MEMORANDUM

To:	Mike O'Dowd MassDOT Project Manager	Date:	August 26, 2019
From:	Doug Johnson Howard Stein Hudson	HSH Project No.:	2013061.14
Subject:	Massachusetts Department of Transportation Allston Multimodal Project Task Force Meeting #39 Meeting Notes of June 20, 2019		

Overview

On June 20, 2019, members of the Allston Multimodal Project team and associated MassDOT staff held the 39th Task Force meeting for the project. The Task Force is composed of local residents, business owners, transportation, and open space advocates, elected officials representing communities impacted by the project, 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 refining the preferred alternative selected by the Secretary of Transportation for documentation in a state Final Environmental Impact Report and in two federal documents: a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). Once the process associated with these environmental documents is completed, the project will be bid using a 25% design/build package which MassDOT will make available to interested general contractors.

At this Task Force meeting, three presentations were given. The first presentation was made by Kevin Casey, a representative of Harvard University. Mr. Casey's presentation covered the history of Harvard's involvement in the Allston I-90 Interchange Improvement Project, and the processes and discussions that underly the proposed West Station "flip" option that Harvard has proposed.

The second presentation was made by Mark Fobert of Tetra Tech. Mr. Fobert's presentation covered the analysis of Harvard's proposed West Station "flip" option, and a proposed conceptual design for West Station and the layover facility based on that analysis.

The final presentation was made by Jim Keller of Tetra Tech. Mr. Keller's presentation covered updated information since the last Task Force meeting regarding the potential construction staging for the project. The presentation focused on the "Throat" area of the project and how construction may be carried out using a temporary bridge structure in the Charles River to carry Soldiers Field Road and the Paul Dudley White Path.

Discussion and Q&A were carried out concurrently with each presentation throughout the course of the meeting.

Agenda

Detailed Meeting Minutes[1]

Presentation by Kevin Casey

C: Ed Ionata: Welcome everyone and thanks for coming. I'm Ed Ionata from Tetra Tech. There are some new faces in the room so let's do a round of introductions. We also ask that you please identify yourself when you make comments.

Before we get started, I have an announcement here from Allston Village Main Streets that I will read: "The Allston Village Main Streets Board of Directors announces Emma Walters' departure as Executive Director of Allston Village Main Streets, effective July 17, 2019. Emma played a pivotal role in the growth, development, and sustainability of AVMS during a transformative time in Allston Village. We will miss her and her leadership but wish her luck as she moves on to pursue a master's degree in urban planning.

[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.

Emma has held numerous roles at Allston Village Main Streets over the past 5 years; first as Farmer's Market Manager in 2014, Farmer's Market Committee member 2014 - 2015, Interim Executive Director in early 2016, and Executive Director of the organization from 2016 - 2019.

We want to thank Emma for her 5 years of dedication and service to AVMS and the Allston community." If Emma attends the meeting tonight, I'll acknowledge her when she arrives.

I know there was some confusion about tonight's agenda due to what appeared on the website long ago versus what was distributed to the Task Force, but tonight we'll talk about the West Station flip analysis. First, we'll have a presentation by Kevin from Harvard University, and then a presentation by Mark Shaman of VHB, then some addition information on construction staging and finally we'll open it up to discussion. Now I'll turn it over to Kevin Casey, Senior Advisor for Harvard.

C: **Kevin Casey:** Thank you Ed and thank you for the opportunity to speak. I'm Harvard University's point person for the project and I've been managing the public process for Harvard relative to this project. I've also been a point person for the team managing the negotiations with CSX and others about the rail yard for the last fifteen years. I think I was asked to speak tonight by the MassDOT team because we're here to talk about the flip option and the ongoing discussions with many of you and the Secretary and others, about how the flip would operate. I think the Secretary has concluded as to how she'd like to proceed with the flip. The flip is an option that Harvard designed. My colleague Joe created the idea. I'll also provide some background about Harvard's' involvement in the evolution of the project, as context for how we got to where we are now with the flip.

This slide shows the condition of the railyard in 2010. It was a fully operational railyard that was run by CSX. Harvard had purchased the underlying fee interest in the land from the Turnpike Authority in 2002-2003, but CSX maintained the right to continue their operations in perpetuity, so that meant Harvard had to engage with them to determine what it would take to move their operations elsewhere. I was a part of that team, and we came to an agreement in 2009. They've now accomplished those steps. It's important because you can see the viaduct, which needs to be addressed and was a focus of the Patrick administration before the current administration, is next to the rail yard. If they were constructing this project today with the rail yard in this condition, maintaining CSX operations would be a huge issue for construction. There would have been an issue of not having enough space to accomplish everything. In 2015 on the north side of Cambridge Street, and in 2016 on the south side, Harvard accomplished the "yield-up" of CSX of their rights. They had done the necessary remediation, removed all of the

structures, and created the current condition. Most recently, just last year, in what we call Area B, Harvard executed the last closing with CSX, to purchase the last easement rights. That is important to the project we're talking about tonight because it allowed for further movement of Soldiers Field Road in this project. This creates a lot of space to consider the project. Both the previous and current administrations envisioned, at the urging of many of you and others, a more expansive concept of what could be done rather than simply repair-in-place the viaduct, and an opportunity to correct decades of impediments to circulation in this area and actually improve, for future generations, what is there.

Before there was any project at all, Harvard and the State negotiated a non-binding set of principles that would govern elements of the project that, if they were delivered, the State could rely on Harvard to execute land transactions that would result in them having access to the land to build the project, at no cost to the Commonwealth. Those land transactions would give access to all the land for staging, layup and laydown that would be necessary to do the project. Some of you will be familiar with this, I presented it to the Task Force in 2015, but the key elements of those shared objectives or high-level goals are, there would be a straighter I-90, an urban street grid, an at-grade Cambridge Street, and a multi-use path for pedestrians and cyclists that would connect Soldiers Field Road to Cambridge Street. It also spoke of West Station, which at the time had not been a part of the project yet, but Harvard and many of you were pushing for its integration. We envisioned it would be 2 platforms and 4 tracks. That was so you could continue on the commuter rail into South Station but there would also be tracks that would serve the Grand Junction Line to North Station eventually, but especially to Kendal Square. There was also a layover facility. These are the pieces of the puzzle that had to fit into the space, in addition to the removal of the existing leftover "spaghetti" interchange that would need to be removed when the new street grid is put in. Perhaps the most important language to Harvard in the LOI, and for placemaking in general, is this clause which talks about the development in the area that's left behind, both on the Terra firma and on air rights, needs to be technologically feasible and economically viable. That was language to try to guard against what we see all across the city which is air rights opportunities that are not viable because they are so complicated by what's going on underneath the air rights that it's prohibitively expensive for developers to contemplate the project. We wanted to plan for future development on air rights and on the terra firma at the start and try to minimize the idea that these would not get done at some point over time.

The 3K design was emerging around this time, and we and others raised some concerns about the feasibility and viability issue. The railyard in the 3K-4 design was a 22-acre layover facility. What happened when you had that piece take up so much room in the crescent was it bowed the

main line highway out, significantly reducing the distance between Cambridge Street and the West station, so that these streets had to have a steep incline to get up and over the highway and get to West station. That created all kinds of mobility and difficult terra firma conditions for placemaking there. A lot of you will remember this because this was raised in the City of Boston placemaking study with the Cecil Group. Many of you have identified these as key issues of concern in what would be left behind by the project in terms of development.

So we talked to the Secretary about it, and at some point she, before the DEIR was filed, agreed to shrink the size of the rail yard to an area that they have an easement for with the right to utilize four tracks for main line traffic and eight tracks for layover. MassDOT then developed what was called the refined 3K-4 plan. This plan had a number of ways to utilize the new space, including other significant improvements to the plan. Shrinking the rail yard allows you to straighten the turn pike a little bit more, I think by about a hundred feet.

The highway was moved to the south, creating a longer distance and shorter, less steep inclines for the streets connecting to West station and a better terra firma condition here. So future developments have more stuff on the ground with better placemaking opportunities for urban design and less in the air. This would allow for more feasible, more viable air rights as well. So, this was a significant improvement both in the development opportunities and placemaking, but also in the condition of Soldiers Field Road at this time.

Houghton Chemical and Harvard negotiated the relinquishing of the rights to rail spur, which allowed us to give more room to move SFR west, creating more parkland and the first river connection for pedestrians and cyclists. Admittedly, it wasn't ideal with all intersections you have to cross, but it is at-grade access. It also created about five new acres of parkland on the river, which helps with the 4f permitting problem, and creates great opportunities for connections to the river. It really was the first opportunity to make that Cambridge Street to Soldiers Field Road to the river connection and many other of these benefits that folks had identified before. Joe and we began to look at this space to see if there were ways to use the geography in ways that could continue to think about the connection to the green space and the operation of West station and we began to think about what became known as the flip. It basically was sort of simple in the initial idea, which was that by putting this straight element near the highway, you were kind of wasting space here at the top.

If you put west station to the top here, maybe there's some room here at the bottom that you could utilize and maybe create a protected green space at the southern edge that's missing currently in the project. And it would be an enhanced component. So really what the flip is, is a

two-piece new element to try to better utilize the space and also correct a couple of other deficiencies in the DEIR. There's the green space element made possible by the better use of the geography here. There's also an improved condition for West Station. The positioning of West Station in the DEIR, as it continued to be looked at in terms of how it would operate, began to reveal deficiencies when you looked at things like the elevators and staircases and the vertical elements in the station.

Thinking outside of West Station itself, what happened was you would be unable to create a Cambridge Street bypass road that could provide access to potential placemaking parcels, really in some of the best locations, right at West Station. There would be no place to open the door, basically on buildings that you would create there. So, we began to raise questions about West Station in the DEIR positioning and wanted to move it to the north so that you could get expanded bus opportunities as well as remove the impediment to a fully connected Cambridge Street bypass road. This became a key element for Harvard in alignment with the principles referenced in the LOI. The DEIR location creates infeasible, economically non-viable air rights for a good portion of the area, over the rail yard and right at the place where West station is.

You can expand bus service in the DEIR, but it's a little bit more difficult and trickier than in the repositioned West station that Joe had designed. We feel that we've received a real fair airing with Secretary Pollack and her team. We've met with many of you too, to describe what our thoughts are on the project. Mark and Chris and others presented here at the task force, I don't know, three or four meetings ago on it. The secretary's concerns have been, I won't speak for the team, but she had raised with us issues about operations in the rail yard with a reduced number of tracks coming through. She had questions about operations, train speeds, and other logistics in the flip due to the arc of the tracks, reliability and on-time arrival for Commuter Rail Service.

We also were sort of pleasantly surprised and assured by the Secretary that one of the other elements in our LOI was an element that was important to her, which was the purpose of the four track, two platforms in Harvard's LOI, which was to service the Grand Junction Railroad. So, I think what we're going to hear from Mark in their plan, there's a three-track service out of West Station to the north. We have a concern that those three tracks may not provide as much service to Grand Junction Railroad to Kendall Square and North Station as would be desired in the future.

The secretary has asked her team to review and provide assurance that the service that people envision can be delivered with the currently proposed West Station. That's one study that Harvard continues to feel is critical as we look forward. We also think that the study that the

secretary laid out in her January 10th letter on the throat option, where she asked her team to look at the viability of moving West Station sooner in the process and as early as before the end of construction, folds into this. Because if you're going to move West Station in sooner, that means that you're not contemplating phase two of the DEIR, which is expansion of the layover rail facility prior to West Station being introduced. That's been a major issue that Harvard has put a focus on. We think that's not a good idea. We would like that to be revisited.

We think our investigation puts that on the table and it puts the layover facility on the table as did her language suggesting that interim layover capacity is going to be necessary when a service to the Somerville facility is shut off during part of the construction period. So, we feel that these studies that the secretary has asked her team to do are very important considerations in the final determinations on these things. They relate to all of the pieces that have to fit into this small geography and to, in order to provide space for all of them, she has already made some concessions that have delivered a lot of it and we hope that the continuation of the discussion will come forward. So I appreciate the opportunity to just give you that kind of background on Harvard's evolution of involvement in this, the things that are meaningful to us, the many significant improvements that have occurred in this project over the evolution of all the work that you all have done over these years, actually of these several years, and we look forward to Mark and the team's presentation on the approach that's going to be actually taken for the flip as of right now.

Q: **Galen Mook:** Is it safe to assume that there hasn't been any updated signed contract or another LOI since September 25th, 2014?

A: **Kevin Casey:** No, there hasn't.

Q: **Glen Berkowitz:** Would you mind going back to the slide that had the LOI listing it? So, a couple of quick questions. Was there any timetable listed in the LOI as to when the new MBTA station would happen?

A: **Kevin Casey:** No.

C: **Galen Mook:** Except, I have it right here, it says "construction not later than 3 years from the signing of the letter and completion of construction 4 years after."

A: **Kevin Casey:** This is a, I call it a guidepost, because this is a nonbinding letter of intent. It represents the best judgments on the values that could be relied upon to deliver the land that Harvard would give in a transaction. To the credit of the Secretary, most of these provisions have

been honored over time and there's been some fluidity because for example, the layover facility in the letter of intent, it's pretty specific in terms of the layover capacity. It says 22 acres of layover, and that has been reduced significantly since then because of the interplay between that and the air rights viability and feasibility. There's a little fluidity, but it's when these items for us have played with each other in terms of delivering those outcomes.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: Two other quick questions. We all know Harvard announced you'd pay upwards of $58 million towards building West Station. Was there anything in the LOI that said if Harvard agrees to pay 50 something million, the state agrees to definitely build the station?

A: Kevin Casey: No, and there was nothing in the original LOI about a Harvard contribution. Shortly after, I think it was shortly after the LOI, we agreed to pay for a third of the cost of what was done, which was anticipated to be about $25 million. Then later, a couple of years ago, we upped that to $58 million, eight for a potential interim station, and $50 for the permanent station, which is more than half of what the estimate was in the DEIR for the total cost.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: This is a two-part question. Did this state know it was signing an LOI that said 50 mph instead of 79 mph and secondly, if they did sign 50 back then, do you know why they did?

A: Kevin Casey: They had to be aware of what they were signing back then. It wasn't an issue that really was discussed much in those tough discussions. It has come up more recently with desires to attain higher speeds and to make some improvements. As I understand it, it will allow for higher speeds that are currently able to be achieved because of conditions both to the west and to the east of this area.

Q: Bob Sloane: The Cambridge Street Bypass isn't mentioned here but seems to be integral when it wasn't before. Are we in agreement on that?

A: Kevin Casey: The Cambridge street bypass road in 3K-4 was something that Harvard introduced and said, if the layover yard was going to be of that scale, the only way you could think that air rights could be achievable would be to build the Cambridge Street bypass road because you would need a platform from which to access the air rights development. Even then it would still be extremely complicated. We hadn't done a total analysis on whether even with the Cambridge Street bypass road, those air rights would be economically viable and technologically feasible. But the secretary wasn't willing to accept and pay for the Cambridge Street bypass road, which has the added advantage also of diverting traffic from Cambridge Street for people who desire to go further to the east and to the West. I think there was something like four to 500

cars during the peak hours that would be diverted from Cambridge Street and help shrink some of the roads. So in the new alternative, the Cambridge Street bypass road, which becomes slightly less important for air rights development purposes because of the scale of the rail yard, still has the value for traffic diversion is included as a "by others", which would mean it would be part of future development opportunities.

Q: Bob Sloane: Is it included in the numbers analysis now?

A: Kevin Casey: It wasn't included in the DEIR nor was it included in the cost analysis because it's a "by others" amendment.

Q: Pallavi Mande: Can you speak to how this review process goes? Some of us at the Harvard and Allston Task Force meeting were made to understand that the Enterprise Research Campus (ERC) will be developed by 3rd party developer, will be kicking off soon. Can you talk to the timing of that and what kind of process it would go through and if it would have any interface with this Task Force?

A: Joe Beggan: It would go through a BPDA process.

A: Kevin Casey: The real estate they're paying attention to is the 14 acres approved in the Master Plan by the BPDA last year. That 14 acres was selected for a number of reasons, but partly because it's right on Western Avenue and nothing in there requires this project to be complete. We chose those to move forward while this is ongoing.

A: Joe Beggan: And it would also leave space for the work areas that the I-90 project is going to need. So that's another reason why the development is focused up on the northern part of Western Avenue.

Q: Pallavi Mande: The reason I was asking about timing for MEPA because the ERC wasn't in any shape or form when the DEIR was doing traffic analysis. So, the assumptions that were made for the ERC might have been very different. I'm wondering if what you're planning for the ERC will influence this.

A: Joe Beggan: I think it will be consistent between the no-build option vs. having the ERC. The MAPC is looking at that from a transportation standpoint.

Q: Jack Wofford: Kevin, can you show the impact on the Grand Junction Line connection in the two options?

A: Joe Beggan: These are diagrammatic, don't read them as plans. At the time, it was the DEIR option that had four tracks, but it's essentially the same with the flip. The Hybrid option goes from 4 tracks to 3 tracks in the station. One of the things the Secretary has asked the team to do is look at is the implications of that.

Q: David Loutzenheiser: You mentioned the advantages of the flip with the station for development. How do you plan to bridge the 14 travel lanes just north of the station? Does Harvard have any thoughts on that?

A: Joe Beggan: This discussion goes way back in terms of the highway configuration. The highway has enough room to maintain 3 lanes in each direction with a work zone so that you could put columns down in the middle of the highway or between the highway and the service road. That's why there's a shoulder there, unlike in the eastern end, to create the work zone there you'd have to remove a travel lane. Here you're able to eliminate the shoulder and shift over the travel lanes to create a work zone. We feel that creates the feasibility to build over the highway in this area. Frontage Road could be built over as well. Cattle and Seattle are rising up; in the new configuration there'd be a connection from Stadium. So, you're about to take advantage of different levels to build out over the highway as part of an air rights development. We were trying to think through how you could set this up so that kind of configuration could be built.

C: Fred Salvucci: There are a couple issues in your history. First, that was a terrific description of a complicated evolution. In 2008, when negotiations with CSX allowed the old freight yard to move, there were two other pieces. 1.) relocation of that yard to Worcester, which couldn't have happened without the enlightened self-interest of Worcester, because the state purchased the rights to run 2 tracks on the Worcester Line. Prior to that Worcester had been condemned to a single-track, resulting in the worst Commuter Rail service in the system. That part of that transaction, thanks to Worcester, Harvard, CSX, and the state, gave Worcester the second track, and the ensuing service improvements and higher ridership. That was an important piece of the progress. 2.) Among the good things about the Joe Beggan flip, which I wish I could claim credit for, is the bicycle path gets an unbroken run from the west of Cambridge Street, it's grade-separated under Cambridge, and it goes all the way to West Station before there's a traffic light, then all the way to the river. It's a dramatic improvement on the original agreement for the cycling/pedestrian path. Far superior, and the buffered park, which helps protect the South Allston community from the noise which already exists, and which become higher as the service increases and highway moves closer. It also provides the City of Boston with maintenance access for the underground storm drain which currently runs under the rail. There are multifaceted improvements that Joe's concept put on the table for third parties like the City, neighbors to the

south, and others. It delivers on the intent of the LOI. Those are important benchmarks in that evolution, and I wanted to make sure the new people here knew about this history.

C: **Glen Berkowitz:** To echo and emphasize the point Fred made what's green was going to be about 35' with plenty of room for a separated cycling and pedestrian path that went west to east. At ABC, when we kept advocating for the at-grade scenario through DEIR, we in part did that because it provides much easier ability for a non-motorized connection at Agganis, just off to the right of this slide. We felt it was a phenomenal one-two punch to connect to, I'll call it the "Joe Beggan Linear Park".

C: **Tom Nally:** Further to that, you can go further west, follow the Lincoln Street Bridge, include a bicycle path on Lincoln Street and go very far west, and cross over the proposed bike/ped path all the way to the river. So you can get a very long benefit for cyclists especially.

C: **Glen Berkowtiz:** Just to tie the ribbon on that, when the Secretary made her decision in January, one of her justifications for choosing a highway at-grade option was in fact the ability to provide that pedestrian connection at Agganis Way. Many of us were hoping that what's shown on this slide was going to include that and it would stay alive and it would be a beautiful tie in with her decision to choose the highway at-grade. So, you could go in this green space here, go across at the Agganis bike/ped connection and boom, you're right at the Charles.

C: **Kevin Casey:** Maybe this is a good point to hand the presentation over to Mark to talk about the actual decision. I want to wrap up by saying the way we do view this is Harvard proposed this with these two components to a plan that didn't have either, and the Secretary as I understand it is going to be adopting one of them with the proviso that they review its ability to deliver on Grand Junction connections. We applaud that new addition to the conversation, and we look forward to trying to see other ways to continue the search for the right kind of green space connections.

Presentation by Mark Shamon

C: **Mark Shamon:** My presentation doesn't hit on what Kevin just presented, it's more about what the modified flip looks like. When the flip was initially presented 3 or 4 months ago, it wasn't too positive. I think there were 14 negatives from a rail operations perspective. We have had quite a few conversations with Harvard and the Secretary, and folks with MBTA Railroad Operations. We've tried to come to some reasonable compromise through that process.

There were a number of issues that we had with the original flip concept. Again, I'm not going to go into that tonight, but I can say that as Kevin and Joe have mentioned, they put a lot of work into trying to overcome a lot of the concerns that the MBTA had from an operational point of view. We do think that they've, we've come a long way. We've got to the point where we think we could come up with a compromise that satisfies the overall public and that includes the people coming in from Worcester as well as the MBTA operations who want to be able to use the rail yard effectively, both from a layover point of view and also to get trains back and forth over to the grand junction and to the Boston Engine Terminal (BET) that's in Somerville.

I think Joe and Kevin submitted eight or nine different options on railroad layouts between the time I last spoke to you and where we are today. As I mentioned, we did express a lot of concerns on the flip. They created multiple refinements and we've had some conversation with the secretary and Harvard in the room and we've come to this idea of a modified flip. It has not been agreed to yet. So, I don't want to overstate what the Secretary has directed us or, agreed to or concluded, but we've come to a point where at least we have some agreement between the parties on something that might work for everybody, both from the Harvard and MassDOT team.

This is a quick overview of the modified flip option. It looks like this. I'll get into more detail on other slides and zoom in, but overall what we're talking about in this modified flip option is two express tracks that actually go right through the yard area, and maintaining a tangent set of track from roughly the turn at the end of Babcock Street all the way to Market Street. As a result, it becomes a very long straight set of tracks where we can get a high rate of speed. Right now, the limit is 79 miles an hour. It's more by rule. You actually could go a lot faster than that if they upgraded the class of the track. It also has, as Kevin mentioned, it's got the tracks that are coming up to the top. I'll present that again. You'll be able to see a little bit better at some later slides. But one of the things I did want to point out to Joe and Kevin's point is the fact that they're looking for additional areas for development and what might that look like? This area that's outlined in red is sort of the area that with the secretary's decision on the throat and the viaduct coming down and everything being more or less at grade there, it's quite a bit more development area on this east side then it would have been or would be with a station sort of here in the middle. So, this is one of the benefits that Harvard is getting on the development feasibility and making it economically viable.

Q: **No Name Given:** This is a modification of what was just presented?

A: **Mark Shamon:** That's correct. So, they did come up with the original concept of a flip. We had a number of concerns about that original concept and developed this modified flip with the idea of

trying to broker a compromise. I won't go through this chart in great detail, but just talk about some of the features and some of the concerns that people had. I think we had pretty much all agreed that we needed four tracks through here to the Worcester Main Line and to the Grand Junction.

In the modified flip we've added a fifth track. There are three tracks in the station and two express tracks. The top two of them here are dedicated to the Grand Junction. The other one is actually a Worcester Main Line track that comes into West Station. We have both the express tracks to the south and a track that's coming in from the West that can get to the station. I'll show you that again, that and a little bit a rail service. In Harvard's original plan, their concern is that they want to make sure that they had great service on the Grand Junction and that was a large part of their reason for the flip. Whereas MassDOT is trying to serve today's public, they're trying to serve people coming in from Worcester, the 18,600 people that take that train daily as well as the people that are out in Springfield who are clamoring for high-speed service into Boston. So MassDOT has two constituencies who are interested in high speed service through this area. You're trying to understand that and trying to accommodate that rail flexibility. The idea of the modified flip is that trains can get from one track to another to another most easily without a lot of crossovers. We do provide for a lot of flexibility through the rail yard and outside the rail yard through what we call CP-4 on the west and CP-3 on the east, which again allows the trains to jump from track to track to track and into the rail yard. The layover yard has been pretty consistent all the way through with four tracks that was in the DEIR.

In terms of bus access – we still have to work out with Harvard how to get buses up there in the future. Pedestrian access and air rights are also both very important.

C: Galen Mook: I think it's worth pointing out that you chose not to have the bicycle/pedestrian path on this chart, and the pedestrian and bicycle access east and West are two features that you chose not to put on this.

A: Mark Shamon: I'll take the hit for not putting that on this slide; this is more about the rail and transit aspects.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: I don't think it is just on you. I mean how could the whole team have prepared this slide and left off the very things that, we can ask Kevin and Joe, from the moment they started showing the flip to the public, where the two most favorite features, this linear park and the new pedestrian bicycle connectivity it provided. You all know that. How could you leave it off this slide?

A: Mark Shamon: I left it off, Glen. It's on me, I prepared the slide.

Q: Bob Sloane: By leaving out the park, you're also going past one other key feature. It's been analyzed that Pratt Street would have some of the worst vibration and noise. How are you handling that?

A: Mark Fobert: The noise is being handled by a noise wall. That's been part of the mitigation from as early as 2015.

Q: Bob Sloane: You're putting express tracks closer and only providing a wooden noise wall?

A: Mark Fobert: Well it would be a concrete noise barrier.

Q: Jack Wofford: Is the bicycle and pedestrian path and linear park left off the chart or off the plan?

A: Mark Shamon: It's not in the modified flip option.

C: Jessica Robertson: There's been a lot of discussion in the past that a 20' concrete wall in people's backyards isn't the best option. It's better than nothing but still a concrete wall, and a buffered path would be better.

C: Jack Wofford: I agree with what you're saying, but there would still be a noise wall on the other side.

C: Galen Mook: But it would be 35 feet away rather than in your back yard, plus there'd be trees, a bicycle path, etc.

C: Jessica Robertson: It's very different having a concrete wall in your backyard than it is having one 35 feet away from your back yard.

C: Harry Mattison: At the last meeting, which was in February I think, you presented some ideas for the edge of the rail yard, and there was a lot of feedback, including that the path is important and has lots of value. That's one of the reasons there was so much support for the flip going back like 3 years. You had technical questions for how it works, and we asked you to work those out because it's really important. It makes the Franklin Street footbridge much better. We've consistently been raising the issue that the geometry of that path isn't ok. You're proposing taking private property for the footbridge, which you don't have to do if you build the path that Joe proposed. It has all the benefits that Glen and Jess and Galen and others have talked about.

It included the Cambridge Street bypass and we agree with all the reasons why Harvard said that's a really valuable element. I think the BPDA's study also excited people. It's really valuable for both relieving traffic from the neighborhood streets where people live like Cambridge Street to reducing the width of other new streets and providing better access from Allston village to West station on the highway. We gave you all that feedback, and now you come back a few months later, and it's like "oh yeah, we had some meetings", and the Secretary's either already decided or going to decide that stuff is gone. It's pretty clear there are a lot of loses from the original flip to the modified flip.

Q: Jack Wofford: Why did you do it? Why did you eliminate that?

A: Mark Shamon: It's not eliminated yet. It's a decision for the Secretary and she hasn't made her decision yet. That said, it's about servicing people who are on the Worcester Line today and it's about servicing people from Springfield in the future. There's 18,000 people a day who use the Worcester Line train. Putting them up on a set of double curves, which the flip would require, adds about a minute of travel time per person. If you calculate that out over a year, that's a big loss for the people taking that train.

Q: No Name Given: You plan on having trains go through there at 50 MPH?

A: Mark Fobert: We plan on having trains go through there at 70 or so MPH.

Q: Harry Mattison: can you show us the math for how you'd achieve 70ish MPH in that section?

A: Mark Shampn: Of course. This is the west side of the track. This is the Boston landing station and Everett Street. We have a tangent track right through here. It's long, flat and straight. You could do a lot more than 79 miles an hour. It's 79 by rule, not by geometry. In a sense, it's unlimited except for the fact that you have to figure out the braking. I don't know what it would be for braking distances when you get into the curve. I haven't done that calculation. The speed limit at Market Street right now, by CSX rule is 79 miles an hour with some limitations because of the curvature through there.

Q: Harry Mattison: So, trains go 79 mph?

A: Mark Shamon: They don't go 79 MPH, but they could. From mile post 3.4 to 4.9 on the west side of Market Street, by rule, they can operate at 79mph. There's a gap where it's slower, then further west it's back to 79. Right now, they operate in the high 60s outbound.

Q: Harry Mattison: Are there any speed restrictions to the east?

A: Mark Shamon: There are further east. On these slides, the purple is the Worcester Mainline, the green lines are GJL, assuming that the GJL goes out here. If you think about the purple line that was thought of in the Patrick Administration going all the way out to Riverside, this potentially could be a Grand Junction service and I would expect that if there is Grand Junction service, it would at least go through to the Boston landing station. So, it's a Grand Junction track. It's also the freight bypass. Any freight that's coming through is also taking that track.

Q: Harry Mattison: So, knowing they're proposing better service to Worcester and in fact many of us advocate very strongly for better service to Worcester and Springfield, you have single-track stations in Newton, which really slow things down.

A: Mark Shamon: and there's a project underway to improve that, independent of this job.

C: Harry Mattison: My point is, you're proposing creating lay over space instead of running all-day service. There's lots you could do that would be much more win-win regardless of where you are. This feels like you're not really trying to find a lot of win-win. This is "sorry Allston."

Q: Bob Sloane: If you took the layover tracks out would there be room for an express track?

A: Mark Shamon: This is the yard area at the track level. There are Worcester Express tracks here, layover tracks in the middle with entrances on both sides. Again, going back to the last slide, these diamond areas that you see here, those are all crossovers that allow the trains to cross over from one track to another. A train on the Worcester tracks if it want to get into the rail yard or even go up to West Station, could take this crossover to do so.

Q: Bob Sloane: But you don't need the railyard if you have express tracks through it. The railyard is more important than the express track?

A: Mark Shamon: It's not one or the other. The railyard is used for layover.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: Can I suggest we just let Mark finish his presentation?

C: Mark Shamon: As I said we have express tracks to the south, the layover yard in the middle, and then on the north side we have two platforms and three tracks. These two green tracks are basically dedicated grand junction tracks. This south track coming off the Grand Junction track is actually the Worcester main line, so any Worcester service that's going to stop at West station stops here and that allows for cross platform transfer for people to get onto the grand junction and then take the grand junction over to Cambridge or the other way around. And in fact if we wanted to, this Worcester mainline train can operate on any of these tracks, although it's going

to be a little bit too long for that platform, but certainly the bottom two of the tracks through the station area would be accessible for the Worcester mainline on a fully accessible platform.

On the east side, again, this is where we get into the first curve that knocks the speed down to 50 miles an hour through the curve. Although it could go faster through here, just because the Landsdowne Station is not far away, it's probably not going to go a lot faster than 50 miles an hour, assuming it's 50 mile an hour track. Grand Junction, again, two tracks going all the way over. We've got our flexibility so we can get trains back and forth. If we have a grand junction train or Worcester Mainline train, it needs to get back onto the Worcester Mainline tracks. It comes down if we need to get a Worcester mainline train into the rail yard it can make this cross over here onto this track and then onto this track and then into the rail yard as well and come back out that same path to get into south station in the afternoon.

For those who don't know, and we've talked about this before, but I know there's new people in the audience, this yard has a couple of different purposes, but one of its main purposes is to store the trains during the day. The trains that come into South Station early in the morning, come back here and sit anywhere from two hours to four to six hours during the day and then go back out from here into South Station to take people back out west again. So that's the essential purpose of this rail yard from a day to day operation. It also offers the opportunity for trains to come in and turn around to get over to the Boston Engine Terminal where the MBTA does all its heavy maintenance. This has several different functions, one is the daily operational basis, one on a maintenance and operational basis for trains that need to get over to the north side.

This last slide is not related to the modified flip, but last time there was a question about coordination with the developers of 76 Ashford. They developed this plan and are working with us and MassDOT in terms of figuring out how we can make our transit way work here with their proposed development. We just wanted to make sure we mentioned that that coordination is ongoing.

Q: Bill Deignan: And that's for bicycles, pedestrians, and buses?

A: Mark Shamon: Yes, the whole gang. In fact, I'll go back a bit, we still have to find a way to get MBTA maintenance vehicles into the yard. So, they're actually offering an option to go down into the yard as well here. We're not sure if we'll go this way or come down Babcock street. There's pluses and minuses to either, but they're giving us that flexibility. We're not sure if we'll do yard access here, too, but they're giving us that flexibility.

So, something will happen on day-1 with that transit way, we're not sure what it's going to be. Kevin talked about Phase II collapsing into Phase I. Everything on buses is up in the air, we have to work that out with Harvard and folks in this room. We want to build functional facilities without impacting the future build; we want to make sure that if we do put a station in that we won't demolish some of it 5 years later. We want to make sure the platforms are positioned appropriately. That's still all evolving. We also need to maintain future construction access, which is very important to actually building air rights.

This is one concept of an early West station. We put the yard in here. We actually have the transit way in here. We have our west station platforms, but in this case, the bus service is happening on basically the Malvern Street extension transit way with pedestrian bridges going to the station and to the stair and elevator systems on each of the platforms. This is kind of the easy build. This stays out of the way of any sort of Harvard future construction. I would say in a certain sense this is sort of the minimum build.

Q: **Kevin:** Mark are you assuming bus service from the south?

A: **Mark Shamon:** Yes, we are. It hasn't been decided but we are expecting availability for north and south bus service. This is a close up just to give you a sense again, we can have our curb stops somewhere on this Malvern Street extension. We have a pedestrian bridge that takes people out to the stair/elevator system. One of the other options we're looking at is a fuller West Station, if you will, a fuller bus concept. So, there was a lot of talk earlier about the Cambridge Street bypass road. That's not something generally that MassDOT is going to build unless it's somehow necessary for the bus station to operate. But the expectation is that Harvard would come in the future and build it. In this particular view where it's suggesting that the bus station might be here, it's a full bus station with bus bays and I'll show you that on the next slide. Also with a roadway that gets traffic sort of all the way around the system in this early build, leading to the Cambridge Street bypass road to Harvard to build later. Zooming in a little bit, looking at the bus station in this option, we've got five bays plus layover berths, we also have a pickup and drop-off area for TNCs and individuals. Here's another option, putting the busway to the west side, providing for the opportunity for a Cambridge Street bypass. We'd have to work out to make sure there's enough room for the buses to circulate. This is a slightly different station configuration: this would require some staggering. This would be where the stair and elevators would come up through the air rights. When we put it all together, here's one version of it with the air rights off to the east.

C: Ed Ionata: Let's take 15 minutes of questions for Mark because I do also want to get to staging. There are also lots of folks who are interested in the Charles, too.

Q: Tom Nally: What's the distance between Market Street and the station?

A: Mark Shamon: About 1.5, maybe 1.3 miles.

Q: Tom Nally: The two express tracks, do they impact the Cambridge Street bridge? Does that need to be rebuilt?

A: Mark Shamon: In this case, we would be maintaining the foundations on that. Some of the options that Harvard has looked at and we've considered as well would rebuild the foundations that actually realigned some of the tracks. That's more related to the flip option that Kevin was talking about before. But in this particular case, we'd leave the sub-substructure where it is and we'd rebuild the superstructure.

Q: Tom Nally: So, this has no impact on that?

A: Mark Fobert: Correct.

Q: Sarah Hamilton: Can you say which scenarios have the ability for through-bus service? Does the bus come to the station and require people to transfer bus-to-bus?

A: Mark Fobert: The bus operation hasn't been determined yet. We're modeling it in a couple of different ways. For the next version of the FEIR, one of the versions does go all the way through from Harvard out to the LMA. There's another version where they would have to change buses and then there's a version that comes in from Kendall. Which I think just turns around and goes back to Kendall or Central station. So, there's several different options that we're looking at, but it hasn't been fully analyzed.

Q: Jessica Robertson: It's fantastic to see the Malvern Street transfer included. It was on our list from day one so thanks to you everyone for figuring that out and thanks to the realtor for donating half the parcel. [on slide 9] I understand there isn't room for 4 tracks in West Station, the layover yard, 2 express tracks and the bicycle and pedestrian path. Wouldn't it be true that if we made the layover yard smaller, we could keep express tracks and keep the pathway?

A: Mark Shamon: We haven't looked at it, but based on this picture, possibly.

C: Jessica Robertson: The South Station EIR said that Allston would do the environmental analysis for the Allston railyard. We have never seen any analysis of whether or not that really is needed, why it's needed, how big it needs to be or what a no build option would entail. That analysis has never been done and I think it was said in the south station EIR that it would be done in this process.

A: Mark Shamon: From an environmental point of view, but not from an operational or the need point of view. This process wasn't intended to develop the need for it. It's different to analyze the environmental impacts.

C: Jessica Robertson: Fine, but this project is going through an EIR in which we are supposed to be analyzing alternatives. Those alternatives should include alternatives for the rail yard that make a case for why it needs to exist at all, and we've never been presented with those options. Many people here do not see the need for the rail yard and think running four more trains per day would be a much better use of state funds. So I would strongly, strongly encourage that the next time we see some of those, we also have some analysis of what it would look like to have no rail yard and what it would look like to have a smaller rail yard and the need for each.

Q: David Loutzenheiser: In the same vein, right now there are 5 tracks and 2 platforms. Why not eliminate the express track with 2 platforms and run the trains through the station itself, even at a slower speed? Two eastbound tracks on one platform and two on the other.

A: Mark Shamon: That's essentially the flip Harvard presented. We've expressed issues with yard operations, flexibility for train crossover between the yard and South Station; I don't have all of the slides back here that go over it, but there were a lot of impacts in terms of how the yard would operate. We lose some of the flexibility that I talk about on this next slide in terms of how the trains can or can't move between the yard and South Station and the Grand Junction. So there are some issues there. Sorry, I don't have those slides.

Q: David Loutzenheiser: What is the peak hour of operations in terms of when trains are coming in and out of the yard?

A: Mark Fobert: In the analysis that had been done, the first train comes into the yard probably around 7:30 in the morning after it's made a run to South Station. These are not all Worcester Mainline trains, you know, some of them are trains that came in from the Providence or Greenbush or other lines. They've come into South Station already and they need a place to park. This is where they come until their next run. So, it starts somewhere around 7:30 in the morning and then they start to move out in the afternoon by say three o'clock.

Q: No Name Given: Sorry if you mentioned this before and I missed it, but the green line you have on the slide there, is that the line that would be going to North Station?

A: Mark Fobert: I don't think I said North Station, but I take it you're asking about the Grand Junction Line.

Q: No Name Given: I am. Is there a plan to do that work too? To connect to North Station.

A: Mark Shamon: Our project limit right now is right here, basically crossing over Soldiers Field Road which is under here, and rebuilding the bridge to tie into the tracks just before we get to that Charles River Bridge. There is a ton of work that needs to be done from a railroad perspective, from a Right of Way perspective, from a public participation perspective to get a train through Cambridge, at-grade into North Station and through all the tracks and where it crosses the Fitchburg Main Line and the new Green Line extension and everything else. It's, it's going to be another billion-dollar project.

Q: No Name Given: Is that planned for a certain year?

A: Mark Shamon: It's not in any plan right now. It's actually being analyzed by the MBTA rail vision contract and they're starting to look at what the future of rail system might look like in 40, 50, or a hundred years from now.

Q: No Name Given: Just an observation. It seems to me that the geometry of this that you are, you've got what, 30 feet of green space that you not showing right now?

A: Mark Fobert: The buffer that Harvard had presented, it's going to go from the south property line to basically the edge of the Right of Way. Right now, there is a legal right for trains to operate in this Right of Way.

Q: No Name Given: Okay. So, you've got 35 feet there. Then you had the width of your layover areas and they have to fit within this limit. The other option is to push I-90 out a little bit more.

A: Mark Shamon: That's where we were before. I think that was the 3K-4 version that Kevin was talking about. I think from the technical feasibility and economic viability point of view of Harvard, and I won't speak for them, but I think the reason why this has come in to where it is today is to create better opportunities for economic development.

Q: No Name Given: So that 35' feet could come out of the developable space, is that correct?

A: Mark Fobert: Technically yes but of course it's more complicated than that. That's not just Harvard's development but elements identified in the BPDA's placemaking study and iif you tried to move the highway further north it would impact all of the on and off ramps and the street grid in the area, it would impact everything.

Q: No Name Given: So, the Turnpike line is the hard line?

A: Mark Fobert: We're working within the Turnpike Line right now, that's correct.

Q: No Name Given: You've done a lot of good work respecting the needs of Western, MA. Would the three Grand Junction Lines work with a shuttle to Boston Landing, so that everyone trying to get to Harvard's future school could get off at Boston Landing instead?

A: Mark Fobert: I'm not sure exactly what you mean when you say shuttle, but certainly under this condition, with a Grand Junction service, that service could go further west to Boston Landing.

Q: No Name Given: I mean for Harvard students to go from the campus to Boston Landing.

A: Mark Fobert: I can't speak to things outside of the scope of this project.

Q: Galen Mook: What happened to the Babcock Street bike/ped connection to West Station?

A: Chris Calnan: We're still looking to maintain that connection.

Q: Harry Mattison: Will you send us the analysis that shows us the 1-minute savings that you claimed earlier?

A: Mark Shamon: We can do that assuming if a request is officially submitted.

Q: No Name Given: I know you said Grand Junction service is probably decades out, but could you distribute some of the layover to the north side using the Grand Junction Line?

A: Mark Shamon: It wouldn't operate the same way. Getting in and back out would tie up tracks and take a lot of time. One of the biggest benefits of the layover here is how close it is to South Station.

C: Ed Ionata: Next up is Jim Keller to give an overview of construction staging and river impacts, which I'm sure brought some new faces to the meeting tonight.

C: Glen Berkowitz: I apologize; I just want to say that so many of us have been together in this room for, what, 5 years now, and there's not one thing that anyone said today about the desire to see a linear park buffer adjacent to the neighborhood with a "Joe Beggan" path connection that you all didn't know before you walked in here today. You're all so much better than the plans you showed us today. For you to come in here today, from the Project Manager, to the head of the team, to every staff person. I'm actually trying to compliment you here. You have all shown us over the last 5 years that you are capable of being so much better as individuals and as entities, you are capable of being so much better then showing us plans today that eliminated the very most favorable things that you 100% knew people want it to see. And it's just so darn frustrated to go through something like that again.

A: Ed Ionata: There are obviously reasons for the changes. It's a closer look at operations that's driving this.

C: Glen Berkowitz: I just wanted to get that off my chest.

Presentation by Jim Keller

C: Jim Keller: Good evening everyone. For those who are new here, back in April we started talking about construction staging for the Hybrid Alternative. We got pretty detailed in April looking at both the staging for Soldiers Field Road over I-90 westbound and eastbound. We walked through staging at a higher level of detail than we'd have at a 5-10% design normally, which we'll increase as we move forward. What we found is we are pretty constrained as we move through the throat. I won't go through the presentations we gave in April, but we started to talk about where we could get some more room to construct the throat area.

If we move outside the throat, we have a much greater area to work with. It's still very difficult, there are many elements to balance, but it's a lot easier from a work zone perspective. Within the throat, we have about a 200' width to put rail, highway, cyclists and pedestrians all in there. There's very little room. We concluded in April that we needed to increase our work area. There are constraints to the south with BU, so we had to look north. That's not exactly where we wanted to go, but we felt there was a need to do it. Some of the previous options we looked at did things like took the Paul Dudley White Path (PDW) out of service on Day 1. But that's not the way MassDOT or users would want it. To maintain that, which is critical, through the majority of construction, we would have to put a structure in the river. In our preliminary analysis we wanted to maintain a minimum of six lanes I-90, four lanes of SFR, and minimize single-track operation on the Worcester Main Line. We know that's important, and we're looking to maximize

two-track service. As we gain more room to the north, there's more potential that we could open up to 2 tracks for much longer periods by going into the river. That's not the only reason to go into the river but that's one major benefit. The GJL will be closed for the majority of construction, and there's nothing we can do to reactivate service during construction due to the structural work and elevation changes that are needed.

What we're finding this this temporary realignment of Soldiers Field Road and the Paul Dudley White Path is required during construction. Some of the benefits of doing that are additional room for construction, safer work zones, and safer operations for all modes of travel. The PDW is away from construction and SFR is further from I-90 construction, so a lot more can take place and maybe save some time in terms of construction duration. The goal would be to decrease the construction duration but we're nowhere near being able to quantify that at this level of design. Other benefits are it increases the potential duration of 2-track service, it has improved constructability of the Grand Junction bridge over SFR, improved constructability of the SFR viaduct, it's easier to carry out demolition activities, and create the temporary highway and rail alignments. We'll have more detailed plans on these in the future.

Coming out of April, we started to think at a conceptual level how this could be staged, and what was presented in May was basically a rectangle in a PowerPoint on a cross-section. We've now taken a more detailed look at this, asked ourselves how close the alignment can be to the riverbank, and some of those types of thing. Where we are today is this plan. We have one up on a board. We have a section up on a board also if you want to take a look at that at the conclusion of the meeting, but it's still very conceptual. The idea is to kind of show what a temporary alignment may look like. Yes, it's away from the bank, but we have to think about our approaches. It's a temporary structure, so it's, going to be kind of like what is being built temporarily for the North Washington Street Bridge project. It would not be a permanent condition, so the tangent straight portion is easier, but the tie-ins need some work. Currently the temporary structure is about 50' off the riverbank, and you may look at it and ask us to bring it closer, but we have to look at the approaches and transitions and make sure they work.

From an early conceptual level we have a 16' temporary PDW path, a barrier separating it from traffic, two lanes in each direction for SFR and those lanes are each 12' wide. The eastbound lanes are on a separate structure because the temporary bridges have a maximum width. Then in blue on this slide is the temporary I-90 at-grade alignments. The current SFR area would be carrying I90 through much of construction.

Our idea was to come tonight with more detail than just a rectangle on a PowerPoint slide and show that we've been really starting to think more about it. We've also started to look at the permitting implications and such. So that's pretty much it. But again, we're going to be putting a lot more thought and a detail in it as we move forward.

Q: Ed Ionata: Before we take questions, what's the total width of the structure?

A: Jim Keller: It's 50' off the shore-line, then 80' of overall width of the structure. So 130' from the bank to the northern limit. It's about 2000' feet long.

Q: Ed Ionata: What's the clearance from the bottom of structure from average water level?

A: Jim Keller: We haven't figured that out at this point but can be within whatever limits it needs to be. The profile can change to fit requirements.

Q: Jessica Robertson: What's the justification for the space between the structure and shore?

A: Jim Keller: That's the hard part in explaining this. We're basically doing a worst-case scenario in terms of how much room we need. What we're struggling with is how to maintain SFR while building the approaches for the future viaduct. Maintaining traffic while putting build up a 7% grade to the future viaduct. We're constrained by the boathouse and the Boston University Bridge obviously. We have the ability to do some shifting, but the more we can shift the alignment to the north, the better, so that we can have temporary alignments coming through this arch, but it's very limited. We're thinking about how we can stage the construction of the SFR viaduct, while maintaining service.

Q: Jessica Robertson: Couldn't it hug the riverbank more?

A: Jim Keller: We're looking into that. Part of the issue is that getting curved sections of temporary structure isn't so easy. The longer we're running along curves, the more difficult it is to get a temporary structure. I'm not saying it can't be done, but we're starting here.

Q: Pallavi Mande: Two questions. For the 8-10 years of construction, we haven't had a chance to understand how different the permitting would be for that vs. small permanent intrusions. Second, you listed benefits from a construction standpoint, but I was hoping you would also list impacts. That was what we were more concerned about. Has there been any analysis?

A: Jim Keller: Mark Fobert can speak to permitting.

A: Mark Fobert: It would be very similar to what is being built for North Washington Street. There would be pipe piles supporting a number of bents. The total impacts to the river will be under, say, 500' sq. ft. since there is no fill associated with the temporary structure. We're still looking at the abutments on either end, but we're trying to avoid using fill.

Q: Pallavi Mande: I'm talking about qualitative impact, not quantitative.

A: Mark Fobert: We'll work through all those. We'll be talking to everyone related to permitting including Chapter 91, waterway, fisheries, Coast Guard, everyone. This concept has just been developed so we still have a lot of work to do to talk to those agencies and determine those impacts.

Q: Pallavi Mande: What's the timeline on that?

A: Mark Fobert: It has to be done before the DEIS.

A: Jim Cerbone: The first agency meeting is July 16, but all of them will be done before the Notice of Intent. And the agencies would be looking at temporary vs. permanent impacts.

A: Mark Fobert: Generally, the agencies do see a difference between temporary and permanent impacts because with a temporary structure it's removed when the project is complete.

Q: Pallavi Mande: When you say they see it differently, what does that mean?

A: Mark Fobert: I can't put words in their mouth but based on earlier conversations they view this as a temporary impact.

C: Jim Keller: We know this is a pretty important item to people; we just wanted to show you that we're starting to think more about it.

Q: Jack Wofford: I have a question about the way you're looking at this. At the last meeting there was widespread interest in seeing options that might, building on the assumption that you need to go into the river temporarily, how could the permanent result be an improvement in the river edge over what is there now. Without talking about how many feet or the specifics, my question is, is anybody looking at that? Can those options be presented to the Task Force?

A: Jim Keller: I know members of the Task Force have brought up rivers' edge restoration before. I think it was back in November, CSS had started looking at treatments; and DCR is putting out some guidance on edge treatment standards, so there will be lots of coordination with DCR on

how it will be restored. We may not be filling but there's no doubt that there will be impacts including removal of trees and impacts along the bank. We're likely going to have to push into the bank with I-90, too. So, the whole area will have a minimum of tree removal and other impacts. It's possible there will need to be a whole restoration of this area. Deneen is on hand to answer questions about where we are currently, but again we're just at the start of looking at that. There will be river edge treatments and restoration as an item on a future agenda. So yes, there will be options to explore but we don't have that yet. We have some boards with some typical details, but they're by no means final.

C: Ed Ionata: There were some questions last time regarding the fact that from a policy standpoint there was a long time before we even considered doing something in the river. So now we're considering temporary impacts in the river, and I think the question is, does that open the door to permanent impacts. At this point, MassDOT's policy call is that temporary impacts are okay, and obviously come with mitigation, bank restoration, etc., but permanent impacts should be avoided at all costs.

C: Jessica Robertson: That's a complete mischaracterization. The permanent condition is an improvement or a benefit, not an impact. It's the mitigation for the temporary impacts.

A: Ed Ionata: When I say permanent impacts, I mean leave no fill in the river.

C: Jessica Robertson: What I'm saying is that we've never seen any options of what the different things are that we could do with the edge of the river. So you're saying "no permanent fill" and…

A: Ed Ionata: What I'm saying is that all the things you're talking about, improvements to the river bank, etc., will be considered as part of mitigating the temporary impacts. But there was a discussion last time about, once we're impacting the river, why not keep going and do things like expand the park into the river, etc., which would require permanent impacts like fill. The policy call is based on agencies drawing a hard line at avoiding permanent impacts.

Q: Jack Wofford: I think what we're saying is that needs to be loosened up a bit to at least explore for example whether the 50' between the temporary structure and the bank, should be filled, to use a problem word, in the permanent condition, because maybe that would actually be better for the river. What I'm asking is, are creative solutions being looked at?

A: Jim Cerbone: We're exploring options for mitigation but ultimately this has to be approved by permitting agencies.

C: Jack Wofford: If something splendid were created, it's not a given that the permitting agencies would say no.

A: Jim Cerbone: We've already met with many of them and they already have. We can't fill the river.

C: Jessica Robertson: No one is saying fill the river. We're talking about bank restoration.

A: Jim Cerbone: I'm just saying we can't eliminate wildlife habitat, which filling the river would do.

Q: Pallavi Mande: I think from the perspective of the people in this room, we're trying to figure out the scope of this analysis that needs to be done. Obviously, you will talk to the permitting agencies and will continue to talk to them. This group is trying to figure out the size and scope of the agency back-and-froth. Likely they won't all agree. If that's the case, how is this audience supposed to understand how long that conversation will go for, so we can try to be helpful in terms of understanding where the restoration is going to land us?

C: Jack Wofford: I think we're just saying, if someone can look at the options, I mean nobody in the room has the solutions at this point. But maybe taking 2' from the river for bank restoration results in a better habitat, and if nobody is looking at that because there's some line going back to the exact inches and feet of the current river line, that's not the long-range visionary thinking a $1b project demands.

A: Ed Ionata: So, let me summarize where I think where we're going with our meetings with the agencies. Other folks on the team can correct me if I'm wrong. The initial meetings are really to talk about what might be the worst-case scenario, which is what you see here. We talk to them about how they view the impacts, temporary and permanent, what's fill, what isn't, what is it be pile supported, what happens to the river bank, how we would evaluate the impacts and potential mitigation, which gets to what you're talking about, and develop a table that says x amount of fill, x amount of bank impacts, etc. So that's step one. Also, we meet with them to further explore how hard their line is on placing permanent modification on the shore. And then we would go back and further the design and further the analysis based on those initial meetings. So that's where we're heading.

Q: Jack Wofford: We're asking if you could present that analysis to the Task Force.

A: Ed Ionata: The first step, before the out-of-the-box ideas for doing more than just mitigation for the impacts, is understand their lines in the sand from their regulatory perspectives, and as you all know there are a bunch of overlapping agencies. Also, understanding how they view the impacts. For every sq. ft. of impact we would be proposing some multiple sq. ft of mitigation. We're at the same point with the agencies as we are here.

Q: No Name Given: Can you remind us what the agencies are?

A: Ed Ionata: They are the Army Corps of Engineers, Coast Guard, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, Massachusetts Division of Fisheries, MassDEP, the local Conservation Commissions for the Wetlands Protection Act, the EPA for stormwater. That's another thing we have to address, what do we do with stormwater on the temporary structure while it's there? What did I miss? There's Chapter 91 Tidelands. All of the agencies have slightly different definitions, so we'll put people from all of them in the same room to figure out how we should proceed with determining impacts, mitigation, etc.

C: Kane Larin: I just want to mention that there are people using the river as well, every day on boats, who also want to be considered.

Q: Ed Ionata: We'd love your feedback on this. Is it bigtime in your way?

A: Kane Larin: Well it's kind of baffling to me how it would take 10 years to build this.

C: Ed Ionata: A lot of it is due to keeping traffic flowing throughout construction.

C: Kane Larin: The main things that boaters would certainly be concerned about are things like stormwater runoff, what's the deck surface made of, will brake dust and tire dust go straight into the river, will the deck be humming 24 hours a day, and then just congestion on the river is a concern.

C: Ed Ionata: Thanks for your feedback.

Q: Kane Larin: To add to that, now I've heard that DCR wants to extend Magazine Beach and make it a real beach again. Are they extending it into the river on that side as well?

A: Deneen Crosby: It's not being extended into the river. There are overlooks, but the shoreline will stay where it is. There isn't a real beach going in; it's not a sandy beach, it'll be tall grass and other plants, not sand.

C: **Fred Salvucci:** I have a couple words in support of what you're presenting. First, I think it's a mistake and inaccurate to view the environment as only the river. There are ecological issues that are very important to some constituencies. The preservation of and ability to use the PDW Path and SFR, and have a 6-lane turnpike, so that Allston, Brighton, Brookline and Newton don't turn into total parking lots when construction begins, that's the environment, too. What you're presenting here is a really important way to avoid a disastrous traffic issue, which would be on the table as an environmental issue. When we started this, we were hearing constantly that the structure of the turnpike was so bad that it couldn't last. I don't know if you've given it vitamin pills; I'm not trying to poke fun, but a lot of time has passed, and that structure isn't any younger than it was. As you know I used to be in charge of things like this, and I remember a case in which a bridge had just been inspected, and right after developed an issue. Stuff like that happens. If it does, MassDOT is going to have to restrict trucks and speeds, which will adversely affect everyone back to Worcester. Those are also environmental impacts. This presentation recognizes the need to deal with those.

My Second point, taking that graphic [slide 23] exactly as it, there's an implicit sequence. You don't deal with the edge of the river until after the Turnpike is fully completed in its final state, so that you can abandon the temporary structure. What this plan offers is the opportunity to tear down the existing viaduct at the earliest possible moment so that the threat is no longer hanging over us. A 6-lane Turnpike isn't 8 lanes, so there's some impact there, but it's reasonably stable. Only after you take down the viaduct can you deal with the permanent construction. Then you'll have the construction space to deal with the edge of the river. I'm looking for a hard look from the environmental side that there's an urgency to getting this stable, and if it takes longer to figure out some of these issues, maybe that happens later. It still has to be appropriately considered in federal and state environmental permitting, but you get into this circular logic where you may not be able to figure out what to do with the river until later. So, it may be appropriate to do this is two stages.

Third, I'm a vegetarian, and something of an animal rights guy. I understand the importance of the fish and wildlife. But there are also humans to consider, and those are all environmental impacts that have to be weighed. You shouldn't take such a narrow view of what the environment is. In general, this is a good approach, and I'm asking the environmental lawyers, and I know the federal and state permitting processes are different, but there must be a way to allow the project to proceed, while figuring out the best thing for the shore. If the temporary bridge is on piles, it'll be a minimal ecological impact, but the lawyers should not be absolutist about saying "thou shalt not cross this line". The lawyers have to figure out a way to deal with the shoreline without delaying the project until the viaduct falls down.

C: Ed Ionata: so far, first blush with the agencies is, I guess the simplest way of putting it is, nobody stood up and said this is impossible.

C: Jim Cerbone: We're not disagreeing with you, Fred. I think what you said about finding a balance is absolutely true, and that's what we're trying to do. We're trying to balance the impacts to everyone using the facilities as well as the environmental impacts. But the DEP as stated in the DEIR said there is a hard line about permanent fill in the Charles. That's all I'm saying.

C: Fred Salvucci: The two parts of the DEP disagree with each other.

C: Ed Ionata: When we had them all in the same room, they were on the same page. As folks start to drift out, I want to say, we have a lot of homework to do. The CTPS analysis has been delayed, which drives the noise and air analysis. The decision has been made to cancel TF for July and August, and hold some western outreach meetings, and our plan is to get back here in September.

C: Galen Mook: There's a lot that we haven't closed the loop on, regardless of the CTPS model, such as the Franklin Street footbridge. So, I propose that we use July and August to make sure it's hammered down.

Q: Jessica Robertson: If Deneen has been working on the water's edge since November, is there interim ideas and analysis she could share?

A: Ed Ionata: We're having agency meetings over the summer and advancing MEPA/NEPA, so we could give a much more informed view of that when we come back.

C: Jessica Robertson: There's an insane amount of materials that we have to cover before the next environmental filing. It's crazy to me that we'd cancel two meetings because of CTPS when we have so much to cover, and presumably there's been work going on in the background that we haven't seen yet.

C: Ed Ionata: There has been, but there will be much more progress made over the summer, and I think we can come back, much more highly informed, in the fall.

C: Mike O'Dowd: We won't be in a position to give you useful information in July and August. We need to do more work on our end, advance many of the things you mentioned like the Franklin Street footbridge, and do more analysis before we're ready to come back to you with information that will make it worth your while to sit here. There will also be many more Task Force meetings in the future before the next environmental filing.

C: Harry Mattison: I think part of the problem is that when you say you met with DEP and they said no, it's like, we'll gee, "where were we?" You go and meet with someone and then come back and see "Here's what we decided."

A: Mike O'Dowd: There haven't been any decisions.

C: Harry Mattison: Well it seemed like you had some meetings and met with the Secretary and then came back here and essentially said "Here's the new track layout". How about instead of meeting secretly with DEP and DCR for two months, you have a meeting where some of us are there. It sounds like that would be a much more collaborative, open process than "see you later guys." The last presentation you gave to your board showed the Task Force process ending in Q3 this year.

A: Mike O'Dowd: That was something that I did present, but that will not be the case. We'll be extending the Task Force process beyond the third quarter of this year, into the end of this year, at least. There's a lot of information we still need to develop, and we are relying on a lot of other entities to provide us with the information that we need in order to do some analysis.

C: Harry Mattison: We're asked over and over again for a schedule, to see what meetings you're having and what the process will be, and we've never seen a schedule or an agenda. To now say, come back in September, raises some concerns.

A: Mike O'Dowd: That's part of the reason that I was hesitant to give a July and August agenda, because I didn't want to make a promise that I wasn't able to keep. So what we have decided to do, and this is based on discussions with the Administrator and the Secretary, is we want to use July and August to engage and inform as many people in the west as we can as to what has transpired on this project.

C: Jessica Robertson: Those don't have to be mutually exclusive. There are 30 days in each month. There's a lot that should be going on, and even if you just come and say "here's a list of the meetings we've had in the last month, even just a status update would be nice.

Q: Galen Mook: Could we use the time for things like site visits?

A: Mike O'Dowd: That's a great idea, Galen. I have no problem at all doing that.[2]

[2] Following the meeting, the MassDOT team began planning for the site walk. It was hosted on July 30th, 2019.

C: Galen Mook: We could go stand in the back yards of Pratt Street, go to the footbridge, explore current conditions. Let's go walk the footbridge.

C: Jessica Robertson: The reason you're getting a lot of frustration is there are a lot of things going on – like the footbridge, Cambridge Road bypass, etc. – and we haven't seen any updates. It's hard to believe that nobody will have anything to show, unless everyone is taking the summer off.

C: Ed Ionata: We hear you on that and understand your frustration. There are a few last people who want to say something before we adjourn, so let's go to them.

C: Mike O'Dowd: Before that, I just want to reiterate that I like the idea of a site visit, let's do that.

C: Representative Hannah Kane: I'm very appreciative of effort to inform residents of Metro West, and I also want to make sure you talk to people in Central Massachusetts. Let's schedule meetings for both.

C: Mike O'Dowd: That's our plan.[3]

Q: Glen Berkowitz: A colleague said to me "have fun tonight" and I wrote "going to these meetings makes going to the dentist seem like a fun time." I'm confused about some of the context about what was just presented. I'll be up at night thinking about this presentation, asking myself "did they say that this is the only way that they could stage the project"? I think you are not saying "this is the only way" – I think if you combine what you presented in April, May, and tonight's presentations, is there are two ways to stage the project. The second is the 80' wide platform that's 130' of the bank, plus some cantilevers and such; two separate river impacts along the bank and in the river. The other way to stage the project would be to build a platform along the bank itself that is somewhere – my math – around 35' wide into the river, just going from the bank into the river with nothing else in the river. Could you clarify whether it's just what you showed tonight, or if there are two, with different impacts?

A: Jim Keller: I will answer your question as best I can. What we presented in April was where we were at the time. Those were the concepts closest to what was presented in the DEIR. We were holding to one-minimum Worcester Mainline track, so everything was based on that. Accommodating everything within that 210' or so. As we got into the IRT, which was a completely different concept, that added another element of difficulty to staging. With that we

[3] Public meetings were held in Framingham on July 18th and in Worcester on August 14th.

said, “we’ll approach this like the DEIR to start” and as we carried that out throughout the throat and tying into the interchange, we started to realize that we’re running out of width to provide everything needed for construction. Because of the constraints along Boston University’s property line and Buick Street, we had to go north. Thinking about everything in one cross-section, we got into challenges at the approaches with the viaduct, not just at the narrowest part of the throat, but all the columns and piers, we needed to go wider.

Q: **Glen Berkowitz:** Can I summarize by saying: you’re looking at this as the way to stage the project?

A: **Jim Keller:** We’re not saying you can’t do it the first way, we’re saying there’s a lot of risk. We’re not saying this is final. Locations of things could change as we continue to work on it. This is just where we’re at.

Q: **Kane Larin:** As you develop this, can you inform us about construction of the temporary bridge? I presume you won’t just take 130’ across the river. Second, with the talk of restoring the riverbank, you should also talk about restoring the river including the floor and other impacts. The river doesn’t end at the water surface. This will have impacts beyond the piles.

A: **Ed Ionata:** In one of those early agency discussions, the same thing was mentioned. There might be an opportunity for river bottom restoration when we pull out the piles.

C: **Jack Wofford:** A couple of meetings ago, you were dealing with two big variants, eastbound vs westbound viaducts. Jess made the point that the tone of the meeting changed because you were showing us a work in progress. This isn’t a work in progress in the same way. There must be different ways to approach this, but you’re approaching this as “in Sept. we’ll have more information to share”. I don’t think the purpose of the Task Force is just to receive information, it’s to be exposed to your process so that issues are raised earlier rather than later. You’ll speed the process up by doing it earlier. If you show us things as you go, this is a group that has terrific insights to share. If you’re just deferring that and assuming all you need to do is present the group with information, you’re selling yourselves short.

Q: **Tony D’Isidoro:** Can we show our appreciation to Emma? Hopefully she’ll cut the ribbon on the new Franklin St. footbridge.

C: **Emma Waters:** Thanks everyone. The Franklin Street reconstruction is so important. It’s an easy immediate mitigation and benefit for the community.

C: Ed Ionata: With that, the meeting is adjourned. Thanks for coming everyone.

Next Steps

The next Task Force meeting is scheduled for September 12, 2019. The meeting will take place at 6PM in the Fiorentino Community Center.