MEMORANDUM

To:	Mike O'Dowd MassDOT Project Manager	Date:	November 7, 2019
From:	Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis Howard Stein Hudson	HSH Project No.:	2013061.14
Subject:	MassDOT I-90 Allston Interchange Project Worcester Public Information Meeting Meeting Notes of August 14th, 2019		

Overview

On August 14th, 2019 a public information meeting was held in Worcester to introduce residents of the City and surrounding communities to the I-90 Allston Multimodal Project. The I-90 Allston Multimodal Project has been in development since 2014, but prior to meetings in Framingham and Worcester held during the summer of 2014, public involvement has been contained to Boston, where the project is located, and the adjoining communities of Brookline and Cambridge. However, with the project now engaged in the Federal environmental permitting process as outlined in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and directed by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and potential impacts to I-90 and the Worcester Mainline becoming clearer as a result of MassDOT Secretary Stephanie Pollack's January 2019 decision regarding the area of the project known as "the throat," it was determined by the agency that the time had come to involve commuters from MetroWest and Central Massachusetts in the outreach process.

The meeting provided attendees with an overview of the project to date, discussed the selected approach for the throat, lowering I-90 and placing Soldiers" Field Road on a new viaduct, and construction period impacts to I-90 and the Worcester Mainline commuter rail. Audience reaction centered on concerns about construction period impacts and the long-term benefit of the project for commuters traveling to and from Boston from the Worcester area. The project team underscored that efforts are being undertaken to stage construction so that impacts to the mainline of I-90 and the Worcester commuter rail line do not overlap.

Agenda

I. Opening Remarks
II. Project Background
III. Alternatives Under Consideration
IV. Construction Impacts
V. Next Steps
VI. Question and Answers

Detailed Meeting Minutes[1]

Welcome & Opening Remarks

C: Michael O'Dowd: Good evening everyone. Thank you for joining us tonight. My name is Michael O'Dowd and I am the MassDOT Project Manager for this project. This project is located along I-90 in Allston, but it may impact you if you drive on I-90, take the Commuter Rail into Boston or use Soldiers' Field Road or Cambridge Street in Allston. Because of that we wanted to reach out to the Metro West and Worcester areas so that we can tell you about the project and get your feedback. We are currently moving forward into environmental permitting phase associated with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, so all of your comments will be documented. The minutes and presentations from all of our public meetings and task force meetings go on the project website, so you can see everything there. All the information through today is up on the website now. That's every public meeting we've had since 2014.

I mentioned we're here because we want to tell you about the project and get your feedback, but I also want to mention that your elected officials wanted more information about the project as well and wanted us to come speak to their constituents. This isn't the last time well be out here talking to you. We'll give you more updates over the next several years as the project progresses. Construction isn't happening tomorrow or next week. We don't anticipate being in construction until 2023. So, with 4 years left before we go to construction, we'll have plenty more opportunities to come speak with you and hear from you. I will defer to the design team for most of the presentation, but I want to say that I hope you have questions and comments for us.

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

Please don't leave tonight without asking any questions you have. We'll take them all. We want to know how you feel and what your ideas are.

I'm joined tonight by the designers of the project. Chris Calnan is from Tetra Tech. He is the lead Project Manager for the design team. Also here is Mark Shamon, who is managing the rail component of the project, including the future West Station and Commuter Rail track and layover configurations.

It is an 8 to 10-year duration for construction. We're trying to find ways to condense that as much as we possibly can, but we're still working on it and are continuing to advance ideas. In terms of cost, what we've been communicating over the past several months is that it's in the range of about $1.2 billion. So, there's a significant amount of investment that's being made on this project for you. It's for the commuters. It's for our transportation uses. So obviously it's important that we get it right, and we are striving to make sure that we do get it right. The structures that we build, the highway, we want to see it in operation for the next 75 to a hundred years. This is important for us.

I would ask if you do have questions, if you could wait until Chris is finished with his presentation and then you can hit us with all the questions and comments that you have. We will stay here as long as it takes for you to be able to walk out of here with all the facts you need, bring them back to your companies, neighbors, etc., whatever the case may be. Thank you.

Detailed Meeting Minutes[2]

Project Background

C: Chris Calnan: Good evening everyone. We have a pretty full agenda tonight. When we're done with the presentation, we want to make sure you folks have a much better understanding of the project. I'd say the presentation is about 35 minutes of going through the slides and then we'll get into the detailed question and answer period. So, let's jump in.

Here's a little bit about the project background. This is the project area here. You can see this slide gives you some perspective of how large a track of area we're looking at it. It's over a hundred acres of land. You've got the MBTA commuter rail line on one side, Cambridge Street on

[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.

another and the Charles River. You could kind of see downtown Boston in the background of this image. This is a very significant area that we are addressing.

As far as project needs, we think about why we are building this project? A lot of people asked. Coming out of the gate we think about there are a lot of deficiencies out there: with the highway and the structures. The high viaduct is in tough shape. It was built in the 60s and has reached the end of its life. Now it's structurally deficient. We have traffic and safety concerns. The Worcester main line has substantial ridership demand. This line is fastest growing in the system. There is also the broader issue of taking care of rail operations. How do we take care of the rail? We'll be looking at a layover facility in this area and how we address that. This all boils down to the purpose of the project. Again, addressing these roadway deficiencies, safety, improving multimodal use, and then expanding some of the park land and better access to the parkland.

There is certainly a lot of history in this project. We've been working on this with Mike for quite a while. We kicked off with early concepts in 2014. From there we filed an ENF filed that with MEPA that outlined the next steps. From there, DOT looked at some alternatives that hadn't been studied. Those were mostly about placing I-90 at grade, that is on the ground, or putting the train tracks on structure. The City of Boston commissioned what was referred to as a placemaking study. Then in the fall of 2017 we filed a Draft Environmental Impact Report with the Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs. That outlined alternatives and disclosed a lot of the impacts. There were a lot of comments received on that. Based on those comments, DOT commissioned an independent review that looked at these alternatives. That was last fall. This past January, the Secretary of Transportation made a decision about the throat and how that area would be treated by the project.

Alternatives Under Consideration

C: Chris Calnan: Over the past five years or so we've studied 20 to 30 different alternatives. A lot of work has been done both on the highway and rail sides. We've made a lot of progress. Tonight, hopefully when you came in you got this handout. This is MassDOT alternative 3L. This is our latest concept. From a color-coding perspective, yellow is at-grade. The lighter blue is a retained fill section that you start to climb up. The red is a bridge structure. If you look at the slide behind me, I-90 is here. Today I-90 comes up and kind of loops around. That's the area where the former toll plaza was. We will be flattening out the highway. This area is rail layover and West Station. This is the throat area I was talking about. We have these ramp and street connections to Cambridge street. We will be replacing the Franklin Street footbridge. All along the river, we be

shifting Soldiers' Field Road a little bit away from the water and creating some new open space. There is also proposed a new overpass on Soldiers" Field Road which would allow for a direct, at-grade connection to the Paul Dudley White Pathway for bicyclists and pedestrians. There's lots of detail on that in our graphic.

Just to step through some of these key elements. We need to address the viaduct. There's some challenging geometry there with the curvature. We are looking to flatten out the highway. We want to eliminate some of the left hand exits. Those are not traditional. We would have more traditional right-hand exit ramps. We have a collector and distributor road system where it funnels the traffic off the highway and provides you different ways to get on or off this city road system. That street grid will provide complete streets for the facility's different users. This is the throat area. The Boston University dorms are here, here's the Charles River, this is the Viaduct, and down here is Soldiers' Field Road (SFR). This is the viaduct and SFR. This is challenging area for us. There are so many things happening in this area. There's been a lot of focus and effort on looking at this area.

This graphic shows what we're looking at for the final configuration. What's happening is the yellow underneath is I-90. The blue stretch is the rail, the realigning piece here in red is Soldier Fields Road. We will basically stack Soldiers' Field Road over I-90. it does provide future 2-track grand junction line service. We are letting this happen so that eventually we can have 2 tracks go to Cambridge. This realignment of Soldiers' Field Road that opens up a lot of new open space for the parkland.

This is a cross section of that area. How to think about this is that what's on the ground today will be elevated and what is elevated today will either go on the ground or below the ground. You have the rail that is elevated and that's going to go to South Station or across the river. This is the elevated Soldiers' Field Road and you have I-90 at a cut section. This area is below grade. The dotted line is approximate current grade. I-90 would be below existing grade. Over here, we have improved pedestrian and bike path area.

We have a short video. It focuses on the throat area. Looking West. You have the path system next to the Charles River, to the left the elevated Soldiers' Field Road, and the new viaduct. As you continue here you have I-90. We are looking West here, and those cars are travelling Westbound. Below that bridge structure is the eastbound barrel. Here's what it's like from a driver's perspective heading eastbound on I-90. Here is perspective if you are actually on I-90 driving into the City. That bridge structure you see overhead is Soldiers' Field Road. That's carrying both inbound and outbound Soldiers' Field Road. Here we are on Eastbound and to the

left of that is Westbound of I-90. On the right, it's hard to see but that's where the rail is coming in from Worcester. At this location, the rail is elevated and it's going to cross over the highway over here. That's the track that would go over to Cambridge. The mainline tracks that stay and continue to Boston through Back Bay and South Station.

The last animation here is if you're on Soldiers' Field Road at the end of the day as you are heading out of town, going towards the West. As you come out from under the Boston University Bridge, you start to climb up this new elevated bridge structure. You've got the train traveling to the left-side of you, the river on the right, and to the right below you, is I-90 Westbound. These are dramatic changes to this area and a lot going on here.

So next I'll go through how traffic moves through the interchange. There's a lot of on-ramps and off-ramps. This is the first move, the Eastbound off-ramp. You would be able to come into this collector distributor road system and go that first one here. Take this bridge over I-90 and connect into the street network. Or you can continue to the second overpass and head North to this Street Grid system here. Or you can take that quick connection and take a right to Soldiers' Field Road and head Eastbound into the City. Instead of today where you got to go over to this intersection to go into Soldiers' Field Road into the City. This will be a quicker route into Soldiers' Field Road than it is today. The Eastbound on-ramp. You use these connector streets to get you unto these main points to the overpass. Again, make your way to the City road system with that on-ramp.

Same thing with the other on-ramp. We've got these two bridge structures to get over to get onto I-90 Eastbound and head towards downtown. The Westbound off ramp: if you're coming out of the city and you want to get off this interchange. You have again a Westbound collector distributor road system. You can take the first off-ramp available and pursue a connection point to your street here. Or you can take the next road. Again, it brings you up to the North with connection points to your local street grid. Or you can actually continue and head up to what we refer to as the Lincoln street connector and connect up to Cambridge Street. Then finally let's say you come to this area you can use the interchange to go back West. So, for the Westbound on-ramp connections you use those Street Grids to maneuver your way down to the Westbound City road system. Or this is the maneuver coming up out of Boston on Soldiers' Field Road. Right now, all of the movements I've described have to go through this intersection here with Cambridge Street and SFR. We all know how that backs up. Our plan will mean shorter routes for some movements and more options to get to the same place. We're looking at a lot of connection points to help disburse the traffic. Now next we will talk a little bit about the rail.

Construction Impacts

C: Mark Shamon: Good evening. I'm Mark Shamon with the rail team for the project. We'll talk through a few slides that talk about the rail system. The rail system somewhat unlike the highway system that Chris just described is still a little bit in flux. We are looking at a couple of different options. I'll step through those quickly. We'll start with West station which would be a new train station in this area. This area was formerly occupied by CSX as a freight rail yard and a transfer facility. That's been abandoned by CSX. There is an opportunity to utilize that by the MBTA for one of those functions to be a new station, West Station. The station itself we're looking at having at least 3 station tracks. More likely 4 to 5 tracks with 2 platforms. The 2 platforms provide us flexibility with a couple different options. Both with commuter rail and the idea of the that Chris mentioned with Grand Junction service which will allow commuters to get from this area of Allston/Brighton to Cambridge and perhaps over to North Station in the future.

I'll talk a little bit more and show you some slides. Potentially we will have these station tracks go through the area. Also, we may have express tracks that will allow trains to pass through the yard area without having to stop at West station. If we were to have express tracks, they would run from about a mile west of here through the Boston Landing Station built a couple of years ago into this project area. This will move straight through to Landsdown Station which is the next stop. Or Back Bay or South Station. That would mean that not every train going past West Station would have to stop there or slow down to get through it.

We're looking at a bus loop. This is one version of West Station. This is a bus concourse on top of the yard. It would allow for buses to come in on the highway grid network that Chris talked to you about. Buses would come in, pick up or discharge passengers, and continue or terminate here. Passengers could also transfer to other buses or to trains. You could make your way over to Cambridge or make your way into Longwood Medical Center to the South. Again, I mentioned the heavy infrastructure that will allow for the urban rail service infrastructure potentially across the Charles on the Grand Junction Line. We are looking at a Malvern street connection from Commonwealth Avenue. It will continue up into this roadway up to this West Station area. Providing the bus transit way so that buses can get into Cambridge into the South to Longwood Medical without having to go all over around. On one side of the transitway, here we will have bicycle and pedestrian connections that will allow people to go from the South Side to the North Side where there is no opportunity to do so today.

Commuter rail layover yards. I'll show you a couple of plans in a moment. We're not only providing a station but also layover. Trains come into South Station in the peak hours of the

morning. They come into South Station and then where do they go? Right now, many of them are running empty back and forth waiting for the evening to come back to go West and then South Station again and take people back home at the end of the day. So, the idea is this layover yard would allow them have a place relatively close to South Station to be parked during the day. I'll get to questions later. Where trains can be parked during the day. It also allows for the MBTA to do running repairs for minor or major things that need to be done. It allows them the opportunity to do janitorial services on the trains so that they can be cleaned and the idea of stopping the trains here is that we don't want them to idle. So, we want to to plug them into these electric circuits to keep them warm during the middle of the winter. During the winter when it's cold it takes a little while to heat them up and be able to move the engine so typically they are left idling. We will reduce the idling times by using these plug-ins and so that we are not creating more greenhouse gases.

Other things that we're doing. I'll show you a different slide here. So, this is the rail yard omitting the bus concourse on top here. This case is from our DEIR and Chris talked about some of the early versions that we went forward with publicly. It three platforms and four tracks. Two of these tracks serve the commuter rail. The other two serve a future urban rail service to Cambridge. The idea is that we have the center platform that allows for cross-platform transfer. So that getting off from Worcester you can head to Cambridge or Boston. So, we are providing that flexibility through this design and also as I mentioned we have this layover yard to the North Side of the train area.

Trains that come in during the day will be able to park. They start coming in at 7:30-8:00 to throughout the day. They come in and they go back out at 3:00 into South Station to pull people out at the end of the day. So that's the purpose of our layover yard. The layover yard is something that has come into play because of the South Station Expansion study in particular. That study recognized that there will be many new trains coming in the future. All of the new commuter service that they're figuring will come into South station and not just on the Worcester Line, but the Providence Line, and the future New Bedford Line. So, everything that is coming from the South side. So that expansion and the fact that they will be making more trains they need some sort of layover. Right now, there is a deficit in terms of the layover needed to support today's operation. That deficit will get worse in the future. The other thing that I was going mention is that we will also be providing a noise wall for the homes along Pratt and Ashford streets. Again, that idea came out of the South Station Expansion study with the idea that this layover facility will be present here. Again, with the idea that this came out of the South Station expansion study. There's also going to be other noise barriers going in other areas. Back on I-90 and elsewhere.

Going up again this is the DEIR version; the original version that we were looking at. This is the bus concourse. The idea being that we will have buses that'll come in and go to live bus berth that is independent of any traffic. It is used for MBTA buses only. There would be five of those which allows you to serve quite a few buses. We also have the bus layover side. So, if a bus needs to make up time if it gets there and it's too early for the next run or if they need to fix buses, they can do that. We are also anticipating there will be a kiss and ride, uber, lyft, and various kinds of shuttles. We are marking up these as opportunities for this concourse. Then these stair/elevator systems allow folks to get down to the platforms.

We are looking at a couple of options for how the station is positioned. One of the options that has been advanced to us is the idea of flipping West Station to the north side of the yard area and having the layover yard to the South. This has been promoted principally by Harvard University which is the underlying landowner. They have strong interests in developing the area like Chris was showing you before. With the idea being that with this case we got two platforms which allows for transfer. But it also provides 3 tracks to the North: one track being more or less dedicated to the commuter rail system with some flexibility for a second track for the commuter rail. But it also provides for 2 tracks to get over to Grand Junction.

Then again as I mentioned before we have 8 layover tracks to the South. We're showing you here where plug ins will be. In addition to what is happening in the station area, we are also looking to potentially have some express tracks coming through. Recognizing that 85% of the trains that will be coming through at least in the short term will bypass the station with about 15% stopping. We will stop the same trains that are stopping at Boston Landing and Boston Landing is the one closer to Worcester. Rather than having every train be diverted here and work at a slower speed. Trains going through West Station without stopping would go about 45 miles per hour. If they were to run by on the express tracks, they could run 79 miles per hour. We're going to have the opportunity of saving people a lot of time on the train through this express track if your destination is not West Station.

This version shows what we call the modified flip, it's what we're looking at now. This is the bus area on top again we would have bus berths for MBTA buses. We can have five buses. We will have the kiss and ride. The station platforms are up to the North. There are stairs and elevators to connect the platform with the concourse. We are still looking at what the actual platform arrangement might be under this configuration, but the idea is that we will provide at least a 2-platform station, maybe 3. We will have at least 3 tracks for one of the stations. With express tracks. Or

C: **Mark Shamon:** Alright, moving on to the other key project elements. We kind of mentioned some about the expanded parkland and spaces that will be available. MassDOT will be improving the bicycle and pedestrian accommodations. We're looking for more connections to the river. This graphic here kind of gives you a little bit of an illustration. We will have pedestrian and bicycle connections to West Station. The existing Franklin pedestrian bridge doesn't meet accessibility requirements so we will be replacing that as well. The project makes some pretty interesting improvements for the cyclists, pedestrians, and of course in terms of additional open space.

Mike mentioned that this is a long way off, and we have a lot of ways to go. That said, we are starting to think about construction staging and it is something that we're taking very seriously. All the different alternatives and options we are considering we've got some challenges to deal go. For instance, I-90 we're going to have some travel lane reductions. From 8 lanes down to 6. Soldiers' Field Road we look to maintain at 4 lanes. We will probably have off-peak travel reductions with I-90 and Soldiers' Field Road. But we're going to try to maintain those the best we can.

There will be times where we will have to go down to a single-track operation between Boston Landing and Commonwealth Avenue, that's about a mile in distance. When people worry about a single-track operation, it's not like it would be a single track from Boston to Worcester, it's just a short distance. The Grand Junction Rail line: there's a bridge structure that goes over Soldiers' Field Road. That's going to have to be shut down, demolished, and rebuilt. So that line itself will be severed. DOT is doing some site investigation for temporary commuter rail layover locations on the South Side. So, more work needs to be done there. Also, we must deal with the Paul Dudley White path construction. Mike mentioned earlier an overall duration 8 to 10 years. And certainly, as the concepts get more refined and developed and we get a design/build entity on board we'll have a better idea of the exact durations. The lane reductions on I-90 are 5-6 years away, it's not happening soon. The reductions on the commuter rail are probably about another year after that so we have plenty of time to work through the details and that is one of our charges moving forward.

Here are some of the highlights that we have on the construction staging side. Trying to maintain ramp alignment. We've got all those existing ramps going between the highway and Cambridge Street at River Street. To maintain those connections, we're going to have temporary bridges and temporary ramps. We're looking at putting a temporary bridge structure into the Charles River. We will show you those a little bit of what that's all about. We've got to make sure that we have safe work zones and area where we can stage the equipment. While this is a

large site, we have a lot of transportation elements to maintain, in the very narrow area of the throat.

One thing we are closely focused on is trying to reduce the amount of time that we impact the Grand Junction Line and the Worcester Mainline. That Grand Junction Line is complicated by the fact that we must create connections for Soldiers' Field Road where it comes out from under the Boston University Bridge and would go onto the temporary trestle. We have to try to accomplish that while keeping traffic moving. We have a lot of work to do. There are sizable utility impacts because we are actually taking elevated I-90 and that's going to go down into a cut, it will be in a trench. Relocation of those utilities will have to happen pretty early on in the job.

Then, as we move forward with considering going into the river, to help with the staging, we are trying to assess those river impacts, and how we best handle that going forward. Earlier on, we were trying to stage this to avoid going into the river entirely, but what we concluded was that there not enough space in the throat to take I-90, de-elevate that, maintain all modes of travel, and build the SFR temporary trestle while minimizing our impacts to the Worcester Mainline. We just didn't have the room. It was going to require a longer construction period, longer outages of the Worcester line main line, and we just didn't see this as a good way to minimize the disruption for the folks using I-90 and the commuter rail. What we've landed on right now is to build this temporary structure into the Charles River.

This kind of gives you a little bit of an illustration. The green on the slide here is a four lane, type of ACROW trestle bridge. What it does is shifts the existing traffic off Soldiers' Field Road and places it out over the river so then we have room here to demolish the existing I-90 viaduct. The blue on the slide would be the temporary alignment for I-90. With this approach we can shift everything North to give us room to get the traffic off of I-90 in order to build the rest of the structure. I think you saw the cross section here and it's just so tight. The only way to get the room is to go out into the river and that helps build this in a bit more efficient manner. Again, this is all done by way of trying to reduce the utility impacts for I-90 and shorten the overall duration of the project.

Some next steps. We've been through a very robust and rigorous process. We've been doing lots of data collection and analysis and filing some of our early environmental forms. Right now, we are refining the preferred alternatives and kind of formally documenting that through both the federal and state process. Eventually that leads to more preliminary design.

Once that is done, we can go out to design/build procurement. At the point when we have a design/build entity, they will take over the project, do the final design, and then do the construction. Just a couple quick next steps related to the Environmental Process. We've got the NEPA, or the National Environmental Policy Act side. Where we will be filing a notice of intent later this year. What that does is kind of kicks off formerly that NEPA process wherein we prepare an EIS for a federal highway that we anticipate will take us about 2 years to get done. Along those lines we have the state process where we are going to be filing a notice of project change in early 2020. That will identify this alternative where we are going to be stacking Soldier Field Road over I-90 as our preferred approach. That wasn't in any of the former state filings, so we will be updating that on the state side and disclosing those impacts and identifying where we're going to go with that. So, lots happening in the next 6 to 12 months.

Lastly, as I explained earlier, construction is a few years away. There is plenty of time to advance and refine the design and improve on the construction impacts side. We will now wrap up the formal presentation and take your questions and comments.

Discussion

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: All right, good evening ladies and gentlemen. My name is Nathaniel Curtis the head of Public Involvement for Howard Stein Hudson and a member of the consultant team for the project. I'll going to be helping run the Q&A tonight. Before we do that, I know that Representative Hannah Kane has stayed so we would like to offer her the floor first. If she would like to say anything. I'll bring the microphone to you.

C: Representative Kane: Good evening, I'm also joined today by my colleague Joe McKenna. I don't know if I have any other colleagues here that I'm not seeing. Thank you for coming out tonight. The one thing that I would like to add is that there are many members of the task force who have been working on this. In addition, from the people you heard from tonight there are people from the surrounding communities and organizations represented there. As well as a member of the Central Massachusetts Caucus, which is me. I represent the Caucus on the task force. We have a Representative from the MetroWest Caucus on there as well, Maria Robinson. As well as a member from the Senate President's Office. This is something that the legislature is keenly paying attention to and making sure that we advocate particularly for some of us from Central Massachusetts so that the impact to our commute during the long construction period is lessened as much as possible. There will certainly be an impact, but we are going to do whatever we can to make sure that we are constantly letting folks know what they can expect from this project and how to make their commutes as easy as possible.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Thank you kindly representative. Sir you're good? Alright. So, the way we're going to do this is just raise your hand up. I'll walk the microphone to you. And to make it logical, we're going to start on this side of where I am, and I'll go back and forth again as many times as we need to. So, hand up if you have a question.

Q: George Allegrosa: Hi my name is George Allegrosa I live in Shrewsbury. Question on the interchange design: it seems to be very well thought out, there seem to be a lot of moving pieces, and I commend the team. Because it certainly looks like there was a lot of engineering that has gone to this and that will need to go into this. The question is in the movement from Soldiers' Field Road Westbound to I-90 Westbound and from I-90 Eastbound to Soldiers' Field Road Eastbound, because those are alternatives when there is traffic or other problems. Was there any consideration for, and I should've gone on the website and did my research, was there any consideration for direct connection for those two movements?

Were they not considered because of cost? The reason I bring it up because we're going through a lot of trouble, which I think very admirably to do the street grid, and you have a number of signal lines which the traffic will need to move to, to go through those two streets. And I wanted to know how much consideration was taken to reducing those. It just seems logical that's going to be a choke point.

A: Michael O'Dowd: Yes you bring up a great point there. There's no harm in looking at the website to help answer that question, but respond to your question, yes it was considered. As Chris mentioned, over the course of the last five years we've looked at dozens of various alternatives. One of the first ones that was in consideration was how could we create a direct connection both to Soldiers' Field Road to I-90 and I-90 to Soldiers' Field Road depending on the direction. It was looked at, but in looking at it, we put it through various screening criteria and once we applied those criteria to the direct connection, it got filtered out.

A lot of it had to do with the fact that not all the traffic that gets off I-90 is going to Soldiers' Field Road. More of it is looking to get back to Brighton/Allston area, Commonwealth Avenue or getting across River Street over into Cambridge. It's smaller overall portion that is trying to get to Soldier's Field Road. When you take into account all the desired move to and from. Not all of it is trying to head to Soldiers' Field Road. By creating that direct connection, we discovered that we would create more conflicts for those other movements.

Q: Paul Matthews: Paul Matthews with the 495 Metrowest Partnership also a Worcester Resident. Just a few thoughts. I'm also on the rail vision advisory committee at MassDOT, so I appreciate the references of alignment to the Grand Junction and the possibilities vis-à-vis the

state's commuter rail plans. A few overall comments, I very much appreciate the state coming out to Framingham to talk about this. I realize that there's a big impact in the Allston/Brighton area and that's where a lot of the focus has been. It's also quite clear to me that as this project proceeds there needs to be a corresponding level of focus to the broader impact and broader mitigation for East-West travel. I think that's why we're all here. I think particularly around the state's greenhouse gas emission goal, for reducing greenhouse gas emissions and the interrelationship between I-90 and the commuter rail. It is vital that attention be paid to that there is adequate needs encouraging that people shift to commuter rail whenever possible, given the impact on the roadway here.

I think part of this conversation needs to be whether there be additional rolling stock, additional fare policies to incentivize people to take the commuter rail system or other means of encouraging it. I think it is vital to minimize the impact on East-West travel out. We can see the Worcester Framingham line had a 46% increase in riders which was 5,000 people from 2012 to 2018. When this project is underway there's going to be more demand. I think if you look at the State's congestion report it showed a 15,000 increase in I-90 traffic over the same time period. It's vital that as the project's focus be developed it be expanded to include appropriate mitigation to the larger, macro, as well as, micro-scale.

One question that I have regarding West station is, although I applaud the idea of having a transit node, I have yet to hear an adequate discussion about the interrelationship with i-90 commuters. Where West Station is being envisioned in being built to be long-term needs. It seems only common sense to have an opportunity for I-90 drivers to get off, get to West Station, and take it to Grand Junction connection or the other transit connections into Boston. I do hope adequate attention is being paid to providing that linkage. Whether it be adequate parking, adequate road access to I-90, and other means.

A: Michael O'Dowd: Very good points made. We appreciate those. We agree with you hopefully this will give opportunities for any of the commuters to find other routes. Ideally using the public transit commuter rail systems. As far as other commuting opportunities, our Central Transportation Planning Staff in Boston, which does our regional modeling, is looking at what the opportunities there may be for parking in and around this area so that we might be able to provide services for parking for people commuting into West Station.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: The only thing I would add to Mike said is that we are looking to make sure that people in central Massachusetts and MetroWest are fully aware of the project and have an opportunity to be engaged in it. As the job goes into the rest of its environmental process and

project development. So, if you did not sign in when you got here tonight to make sure that you do on your way out. That would put you on our project database which is in excess of 1,600 entries at this point. That way, when there is a meeting, whether it's being held in Boston, Framingham, Worcester, or somewhere else, you will have the notification served right up to your inbox. So, just for what's that's worth, please make sure you sign in.

C: Jay Flynn: My name is Jay Flynn I'm here on behalf of Transit Matters, the transit advocacy group. Some of you may have heard of us. Some of you may have not and I'll be happy to chat to anyone about us during the evening. We still remain concerned about provisions for the rail. In this we are very concerned about single tracking. We should be hearing even at this stage, we think, about increasing transit from Worcester and Framingham, not impeding it. To tie it into the recent Newton presentations, there are stations there. There seems to be no provision for the short to medium term, as far as making it more feasible to run more trains and more utilized trains. We get nervous when we hear things like we're only expecting only 15% of trains stop here. Because if you're trying to make it an intermodal area, trains need to stop to make it intermodal. Why spend all the money on Grand Junction if you're not going to make any trains stop? We have yet to hear, much in the way of what rail mitigation is going to be. We remain opposed to single tracking. We would love to start hearing things like hourly service so that people can count on it. People will take trains and mitigate the problems you are going to have on this nightmare we're calling Allston/Brighton. It will be a nightmare, there's no way around that. You can do your best, to try, and I'm not saying you're not going to do your best, but you know as many people who can take the train the better, and we really need to see more provision for that. Thank you.

C: Michael O'Dowd: Thank you; I appreciate the comment. One of the things I mentioned when you were at the Framingham meeting is that the idea that DOT is investigating ways to provide for service improvements, so that when this does get to construction, and so that we can move as many people utilizing the commuter rail from the West, into Boston or Back Bay, as frequently as and in as large numbers possible. By then, we will have replaced single level coaches with bi-level coaches so that we can increase the capacity and the frequency of movements.

Q: Nate Cabral-Curtis: The only thing I would add to that Mike, and I recall you mentioned it at the Framingham meeting is that idea of trying to staffer the impacts on I-90 and the commuter rail so that they don't overlap. That might be something to touch on here?

A: Michael O'Dowd: It's something that we're looking at as we continue to advance our construction staging in the hopes that we can condense and compress the schedule of 8-10 years

that we've been communicating to many of you and the Allston Taskforce. The idea is that if there is an opportunity for us to do so, we're striving to minimize the disruption, so that it's not happening on both I-90 and the Commuter rail at the same time. So, in the instance that we'll be able to maintain the full capacity on I-90 perhaps we might be down to single track operation. But if we're at a point where we can offer double track operation, we would look to have that been the time when we reduce the number of lanes on I-90. We're striving to offset wherever the impact is so that it's not being felt by both users of the commuter rail and I-90. So, it's something that we're striving for, while we're also looking to condense and compress the operation as much as possible.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Just because this question was asked from the gentleman here behind me: my collogue Doug Johnson is making a detailed record of this meeting. If you go on the website, you will see detailed records of all the meetings of this project dating back to the 10th of April of 2014. So, if you want to print them out and enjoy a thorough reading of the project's history, all of this is captured.

Q: Trina Robinson: Thank you I'm Trina Robinson and I live in Worcester. I'm not representing any advocacy groups just passengers. But my question is in the interest of condensing the time for construction, and I don't know how it's done today, but have any thoughts been given to any public-private partnerships in the construction phase? I happen to know that in the Dallas-Fort Worth Metro Area, they've had a number of these projects that came in under budget and on time based on that they've used public-private partnerships and incentives in the contracts.

A: Michael O'Dowd: That's a great point and it's been used very successfully in other parts of the country: Florida, down South, and Virginia, the Carolinas, and of course as you mentioned in the Texas area and California as well. It's one of the ideas that we're looking at it's not only for procurement delivery system but it's also a financing system, those public private partnerships. Or as P3s as we refer to them in the industry. What I can say right now is that we have a finance commission that has been established specifically for this project, as well as for some of the other larger projects like the I-495/I-90 Improvement Project. Their goal is investigating P3's to see if they would be a viable option for these particular projects and whether or not the firms which typically participate in P3's would be interested in taking this on.

Q: Trina Robinson: With such a long lead time, would it be possible for there to be some time to investigate best practices, of municipalities or agencies that have already done it?

A: MOD: We have looked into best practices. Many of the members of the design consultant team are national firms and many of those firms have been engaged in other, similar projects so we

have been drawing on their expertise. I've also been approached by finance partnerships and contracting teams that have been engaged in in public-private partnerships. They've all brought to us some of their ideas and thoughts how something like that could work. If not necessarily in this particular project, then in future projects. We've look at lessons learned in Massachusetts and other states and that is something that the finance commission is looking at, listening to ideas, and still evaluating. No commitments have been made. We haven't ruled it out. We do anticipate this going to design/build, but that doesn't preclude this from going to a public-private partnership. It's just another mechanism that we're looking at.

Q: **John:** John from Bolyston. First a clarification, Mike in your introduction you said that this is going to be advertised in 2022. I think that one of the original graphics had going on for design/build procurement in the second quarter of 2021?

A: **Michael O'Dowd:** So, there are two parts to that answer. The way that we handle design/build in Massachusetts has two parts: phase 1 and phase 2. Phase one is putting out a letter of interest; we put that out nationally and internationally. Believe it or not we have international firms interested in chasing this project. Just because of the magnitude, complexity, and of course the dollar value. So, phase 1 is getting letters of interest. We are striving to get that out by the end of 2021. That gives your third quarter of 2021. A lot of the timing of that hinges on where we stand on our environmental permitting. Once the letters of interest are complete, our typical timeframe for design/build procurement is a range of 9-14 months depending on the size, magnitude, and complexity of the project.

A project of this size of this magnitude we fully expect at least a year for procurement. So, the idea is that if we get out with letters of interest by the end of 2021, by the end of 2022 we could be in the position of awarding a design/build entity, a D/B entity, with the contract. So that's the game plan. This team won't bring this to a full design. When they're done, you're going to what we call a 25% design or a base technical concept. Using that we would issue the RFQ, the Request for Qualifications. Then we would finally release an RFP, Request for Proposals, to those D/B entitues which have been shortlisted through the LOI and RFQ process. At that point, they would work up their proposals and cost estimates to submitting it to a selection committee for review. That's a lot of work in a 12-month period. Especially on a project on this side where there are so many disciplines involved.

Q: **John:** Absolutely, you're correct, based on the 8 to 10-year duration and the complexity of the job. Given the recent trends in design/build for these mega-heavy civil engineering projects are

you concerned that you may not get the positive response from the industry that you're hoping to get?

A: Michael O'Dowd: What I can say right now is that I'm hopeful based off the response I've been getting over the past year from the industry. Both the design community that's chasing it from the design side but also from the contracting side. I deal with the contractors as much as I deal with the designers which is to say on a very regular basis. They are all interested in putting teaming arrangements together. So, if I can continue to hold unto that interest as we move along the environmental process, I think we'll have a pretty competitive environment for the project and the DBT teams chasing it. A lot of teams, not just from the New England area that we are familiar with, but I'm getting calls from people from Chicago, companies from Spain believe it or not, companies from California, and companies from Texas. There is a lot of interest right now. I just need to retain that interest so that I could have a competitive pricing two years from now, three years from now.

Q: Mary Connaughton: Mary Connaughton, I'm a resident of Framingham and I'm also with Pioneer Institute and I just want to again reiterate the importance of maintaining two tracks throughout the entire construction process. I mean this is going to hugely impact our lives, everyone, MetroWest and beyond that commute into work on a daily basis to Boston. So, doing your best, it is unacceptable to go down to a single track. Paul Matthews said, this is an opportunity for more people to take the commuter rail and get off the roads. If they have a single bad experience they will never come back. This is an opportunity to get more people on the commuter rail and having single track will totally dissuade them from making that a habit. Also, people who are not taking the commuter rail will face slowdowns in work zones. The layover facility will mean more trains crossing the active tracks, not just Worcester line trains, but trains from other lines going in and out of that facility will additionally disrupt our commuter. as more trains will come in, not only the Worcester line train, but other lines come in and out of the Worcester line to get to that facility that's going to additionally disrupt our commutes.

As such, I hope that MassDOT reconsiders that layover facility and just have the trains run on the lines throughout the day. This is a changing world. It sounds like it's being built for today, not five years from now, or 10 years from now when more and more people are going to demand public transit. Additionally, the cost of this hasn't been disclosed in terms of how the cost will be paid. We've heard that $1.2billion is the total cost. I believe that there's been $250 million committed through a transportation bonding bill for this project. That leads another billion or so to come from somewhere. Is the toll payer going to be paying for it? Is the toll payer going to pay the total cost of this project outside of West Station? Additionally, is there a firm commitment

from the secretary for that Kendalll connection to occur? Is that something out in the future? Because that would be what most benefit people in MetroWest in Worcester to be able to have access in Cambridge. So that needs to be a very firm commitment on the timing and again who's going to be paying for it and how it's going to be happening.

A: Michael O'Dowd: I think that brings up a good point. It points to the $1.2 billion that I've been speaking to which is consistent with the environmental report that was filed in 2017. We were looking at 3 alternatives at that point. This alternative that we showed you today is sort of a hybrid of all the three alternatives that were discussed earlier. So, we still need to do an in-depth cost estimate for this alternative. We feel reasonably confidence that it's in that range, $1.2billion. For who is responsible, absolutely toll users will be a component of paying for this. In addition to bond funds, there will likely be special obligation bonds necessary to cover the cost. So, it's not just toll users, its tax payers, and likely the Federal Government.

We're still expecting to utilize Federal funds. We're looking at grants that maybe available through the federal process. Possibly public-private partnerships as we discussed earlier or funds from the cities and institutions that will benefit from this. So there is a range of different opportunities for identifying the funding. It has not been nailed down. We continue to dig into it. Addressing that is one of the tasks of the finance commission. They are looking at mechanisms for financing and funding this project and when they will become available. There's nothing that I can say tonight that will finalize that. It's still on going. It's still being discussed with various avenues outside of my purview.

Q: No Name Given: Can you respond to the Kendall Connection question?

A: Michael O'Dowd: So, I can't speak for the Secretary in terms of when a future Grand Junction service would be established, but what I will say is we are committed to facilitating it when it does come. What we are committed is to ensure that what we build for West station, for a layover yard, and various connections that we'll show within the limits of this project will be able to accommodate any of the future services that maybe built across Grand Junction. Urban rail systems, DMUs, EMUs, whatever the case maybe, that can ultimately serve Kendall Square or maybe Kendall Square through to North Station. So, the idea is out there. It's brought to our attention on a regular basis the secretary has spoken to it. It's not being built as part of this project. She's clear on that and I want to reiterate that it's not being built as part of this project. But what we are proposing to do is to build the infrastructure to support that service in the future. We do not what the future is. It could be in 20 years, it could be in 10 years, I'm honestly not in the position to address that.

Q: Mary Connaughton: You've talked a lot tonight about how Allston will benefit from this project, but in Central Massachusetts and MetroWest, it seems like we're going to have to deal with all these inconveniences, but we're going to get very little in return. What is our long-term benefit?

A: Michael O'Dowd: Right, I think that we should go back and identify why we are doing this project. Right now, we have an existing elevated viaduct that I'm sure each and everyone one of you have in the past and in the future will continue to drive over. That elevated viaduct is somewhere along the lines of 2,500 feet long, not that different from some of the different viaducts that you have travelled, whether it be I-91 in Springfield, some of the viaducts in Somerville, viaducts in Fall River, all of them built in the 60s. All of them are from the same time frame, and in same condition: deteriorating faster than we are able to maintain them. One thing you, and everyone else in the Commonwealth will be getting is a facility that will be able to withstand the next 75 to 100 years of use.

What's out there right now is from the 1960's. We're at a point where we are constantly inspecting it, looking at what maintenance it needs, and constantly making repairs to the steel underneath it that you don't see. I do see it because it is required of me to inspect it. It's also necessary to constantly maintain to ensure that not only passenger vehicles are able to use it on a regular basis, but all of the heavy trucks that use it daily to move goods, services, and produce; whatever the case maybe. We want to get this project done because we know we have a structurally deficient viaduct that is carrying 150,000 users every day. So that is our number one objective in this transportation project: to address that.

We also want to address safety issues that came as a result of the various changes in alignment that you see out there. Granted the toll plazas are no longer there but you still have a curve which now slows drivers down unnecessarily and contributes to accidents. We're also looking to address the concerns at the intersections. So there' a number of things that all users, whether you're a commuter by car, truck, or the commuter rail will benefit from what we are proposing to do here. Now you will not see it tomorrow, you won't see it five years from now. It maybe 10 years out, but the idea is greater reliability and opportunity for us to find safer, and more reliable, and more efficient, and faster commutes. That is what we are providing. That's what MassDOT does.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: The only thing I'd add to what Mike said, and this is based on work we did responding to questions received at the meeting in Framingham back in July, is this: right now if you are coming in from Worcester or MetroWest, and you thought "I'm going to make my last lap

of this trip by bicycle" there's really not a great way to do that. In the future with West Station, you will be able to get off the train and fully access the Paul Dudley White system. The street grid coming out of West Station is proposed with fully protected intersections, separated bicycle facilities, that will deliver bicyclists from West Station either by their own folding bicycle that they pull off out of the commuter rail or a regular bicycle from one various bike share programs directly into the Charles River paths and their connections. Bus connections that would be available from West Station as well. Those are connections which do not exist today. Those are also benefits which accrue to everyone.

Q: No Name Given: Thank you, I'm with MIT and the Pioneer Institute. You mentioned earlier that some additional rolling stock is going to be purchased to try and alleviate the congestion on the rail system. With this project you have stated for a number of years will be cutting down the lanes on I-90 during construction from 8 to 6?

A: Michael O'Dowd: Yes.

Q: No Name Given: Now all of those people have to go somewhere. And I'm wondering whether apart from those few extra carriages for the train system whether you will be discussing with the MBTA opportunity to run additional train trips. Additional train sets might need to be procured, not just a few carriages. Regarding the Worcester Mainline, apart from the comments that you've heard about trying to keep a double track passing through a construction site, could be used to run additional train trips. Particularly during peak hours, because those, whatever it is, 20% of motorists who are driving on the I-90 -when you go down to six lanes, they have to go somewhere and I'm wondering if you're actually putting pressure on the MBTA to stop not just thinking about a few extra carriages on each train, but complete additional trains out and back every morning every rush hour, because that would at least mop up some of the additional traffic.

A: Michael O'Dowd: You bring up a good point. The answer is yes. We've absolutely been discussing it with our operators both Keolis and the MBTA commuter rail system. To the extant that we can maximize and put out more rolling stock on the track, running on shorter headways at any given time, ideally we will. Right now, the services are optimized. To the extent that we maybe able to provide more service, more train trips during the course of the day, I wouldn't commit to that, but it's certainly something that we continue to discuss, coordinate, and strategize with the operators at Keolis and MBTA. With regards to, you know the idea of going down 3 lanes in each direction, albeit it an extended period of time, I just want to bring everybody to the idea of just a few short years ago, people forget very quickly, we had this happen before with three lanes on each direction for the Commonwealth Avenue Bridge. Now

granted some people will say "well, Commonwealth Avenue was only for a couple of weeks during a couple of the summers," but everybody seems to have forgotten the impacts from the substructure repairs we had to undertake before we got to the superstructure repairs going back to 2014 and 2015. The same thing happened, we had to bring it down to three lanes in each direction. The idea was "oh my God you can't do this." We did it. Was it painful? Yes. Was there congestion? Yes, but based on evaluating traffic conditions on a day-to-day basis to see how long it was taking people to get through there and how many people were still using I-90, we discovered that the same number of commuters were going in and out of Boston, albeit with an extended peak period, and there were not that many diversions. So, in the end, we perfected it, I supposed perfect is a relative term if you drive on I-90 at peak hours, but it still moved.

What I'm saying is that people will tend to find the best option of them. If that's continuing to use I-90, they'll continue to use I-90. If it means commuter rail service, it will be the commuter rail. We strive to optimize and maximize everyone's opportunity to get in and out as painlessly as possible with what we have available to us to still be able to construct this job. It's not easy. It's difficult. We face this challenge on every major project we conduct throughout the Commonwealth, but we get through it and fortunately enough people are still able to continue on their daily lives: work, play, recreation, business, shopping, whatever the case maybe. So, we're looking at it. The Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS) is making a regional traffic model for us for this project. We'll have a good understanding of where people are coming from and going to and if there are alternate routes available, we will identify what they may be, whether they be bus, transit, commuter rail services etc. There is a whole range of things we still need to iron out. To the extent we can maximize the volume of commuters we can move and minimize the disruption they have, we will. There will be no stones left unturned on this one.

Q: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Speaking of nothing left unturned, again, speaking to the responses we issued last week to the questions we got in Framingham, safe to say that you know we're also thinking of the transit roadway side, and having conversations vis-à-vis express buses as well, yes?

A: Michael O'Dowd: Yes, yes. That's correct.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Okay so, we do have at least two of our excellent task force members here who hauled themselves all the way from Boston for which we thank them, but I do want to make sure that I get to members of the general public first. I have two public hands up here in the middle, and on the side, and if that's it then I will track back to task force members. So, we're

going to go down here, over there, back this side, and then task force members. I'll start with Mike Santos, formerly of Howard Stein Hudson. He left on excellent terms for what it's worth.

Q: Mike Santos: First I want to say thanks to the project team for the presentation and coming out to Worcester. My name is Mike Santos, I am a current Worcester resident and also a transportation consulting professional. I think this project it doesn't really look like it's going to have a lot of regional benefits for people traveling into the city. You're not adding capacity in any significant manner. I appreciate the, you know, the safety improvements, the multi-mobility improvements, this a great project for Allston/Brighton. I think, you know, the City of Boston is going to get a lot of benefits from this. I want to know if you can speak to what's going to happen to the street grid network. So right now, you know that's a lot of land right there. I was wondering, first of all, who owns it, who's going to benefit from the development of that land, because that's a goldmine right there and if the Commonwealth and/or the City of Boston are determining what is the best use of that. I know that MassDOT done a position study before for things like this. So yeah, that's basically it. Thanks.

A: Michael O'Dowd: Okay. I'll strive to hit on all the things you mentioned. As far as the street grid, in the course of the last several years, we've looked at, various alternatives, various routes, various connections between I-90 and Cambridge street that would allow traffic to connect into Allston and Brighton, which is, for any of you who aren't familiar with it, back through this area here and for the large majority of traffic that's coming off of I-90 that's striving to make it over to Cambridge and the small group that is going in over to Soldiers' Field Road. We've looked at well over a dozen different alternatives just for the street grid network alone. This is the best way we've found so far for us right now to manage 66,000 vehicles every day. That number will grow obviously with development comes traffic.

Obviously, it's going to grow because everything else in the City and the region is growing. There's a lot of development going in Kendall, there's a lot of development going on in Somerville at North Point. With this development going on everywhere that bring more traffic. Also, it brings more transit use as well. What we are proposing right now, is what we believe to be the best way to process all the various vehicles, in all the various destinations without focusing or concentrating all of the traffic at one particular location, which is exactly what we're faced with today. For any of you that get off I-90 in the morning, if you're heading East and you want to get across the river, that signal intersection at the Double Tree backs traffic all the way back into the ramps and sometimes onto the mainline. By redistributing traffic into other locations, we're able to keep the impacts off the main line on I-90 and within the local street network that would service both Boston and Cambridge.

As far as who is going to benefit from future the development. The underlying landowner, Mark had pointed out earlier, is Harvard. There have been various transactions that have occurred over the course of the last, I'd say, 15 to 20 years between MassDOT, the former Turnpike Authority, and with also Harvard University. Harvard University is the underlying owner of all this property and this parcel to the north of the ramps. It's somewhere the range, and I don't have the exact figure, but it's close enough to 100 acres for discussion purposes. With all of our various facilities and public ways, we expect we will take up about 40 of those acres. Those roads will still be used by us, by you, and everyone currently using them. And we anticipate occupying with all of our facilities and public ways that we're showing here is 40 acres of land that's going to be occupied by public roads. Those roads will still be used by us, by you, by everyone that is currently using them. And for the future.

Who benefits from the future development? I won't know that the timeframe on the development is or what type it's going to be, but what we're being told is that they anticipate in the future a lot of mixed development. It could be commercial, educational, it could be retail, residential. There is a whole range of uses that could be occupying this site. If that is the case, the City of Boston stands to benefit greatly, but I think we all will benefit greatly because the more uses that are here, the more tax dollars that will be generated, and any tax dollars that are generated in Massachusetts will funnel back to us. So, in the future, any revenue generated, and any tax revenue generated, will only serve the Commonwealth better for its uses. Whether it's for transportation, education, whatever the case maybe. That's not my decision to make, but to think that the benefits are only specific to Allston/Brighton or the City of Boston I think is marginalizing the opportunity that anything that we do in transportation is to benefit the Commonwealth as a whole.

Q: **Tom:** Hi my name is Tom. I'm one of the other commuters on the Worcester line. One of the concerns that I have is, there's has been talk about possibly adding service and all that and I get there's a lot of shared pain between both traffic and rail. I don't necessarily foresee adding extra trains to be helpful, because with the choke point that's going to be caused during construction there's going to be issues, but is there flexibility to add coaches to some of the existing trains? I know you also mentioned the possibility of pulling doubles off other trains and putting them on the Worcester Line and what occurred to me is perhaps the negative impacts that could have on the other lines? Particularly the very popular Providence line. And the last question, is there any flexibility to put a time box around the closure of the second track so that it would only be allowed only during off-peak hours? I get that there's some safety issues driving that closure, but the time box could help alleviate things.

A: Michael O'Dowd: I'm going to touch each of your questions, and I know Nate will remind me of anything I miss. As far as whether there is the opportunity to increase the number of coaches that are running with any train set, the answer is yes. With the yard and station configuration Mark went over earlier tonight, we'll be able to handle 9-car consists – that's 9 coaches, plus the locomotive, which is about 800 feet. That's different from what's currently running on the Worcester line today, which I believe is 7 coaches and the locomotive, so yes, we'll have the opportunity to expand the trains.

Q: Tom: And what about during construction?

A: Michael O'Dowd: During construction, that is yet still a possibility assuming the coaches are available. The problem that we're having right now from the T's perspective is, making sure there are enough coaches available to service this line and all the other lines that we have both on the North side and South side, all the more reason why the MBTA and MassDOT, are looking at procuring additional rolling stock, not only to be able to retire some of the older stuff but also to be able to supplement and address our current deficiency. So, yes, the T is constantly looking at ways to procure and invest in new rolling stock and new coaches including bi-level coaches, so we'll be able to add on to the existing train sets out there now. There was a second part of your question.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: The thought was, Mike, was that by getting these additional coaches you wouldn't be put in the position of robbing Peter to pay Paul. You wouldn't be in a position of having to pull bi-level coaches off Doug's commute up from Providence just to bring them to Worcester, because by the time we get to construction, there would be more coaches available overall.

C: Michael O'Dowd: We're trying not to penalize one community or one commuter for the purposes and benefit of another one. You had some more, yes?

Q: **Tom:** Time boxing and single tracks.

A: Michael O'Dowd: Single tracks, that's something that we continue to look at. Yes, you are right to the extent that we'll be able to focus that during off peak hours, we will look to do so. You know I've said this before and I'll say it again, identifying what peak hour is, or better what off-peak hour is anymore is kind of difficult because the number of volumes of people that we're pushing through the system, whether it be on the rail system or the highway system, the peaks continue to grow and the off-peaks continue to shrink. A lot of time, we look at contractors and say, "you can only work during off-peak hours," and the response is "O.K. but we'll be here

another 20 years." We don't want that either. It's unfortunate, but it's not unfortunate it means the economy is doing well. It's unfortunate for contracting and building things because we don't really have an opportunity to do it without impacts anymore. On the T side, the rail side, typically you're typically looking into a window of opportunity between 1 o'clock and 5 o'clock in the morning during which you can actually construct anything. It's hard, but we are striving to find out what the right balance is of minimizing disruptions and not setting up conditions which make it impossible to build the job. If that means we need to go to a single track so that we can expand the opportunity and window for construction, so we can lessen and minimize the duration so it will be less than the currently projected 8 to 10 years, then we need to look at that, too. There's a lot of moving parts that we need to get a handle on and what I can tell you now is that I don't have a handle on it and I know for a fact the team's leadership doesn't have a handle on it, because if they did I would as well, but as I continue to come out here and see you in the course of the next three years I will have more and more actual information that I can give you, but tonight, we just don't know it yet.

Q: Phil Levit: Phil Levit from Shrewsbury. I saw the plan of putting the turnpike below grade. Does that present any flooding problems especially with climate change given the fact that you're right next to a river?

A: Michael O'Dowd: It's a great point. It certainly presents a challenge to us. We will be building boat sections. We will need to ensure that slab is well waterproofed because the riding surface is either in or very close to the water table and we are close to the elevation of the Charles River. It's not insurmountable but it certainly presents some challenges for contractors and the designers who have to develop it, but we're confident that we can do it. We will be providing additional pumps so that in the event that there is flooding, or any storm events that we're not able to manage through the regular drainage system, we'll have pumps that will be able to go into effect to remove that water. It's not going to be high, but we do want to keep it dry.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: And flood modeling has been conducted for this using the latest data from the latest data from the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institute.

C: Michael O'Dowd: That is correct. We are using the Boston Harbor Flood Risk Model or BHFRM. It's a model that's been developed by engineers and scientists down in Falmouth that evaluates what the potential is for flooding in Eastern Massachusetts and some of the other low-lying areas along the coastline. Certainly, this is one of them because it is subject to the tidal flooding. However, we're fortunate in the fact that we do have a dam, which separates the Charles River from the Boston harbor. Through that, we have the ability to monitor and meter

how much water goes in and out of the Charles, whether it be during a storm event or just a very high tide. It is a great point you bring up and something we are looking at closely.

C: **Dan Ray:** Hi there, Dan Ray from the Pawtucket Red Sox, soon to be the Worcester Red Sox. As new member of the Worcester community and the Worcester business community, I'm just here to echo a few early sentiments about the importance of the frequency of transportation services. You know there are several reasons as to why we chose Worcester as our new home. Certainly, the passion of the baseball fans here was the foremost reason and very enlightened public leadership, which I think this meeting shows. Certainly, the outreach you are doing is commendable. We've seen that at the state level and city level, and it's been gratifying to see that, but a really big factor for us in our decision was the ability to regionalize our sales and marketing efforts and to bring people to our new ballpark. We don't doubt that we're going to do well with people in Worcester or Central Massachusetts coming to our games, but for us getting people from other parts of the Commonwealth, getting people from other parts of New England is really important to our business model. In addition to a 10,000 a person ballpark, we're going to be building about 1 million square feet of mixed-used development near our ballpark and maybe the most consistent refrain and question we get from development partners, from investors, from potential office tenants, from potential residents is about transportation and getting to and from Boston for people who live in Boston that are coming to jobs in Worcester or people who live in Worcester getting jobs in Boston.

It's really essential for us, and when I hear others talking about the importance of the frequency of service and hoping that we're adding to it and not diminishing it or restricting it we would echo those sentiments and I doubly echo them as a new member of the business community and new member of the Worcester Community. It is really, I think, essential to what we're doing and what we're trying to bring into this community and business and climate. We would echo those sentiments and appreciate the time and effort you all are making to have this dialogue and this conversation, but it is important for us to make sure those connections are strong and robust when we start playing baseball in 2021 and throughout our time here in Worcester hopefully to many years to come.

C: **Michael O'Dowd:** That's a great point and it certainly doesn't fall on deaf ears. As you may know the DOT and the Highway Division was very involved in some of the infrastructure improvements that we made in Kelly Square here to support the location of the new stadium. So yes, the idea is not only for the commuters that have to deal with the delays on I-90 on the commuter rail during construction but also for the fans that are going to want to get there,

including myself, because while I'm used to going to Pawtucket, it would be nice to come out to Worcester, especially coming from Boston.

C: Dan Ray: We'll look forward to seeing you there. And I'll say on the Kelly Square project, MassDOT has been tremendous. I think this is an example of sort of that communication. Thank you and thank you for listening.

C: Michael O'Dowd: Thank you, I appreciate your comments.

C: Representative Joe McKenna: Thank you, I want to follow up on the question from the gentlemen who's now left regarding the development of the underlying Harvard property. Certainly, this is going to be constructed to accommodate traffic exiting and entering I-90. I just wanted to make sure that you are developing this with that future development in mind. So, that when that land becomes developed with mixed-uses that we don't have somebody stopping with his uber over the Wholefoods that goes in and then winds up blocking an entire lane of traffic that is intended for offloading I-90 traffic.

A: Michael O'Dowd: That's a great point. I mentioned CTPS and the regional model they are doing for us earlier. That model lets us understand baseline conditions today, the volume of cars coming in, where they are coming from and where they are going. That model also helps us to ensure that when that development does start to take hold, the infrastructure that we build today will be able to support, not only the vehicles that are currently operating over today's roadways, but any future added commuters that are using highway and/or the commuter rail. We've been told to anticipate upwards of 7 million square feet for the entire area. So, there is a significant development planned. I don't know what the time frame for that future is, but I know if it occurs in the next 20 years, which is what we've designed for, the infrastructure will be able to support it.

Q: Representative Joe McKenna: Related to the time frame of the construction, and this is probably putting the cart before the horse, but speaking for myself and I believe most people here, we were pleasantly surprised by how quick and smooth the demolition of all of the toll plazas and the re-pavement of those roads were. That was facilitated by a round the clock schedule and I certainly understand that doing it that way comes with cost premiums. Is that something that is considered here? Is this a standard 2 shift construction? Or I guess it would be a 12 hours construction schedule? And if a 24-hour schedule is discussed do you have any idea as to what sort of impact that would have on the cost?

A: Michael O'Dowd: Right now, I don't, but what I can say is that for every project that DOT has put out and I have been personally engaged in over the last 10 years, which is a significant number of projects and a significant number of commuters both in cars and in rail, what I can say is we offer incentives. So, we'll look at what a baseline condition is for the project assuming that we are working at least 12 hours a day and then what we do is we further dig into it and evaluate it and say "if it's going to take us this long for over the course of each phase and each stage, how long is that going to take? Is it 8 years? Is it 10 years? What is it?" Once we know that, we model it out saying "O.K. now what about 16-hour shifts, or how about going the full 24-hours?" What is the impact? What is the benefit? We need to be cautious. Sometimes you, just because you're working 24 hours a day doesn't mean you're getting 24 hours of production. It's a matter of evaluating where are those hours best spent, doing what kind of work. So, we'll look at that and we'll evaluate it.

One of the things that we do for these types of projects is that we incentivize it. We will be offering contractors incentives to get it done faster. Now with that is the flip side. If they don't get it done faster and it takes longer then they anticipated, then we'll also penalize them. It's the incentive and disincentive clause. We put that into a significant number of our projects right now. It's certainly going to be in here, just due to the number of people that will be impacted, the number of commuters, business, recreational, daily living etc. There will be an incentive and disincentive clause in the hopes that a contractor will be able to find the fastest and expediate way to get it done.

Q: Patrick Ogan: Patrick Ogan, Worcester resident, multi-modal transit advocate for MassBike here tonight. I was one of the community advocates that MassDOT and VHB worked with on Kelley Square. That project is phenomenal, thank you guys for that. Couple of questions: a little bit more on the technical side about the road surfaces for the pedestrian and bicycle paths in terms of keeping up with maintenance on those. There's a lot of the bicycle paths that have been built in the last decade tend to be deteriorated and in worse condition than the roadways that were built next to them. What will the maintenance program for the bicycle infrastructure be and will it be put in at the same quality as the roads? Will there be any physical track improvements? In terms of new rail being put down in the old CSX yard, sort of future proofing the commuter rail to allow for faster trains.

A: Michael O'Dowd: That was a multi-part question, let's see if I can hit on all of it. A lot of the area that was occupied by the old CSX intermodal facility is going to be occupied by the new highway. That is why we will have the flexibility to be able to move the alignment of I-90 several 100 feet to the South and flatten out the curve in it today. There two tracks are currently out

there, tracks 2 and 1. But from that point northward there were about 16 different yard tracks as well as a couple of sidings that bypassed the yard altogether and serviced Grand Junction and the Boston Engine Terminal in Somerville for MBTA services. In terms of tracks, area that was once occupied by CSX will be partially occupied by MBTA revenue and layover tracks. We have condensed that space as much as we can.

I pointed it out earlier, Mark's pointed it out, we've said it over the last several years: it is a key component of this project to be able to provide layover. The layover serves our ability to be able to continue to service all of the various routes on the commuter rail network, North and South. So, it is a key component and it's not something we feel we cannot compromise because it will compromise our ability to offer a good service. I just want to make sure that's clear. As far as the cycle tracks and what is the composition of those will be, in all honesty that will likely be heavily influenced by DCR. They will be the owner, operator, and maintainer of some of the largest improvements and enhancements along the Dudley White Path. DCR is continuing to look at different options for what the pavement type will be, what the material type would be.

We'll be doing the same as we look at some of the multi-use paths that we have along South Cambridge Street or Cambridge Street itself we're providing all separated tracks for cyclists and pedestrians. This represents a great improvement from what currently is there, which is really on-road access and you're pretty much fighting for your own space. So, I think there is going to be a range of pavement types. Those are some of the things that we continue to coordinate with DCR and our own bicycle group here at MassDOT.

Q: **Nate Cabral-Curtis:** Perhaps this is something that Mark would want to touch on, but it sounded like to me, like some of your question was about thinking about those new rail alignments. How much effectively new steel will be going into that to provide, a faster, better less maintenance-heavy commuter rail system? Gentlemen, do you want to speak to that a little bit?

A: **Michael O'Dowd:** Everything is being replaced. We're not going to put any of that back, there's really no salvage value to any of the material out there right now.

Q: **Patrick Ogan**: What standards are the new tracks being built to?

A: **Mark Shamon**: Class 5. That's as good as it gets.

C: **Nate Cabral-Curtis:** And then the only other thing that I would say about the bicycle paths is right now I'm working on a project with DCR in the Cambridge side of the river and we spent

about 45 minutes today in a coordination meeting talking about how do we create a bicycle path that doesn't wind up with a bunch of tree roots in it turn into a washout. A MassDOT project that was recently completed next door to my house is the Casey Arborway. They spent months burying Silva cells to keep the tree roots down to prevent the bike paths from becoming nothing but lumps. I do know how that happens. If you've ever ridden on the Southwest Corridor Path, Charles River Path, those lumps are there and it's a top of mind issue for DCR.

C: Patrick Ogan: It's not built to the same standards as the roads.

A: Nate Cabral-Curtis: I believe they in fact are and I only happen to know this from the Arborway project, but they went out and use the same vibratory compaction standards that they used on the roads and while they are not signed this way, you could in theory drive the Arborway at 80 miles per hour, and they used the exact same equipment for the roads and the bicycle paths. I watched them do it. Okay; thank you sir.

Before we go to task force members, who have come to every meeting since we started in 2014, you can check out a full listing of task force members on our website so you can determine which one of them best suits your needs if you want to get further involved in the process. We have two task force members who made the trip out, Tom Nally from a Better City and Ari Ofsevit who represents Livable Streets only because I'm going this way, I'm going to do Tom first, then Ari, and then I'm going to give it to the former Secretary of Transportation, Fred Salvucci. We appreciate all of their attendance.

C: Tom Nally: Thank you Nate. I did miss one of the meetings I have to admit. I had another conflict with my other responsibilities in the town of Brookline. A Better City has some comments I wanted to make about what we are seeing on the screen and what we've talked about tonight. First of all, we're very pleased that the turnpike viaduct is being placed on the ground. We've advocated for this for a number of years, it's finally coming to pass and we're pleased to see that. We prefer the 3-L placement of the Soldiers' Field Road viaduct over the eastbound lanes of the Turnpike. We think it's the best location for a number of reasons: it steps the elevated portion back from the river, it makes it smaller, it provides buffers and opportunities to reduce impact. We think it's the best way to go.

We think that the construction staging we saw tonight needs more work. As been said already, there are a number of key elements that need to be examined even further than they have been already. We want to see 2 Worcester Mainline tracks maintained with the work above them scheduled for evenings, weekends, or times that the trains don't need to run, because they carry a lot of commuters into downtown and beyond. We'd like to see West station built sooner rather

than later. We want to see all Worcester Mainline tracks go through West Station, without express tracks, to further the Grand Junction connections to future connections to Cambridge and North Station. We believe that a higher design speed can be achieved by changes in the geometry and avoid the time penalty that has been discussed routing every train through West Station.

Some of those changes would also include potential improvements on the Worcester mainline West of West Station, so that any penalty involved in stopping at the Station, is minimized reduced or perhaps eliminated. We think that travel time penalty can be eliminated. I also want to say that a Better City has received a grant from the Barr Foundation to take a look at what type of improvements that can be made on the Worcester mainline during construction, which perhaps would mean more trains, perhaps other improvements on the line, so that we can mitigate the impact of reducing the number lanes on the Turnpike during that time. We think other measures would be necessary as well. Such as more parking. More opportunity for express bus service from those remote lots. Anything that'll reduce the impact of the constraints on people who want to get into downtown. We like the cross-corridor connection on Malvern Street that allows the buses to go between the South and the North through West Station and at West Station. We think that's very important.

Finally, for our friends in Allston, we would like to see the restoration of the buffer that was originally proposed by Harvard in their original flip concept that would contain some open space, contain a pedestrian and bicycle path, that would be continuous and uninterrupted by cross streets from the Western portion of this site, to the Eastern portion. We would like to see it crossing at Eastern end of the yard area at the Western End of the throat to connect to the edge of the river. We think those connections are critical and there is a great opportunity to do that especially with the location of Soldiers' Field Road where it's being placed in this option. So, with all of those things we think we can have a much better project. We can see that these are tweaks really to what we've already seen on the screen because we're very pleased with what we've gotten so far. But this is still a little way to go and we think it can be done. Thank you.

C: **Nate Cabral-Curtis:** Thank you Tom. Here you are, Ari.

C: **Ari Ofsevit:** Before I talk through the microphone, I want to thank everyone for coming out. We've been coming out to these meetings in Allston and I think it's great to come up to Metrowest, to Central Massachusetts, and to talk about why it's an important project not just for Allston, for Cambridge, for Boston, but really for the region. I think that Mike is almost underselling the benefits of this project. This project will have 7 million square feet. That's

probably going to be 10,000 jobs, give or take, maybe more, that will be accessible to the Western corridor. So, these are going to be jobs that will be accessible with good service to West Station with people commuting from Worcester, from the Western corridor. The potential for a connection to Kendalll Station, would mean if you want to utilize the facilities there you can. There are thousands of jobs there. Instead of taking a train all the way downtown and taking the Red Line all the way out, you would be able to get off at West Station, which would be about under an hour from Worcester proper, get on a shuttle train and be in Kendall in 5 or 10 minutes. That would be much better accessibility, you wouldn't have to sit in traffic or take that long commute into town. It's great to hear that West Station the ability to provide that service to Kendall would be built as part as this project, which sounds like there's a commitment to tonight.

We would like to see that go forward tomorrow, because that is what makes this project really multimodal. You can get off at West Station and whether you have a job at Longwood Medical, Harvard Square, or Kendall Square you have good bicycle, transit, or walking last mile connections to get there. I do have a couple of clarifying questions and comments. When you said 85% of trains currently bypass Boston Landing? I think that numbers off. I looked into the schedule 21 of 28 trains do stop there. So, it's only about 25%. The idea that we would like to see is that while some trains might bypass West Station, we would like to see the ability of any train to stop at west station, because if there are 50 thousand jobs accessible from West Station whether they are at Harvard in Cambridge, Harvard on this parcel, or in Kendall Square. The express tracks, to sort of echo what Tom said, I really don't understand what the major benefit is there. Right now, I took the train here today left Landsdown Station and it went through on the line of those tracks and it made up to about 55 miles per hour by the time it got to Cambridge Street.

So, having a 45 mile an hour restriction which Tom said we can probably push and go higher versus 55 is going to be the difference of a couple of seconds. Plus, the train had to slow down to get past Boston Landing to get under the Bridge there because there's a curve. So, to build those tracks for very, very little benefit and have some constraints getting out into the Yard is something that I don't understand and I always talk about this, a lot, and I just want to reiterate to folks in Worcester that when we talk about express tracks were talking about a couple of seconds here and there. Building a platform doesn't mean we have to stop trains there and the other piece that I really wanted to clarify, maybe you can clarify this. Right now, you have trains running back and forth empty all day. Is that the case? Where is that occurring?

A: Mark Shamon: I understand that it happens on the south side of the system. The trains run out to Readville and back. You wind up with storage happening on that line going south between the Southampton Street facility and Readville.

Q: Ari Ofsevit: So, trains are run back and forth empty? They don't go to Readville and park?

A: Mark Shamon: They run, not all of them, but some of them are in fact shuttling back and forth because there is not a spot for them, but the demand for service isn't there.

C: Ari Ofsevit: Right now, if you wanted to get on a train from Boston to Worcester at rush hour there's a train every 30 to 40 minutes. That's pretty good service; it could be better. If you want to get on the train to Boston during the middle of the day, you would likely drive in at 1:00 or come in during the peak which impacts rush hour because at 1:00 there isn't a train for two hours. Finish that appointment at 3:30 or 4:00 and you're driving home in rush hour. Now you're adding to that congestion because there's not good train service during the day. So, if we have trains running back and forth all day, and we're paying to run those trains, why don't we put them on the Worcester line? Run them out to Worcester and give Worcester a train every hour? And why don't we look at, as part of this project, what would be the upfront cost of building a layover versus the cost and benefit of running more service to Worcester, because Worcester deserves a train to Boston. It's the second largest city in the Commonwealth and it only has a train every two hours.

A: Mark Shamon: I can't speak to the policy part of it with respects to how much train service they are operating or not. The MBTA looks at what the demand is and then figures out the train service based on that. There isn't a great deal of added cost to get another full train going. The empty trains represent a high, ongoing cost, relative to the fixed cost of having a layover facility. Running the empty trains puts wear on the engines, it puts wear on the track. I haven't done the calculations, I don't want to lie to you, but I think if you do, the cost of operating those trains back and forth every hour versus parking them idle in the yard that has a fixed cost for short period of time. I don't think that there's a comparison over the years. I can't see it even being close.

Q: Ari Ofsevit: I guess what you're saying is that right now it is a better that the state spends money on parking trains than to provide the service to the Worcester line and the Worcester community?

A: Mark Shamon: That's not what I said at all. That's a policy decision. You brought up an economic cost. I was just responding to that.

C: Ari: That is what you said and right now there's a train to Lowell every hour, but there's not a train to Worcester every hour. I think we have the opportunity to look at this project and say: "Let's save money." And this is partially a policy issue, but I think it needs to be raised. Let's save money by not building as much layover. And let's run more frequent service to Worcester. And I think we need to talk about that.

C: Michael O'Dowd: So obviously this is something that you have that we all have expressed an interest in being able to provide better service and to imply that MassDOT, MBTA, or Keolis isn't doing everything that we possibly can to maximize service to areas served by commuter rail it be Worcester, whether it be the Old Colony line, whether it be Greenbush line, whatever line it maybe. We strive to optimize service to each of the communities that need it and that have demand. So, to say that we are arbitrarily dismissing the needs of Worcester by not providing service every hour on the hour through all times of the day is an unfair, incorrect statement to make. We maximize the headways that we possibly can. We maximize the number of trains that we can occupy the track on any given time. Respectfully, you're overstating the point and overstating what is actually occurring.

To the extent that we can, with this project, increase operations, increase movement, and increase the number of coaches that are servicing Worcester we certainly will. To say that will increase service and in so doing negate the need for a layover, is wrong. It's wrong Ari. So, we'll continue to have this discussion, I am sure, but a layover is a key component to this project. It provides the need that we have, not only in Worcester but for all of the other branches that we have throughout the network.

C: Ari Ofsevit: I don't like being told I'm wrong when I'm not. I'm going to hold the floor here right now. Okay? Because right now Worcester has a train every two hours. There are 9 trains that operate to Worcester in the evenings, there's about 3 during mid-day. If you operate a train to Worcester every 60 minutes instead of every 100 minutes, which you're telling me the state has no interest in doing because optimization for Worcester means poor mid-day service.

C: Michael O'Dowd: That's not what I said.

C: Ari Ofsevit: That's what you're implying.

A: Michael O'Dowd: What I am saying is that we have people that are responsible for ensuring all the on the network on a daily basis moving hundreds of thousands of people. To the extant that they can optimize and provide better service, to maximize that service to certain areas of the Commonwealth they will do that. Now if there is room for improvement in the system today or in

the future configuration when we have this built, that's great, but that's not going to be my decision to make. That'll be the people that operate the commuter rail services.

C: Ari Ofsevit: That's MassDOT. That is, you. If you are optimizing service, if someone wanted to get on the train in noon, they wouldn't have to wait two hours like they do today. That's what I'm saying an you wouldn't use as much layover which would make the project easier to build and provide more service to Worcester. Provide more service to Worcester during a time in which Worcester is going to be having issues with getting people through here. What I'm saying is that if you provide more mid-day service you will pull people out of rush hour because they are going to be able to take the train instead of driving. I know we've discussed this before; I just want to make sure that everyone in Worcester know that there could easily be a train leaving Worcester tomorrow every hour from Boston. They're running a train to Lowell every hour, but they don't want to run a train to Worcester every hour. We have plenty of trains to do that right now. If you want to go to Boston in the middle of the day, it's a two hour wait. So, if you want to continue to have 2-hour service into Boston, great. That's people that are going to be driving into the city, and get stuck in traffic during rush hour because there's not a train frequently enough.

C: Fred Salvucci: My name is Fred Salvucci and I live in Brighton. I advise Harvard on this project, I work at MIT, and I used to work for the State government. So, I have some experience with these larger projects. First of all, let me congratulate you on a really good presentation on a really complicated project. I, just for continuity, I just want to stick with the exchange with Ari. I agree with Ari and want to frame it, so you might be able to agree Mike. The problem with the frequency of service isn't a policy decision based on the needs of the traveling public. It is the outcome of an operating budget that is not adequate to provide the level of service to the people. Whether you're talking about someone in East Boston who's waiting for a bus that doesn't come or you're talking about someone in Worcester who's waiting for a train that doesn't come. That's a policy decision to underfund operating costs of the MBTA. There has been an attitude and willingness to spend capital dollars where there has not been a willingness to spend operating dollars. This project could be an opportunity to recognize that especially here in the decade of difficulty, construction, it is a legitimate use of capital funds to increase the amount of service to the people of Worcester and the people of Boston who might want to go to Worcester to watch a ball game.[3]

That's a decision that can be made. It's not your decision to make. It is the Secretary's decision to make and the Governor's decision to make to use capital funds because it is a legitimate part of a

[3] The speaker here is suggesting the use of capital dollars, intended for construction, to operate service, typically paid for through operating revenues and other sources.

capital project to reduce the impact that otherwise occurs to the traveling public. So, I think there is a way to make this project a big part of the solution. I would urge that you consider that. In terms of the technical challenge of making that case and understanding that case, I think it's important to look at the fact that any layup in Allston, in the short term, in the next decade, means bringing trains from Providence, Needham, and Old Colony out to Allston to park in the middle of the day. To the degree that facility is being proposed to accommodate non-Worcester trains, the number you gave in Framingham was about a 50 or 60 percent, all the non-Worcester trains are requiring the use of very scarce capacity during the decade. Because during the decade, you're hopefully going to be able to provide the two tracks, but the two tracks are going to be operating on slower speeds for the safety of the construction workers. I think it's urgent to maximize and optimize the use of that capacity to mitigate the impact of people of MetroWest and Worcester by running more service and that directly competes with possibility of having Providence trains come to the middle of the day to park. It makes no sense in my view to talk about layup in this area at least during the next decade. There are other places that trains for Providence could be using layups.

If layups continue to be the motive. There is an ongoing study of something called regional rail that would dramatically reduce the use of layup and it's going to be reaching some conclusion this year. So, it's well within your environmental timeline. I think it's important that the technical information be provided about what it would take and policy decision needs to be framed clearly that if you use capital funds to provide service I think that takes the shackles off the operating people, I'm not trying to blame the operating people at the commuter rail or at the MBTA. They've got a budget that is not adequate and that's why the service is inadequate. If that could be supplemented with capital funds, they could provide better service. The public would be happier. And I'm sure they would be happier to provide a better service. My second comment, again, this was an excellent presentation. By all of you. This project has gotten a lot better over the years. This is going to be a design build project. It's extremely important that, in my view, that all of the knowledge that's been built up be available to supervise the design builder.

The design builder is someone that none of us know. We don't know who it is. Like you said, they could be from Spain, let's hope they're great, but they won't have the background that you've build over the past 5 years. Someone has to supervise them. I think it's extremely important that you personally and your consultant team be retained to oversee that design/builder. Otherwise there is a big risk of a lack, a total loss of memory, of why these things were done. That happened to some degree on the Big Dig. There were a lot of things that were supposed to happen that fell between the cracks, to the detriment of the public, because that overlap was not

there with design build and design bill was not one of the modes used at the time. There's a great opportunity to do much, much better by retaining all the expertise that you have personally built up and your team has built up, to oversee that design/builder and ensure that they understand the nuances. I would disagree a bit with some of the emphasis on speed. If this is going to take 10 years to build it's going to take 10 years to build. Trying to rush it to 8 years, you might end up damaging the public a lot more and I think you alluded to this, that you may not get productivity out of 24 hour a day construction you have to look at the case. So, I think it's all deliberate speed.

You really want to be sure that the quality of the work and the end product is at least as important as the length of duration. A little bit longer and less miserable is much better than shorter and more miserable. I just wanted to make that point. On the finance, again, issues that you can't decide, but other people have to decide. This is an interstate highway. It has access to federal funds. There is another authorization coming at the Federal Level. The Senate marked something up, I think last week, it's not moving that fast, but eventually there will be new Federal money. This area, Worcester area in particular, has a very talented congressman. Springfield has a very talented congressman. So, this is a two-way street. So MassDOT would have better luck accessing Federal Funds and this should be entitled for interstate funds with the full support of the congressman, the Governor, and that needs to be clearly understood. You're not a magician you have to get the money.

We deserve Federal money, for most of this construction. It's an interstate facility. It was built before the availability of interstate highway funds. The people of Central Mass and MetroWest paid for this with their tolls. When everywhere else interstate highways were paid by the Federal Government at a 90% level. So, the original road was built without the help of the Federal Government. Rebuilding it now that it's falling apart deserves the Federal Government. I think that is a case I believe that can be successfully made but people have to understand that there is a real equity issue here for the people of Central Mass and MetroWest to get the Federal funds to fix this so that it doesn't fall on the toll payers, which would be really unfair because they've already paid more than everyone else in the Western corridor. Next issue I wanted to comment on, sorry for having a long list, but a really smart person within MassDOT who knows things really well has made the observation that the deficient structure in this area are exactly the same age as the deficient structures of the Turnpike crossing Route 128 that there is an opportunity. Since that interchange also has to be redone, there's an opportunity there to think in the intermodal, multi-modal way that you have here in Allston and put a multi-model facility there. Right now, MassPort has publicly committed to putting a Logan Express at the interchange of 128 and the Turnpike. There is a room there for a park and ride facility for

commuter buses and if a commuter rail station were added to that spot you could have a truly intermodal place that would greatly increase the availability of parking for people in MetroWest, because right now, there is a limit to the amount of parking even if we get much better train service then there already was. The parking is a constraint. There could be a big solution at 128 and I think it's important to people in MetroWest and Western Mass to understand that, that opportunity is there.

If someone wanted to go to the ball game, I hope at a more reasonable cost than Fenway, out here in Worcester, they could park at 128 in such an intermodal facility and take the train out to Worcester. So, this is a two-way railroad bringing people and commerce to Worcester and that really smart guy who told me "gee there's an opportunity out here at 128", I just hope that people in MassDOT really listen to that smart guy because it's a great opportunity. People in Western Mass and Central Mass and MetroWest have an opportunity to encourage the Secretary to think about coordinating that as part of the project. It's not part of the $1.2 billion price tag, but it is an unavoidable expense because those structures have got to be dealt with just like those structures in Allston. I appreciate you tolerating my making these points, but they're points that hadn't been made that are very germane to the people in the Worcester area and Metro West generally. And thanks again for representation.

C: Nate Curtis-Cabral: Thank you sir. I'll just note that I think as we get ready to close tonight's meeting that the project team did not pass the hat to have this guy tell us to stay working on the job through whenever the end of it is so I just want to make sure that is clear.

Is there anyone in the general audience that did not have a turn? Going once? Going twice? So then get home safe. Thank you so much everybody for staying 20 minutes over time.

Next Steps

This meeting represented the second and final in this round of meetings to introduce the communities west of Route 128 to the I-90 Allston Multimodal Project. The next effort to ensure involvement by these communities will be held on December 4th, 2019 when a meeting to introduce the NEPA Scoping Document will be held in Framingham.

Appendix 1: Meeting Attendees

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
George	Allegnezza	
George	Briones	MBTA/TF
Chris	Calnan	Tetra Tech
Meg	Coffin	Center for Living & Working
Jack	Connagan	
Brian	Craig	RND Consultants, Inc
Nate	Curtis	Howard Stein Hudson
Jay	Flynn	Transitmatters
Patrick	Goguen	MassBike
Alex	Guardiola	Worcester Regional Chamber of Commerce
Ken	Hartung	AbbVie
Doug	Johnson	Howard Stein Hudson
Rep. Hannah	Kane	
Jim	Keller	Tetra Tech
Jim	Kersten	MassDOT
Tom	Kies	
Nick	Kotsopoulos	Telegram and Gazette
Sara	Kreisel	Tetra Tech
First	Last	Organization
Philip	Leavitt	N/A
Jen	Lombardi	
Paul	Matthew	945/ Plumbing MetroWest
Joe	McKenna	State Representative Worcester 18th
Greg	Michel	
Diana	Michel	
Fred	Moseby	
Seth	Nadeau	McGovern
Thomas	Nally	A Better City

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Tracy	Norick	
Mike	O'Dowd	MassDOT
Ian	Ollis	
Dan	Rea	Worcester Red Sox
Trina	Robinson	
Michael	Santos	
Fred	Selvucci	
Mark	Shamon	VHB
Ann	Sullivan	MassDOT
Steven	Tyler	HSH
John	Waugh	
Steve	Winn	
Tim	Young	HDR