MEMORANDUM

To:	Mike O'Dowd Project Manager	Date:	December 21, 2020
From:	Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis Howard Stein Hudson	HSH Project No.:	2013061.14
Subject:	Massachusetts Department of Transportation Allston Multimodal Project Public Information Meeting Meeting Notes of 10/20/2020		

Overview

On October 20th, 2020, members of the Allston Multimodal Project team and associated MassDOT staff held a public information meeting to introduce the three options being analyzed for the Throat Area of the project. These options include the Soldiers' Field Road Hybrid, a new, Modified At-Grade option, and a new, Modified Highway Viaduct option. Under the Hybrid, I-90 and the Worcester Mainline are either at or somewhat below grade in the throat. Soldiers Field Road would be placed on a new viaduct over the eastbound lanes of I-90. The Grand Junction Line would cross over I-90 and Soldiers Field Road on a new bridge. The latest Modified At-Grade agreed upon by MassDOT and its chief proponent, A Better City (ABC) an I-90 Allston Task Force member places the Paul Dudley White Path on its own boardwalk in the Charles River in the throat, places I-90 at or somewhat below grade depending on location, and rebuilds the Grand Junction Line bridge similarly to in the Hybrid. In this option, fill is placed in the Charles River to create a soft shoreline as opposed to the seawall that had been present in earlier iterations of this concept. The Highway Viaduct keeps all transportation assets where they are today more or less but slides a portion of Soldiers Field Road under the viaduct's westbound lanes to create more accessible parkland along the river. All three of these options will be discussed in the project's next two major environmental filings, a Notice of Project Change (NPC) at the state level and a federal Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) both slated for submittal for public and agency comment in 2021.

The meeting occurred against a backdrop of a shift in public sentiment regarding how to replace the aging I-90 Allston Viaduct and reconstruct the throat area of the project. Coming out of 2018 and through much of 2019, the Hybrid had been a clear public and Task Force favorite with renderings

drawing applause at several meetings. However, over the course of 2020 community sentiment has turned against the Hybrid, not for its proposed finished condition, but for the temporary trestle that would be placed in the Charles River for roughly 8-10 years, to gain adequate construction room in the throat and impacts to the Worcester Mainline and Grand Junction Line. Since learning of these construction impacts, public support has shifted to the At-Grade concept, but permitting challenges associated with placing fill in the Charles River when options that do not require this permanent impact remain what they have been at both the state and federal levels.

In light of these facts, MassDOT entered into a voluntary comment period in October 2020 wherein members of the public were provided with information in the form of this public meeting and materials made available via the project website laying out the benefits and challenges of each throat option that will be discussed in the upcoming NPC and invited to offer their comments on each. Selection of a preferred alternative will be delayed until submittal of the DEIS. Comments made during the comment period and at the meeting described herein echoed sentiments with which MassDOT and its project team have become familiar over the past year. These include that the Hybrid remains attractive in the finished condition, but that its construction impacts, particularly the trestle in the river are more than the community wants to bear, the idea that the Charles River should not be permanently impacted, and that many commenting would prefer to see lanes dropped from I-90 or Soldiers Field Road to avoid placing the Paul Dudley White path on a permanent boardwalk, and that while placing I-90 on a viaduct avoids river impacts, such a structure seems a monument to the age of the automobile and carbon heavy transportation just as the Commonwealth is trying to cut down on single occupancy vehicle use. Construction period impacts are also top-of-mind for members of the public: anything that cuts down the reliability and speed of the Worcester Mainline should be avoided completely or minimized to the greatest extent possible and proactive plans to keep commuters moving through the site should be developed at the earliest date practical.

Agenda

I. **Welcome & Opening Remarks** 3
II. **Presentation** 4
III. **Discussion** 21

Detailed Meeting Minutes[1]

Welcome & Opening Remarks

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis, *Howard Stein Hudson*: Welcome to this meeting of the Allston I-90 project. My name is Nathaniel Curtis and I work for Howard Stein Hudson who is under contract to provide public outreach services to MassDOT on this project. We want to thank you all for joining us tonight. I'm going to kick this meeting off with a couple of basic ground rules. This meeting is occurring on Zoom tonight, which is a platform that most folks are familiar with, and we hope that folks will be able to know what to do. Once we get to the Q & A period, at the end of the presentation, we ask that folks either use the Questions feature, which will be monitored by a member of Howard Stein Hudson staff, or that you raise your hand so that everybody can hear what you have to say, as if this was a physical meeting. The system we are using will automatically record this presentation. We will use that recording in the furtherance of getting an accurate transcript. Our goal is not to make anybody internet famous. If you feel uncomfortable being recorded, you don't have to raise your hand or speak.

Tonight, we're going to go through a presentation that talks about the three options we're analyzing for the area known as the throat. We'll get into what that is very shortly. I wanted to let everyone know that this is going to be a lot like some of the scoping meetings that were held for the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) last fall/ early winter in that we're not looking to go into great detail with Q & A tonight. We are in the midst of a comment period which lasts through the 30th -- not this coming Friday, but the following Friday – and we'll be talking to you about how you can provide comments. So, questions tonight should focus on getting clarity around what's been said in tonight's presentation and/ or how you can share your comments. That said, I'm going to turn it over to Donny Dailey from MassDOT Government Affairs. Donny, if you have any remarks that you'd like to make, go right ahead.

C: Donny Dailey, *MassDOT*: Thank you. My name is Donny Dailey. I'm a government affairs public affairs liaison for the MassDOT Highway Division. I'd like to welcome State Representative Hannah Kane from Shrewsbury.

Q: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Do you see any more elected folks, Donny?

A: Donny Dailey: Not yet. I'll keep looking and send you a text if I see someone.

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

Q: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Owen Kane from MassDOT, do you have any opening remarks?

A: Owen Kane, *MassDOT*: Thank you, Nate. I'm Owen Kane and I'm the Deputy General Counsel for MassDOT and the MBTA. I just want to first thank you all for participating tonight. We really do want feedback from you on the Allston Multimodal Project. I want to remind everyone that the purpose of tonight's meeting is to present the status of the project. You will hear a presentation from the team that will provide you with the information that's in the matrix that we have submitted to Federal Highway as part of the process. There will be no response to the public feedback from the team tonight. If you have questions for the purposes of clarification, we can certainly address those, but there will not be an interactive dialogue this evening. We are looking for feedback from you, the public, and as Nate said we're looking for feedback through October 30th. As you can see on the screen right now there is an email address that you could send your comments to. Thank you.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Thank you. What Owen stated is in bullets on the slide that's up on the screen right now. I'm going to move us right ahead into the presentation. I will be turning my camera off and we'll hear from the folks with the engineering consulting team. Thank you, folks. We'll get through this presentation and then we'll take your questions.

Presentation

C: Sandy Hoover, *Tetra Tech*: Good evening everyone. My name is Sandy Hoover and I am a project scientist with Tetra Tech. This is tonight's agenda. I'm going to kick off today's presentation with a short discussion of the current status of the I-90 Multimodal Project and where we are in the NEPA process.

Currently, the project is still in a scoping process under NEPA. The purpose of scoping is to collaborate with the public to determine the scope of analysis and range of alternatives to be analyzed in the NEPA environmental impact statement. A scoping report for the project was published in November of last year and describes the proposed Purpose and Need, alternatives currently under consideration, environmental analyses, and proposed public coordination for the project. Public comments were received on the scoping report until December 12th of last year. Following the scoping report, a scoping summary report was published, which responded to public comments received on the scoping report and identified what alternatives will be carried forward to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for further analysis. Additional stakeholder engagement since publication of the summary report has led to further refinement of one of those alternatives: The Modified At-Grade Throat option within the 3L realignment alternative, which we'll discuss in more detail later in this presentation.

The NEPA DEIS will include a full analysis of all reasonable alternatives identified during scoping, as well as detail a draft set of proposed mitigation measures to address the project's environmental and traffic impacts. MassDOT and Federal Highway are pursuing the identification of a recommended preferred alternative and preparation for One Federal Decision concurrence point three. And again, we'll get into more detail regarding choosing a preferred alternative later in the presentation.

These are the next steps in both the federal and state environmental review processes. We just want to give you guys a sense of what documents you'll see next and generally what you can expect to find in those documents. The next MEPA or state environmental review document you will see is the notice of project change (NPC). The NPC will update the project's Purpose and Need to align with the NEPA Purpose and Need, update the design of alternatives currently under consideration, as we have a lot of catching up to do with what's been described in the most recent NEPA documentation, and it will select a preferred alternative in the state environmental review process.[2] The public will have an opportunity to provide comments on the NPC and the NPC will result in an updated Secretary certificate to support preparation of a final environmental impact report.

Following the NPC, we expect to publish the NEPA draft DEIS. I touched on this on the last slide, but the DEIS will provide an evaluation of the reasonable alternatives identified during scoping and will also detail draft mitigation measures. Following the NEPA draft DEIS, the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) final environmental impact report (FEIR) will be published, followed by the NEPA final environmental impact statement (FEIS) combined with a record of decision (ROD) document. And all this is working toward and in preparation for obtaining the appropriate state and federal permits for the alternative that will ultimately be selected.

Next up, we'll provide an overview of the updates of the Modified At-Grade alternative.

C: Jim Keller, *Tetra Tech*: Good evening everyone. I will be giving a brief overview of the refinements to the Modified At-Grade that have been made since the submission of the scoping summary report in August. For those who haven't seen it, it's available on the MassDOT website. It thoroughly explains the three Throat Area alternatives that were studied at that time.

The Modified At-Grade has been refined some since that submission based on additional stakeholder engagement between MassDOT, City of Boston officials, and primarily the stakeholder and Task Force member, A Better City. Everything else within the Throat Area for this alternative has

[2] As noted in the executive summary, selection of a preferred alternative has been delayed to the filing of the DEIS.

remained unchanged, the Grand Junction rail location, commuter rail, I-90 eastbound and westbound at grade/ below grade, as well as the location of Soldier Field Road (SFR). Alignments have stayed fairly steady, with the exception of a wider part of the Paul Dudley White path to the north, that white hatched area along the river, which is now on a boardwalk, as well as a living shoreline as a result of placing the Paul Dudley White path on a boardwalk.

Here's a cross section. The overall cross section for I-90 was decreased by approximately four feet. As a result of narrowing the shoulders, the left shoulders for I-90 eastbound and I-90 westbound from four feet to two feet, as well as a slight reduction elsewhere within the cross section for a total reduction of approximately five and a half feet.[3] This allows for less incursion into the river that was shown for Soldiers Field Road in the Scoping Summary Report. Here you see the entire cross section with the commuter rail, Grand Junction, interstate 90, eight lanes, four lanes of Soldiers Field Road, as well as a proposed living shoreline, as well as the Paul Dudley White path on a boardwalk.

Here we have a blow up of the outbound lanes of Soldiers Field Road and an approximate proposed living shoreline concept that MassDOT is currently analyzing for the draft environmental impact statement as well as other environmental documents. Here is the Paul Dudley White path, 20 feet wide on a boardwalk over the Charles River. What this does is create a more significant intrusion into the river, but MassDOT believes that the benefits of the variant in terms of bicycle and pedestrian accommodations delivered by the rethinking of the Paul Dudley White path and the aesthetic and potential environmental benefits of the restored bank, both of which have received significant stakeholder support, make it a more desirable version of the At-Grade. So, this version of the Modified At-Grade will be what MassDOT studies in further environmental documentation. Both the benefits of the Modified At-Grade and the impacts including impacts to the Charles will be considered when the Throat option is compared to the other two Throat options for purposes of selecting a preferred alternative.

Next, Mark Fobert will discuss the remaining slides.

C: Mark Fobert, *Tetra Tech*: I'm going to briefly review the federal wetlands state waterways permanent environmental impacts. Both the federal waters of the United States and the state flowed tidelands show the same limit of jurisdiction, which is elevation two and shaded in blue on the section view. The Paul Dudley White path which would occupy approximately 29,000 square feet of the Charles River. The path would be supported on approximately 250 piles, which would result in a

[3] The three options that will be considered in the DEIS and NPC are not "apples to apples" in this regard. The Hybrid and Highway Viaduct options do not require reduced shoulders.

direct impact of 500 square feet. The fill associated with the bank restoration is approximately 20,000 square feet. And finally, the fill for SFR is approximately 600 square feet.

Here are the state wetlands jurisdiction. State wetland jurisdiction, starting at the river and moving landward includes land under water, shown in dark blue, which is one sheet below elevation zero. Inland bank, which is the riverbank between elevation zero and two and shown in light blue. Bordering that is subject to flooding which is the flood storage located between elevation two and elevation four, elevation four being the 100-year flood. Alterations to the river from fill are shown in the various crosshatch colors on the graphic. Alterations to land underwater include 28,000 square feet of shading from the pile-supported Paul Dudley White boardwalk. 250 piles would support the walkway and result in a direct alteration of 500 square feet. 1300 square feet of land underwater would be altered by the bank restoration. Borderland subject to flooding and the Paul Dudley White path would occupy 620 cubic feet of flood storage, SFR 1,000 cubic feet of flood storage, and the bank restoration 3,100 cubic feet of flood storage.

All the Throat options allow for the riverbank restoration enhancement at the end of the project. The Modified Highway Viaduct and the Soldiers Field Road Hybrid allow for bank restoration enhancement, with no additional fill in the river. The Modified At-Grade allows for bank restoration if the required fill in the river is deemed permittable by the regulatory agency. Here we have a rendering of some of the possible planting schemes that could happen out there.

C: Jim Keller: Here is the 3L realignment alternative. This alternative is a result of several years and iterations of the interchange design which realigns I-90 to a straighter alignment with the removal of the Beacon Park Freight Yard. It also accommodates a three platform, four track West Station. It includes a busway above the platforms with a Malvern Street connection for buses, pedestrians, and transit only. West Station is situated in what we call the Modified Flip with a single Worcester Mainline express track and the commuter rail layover facility between the station and the Boston University property line. Separated bicycle and pedestrian facilities are present throughout the street grid that connects from I-90 ramps. The Franklin Street footbridge which is at the far left of this diagram will also be replaced to bring it up to modern accessibility standards.

The 3L realignment is a result of several years of study with a taskforce, various stakeholders, as well as the City of Boston. There was a significant planning study that had support for this alternative and some of the changes that were made to the 3L realignment alternative. For the purposes of tonight, we're focused on the Throat Area for the purposes of selecting a preferred alternative. In the Throat, any changes that could happen as a result of refinements within the

interchange will be allowed as we move forward as we go to the draft environmental impact statement. But again, tonight we're mainly focused on the Throat Area.

Here we have the Modified Highway Viaduct that was presented in the Scoping Summary Report which has remained largely unchanged. It keeps all the infrastructure currently where it is today within the Throat with the exception that today's viaduct is supported by four columns, the proposed version would be supported by three. That allows SFR to shift further to the south which opens up room further to the left for a separated bicycle and pedestrian facility within a substantial portion of the Throat Area. It also allows for a second Grand Junction track for a future connection over the Charles. It also maintains, generally, the alignments of the commuter rail and Grand Junction that exists today. It also allows for area under the viaduct for stormwater treatment from the viaduct itself.

Here we have the Soldier Field Road Hybrid plan view. Again, it was described in the Scoping Summary Report from August which is available on the MassDOT website. It has remained unchanged since then. These are the highlights to the right. I won't touch on every one of them. They are thoroughly described and have been described through previous environmental documentation.

Here we can see the cross section of the narrowest location for the Soldiers Field Road Hybrid. It shows the commuter rail all the way to the right, two commuter rail lines, the Worcester Main Line as well as the two Grand Junction lines that vary in elevation to allow for interconnecting between the tracks and to allow for the Grand Junction rail to pass up and over I-90. As you head east to the rail bridge over the Charles River, you can also see Soldiers Field Road here on a viaduct over I-90 eastbound. The dashed line is the approximate existing grade, and it shows that this variation has the greatest amount of cut resulting in a portion of I-90 being depressed into the water table requiring a boat section. As a result of placing Soldiers Field Road over I-90 eastbound, it opens up area all the way to the left along the Charles River for the greatest extent of separated bicycle and pedestrian facilities without impacts to the river.

Here we have the No Build alternative. This was described in the Scoping Summary Report as a major preservation of the existing viaduct including replacement of the bridge deck, deck joints, bridge railings and repair of the substructure. This is an option, and it will be described in a few slides in the next section. I will describe how this will be an option if a preferred alternative is not chosen. This option also would include rehabilitation of the Cambridge Street Bridge over an I-90, a formerly standalone project that has been placed on hold since it has been rolled into our larger job. The No Build alternate would also include a major preservation of the Franklin Street pedestrian bridge.

C: **Mark Fobert:** Next, we'll discuss choosing a preferred alternative. MassDOT has not identified a recommended preferred alternative but need to do so soon to support a reasonable permitting timeline. Cooperating agencies are in the process of reviewing available material to determine if they have sufficient information to undertake federal action and approvals on a recommended preferred alternative. The recommended preferred alternative needs to be determined to aid the NEPA process and interagency coordination supporting One Federal Decision. It's important to note that all the alternatives will be fully analyzed in the DEIS and the designation of a preferred alternative could be modified through the NEPA process. The public will have additional opportunities to comment on the preferred alternative upon publication of the MEPA notice of project change and the NEPA draft environmental impact statement.

One of the major reasons why it's important to select a preferred alternative now is the condition of the existing viaduct and the time it will take to replace it. The Allston viaduct is a critical piece of regional infrastructure as well as a major evacuation route for the City. The cost to maintain the viaduct is now more than $1 million dollars a year. Regardless of the alternative selected, there are at least two years of permitting and procurement along with six to eight years of construction required before the viaduct can be replaced. Because of this, the time has come to either select a preferred alternative or fix the current viaduct.

C: **Donny Dailey:** Mark, if I may, I just want to mention to everybody that State Representative Carolyn Dykema has joined us from Hopkinton, along with Representative Kane. Thank you.

C: **Mark Fobert:** Thanks Donny. Here are some photos from the recent 2020 inspection of the viaduct. As you can see, these photos show the advanced deterioration of the concrete, steel, and structural members along with deterioration of the decking. Another major reason for selecting a preferred alternative now is to meet the state environmental review timelines which require filing of the permits prior to the publication of the NEPA DEIS. A preferred alternative is required to inform the project's financial plan. The selection of the preferred alternative will also inform whether the MBTA needs to accelerate planning and construction of a southside maintenance facility. And finally, the selection will allow the development of detailed environmental and traffic mitigation plans.

Here are the criteria for evaluating the alternatives. How well does the alternative meet the project's Purpose and Need which was included in both the NEPA Scoping and Scoping Summary Report? Under environmental criteria, does the alternative result in excessive permanent environmental impacts or permanent or temporary intrusion into the Charles River? Under Construction logistics, can the alternative be constructed and what are the impacts and duration of that construction? For Highway Traffic Safety operations and maintenance, will it improve safety, will travel times be

affected, will the level of service be worse, will there be long vehicle queues, and will maintenance operations be improved?

For rail operations, is local and regional multimodal access to a future West Station supported, does the alternative support the rail operational needs of the MBTA, does the alternative require the construction of a Southside maintenance facility in advance of mobilization? Under cost and schedule, does the alternative require an unreasonably high cost or complicated schedule, and have environmental performance commitments been considered.

I'm not going to go through the summary analysis matrix. Here is the summary analysis matrix. It has been posted on the project website. Hopefully, you've all had a chance to download and review it. It is currently under review by the cooperating agencies. The three alternatives, along with the No Build, are included in the matrix. Subjects included in the matrix were developed in cooperation with Federal Highway and are based on the established NEPA evaluation criteria. The purpose of this section is to guide you through the matrix of the Throat Area options with a focus on those categories that have been identified as differentiators.

Eight major categories are included in the matrix. They are environmental, land use, and economic development; construction; cost; public input; mobility and access; safety; and operations and maintenance. We'll start with permitting. Consistent with state and federal regulations to protect wetland resources, MassDOT's intention is to avoid and minimize impacts to the Charles River wherever practical. The Federal Clean Water Act, the State Wetlands Protection Act, Massachusetts Public Waterfront Act all include provisions for the avoidance and minimization of wetlands and waterways impacts. Similar considerations exist for parks and historic properties under Section 4F which requires selecting an alternative that causes the least amount of harm. SFR Hybrid and Modified At-Grade result in more impacts to wetlands and waterways resources and therefore have a greater potential to delay an implementation of the schedule of the project in order to obtain needed permits.

Here's a summary of the permanent impacts to the Charles River. I went over the permanent impacts of the Modified At-Grade earlier in the show. For all the alternatives, their impacts are approximately 1,000 square feet associated with the construction of outfalls. For the Modified Highway Viaduct and the SFR Hybrid, these outfall impacts are the only permanent impacts to the river.

The Modified At-Grade is expected to be less resilient with I-90 being depressed below the water table and narrower shoulders on I-90. The Modified Highway Viaduct is expected to be the most resilient. The SFR Hybrid is expected to be the least resilient with major portions of I-90 below

grade. With regard to future rainfall intensity, alternatives with more shoulder width will be better able to accommodate future storms.

C: Stacey Donahoe, *MassDOT*: Hello, my name is Stacy Donahoe and I'm the Senior Historic Resources Specialist at MassDOT. Under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, Federal Highway as the lead federal agency, is required to take into account the effects of the project on properties that are listed in or are eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

A portion of the Throat Area is within the National Register listed Charles River Basin Historic District. The Section 106 process is still in early stages, and Federal Highway will be seeking the concurrence of the State Historic Preservation Office on the list of historic properties within the project area. Within the Throat Area, MassDOT has preliminarily identified the Charles River Soldiers Field Road Parkland and the Boston University and Grand Junction rail bridges as historic properties to be considered. While it won't be until the next phase of the Section 106 process that impacts to historic properties will be evaluated, the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), in response to the scoping report that was published last year, wrote a letter that noted the potential construction of a bypass road in the river and stressed the importance of carefully considering alternatives that would avoid adverse effects to historic properties, including the National Register listed Charles River. Section 4F is another federal law that requires the consideration of historic properties as well as park and recreation lands and other resources. In this project, the historic property in the park and recreation lands are one and the same. So, for ease of understanding, my discussion will focus on historic properties. And in a few minutes, you'll hear Nick Cohen discuss parkland.

For those of you familiar with Section 4F it is too early in the process to get into 4F specifics like uses and levels of evaluation, especially given the early stage that we are at in the Section 106 process. Accordingly, our discussion is a high-level comparison of the alternatives, given the existing information rather than the regular reviews that will come later.

So, we have this first cross section showing the Modified At-Grade. The Charles River Basin Historic District is indicated by the green line you see at the bottom of the image, and blue line indicates the area of the interstate that would be shifted into the historic district at this particular point. In the Modified At-Grade alternative, the highway viaduct structure would be removed, and I-90 would be brought down to grade and would occupy a portion of the existing Soldiers Field Road in the existing green space that lies between Soldiers Field Road and the existing rail. The total area of the interstate that would be shifted into the historic district is approximately 57,000 square feet. Soldiers Field Roads would be shifted towards the river, and the new riverbank would be constructed

on fill. The Paul Dudley White path would shift onto a pile-supported structure in the river, and the Grand Junction bridge over Soldier's Field Roads would be replaced.

This cross section shows the proposed Modified Highway Viaduct alternative. This would largely maintain the existing conditions but with a few exceptions. In this alternative, the new interstate viaduct would be slightly wider than the existing, so a few of its peers would occupy approximately 500 square feet within the historic district. In addition, approximately 4,900 square feet of the viaduct would overhang the historic district.

The alignment of the Grand Junction rail would shift so that it occupies approximately 3,000 square feet within the historic district. Soldiers Field Road would shift away from the river onto that existing green space between Soldiers Field Road and the railroad. That would allow for more green space to be created adjacent to the Paul Dudley White path. Permanent or temporary structures are not proposed in the Charles River and the Grand Junction bridge would not be replaced.

In the Soldiers Field Road Hybrid, SFR would shift onto a viaduct outside the bounds of the historic district, and I-90 would be relocated slightly below grade, with the interstate occupying approximately 66,200 square feet of this historic district. The Paul Dudley White Path would remain at the river's edge, and a new wall or fence would be constructed to separate it from the interstate. During construction, Soldiers Field Road would be positioned on a trestle in the river, and the Grand Junction Bridge over Soldiers Field Road would be replaced.

This is just a summary of what I've discussed. Historic resources are listed on the left, and the right column summarizes the different alternatives. The bottom row summarizes the degree which it encroaches into the bounds of the historic district.

C: Jason Ross, *VHB*: Hello everyone, I am Jason Ross from VHB. I'm going to give an overview of a preliminary noise analyses that we've done in the Throat Area. Overall, there are relatively small differences in sound levels among the alternatives. We're talking about two, three, maybe four decibels. A three-decibel change is just at the threshold of perceptible change to a human.

One thing to keep in mind is that all of these alternatives have introduced elements to the project that improve noise conditions relative to existing conditions. For example, where the Soldiers Field Road underpass is proposed,[4] noise will be substantially reduced along the Paul Dudley White path.

[4] This underpass is outside the throat area, closer to the Double Tree hotel and approximately opposite Micro Center in Cambridge.

The roadway will be in a depressed area and it will be separated quite a way from the Paul Dudley White path. This is effective in reducing noise levels ten decibels or even more in some cases.

Another thing that has been done to help improve the noise conditions for all the alternatives has been to increase the distance between the Paul Dudley White path and roadway. Right now, it's very adjacent to Soldiers Field Road, and all of the alternatives have, in some way, been able to create some separations. With that separation comes lowered noise levels.

In Cambridgeport, which is relatively far from the Throat Area, we see differences of about two, three, four decibels among the alternatives. For Cambridgeport there are a lot of traffic noise from other sources that are common to all the alternatives -- Memorial Drive, Brookline Street – that causes differentiation. Noise levels are slightly lower for the Soldiers Field Road and the Modified At-Grade options, and this is because I-90 is not elevated and there's less efficient sound propagation. However, it's important to keep in mind that for all the alternatives, the noise levels in Cambridgeport are in the mid-50's to low-60's decibels, and they're substantially below the noise abatement criteria which is 67 decibels.

At Magazine Beach, which is right across the river from the Throat Area, we're looking at differences of about two or three decibels among the alternatives. In this area, noise levels from the Modified At-Grade alternative would actually be the highest, and that's because it's closest to the river and causing a little bit higher sound level.

Along the Paul Dudley White path in the Throat Area, we're seeing very similar noise levels among all three alternatives. This is due to a balance of the distance between the Paul Dudley White path and the roadway sources, as well as changes in the shielding, things such as a jersey barrier, things that could help reduce the noise by blocking the line of sight, those as well as separation between the Paul Dudley White path and the roadway cause similar noise levels among the alternatives.

Finally, in the Boston University area, the commuter rail tracks are the closest to the BU property, and because there's relatively limited differences in the train operations and track locations among the alternatives relative to noise. We're seeing relatively similar noise conditions for all three alternatives at Boston University.

C: Nick Cohen, *VHB*: Good evening everyone, my name is Nick Cohen from VHB. I'm another consultant on the team. Next, we're going to talk about park land which is a subsection of the land use category on the matrix. As a reminder, park land in this case is also in the historic district. Park land includes accessible and inaccessible green space, Soldiers Field Road and the Charles River

itself, and that's because all of those are under the care, custody, and control of the Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR).

Echoing a bit of what Stacy just said, Section 106 and Section 4F processes have not advanced far enough for us to talk about specific terms like Section 106 adverse effects, or specific 4F uses, or level of evaluation. This is a high-level comparison, at this time, across the Throat Area options with regard to park land. Those regulatory reviews come at a later stage.

The park land comparison we're making here is in terms of accessible park land. The At-Grade option results in 7.3 acres of publicly accessible park land which is a net increase of 3.9 acres. The Hybrid Viaduct option results in 7.1 acres of publicly accessible park land with an increase of 4.5 acres. Lastly, the SFR Hybrid option results in 8.7 acres with a net increase of 6.1 acres.

One important nuance to understand here with the At-Grade is that 1.1 acres of that park land is really just a trade off from the Charles River parkland that I just mentioned to what would be the Paul Dudley White path on a board walk. So, it's not 1.1 acres of new park land, it's just 1.1 acres of park land transferred from the river park land use to the Paul Dudley White bicycle and pedestrian path use.

The next row is impacts of I-90 and the Grand Junction railroad. These numbers, you'll notice are the same as the numbers Stacy just mentioned. That's because the park land is in the historic district. I won't repeat the numbers, I'll just go over where they come from. These are places where the interstate occupies park land area or is an incursion to the park land area. For the At-Grade and SFR Hybrid, those numbers result from I-90 at-grade or below grade actually occupying park land space. In the case of the Highway Viaduct, it's from the viaduct or the piers overhanging the park land. In addition, the Highway Viaduct has an additional 3000 square feet of park land impacts from the realignment of the Grand Junction railroad. Lastly, the Paul Dudley White path is widened in all of the options, with SFR Hybrid there's a separated bicycle and pedestrian path the whole way. In the case of the At-Grade, it would be separate most of the way through the throat, though the boardwalk would be shared. For the Highway Viaduct, the bicycle and pedestrian path is separated for the majority but not the entire length of the Throat Area as Jim showed in that cross section a moment ago. With that, we can move onto the next topic area

C: Mark Fobert: Now we'll discuss anticipated permits. For a detailed list of environmental approvals, please see the matrix. It's quite a complex list from several agencies, so I won't go through them all. The anticipated permits are on page six of the matrix. The ability to permit, the level of complexity, and the type of permits required for each alternative has not been established by environmental agencies yet. The SFR Hybrid and the Modified At-Grade result in significantly more impacts to

wetlands and waterways resources and have a greater potential to delay the implementation of the project. I will now turn it over to Jim to discuss construction staging.

C: Jim Keller: Thank you, Mark. We'll briefly discuss the construction category of the summary matrix. Just please note that this is very early on in the design of the alternative, staging is at a very conceptual level. Looking at staging for the Modified At-Grade, there are approximately 13 stages. As time progresses, the number of stages can move up or down. Generally, we look at an alignment shift as a stage when numbering them, and there are more alignment shifts required for the Modified At-Grade and the SFR Hybrid as a result of placing all the elevated infrastructure for I-90 down to at-grade or below grade. Also, for Grand Junction and the commuter rail profile changes to place the commuter rail over I-90 on a viaduct and over Soldiers Field Road on a viaduct to connect to the Grand Junction bridge, over the Charles River, as well as other elements that shift horizontally and vertically. With that said, there is some challenging geometry to maintain I-90 and Soldiers Field Road travel lanes throughout construction as well as the commuter rail. We'll get into the impacts on the rail as we move on into the matrix.

As a result of needing to lower the I-90 profile out from under the Commonwealth Avenue bridge to accommodate the Grand Junction rail viaduct over I-90, there are some utilities that are impacted. The Boston Water and Sewer Commission has a 16-inch drain line that runs perpendicular to the Throat Area, north-south, as well as the Massachusetts Water Resource Authority has a 58' x 63' sewer line runs parallel to the Throat Area. It will partially be impacted by the Modified At-Grade; the extent is not yet fully known. The MassDOT pump station that exists below the viaduct that collects stormwater from I-90 would need to be relocated because it's within the alignment of the new I-90 that will be at-grade in that area. There will be relocation of some fiberoptic lines between all three alternatives, some private fiberoptics lines as well as some Boston University utilities that would be impacted as a result of using seven feet of width for the cross section to get as much cross section as possible for the At-Grade and Soldiers Field Road Hybrid.

For the Modified Highway Viaduct, because all the highway and rail elements and Soldiers Field Road and the Paul Dudley White path stay in similar locations horizontally and vertically as they are today, there are fewer alignment shifts and therefore fewer stages. Again, as staging design progresses, that could change. Fewer alignment shifts are generally more favorable so that drivers don't need to familiarize themselves with a new driving route, but 150,000 users are pretty consistent so they would generally get used to the alignments during construction as they would last several stages.

This Modified Highway Viaduct has a need for temporary widening of the elevated structure so that traffic can be maintained. So, there would be an overbuild of the structure to allow for three lanes to be maintained at all times on I-90 to allow for demolition and construction of the new viaduct. Since the infrastructure elements all generally remain in the same place, there are no major impacts to utilities. And it retains the existing pump station below the viaduct.

The Soldiers Field Road Hybrid is the most complex to construct even though it has fewer stages. Just because of alignment shifts, to maintain traffic it is by far the most complex to construct, requiring the temporary trestle in the Charles River. It has extremely challenging and would involve substandard geometrical alignments during construction as a result of the major boat section; it requires the most extensive relocation of major utilities. It impacts a 64-inch MWRA water line and a 60-inch BWSC drain, as well as several others.

This will be a brief summary of some of the construction elements listed in the matrix that's available to the public on MassDOT's website. For temporary impacts to the Charles River users, construction of the boardwalk for the Paul Dudley White path would infringe temporarily, as well as permanently. For temporary impacts there would be a barge required to construct that boardwalk which would impact the water sheet. Since all elements remain outside the Charles River for the Modified Highway Viaduct, there would be no impacts to river users. The Soldiers Field Road Hybrid would have the most extensive impacts so that construction of the trestle could take place that would accommodate Soldiers Field Road and the Paul Dudley White path for the majority of construction. For navigation and encroachment, there are similar impacts for the Modified At-Grade for construction of the boardwalk as well as the living shoreline. On a temporary basis, there would be construction zones in the Charles. There would be limited contractor impact for the Modified Highway Viaduct because all of the construction is outside the River. For the Soldiers Field Road Hybrid trestle, there would be the most narrowing of the water sheet by approximately 110 feet to carry Soldiers Field Road and the Paul Dudley White path on a temporary basis throughout the majority of construction.

Temporary and permanent resource area impacts are expected to be similar because the limit of the boardwalk would be the extent of the construction limit within the Charles, except for the barge which would be out there on a temporary basis for construction. There would be limited impacts for the Modified Highway Viaduct, for the construction of the outfalls. The Soldiers Field Road Hybrid on a temporary basis would have the greatest extent of State and Federal resource areas.

Regarding ecological impacts, again for the construction of the living shoreline as well as the boardwalk for the Modified At-Grade, there would be a disturbance to the river sediment as well as

production of silt for those construction elements. For the Modified Highway Viaduct there would be very limited impacts, if any for the outfall construction. The Soldiers Field Road Hybrid would be the most extensive for the number of piles and then for the construction and operation of the Soldiers Field Road and Paul Dudley White path trestle. As far as noise, on a temporary basis for construction, noise on the River will increase due to pile-driving for the Modified At-Grade's boardwalk and the installation and operation of the trestle for the Hybrid. For the Modified Highway Viaduct there would be no temporary noise on the River.

Here we have construction duration and impact to commuters. For construction duration, please note that we had a number of stages for each of these alternatives. We want to note that for the Modified At-Grade and the Modified Highway Viaduct there is a similar construction duration which is approximately six to seven years, and for the Soldiers Field Road Hybrid it's approximately eight to ten years as a result of the trestle and more extensive relocation of utilities and other infrastructural elements from elevated to below grade and from at-grade to elevated. For interstate 90 there is a better potential to maintain four lanes at certain stages for the Modified At-Grade; however, three lanes in each direction will be provided at a minimum throughout construction, except for the short durations when it's required to lower the I-90 profile below the Commonwealth Avenue bridge to allow for the Grand Junction bridge to pass over I-90. This is similar between the Modified At-Grade and the Soldiers Field Road Hybrid, except the Soldiers Field Road Hybrid has limited opportunity to maintain four lanes during certain stages of construction. The Modified Highway Viaduct has limited opportunity to maintain four lanes on I-90 during certain stages but would maintain the three lanes in each direction as required for all alternatives.

Impacts to commuters for Soldiers Field Road include two lanes in each direction maintained throughout construction for the Modified At-Grade and the Modified Viaduct, with minor shifts in alignment to accommodate construction stages. Under the Hybrid, Soldiers Field Road would see temporary reductions and closures to tie the temporary trestle into the adjoining sections of the Parkway. Again, that trestle is required construct all infrastructure elements and the Soldiers Field Road viaduct over I-90 eastbound and to lower Soldiers Field Road profile in the vicinity of the new Grand Junction bridge over Soldiers Field Road, all within the narrow constraints of the throat.

The Paul Dudley White path is maintained throughout construction of the At-Grade. The boardwalk would be constructed early on so that users could be shifted onto the path and they would be maintained on that new boardwalk for a majority of construction. The Modified Highway Viaduct would maintain the path throughout construction with a majority of time spent on the existing alignment with the need to shift accordingly for the construction of the final Paul Dudley White

path. For the Soldiers Field Road Hybrid, the path would be temporarily, intermittently closed to allow for shifting onto the trestle.

We're looking at different options for maintaining two tracks on the Worcester Mainline for the maximum extent possible. We understand that this is a very urgent and important desire for many people attending this meeting, and the team is doing everything that we can to maintain two commuter rail tracks for the maximum extent practical for the three alternatives. At this time, it's pretty similar between the three, with Soldiers Field Road Hybrid allowing for the two rails for the least number of stages, with more, but about the same between the Highway Viaduct and the Modified At-Grade.

It's been determined that the Grand Junction Rail needs to be closed fairly early for the Modified At-Grade to accommodate construction of the Grand Junction viaduct over I-90 and over Soldiers Field Road and other throat area elements. For the Modified Highway Viaduct, the Grand Junction Rail is able to be maintained because vertical and horizontal alignments of infrastructure remain where they are. Reduction of the viaduct's columns from four to three allows for wider cross-sectional area to allow for temporary Grand Junction Railroad relocation. For the Soldiers Field Road Hybrid, Grand Junction Rail must be closed early on and remain closed throughout the majority of construction. For the Modified At-Grade and for the Soldiers Field Road Hybrid, due to the extent of the closure of Grand Junction Rail, a 100 mile plus detour would be required to transfer equipment to the Boston Engine Terminal in Sommerville for heavy maintenance. It has been determined and discussed recently that any duration of closure for the Grand Junction Rail beyond six months would require the construction of a southside maintenance facility to continue require locomotive maintenance.

For the safety portion of the Matrix, I'm just going to touch on the highway elements. For the Modified At-Grade, there are 11-foot lanes on I-90 with varying four foot outside shoulders and two foot inside shoulders. The Modified Highway Viaduct has 12-foot lanes and four-foot shoulders, left and right, which allows for some minor shifting of travel lanes during maintenance activities. There are 11-foot lanes on I-90 with four-foot shoulders for the Soldiers Field Road Hybrid. Overall, the Modified Highway Viaduct has a wider cross section. There is a fairly minor changes since the Scoping Summary Report for the Modified At-Grade. There is improved I-90 geometry for the Modified At-Grade, providing a flatter, straighter highway. It removes the reverse curves that exist with the highway viaduct today. The Modified Highway Viaduct maintains those curves horizontally and vertically which is less safe, but I underscore that does not mean it's unsafe. It just means it's not as flat or as straight as the Modified At-Grade. All of these options would need some kind of design exception through the Federal Highway and MassDOT process. The Soldiers Field Road

Hybrid, similar to the Modified At-Grade, improves the I-90 geometry by providing a flatter, straighter highway. Cross sections for all three alternatives are similar, as well as the alignment for Soldiers Field Road for the Modified At-Grade and the Modified Highway Viaduct. The Soldiers Field Road Hybrid introduces steep reverse curves to place Soldiers Field Road on a viaduct over I-90 eastbound.

For operations and maintenance, there are more frequent and complicated stormwater inlets for the Modified At-Grade due to the narrower shoulders and insufficient width within the travel lanes to accommodate drainage manholes. The Modified Highway Viaduct would use traditional bridge scuppers for stormwater inlets with no drainage structures in the travel way, similar to existing conditions with updated stormwater collection and treatment bellow the viaduct. The Soldiers Field Road Hybrid would require a more complicated stormwater inlet designed for I-90, and it would require manholes in the travel way as well. Both the Hybrid and Highway Viaduct options include ongoing maintenance for the parkway or interstate viaduct respectively.

Here is the environmental category. To discuss the visual category, here are some renderings for the Modified At-Grade. We're looking westbound, heading towards the 3L interchange in the final condition, and off to the left are the BU dorms. It shows no viaduct resulting in improved visuals of the BU buildings from the riverbank. From the south, it shows a widened Paul Dudley White path on a 26-foot-wide boardwalk, similar to the Soldiers Field Road Hybrid, to allow for separation of bicycle and pedestrian facilities throughout the majority of the Throat Area. You can see Soldiers Field Road off to the left, and I-90 on the same plane, at-grade, with the Grand Junction Rail, all the way to the left, rising over I-90.

Here we have the Modified Highway Viaduct. As you can see to the left, I-90 remains on a viaduct, a new viaduct with improved architectural elements. You can see Soldiers Field Road at-grade; it's been shifted south as a result of the three-column arrangement of the viaduct versus the existing four columns. With that shifting of Soldiers Field Road to the south, it allows for a wider and separated Paul Dudley White path for a substantial portion of the Throat Area. It also shifts the commuter rail and Grand Junction Rail further to the left. To the right, the separated bicycle and pedestrian facilities on the Paul Dudley White path are within the existing limits and do not impact the riverbank of the Charles River.

Here we have the Soldiers Field Road Hybrid. A wall is being proposed in the Scoping Summary Report cross section that separates the Paul Dudley White path from I-90, the Grand Junction Rail, and the commuter rail. No changes have been made to that. You can see it has the greatest amount

of separation for the greatest length of the Throat Area. It also does not permanently impact the Charles. It also has separated bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

This is the mobility and access category. We've discussed the cycling and pedestrian information on the previous slides. I just wanted to note the north-south connection at Agganis Way. That is possible for all three alternatives with varying differences on how the ramps would work. For the Modified At-Grade, it would go over I-90, over the rails, over Soldiers Field Road, and touch down on the river side at the Paul Dudley White path without passing under any rail structures. For the Modified Highway Viaduct, it has to go below the viaduct and over the rail. For the Soldiers Field Road Hybrid, it would have to go over the rail and then over the Soldiers Field Road viaduct structure. It's feasible, but it would be the highest and have the longest ramps associated with it.

Here we have the cost category. These costs include the entire interchange West Station, the layover yard, the bus concourse, as well as everything within the 3L interchange street grid, all the separated bicycle and pedestrian facilities, ramp connections to the street grid and West Station, as well as the Throat Area and all the elements associated with it. For the Modified At-Grade, the early conceptual cost is $1.3 billion, the Modified Highway Viaduct is $1.3 billion, and the Soldiers Field Road Hybrid is $1.6 billion. The costs of the Modified At-Grade and the Soldiers Field Road Hybrid do not include the cost of the southside maintenance facility which would be needed for these alternatives and is estimated at $300 million. A lifecycle cost analysis estimates are not currently available, but they would be available for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Mitigation costs are also not included in this analysis but are expected to be very low between all the options. Selection of the preferred alternative is necessary to inform the financial plan for the Allston I-90 project.

Q: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Good evening folks. Owen, would you like to wrap us up here before we go to Q&A?

A: Owen Kane: Yes. Thank you, everyone, again, for participating tonight. We encourage you to provide any feedback by October 30th. The purpose of tonight's meeting is to gather public input. I know some will be disappointed because I said that our team would not be responding to all your questions. They will answer questions to clarify what has been presented, but it's not an interactive meeting.

I saw some folks ask in the chat whether we would release any of the supporting documentation for the matrix break down. I should let all of you know that we're in the midst of NEPA and One Federal Decision process. We've submitted a lot of information, including the matrix analysis, to Federal Highway and to the cooperating agencies and out of consideration for the work that they're doing

now, we believe it's inappropriate for us to release any of the supporting documentation now. We will certainly talk to Federal Highway and the cooperating agencies, but we will not be releasing any of the supporting documentation for the matrix at this time. With that Nate, I'll turn it back to you.

Discussion

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: I just want to recognize that the audience has been going up and down as we go through this. I do want to recognize Andrew Bettinelli from Senator Brownsberger's office, and Councilor Liz Breadon who joined us a little while ago. I offer any of the elected officials the opportunity to speak first. Once we get into that, I'll have Erin read through the text questions and find answers for them. Then, we'll go to raised hands from the general public. And then if we have time, we will get to the raised hands from the members of the I-90 Allston Task Force who are here tonight.

For folks who want to make a comment, we ask that you try and keep it to two minutes tonight because we do have 140 people. I will be gently keeping time, but I ask that you try and keep your comment to the two-minute mark. Any elected officials, if you would like to speak now, please put your hand up so I can call on you. I don't see any hands from elected officials but do raise them at any point if you have a question.

Erin let's go ahead and start with questions that came through over the Q&A feature and then we'll do hands.

C: Erin Reed, *Howard Stein Hudson*: Sure, except I see that Representative Kane has her hand up, so I'll take her off mute.

C: Representative Hannah Kane, *Massachusetts House of Representatives*: Good evening. I just wanted to thank you for hosting this public information session and say that I'm looking forward to hearing the feedback and questions from the people listening. Thank you.

Q: Nate Cabral-Curtis: I see that we've been joined by Representative Honan. Representative, would you like to speak?

A: Representative Kevin Honan, *Massachusetts House of Representatives*: Thank you, it's a pleasure to be on. I look forward to hearing some of the questions from the many people who are on. I've had a tremendous opportunity to meet with neighborhood residents who I believe are all on -- Harry, Galen, Jessica, Secretary Salvucci. Mike Moran and I have met with the neighborhood residents. Obviously, we're the host community so we'll be impacted the most by this, and we want

very much to reconnect our neighborhood in a way that they haven't been in years. We are looking for a straighter, at-grade I-90 where we can connect the community back to the river and connect north Allston to south Allston and Allston to Brighton. Like my colleague Hannah Kane, I'm very excited to listen to our neighbors' and residents' comments. Thank you for allowing me to say hello and make some comments.

Q: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Of course, sir. Erin, do you want to start reading off the text questions?

Q: Erin Reed: Yes. There were a couple questions about Soldiers Field Road. Adam asked, "Why is there no option that considers closing the wholly redundant Soldiers Field Road? Doing so would totally resolve the space restraints, protect the Charles River, and be forward looking since the City of Boston aims to drastically reduce car use by 2030." And there was another question that was very similar to that as well.

Q: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Owen, I think you gave a solid answer to that at the Task Force meeting last week. Would you care to repeat that for folks?

A: Owen Kane: Again, the purpose of tonight is for us to get input. If that's a suggestion that's been made, we'll certainly take a look at it along with everything else.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Excellent. Keep going, Erin.

Q: Erin Reed: Someone asked, "Have you considered reducing the width of lanes, especially on Soldiers Field Road, to nine or ten feet and removing the shoulders and center guardrail? It would reduce the need of incursion into the river without affecting traffic."

Q: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Jim, do you want to say a few words on that just to help the gentleman write his comment?

A: Jim Keller: As part of the additional stakeholder engagement, MassDOT met with City of Boston officials, A Better City, and the Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR). Some of these things have been discussed. This is currently what is depicted for the Modified At-Grade. It's what MassDOT supports, as well as DCR, as far as the cross section for Soldiers Field Road. We'll definitely take any comments on that, but that is where that currently stands.

Q: Erin Reed: Priscilla asks, "How will riverbank land be protected from trash accumulation? It doesn't look like there's an easy way to maintain it."

A: Nate Cabral-Curtis: I think we're still a little early for that. I think that's something to put in your comment letter. Trash accumulation in an urban environment is a real concern. I think we're just trying to figure out exactly what we're going to build before we come to things like that.

Q: Erin Reed: Sarah asks, "How will the Modified At-Grade option change the flow of the Charles River, including increased scouring under the BU bridge supports and eddies and accelerate the growth of cyanobacteria?"

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: That sounds like a question for Mark Fobert, and it sounds like something that will be further visited in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Mark, do you have anything to add to help her write her comment letter?

A: Mark Fobert: We haven't looked at the flow yet. The river is a low energy environment controlled by the dam, but it is something that we'd have to look at to see if there would be increased scouring. It is the widest part of the river, and it's something we will definitely look at when we do our analysis for the DEIS.

Q: Erin Reed: Thank you. Evan asks, "The Viaduct options shows the commuter rail in a different position than the other two options. Which of these options includes closing the commuter rail during construction?"

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: That's a good question for Jim. Jim, can you give a little bit of background on that?

A: Jim Keller: The Modified Highway Viaduct shows the commuter rail generally in the location it is today, and that's because the viaduct remains. For the other two options, the rail needs to be shifted to the south to accommodate the additional infrastructure that needs to get placed where the viaduct was removed and I-90 lowered; it has to go within that corridor. The location shown on those cross sections does not have any impact on the staging of construction. It's the location for the rail in the final condition. It's what has to happen to the rail during the temporary construction impacts, and the rail shifts alignments throughout that time. Because of the need to have all the elements shifted for the At-Grade and the Soldiers Field Hybrid, generally what we're finding as we look at maintaining two commuter rails for the complete duration of construction, there needs to be certain parts of stages where it will need to go to a single track for certain periods of time. It's similar for the three alternatives with the maximum extent of impacts to two track service for the Soldiers Field Road Hybrid, and its similar between the Modified At-Grade and the Modified Highway Viaduct.

Q: Erin Reed: Thanks. So, we've already discussed construction staging to an extent, but for clarification, "Can each alternative be built without entering the river or with minimal incursion?" That's a follow up question.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: That's another good Jim question.

A: Jim Keller: For the final condition of the cross section for the At-Grade the boardwalk is in the river, so you need to go into the river to construct it. For the Modified Highway Viaduct, you don't need to go into the river because in the final condition the location of the Paul Dudley White path is generally in the same location as the existing condition, so you don't need to go into the river to construct the Modified Highway Viaduct. For the Soldiers Field Road Hybrid, to place all the final condition elements where they need to go, we need to gain some space, which is why we need to place the temporary trestle, within the river. It has the greatest extent of temporary impacts on the river in order to carry Soldiers Field Road and the Paul Dudley White path and allow sufficient width to construct the other elements.

Q: Erin Reed: Tom asks, "Is the Purpose and Need piece of this subject to any changes?"

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Owen, I think that's a question for you. Mark, if you want to speak to Purpose and Need go ahead, I can't seem to reach Owen.

A: Mark Fobert: We certainly accept comments on Purpose and Need. Any proposed revisions would need to be coordinated with Federal Highway as it is their process.

Q: Erin Reed: Kay asks about sound mitigation during construction. Is that something that has been considered?

A: Nate Cabral-Curtis: I can take an initial swing at that. Right now, we need to figure out what the preferred alternative is going to be prior to dealing with questions on how we're going to mitigate its construction. The mitigation measures will be different depending on which option is picked. So, we need to figure out what we're going to do first before we figure out mitigation measures, but I think that is going to be investigated more in the DEIS.

Jason, is there anything you'd want to add to that?

C: Jason Ross: No, that about covers it Nate. We're going to be looking at best practices to reduce construction noise for any of the alternatives.

Q: Erin Reed: Is sound-absorbing windows one of those best practices?

A: Jason Ross: Not typically.

Q: Erin Reed: An anonymous attendee asks, "What traffic volumes are being used to determine the level of service impacts of each alternative, and does this reflect regional goals of reducing single-occupancy vehicle travel? Does this reflect that many people will have shifted their travel modes during the 10 years of construction where there will be fewer than 12 lanes available?"

A: Nate Cabral-Curtis: That's a fairly complicated question. The traffic modeling will be addressed heavily in the DEIS. If you go back and look at the DEIR document, they discuss traffic in there. I don't know if we have anything really brand new to present on that tonight. We know that Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS) of the Boston Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is heavily involved in the modeling for this and looking at the long-range forecasting. Would anyone from Tetra Tech like to add to that?

C: Chris Calnan, *Tetra Tech*: I would just add that as we work through this with CTPS, we'd look at the final condition 20 years out, that is what those volumes and projections will be. We don't look at what's happening in the next couple of years. This is a long-term planning project that goes through a very rigorous review with Federal Highway and others and that's the methodology we provide, following that context to look at a 20-year projection for this project and others of this type of magnitude.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Thank you, Chris.

Q: Erin Reed: Tom asks a question about the status of the layover. The need for which in the designated location has been questioned. Are there alternatives for the location and, if so, are those locations included in the set of preferred alternative options?

Q: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Mark Shamon, are you on the call this evening?

A: Mark Shamon, *VHB*: I'm here Nate, and I think the direct answer is no, there haven't been any changes to any of these alternatives at this point. All three still consider the rail yard, the four tracks, supporting the trains.

Q: Erin Reed: Galen, I see your question and we'll come back to it.

Timothy says, "Even without closing Soldiers Field Road, which I also think should be seriously considered, why is there no consideration for narrowing to single lane with a multimodal lane alongside? Also, can reduce space with effect of traffic calming, noise impacts, safety, and space for

multimodal commuters." So, has a single lane with a multimodal lane alongside been considered for Soldiers Field Road?

A: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Not to date. The lane count has remained consistent based on direction from MassDOT leadership. But if you'd like to write that in, go right ahead. Owen, is there anything you'd like to add to that?

C: Owen Kane: It sounded more like a comment than a question. I would strongly encourage the individual to send that to us, and we'll certainly consider it along with everything else.

Q: Erin Reed: Someone commented that the construction staging phases were difficult to understand without diagrams. Will MassDOT be making the construction staging diagrams available to the public during the current comment period?

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Owen, I think you addressed that earlier, but go ahead and address it one more time.

A: Owen Kane: Right now, it's inappropriate for us to share any of the supporting documentation. But send us a comment or your thoughts on it and we'll certainly discuss it with Federal Highway and the cooperating agencies.

Q: Erin Reed: Tom asks, "Please clarify 'users.' 150,000 operators of SOV's per diem? How are you defining users?"

Q: Nate Cabral-Curtis: So that's a question asking how we are defining the number of vehicles traveling through the area. Chris, do you want to take a swing at that since you've been so close to the traffic work?

A: Chris Calnan: So, the question is about what the 150,000 is. That's the average daily traffic on the turnpike. The users are vehicles.

Q: Erin Reed: "Has putting I-90 at-grade and routing Soldiers Field Road beneath it been considered? Soldiers Field Road drops below grade further down at River Street, and as a narrow roadway the required pitch would be relatively small." That, again, is more of a comment than a question to be answered this evening.

Robert has his hand up. Do we want to switch over to him?

A: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Yes, let's do that. We've got five hands up that we'll get to after.

Rob, it's Nate Curtis. I always appreciate your comments, but just remember we're looking at about a two-minute spread here, my friend, and we're already over the eight o'clock mark. You're on, go ahead.

C: Robert LaTremouille: I was so pleased with the first announcement from the Secretary because we had three alternatives, all of which were involved in environmental destruction along the Grand Junction Railroad, on the Charles, and up through Cambridge. I was pleased she got rid of it. But I find that we've got an added 22 feet of construction of a boardwalk in the Charles making the Secretary's alternative destructive to the Charles. This is incredible! I didn't like either one of the Secretary's alternatives because they were very destructive in many ways themselves. I would hope that the Secretary's alternative would mention that fact that they're building 22 feet into the Charles River. This is very bad, and I really object. Thank you.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Thank you Bob, we appreciate it.

Q: Erin Reed: Lisa comments, "It seems that the railroad bridge poses the most constraint. Is this rail line going to be used again? If not, why can't it be removed? This would improve river access and relieve the Throat space issue."

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: That sounds like a question about the Grand Junction bridge and the importance of the Grand Junction Line. It's a perfect question for Mark Shamon.

A: Mark Shamon: Thank you, Nate. The Grand Junction Line provides a very vital link for the MBTA. Their major maintenance facility for all their railroad vehicles is on the north side of the river and they do run daily trains to the north side of the river. So, that's the need for at least one track. We're also anticipating that at some point in the future MBTA and MassDOT may choose to add some passenger service into Cambridge, and that second track is going to help with the frequent shuttling back and forth between Kendall Square and West Station, so that's why it's two tracks.

Q: Erin Reed: Someone has commented, "Have Harvard take responsibility for providing and paying for their commuters. Close Soldiers Field Road now." That's a comment that you can certainly include in your email to us.

Emily says, "Hello. Considering that Climate Change is arguably the most important environmental impact facing our communities and country, and that transportation accounts for 30% of greenhouse gas emissions, I'm surprised to see the effect on Climate Change has not been included in the decision matrix under 'Environmental Impacts.' How will each of these alternatives contribute to the reduction of greenhouse gasses?"

A: Nate Cabral-Curtis: I'll take a swing at this one and then let Mark speak to it. Tonight, we're focused on the Throat Area. This was discussed in the DEIR and will be discussed further in the DEIS. The project does contain West Station which creates a transit link for both busses and rail where there was none before and the street grid envisioned inside the former Beacon Park Yard creates new links for cyclists and pedestrians including fully separated facilities. So, there are things in this for the transit user, the cyclist, and the pedestrian that aren't really being covered tonight but will be discussed. Mark, do you want to add anything to that since you are the environmental champion on this?

C: Mark Fobert: I would echo that. State and Federal regulations require us to document greenhouse gas, so as part of the NEPA and MEPA processes that will be done.

Q: Erin Reed: We've already addressed lane widths. "Which alternative has the lowest long-term maintenance costs?"

A: Nate Cabral-Curtis: I think this one goes to Jim Keller for the most part. Each one of these alternatives has their own maintenance challenges, whether they be based on structure or drainage. We don't know the lifecycle costs yet. That's being prepared for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Is there anything further on that that the folks at Tetra Tech would want to say?

C: Jim Keller: That's it Nate.

Q: Erin Reed: Emily has a question/ comment, "It's terrific to see the commitment to riverbank restoration and enhancement. *The State House News* ran a story quoting Secretary Pollack about the significant decline expected in morning commuters 'at least until 2024 and possibly longer.' And use that as a justification for MassDOT to implement transit service cuts. Why is that not also a justification for rebuilding the Mass Pike with fewer lanes? It would save many millions of dollars and allow for an at-grade project that does not intrude into the Charles River. This is especially puzzling since 1.) there will be reduced lanes anyway during the years of construction, 2.) there are six lanes on the Pike now and drivers are dealing with it. Zipper lanes, congestion pricing, working with employers to incentivize remote work or staggered start times, enhance public transportation options… there are many ways to make it work. Emily Norton, Charles River Watershed Association."

A: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Again, I think what's been stated from MassDOT leadership about lane count has been pretty consistent, but if you want to include that in your comment, we've certainly received comments along those lines.

Q: Erin Reed: Tom asks, "Why does the all at-grade option not have a noise barrier?"

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Nosie barriers is something that can be addressed by Jason Ross. Jason, do you want to take a swing at where we are with noise barriers?

A: Jason Ross: Sure. First and foremost, for all the alternatives we'll be looking at ways to reduce the sound, such as with noise barriers. Numerous factors go into whether a noise barrier would be constructed: safety, whether it's actually effective at reducing sound, whether it's cost effective, whether it may be needed to reduce impacts caused by snow, whether it can be maintained, and whether it has adverse effects on a historic district. Needless to say, we're not at the point right now to provide any decision whether or not a noise barrier is being considered for any of the alternatives. But they will be considered as we move forward.

Q: Nate Cabral-Curtis: How are we doing getting through the text questions, Erin?

A: Erin Reed: We still have 36.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Folks who still have their hand up, we see you and we will get to you.

Q: Erin Reed: Galen, I see your other question and we'll come back to it if we have time.[5]

Someone asks, "Will a bike/ped switchback still be required for the Modified At-Grade alternative is modifications to Agganis Way were made/ agreed upon BU or the City of Boston?"

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: We're not exactly sure what those modifications would entail, but Jim maybe you can speak to some of the things that drive the profile of the Agganis Bridge so that folks can write their comment appropriately.

A: Jim Keller: There would be a possibility to remove the switchback, but there would be impacts to BU property and they, in conjunction with MassDOT, would need to discuss those impacts.

Q: Erin Reed: "What prevents an option that includes putting at least some car traffic underground?"

A: Nate Cabral-Curtis: This has been talked about a little bit. One of the things that could come with longer car tunnels is the need for ventilation buildings. Unlike places along the Rose Kennedy Greenway where there are a lot of other tall structures, ventilation buildings along here would stand

[5] In public meetings, comments from members of the public receive priority with members of the I-90 Allston Task Force waiting until the end to speak. In Task Force meetings, the order is reversed. This is articulated in the ground rules received by all Task Force members when joining the body.

out pretty stiffly and starkly and kind of break things up. We've tried to avoid going underground as much as possible. It does look like the old Beacon Park Yards is a blank canvas, but in the underground world it's not. There are a lot of really large water utilities under there, including the Salt Creek Culvert which provides drainage for much of Brookline. As you can see there's a cut on the picture on the screen in front of you. Cars are below that dotted line. The deeper you go the more you get into the water and the more you have to move very large utilities and if you keep the cars down long enough, you have to vent the exhaust. So, there are a lot of challenges.

C: Erin Reed: We're going to take a couple of hands. I know Martin has had his hand raised.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Sounds good. It looks like we only have five hands up, so we're going to go through the hands that are currently up. Martin you're on, go for it. And thank you for waiting.

Martin, we'll wait for you to come back. I have someone here whose name is Kay. Your microphone is live if you wish to speak.

Q: No Name Given: I've been finding it very difficult to move into another comfortable building, back across the street. We live in this triangular border of no man's land. BU doesn't want the train in Agganis Way, and Allston doesn't want it in Allston, either so it remains in this triangle. I understand that we cannot stop this, so I'm wondering as a tall building with 300 people, to avoid displacement, what kind of noise mitigation can you, or would you, provide with us? What else would work if a sound barrier does nothing?

A: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Thank you, Kay. I will say this was covered in the DEIS and it's been part of the project for a really long time. If I'm recognizing your voice correctly, I believe you've come to a number of our meetings. I believe I understand where your home is located, roughly. A noise barrier along the train tracks, along Pratt and Ashford Streets, has been part of this project for a fair bit of time, and unless I'm mistaken, it remains a part of this project to this day.

Jim, since you keep track of things like that, can you just confirm that the Pratt and Ashford noise barrier is still a part of the project?

C: Jim Keller: I think that's more for Mark Shamon, but I believe it is.

Q: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Mark, would you confirm that for us as well?

A: Mark Shamon: Yes, confirmed.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Thank you, sir. I'm going to move on to Adam. Adam wants to close Soldiers Field Road. He has that in his name. Go ahead, Adam.

C: Adam Pieniazek: My name is Adam Pieniazek and to summarize, I think that closing Soldiers Field Road solves a lot of problems. Either way, this is going to be a complex engineering and environmental project and closing Soldiers Field Road would solve all of the space constraints, would likely save us a good amount of money on construction, and Soldiers Field Road starts by I-90 and two miles later ends right by I-90. So, I-90 can service a lot of what people are driving on Soldiers Field Road for. I heard earlier that MassDOT would consider closing Soldiers Field Road if that was a suggestion, so take this as my official citizen's suggestion to create a fourth alternative option that would close Soldiers Field Road and reallocate that space to the other needs of this project. Thank you.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Very good sir, thank you.

Galen, we see you. We know your questions are there. This being a public meeting, we're going to push through as many members of the public as we can before we get to Task Force folks.

Erin, I don't see any new raised hands outside of Galen and Glen Berkowitz who are both Task Force members. Let me do a quick scroll. Let's do some more of the questions that folks wrote in since I see we still have 34.

Q: Erin Reed: "Prior to the extension of the comment period to October 30th, what was the preferred alternative, or which was it most likely to be? We would have to know what we are building off of to judge any modified plans as it were."

A: Nate Cabral-Curtis: I think one of the things that would be most helpful to you would be to go to the I-90 Allston website. If you Google "MassDOT I-90 Allston" it's the first thing that comes up. Take a look at the 2020 documents pages and take a look at the Scoping Report and the Scoping Summary Report which are both available there. The Soldiers Field Road Hybrid was looked at very favorably as being attractive and meeting a lot of needs. However, the incursion into the water sheet by the temporary trestle for potentially eight to 10 years, the potential impacts to the river boating community that would have arisen from that at the same time, and concerns about water quality, has led us back to reopening some of these other options to see if we can address the concerns that were heard, not about the Soldiers Field Road Hybrid's final condition, but its construction period conditions. If you take a look at those documents on the 2020 documents page that will help you see where we've been most recently.

Q: Erin Reed: Christian asks, "Are the impacts to the public realm and neighborhood fragmentation being considered? An elevated structure poses a much larger barrier in that regard. Additionally, are we considering the permanency of each alternative should transportation uses change in the future? It would be much more intensive to change elevated structures versus structures at-grade."

A: Nate Cabral-Curtis: I'll take a quick swing at that. There are a lot of things worth putting in a comment there. The elevated structure is along the backside of BU and is down by the time you get to the large part of Beacon Park Yards. Right now, the big gap is between Cambridge Street, and then streets like Babcock and Buick, and really the only way to go around that is to go around the Beacon Park Yard parcel in one form or another. That is going to be stitched together with a new street grid. I think that the neighborhood is going to feel much more contiguous when everything's said and done, especially between Allston and lower Allston. Those two neighborhoods have historically been split up by the railyard. That will be especially true for cyclists and pedestrians. The vehicle connection across I-90 at West Station is supposed to be transit only, so we're not looking to introduce new car flow onto the small streets. That said, we will be looking at the life cycle costs of each one of these structures as we get into the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. If there's anything that Owen or the Tetra Tech folks would like to say on that I'm more than happy to add it on, but that's where we are at the moment.

Q: Erin Reed: There's a follow up question for Owen in the chat that's getting a lot of talk. "Why is it inappropriate to share with the public the supporting documentation that has already been shared with public agencies?" So, Owen, if you could answer that one.

A: Owen Kane: I'd be happy to. As I said, we've had ongoing discussions with Federal Highway and cooperating agencies and a lot of these cooperating agencies are doing preliminary work with regards to permitting. A final decision hasn't been made yet on a preferred alternative and a variety of others things. Right now, we're looking for information from the public. We'd like to hear from you; if you have concerns please visit the website Nate's shared because some of the things that you're looking for might already be there. Right now, we're focused on gathering information and we won't be releasing any of the supporting documentation right now.

Q: Erin Reed: "I know that you mentioned the cost of the southside maintenance facility several times, but the full summary analysis document on Mass.gov says 'This southside maintenance facility would have independent utility and would be considered regardless of the I-90 project.' Why is this being presented as if it adds to the cost of the project when it will be constructed regardless of the alternative chosen."

A: Nate Cabral-Curtis: I think that's been covered a little bit. Yes, it does have independent utility and it would be considered, however, and I will defer to anyone at MassDOT if I get this wrong, what I understand by having spent as much time around the project as I have, is that the MBTA views that southside maintenance facility as critical to being able to get through this project if they lose access to the Grand Junction line for a long period of time. So what it forces them to do is to is accelerate the construction of that facility and accelerate the permitting and the design of that facility, all of which is really just in its opening stages right now. It adds some cost and complexity, and theoretically could put this project on a longer timetable. Anyone for DOT want to add to that?

Q: Erin Reed: Tom asks, "What about consideration of the public taxpayer?" I think Owen just said that MassDOT is looking for the public's opinion currently.

"Is it possible to comment on the tentative design and construction timeline regardless of the selected alternative?"

A: Nate Cabral-Curtis: I'm not exactly sure what that question means, but if you have thoughts about the timeline that has been projected by the project, by all means you can write in on it.

Q: Erin Reed: "Can you give more information on why the viaduct versus not viaduct is only $300 million out of a $1.3 billion project? Are there lifecycle costs included in that?" asks Alex. It's the difference in price between the alternatives.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Let me see if I can find the slide. Jim, I heard you unmute yourself. If you have something to say, go ahead.

A: Jim Keller: Those are the conceptual costs developed for the three alternatives, and the current findings are what's presented here. We definitely understand if there are questions, please submit them, but as far as the similarity of costs between the Modified At-Grade and the Modified Viaduct at this time, even though you're removing a viaduct, you're constructing the infrastructure for I-90 in a partial boat section, there are utility relocations, there's the addition of the retaining fill for the Grand Junction Rail and the commuter rail, and then the addition of the Grand Junction viaduct over I-90, eastbound and westbound, as well as the replacement of the Grand Junction bridge over Soldiers Field Road, as well as additional work for the boardwalk within the river.

Q: Erin Reed: Meryl asks, "Do you have a behavioral scientist on your team who has given you their expert opinion on commuting behaviors? If so, after six to 10 years of Soldiers Field Road with two lanes and the Pike with six lanes, what makes them think that commuters who have changed their behaviors will change it again and restart an extinguished behavior?"

A: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Sure, so the commuting patterns are being looked at by the Central Transportation Planning Staff. They do the forecasting for all of eastern Massachusetts, and their model takes into account all kinds of things, projected job growth, projected housing density, projected educational patterns, and all those things get factored in there, effectively all the things that drive those commuting behaviors.

I just want to clarify because I've been hearing folks say that Soldiers Field Road is going to be put to two lanes during construction. Jim, correct me if I'm wrong, but the goal here is to have I-90 at four lanes as much as possible, if not, then three lanes in each direction, and Soldiers Field Road outside of nighttime and weekend work for doing various transitions depending on how it has to move around, the goal would be to have Soldiers Field Road at two and two, is that correct Jim?

C: Jim Keller: Yes.

Q: Erin Reed: As a follow up to that, "What car volume are you expecting for future use? For example, by 2040 when we have to be at zero emissions, and we'll have an expected West Station."

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: We are looking out at a 20-year timetable with the assistance of CTPS in terms of traffic volumes as Chris mentioned earlier. Chris, do you want to add a bit to that to help the comment get written?

A: Chris Calnan: With CTPS we don't have final volumes calculated yet. That is going to be prepared as part of the DEIS. It's currently not information that's available right now.

C: Erin Reed: Eileen has written out five questions and comments. It might be faster to see if she'd like to be taken off mute.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Eileen, if you'd like to raise your hand feel free. We'll give her a minute, in the meantime Erin why don't you read another question.

Q: Erin Reed: "What is the plan to make up for the incursion into the river with the proposed Modified At-Grade option?" That's Kane.

A: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Kane, nice to hear from you sir. We have to determine what we're actually building, and if that's the direction that we wind up going in, with the boardwalk out in the river, then we'd have to find out what that kind of mitigation looks like for environmental agencies. Mark Fobert, do you want to say anything to that?

C: Mark Fobert: That's exactly what I was going to say. That mitigation would have to be worked out with each environmental permitting agency, both Federal and State.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: There's nothing from Eileen yet, Erin, so go ahead and read another text question. If we don't hear from her we'll go ahead and read them all.

C: Erin Reed: Ilene says that she can't find the unmute button, but her hand is raised.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: I've got you Ilene. Go ahead.

Q: Eileen Houben: Thank you. I had several questions in conjunction with concerns that many people in Allston-Brighton have had. A lot of people are finally becoming aware of the project but not the details which I have always found to be complex and I've tried to look at things over the years with the Task Force. Something that the community needs to be made aware of is what is the difference in pollution, at ground level where people are walking and biking, between the viaduct and the at-grade option.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Let's take them one at a time Eileen to try and be efficient. Mark Fobert, could you weigh in on that as that's an environmental question. It's something that will be looked at in the DEIS of course, but is there something you can share right now to help folks comment?

A: Mark Fobert: Yes, that's something that we'll be looking at when we get to the DEIS, and in the Notice of Project Change (NPC) which is coming out sooner than that.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Okay, so next question Eileen.

Q: Eileen Houben: I didn't see in the past or in the presentation today, how much room is there in each of the three plans for a green barrier, like living vegetation with trees that are designed to be a barrier, or other barriers to deaden sound or absorb pollution? Also, can those plans be extended? Because I'm not sure if the area next to Brighton Landing and Allston Yards is right beyond the project or at the western end of the project. That area has been greatly impacted by the Pike, especially since the development which has echoed sound back and forth over to the other side. They've been waiting for almost 20 years for a sound barrier for that part of the Pike. Sound and pollution is an issue for all of the Allston-Brighton neighborhood. Planning to do things to the Pike without dealing with that, I think, is a big problem for everyone.

A: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Ilene that's a good statement. One of the things you can see in tonight's presentation is the amount of new green space that each of the options would create. And on this slide up on the screen right now, in red is the Cambridge Street bridge, the yellow is I-90, and that

red is the Franklin Street footbridge which gets reconstructed as part of this project. Where that yellow ends is the western limit of the project. Anything that has that color on it is the limits of work. So, if I'm not mistaken Brighton Landing is out past that. Within the area, again, are noise walls. Each one of these options creates a certain amount of green space. A thought also would be to reconstruct Cambridge Street as a Complete Street and get some greenery in there, as well.

Q: Eileen Houben: Is it possible to have some sound barriers that are also green? Yes, there's green space added but not in the areas of immediate sound pollution. So, I would add that to the comment.

Presumably, when the project is finished there will be fewer cars. When I was growing up in the 50's, 60's, and 70's, when new highways were constructed, there were these nice big tree barriers in the middle so that you didn't have glare from the other side, and it was safer in terms of crossover accidents. They then shrunk it to cement barriers as they expanded highways. Can this highway be built in some way that the plans include the possibility that ten or twenty years down the road, two lanes can be taken out and the middle can have a safety as well as pollution green median?

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: I think you should put that in your comment because MassDOT spends a lot of time on where to plant trees so that they will grow, and that depends on a lot of factors like how close the lanes are and the kinds of water and light conditions you should have, but I think that's a fine comment to put in.

C: Eileen Houben: Another big concern is West Station and having it built at the beginning of the project rather than at the end. In Allston and Brighton, when there's more traffic on the Pike, whether it's due to detours or lane restrictions for construction, traffic ends up on our streets. When people want to avoid the Allston-Brighton Exchange because it's backed up with traffic, they get out at Newton Corner, and then Washington Street in and others in Brighton are backed up. Friends who live near Lincoln Street complain that they have a lot of traffic from the Pike that comes through residential streets that aren't designed for that. So, especially during construction but also not during construction, if West Station is active and there are transportation alternatives then that might take some of the brunt of construction traffic when the lanes are closed.

Q: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Thank you for that, Eileen. We're aware of that. Mark Shamon, you can confirm for me that West Station is not quite at the remove in time when we put together the DEIR. The project team is actively looking at how we stage all this. There are some challenges in trying to bring West Station on before some of the other things, but we did hear loud and long from people in the DEIR that they would prefer to have it brought up in time, so the phasing has been bumped up a little bit. Mark, can you confirm that for me?

A: Mark Shamon: The phasing has been consolidated; it hasn't really been bumped up. It's all part of one project as opposed to being phased in three different projects as we identified in the DEIR. It would be difficult to build and run the station at an early stage because the area of Beacon Parks Yards is going to be a major staging area where all the materials that are coming in and out of the project area, including the Throat Area, will most likely come through this space. I think they're still considering a temporary off-ramp from the Turnpike underneath Cambridge Street to bring materials from the Turnpike into the project area. It really isn't feasible to be running a station with all this construction traffic and crossing over the tracks here.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Thank you for that. At this point I just want to let everyone know that we're at 8:49 PM and we're going to try to spin this down in five minutes here. I do want to be respectful of folks' time. Erin let's try and get through a few more quick questions. Again, the goal of tonight is to show you this information and encourage you to comment on it. There's a lot here, and we had quite a few people tonight, 150 people which is quite impressive. So, we'll try to get through a few more questions in the next five or six minutes, and then we'll bid folks a night because it's moving on towards nine o'clock.

Q: Erin Reed: "The road design is based off the peak traffic flows at rush hours. Is a zipper lane being considered for the Mass Pike?"

A: Nate Cabral-Curtis: I don't think we've looked at a zipper lane, so I would put that in your comment. It does have width implications and I think we're trying to keep things as skinny as we can but go ahead and put it in your comment.

Q: Erin Reed: "What are the number of walking, bike, and train users?"

A: Nate Cabral-Curtis: That will be listed as part of the DEIS. That's data that you can take a look at when we get to that document.

Q: Erin Reed: "Have air pollution impacts for the three options been modeled from the standpoint of pedestrians and cyclists and the Paul Dudley White path relative to each other and current situations?"

Q: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Mark Fobert, that's something that you'd be able to speak to in the DEIS, is that correct?

A: Mark Fobert: That is correct they have not been modeled at this time, but it will be.

Q: Erin Reed: Larry asks, "Would the relocation of the rail maintenance facility, if required, be temporary or permanent?"

Q: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Did we say which one? Can you just answer the question briefly for both, a potential southside facility and anything that would go into Allston?

A: Mark Shamon: We're not really talking about a relocation of a rail maintenance facility. We're talking about, potentially, a new one on the southside that would supplement the one on the north side. It wouldn't have the same capabilities as the one on the north side, but it would supplement it. And it would be a permanent facility.

Q: Erin Reed: I'm trying to find people who haven't asked a question or offered a comment before. Robert asks, "What about using the old Allston Depot as the only Allston train stop, eliminate the West Station construction, and close the New Balance station after the whole project is over. The Depot has been the train station for over 100 years. I believe it's vacant now. This would open up more land where the proposed station is now. The Depot is very central for most of Allston." That was a comment, I just wanted to make it public.

"BU has offered to provide some space, but that hasn't happened here. Will that be considered in order to reduce potential impact on the river?"

A: Nate Cabral-Curtis: That's a good question for Jim Keller. We know there's a certain amount of space that BU is willing to provide for the project. The more you venture onto BU land, the more you have impacts to things that they're doing back there, access to Nickerson Field, access to buildings and access to serving those buildings. It looks easier than it is. Jim, do you have anything more that you'd like to say on that?

C: Jim Keller: You summed it up as far as impacts to the BU operation. The only thing I would add, and Mark can confirm this, is that the commuter rail, as well as Grand Junction Rail, have alignment constraints, and the commuter rail has to tie back into the rail that goes below the Commonwealth Avenue bridge so there's only so far south that you can put the commuter rail before the alignment meets some challenges.

Q: Erin Reed: I believe someone meant to ask for the start and end dates for construction.

Q: Nate Cabral-Curtis: The three different options have slightly different construction timetables. I'll go back and find that slide. Chris, do you want to speak to when we currently think we might finally put a shovel in the ground?

A: Chris Calnan: I think we'd have to take a closer look at the schedule. It's a couple years out. We still have to go through this environmental process, we have to do a procurement for Design Builders, so we're still a way out.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Let's put it this way, it's not tomorrow.

We've got two more minutes before I've been asked to spin things down. I know we weren't able to get to everyone tonight. There is an I-90 Allston project email address. It's visible on the project website. If you have a clarifying question that you feel you need to ask to write an effective comment by the 30th, you can do it tonight, tomorrow, or over the weekend. That email will come to me, Donny, and several other folks at MassDOT and we will work to provide answers to you in an ongoing dialogue to get you the information you need.

Erin let's take two more minutes and get through any additional questions we can.

Q: Erin Reed: There are a lot that are just comments. Ann asks, "Has MassDOT considered the equivalent of Rails to Trails railbanking in which trails are built on railroad corridors to be later used as railroads if the demand for rail is shown? In this case, MassDOT would build some lanes and put the Paul Dudley White path on the remaining lanes in the at-grade alternative. When we see transportation trends after COVID, working from home, Climate Change, transit, electronic vehicles, biking, and walking, MassDOT could decide if they have to add lanes to Storrow Drive. If yes, the Storrow lanes could be built on at-grade land and the Paul Dudley White path could be put on the riverbank."

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: That's a good comment, but I think the point is to do it once and then leave the good folks of Allston alone. By all means, write it in.

Erin, while you're going in to look for things that are a true question as it relates to the 30th and not a comment, if you have a comment by all means send it in. We are gathering them. They will go to Federal Highway and will be shared with cooperating agencies. Owen, do you want to offer any closing remarks? Or Donny?

C: Owen Kane: I'd like to thank everyone again. I know that a lot of you are not happy with my answers in particular. I do encourage you to submit comments by the 30th of October and know that this is not the last chance that the public will have the chance to weigh in on this. I will take the final comment in the chat to heart and say again, thank you for coming.

Q: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Anything further Erin, or should we invite people to use that email address and thank them for their attendance?

A: Erin Reed: Galen did have a couple of questions, but they were questions and comments of which we didn't need to read every one as nothing was too different from what has already been said tonight.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Alright, well in that case, I want to say, as Owen said, that we appreciate everyone for being involved tonight. If you have a question, send it to the email account. If you have a comment, get it in by the 30th. The presentation that was made to the Task Force last week is quite similar to the one tonight, and that is currently in the hands of MassDOT Web Services who will be putting it up. We will be putting this one up as well, so you will be able to look at either one on the project website's 2020 document's page.

Owen and Donny, with your permission and based off the direction I'm receiving, I will ask Erin to spin us down. Hearing nothing from Owen and nothing from Donny, Erin you can go ahead and press the button. I wish everyone a good night. Thank you for attending, and we look forward to hearing from you by the 30th.

C: Erin Reed: Thank you.

Next Steps

The project team will collect public feedback on the Throat Area options through October 30th, 2020. MassDOT will share this feedback with FHWA and cooperating agencies. The project is still in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) scoping process to determine the scope of analysis and range of alternatives to be analyzed in the NEPA environmental impact statement.

The next Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) or state environmental review document is the notice of project change (NPC) which will update the project's Purpose and Need to align with the NEPA Purpose and Need, update the design of alternatives currently under consideration, and select a preferred alternative in the state environmental review process. The public will have an opportunity to provide comments on the NPC.

Following the NPC, the NEPA draft DEIS will be published. Following the NEPA draft DEIS, the MEPA final environmental impact report will be published, followed by the NEPA final environmental impact statement combined with a record of decision document.

Appendix 1: Meeting Attendees

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Anthony	Aiello	Community Member
Chuck	Anastas	Community Member
Stephen	Andersen	Community Member
Priscilla	Anderson	Community Member
Meredith	Avery	VHB
Harris	Band	Community Member
Scott	Barboza	Community Member
Ed	Barker	Community Member
Peter	Beaman	Community Member
Joseph	Beggan	Task Force Member
Glen	Berkowitz	Task Force Member
Andrew	Bettinelli	Massachusetts State Senate
Eric	Bourassa	Metropolitan Area Planning Council
Liz	Breadon	Boston City Councilor
Robert	Breslin	Community Member
Christine	Brock	Community Member
Beth	Budner	Community Member
Joshua	Burgel	Community Member
Valarie	Burrows	Community Member
Alan	Butler	Community Member
Nathaniel	Cabral-Curtis	Howard Stein Hudson
Genevieve	Cahill	Community Member
Chris	Calnan	Tetra Tech
Tristan	Campbell	Community Member
Kevin	Casey	Community Member
Jean	Charles	Howard Stein Hudson
Anthony	Christakis	MassDOT
Nick	Cohen	VHB

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Christian	Cole	Community Member
Gideon	Coltof	Community Member
Darren	Conboy	Community Member
George	Coutros	Community Member
Sharon	Cranston	Community Member
Deneen	Crosby	Community Member
Donny	Dailey	MassDOT Government Affairs
Julia	Damiano	Community Member
Lourenço	Dantas	Community Member
Annette	Demchur	Central Transportation Planning Staff
Charles	Denison	Community Member
Richard	Devanna	Community Member
Rita	DiGiovanni	Community Member
Shane	Dlima	Community Member
Andrés	Domínguez	Community Member
Stacey	Donahoe	MassDOT
Thomas	Donovan	Community Member
Caroline	Downing	Community Member
Marc	Draisen	Metropolitan Area Planning Council
Anna	Duffy	Massachusetts House of Representatives
Courtney	Dwyer	Community Member
Carolyn	Dykema	Massachusetts House of Representatives
Kat	Eshel	City of Boston
Mark	Fobert	Tetra Tech
Erica	Frank	Community Member
Sarah	Freeman	Community Member
Alex	Frieden	Community Member
Kurt	Gaertner	Community Member
Sean	Gallagher	Community Member
Sarah	Gant	Community Member

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Richard	Garver	Community Member
David	Gaudet	Community Member
Lisa	Gianelly	Community Member
Kathleen	Glass	Community Member
Jacquelyn	Goddard	MassDOT
David-Marc	Goldstein	Community Member
Yahaira	Graxirena	Central Massachusetts Regional Planning Commission
Marjorie	Greville	Community Member
Martin	Hall	Community Member
Dale	Hamel	Community Member
Mark	Handley	Community Member
William	Hanson	Community Member
Morgan	Harris	Community Member
Niki	Hastings	VHB
Walter	Heller	Community Member
Chuck	Henebry	Community Member
Kevin	Honan	Task Force Member
Sandy	Hoover	Tetra Tech
Jeffrey	Houben	Community Member
Eileen	Houben	Community Member
Peter	Howe	Community Member
Jessica	Hughes	Community Member
Kathy	Hynes	Community Member
Ed	Ionata	Tetra Tech
Emily	Jacobsen	Community Member
Linda	Jason	Community Member
Neal	Johnson	Community Member
Stephen	Kaiser	Community Member
Owen	Kane	MassDOT
Hannah	Kane	Massachusetts House of Representatives – Task Force Member

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Beth	Kates	Community Member
Kathleen	Keen	VHB
Jim	Keller	Tetra Tech
Timothy	Kennedy	Community Member
Jim	Kersten	MassDOT
Meryl	Kessler	Community Member
Meeok	Kim	Community Member
Brandi	Kinsman	Community Member
Todd	Kirrane	City of Brookline
Peter	Klinefelter	Community Member
David	Krewinghaus	Community Member
David	Kroop	Community Member
Ken	Kruckemeyer	Community Member
John	Kyper	Community Member
Robert	La Trémouille	Community Member
Paul	Ladd	Community Member
Juliette	Landesman	Community Member
Wendy	Landman	Task Force Member
Brian	Langevin	Community Member
Kane	Larin	Community Rowing
Marie	Law	Community Member
Kevin	Lawson	Community Member
Elizabeth	Leary	Task Force Member
Larry	Lebowitz	Community Member
Marianne	Lee	Community Member
Kristen	Legendre	Community Member
Jon	Lenicheck	MassDOT
Ruth	Levenson	Community Member
Otto	Lies	Community Member
Parker	Llewellyn	Community Member

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Evan	Lowell	Trans Systems
Anne	Lusk	Community Member
Harry	Mattison	Task Force Member
Tim	McCarthy	MassDOT
Kathie	McCarthy	Community Member
Moira	McCrave	Community Member
Brian	McDonald	Community Member
Kinsale	McGrath	Tetra Tech
Anne	McKinnon	Community Member
Ian	McKinnon	Howard Stein Hudson
Alison	McRae	Esplanade Association
Katherine	Mears	Community Member
Jennifer	Migliore	Community Member
Marty	Milkovits	Central Transportation Planning Staff
Jessica	Mink	MassPath
Liam	Monahan	Community Member
Nupoor	Monani	Boston Planning and Development Agency
Galen	Mook	Task Force Member
Andrew	Morvay	Community Member
Julia	Murdza	Community Member
Conor	Murphy	Community Member
Jim	Murphy	Community Member
Ron	Newman	Community Member
Michael	Nichols	Esplanade Assiciation
Emily	Norton	Charles River Watershed Association
Mike	O'Dowd	MassDOT
Ari	Ofsevit	Task Force Member
Mark	Olson	Community Member
Lynn	Osborn	Community Member
Tom	Paine	Community Member

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Jason	Palitsch	495 Partnership
Barbara	Parmenter	Community Member
Rich	Parr	Community Member
Soni	Patangay	Tetra Tech
Jeffrey	Paul	Community Member
Adam	Pieniazek	Community Member
Ashley	Pierre-Louis	Howard Stein Hudson
Jennifer	Pieszak	Community Member
Kate	Poverman	Community Member
William	Quan	Community Member
Carolyn	Radisch	Community Member
Raymond	Raposa	Community Member
Erin	Reed	Howard Stein Hudson
Abby	Reip	Community Member
Clint	Richmond	Community Member
Seth	Robbins	Community Member
Andrea	Roberts	Community Member
Kevin	Roberts	Community Member
Jessica	Robertson	Task Force Member
Leah	Robins	Metropolitan Area Planning Council
Martyn	Roetter	Community Member
Jason	Ross	VHB
Adriana	Santiago	VHB
Mike	Sars	Community Member
Jason	Schrieber	Community Member
Hugh	Scott	Community Member
Geoff	Searle	Community Member
Bob	Seay	WGBH
Mark	Shamon	VHB
Reed	Shea	Community Member

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Jacob	Simmons	Community Member
Sarah	Slaughter	Community Member
Robert	Sloane	WalkBoston
Adam	Smith	Community Member
Marilyn	Smith	Community Member
Christopher	Smith	Community Member
Craig	Stewart	Community Member
Daniel	Sullivan	MassDOT
Ali	Tali	Community Member
Tegin	Teich	Community Member
Jeremy	Thompson	495 Partnership
Timothy	Timmermann	Community Member
David	Trevvett	Community Member
Kenneth	Truesdale	Community Member
Marc	Wallace	Community Member
Jeff	Wang	Community Member
Aaron	Welles	Community Member
Randolph	Wentworth	Community Member
Stefan	Wuensch	Community Member
Fred	Yalouris	Task Force Member
Stephen	Young	Community Member
Jaclyn	Youngblood	City of Boston Mayor’s Office
Evan	Zinner	Community Member
Joe	Zissman	Community Member