
To:	Michael O'Dowd Project Manager	Date:	August 26, 2020
From:	Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis Howard Stein Hudson	HSH Project No.:	2013061.14
Subject:	Massachusetts Department of Transportation Allston Multimodal Project Task Force Meeting Meeting Notes of 8/19/2020		

Overview

On August 19th, 2020 members of the Allston Multimodal Project team and associated MassDOT staff held a Task Force meeting for the project. Due to the Commonwealth's response to COVID-19, this meeting occurred virtually. Audience members were able to attend remotely and use the virtual platform to engage with the project team by asking questions and offering feedback in real time.

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 that MassDOT will make available to interested general contractors.

The Project Team provided a review of the recently published NEPA Scoping Summary Report that was recently published on August 7th 2020, an outline of the project's anticipated schedule, followed by the next NEPA and MEPA milestones concurrence on a preferred alternative under NEPA, and then a Notice of Project Change. The Project Team noted that the concurrence point two process has already begun. FHWA has requested written concurrence from each of the cooperating agencies on the range of alternatives that are being advanced in the DEIS.

During the discussion portion of the meeting, Task Force and community members requested additional information regarding the concurrence process and schedule. They also requested for clarifying information regarding the lane configurations of the different alternatives. Confusion was

expressed from Task Force and community members about whether the Grand Junction Bridge fits the Purpose and Need within each alternative.

Agenda

I.	Welcome & Opening Remarks	2
II.	Presentation	4
III.	Discussion	10

Detailed Meeting Minutes¹

Welcome & Opening Remarks

C: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: Hello, everybody, this is Ed Ionata from Tetra Tech, we're here, as you can see, I think most of you can see in our conference room, socially distanced. I want to remind everybody before we get started, that this event is being recorded for a clean transcript. I'm going to call on Mike first to give a quick project update. Before anybody asks any questions right after Mike's project update, and they will go through the details of the questions and answers and how all that will work. Mike, any comments before we get started, please?

C: Mike O'Dowd, MassDOT: Yes, thanks, Ed. Hopefully, I am heard as I was having problems with my audio and my speakers earlier today but I want to welcome you all to the Task Force meeting this evening. I appreciate your attendance. As you all know, we have recently filed with Federal Highway Administration the Scoping Summary Report, which, as all of you know, is something that we were anticipating doing in July, however, for one reason or another, it got extended and delayed until August seventh. We're now in a process under the One Federal Decision process as has been the case for the last 12 months or so.

We are now in concurrence point number two, where we are requesting written concurrence from each of the cooperating agencies on the range of alternatives that are being advanced in the DEIS. For many of you that aren't familiar with the Scoping Report or the Scoping Summary Report, what that means is that there are three alternatives, three build alternatives were advanced in the Scoping Report that was filed back in November. At that particular point in time, there was recommendations to dismiss two of those alternatives and advance forward with the Soldiers' Field Road hybrid.

Since then, based upon all the public comments that we did receive, we've now reconsidered the opposition and the Scoping Summary Report reflects three alternatives will be moving forward

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

into the DEIS. From that perspective, I think it's a plus in that we are being responsive to the comments. There were comments relative to making decisions and making refinements to alternatives, that would achieve a purpose and need, meeting the purpose and needs so that we could advance them forward into the DEIS, and we've done that. Tetra Tech, Sandy Hoover, Mark Fobert, will walk you through some of those tonight.

Since we met previously, we have had cooperating agency meetings, we meet regularly with Federal Highway Administration. We're sure to do that under the One Federal Decision process. We would be answering their questions in accordance and in compliance with the schedule and it's an aggressive schedule, as we had pointed out a while back. Once concurrence point two is completed, we will advance into the next concurrence point. That'll be in the fall of this year. During the course of the next couple of months, there'll be ongoing coordination meetings with Federal Highway with the cooperating agencies and an exchange of information relative to the three build alternatives moving forward. That will allow for MassDOT to arrive at a decision sometime in the fall for the selection of a preferred alternative and we will seek the concurrence of the cooperating agencies.

Though we will be making a recommendation and a selection of the preferred alternative, we will still be advancing in analysis and evaluation of the three build alternatives on the DEIS. I just wanted to be clear that despite the fact that MassDOT is making a decision on the preferred alternative come the fall of this year, after extended coordination and co-operation with the agencies, the three alternatives that we'll discuss tonight will be advanced in the DEIS, and each of them will undergo a full assessment and analysis of the NEPA concerns and NEPA components.

There are many things in the presentation that you'll see tonight. We feel very comfortable moving forward with the selection of the alternative within the interchange area. And for many of those concerns that were generated earlier relative to West Station, we've agreed that each of the three build alternatives would move forward with a West Station that has a configuration of three platforms and four tracks. That station configuration will also include an express track, as we've talked about in the past. In that, like I said, could be applicable to any of the build alternatives within the throat area itself. With that said, I'll allow Tetra Tech to advance onto the presentation. I would ask that you hold any of your questions or concerns or comments. We'll have plenty of time after the presentation to answer any of those questions that you may have. With that said, I'll pass this back to Nate, and he can upload the presentation.

C: Nathaniel Cabral Curtis, *Howard Stein Hudson*: Just a quick, quick blurb on questions. This is not a long presentation. We will do exactly what we did at our prior meeting in June. Once we get to the Q and A, at the end of the presentation. I'll be watching raised hands in the questions section. Erin Reed, who's also a member of Howard Stein Hudson staff, will be watching any questions that come in that people type and we'll read them out loud, and say the name of who

asked them such that you know anybody who is participating by phone can hear, you know what was asked, and who asked it. As Ed said, we are making a recording in the furtherance of an accurate transcript. If you don't feel comfortable being recorded, just you know, don't raise your hand, turn the camera off for starters, begin the video.

Presentation

C: Sandy Hoover, Tetra Tech: Good evening, everyone. My name is Sandy Hoover: Project Scientist with Tetra Tech.

C: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: Nate, I don't believe anybody can see anything.

C: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis, Howard Stein Hudson: Yes, I think we lost the video. Hang on just a second Ed.²

C: Sandy Hoover, Tetra Tech: Good evening everyone. My name is Sandy Hoover: Project Scientist with Tetra Tech. I will be walking everyone through tonight's presentation. Today's agenda includes a review of the recently published NEPA Scoping Summary Report. An outline of the project's anticipated schedule, followed by the next NEPA and MEPA milestones concurrence on a preferred alternative under NEPA, and a MEPA Notice of Project Change.

The NEPA Scoping Summary Report was published on the project's website on Friday, August 7th. Several hard copies were also made available at repositories throughout Boston, Cambridge, Worcester, and Framingham last week. The purpose of the Summary Report is to summarize the scoping process that was undertaken for the project. Respond to comments received on the Scoping Report published in November of last year and identify what alternatives will be carried forward to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement for further analysis. The Summary Report is divided into five sections. Section One, the Introduction, covers project location and background information. Section Two, the Purpose and Need. Section Three, Scoping Meetings and Outreach. Section Four, responses to Frequently Received Comments on the November Scoping Report, and Section Five, Alternatives and Screening Criteria. In this section, we describe the alternatives that have been dismissed and what alternatives will be carried forward for further analysis and the draft EIS.

Next, I'll walk through the individual sections of the Scoping Summary Report, just to provide an overview of what you can expect to find and focus on Sections two through five, as I'm sure most people on the line are very familiar with the project background information. Section Two of the Summary Report covers the Purpose and Need of the project. This has not changed since publication of the Scoping Report in November. I'll cover these very quickly as I'm sure most people on the line are familiar with the Purpose and Need at this point, the project needs, or the multimodal deficiencies within the transportation system that MassDOT is proposing to address. Those project needs are broken into four categories, including roadway deficiencies, safety, rail limitations, mobility limitations, and transportation access within the project area.

We'll start with roadway deficiencies. These include the structurally deficient I-90 viaduct and substandard highway layout and geometry within the I-90 mainline and interchange. Safety concerns include crash rates on the I-90 main line and viaduct, as well as crash rates at the

² Video was restored at this point.

intersection of Cambridge Street and Soldiers Field Road. Rail limitations include the existing obsolete infrastructure that constrains movements of commuter rail and Grand Junction Rail operations, increasing ridership and transit demand as well as a lack of multimodal connections, and deficient mid-day layover capacity on the MBTA Southside rail system. Finally, mobility limitations and transportation access within the project area, including deficient level of service at ramp terminus intersections, lack of opportunities for the public in neighborhoods in Allston, Brighton, Brookline, and Boston University to access the Charles River Reservation. Existing substandard width of the Paul Dudley White Path, and limits to Multimodal access within the project area.

In Section three, Scoping Meetings and Outreach, we describe the opportunities provided to the public to comment on the Scoping Report. A Title VI compliant version of the Scoping Report was made available on the project's website on November 6th. Hard copies were also delivered to nine locations throughout Boston, Brookline, Cambridge, Framingham, and Worcester. Also, on November 6th, two public information meetings were held to present the content at the Scoping Report. November 7th in Brighton, in which we had 50 attendees, and again on December 4th in Framingham, which brought in 16 attendees. Two Task Force meetings were also held in which the Scoping Report was discussed, a workshop on November 13th, and another meeting on December 11th. The comment period closed on December 12th and brought in over 800 comment letters and over 2,000 substantive comments.

Upon review of those 2,000 substantive comments received on the November Scoping Report, the project team identified 11 frequently received comments which are outlined in Section four of the Scoping Summary Report. The project team outlined these frequent comments at the June Task Force Meeting, but we did not go into detail regarding responses to those comments which we will summarize today and I should also mention you can find a matrix of all substantive comments received on the November Scoping Report and corresponding responses and Appendix D of the Scoping Summary Report.

These frequently received comments listed here are all related to transit. First up, is general lack of support for the inclusion of midday layover in the Purpose and Need. Midday layover is an ongoing need of the MBTA, and the limited layover provided at Allston is an integral part of solving that need. This is also consistent with the existing easement rights. Current and projected layover needs are described in the Scoping Summary Report and will be further documented in the draft EIS. The next frequently received comment or comments, expressing support for a four-track West Station and a 15-minute inbound and outbound service on the Worcester main line. As well as pedestrian and bicycle connections in the vicinity of West Station, including redesign of the Franklin Street Pedestrian Bridge, an open space buffer path on the south side of the layover yard, and a pedestrian connection at Agganis Way.

As was discussed at the June Task Force meeting, the Modified Flip option has been further refined to include a four-track, three-platform station, which would enable aspirational future service operations through west station. The Franklin Street Pedestrian Bridge will be included as an element of all build alternatives proposed for the project, and the draft EIS will incorporate a concept layout or layouts for the bridge. A linear park was included with a Flip West Station design option. The Flip West Station design is dismissed from further analysis, as it would limit operational flexibility for Worcester mainline, layover, and Grand Junction rail operations, thereby failing to meet the rail operations screening criteria established for the project. The design of the Modified Flip, which does meet the rail operation screening criteria, does not include this linear park. Finally, connections have been studied to allow for a dedicated bike and pedestrian connection running north-south across the project area. The Highway Viaduct, At-

grade options have been modified to better accommodate this future north-south patent by connection.

Another comment was that construction of West Station should be accelerated. As described in the November Scoping Report, MassDOT is no longer relying on the phased project plan previously described in the MEPA process, the project will be built under a single project scenario, and West Station will be built as part of the project with completion prior to the end of construction anticipated to be in 2032. In support for maintaining two tracks on the Worcester Mainline during construction, it is not MassDOT's purpose or intent to reduce the capacity of the Worcester Mainline during construction. However, in order to build the project within the throat, the design/builder may be required to reduce service to a single track. If necessary, single track operations would be limited to the relatively short area of the track within the throat. For analysis purposes, the project team has conservatively estimated that the single-track operations would be up to one mile in length, at a maximum, but would most likely be shorter. MassDOT and MBTA will continue to explore options to maximize the availability of two revenue tracks during off-peak periods of commuter rail operations.

Next up are comments received on the November Scoping Report related to the scope of the project. There was support voiced for rebuilding the Grand Junction Rail Bridge. Reconstruction of the Grand Junction, over the Charles River is beyond the scope of this project. Rebuilding the Grand Junction Branch is a separate project with its own set of complicated issues that must go through its own planning and funding process. However, none of the throat area options will preclude future rebuilding of the Grand Junction rail bridge over Soldiers Field Road, or over the Charles River after this project is completed.

There was support stated for a Cambridge Street Bypass Road. Harvard University has described a concept in which they propose a new viaduct structure within Beacon Park Yard, that connects Cambridge Street directly to the proposed highway interchange eastbound service road. The project would not preclude future action by Harvard or another developer to extend the viaduct westerly to intersect with Cambridge Street.

There were concerns and suggestions regarding methods and models used to assess traffic and transit. Updated methodology, including transit related results of the revised Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS) modeling will be documented in the NEPA draft EIS. In addition, as discussed at the June Task Force meeting, MassDOT is not considering reducing the number of lanes on I-90 and Soldiers Field Road in the final condition. Lastly, there were requests to include environmental goals such as enhancement of the Charles River, expansion of park land and open space, and transportation mode shifts in the project while prioritizing safe and improved pedestrian and bicycle access and connections.

The NEPA Purpose and Need describes the multimodal deficiencies within the transportation system that MassDOT is proposing to address. In general, environmental goals such as these are not considered transportation deficiencies and would not be appropriate to include in the NEPA purpose and need. MassDOT is committed to mitigating project impacts, including considering restoration of the Charles Riverbank and has included several multimodal elements to the project's Purpose and Need directly related to pedestrian and bicycle connections and the Charles River Reservation. These are further described in the Scoping Summary Report.

Next up are comments received on the November Scoping Report related to Project Alternatives. Far and away the most frequently received comment on the Scoping Report or comments that expressed criticism of the Soldiers Field Road (SFR) Hybrid, particularly centered around its impacts to the Charles River and its difficult and lengthy construction. MassDOT proposed the

SFR Hybrid as its preferred alternative because it was believed to be a consensus opinion. We now know that not to be the case, and three throat area options will be carried forward into the draft EIS for further analysis.

With regards to concerns related to construction of the SFR Hybrid, the project team conducted their preliminary construction method alternatives analysis for staging alternatives for the SFR Hybrid Throat Area option. That analysis is provided in Appendix C of the Scoping Summary Report and concludes, that in order to avoid severe impacts hit traffic operations, a temporary structure would be required for Soldiers Field Road traffic and the Paul Dudley White Path users during the majority of construction.

There was support for an At-Grade Throat area option to be further analyzed in the draft EIS. Multiple design refinements also described at the June Task Force meeting, have been made to the At-Grade Throat area option for it to meet the Purpose and Need, although this updated design renamed the Modified At-Grade will still result in permanent encroachment into the Charles River. Public comments to describe other potential benefits associated with an all at grade design such as potential cost and schedule benefits. Therefore, the Modified At-Grade will be carried forward into the draft EIS for comprehensive comparison of throat area options.

Finally, many comments were received expressing support for a mitigation package to address environmental impacts as well as travel impacts to commuters during and after construction. The NEPA draft EIS will document the environmental impacts for each alternative and once a preferred alternative is selected, MassDOT will work with the public and the affected resource agencies to develop a mitigation plan to address those impacts. MassDOT will also consider the magnitude of the environmental impacts as an input and the decision about which alternatives to select as the preferred. MassDOT also realizes that whatever alternative is selected it will be important to provide mitigation measures to manage the commute during construction. Working with the public, MassDOT will develop a mitigation plan during the environmental review process to manage traffic disruption. MassDOT will also consider the magnitude of such disruption as an input and the decision about which alternative to select as the preferred.

As I'm sure you all remember, the SFR Hybrid was the only throat area option suggested to be carried forward to the draft EIS in the November Scoping Report. Based on a lot of the public comments received, that is no longer the case. The Scoping Summary Report clarified that three throat area options will be moving forward to the draft EIS. We just want to take a little bit of time and revisit, again, the most frequently received comment, which was opposition to the SFR Hybrid, and specifically, opposition to construction of the SFR Hybrid requiring the temporary Soldiers Field Road and Paul Dudley White Path trestle located in the Charles River.

Many of the major concerns brought up regarding the SFR Hybrid, and these comments were focused on concerns regarding impacts to the Charles River, impacts to river users due to the narrowing of the water sheet, stormwater, and water quality concerns, climate change and resiliency concerns; a construction duration of eight to ten years, and MBTA operational disruptions during construction, including long term closure of the Grand Junction Bridge, and a single track on the Worcester Mainline during construction.

Because so many of the comments on the November Scoping Report expressed opposition to impacts to the Charles River, the project team wants to take a quick minute to further address this issue. The Charles River in Allston is a tremendous asset that should be restored, enhanced, and made accessible. Mitigation measures must be thoroughly and transparently considered when selecting an alternative to ensure the least overall harm and most overall benefit to this important regional resource. As we move through the NEPA process, one of MassDOT's guiding

principles will be to avoid and minimize long term or permanent impact to the Charles River and to avoid all impacts if possible. MassDOT believes that any permanent impact or encroachment into the river is inappropriate if there is an alternative that meets the project's Purpose and Need and avoids or further minimizes such impact. MassDOT is fully committed to ensuring that the selected alternative ensures the treatment of all runoff to the maximum extent practicable, to safeguard this vital resource. Once we get to concurrence on a preferred alternative, we can begin discussions around the appropriate mitigation for the river.

Finally, Section five of the Scoping Summary Report, alternatives, and screening criteria. We begin this section, with an overview of the preliminary alternatives that were discussed in the November Scoping Report. Those were the no build, major rehabilitation, and replacement, and the 3L Re-Alignment alternative, which included two infrastructure elements with various design and layout options, the throat area, and West Station. We've been making some progress and updating the design of several of these alternatives and options. At the June Task Force meeting, we reviewed some of those design updates with you. Those focused on a Modified Highway Viaduct and a modified At-Grade in the throat, and an updated, modified flipped West Station. I'm not going to go over those design updates again, although, if there are further questions we can discuss them

Continuing through Section five. The Summary Report then describes which alternatives have been dismissed from further detailed analysis. Those alternatives are the major rehabilitation and replacement, as it does not meet the purpose and need. The 3L Re-alignment, with a draft EIR West Station and rail layout, as it also doesn't meet Purpose and Need. The 3L Re-alignment with the Flip West Station, and rail layout, as it doesn't meet the rail operations screening criteria established for the project. Alternatives carried forward to the draft EIS for detailed analysis then include the updated no build, as well as the 3L Re-alignment with the updated Modified Flip West Station and three throat area options Modified Highway Viaduct, modified at grade, and SFR Hybrid.

- C: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis, *Howard Stein Hudson*:** Okay, folks, we're going to hop over here. We're going to go from it being recorded to being live, so just bear with me while I get this ready.
- Q: Ed Ionata, *Tetra Tech*:** First of all, I want to make sure that people can hear us. Mark Shamon, can you hear me? Just give me a thumbs up if you can.
- C: Ed Ionata, *Tetra Tech*:** Okay, thank you. There were some questions I see that rolled in for Mike. We won't forget about those, there are some questions for the project manager, we'll go over those once the presentation is over. Erin, please include them and then continue with the rest. I just want to make sure that people understand what we showed as Mark Fobert will continue with the slide presentation live with the schedule and the NEPA and MEPA milestones.
- C: Mark Fobert, *Tetra Tech*:** The three build alternatives that are all multimodal and make transformative changes to the portion of the project on the former Beacon Park Yard. The three build alternative options all include a new interchange and associated street grid, a four-track three-platform commuter rail station – West Station, and bicycle and pedestrian improvements.

The three alternatives take different approaches in this area known as the throat. One involves a new I-90 viaduct to carry the Turnpike, one that is further from the Charles River and does not require any construction in the Charles River, either during construction or permanently. Another puts Soldiers Field Road on a new viaduct and I-90 at-grade requiring construction in the Charles River, but leaving no permanent infrastructure in the Charles River itself. The third

eliminates any viaduct and puts all rail tracks and roadways at or below grade. This alternative does require construction on the Charles River, and it does leave some infrastructure also in the Charles River permanently. Next slide, please.

Outside the throat area the project is well defined. Here's a graphic of the interchange itself. This is the re-alignment alternative 3L. Next slide, please. This is the Updated Modified West Station: modified with four tracks and three platforms. Operation includes an express track to the south to accommodate more express trains in the future. It also allows for future two track urban rail service to Cambridge. Next slide please.

Here's our anticipated schedule with the NEPA Scoping Summary Report, which was already published in August 2020. We have a One Federal Decision concurrence point which identifies the preferred alternative through the One Federal Decision process, that is in the Fall of 2020. We have the MEPA Notice of Project Change, which is due also in the Fall of 2020. A NEPA draft Environmental Impact Statement, Spring of 2021, then the Final Environmental Impact Statement and Record of Decision in the Winter of 2021-2022. Next slide, please.

Now I'm going into NEPA milestones and concurrence on the preferred alternative. The cooperating agencies must concur on the preferred alternative. The reason for this concurrence, is it's part of the One Federal Decision (OFD) process, as outlined in the 2018 Federal Memorandum of Understanding implementing One Federal Decision. It accelerates the timeframes from Notice of Intent to the Record of Decision and establishes agency concurrence points along the way to facilitate those deadlines. To meet this timeframe MassDOT will need to begin the state permitting process prior to the publication of the NEPA DEIS, requiring timely concurrence on the preferred alternative so that designed permitting can go forward. MassDOT and FHWA are pursuing the identification of preferred alternative and preparation of this OFD concurrence point. Regardless of concurrence, at this stage, all alternatives identified in the Scoping Report will be thoroughly and equitably analyzed in the DEIS. Next slide, please.

Now, we're going to discuss the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) Notice of Project Change (NPC). The MEPA Notice of Project Change is expected to be published in the Fall of 2020. The NPC will respond to comments received on the DEIR, update and analyze the various design elements, including the 3L alternative, West Station, and the throat area variations. It will also introduce the SFR hybrid into the MEPA process as you will remember it was not part of the DEIR, it will be part of the NPC and represents the major reason for filing NPC. We will also provide an updated proposed Purpose and Need to align with NEPA. The Purpose and Need statements right now are inconsistent between the state and federal documents. We want to make those two consistent and then also select the preferred alternative, the MEPA process. Next slide, please.

This is the anticipated review process for the remainder of 2020. We have the NEPA. We had the Scoping Summary Report, which came out earlier this month that included that response to comments. In September, with federal and state agencies, there'll be concurrence meetings; and 45 days after the filing the Scoping Summary Report that is expected to happen. If concurrence is reached, work on the draft Environmental Impact Statement will begin in October. For MEPA, as I mentioned previously, you'd see in October of filing of the Notice the Project Change. That's so we can get re-scoped with a with a proper scope, so we can prepare the final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR); right now, it's inconsistent. Our scope that we currently have in the DEIR is not consistent with where the project is going, so we have to go back and update that through the Notice of Project Change. Then, the Secretary of Environmental Affairs will issue a consistent scope.

There's a MassDOT board update on the throat alternatives under consideration that's going to be happening in September. The Board will get an update on whether there is concurrence on the throat alternative and, if so, we would move on to the MEPA Notice of Project Change, which is scheduled to happen in October.

The Task Force meeting, we're having this meeting now in August. This slide appears to be a little older and does not quite reflect how things have shaken out time-wise. There will be meetings to review of the throat alternatives under consideration, and concurrence meeting. And then in October, there'll be another meeting to review whether there is concurrence on a throat alternative and, if so, the MEPA Notice of Project Change. Next slide. And that's the end of my presentation, I think I'll turn it back to you Ed.

Discussion

Q: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: Thanks, Mark. For the rest of the session. Mark Shamon, can you hear us okay? You're going to be our soundcheck, thank you.

C: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: The rest of the presentation will be questions and answers. As I said earlier, Erin has been tracking the questions and will read them back in order. Erin, if you could address the questions that I think I saw a few come in that were for the Project Manager, those first, and then take the rest in order. Once we hear the question, we'll figure out who'll give a response. Thanks.

C: Erin Reed, Howard Stein Hudson: Glen Berkowitz has a question and asked to come off mute. Nate, if you could do that please.

A: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis, Howard Stein Hudson: Folks, if you want to ask your question by voice, we encourage you to raise your hand in the appropriate pane so that we can see you doing that. But we'll happily take them this way as well. Glenn, you're just self-muted now on. You can come on whenever you like.

C: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: I do have a text from Glen who's having trouble with his audio, but I thought I saw a typed question come in from Glen to the Project Manager.

C: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis, Howard Stein Hudson: Glen is good. His microphone is on. I can see that.

Q: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: Can you hear? can you speak?

Q: Glen Berkowitz, Task Force Member: I'd be happy to, Mark. Can you hear me now, Mark?

A: Mark Fobert, Tetra Tech: Yes, we can. Yes, thank you.

Q: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: Everybody can see Mark Shamon, right?

A: Mark Shamon, VHB: I know. I'm the poster boy.

Q: Glen Berkowitz, Task Force Member: We're all wondering what music he's listening to. Thank you for taking this question via audio. I really appreciate it. In his opening remarks, the project manager, I believe specifically said we are currently in concurrence point number two. For those of us who have read the One Federal Decision executive order and we read about concurrence points 1, 2 and 3. In the Executive Order, it says concurrence points last a maximum

of 10 days. I was startled when I heard the project manager say we're currently in concurrence point number two and I'd like him to say specifically what day concurrence point number two began and is it true that concurrence point number two was going to conclude within 10 days of that day? Thank you for taking the question.

Q: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: So, Mike, are you still there?

Q: Mike O'Dowd, MassDOT: Can you hear me?

A: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: Yes, we can hear you. It's probably a good idea to start with the details of this, about what concurrence point number two is?

C: Mike O'Dowd, MassDOT: Sure, thank you Glen for the question. As you know, on August 7th we filed. The following Monday, August 10th Federal Highway Administration requested the written concurrence from the cooperating agency on the range of alternatives being recommended for advancement into the DEIS. That timeframe started on August the 10th and I believe, according to their calculations, would expire around August the 24th, so there is an expectation that we would have written concurrence from our cooperating agencies on August, the 24th.

Q: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: Okay, Nate, can Glen still speak? Is that satisfactory or a complete answer?

C: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis, Howard Stein Hudson: I'll switch him back on - hang on two shakes. There's Glen, he's back.

C: Glen Berkowitz, Task Force Member: Thank you, Nate, Ed, and of course Project Manager, thank you for that answer. Just a quick follow up question, the Project Manager also referred to a timetable when he was talking about concurrence points. I don't recall ever seeing a published timetable from the project team on things like concurrence points and in the timeline slide that was shown to us five minutes ago; it did not provide, for example, didn't even list concurrence point number two. Can the project manager, tomorrow, make that schedule for all of these things related to One Federal Decision available to the Task Force, please? Thank you.

Q: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: Can you handle that Mike and Nate?

A: Mike O'Dowd, MassDOT: Yes, I'll take care of it.

C: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: Thanks, Mike.

Q: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: Nate and Erin, are there any other hands raised for live questions? If not, please go to the questions in the order they were received in the written chat.

A: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis, Howard Stein Hudson: I currently do not have a raised hand, so we'll go to the written chat. Go ahead, Erin, and I'll let you know if I see a hand pop up. Folks, do feel free to raise your hands. We have no problem with doing that.

Q: Erin Reed, Howard Stein Hudson: Perfect. Christine asked, right at the top, "why wasn't an alternative where we remove a travel lane and have it all at-grade, without getting into the river considered?"

Q: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: Mike, do you want to start with that or? Mike, I guess that's best handled by you at this point.

Q: Mike O'Dowd, MassDOT: No, that's fine. If I understand the question correctly, the questioner was asking why we haven't considered removal of lanes?

A: Erin Reed, Howard Stein Hudson: Correct.

Q: Mike O'Dowd, MassDOT: Okay. This is something that we have considered in all of the analysis pertaining to traffic. Our response to that concern, question and comment, all along, has been that, based upon the traffic analysis that we've conducted, it is clear that I-90 and Soldiers' Field Road require us to maintain the current lane configuration that is there now. Moving forward, we will be carrying four lanes eastbound and westbound. Four lanes eastbound, four lanes westbound on I-90 in the final configuration. For Soldiers' Field Road, we will continue to carry two lanes eastbound and two lanes westbound.

Q: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: Okay, thanks. Erin, could you go to the next question? And I think you can back off; you're clipping a little bit. If you could back off your mic a bit.

A: Erin Reed, Howard Stein Hudson: Yes. Jen from Representative Moran's office asks: I just wanted to confirm I heard that accurately, since I had heard previously that the no-build option would not include a West Station. Does that mean the no-build option would include a West Station?

Q: Jim Keller, Tetra Tech: The no-build, is that the question?

A: Erin Reed, Howard Stein Hudson: Yes, does the no-build option to include a West Station?

A: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: That's Jim Keller. The no-build option does not include West Station as presented in the Scope Summary Report. Okay, next question, please, Erin.

Q: Erin Reed, Howard Stein Hudson: Jessica has a comment and a question. "Many of the comments on the Scoping Report were on the Purpose and Need. Why have there been no changes to the Purpose and Need in order to respond to those comments?"

Q: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: Mike, if you want to begin with that, please?

A: Mike O'Dowd, MassDOT: Sure. That is something that we took significant interest in when we were evaluating all of the questions received back in December of last year. After that further assessment and discussion amongst the cooperating agencies, as well as, our Federal Highway partners, as well as, the leadership, MassDOT all felt that the Purpose and Need that was communicated in the Scoping Report from November of 2019 correctly reflects the ideals of MassDOT moving forward with any of the build alternatives. We felt that it was not necessary to make any changes or modifications to the Purpose and Need from what was shown back in the Scoping Report in November of 2019.

C: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: And Mike, I think I would add that at this point, Federal Highway is in concurrence with that.

A: Mike O'Dowd, MassDOT: Correct. They are.

C: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: Federal Highway agrees with that. We will try not to use the One Federal Decision technical words or anything that doesn't apply to the technical definitions.

C: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: Okay, Erin. Next question, please.

Q: Erin Reed, Howard Stein Hudson: Sure. Rick asked, "why is pedestrian bicycle improvements only indicated for part of the project area and not the throat as well?"

Q: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: Okay. The question is, is there bicycle access in the throat. Jim, could you cover that?

A: Jim Keller, Tetra Tech: I don't follow the question exactly, but there are enhanced bicycle and pedestrian connections within the throat that are being considered for future connection; a north-south connection from Agganis Way to the Paul Dudley White Path, depending on what are alternatives is being discussed. There is a separation of the bicycle and pedestrian path within the throat area to certain degrees that was asked for SFR hybrid link to the throat within the modified HV, probably similar to the throat length. And for the at-grade, it's a 16-foot-wide path.³

Q: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: Anything to add there, Mike?

A: Mike O'Dowd, MassDOT: No. I believe Jim answered that completely.

C: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: Okay, our next question, please.

C: Erin Reed, Howard Stein Hudson: David just has a comment. And again, we're reading them so that anyone on the phone can hear them as well. "It's a mischaracterization to say that the hybrid option is not the consensus option. The issues are with the construction sequencing and impacts during construction as proposed by MassDOT, not the alternative."

Q: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: An understood statement. Mike, anything to add?

A: Mike O'Dowd, MassDOT: No, I thank them for that question and that comment. What we had seen, it was well in excess of several hundred comments, regarding how MassDOT was anticipating constructing the Soldiers Field Road Hybrid. We continue, as this is one of the alternatives advancing into the DEIS, we continue to evaluate ways to construct that particular option more efficiently, with less disruptions and less intrusion into the river, but based upon our efforts, at this point in time, we don't see that there is an opportunity to construct the Soldiers' Field Road Hybrid without some encroachment or intrusion, temporarily, in the river. The extents we may be able to improve upon the extent of what was shown in the Scoping Report. We may be able to minimize or decrease some of that encroachment, but in no instance that we identified are we able to construct SFR Hybrid without some temporary encroachment in the river.

C: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: Okay, Mike. Thanks. Erin. Next up, please.

Q: Erin Reed, Howard Stein Hudson: Sure. Pallavi also asked about for concurrence points: "I was kind of going through things, where are MassDEP and DCR in terms of perspectives on the three alternatives?"

A: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: I guess I'll start with that Mike and you can add at the end. The cooperating agencies are about to have a whole series of presentations on information so as they are considering those alternatives, and the potential selection of a preferred alternative, over the over the next I think it's 30 days of information exchange, at the end of which will start a period where the development of a preferred alternative for the purposes of One Federal Decision will take place. A distinction with the preferred alternative for One Federal Decision, we did run through this is the at last Task Force meeting, but to cover that, again, the preferred alternative used by the cooperating agencies in One Federal Decision basically is an acceptable preferred to those agencies or potentially likely preferred so they can begin detailed analysis for purposes of permitting, in order to try to accelerate the schedule. As said earlier, all three alternatives will be carried into a draft Environmental Impact Statement and get full review and full analysis. At the end, based on public comment, another preferred alternative may indeed emerge. There's a concurrence preferred alternative and then, ultimately, out in the future, according to the

³ The street grid that would be built within the former Beacon Park Yard connecting I-90 to Cambridge Street would also include separated bicycle and pedestrian facilities, protected intersections, and separate, signalized bicycle and pedestrian crossings at intersections in alignment with MassDOT and City of Boston complete streets guidelines.

schedule that Mark showed you, a NEPA preferred alternative coming out of that process. Mike, anything to add there that I might've messed up at all, or Sandy?

- A: Mike O'Dowd, MassDOT:** No, not at all. I think the only thing that I may have heard, and maybe I misunderstood the question, but if Pallavi was asking whether or not DEP or DCR have concurred on CP2 and the reasonable range of alternatives, I can't say that definitively, but, as I mentioned earlier, we're still within that 10-day timeframe that's set to expire on August 24th. I can't speak for what has occurred or what hasn't, because those responses are going directly to Federal Highway.
- C: Erin Reed, Howard Stein Hudson:** She does have a follow up question and her hand was raised. I'm trying to find - here we go. You're off mute now.
- Q: Pallavi Mande, Task Force Member:** Thanks. That was helpful, Mark, and Mike, but I guess my question was more in line with, are you just waiting for a letter from DCR and MassDOT saying that either concur or not? Or do you have a sense of their preference for where MassDOT is looking to incorporate that feedback? I would imagine since EEA has taken a strong stance on how they are going to see this project, DCR, as a coordinating agency responsible for parklands would have a strong opinion on how they are looking at the three. I was hoping you could tell us a little bit more about, as the parks agency, where those conversations have been going.
- A: Mike O'Dowd, MassDOT:** I have not had any conversations with the concurring agencies since Federal Highway sought their concurrence on the range of alternatives. As I mentioned, Pallavi, over the course of the next 10 days, if they seek any assistance or if there are any communications, it would be directly with the Federal Highway Administration, which is the lead agency, under One Federal Decision. And to your point, I'm just confirming that DEP and DCR are both members of the cooperating agencies.
- C: Pallavi Mande, Task Force Member:** Great. And if I may, I had another question. But I can either wait for my turn again or ask it right now.
- C: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech:** Pallavi, why don't you finish up. This is Ed. Before you do, just a note, that really what these agencies are looking at for concurrence point two, is that there is a good representative range of alternatives so it doesn't mean that they would favor any one in particular. I think from an agency standpoint, and this is just my opinion, for example, the parks agency and DEP will want to be sure that at least some of those alternatives, are alternatives they feel they could support permitting, but not all of them. It's concurring on the range for further analysis. Please proceed with your question Pallavi.
- C: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis, Howard Stein Hudson:** One quick note from me since we're doing some hands, Fred has his hand up. Once we get through with Pallavi, I'll go to Fred, and then we'll go back to the text questions.
- Q: Pallavi Mande, Task Force Member:** This will be short, I promise. Just a quick check on the discussion around both reduction of travel lanes on SFR and Mass Pike, and/or MassDOTs, willingness to look at narrower travel lanes and narrower shoulder widths. I'm assuming nothing has changed since what we saw at the MassDOT Board meeting in terms of the actual sections, I just wanted to confirm if that's the case and if you wanted to elaborate a little bit more about where those conversations around, both reduction of travel lanes and widths are at. Thank you.
- C: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech:** Mike, you've had the most recent conversations on this.
- A: Mike O'Dowd, MassDOT:** What I would do is, I would refer Pallavi to the graphics that are contained in the Scoping Summary report. They reflect what MassDOT's preference is for lane

configurations, lane widths, shoulder widths, for each of the transportation facilities within the project area, including I-90 and Soldiers' Field Road.

Q: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: Mike, I'll ask the question: presumably, that's a pretty firm policy decision at this point?

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

C: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis, Howard Stein Hudson: Alright. I'm going to unmute Fred Salvucci and then we'll go to Joe Beggan. and we also have Sarah Hamilton's hand up. For folks who put their hand up, just do me a favor. Once you've had your question answered, pop it back down again just so that I can see that we've taken care of you. You can always raise it again. Fred, you are now only self-muted. You just have to take yourself off self-mute. Your microphone is live. Go ahead, sir.

C: Fred Salvucci, Task Force Member: Okay, thank you very much. Four points real quick. First, there's a big difference between the number of lanes where you did include analysis. People may agree or disagree with the analysis, but you do have an explanation about why, particularly vis-à-vis, the turnpike; you're talking about eight lanes. However, on the issue of lane widths and shoulder width, the November document on the all at-grade, because the road is flatter and less aggressively curve, there's no S curve. In the Independent Review Team (IRT) standards we used, to my knowledge, and I've tried to read all these comments, no one commented that that was a problem. Yet, you widen the lanes and widen the shoulders, pushing the all At-Grade into the river when it was not in the river in the November document. That's a serious problem. I'm not expecting that answer on the spot. I just want to flag it for everyone that that's an act of vandalism towards the all At-Grade.

There's a difference between permits, particularly with some of the advocacy groups. There's a difference between permanent location, of road elements in the river, or a permanent location of the Paul Dudley White path in the river. They don't like either, but there's a big difference. The change from last November to now is not justified. I believe that the all At-Grade with the IRT standards is safer than the Highway Viaduct, because the Highway Viaduct has an aggressive, more aggressive S-curve and a serious grade element. That issue needs serious analysis at the very least. I don't think it leads analysis; I think it needs a return to the November standards as to width. There's a big difference between the width issue and the number of lanes issue.

The second comment I'd make, is that I think it was very appropriate for the Highway Viaduct alternative to be rejected last year. It was rejected because it did not meet Purpose and Need, it still does not meet the Purpose and Need. The Agganis Way connector it describes, is not at all adequate. That was the basis it was rejected before. In addition to that, the replacement of the little Grand Junction Bridge is essential to achieve a less constrained width for the Paul Dudley White. It's now about eight feet, if that. That's caused by the roughly 90-year-old, little Soldiers Field Road Grand Junction Bridge.

That bridge is to be replaced in both the all At-Grade and the Soldiers' Field Road hybrid with something that would permit a better dimension for the path. Jim just mentioned 16 feet. That may not be as much as many advocates would like, but it is much better than 8-feet. 16-feet does not fit if you don't replace a little Grand Junction Bridge. The Modified Highway Viaduct fails the Purpose and Need test. It also is a bear to construct. Many of us doubted that the old Highway Viaduct was constructible. Well, the Modified Highway Viaduct is more difficult to construct because you've added a new constraint without talking about it much. Keeping the access from the south side for rail equipment. Keeping a single track open to reach the Somerville maintenance facility throughout the construction rather than eliminating it for a substantial period, which was the earlier assumption, is probably the right decision from a rail operations point of view and the Secretary cites a \$300 million cost item. It's understandable

that, that change would occur, but that change is a very big deal and needs to be more visible and understood.

When you make that change, you make it even more difficult to build the Modified Highway Viaduct than the Highway Viaduct, because now you're trying to reconstruct a highway viaduct in a very constrained location with Worcester branch operations, hopefully two track operations on the southern side, and with maintaining the single track at least at night, on the northern side, and cutting diagonally across your access to the laid-out areas. You already had a very difficult constructability issue with the highway viaduct, which I don't believe had been solved. It's become much, much worse with this new constraint. It also has become much more difficult to maintain two tracks on the Worcester bridge. The Modified Highway Viaduct, I believe, should be rejected as the Highway Viaduct was, because it doesn't meet Purpose and Need because the constructability is totally opaque. No one has explained how that can possibly actually happen.

Third issue. Many of us, as you know, believe strongly that the original Harvard flip made the most sense because it provided that buffer park, which I think the community to the south of this rail infrastructure deserves. There's bad news and good news in the report. The bad news is you're rejecting the buffer park. The good news is, you're acknowledging that you committed in the South Station EIS that there needs to be noise and vibration mitigation for the communities to the south and you proposed to do that with a wall. But the wall needs a dimension and needs to be constructed. Well, many of us would prefer the buffer and urge that to be looked at again, whether the wall is exactly on the property line or whether it's set back to allow a buffer park. It cannot be constructed in the backyards of those houses and it cannot be constructed with a pair of tweezers and a hook. A wall of that size is a big deal and it's going to occupy space. It would require, at least, that the southern track be eliminated permanently, in order to provide sufficient depth of structure for the wall to be stable. That's assuming that you're not proposing to take everyone's backyard by eminent domain, which I'm assuming you're proposing. That means that there is a constrained number of tracks between what's being proposed, this mid-day layup, which you know is problematic for many people. And what's proposed as an express separate track rather than expressing through the station, which you also know is objectionable for many people, but they can't all fit in the same space at the same time, it goes back to Euclid. There is a constructability issue here. The good news is you are admitting and committing to providing that mitigation, but how to do the mitigation, how to fit it in, in the end state, and even more importantly, how to build it needs an answer before this layout can be finalized.

Last issue, the Cambridge Street bypass is tremendously important. You've heard that over and over. ask the question. It seems unlikely to me that given the number of times that's been raised as a very important issue for the community, to reduce the excessive traffic that otherwise occurs in the urban grid streets. It seems unlikely to me that at all this time, you have not run the traffic model to see how much the existence of the Cambridge Street bypass would relieve Cambridge Street itself, South Cambridge Street, and all of the perpendicular streets to those streets.

Question, have you run the model? Question number two, will you show us the results of that? Question number three, if you haven't run the model, you should run the model; that's a very important issue. I just wanted to lay those questions out. The last one, you may have an answer on the spot. The others require more analysis, and I'm not expecting a quick answer. Although if you have one, I'd love to hear.

- C: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech:** Well, Fred, this is Ed. We have all of those questions recorded and will certainly consider those and get back to you. Mike, for the last one on the modeling, any comment this time?
- A: Mike O'Dowd, MassDOT:** First, good evening, Fred. I hope all is well and hopefully you're maintaining good health. First and foremost, Cambridge Street Bypass Road and whether or not

we have run a model inclusive of the Cambridge Street Bypass Road and the answer to that is, no, we have not for that particular portion. Though it has been raised by many over the course of the last year and a half, two years, it is outside the limits of what we would be proposing to construct as we don't feel it's part of the overall Purpose and Need of the project. However, what we are constructing in order to accommodate the movements to and from West Station would allow for a future accommodation of the Cambridge Street Bypass Road to be constructed by others, as we see that facilitating future air rights development by the landowner. We don't anticipate running a traffic model that includes the Cambridge Street Bypass.

C: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis, Howard Stein Hudson: We've got two more hands, and then we'll go back to text questions. We're going to do Joe Beggan, then Sarah Hamilton. Joe, your microphone is now on. You're self-muted, Joe, so you can take yourself off. Go ahead; microphones is green, Joe. Go ahead. Joe, you're very quiet.

C: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: Nate, go to the next hand and we'll come back to Joe, please.

A: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis, Howard Stein Hudson: Yes, that's what I'll do. Sarah, you're live, Go ahead.

Q: Sarah Hamilton, MASCO: Hi, good evening. I had a question about the, all of the station design options which seem to point two track or urban rail alternative over the Grand Junction right of way, which is called out of the scope. The question is, doesn't that preclude future BRT views of that station and right-of-way? If that became warranted for short- or medium-term transit improvements, isn't that against the Purpose and Need for multimodal access? Then when, if at all, would these alternatives be considered in your process, like which part of the process ahead would consider alternatives to a two-track urban route?

I, by the way, I'm not opposed to two track urban rail. I'm just saying, I feel like, now, the process needs to look at many different alternatives for service and terminal, which is the right set of alternatives, not only to go through the station, but also to be able to go over Grand Junction. Thank you.

Q: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: Mark Shamon, you want to take a start on that and then get Mike's input, if there's anything additional?

A: Mark Shamon, VHB: Sure, I'll be glad to start. Hi, Sarah. I think your understanding of the plans as they exist today is correct in that the Grand Junction is anticipated in this program as an urban rail with two tracks. Really, at least recently, there has not been much if any consideration of putting BRT there, either in the short-term or long-term. I don't know that there's any interest on the MassDOT side in looking at another alternative. This group here, this Task Force, has been pretty adamant from the start that they're interested in seeing an urban rail service across this Grand Junction at some point in the future; that's the direction that we've taken thus far.

Q: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: Mike, anything to add to that?

A: Mike O'Dowd, MassDOT: In response to Sarah's question, although Mark did answer everything correctly on the Grand Junction service, I'm just going to mention the BRT service. You know, any of the configurations that we're proposing and West Station, and the bus concourse area, and access to and from would be able to accommodate future BRT services, but that's something with which there is no associated immediate timeframe. I believe the City of Boston has expressed interest in that at some point in time, but, as I mentioned, there's nothing definitive in place, but we feel confident that the station will be able to accommodate those movements in the future as needed.

- C: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech:** Okay, Mike. Thanks. Nate, I just got an e-mail from Joe Beggan who does not have a question. I guess he clicked hands up said we could move on. Any more hands up?
- A: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis, Howard Stein Hudson:** What I'm going to do, actually is right now we have a lot of hands like that one, which looked to be possibly leftover. What I'm going to do is I'm going to click the button to put down everyone's hand. If you still have a question, go right ahead, and put it back up but we've been sitting on Erin's text for a while. Let's have a couple more text questions while I put the hands down.
- C: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech:** Okay.
- C: Erin Reed, Howard Stein Hudson:** The next question is from Ari, but Ari also had his hand up.
- C: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis, Howard Stein Hudson:** I'll just unmute Ari because I did see his hand up and I wasn't sure if it was a leftover not. Ari, you're self-muted, Go ahead.
- C: Ari Ofsevit, Task Force Member:** Okay, I think I'm unmuted now.
- C: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis, Howard Stein Hudson:** I can hear you loud and clear.
- Q: Ari Ofsevit, Task Force Member:** I had a couple of questions, which I'm going to try to find in the chat as I wrote them. Of course, this is going to be difficult. One of the questions that I had is that on page 22 of the Scoping Report, it says, "the length of a single track would not mean reversion to the single track for the Worcester main line in 2018. At that time, the single-track operation extended to Newton." I want to make sure that it is clear to the project team that that's not true, there's no crossover in Newton. The single track extended from CP3 to CP4 for a distance of about one mile. There were a lot of issues with the rail service that were solved by the double track and saying that this would be better than what was occurring before, is just not the case. That needs to be clarified and corrected. Unless someone can tell me that I'm wrong and that there was a, you know, some kind of interlocking in Newton, that as far as anyone knows, never has never existed. That's sort of the first question. I don't know if anyone can just clarify that.
- Q: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech:** Mark, can you clarify that? Or should we.
- A: Mark Shamon, VHB:** Sorry, I was on mute. We will look into that, Ari. I will verify the information. My understanding is that when Boston Landing was built, or that whole project was built, they actually put the second track in from CP6 all the way into CP3.
- C: Ari Ofsevit, Task Force Member:** Well, CP6 is in Brighton, but CP6 was brand new. Before that, it was CP4.
- C: Mark Shamon, VHB:** Let me verify that. I don't want to give you the wrong answer, but we'll get back to you.
- Q: Ari Ofsevit, Task Force Member:** It definitely wasn't in Newton. And that's it. All of these are in the chat, so you can find it there. But the second question is, Purpose and Need item D2, the Paul Dudley White Path; the sections that need to be widened, basically to accommodate mixed two-way bicycle pedestrian use. I think someone asked this earlier. I wanted to clarify that the Modified HV shows continued substandard width for several hundred feet. The question would be how does this conform with the Purpose and Need? Then sort of to add on to that, you know, what this is basically saying is that for bicyclists and pedestrians were willing to have a level of

service that is acceptable for three quarters of the project, but then move down to a level of service is not acceptable for about a quarter of the project. We wouldn't do that with any of the other modes, so why is that an acceptable way to address the Purpose and Need, if it doesn't extend the entire length of the project?

A: Jim Keller, Tetra Tech: Hey Ari, how are you doing? As far as the Modified HV goes, we showed the separated width in the limits that we could, then necked it down, but there is an ability there. Yes. I'm picking up on what you're saying at the eastern limit and why we don't widen beyond the existing width. But yes, it is narrower in that location, that is correct.

C: Ari Ofsevit, Task Force Member: Okay. It looks like at the cross-section like it is substandard, but maybe that's something that could be clarified. I had another question about discovery report, but I'm not sure where it went. Oh no, these are just repeats. Okay, I think that's all the questions I've had.

Q: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: Thanks, Ari. Any more hands up, Nate?

A: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis, Howard Stein Hudson: Not right now. Let's go back to Erin because we've been letting those linger.

Q: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: Erin, can you give us an idea of how many you have?

A: Erin Reed, Howard Stein Hudson: We have quite a few. All right, the next one is from Guus Dreisen. "Are the north-south connections for pedestrians and bicycles limited to the travel way at West Station or are other connections still considered?" While you're answering, I'll go and count the number of questions we still have to get through.

C: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: Just trying to gauge if we can get through all them by eight o'clock. Thank you.

Q: Jim Keller, Tetra Tech: Can you please repeat that question?

A: Erin Reed, Howard Stein Hudson: Sure. Are the north-south connections for pedestrians and bicycles limited to the travel way at West Station or are other connections still considered?

A: Jim Keller, Tetra Tech: Yes, there's a connection at the Agganis Way, Buick Street intersection area over to the Paul Dudley White Path bridge connection over the I-90, the rail over SFR is being considered for future connection.

C: Mark Shamon, VHB: I'll just add to that quickly. Through the West Station area itself, the Malvern transitway, there's actually separated bicycle paths. It's not necessary that a bicyclist or pedestrian walk on the roadway, or even right up against the road, there is a separated path.

Q: Erin Reed, Howard Stein Hudson: Galen Mook asked, "Does the no build option include a layover yard?"

Q: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: Jim, does the no build include a layover yard?

A: Jim Keller, Tetra Tech: It does not include a yard per se, as shown for the 3L alternative. The operations layover yard supported on existing tracks within the easement would be a configuration of a train set, is not the same configurations as it would be with a modified flip station. It'd be utilizing an easement that exists to support the layover. It wouldn't be the same as the 3L interchange though.

- Q: Erin Reed, Howard Stein Hudson:** Christine had a follow up question on her, “have you thought about just taking a lane away to the Turnpike?” “Where’s that travel and traffic analysis? It’s absurd to think that a traffic analysis will call for that in the future. We need to look to the future, not the past. People need to be encouraged to ride the commuter rail in and including West Station will make more people take the commuter rail. Climate change is real.
- C: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech:** Okay, I think that’s understood and noted.
- Q: Erin Reed, Howard Stein Hudson:** Galen also asked, “how many comments are received in the Scoping Report? And how many referenced the need to re-assess the Purpose and Need?”
- Q: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech:** I don’t know if we have that count exactly. Sandy, if you’re still on, do you have an idea about that?
- A: Sandy Hoover, Tetra Tech:** Yeah, can you guys hear me? Okay, great. Sorry if you hear any little ones in the background. To address the first question, we received over 2,000 comments on the November Scoping Report. As far as how many comments were related to the Purpose and Need, I don’t have that exact number.
- C: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis, Howard Stein Hudson:** We can work on getting that back to you, Galen; we can do that. We’ve got to sort the data and work on it, and I’ll get back to you through to the appropriate channels.
- Q: Erin Reed, Howard Stein Hudson:** Ian asked, “is there any possibility of making any or some of the project underground?”
- Q: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech:** Mike, do you want to return to the early thoughts on this? You’re probably, really, the best to start on this one.
- Q: Mike O’Dowd, MassDOT:** First, let me confirm what I heard as the question, because I just lost audio real quick, but were they asking whether or not any of the project elements could be built underground?
- A: Erin Reed, Howard Stein Hudson:** That is correct.
- A: Mike O’Dowd, MassDOT:** Okay. That was a question that was raised several years ago in advance of filing the DEIR. We did look into whether there are significant costs, construction, staging, and utility implications associated with that. We discounted that after a significant amount of assessment and evaluation on cost, utility implications, construction, and overall duration.
- C: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech:** Thanks, Mike, and I remember the resiliency and potential future storm impacts was also part of that decision. Okay, next question, please.
- C: Erin Reed, Howard Stein Hudson:** Sure. Glen has another question. Nate, he has asked to come off mute. He has a question regarding the Modified Highway Viaduct.
- C: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis, Howard Stein Hudson:** Sure, that’s fine. Give me one minute. Glen, you’re logged in twice, so I want to make sure I get the right one, but I think that’s the right one.
- Q: Glen Berkowitz, Task Force Member:** Hello? Hello? Can you hear me now?
- A: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis, Howard Stein Hudson:** Yes, sir. We have you.

- C: Glen Berkowitz, Task Force Member:** That's great. Thank you very much. In the slide presentation that was given to us earlier tonight, could you put up, if you would, please slide number 14, I think it is. It's labeled Alternatives Carried Forward into the DEIS. I have a comment and question on that slide. Please.
- C: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis, Howard Stein Hudson:** That slide should be up now, folks.
- C: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech:** We can see it here, Nate.
- C: Glen Berkowitz, Task Force Member:** That's great. Thank you so much, Nate. On the third bullet, the three build alternatives, take blah, blah, blah, yadda, yadda, the first sub thing there. "One involves a new I-90 viaduct", I assume, that's referring to the new Modified Highway Viaduct that was unveiled on June 22nd. One that is further from the Charles River" that's the exact same quote that was in the Project Manager's presentation given to the Board on June 22nd when this was first unveiled. One, that is further from the Charles River. Further from the Charles River in terms of what? It's so obvious that you all purposefully wrote this so that none of us would know what you're referring to.
- I asked to share my screen, to show a new drawing that A Better City has prepared, but Nate and others told me that the system you use is unable to do that. So I'll make a comment, or ask a question, but, also ask that Nate, if I provide you with the drawing, can you distribute it to all the people who are here tonight, so they have the benefit of seeing the drawing? If you could just give a quick yes or no.
- C: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis, Howard Stein Hudson:** Provided the project team leadership agrees with it. It's really a question for Mike.
- C: Mike O'Dowd, MassDOT:** Sure, that's fine, Glen.
- Q: Glen Berkowitz, Task Force Member:** I really appreciate that. The question and the comment is, one that is further from the Charles River, so you're seeing the new Modified Highway Viaduct is further from the Charles River. Further from the Charles River than the existing viaduct?
- A: Mike O'Dowd, MassDOT:** This is a comparison to an alternative that was previously brought forward on the Highway Viaduct. The Modified Highway Viaduct, due to the fact that it is narrower, would move the travel lanes further away from the location of where the previous highway viaduct was configured. It's a comparison against the Highway Viaduct that was in the DEIR and the Scoping Report.
- C: Glen Berkowitz, Task Force Member:** That's what A Better City's drawing proves. Just if you would please confirm project manager, or maybe Jim Keller and hi Jim. The analysis shows that the new Modified Highway Viaduct is basically in the facade of the outside barrier. It's basically in the same exact footprint, in terms of proximity to the river as the existing facade. Could you please, generally, confirm that that is accurate?
- A: Jim Keller, Tetra Tech:** Yes, generally confirm those are.
- C: Glen Berkowitz, Task Force Member:** Could you all, just as a comment, could you please revise this sentence so that, at best, you're not being slightly deceitful? And at worst, that you're not lying to people who see it. Thank you very much. And we'll give you that drawing and appreciate you sharing it with everybody. And thanks again.
- C: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech:** Okay, Glen. Thanks. More hands up, Nate.

- C: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis, Howard Stein Hudson:** Yes, Joe Beggan's hand is back up again. I don't know if that's an error again. All the hands up, there all repeats, so I want to make sure that, you know, as we're working our way through the hour that. Right now, I have Ari who spoke once. I got Fred, who spoke. Glen, your hand is still up. I don't know if you want another one. Joe Beggan his back up again. Those are all repeats at present. Maybe, Erin we should get through a few more of the text questions, just so people aren't left hanging.
- Q: Erin Reed, Howard Stein Hudson:** Yes we do have some that it's their first question or comment. Alana, question/comment. "Given that transit connections on the Grand Junction were identified as a priority and central benefit of West Station and comments on this project, and have been included in the Master Rail Vision plan, why was the reconstruction of the Grand Junction rail bridge left out of the project? Wouldn't that make more sense logistically to manage these projects together rather than wait an unidentified amount of time to realize the full potential of this project, from a transit perspective? Has anyone even studied what that would look like?"
- A: Mike O'Dowd, MassDOT:** What I can tell you is that the considerations of replacing the Grand Junction over Soldiers' Field Road have been evaluated relative to the two alternatives that would warrant or require its replacement in order to be able to advance them and construct them. Whether or not the MBTA has given consideration to replacements of the main Grand Junction crossing over the Charles River, I can't speak to. However, at my last look under their own capital investment program, I do not believe that they've made any investments toward that project. But it is outside of the limits of this work, related to the Allston Multimodal project.
- C: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech:** Okay, Mike. Thanks. Let me ask you a question, Erin. You're now proceeding with people who have not been called on, correct?
- A: Erin Reed, Howard Stein Hudson:** Correct.
- Q: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech:** Okay. Knowing that we have to end at eight, Nate, before we continue, could you confirm that, any questions we might not get to, have captured, and we will get to, in writing later?
- A: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis, Howard Stein Hudson:** We can do that. We'll pull up the chat log at the end of this. One of the things that we've agreed to do is, you know, it looks like you have a few things to issue tomorrow. We'll pull the chat log off this, and we will try to provide answers to any unanswered questions as part of the meeting minutes.
- C: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech:** Okay, so we'll continue through the questions for the next 30 minutes, and hopefully it won't have to interrupt them with any administrative trivia, so please go Erin.
- C: Erin Reed, Howard Stein Hudson:** Based on the number of questions that are still in the chat feature, I think we can get through all that are there. Thomas' comment and question, "we would like to see the all at-grade option developed by A Better City and supported by the City of Boston evaluated in the DEIS as a substitute or in addition to the At-Grade alternative in the Scoping Summary Report. What is the status of that alternative at this time?"
- Q: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech:** Mike, do you want me to start with that or do you want me to take a shot?
- A: Mike O'Dowd, MassDOT:** No, I'll take it. It's my understanding that A Better City has recently made some improvements and refinements to the graphic that was shown in the Scoping

Summary Report. I can confirm that we will be looking at and evaluating that as part of our overall assessment and evaluation of alternatives as a refinement to the at grade in the DEIS.

- C: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech:** Just a note under NEPA, and some concurrence points that we discussed earlier, as we covered what the agencies are concurring on is a reasonable range of alternatives at this point. Basically, the concepts, not all of the detail. Those alternatives can be certainly amended, modified, and improved as we go into the DEIS. Next question, please.
- Q: Erin Reed, Howard Stein Hudson:** Sandy, this may be for you, it's from Galen. "Out of the comments that were received in response to the Scoping Report, how many, number wise preferred the I-90 viaduct versus the Soldiers Field Road Viaduct versus the At-Grade?" He says a rough estimate is fine.
- C: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech:** Sandy, if you're still there and you can estimate that, please do.
- A: Sandy Hoover, Tetra Tech:** It's a good question. I don't know if we have exact numbers for that. Right now, I would say that the number of comments that came in that advocated for an at-grade to go forward to the DEIS are probably a little bit less than 100, maybe between 80 and 90. There were a handful that came in that wanted a highway viaduct to go forward to the draft EIS. Again, as far as the SFR Hybrid, the vast majority of the comments that we've received regarding the SFR Hybrid were opposition to the construction.
- C: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech:** I'd like to point out here that in both NEPA and MEPA, the number of comments, it's not a voting tally or a percentage tally. It's all based on the content of the comments. While this is interesting, it's not a direct tie to how these alternatives will be evaluated. Next questions, please.
- Q: Erin Reed, Howard Stein Hudson:** Galen has another question. "If I'm biking from Malvern Street in Allston and attempting to get to the Charles River via West Station, how many lanes of traffic I need to cross with my children?"
- A: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech:** Jim will count that up, and we'll get you an answer, but he doesn't have it right now. Let's move on to the next.
- Q: Erin Reed, Howard Stein Hudson:** Sarah just comments, "nice to know, many modes can be accommodated into the station." And then asks, "how will the modes allowed into West Station and over the junction right-of-way, be modeled and considered and decided - urban rail, commuter rail, bus, BRT, bicycle, and pedestrian impact potential ridership costs and impacts?"
- Q: Mark Shamon, VHB:** I'm sorry, could you repeat the question?
- A: Erin Reed, Howard Stein Hudson:** Yeah, sorry, it was a long one. The question is, how will the modes allowed into West Station and over the Grand Junction be modeled, considered, and decided? Urban rail, commuter rail, bus, BRT, bike, and pedestrian for potential ridership costs and impacts?
- A: Mark Shamon, VHB:** Okay, I'll try to take that on it. That's a big question. We are, as most people on this meeting know we are doing some modeling. We've done some modeling in the past that's based on the expectations of the system at the day of opening, as well as, a later phase. As I think many of, you know, we've got a lot of comments in the past about looking at the system to make sure it actually works for a 15-minute bi-directional service. I'm talking about the rail at this point. We are now starting to implement a kind of a forced analysis, if you will, of the Grand

Junction and the Worcester Mainline to make sure that it actually works for 15-minute service so that we're not just saying it and that we'll have a model that effectively proves it.

In terms of the bus, we did have a very robust set of criteria in terms of where the buses will be coming from. There are buses coming from Harvard Square, Central Square, and Kendall Square, coming through West Station, and going in different directions, and even as far as the LMA. The service was fairly robust, I think, in the peak hour, and I'm doing this by memory, so I apologize if I don't have the numbers exactly right. But I think we're looking at 15-minute service and even 10-minute service in some cases. For some of those buses coming through the West Station train yard area and coming down or up Malvern Transitway, connecting the North and the South, so it's fairly robust. I'm not familiar with any pedestrian modeling that may have been done. Jim, maybe you can respond to that, but that's what we stand on the rail and bus.

C: Jim Keller, Tetra Tech: Pedestrian modeling. At this moment, I don't have that, but we can get back to you with that information. We can our traffic folks put that together from the modeling that's been done.

A: Erin Reed, Howard Stein Hudson: Ari is next. Nate, if you could unmute him.

C: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis, Howard Stein Hudson: Yes, I see his hand up.

C: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: Nate, Joe Beggan confirmed again that his hand is up, but he doesn't have it up.

C: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis, Howard Stein Hudson: Well, Joe Beggan is logged in three times. I'm going to actually lower Joe Beggan's hand. We'll just turn that off. Maybe Joe has passed out his link to other people. So, there we go. Ari.

Q: Ari Ofsevit, Task Force Member: I guess the first comment is that it seems like if you're building a railyard, it's a no build within an easement, we could build anything within the easement, but that would be a new use because we have not stored passenger equipment there, ever. The other question I had is, is there any drawing in the Scoping Report that shows a cross-section of the project where the two tracks of the Grand Junction move out from under the newly proposed Modified Highway Viaduct? That seems to be the biggest pinch point. I haven't seen any cross-sections there showing where that would occur exactly, what grades would be required for both the highway and the railroad, I know that was a discussion point several years ago.

A: Jim Keller, Tetra Tech: It's not in the Scoping Summary Report. You're correct Ari, but we do have some sections there that we're working on developing.

C: Ari Ofsevit, Task Force Member: Okay, that'd be great if those could be shared. The one other question I had, you mentioned earlier, that someone in the project team, that the Grand Junction was outside of the scope of the multimodal project. I'd also point out that theory again, you could easily say a station expansion was outside of those limits, and therefore, probably shouldn't be carried through as well. But I know that has been decided by MassDOT and MassDOT decides which projects are in or not in the scope. Thanks.

C: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: Thanks, Ari. Erin, go ahead, please.

C: Erin Reed, Howard Stein Hudson: That's the last of the types of questions, so we can move on to hands.

- C: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis, *Howard Stein Hudson*:** Hands that we have up so far, we have Alana Westwater. Alana, I think we got you on text, but I'll turn your microphone on. You are self-muted at this time. Go ahead, if you wish.
- C: Alana Westwater, *Community Member*:** Hello everybody and thank you so much. I just wanted to clarify, and I apologize for the incorrect typing in my typed question. I'm curious about the little Grand Junction bridge. I feel really confused about whether or not the little Grand Junction bridge falls into scope of this project. I've heard that it has to be replaced, and there's some alternatives that it won't be replaced under other alternatives, and I'm just confused about how all of that plays in from a scope perspective, and if you guys could help eliminate that, that'd be great.
- C: Ed Ionata, *Tetra Tech*:** Mike, I think you have the best grasp of this. You're still there?
- A: Mike O'Dowd, *MassDOT*:** I'm here. I didn't go anywhere. I'll respond the same way I responded to the previous question that was very similar in nature, is that under two of the build alternatives being advanced into the DEIS, a replacement of the span of Grand Junction over Soldiers' Field Road would need to be replaced during the construction staging and phasing of those alternatives. It would not extend to any improvements, rehabilitation, or structure replacements of the major span over the Charles River. That is something that would fall within the purview of MBTA. It's a program in their own capital investment plan.
- C: Ed Ionata, *Tetra Tech*:** Okay. Thanks, Mike.
- C: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis, *Howard Stein Hudson*:** All right, so, next up, we have a hand. Alana put her hand back up. Alana, do you have a follow up while we're still here? You're self-muted, again. Oh, there you go, You're on.
- Q: Alana Westwater, *Community Member*:** Yeah. Thanks. Sorry, Mike, I think that's exactly what I'm asking about. Why is it in scope to replace the little Grand Junction for two of the alternatives and not in scope one of them? I don't feel like I understand what's going on there.
- A: Mike O'Dowd, *MassDOT*:** It's, it's a forced issue. Originally, MassDOT had no anticipation or direction to move or replace Grand Junction. However, in the two alternatives, the At-Grade and the Soldiers' Field Road Hybrid. In order to be able to effectively constructs either of those two alternatives, we would need to replace Grand Junction as it becomes a critical component woven into the completion of those two alternatives. Looking at the horizontal location and the vertical alignments of those relative to Grand Junction forces us to have to replace the structure over Soldiers' Field Road.
- C: Ed Ionata, *Tetra Tech*:** Thanks, Mike.
- C: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis, *Howard Stein Hudson*:** Next hand is from Galen, I'll turn the microphone on. Galen, you're self-muted. You got it.
- Q: Galen Mook, *Task Force Member*:** Thanks, I appreciate that. And I appreciate the fact that I can hear the questions that they're popping up too. Thanks Nate, for improving this meeting over the last. I don't know if Alana's question was answered. I think she was asking why the replacement was in two of the alternatives and not the third alternative, though I get that are we comparing apples to apples, conversation. I think, that might be where she is going. I understand that we're not asking about replacing Little Grand Junction fully over the river, but I just want to be clear that, you know, I think what she's getting, I don't want to speak for you Alana. My questions then is, are we actually comparing apples to apples when we're talking

about cost? Because a lot of us feel that replacing the old Grand Junction Bridge is a benefit to this project, even though last meeting was referred to as a cost cutting need for one of the alternatives not to have that.

That was just my little hit there, but my real question actually pertains to the point where you said that the rest of the project is well defined. Could you go into a little bit of detail as to what you are defining in terms of the Franklin Street Footbridge, what you're defining in terms of the Cambridge Street overpass? What you're defining in terms of the width of the lane, maybe even the numbers of lanes that are going to be in the street grid, including the alignment of the roadways, et cetera, et cetera. It seems like even though the throat is the topic of most of these talks, I don't want to lose the forest for the trees here to say that a lot of this is going to actually be built based off the street width and the rest, and the actual rest of the 100 acres. That's my real question, is how well defined, can you go into that?

And then lastly, did you get to count on how many lanes I'm going to have to go with from Malvern Street over to the river? How many lanes of traffic I'm going to have to cross there from my former question? I just want to make sure that didn't go unanswered either. With that, I will re-mute myself, and put down my hand.

- C: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech:** Galen, we'll get the count for you, we don't have right now, we'll get it for you and get it to you. Jim will do that. Mike, do you want to talk about the rest of the interchange?
- C: Jim Keller, Tetra Tech:** We could touch on the interchange. Essentially, saying it's well defined, we understand that there's still...
- A: Mike O'Dowd, MassDOT:** Jim, can I interrupt you for one second? I apologize. Could you bring that slide, do we have a slide that would show 3L in the interchange area?
- C: Mark Fobert, Tetra Tech:** You'll get it.
- Q: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech:** Mike, you can see that right?
- A: Mike O'Dowd, MassDOT:** Perfect. I'm sorry about that.
- Q: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech:** Go ahead. Do you want Jim to continue or do you want to take it?
- A: Mike O'Dowd, MassDOT:** I want Jim to continue. I just wanted a graphic to sort of walk us through it.
- Q: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech:** Okay, go ahead, James.
- C: Jim Keller, Tetra Tech:** Generally speaking, the interchange is well defined, for several years, several iterations and we're at 3L now. To work our way back to where we started, but it's been a long process. As far as horizontal vertical locations of the skeleton of the street grid, based on stakeholder input, Task Force, public, all the studies that were done, making different connections, changing the underpass for Soldiers Field Road, the at-grade connection from Cambridge Street south, better connections from lower Allston.

Understanding your question about the number of lanes you'd have to cross, but over time, to look back at what was previously proposed for this interchange is kind of how MassDOT is stating that interchange is well defined; straightening of I-90, improving on the realigning of I-90 for the commuters using the interstate, as well as, the modifications adding the open space for SFR. For Franklin Street we understand that is not finalized; the switchbacks are in contention

with that, and we understand that fully, there's not a lot of property to drop a ramp there from Franklin Street, but we're still looking at that and re-engaging urban ideal labs. Taking a closer look at Franklin Street as we progress into the DEIS, as well as the number of lanes within the interchange, but getting back to your point. This will all be redone with new CTPS numbers. Anywhere we can shave lanes, we are looking into that. If it's turn pockets that can get removed, looking into that, but generally speaking, the interchange 3L is well defined. Mike, if you have anything to add.

C: Mike O'Dowd, MassDOT: No, I would agree with what you said and just adding Cambridge Street.

C: Jim Keller, Tetra Tech: I was just going to touch on that.

C: Mike O'Dowd, MassDOT: Yeah, go ahead. Go ahead, Jim.

C: Jim Keller, Tetra Tech: As far as Cambridge Street, that was a project from several years ago that MassDOT was going to move forward to with construction. We do understand the Cambridge Street overpass over I-90 in the western location of the project.

We understand there was some interest in replacing that. I guess some columns can get moved around with this Modified Flip version of West Station. The current approach, the major rehabilitation as previously proposed would also include that project, but that project has been accepted, and it just has not got to construction yet, but would be part of this project as well.

Q: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis, Howard Stein Hudson: Galen, put his hand back up again. You want another shot at it or are you good for now?

Q: Galen Mook, Task Force Member: Sorry, I didn't mean to put my hand up. I think you did, but I just want to be clear, I wasn't clear on that answer. Are you going to replace the Cambridge Street overpass, the whole thing or are you just going to do the decking?

A: Jim Keller, Tetra Tech: Currently, it is not a full replacement, it's a major rehabilitation.

Q: Galen Mook, Task Force Member: Okay. The pillars where they're at are going to stay where they're at, we'd assume and we're just going to replace the surface?

A: Jim Keller, Tetra Tech: Yes.

C: Galen Mook, Task Force Member: Okay, thanks. Just to remind us that the Franklin Street Footbridge is more than just the intestinal switch back to the open the land that's going to be required for taking that and that might impact the track layup and it might impact a whole slew of things. I just want to be clear that, as you say, well defined, clearly in my mind, there's still a lot of open questions that we've had for about six plus years here.

A: Jim Keller, Tetra Tech: We understand, Galen. There's definitely going to be another look at the Franklin Street pedestrian bridge. We looked at it pretty thoroughly a couple of years back and came up with this layout, because the of the constraints that are there, not because we would choose to put this switchback ramp system in. We've seen some of the chatter out there and some of the ramps that you've shown and some pedestrian connections you've shown from other places that are pretty amazing, but you need quite a bit more area to accommodate the curves, and the length. the curves. It's definitely a tricky area that we're very sensitive to; we would really like to improve that if it's possible.

- C: Galen Mook, *Task Force Member*:** I hear you there, but I want you to keep that in the forefront. If you're going to make the highways safer, I would really appreciate that same mentality for bicycle and pedestrian crossings, because again, just to remind everybody what Representative Honan said at the very first comment of the very first meeting of the very first time that we met publicly, this is about knitting the neighborhood back together.
- A: Jim Keller, *Tetra Tech*:** Thank you.
- Q: Ed Ionata, *Tetra Tech*:** Nate, any more hands up?
- A: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis, *Howard Stein Hudson*:** Yes, the last hand is with Fred. Erin, any additional text questions come in while we've been waiting? Fred had one bite at the apple already. I just want to be sure because we're 10 minutes from the hour.
- A: Erin Reed, *Howard Stein Hudson*:** We just have one more.
- C: Ed Ionata, *Tetra Tech*:** Okay, let's read the question and then we'll finish with Fred.
- Q: Erin Reed, *Howard Stein Hudson*:** Pallavi asked, "can any of the consultants from VHB elaborate on the climate, resilience and precipitation-based flooding modeling to the overall project? Assuming that will affect how the different alternatives and the overall project will be up to incorporate flood storage and elaborate this more into the context of the Salt Creek watershed drain through the project area?"
- A: Mark Shamon, *VHB*:** This is Mark. I think I'm the only VHB representative and unfortunately, I am completely unable to answer that question and I won't even pretend to, but we're happy to bring it back to the office and have folks respond back in writing.
- C: Mark Fobert, *Tetra Tech*:** This is Mark Fobert of Tetra Tech. That's one of ours actually. Sorry Mark, I should've chimed in earlier. We're working with storm water group. We'll bring your question to them. Part of the NPC is resiliency, there'll be an analysis in the NPC. That was one of our differentiating factors I think, going forward with what alternative moves forward.
- C: Ed Ionata, *Tetra Tech*:** The additional information that needs to go into that analysis since the draft EIR model...
- C: Mark Fobert, *Tetra Tech*:** It has not changed. As far as I know, the model has not changed. The Boston Harbor model that we used to define the....
- C: Ed Ionata, *Tetra Tech*:** Elevation, but there are now new or different storm entity inputs, which we have talked about before, and those will be considered.
- C: Mark Fobert, *Tetra Tech*:** The methodology is in the Scoping Report, and the DEIR. The methodology going forward was in the DEIR.
- C: Jim Keller, *Tetra Tech*:** There are definitely some concerns that have been voiced about storm intensity and things that occurred in the last, however long it's been four years since the draft EIR, and those updates are coveted methodology in the Scoping Summary Report, and that will be considered.
- C: Mark Fobert, *Tetra Tech*:** Yes, correct.
- C: Ed Ionata, *Tetra Tech*:** Okay, we're going to Fred, unless there are any more text questions.
- Q: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis, *Howard Stein Hudson*:** Erin, are we good?

A: Erin Reed, *Howard Stein Hudson*: We are good.

C: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis, *Howard Stein Hudson*: Alright, go for Fred.

C: Fred Salvucci, *Task Force Member*: Thank you. A couple of residual issues. It seems to me that picking a preferred alternative under MEPA while you don't have a preferred alternative under the National Environmental Policy Act until much later, introduces a lot of confusion.

The proper selection of the preferred alternative should include mitigation under federal law and could very well be a different preferred alternative than might be chosen without having considered mitigation much earlier in the process. I don't believe it's necessary for MEPA to pick a preferred alternative. It would simplify this process if the selection of a preferred alternative for MEPA purposes occurred later at the same time, as the national and this is going to create a lot of confusion and leave out the mitigation considerations from the selection of a preferred alternative on the MEPA. I would propose that look to be taken at MEPA because I believe it's possible to defer the choice to the same point in the process as it occurs in the Federal. I'll leave that as a question, I'd like a written answer that everybody can look at.

The other issue that I wanted to raise, at Alana's point, the two-track connection is extremely important to get service to Kendall and it's been an issue for a long time. Two of the alternatives, The Hybrid and the All At-Grade upgrade replace the Grand Junction Bridge over Soldiers Field Road, both allowing a wider Paul Dudley White, thus meeting Purpose and need, and a robust two track connection to the edge of the Charles River.

The third alternative, the Modified Highway, does not do that, and it neither fills the purpose a need for Paul Dudley White purposes, but it also does not satisfy another condition. There's some good wording about how the Highway, the All At-Grade and the Hybrid because they get the two tracks to the edge of the Charles River would not involve any reconstructing of brand new infrastructure and re-opening of environmental issues when the decision to add the second track comes. In the Highway Viaduct, that is not true, and that's a big problem, and it is not clearly stated. In other words, the Modified Highway Viaduct if it were chosen, which I hope it won't be, would require reconstructing pieces of the Grand Junction and Soldiers Field Road in the middle of something that had just gotten through a very disruptive construction process. It's very undesirable for traffic maintenance. It's very undesirable from an environmental point of view. And since MassDOT has put a \$300 million value on keeping the single track open for purposes of getting to the maintenance facility, there ought to be some money to do this, right, and at least do the engineering properly, to provide for the two tracks all the way to the Cambridge side of the river.

I understand that environmental processes require for the two-track service within Cambridge, there are a lot of complex issues there. But at the very least, getting to the Boston side of the river, which the All At-Grade and the Hybrid achieve, clarifies a lot of what is needed and either eliminate or substantially reduces any risk that you would have to re-open a construction process in an area that had just completed this massive construction project. That needs to be much more clearly explained. Or preferably, you should drop the Modified Highway Viaduct because I don't believe it satisfies the Purpose and Need and I don't believe that the constructability is viable.

There's been a lot of talk about keeping two tracks open on the Worcester branch at all times. Which, I think is very important, which you have not been able to commit to yet, but there's another condition that's been assumed throughout this five or six-year process, which is that when the Turnpike gets disrupted, there will be three lanes of temporary turnpike in each direction at all times. I do not believe that that condition is possible with the Modified Highway

Viaduct. I suspect you would be forced if you had a gun to your head, and you had to build that you would be forced to doing single and two lane pieces, and it would be murder for maintaining traffic. A three-lane reasonably straight and flat turnpike, even temporary, can maintain a reasonable amount of traffic; two lane stretches do not have the same capacity, so you can't just count lanes.

The condition you adopted earlier that there be three lane sections in each direction is a very important one. I don't believe you can satisfy that condition in the Modified Highway Viaduct. The biggest single environmental issue on this project, probably is the disruption of traffic and all of the consequences of what happens when people from MetroWest can't get to their jobs.

And when they try to get to their jobs by using every parallel street overrunning: Allston, Brighton, Brookline, and Cambridge. Those are huge environmental impacts and they would be exacerbated. The Highway Viaduct, either the old one or the new one, and those environmental impacts, if you've got to keep that on the table, those environmental impacts have got to be understood before a choice is made.

I go back to, don't choose the preferred alternative until a point in time, when you do it under the National Environmental Policy Act or you're introducing an awful lot of confusion, I'm likely, to make a big mistake in choosing preferred alternative too early. I don't expect a yes or no answer on that, I do expect a written answer though, because the constructability issue on the Modified Highway Viaduct is huge and has never been reviewed in any meeting that I'm aware of.

C: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: Understood Fred. Most importantly, I think Mike understands that, and the path followed through MEPA is certainly a topic of discussion. With that, any other hands pop up, Nate?

Q: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis, Howard Stein Hudson: Fred, you still got your hand up. I'm going just pop it down for you. There you go, it's down. No, I did not see any additional hands up at this time. Erin, any more text questions?

A: Erin Reed, Howard Stein Hudson: We do not have any.

Q: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: Okay, thank you to all the participants. Nate, do we have a target for the next Task Force meeting?

A: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis, Howard Stein Hudson: I would defer to Mike. I know that we have plans for additional outreach, tentatively, in the middle of September. I would leave that defined by our project manager.

C: Mike O'Dowd, MassDOT: I would anticipate that to be the latter half of September. Thank you all for your participation this evening.

Q: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: Nate, do you have the chat log? We have a few things to respond to. I think we have them all documented?

A: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis, Howard Stein Hudson: I've done that, and I've also taken them down in the way I feel most comfortable with, in my very 20th century way, they're written down in my notebook. We'll work on getting all that stuff out to folks tomorrow.

Q: Ed Ionata, Tetra Tech: Thank you to all the presenters and all the participants We should be back together in mid to late September. Thanks very much. We'll be following up. Goodnight.

Next Steps

The Project Team will begin working on responses for unanswered Task Force member questions and distribute responses in writing. The next outreach to the Task Force and public is anticipated for the latter half of September, 2020.

Attendance

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Meredith	Avery	VHB
Robert	Alger	Community Member
Doug	Arcand	Community Member
Jay	Arcand	Community Member
Meredith	Avery	VHB
Joe	Beggan	Task Force Member
Glen	Berkowitz	Task Force Member
Andrew	Bettinelli	Task Force Member
Gregory	Boles	Community Member
Eric	Bourassa	MAPC
Liz	Breadon	Community Member
Will	Brownsberger	Task Force Member - Senator
Nathaniel	Cabral-Curtis	Howard Stein Hudson
Nick	Cohen	VHB
James	Curley	Community Member
Andrew	Curtis	Community Member
Tom	Daley	Community Member
Anna	Darrow	Community Member
Jeff	Dietrich	Howard Stein Hudson
Thomas	Donald	Community Member
Mark	Ennis	Community Member
Mark	Fobert	VHB
Dennis	Giombetti	Task Force Member
Mercy	Gomez	Community Member
Sarah	Hamilton	MASCO
Steven	Heikin	Community Member
Sandy	Hoover	Tetra Tech
Edward	Ionata	Tetra Tech
Hannah	Kane	Task Force Member
Owen	Kane	Community Member
James	Keller	Tetra Tech
Don	Kindsvatter	CSS
Peter	Klinefelter	Community Member

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Bill	Ko	Community Member
Edward	Kotomori	Community Member
Wendy	Landman	Task Force Member
Elizabeth	Leary	Task Force Member
Rich	Lenox	Community Member
Priscilla	Livingston	Community Member
Oscar	Lopez	Community Member
David	Loutzenheiser	Task Force Member
Pallavi	Mande	Task Force Member
Harry	Mattison	Task Force Member
Tim	McCarthy	Community Member
Jen	Migliore	Office of Representative Moran
Marty	Milkovits	Community Member
Heather	Miller	Charles River Watershed Association
Galen	Mook	Task Force Member
Thomas	Nally	Task Force Member
Mike	O'Dowd	MassDOT
Ari	Ofsevit	Task Force Member
Barbara	Parmenter	Community Member
Jeffrey	Paul	Owner's Representative
Dorri	Raposa	Community Member
Susanne	Rasmussen	Task Force Member
Erin	Reed	Howard Stein Hudson
Karen	Reichenbacher	Community Member
Maria	Robinson	Community Member
Robert	Simha	Community Member
Robert	Sloane	Community Member
Karen	Smith	Community Member
Marilyn	Swartz-Lloyd	Community Member
Tegin	Teich	MAPC
Elizabeth	Torres	Community Member
Adam	Vaccaro	Boston Globe
Christine	Varriale	Community Member
Alana	Westwater	Community Member