertson**: Thanks to recent reconstruction we now have a pedestrian signal, and it's not great because people fly up Soldiers Field Road and they don't look. They should look, but they don't.

C: **Glen Berkowitz**: It may be possible to have the right turn, but have that piece of crossing related to another phase, and hold the pedestrians during that, so that the right-turn could be separated from the crossing pedestrians.

Q: **Jessica Robertson**: If you have Soldiers Field Road ramp through movement go with bicycles and pedestrians, could you then let the right turn to Cambridge go by itself?

Q: **Glen Berkowitz**: Can you distribute a signal-phasing diagram, so we can look at that? There may be a way to solve this problem without creating conflict.

C: **Henrietta Davis**: Thank you for doing this. As you heard from me earlier, Cambridge really cares about bicycles and pedestrians, but sometimes we're drivers. Part of my role here is to protect that interest because there are still people commuting by car or going to the Airport. Thank you for doing that. This looks like minimal impact and preserves the options for Cambridge drivers. And thanks to everyone else for your consideration of this. Cambridge drivers are being negatively affected by I-90 and it'd be a double-whammy to the potential lose getting home via Soldiers Field Road. Since we caused this difficultly, I wanted to comment.

C: **Bill Deignan:** Thanks for presenting and I appreciate people's creativity about making this work. It would be interesting to look at signal phasing to minimize conflicts—leading pedestrian intervals or hold right-turn or something else. I did want to point out that you said something about no delays but adding three signals. We were told earlier on it would be adding 3 minutes.

C: **Jim Keller**: Similar delays, not no delays.

C: Chris Calnan: The analysis will look at travel-time further. The similar delays point was having to wait multiple cycles during the peak hours for that off ramp.

C: Henrietta Davis: But only peak hours. 4:30-7pm it's gridlock from Cambridgeport. But there are other times in the day – and there would not be other times in the day if the ramp was removed.

C: Jack Wofford: The Charles River Conservancy has presented plans from Gill Engineering providing underpass under River Street. Plans are compatible with current configuration of roadway but even more with retaining a lane. Mike, please take that into consideration. It also relates to the point being made about responding to multiple interests. There is a systemic concern from CRC and others to develop underpasses at River, Wester, and Anderson. Anderson is at 25% design approval and Mass Historic approval for the portal with engineering plans also done by Gill. These are viable plans. They were first cut several years ago and may need to be updated, but if they're incorporated into River Street, I think it would be helpful to everyone.

C: Mike O'Dowd: Thank you all for coming tonight. Have a good night.

Next Steps

The Allston I-90 Task Force will meet again on November 14th. At that time, it is anticipated that IRT Team and FEIR team will both present to the task force for their comments and feedback.

Appendix 1: Meeting Attendees

First Name	Last Name	Town/Affiliation
Guus	Driessen	Brookline Transportation Department
Wendy	Landman	WalkBoston
David	Loutzenheiser	Metropolitan Area Planning Council
Pallavi	Mande	Charles River Watershed Association
Jack	Wofford	Cambridge, resident
Mark	Ciommo	Boston City Council
Henrietta	Davis	Cambridgeport, resident
Jason	Desrosier	Allston-Brighton CDC
Anthony	D'Isidoro	Allston Civic Association
James	Gilooly	Boston Transportation Department
Karl	Haglund	Department of Conservation and Recreation
Oscar	Lopez	Office of Representative Honan
Galen	Mook	MassBicycle
Tom	Nally	A Better City
Conor	Newman	Mayor's Office of Neighborhood Services
Jessica	Robertson	Allston, resident
Rani	Schloss	Brighton, resident
Hazel	Ryerson	Allston, resident
Steve	Kaiser	Resident
Mike	O'Dowd	MassDOT
Jim	Cerbone	MassDOT
Donny	Dailey	MassDOT
Chris	Calnan	Tetra Tech
Nate	Cabral-Curtis	Howard Stein Hudson
Jim	Keller	Tetra Tech
Bob	Sloane	WalkBoston
Joe	Beggan	Harvard University