



To:	Mike O'Dowd MassDOT Project Manager	Date:	June 12, 2019
From:	Doug Johnson Howard Stein Hudson	HSH Project No.:	2013061.14
Subject:	Massachusetts Department of Transportation Allston Multimodal Project Task Force Meeting #38 Meeting Notes of May 23, 2019		

Overview

On May 23, 2019, members of the Allston I-90 Interchange Improvement Project team and associated MassDOT staff held the 38th Task Force meeting for the project. The Task Force is composed of local residents, business owners, transportation, and open space advocates, as well as representatives of local and state agencies. The purpose of the group is, through the application of its members' in-depth knowledge, to assist and advise the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) in determining a single preferred alternative to be selected by the Secretary of Transportation for documentation in a Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) document.

At this Task Force meeting, members of the project team presented an updated construction staging schematic that includes building a temporary structure in the Charles River to accommodate four travel lanes of Soldier's Field Road (SFR) as well as the Paul Dudley White Path (PDW). Rich Lenox of WSP presented staging schematics for both SFR over I-90 Westbound and SFR over I-90 Eastbound (the two options within the Modified Hybrid Alternative).

Following the presentation on construction staging, Mark Fobert of Tetra Tech presented a flow chart depicting the MEPA and NEPA processes that the project is undertaking. He outlined the parallel, but separate processes, and gave an overview of the anticipated schedule of each project.

An animation was then played for meeting attendees showing the final condition of both options of the Modified Hybrid Alternative. Task Force members expressed appreciation to the project team for providing the animation and accompanying renderings, and after approximately 45 minutes of

viewing the animation from different perspectives and angles, the meeting was concluded with a round of applause from meeting attendees. Selected still images from the video are available at https://www.mass.gov/files/documents/2019/06/19/dot-allstonTaskForce_052319.pdf.

Agenda

I. Welcome & Opening Remarks	2
II. Presentation	5

Detailed Meeting Minutes¹

Welcome & Opening Remarks

C: Ed Ionata: Hi everyone and welcome. I'm Ed Ionata from Tetra Tech. We have a pretty full agenda this evening. We are going to discuss additional Westbound versus Eastbound Soldiers' Field Road (SFR) staging details building off of what you saw at the last meeting. We'll also be looking at the potential temporary structure in the river to ease constructability. We will also have a quick update on the MEPA process and permitting. There have been a number of internal meetings since the last Task Force Meeting. Also, we have some renderings and visualizations of the Westbound and Eastbound Soldiers Field Road Viaduct design concepts to show you. So it's a reasonably full agenda. We'll start with Rich Lenox on staging.

C: Rich Lenox: Thanks Ed. Good evening, I'm Rich Lenox with WSP. I'm going to give an update tonight on the ongoing study of the Throat area staging, and we're going to talk about a potential new concept that was born out of the findings and challenges that were identified in the staging concept that Jim Keller outlined at the last meeting.

So, at the last meeting, Jim did a good job of identifying some of the challenges that we think require further study from the staging concept that was outlined at the last meeting, including providing space for a temporary Paul Dudley White Path (PDW), providing space for work zones, and impacts to the Worcester Commuter Rail line. Also, taking a look at transitions at each end of the Throat. Some big questions are "How do we transition at each end?", "How do we switch

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

from stage to stage?”, and “What are the temporary alignments, the horizontal and vertical geometry?”

In addition, one of the things we talked about last time, is that one of the key challenges is how to maintain all modes of transportation in each stage. One bullet on this slide that I wanted to highlight and clarify is the fourth bullet. Last month when we talked about the staging concepts and a potential single track on the Worcester Commuter Rail line, we’re talking about having a single track on only one section, not the entire line. It would be roughly from Boston Landing to Commonwealth Avenue; just that segment.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: Imagine if you said, “We’re going to maintain six lanes on I-90 except for 200 feet where we’re going to take it down to a single lane in each direction.” The length is immaterial to the definition of capacity. It doesn’t make sense whether the single track was 1000 ft or 2000 ft long. Is there anyone on your team who hasn’t heard a clear message that two tracks should be provided, at least during rush hour on weekdays? Why would you even show that bullet? Why can’t we just make this easy and say there are going to be two tracks? Rush hour on weekdays is when it’s needed the most. We all understand that there needs to be flexibility and that it might be a single track on maybe nights and weekends for example.

A: Rich Lenox: That’s our objective in our concept. That’s the goal we’re striving towards, to maintain two tracks when possible.

Q: Ed Ionata: Mike just arrived, so I’ll restate Glen’s question. The potential rail closure is only for a limited length. Glen is stating that if there is a limitation, it doesn’t matter how long it is, a loss is a loss. So, the question is why do we show that bullet in the slide?

A: Mike O’Dowd: Good evening everyone. First I’ll address how we came to the conclusion that a single track would work between these two defined points. One is due to the fact that we currently have an interlocking system at Interlocking or switch CP3, which was rehabilitated under the Commonwealth Avenue project, due to the fact that during that project they had to go down to a single track during some periods. Interlock Number 4, also referred to as CP4, which exited just east of where Boston Landing currently sits, was decommissioned temporarily as part of the construction of Boston Landing. CP4 was then recreated just west of Boston Landing.

One thing I’ve been coordinating with Rail Operations is determining, in the event that we did need to go down to a single track operation for this project, the ideal way to maintain two tracks throughout a maximum portion of the area, and then if necessary have a single track in a short area through the project area only. I’m also coordinating with them to determine the impacts to

operations for the services that are currently out there. As you know, a few years ago, there was only a single track operation. With the implementation of Boston Landing and more frequent service being offered on the line, we're using two-track service more frequently. So we're looking at what the ideal case would be if we did need to go to a single track operation, in order to minimize potential delays. The answer from the Rail Operations group was to reinstate CP4 east of Boston Landing, that way Boston Landing keeps functioning with two tracks. East of Commonwealth Avenue, we'd maintain two tracks as well. We're looking at what the delay would be in the rare event that two trains are trying to use that section of single track at the same time, and how to manage that. So that's how we got to this solution, by working with our Rail Operations group to determine the best and most efficient way to manage having a single track operation.

C: Glen Berkowitz: So Mike, we can take a vote of people in the room but my general sense is that most people think two tracks during weekdays should be provided in this project.

A: Mike O'Dowd: That doesn't need to go to a vote. Obviously it's something that if we can find a way to do that, during as much of the project as possible, we'd want to do that. That's one of the things we're going to touch base on tonight. We're looking at how we can do that. We want to accommodate two tracks through the project area for as many stages for as long as we possibly can. It forces me to place some assignment on the team to figure it out and determine what it would take to do it, how could we do it, and what are the potential impacts to other resources as a result of doing it. One thing we will see this evening is we started looking at the possibility of utilizing some waterway, as an opportunity to find out if it would give us some flexibility for travel lanes, the PDW Path, as well as being able to stretch out the times we could have two track service. So there are a number of things that I have tasked the team with identifying and analyzing. We may come up with some ideas, and people on the Task Force may come up with their own ideas, but ultimately we need to find a way to permit this, and have the permitting agencies agree with our approach to building it.

As a matter of fact, once we go into design-build, there will be a number of firms out there with their own, new ideas. Our goal right now is to permit something that would allow a Design-Build entity to come in and, working within the constraints of permitting, move forward into construction. So we don't need to go to a vote to determine whether the public interest is to maintain two tracks during all stages of construction. We know that, and to the extent that we'll be able to do that, that remains to be seen, but fortunately we're starting early enough in the process to make sure that a year from now or two years from now we'll be in a better position to be able to address that.

C: Ed Ionata: To blast ahead a little bit, Rich will get to the point where there is, at least right now, a possible solution that minimizes the time period when there is a single track. And he'll tell you why there is a need to have some periods of single track in our current concept.

A: Rich Lenox: I think that remains to be seen as it's something we're working through.

C: Ed Ionata: Let's go through the presentation and hash everything out at the end.

Presentation

C: Rich Lenox: So this is the next iteration of the concept that we've worked through. Jim walked through a number of challenges resulting from the lack of space in the Throat while trying to avoid impacts to the river. One of the big takeaways was that even with us trying to do our best, there is still going to be some temporary projection into the river. So with that understanding, we looked at a concept that has more temporary impacts to the river to see if it would help solve some of the challenges and issues that have been identified, such as providing space for a temporary PDW Path, better work zones, facilitating utility relocations, minimizing train disruptions, etc. So the alternative I'll show now, is again only focused on the narrowest section of the throat. This scheme will basically consist of temporary construction from north to south and relocating all facilities temporarily to the north. Once we have that accomplished, we then reconstruct the permanent infrastructure from the south to north.

So the first phase will be to construct a temporary trestle structure to accommodate the temporary PDW path and both directions of SFR at some location off the bank of the river. Once we have that accomplished, we'll then construct a temporary, at-grade Westbound I-90, as well as column foundations of the boat section/viaduct. At this point there is really no difference for the two options right now (SFR over I-90 Westbound or Eastbound). As you'll notice here too, I-90 goes into the river a little. So with this particular concept, there is a slight impact to the riverbank in the narrowest portion to accommodate this. Once we have Westbound I-90 at-grade, we can then demolish part of the viaduct and build a temporary Eastbound I-90 at-grade. Once we've done that then we can demolish the rest of the viaduct. At that time we can look to construct a temporary one or two track corridor for the Worcester Main Line. The challenge with that is the further you go to the north with that temporary line, the harder it is to tie back in at the Commonwealth Avenue end, so we're looking to see how that works. It's a longitudinal geometric issue.

So now everything is temporary, we move south to north to build permanent structures. We start with the two tracks for the Worcester Main Line, then we construct the boat section for I-90

Eastbound and the retaining wall and retained fill for the Grand Junction Line. Then we build the permanent I-90 Westbound, move traffic into the new position, then complete the I-90 boat section and the SFR Viaduct. Then we would complete the green space and restore the riverbank. So it's a north to south sequence and then a south to north sequence. That was for SFR over I-90 Westbound.

Now I'll show you SFR over I-90 Eastbound. It's basically the same. The first stage is a temporary structure over the river, then we build a temporary I-90 Westbound, demolish the viaduct, and build a temporary Worcester Main Line. Then we go south to north with permanent construction, build the new viaduct, then complete boat section, and move everything to its final condition. So that's sort of the sequence in a nut shell. Any questions?

Q: Jessica Mink: How long will the path be totally gone?

A: Rich Lenox: In this concept, never. It's always open. That's one big benefit of this.

Q: Bob Sloan: The first action you have to take is moving the sewers. Do you have to extend the outfalls temporarily as well? I believe there are 15 of them.

A: Rich Lenox: That depends on the location of the temporary structures. On this slide we put "Distance to be determined" because we haven't gotten that far in the process yet. If the structure in the river is far enough out that we're not really disturbing the bank itself, then we might not have to extend the outfalls. That will be complicated by the temporary I-90 Westbound structure, but that would only impact the river bank for a short length.

C: Mike O'Dowd: You do bring up a good point Bob. A significant portion of the first phase of construction is relocating the MWRA sewer line, Boston Water & Sewer Commission (BWSC) storm drain, water mains, recreating a pump station to replace the existing pump station, potentially building a new syphon chamber for the BWSC storm drain, etc. So that first action exists where the PDW Path and SFR Westbound currently exists. So represents a challenge, to maintaining a principle that was identified in 2014 when we all started meeting, that of maintaining SFR traffic and I-90 traffic in three lanes in each direction in each phase. Recognizing that with the announcement of the preferred alternative by the secretary in January, and I clearly communicated this to her so it's not news to her, there are challenges associated with honoring the commitments to do up to this point, and now trying to address all of these utility relocations that had not been anticipated at that point back when we all first met. I think you bring up a good point that obviously we need to maintain connectivity for the PDW path. I think in one alternative in the DEIR we had a phase where we relocate all path users

over to Memorial Drive. We on the project team even feel that is an inconvenience that is too much to ask. So we're focusing on figuring out how we can do all of the things that we've been communicating for the past five years, and we don't take it lightly, but unfortunately it may mean coming off the banks of the river and going into the river.

C: Tom Nally: Each one of these concepts has pros and cons. It would be very helpful to us to see a summary comparison of them so we can weigh them.

A: Mike O'Dowd: That's a good idea.

Q: Bill Deignan: I have two questions. First, about how wide is the structure in the river? Also, when you get to the final condition, you show the path on land in the narrowest section. Does that mean you've eliminated the possibility of having a permanent path in the river in the final condition?

A: Mike O'Dowd: One of the reasons the Secretary chose this alternative was to stay out of the river as much as possible, whether temporarily or in the final condition. We've been saying for four years that we need to stay out of the river. Now the process has taken us to the point where we are at this evening where we are saying it may be acceptable to have a temporary impact in order to maintain all transportation needs, minimize and reduce construction impacts as much as possible, and still ultimately provide what everyone in this room has been asking for, which is a greater public park space along the PDW path, without permanent impacts to the river. So to answer your question, the idea is that there will be no permanent impacts into the river while still providing the most recreational space possible.

C: Bill Deignan: I didn't ask for there not to be any permanent impacts to the river. I don't think we as a Task Force ever said that we don't want to see permanent impacts to the river. Maybe some people did but I wouldn't characterize the Task Force's position that way.

C: Jessica Robertson: One of the things that we brought up in the discussion last month is that with these concepts we potentially have 10 years of temporary impacts. That's a stretch of the word temporary. Those may be unavoidable, but they are serious impacts that trigger mitigation, which means that the end state of the riverbank or park should be better than it is today. In the opinion of many of us, better means a different type of shoreline that has better habitat and vegetation and more space for walking and biking and all of these things, including being wider than it is now. We had this discussion at the last meeting, and we asked you and the team to think about what that final condition would be, and I thought the answer that we got was that you were going to think about it.

- A: Mike O'Dowd:** It's a major discussion point, and obviously it's not something that can be determined tonight, especially since we still have a couple years of project development and environmental documentation ahead of us, but you bring up a good point. The discussion is now becoming one about how this could be undertaken from a construction standpoint. What the final condition will look like is a different discussion, and we won't conclude that discussion this evening, but we can talk about it as we progress forward. Right now though, what I can tell you is that there is still no appetite from the DOT to arbitrarily say we're going to permanently fill part of the river, but you bring up a good point that that may constitute mitigation. I'm not in a position to say one way or another, but I do think it is something that will come up and we will discuss as we go forward.
- C: Jessica Robertson:** The reason the Secretary chose this alternative was to avoid and minimize impacts, but that ship has sailed. We haven't avoided or minimized impacts to the river. So now we need to move on to mitigation and stop pretending that we can avoid impacts.
- A: Mike O'Dowd:** You were here last month when folks from the FHWA were here talking about the NEPA process. We need to comply with MEPA and NEPA. So, we can't arbitrarily say that ship has sailed. Avoiding and minimizing impacts is something that we're still working through as we advance through to the FEIR and Notice of Intent for the DEIS in 2021. We can't say that ship has sailed. We're on that ship right now, and it's going to continue to sail for the next couple of years.
- C: Jessica Robertson:** We should have an answer for what the mitigation looks like, and what the final condition will be. Alternatives will be evaluated in all of those documents, and one should include a better riverbank.
- A: Mike O'Dowd:** Mitigation will be a key theme in those documents. So a lot of those decisions will be made here by this Task Force as it continues to meet on a monthly or quarterly basis. This is a long process.
- Q: Jack Wofford:** If you can come up with a permanent plan, the FHWA may look at the total package differently if you have a permanent solution that will be in place for the next 50 or more years. Isn't this the time to take a look at those options, in a realistic way? Is there a way for the project to meet its temporary construction needs while still ending up with a permanent condition that people can really celebrate? This is the time to do sketch planning to look at that. If we could get into that approach we'd appreciate it.

A: Mike O'Dowd: Good point Jack. We have our landscape architects from CSS here. One of the things we'll have them look at is what constitutes "bank restoration", as many people have asked for. Maybe it looks like what this particular team did on the Cambridge side of the river along Memorial Drive. We'll keep working on this and developing schemes. We'll keep working with the public and talking to agencies like DCR. Ultimately this is their resource that we're disrupting temporarily. So we'll continue to work on this.

Q: Steve Kaiser: What's the length of the temporary SFR structure out in the river?

A: Rich Lenox: It's essentially the length of the throat, about 2000 feet. We're taking a look at what would be the best alignments and transitions. In terms of width, it will be four lanes for SFR plus the PDW path. The type of structure will determine the exact width.

C: Steve Kaiser: When it comes to figuring out the cost, you have to figure out the cost of the whole structure, the cost to construct it, and the mitigation for it. remove it to cost the whole thing and mitigation.

C: Mike O'Dowd: We'll have to price it out.

C: Fred Salvucci: I have a few comments. First, I think this is terrific progress. I've been asking for constructability analysis for maybe four years. Your engineers have looked at it, and the only way you've found to do this, without unacceptable disruptions to transportation, is by going into the river. That ship has sailed. Space is finite. A decision needs to be made clearly by MassDOT that it's not possible to do this without going into the river to some amount. That is established. Second, once that's established, the ship has sailed, then there are a couple of other things that happen. There may be some environmental impacts from that filling of the edge of the river. I don't know what habitat is there, but if it is inevitable that fill happens, you have to document that, and even if you restore it at the end, what was there now is still gone. Maybe you put it back to the way it was, but the decision has to be made clearly, so that you can make progress on this. That's my main point. I like this a lot, but I think the Secretary has to say that this has been decided, and make it clear. Then you do have to see what those disruptions are in the short term, for no other reason than, if you want to restore something, you have to know what you're disrupting. That work needs to be done, but the ship has sailed. The consequence of losing the turnpike, even slowly by restricting truck traffic for example if it's no longer safe, you've said for years it's in bad shape and can't go on forever, so there are consequences of a failure of the turnpike, and there are consequences of going down to one track. That's an environmental impact if you try to put those commuters back onto one track. You can walk and chew gum at the

same time. So there needs to be a documentation of why the ship has sailed, and of why this project is absolutely necessary. So that's the first thing I wanted to say.

Second, when you have the temporary six lane turnpike and you go to the permanent eight lane turnpike, that dimension grows. Given how tight it is in the throat, you might have to relocate the MWRA line first. Those eight lanes, even 4 at a time, is a clumsy things to build. So that's complicated. If you think of this, you have 6 temporary lanes, then you tear down the viaduct, that seems to me to be an opportunity for West Station to be an early action. Then the construction of the permanent highway can be last thing you do. Another thing, I don't disagree with Jack: people want the details of that end state. You don't want to delay the day when you can replace the viaduct. Do that as quickly as possible so that you don't have to worry about a catastrophe happening. You could do a 2 phase path, and live for a while with 6 lanes on I-90, which allows for space for the MWRA line before you place the PDW on top or whatever. There is an opportunity here to deal with public safety issue. Take the time to figure it out. You're onto something that can succeed in many ways and I'm very happy with the direction you're going in. There will be time for people to get their heads around it.

Lastly, if the temporary SFR and PDW are only temporary, it maybe that they can be located lower and closer to the river level. You wouldn't want it to be lower than it is today because an unusual rainfalls could cause you to lose the road, but maybe if it's temporary it doesn't matter, so maybe it will need less fill and therefore less complexity. Anyway, good work.

C: Mike O'Dowd: Thanks for your comments, Fred.

Q: Tad Read: I agree with this idea that going into the river is compelling. It wasn't even 6 months ago that we were avoiding impacts to the river at all cost, so I'm trying to understand why we think this will pass muster, whereas going into the river permanently wouldn't. Is the difference that great? Will this succeed? Also, do we know how much this will raise the cost of the project?

A: Rich Lenox: We don't have a price yet.

A: Mike O'Dowd: I agree with you that sometimes adding temporary structures raises costs. The North Washington Street Bridge for example, we looked at the potential impacts on parks, on the river, and we looked at the cost differential, lifecycle cost, etc. We decided to find a way to build that bridge in place. Then JF White proposed a temporary bridge, and they bid it for within a few percentage points of what we had actually priced the project at. So my point is, sometimes contractors calculate their costs differently than designers. They may save time by doing it that way, which will in essence save us money. So we can't quantify that here. Regarding the

encroachment issue, 6 months ago, in December 2018, we weren't even considering the Hybrid Alternative. In January the Hybrid Alternative was selected. The Secretary hired the Independent Review Team and after several months they came up with something that is similar to what you're seeing today. Now it is our task to figure out how to build it, so that's why we are where we are now. We feel this is one of the most optimal ways of constructing this alternative.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: Can you go back two slides? So, if I understand it, the blue area is in operation, right? So, it looks to me like, this is the first time in 5 years, that you're showing a construction staging that goes not involve temporary reposting of the columns holding up the old viaduct. There would no longer be vehicles on the viaduct, so there is no longer a need to do temporary reposting of the columns. Is that correct? It is very expensive to do temporary repostings, and it's time consuming and difficult, I believe.

A: Rich Lenox: There will have to be some temporary postings. It will be fewer than there would have been, but we will still need some. When the viaduct is half demolished, there will still be vehicles on the other half, but there are a lot less temporary postings that there would have been.

Q: Ed Ionata: A temporary trestle doesn't seem like budget buster right?

A: Mike O'Dowd: We haven't priced it yet. I met with some of the regulatory agencies today. One thing I pointed out, is over the last 10 years, MassDOT has undertaken quite a few large projects, all of which were in waterways that were context and environmentally sensitive. In many instances, we've put temporary structures out there whether that be for construction purposes or purposes of maintaining transportation. This isn't really any different from the Fore River, the Kenneth F. Burns Bridge, Westfield Great River, and University Avenue in Lowell. There are others: the Merrimack River, Mount Hope Bay, or North Washington Street in Boston. My point is, sometimes it is beneficial, even from an environmental standpoint, if it means we will shorten the timeframe of the impact, to do this. Maybe it isn't always for temporary traffic. In some instances it's to facilitate construction, so it could be for staging areas for instance. That was the first time it had been presented to them for this project because it had never shown up in a DEIR. So now they have to take it into consideration. As Tom pointed out, now we have to say what the pros and cons are so we can get the support of regulatory agencies.

C: Galen Mook: Thanks for having the path there for all of construction. Kudos.

C: Fred Salvucci: I just want to follow what you just said Mike regarding permitting agencies. There are the MEPA and NEPA processes, and then there is the ultimate permitting. Agencies

may not like this, so the answer may be no. That second process is where the biggest delays come. If the end state, if you think about the two phases approach I've been advocating for, if you can get rid of viaduct as fast as possible so that the concern of it failing is no longer hanging over us, that may be advantageous. It will take longer than we will like for permitting the end state, but most of the comments from the early process did make a big distinction between temporary and permanent impacts. So that can work in your favor. Don't rush the agencies and the people who will care about the end state. Separate getting rid of the viaduct and creating the end state.

C: Ed Ionata: One thing that will help, when we get into the federal decision pathway, at least the federal agencies are committed to issuing a permit after the Record Of Decision (ROD), but you have to do your homework up front to make that happen, of course. Mark will show you that timeline a bit later.

C: John Shields: You've mentioned "mitigate" 8 times. I'd rather we think larger, think about celebrating instead of mitigating. That opportunity is getting lost as we work through the mitigation discussion. You can make this a really special place. So let's think about celebration.

C: Mike O'Dowd: Thanks John.

C: Mark Fobert: Moving onto the next part of the presentation, this slide shows our process now. You can see this flow chart. We are now running two parallel but separate processes, MEPA and NEPA. We did the ENF and DEIR for MEPA. The next step is filing of the NPC in Winter 2019. That will include everything we've done so far. Then we get the Certificate in 2020. The process moves forward with the FEIR in Spring 2021. Then we go into state permitting in Fall 2021. You can see how it is staggered. Going through it this way, I think there is also more opportunities for public comments. We're working on agency coordination right now. The Notice of Intent which kicks off the NEPA process is being worked on right now. There will be a scoping report in 2021. Then we have the DEIS and FEIS in 2021, and then the federal permits are issued in Fall of 2021. We have the state process finishes a little earlier, because state agencies aren't beholden to issuing their permits within 90 days. Federal agencies have to issue permits within 90 days of the ROD, so we want to start the state process earlier. State agencies issue permits on their own timeline. But this shows how everything lines up.

Q: Pallavi Mande: Do you have to provide documentation of construction impacts in the Notice of Project Change and also corresponding mitigation?

A: Ed Ionata: There would be a description of construction impacts so that MEPA could scope correctly. So we might not have all of the analysis and details, square footage, things like that,

but we'd put in the NPC that there is temporary structure in the river with approximate dimensions. Then they'll ask for details about those impacts. The NPC has to give MEPA enough information about the Hybrid Alternative and update everything else so they can make sure the scope of the FEIR is proper.

C: Mark Fobert: That's it for that part of the presentation, now we'll move onto the renderings and animations.

C: Mike O'Dowd: You've asked for renderings to see how this will look. This is only for the final build, not for construction. We also have a quick video drive through of it. You've probably seen these on other projects. As we advance the project this will be updated. This is only for us to show you the final build. At the narrowest section, the width of the path is basically the same between the two alternatives. We'll show both videos and take a look at different views. We want to show this as best we can so you can see the two different options. This will be made public at some point, and this is just the start. We'll take this through the entire project so that we have an animation of the full interchange and project area.

C: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis: We'll make sure these renderings are Title VI compliant and we'll put it on the project website.

C: Ari Ofsevit: Having Harvard here to include their potential development in the model might be helpful. Also you should include West Station.

C: Mike O'Dowd: We'll include West Station, the layover yard, the Franklin Street bridge, everything. One DB entity for the whole job, several subs.

C: Ari Ofsevit: When this project starts, the video will help the public understand what's going on.

C: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis: I think that adjourns the meeting. The next meeting is June 20th.

[During the viewing of the animations, multiple views were shown and small group conversations concerning various elements of the animations took place. After the initial playing of the animation, many meeting attendees began to leave. At the formal conclusion of the meeting, the attendees remaining applauded.]

Next Steps

The next Task Force meeting will take place on June 20, 2019.

Appendix 1: Meeting Attendees

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Batchelor	George	MassDOT
Berkowitz	Glen	A Better City
Briones	Jorge	MBTA
Cabral Curtis	Nathaniel	Howard Stein Hudson
Cerbone	Jim	MassDOT
Connaughton	Mary	Pioneer Institute
Dailey	Donny	MassDOT
Deignan	Bill	City of Cambridge
Desrosier	Jason	Allston/Brighton CDC
Di Franco	Christopher	Cambridge Resident
D'Isidoro	Anthony	Allston Civic Association
Driessen	Guus	Town of Brookline
Ionata	Ed	Tetra Tech
Jasinski	Laura	Charles River Conservancy
Johnson	Doug	Howard Stein Hudson
Kaiser	Steve	
Landman	Wendy	WalkBoston
Leary	Elizabeth	Boston University
Lenox	Rich	WSP
Mande	Pallavi	Charles River Watershed Association
Mattison	Harry	Allston Resident
Miller	Ken	FHWA
Mink	Jessica	MassPaths
Mook	Galen	Allston Resident
Nally	Tom	A Better City

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Nave	Lee	
Newman	Conor	ONS
O'Dowd	Mike	MassDOT
Pollack	Travis	MAPC
Read	Tad	Boston Planning and Development Agency
Robertson	Jessica	Allston Resident
Robinson	Maria	MA House of Representatives
Rubin	Staci	Conservation Law Foundation
Salvucci	Fred	
Silveira	Steve	Boston University
Strysky	Alex	MEPA
Wofford	Jack	