MEMORANDUM

To: Mike O'Dowd
MassDOT Project Manager

Date: January 27, 2020

From: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis
Howard Stein Hudson

HSH Project No.: 2013061.14

Subject: MassDOT
I-90 Allston Interchange Project
Task Force Meeting
Meeting Notes of December 11, 2019

Overview

On December 11, 2019, members of the Allston Multimodal Project team and associated MassDOT staff held a Task Force meeting for the project. The Task Force is composed of local residents, business owners, transportation, and open space advocates, elected officials representing communities impacted by the project, as well as representatives of local and state agencies. The purpose of the group is, through the application of its members' in-depth knowledge, to assist and advise the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) in refining the preferred alternative selected by the Secretary of Transportation for documentation in a state Final Environmental Impact Report and in two federal documents: a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). Once the process associated with these environmental documents is completed, the project will be bid using a 25% design/build package that MassDOT will make available to interested general contractors.

The goal of the meeting documented herein was to provide Task Force members with an update on the evolving Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS) traffic model for the project and provide answers to any, last minute clarifying questions from Task Force Members on the NEPA Scoping Report, the due date for comments being December 12th.

Conversation during the meeting was dominated by two key themes. With regard the CTPS model, Task Force members did not disagree with the model's validity, but noted deep concerns with assumptions being fed into the model with regard to the level of transit service which will be provided at West Station and whether or not service would be provided over the Grand Junction line from West Station into Cambridge. These concerns were voiced in light of the adoption of parts of the commuter rail vision study by the Fiscal and Management Control Board of MassDOT in the fall of 2019 as an aspirational vision for commuter rail service. While the Board has adopted the vision as a goal to guide future commuter rail studies and potentially development, the direction that the I-90 Allston Multimodal Project team has been given from MassDOT's planning office and Secretary with regard to service levels at West Station is to assume a more constrained future picture based on direction from the MBTA's general manager and ability to fund service. This is of concern to Task Force members since transit assumptions may in turn have impacts on the assumptions made

around future vehicle trips and therefore roadway sizing. Some members went as far in their concerns as to suggest that the modeling was being done the way it is as a way of ultimately removing West Station from the overall project. West Station remains firmly part of the I-90 Allston Multimodal project and no effort is being made to remove or delay its construction.

The second key theme was concern over defining what elements are present in the no-build alternative for the project, particularly the layover facility for MBTA commuter trains in the former Beacon Park Yard. The layover is included as part of the no-build alternative because the MBTA physically has access to Beacon Park Yard in its current configuration and has legal right to store trains there regardless of any action taken by the I-90 Allston multimodal project. Task Force members disagreed with this perspective stating commenting that the layover should not be part of the no-build since it is not in active use at the time of this writing.

Agenda

I. Opening Remarks
II. Traffic Modeling
III. Review of Previous Meetings
IV. NEPA Process
V. Question and Answers

Detailed Meeting Minutes[1]

C: Ed Ionata – Tetra Tech: We'll go around the room quickly with an introduction and we'll start with Nate.

Tonight's agenda, as you probably have all read in your reminders, is an update from CTPS on the traffic modeling from Scott Peterson joined by Travis Pollacks. Then Nate is going to review all the other meetings that have happened since the last Task Force meeting and give a quick update on what happened at these meetings. And then, with whatever time remaining we have, Mark Fobert will answer any questions and have a quick discussion about the MEPA and the environmental process.

As you all know, comments are due on the NEPA scoping report tomorrow. So, with that, we'll go to Scott. Also, Scott's got a couple of breaks in his presentation where he'll ask for question. So, if you could let him get to those breaks before popping up with questions, that would be much appreciated. Thank you.

C: Scott Peterson – CTPS: When MAPC started looking at the 4 transportation access zones (TAZ's) in the study area, they considered a few different things. One was the higher densities around potential transit stations and mixed land use. What type of transit service could potentially serve this land use type? Since this is a multi-modal project, we need to understand the pedestrian and bicycle accommodations, what the non-motorized modes of travel that could fit with the land use that's being assumed here. Other components such as affordable housing rental units and parking policies, these are significant inputs added into the model that I'll talk about that later. Also the difference between the 2030 and 2040, likely build out scenarios versus a full build out, because you have terra firma and you have air rights development. Through a lot of the discussions, between

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

Boston, Harvard, and MassDOT there was a desire to try to understand what the potential for that development is occurring in that year without being too speculative.

So, between 2016 and today we've made a conscious decision to go with 1 model and invest all our time, staff resources, and data sets to support the statewide model. This benefits this project given the commuter rail and the mass turnpike that bring people into Boston. This model set covers Southern New Hampshire, all of Massachusetts, and all of them in Rhode Island.

C: No Name Given: Is this a multimodal project or a highway project?

C: Scott Peterson: This is multimodal. We integrated both. Trust me, we weren't going to create just a highway model. This is the geographic coverage and the boundaries that our transportation analysis zones, the TAZs. Just for a point of reference, the older model had 2,700 TAZs up to the New Hampshire border, I-495 just East of Worcester, going down to the Rhode Island border, and around Route 146.. This model set has 5,800 zones, with almost 4,500 in Massachusetts. So, we have a lot more spatial resolution to understand demographics growth, where it's located, and how it accesses the different transportation modes. These modes including highway, transit, walking and biking.

If we zoom in on the Allston area, I'll be talking about those TAZs in this, which includes 238 with its borders being Harvard street going up to the Cambridge river, coming down to Western Ave.; 244, 245 and 243. These are the four zones are the key ones I'm going to talk about in terms of the land use that's being forecasted as well as some of the trip generation that we've identified that's going to occur due to this land use. As we proceed with this project, we're looking at the base year, which is done 2018. 2030 will come after 2040, but we have land use forecast for that as well and what we're working on right now is 2040. So, when we produce results, it's going to be at this spatial resolution. The transportation system is at the same level of detail that we had assumed in the DEIR: meaning this analysis includes commuter rail lines, commuter rail stops, Greenline, all the local buses, all of the infrastructure to support this demand is being included in four different time periods. The model is structured for an average weekday. We have an AM peak at 6:00 to 9:00, midday at 9:00 to 3:00 PM. We've got the PM peak, which is 3:00 to 6:00, and then nighttime falls into all the other time periods.

C: Jessica Robertson –Task Force Member: The 4 TAZs that you included don't look at Beacon Yards.

A: Scott Peterson: 246 is right here.

Q: Jessica Robertson: Sorry, can you point out the 4 again?

A: Scott Peterson: There is 238 and then 244 that is in the Northeast quadrant. Then 245 is also in the Northeast quadrant and 246 is the Beacon Yards.

Q: Jessica Robertson: Okay, so you're not including anything on the other side of the future West Station and you're not including any of the other ones that immediately touch Beacon Yards that have thousands of units of housing currently in the pipeline?

A: Scott Peterson: That is being forecasted in the MAPC forecasts separately from this study, I'm just presenting those four.

Q: Jessica Robertson: Right, but why did you pick those four and exclude the others?

A: Travis Pollack - MAPC: We are including growth in all the TAZs, but the area that we see the greatest amount of growth would be the areas that have the blank slate with the terra firma particularly in 246. That's where most of the growth is and where we're looking at things in a greater

level of detail to say this is where we think you have a higher amount of densities, with a greater growth of jobs**.**

C: Jessica Robertson: There's a couple of those Boston University ones where they're currently parking lots and 1 story buildings on the other side of the tracks. I think those ones would also see a lot growth. Excluding major relevant piece of land is concerning.

A: Travis Pollack: We can go back and look at that, but that's not where we saw most of the growth. These four are where we see the biggest growth.

C: Jessica Robertson: The reason that I bring this up is that many of us had major issues with the DEIR, because in our opinion it vastly underestimated the future ridership of West Station. So, when we see that major relevant pieces of land are being excluded from the production it becomes a little suspicious.

C: Scott Peterson: I apologize, I just wanted to focus on these 4 zones. As Travis said, the forecasts we're using for 2030 and 2040 will include every zone here with the assumption of growth. I don't know the specific details of the developments in those locations that you're referencing, but I just wanted to give you an idea of what those 4 zones, Beacon Yards going up to the Cambridge at the Charles River, going up to Cambridge up here, are all showing. I am open to sharing all the growth assumptions for Boston, Cambridge, and all the zones in these areas.

Q: Jessica Robinson: In the model there's no difference between how you're treating the 4 that you're talking about tonight and the rest of them?

A: Scott Peterson: Correct.

C: Jessica Robinson: Okay.

Q: Glen Berkowitz – ABC Consultant: Excuse me, sir. If you could just go back again. I apologize. I should know the answer to this, but Harvard has a big athletic facility with the football stadium and all that stuff. Which zone is that in?

A: Scott Peterson: I believe it's 244.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Move your hand one more TAZ over, Scott. Now you're on it.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: The question that Jessica asks and I'm glad she did, is for any of us who've been sitting in this room for 4 or 5 years, it's a question we've always wondered why did these 4 zones get picked, including one that is a football stadium. Why would that zone be 1 of the 4? If you're going to highlight 4, how much development is going to happen where the historic Harvard stadium is?

These are questions we've been wondering for years. There's a why behind someone's picking these 4 and why they have continued to pick these 4. And it just seems like we never get the answer as to why these 4 and how did these four get chosen? Why is one of the 4 zones one where you would think very little new development is going to occur over the next 30 years, and how do the assumptions of growth in these zones differ from the ones that are abutting? And then if the answers will those have a one and a half percent growth, not a 15% growth, then we'd all want to know, well what if those ones with the 1% growth had a 10%? There's just these basic questions that just seem to never get answered.

C: Jessica Robinson: Those 4 zones were identified by the Project Team early on as the ones that have the potential for seeing growth through this process. That's the part that doesn't make sense to me. 3 out of the four zones are on Harvard's campus and Harvard builds things on a 50-year planning horizon. Also, there's a lot of other abutting zones where all the new growth is going to be

done by developers that respond with a lot of sensitivity to what type of transportation infrastructure exists. So, it makes a lot more sense to focus on those zones than to focus on Harvard campus.

C: **Scott Peterson:** I'm very happy to share what the growth is for all the neighboring zones so you can understand what the surrounding growth is. As I said, this was just a focus area. I understand that you're looking at more of a regional concern. I must confess; I don't know the history of why these 4 ones were picked.

C: **Jessica Robinson:** You should be aware that there's a parcel, and I can't read what that is, but one of the ones immediately South of the tracks, which is currently a 1-story industrial building. This building was purchased by City Realty specifically because West Station is going in and they're supporting West Station and the Malvern Street connection specifically because they want to get community support for a 20-story tower. None of that would've happened without West Station. So, it makes no sense to not include the things that are immediately adjacent to West Station, but just on the other side and instead to include Harvard's campus where very little is going to happen. And if it does happen, it's not going to be necessarily tied to what choices are made with the transportation. So, I understand you're including all the things, but the reason that this is a sensitive issue is that in the DEIR several years ago, the ridership estimates at West Station were preposterous. That's why we're suspicious about seeing other analysis, whether you're just focusing on it for the presentation or whether it's somehow reflected in the actual model that downplays the amount of growth that will be triggered by building West Station or not building West Station or the timing of West Station.

Q: **Glen Berkowtiz:** If I could just add? I think, I don't mean to speak for everyone, but I think we appreciate your honesty that you just shared in saying you don't know how these 4 zones got picked. That's a perfectly acceptable answer. Is there anyone in the room who does know how these 4 zones got picked? Who would like to share with the rest of us as to how they did get picked? Is there anyone in the room who does know how the 4 were picked, without guessing?

A: **Mike O'Dowd – MassDOT Project Manager:** I'll consult with the planning office on that question.

C: **Glen Berkowtiz:** Thank you.

C: **Scott Peterson:** And I will offer a spreadsheet for anyone who's interested with a map of these TAZs so that you can see what the growth is in this area and region. I want to be transparent with you.

Q: **Joe Beggan – Task Force Member**: Just 1 question. This is about build versus no build. Tell me again, looking at all the parcels, are they all generally the same in terms of employment and residential? Does 246 vary for Build versus no build? Is that a true statement?

A: **Scott Peterson**: From what I've seen, 246 is the one that has the greatest exponential change.

Q: **Joe Beggan:** So, the others in this case: their land uses are static between whether the highway and West Station or built or not? For 246, because the land area is available, you see the change in build?

A: **Scott Peterson:** And when I go to the spreadsheets you can see that because the 246 has the greatest growth going from the no build to the build.

Q: **Joe Beggan:** In formulating this, and this very Harvard stuff, you were considering institutional master plans and other filings that happened in this area as guidance?

A: Scott Peterson: Yes.

Q: Jessica Robinson: But how can you say with a straight face that the level of development won't change based on whether and when you go West station?

Did the level of development change when we decided to build the Green Line? Did the level of development in Davis Square when we decided to extend the Red Line? What about Boston Landing, what was it 10 years ago?

A: Travis Pollack: But when we looked at other TODs in terms of floor area ratios, in terms of what you saw with growth, whether it's happens all in 246 or maybe some of it goes on the other side of the tracks, I think the overall number is good. We feel good about in these numbers in terms of showing for 2040 and then realizing that we're showing a lot and there's the potential for a lot more growth after 2040 into 2050 and 2060 especially with air rights development for this area. This development would be closer to what we've seen elsewhere like in Kendall and other TODs like Longwood and in other areas as well.

But Scott's got a lot of slides so maybe we can come back to that. But in terms of how we came up with some of those Scott's got the numbers for going to 2040, 2050, 2060.

Q: Jessica Robertson: Maybe you said this already, but what is the model supposed to inform? What decisions are we making during the process that the model is supposed to help us make?

A: Scott Peterson: Land use in this unit of geography shows how different land uses produce different number of trips, either in terms of generation or attraction.

Q: Jessica Robertson: I understand that, but can you take a step back from that? Why are we doing a model? What does it is it supposed to tell us?

A: Scott Peterson: If you're adding a new commuter rails stop; how many people are going to use it? How are they getting there? Assuming there are new bus services being redirected to this station you want to try to understand the transfer activity. All of that is hard to just kind of do a sketch planning exercise. This model is built on a lot of empirical data; including household survey, ridership, passenger surveys on the commuter rail and rapid transit lines. So, there is insight to be learned from this that someone couldn't just kind of infer by running existing trends 20 years out.

Q: Jessica Robertson: Right. And then, so we do the model and we learn all that information about where development is likely to happen and how much travel demand there is likely to be. And then does that change how we design the project or how we phase the project? This is more of a question for Mike and team.

A: Mike O'Dowd: It certainly informs it. I don't know if it necessarily tells us how to phase it. But it certainly is looking at how we are looking at the opportunities, how we're addressing the street network, the potential growth in the street network, not only on the vehicular side but also on the non-motorized side as well. Because I think that the model also projects growth in the pedestrian and bicycle movements as well. Scott, is that correct?

A: Scott Peterson: The non-motorized mode is probably the mode that's most difficult to address at a granular level. For the transit and highway, we can get it down to the station level and roadway segment level. When we're dealing with non-motorized walking and cycling, it provides mode shares in these geographies. I can't tell you how many people are walking on a given roadway. That's just too far and too much detail going 20 years out. But I can give you an idea of what the mode shifted to that mode will be in a larger geography, with a reasonable degree of confidence.

C: Glen Berkowitz: So Scott, I might be oversimplifying and others will correct me, but since the DEIR got published on the subject matters that you're presenting on, I think there were two key issues that many of us around the room had a lot of uncertainty about. The first of those is the one we've just been discussing, which is why did these four TAZs get picked as opposed to why not draw a circle of a half a mile radius around the station or whatever the right radius is to say that's the zone of the catchment area and any TAZ within that half a mile or whatever, the correct radius, that's what we're going to highlight or include. Like we've just never understood why these four got picked as opposed to some radius thing. So that's the first of the two.

The second of the two is how many trains per hour we should assume to be stopped at West station? Because one would think if West station is served by a train once every 50 minutes, you're going to get different outputs to your model than if it was served by some newfangled urban rail with 15-minute headways. And we've never quite understood why every model to date was based on the current MBTA service something or other. This service which had four trains per rush hour period, which really was a 3-hour periods or is about once every 50 minutes.

A: Scott Peterson: 45 minutes.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: Is everything you're presenting to us still using that same service? Or are you using some other input. That would be helpful as you go along to inform us.

A: Scott Peterson: I have a slide. I was anticipating that as a question. If you can wait probably 15 minutes, I will get to that. But there is a reason why that helps explain part of it. So, I'll keep you waiting for another 15 minutes.

Q: Galen Mook – Task Force Member: I'm sorry. It's a quick question. Can you go back to the FAR slide really quick?

C: Scott Peterson: Sure.

Q: Galen Mook: Can you zoom in? I'm in I'm just trying to see the examples that you're drawing from.

A: Scott Peterson: The pink bar represents Allston landing, DEIR build. That's a reference point. The employment from the DEIR to the FEIR is very similar. It's not exactly but it's very close. For 2040, the households have increased a bit. Then working your way across, we've got the ERC represented by the red bar, Suffolk downs, the Harvard PDA site, 115 Dartmouth Street, which goes off the screen. Then we have Kendall. There's a big jump going from the Harvard site to 115 Dartmouth and at that point, you're starting to get closer into the CBD.

Q: Jessica Robertson: So, what are you assuming for your model?

A: Travis Pollack: The eventual plan is that once everything is built out, we're looking at something that's sitting somewhere on a 5 for the terra firma and maybe at a 7 on the air rights, which is about 18 acres that we're seeing as air rights development. So, what we're saying is that between 2032, and 2040 when the station is open and the interchange is done, you would see some development. The actual numbers were very close to what was in the DEIR as to total employment, a little bit more housing. Then what we're saying is that after the project is completed we see the potential for development that is more and that's in the other slide. In that case those FAR ratios would be around 5 on the terra firma probably for that area around TAZ 246 not for like 238 which is further out. For right around the station and potentially up on the air rights going up to a 7.

Q: Pallavi Mande – Task Force Member: Could you explain the no build assumption next to the ERC? What is that about?

A: Travis Pollack: That is the enterprise research campus. They are, I think at this point, there under the no build assumption that the Enterprise Research Campus is at most a 2 on a floor to area ratio. The Enterprise Research Campus is North of...

C: Pallavi Mande: I know exactly where it is. I'm just wondering why the no build is an option as opposed to ERC getting built in the next 20 years.

A: Travis Pollack: No, I'm sorry. The no build assumption is, I believe that they're saying, is what would happen if the interchange is not built and West station is not built. Even under those conditions, certain other, programmed building like the ERC are assumed to still go ahead. My apologies for the confusion.

A: Scott Peterson: Going from 2018 to 2040 no build there is an increase in the study area regardless of the project, regardless of what station there is going to be some growth. And that is spread out between all 4 zones. When you go to the build zone, 246, this bottom row on the right gains just under 4,100 jobs. TAZ 245 gains about 1,000 and the other 2 are negligible. To kind of put that in perspective, I also included Boston and Cambridge getting back to your point to show you what the growth in the region is for these two communities. But every community is showing some sort of growth going into the future. Boston is gaining roughly the exact same amount due to the project. But when you go from 2018 to 2040, you're gaining about 70,000 jobs, and then 5,000 dues to the site. This is just to put things in perspective. Cambridge has about 13,000 job increase.

Q: Dick Garver – Community resident: Can you explain how you calculate the job growth? Is it based on land area and a formula of density? Is it based on specific plans that have been filed? How did you derive these calculations?

A: Scott Peterson: I'll do the first take and then I'll pass it to Travis. MAPC worked with the Donahue Institute to understand where potential employment sites would be from various developers applying for permits and just working their projects through the pipeline. Some projects are much more speculative than others. So, the state puts together a control total for the region. In this case, the Boston MPO is doing the work. Every MPO has its own control total. So, at this point MAPC starts looking at all the development and tries to determine which ones are the ones most likely to be built, in this case in the year 2040, based on where they are in discussions with each community.

Q: Dick Garver: But 246 doesn't have any plans filed for it. Right?

A: Scott Peterson: I don't believe there's plans, just discussions.

Q: Dick Garver: So where did you get those numbers?

Q: Travis Pollack: We looked at what we've seen elsewhere with other developments of similar size and in terms of their overall numbers. And then try to come up with what we think is a best educated guess as to what that area would if once it comes online with the new station with a new street network. Then we said this is available for development. And one thing we did is we did look at it overall and then looked at what the market absorption rate had been over the past 10 years and looked at that to see is okay, if all this land comes online, could it be developed? And the answer was yes. I mean it's within what we see as a reasonable amount of demand out there. Assuming again, there's no market crash and things like that, this area could develop.

C: Dick Garver: To me, the key of what you just said is they are the result of some conversations with Harvard and with Boston Planning and Development, but that they're not formulaic. In this case there's no actual thought process in what this area might be. Is that, right? These are based on convos between BPDA, Harvard, they are not formulaic.

Q: Joe Beggan: I think to characterize it, if you remember the green book for the central artery project?

A: Dick Garver: Yes.

C: Joe Beggan: All the land that was vacant and if you went to court and said, what is it going to be? There was no plan.

C: Dick Garver: I remember the process. I'm asking him mostly because most people sitting in this room probably don't have a clue where that number comes from and they ought to know where it comes from.

C: Henrietta Davis – Task Force Member: If you look back on job growth in Cambridge over the last 4 decades. I think that the rate of growth was 10,000 jobs per decade. Bill do you know? It was much higher than I think people imagined and you don't show nearly that rate of growth in this period. I'm curious about that data as a benchmark because the jobs didn't track housing which is how I happened to be paying attention to it.

C: Scott Peterson: We are looking at 13,000 jobs over 20 years. While for Boston, I believe it's around 81,000. I'm looking at it from an angle, I'm sorry. Anything more on employment? Then I'm going to population. So, the population is linked with the households, which are, one of the criteria that we use as an input for the travel demand model.

Every household size is different. We also look at different age groups, income levels, and different numbers of people. When you look at all those different types of households, this is the summation of the population. So, in this 4-zone study area the population from the 2018 to 2040 goes up about 2,000 under no-build. Then with the build scenario, it goes up just under 5,000. Now Boston and Cambridge see increases with population. And if I go back to the employment, this number matched up with that. So that showed that the employment growth that was occurring in the Allston study area was the only employment growth that was occurring within Boston.

That's not the case with population. One of the items that was discussed is how do you supply the labor force to satisfy the job increase? In order to satisfy that labor force, additional population and households were added to the region. So, Cambridge had 182 people added that could potentially provide labor, to the Allston area development and the Delta between Boston and this is roughly 600, so there's 600 additional people being added to Boston to fill jobs potentially being created at the Allston site.

The population of household's employed individuals are input into the travel demand model. And the point is to understand trip making. We know that different household sizes produce different number of trips, different types of employment, attract different number of trips. So based on past research, surveys, observation, and ITE research we've developed formulas to estimate the number of trips each household will produced, and each employment location will attract. And this number here represents the total number of trips those 4-zones are likely to produce. So, in this case the Delta is 56,400 trips daily are either being produced or attracted to these four zones. There's a lot more activity in the surrounding zones, which I'm not showing here. But that gives you an idea of the magnitude that these four zones as a sample are going to produce with those population and employment increases.

Q: Bill Deignan – Task Force Member: Scott, is that for all modes I assume. And is that counting each way or each person?

A: Scott Peterson: This is regardless of mode. This includes almost all modes and they are 2-way. The whole region, any trip passing through, destined to or being produced in that area could potentially be using West station, the surrounding bus routes, I-90, Western Avenue, and any of the roadways being examined. So, this is not the universe of trip making that's occurring in the area. It's just an example of what is occurring in those four zones**.**

Q: Wendy Landman –Task Force Member: The roughly 5,000 jobs and the 5,000 new residents are generating 56,000 trips a day?

A: Scott Peterson: There are a lot of intermittent trips that can be made. An employee also has something called non-home based trips. Someone goes to work and then they go for lunch or they do a delivery. So, there's a lot of different permutations of the trip making right.

C: Wendy Landman: But that's about 10 trips per person per day, or maybe they're a little less than that.

Q: Scott Peterson: Was there a follow up question to that?

A: Jessica Robinson: That just seems like a lot of trips.

C: Wendy Landman: Okay, well that includes going out to get a sandwich. That's two trips right there.

C: Scott Peterson: And then you could have deliveries.

Okay, for the calibration of the base here, we've got newer information. We've got updated traffic counts. There is a data set called INRIX. I'm not sure if anyone's heard of that. INRIX provided us congested speeds. This isn't something we looked at previously. Understanding how to replicate, replicate congestion on the roadway, which is one of the factors driving people to the other modes, and pardon the pun. That understanding of the speeds and how bad they can be with more trip making on the roadways is an important piece of the puzzle. So, this gives you an idea of how bad I-90 is, as an example. This INRIX data set gets pings from people's cell phones. When you enabled GPS, that information goes to your phone provider and that is stored.

So, it tracks you in increments of 30 seconds and one minute. That data is then accumulated, and the phone provider makes money by selling that data and those pings to help understand what the speeds of those travelers are on the roadway. And that is I think, an important piece of the puzzle. So up here you have the Ted Williams Tunnel. Down here you have the I-95/I-90 toll plaza. So, as you can see, the congestion is in the order of 20 miles per hour, 10 miles per hour down here. In the PM it's more located in the downtown area because everyone's gone to work and then everyone tries to leave. So, between the Ted Williams tunnel and somewhere in the Back Bay, it just bogs down. And the redder, the worse it is. That type of data helps us understand, calibrate and validate the model sets that we're using.

So, transit, as I said, we've got the commuter rail, the green line. Be need to understand what the inputs are because the assumptions are driving the model. The model is a good model, but if you give it bad information, it's going to produce results that are questionable. So, we need to understand where the stations are located, where buses are going to transfer, and we need to understand fairs. And that was something that wasn't replicated properly in the previous model. We put higher fares at the West station and people did not want to take something costing as much as zone 1. We updated our parking lot capacities and mode shares from ACS work trips. So this is sort of the sequence of steps for the assumptions. We need to get the baseline, that's done, the 2030 no build and build. We're working on 2040 no build and build. We're in the process of reviewing the results.

Q: Jack Wofford – Community resident: Can you guys come back to the slide on your transfer assumption for a minute? I don't see on there anything about future shuttle service on the Grand Junction to Kendall and maybe I'm missing it on the chart.

A: Scott Peterson: I have another slide for the future build conditions.

What are we assuming in the no build? This gets back to I believe your question about why we are assuming certain levels of transit service. Through any NEPA and MEPA process, they want us to use the latest planning assumptions that are in sync with the long-range transportation plan from that region, the Boston MPO. That plan is fiscally constrained. So whatever projects are submitted by the MBTA or MassDOT as planned projects that have a funding source, they'll be included. There is Rail Vision which is a project I've worked on. There's a lot of discussion about future commuter rail technology and beefed up service on various lines with the Worcester line potentially going to 15 minute headways, but that has capital costs included in it that do not have a corresponding funding source. So, in this case, our no build is only what is in a fiscally constrained plan. That doesn't mean you couldn't do alternate scenario planning or test out something. But MEPA and NEPA want to go after something that is more firmly based in reality and is fiscally constrained.

The land use assumptions pivoted off the Long Range Transportation Plan and for the most part they're similar except for those 4 zones on the employment side. For the population, they made some adjustments across the region to provide a labor force to accommodate that employment. The no build also has the better bus improvements, which I think I mentioned in an earlier meeting. I think this is something you're interested in - the future build assumptions. So, this roadway schematic is consistent with what was in the scoping report. This is what's been published in terms of what we're pursuing in terms of network capacity, network connectivity speeds in the year 2040. We are also preparing one for 2030.

So, what are the trends and assumptions? CTPS worked with the City of Boston to identify short term improvements. We have included those. We're including West Station. We're also including some improvements to the bus routes, 64, 66, and several other bus routes that represent feeders and connections to West Station. This represents the details of all those bus improvements for the different years. This is consistent with what has been shown before, so I'm not presenting anything different. In this scenario you've got the Harvard Barry's corner shuttle, the Harvard West Station shuttle, Kendall/Central shuttle in addition to bus routes 64, 66, and commuter rail.

The no build and build scenarios headways for the Worcester line are the same. Going to the build scenario, we're not looking at increased headways on the Worcester line. We are having some of those trains stop at West station now, but not all of them. It's been vetted with railroad operations. This is an input provided by the project team. They've done a lot of analysis of how the Worcester Mainline operates and feeds into South Station. I'm not going to get into the details of that, but I'll show you what some of those operating assumptions are.

C: Jessica Robertson: You skipped over the most important point though. That it does not include the Grand Junction rail.

A: Scott Peterson: Yes. I've already said that Rail Vision and the Grand Junction cannot be assumed because they have not secured funding.

Q: Wendy Landman: So, can we point out the highway interchange also doesn't have financing as far as we know? I mean this entire exercise is about things that we need to develop funding for in Massachusetts. I think there's a lot of unhappiness that we're assuming we're going to need to build a rail station and continue to have poor rail service.

C: Jessica Robertson: We also brought this up a year ago last time you were at this meeting and said that, sure, we understand. You want to provide one scenario that you're testing that includes the level of service that the MBTA and MassDOT can commit to providing. But then we asked that an additional scenario be studied, which is the level of service that everyone wants to provide, which may or may not have funding. But we said you should have both and we asked that a year ago. And especially considering the recent vote in favor of regional rail. It's completely offensive that's still not in this model. Why are we all here if what we say just goes into the void?

A: Scott Peterson: I want to be transparent with my assumptions and this is the direction that I was given.

Q: Jessica Robertson: So, who gave you this direction?

A: Scott Peterson: The project team.

Q: Jessica Robertson: So, Mike, why was that direct and specific request not addressed?

A: Mike O'Dowd: So, I've asked that question to leadership as to whether or not this is something that we need to recognize given the fact that Fiscal Management and Control Board endorsed some of the results that came out of the rail vision study. It wasn't approved. I think there was six or seven different plans that were analyzed or investigated. I don't know a lot about it because I wasn't involved in it. I would imagine that those scenarios will feed into future planning studies and some of those things may be advanced in the future and come to fruition.

But when I asked leadership as to whether or not it's a consideration that I should be taking, I've been directed that it's not to be included in a model, but what they've asked us to do as the team is arrive at a scenario where the infrastructure was in place so that when this project is complete, we have set the stage for one or more of those rail vision scenarios to be enacted.

C: Jessica Robertson: The West Station that you designed in the modified flip does not accommodate those scenarios.

A: Mike O'Dowd: I would not say that.

C: Jessica Robertson: I would say that and many other people in this groups would say that, and if Ari was here, he would say plenty of that.

A: Mike O'Dowd: I spoke with Ari last week. He shared the idea we need to take a second look at this, because he's doubtful and uncertain that the analysis that we have performed shows that a 3 track station will be able to handle the demands of the capacities of the services that are going to be placed on it in the future.

C: Jessica Robertson: Doubtful and uncertain is a gross understatement. It doesn't work. And the fact that we haven't committed to implementing everything in regional rail and therefore the best we can do is hopefully not preclude it, is totally inadequate. We asked a year ago to say, we understand you must have the minimum reasonable level of service and we should also be studying what happens if we provide the service that the FMCB said that they want. And if 3 years ago nobody was talking about regional rail, when this thing is built, it's going to be another 12 or 13 years from now, I think we're going to be a lot further in that direction. And so, it's completely irresponsible to not consider that in your model.

Q: Bill Deigan: Mike I totally agree with that. I just don't see how, given how far out this, to only include things that have financing absolutely attached to them. I mean, you're basically saying F you to the FMCB by not including rail. I mean, that's really kind of outrageous that it's not being

included here. How can you create a vision for what this place could be from a transportation standpoint if don't look at assumptions about what could be included and what should be?

Q: Glen Berkowitz: Scott, can I just ask how many more slides do you have? And if it's just a few, maybe we should let you continue and then have continued conversation?

C: Jessica Robertson: Actually, I would like to get an answer on this point because we asked this a year ago.

A: Mike O'Dowd: You've asked this of the director of planning as well and I think that the response he gave you then is not dissimilar from what I'm saying now. I have gone back after several requests from this group on this topic to the Secretary of Transportation and the response that keeps coming from the Secretary of Transportation is that many of those planning studies will inform how the future of this area will be, but they are aspirational. There is no commitment made. It could be 12 years, 13 years, but it could also be 20 years or 30 years. The timeframe is indecisive. So, to be anticipating something as concrete that is yet to be acted upon is something I have not been directed to do. It may be endorsed, and it may be something that FMCB recognizes, looks at and says, "This is something that we need to strive for," but we don't currently have the resources, the technology, or the demand to do it.

Q: Jessica Robertson: So, when was the last time you brought this question to the secretary?

A: Mike O'Dowd: This question? Probably within the last few months. But I also, as recently as today, I was meeting with the MBTA on the same topic, and they report to the FMCB. So, these are decisions that are not made by highway division in a vacuum. These are made by MBTA, the Secretary's Office, and the Planning Offices. When it comes this, we get our direction from them.

Q: Jessica Robertson: But within the last 3 or however many weeks, there was a very significant change in the stated direction of all those agencies to move in the direction of regional rail. And so yes, it's aspirational, but it's not like we're saying have a scenario in here that includes flying cars, right? There're different types of aspirational. Some things are a wild, crazy random idea and other things are things that have been voted on by the FMCB. Why are we not including them?

A: Mike O'Dowd: I understand. The FMCB had their vote within the past month, but I have not gotten any direction that is counter what I am showing you tonight or how we are modeling this or how I am asking CTPS and MAPC to evaluate what the potential opportunities are. The directions are still clear on my side as to what we should be asking CTPS to do.

C: Jessica Robertson: But the thing about the timing was that, I don't think, I don't think the Secretary is sitting in her office remembering to go tell every project manager to change what they're doing every time the FMCB takes a vote. It's your responsibility to go back to her and ask. I'm asking you now that you're getting some very strong feedback.

A: Mike O'Dowd: I know clearly what my responsibilities are to this project and I speak with them regularly with executive leadership at the department.

C: Jessica Robertson: Then I would like a written answer from her saying why we can't include regional rail as part of the assumptions as one of the alternatives that we're looking at in this model.

C: Jack Wofford: And you can state it as in accordance with the vote because they adopted one of the options. I'm forgetting but it included 15-minute service on regional rail, it includes Grand Junction shuttle service to Kendall and Somerville.

Q: Mike O'Dowd: Can you speak to the shuttle service that Jack was just mentioning? You know more about the rail vision study than I do, Scott.

A: Scott Peterson: There was several alternatives examined. They recommended the aspirational alternative six which included Grand Junction and 15 minute headways. That 15 minute service was primarily focused on key stations, urban rail service. Those places being inside of Route 128 from places like Lynn and Framingham on in. So, there was a plan, but they acknowledged that they couldn't implement that across all the lines. So they picked three lines to do more detailed studies and more to try to understand what the implementation steps would be because the electrification piece was a significant component of this. So, the lines that they picked were Worcester, Providence, and Rockport/Newburyport up to Lynn. Worcester was one of them for their short-term feasibility study. Rail vision was conceptual, it didn't have any bounds really. So, the direction was to go and study these options further, but there was no timeline for implementation.

C: Jorge Briones: And if I may at that Fiscal Management Control Board meeting, they didn't vote on alternative 5 or 6, they came up with their own alternative 5.5 so we need to do some work to figure out what that would entail since it wasn't one of the original possibilities.

C: Jessica Robertson: Right. But I think the point is that this project isn't going to be finished for 13 years and then the station that we build is hopefully going to last us like 50, 60, 80 years, however long stations last. So yeah, we're not going to have regional rail on the Worcester line in five years, but it's completely irresponsible to not consider the possibility that we might have it within the next 60 years.

C: Glen Berkowitz: Excuse me, it has no Grand Junction service. There's a more aspirational scenario that you could have presented that to us and I'm sure a lot of us are frustrated that that's not what we're hearing today. I think we all were expecting that's what the kind of stuff we would hear given that we thought it was very clear to everybody a year ago. And then I guess the second point I'd make is it's almost like you couldn't make it more complicated and confusing if you tried. You're saying you're not allowed to model for something that's not funded today, but the very project we're talking about, we all know has zero funding today. But then beyond that craziness, the whole project design, if you put up the image of 3L on the screen right now has the grand junction with 2 tracks at quite an expense on the half of a West station with 2 tracks and then climbing to go up above I-90 you have a design that assumes the very thing that you're saying you can include in the model. It's nuts. How can any of you stand up there and defend it?

C: Jessica Robertson: I think the secretary did that a year ago or so. Or however many months ago when she said building the station does not necessarily mean that I am providing you the service at that station. The station as you've designed it, that you propose to build, precludes that service, which is why we care about this.

Q: Mike O'Dowd: I'm not convinced of that. Mark, are you convinced of that?

A: Mark Shamon: So, the station as it was laid out as you're looking at 3L was based on current service, not 15 minutes, or with dual direction service capacity.

Q: Galen Mook: Would it change things if you assume the 15-minute dual direction service?

C: Mark Shamon: We haven't really developed that yet, but it is being looked at right now.

C: Jessica Robertson: That's exactly why we need to include in the model that version of service.

Q: Jack Wofford: Can you make the assumptions of vision 5.5 and apply it to the model over the next year?

C: Glen Berkowitz: And just to be clear, Jess, you made a couple of references to 13 years from now or whatever when the project will be done, but they're talking here 2040 right? Those are their own numbers that they put up there. So, they're talking 2040 as if none of this stuff exists. And Mike I agree with what you just said. 100% I agree with you. The secretary did say that. Please do not infer that because something's shown in design it means I'm agreeing as secretary today to build it and make it happen at some point in the future.

She did say that. But that had nothing to do in my understanding with whether it could be modeled as an alternative scenario. So again, I don't think any of us are concerned, upset, frustrated, demoralized, because the project's not committing to do 15 minutes service on the Worcester branch and shuttle service on the Grand Junction. What we're frustrated about is why if we're going to be doing modeling, can't there be more than one scenario? Even if you're not required to, even if your superiors did approve it, why can't the Team as a partnering collaborative exercise just simply say that the folks doing the modeling: "sure, your base model the way you got to do it. But then do this aspirational model as just as described." That's all that I think people are asking for at this point,

C: Wendy Landman: I think there's more to it than that. So, what we haven't started talking about yet to is the scale of all the roadways and what the model is going to tell us about traffic. If we assume that transit service is going to be lousy, then all those trips moving through this area are going to be in vehicles. So, there's a very direct impact and a whole bunch of other things that are going to come out of this design project. I hear what you're saying Glen, but I'm also very concerned that if we insist on running this thing as if we're going to have 45 minutes service, then those trips are all going to be in cars. That is the point of providing good transit is that we don't build this thing as if we're building it in the 1960s but we build it as if it's a 21st century project where we're trying to do something that is not dependent entirely on vehicle trips. This modeling is going to have an impact on everything else about the project.

C: Jessica Robertson: And if this model includes some bare minimum assumption for transit service, what it's probably going to tell us is that we are going to have a lot more traffic. And then we get roads like you've designed them where there is an average of four and a half lanes on every side of every intersection that you're designing. Which is by the way doubling more than doubling the capacity because it puts Cambridge Street back worse than it is today and adds a Cambridge street South, which is even wider. What is the justification for that? It's insane and if we put together a traffic model that just shows we're going to have traffic congestion everywhere, then you're going to get all sorts of people saying: "Oh yeah, we should have all these five and six lane streets" and it's completely unacceptable.

C: Steve Kaiser: Tomorrow is going to be the deadline for public comments on the scope one day from today. I sent in my comments yesterday. I went into the traffic issues and the modeling issues in some detail and was very critical. Nothing you have presented here tonight makes me change my opinion and my recommendation was that the CTPS model should be abandoned, and another better model should be found.

My reasons for that are in my written comments. I feel very strongly that there's something terribly wrong the way traffic is being modeled. The highway engineering is a little bit controversial but in many ways it's high quality and respectful even though we may differ with it, but I see virtually no merit in the traffic analysis that has been done and I find it no comfort in the results that you have presented.

Q: Galen Mook: I appreciate that. I look forward to reading your comments. Quick clarification and maybe for Mike, were you explicitly told not to include the Grand Junction service? Or is that a choice of the project team made?

A: Mike O'Dowd: I was directed not to include the aspirational services of the Grand Junction in the model.

C: Galen Mook: Okay, that's one clarification.

C: Scott Peterson: I'm close to being done.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: You had a slide with some numbers of trains. Did you go through that?

A: Scott Peterson: There's two slides left. So, the no build this gives you the number of trains inbound and outbound at the stations in the study area. For Boston Landing 22 inbound and outbound and for Lansdowne, 28 inbound, and 26 outbound. That's consistent with the schedule that's being published today. The build has 21 and 17 at Boston Landing nine and 10 daily at West station 32 and 31 at Lansdowne. Any questions on that?

Q: Jessica Robertson: You are assuming that there are few trains at Boston Landing in the future then there are today?

A: Mark Shamon – Project Team Member: 2-hour service to West Station and 2-hour headway.

C: Galen Mook: So, this is the conversation we've been having all day.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: So, Scott, before we get to the stuff that you can't control yourself, like what would the future service be, could you just take us through the AM peak and tell us what's your assumption of that serving? How many stops will be between 5:00 AM and 9:00 AM or whatever you define as AM peak?

C: Jessica Robertson: It's 3 to 4.

Q: Glen Berkowtiz: In the year 2040 you're assuming 3 to 4 trains stop between 5:00 AM and 9:00 AM at West Station?

A: Scott Peterson: That was the information that the MBTA and consultant team provided me to assume for operation.

C: Glen Berkowitz: I just find it almost impossible to understand how the project team could come to this conclusion. It just blows me away. In the year, 2040 a train an hour in rush hour West Station with zero for Grand Junction. So, you're going to come out with a number that is then going to get compared to the cost of West Station.

C: Wendy Landman: It does seem like the model is set up to do away with West Station.

C: Mike O'Dowd: That's not the intent at all, Wendy.

The secretary has been clear that she's committed, that this administration is committed to building West Station. But she's also been quite clear in the directions that I get from the MBTA General Manager and our Highway Administrator and Secretary in what I communicate back to Scott and what it is that the team needs to continue advancing the project. Those directions that I get I forward them along as to what we would need from the team's perspective to be able to continue advancing the NEPA and MEPA documentations. The station construction hasn't been omitted. The services that the station could be able to deliver in the future are not being modeled.

Whether that's good or bad I recognize the frustration, but those are the things that MassDOT leadership has directed this team to do.

C: Wendy Landman: I'm not saying that you or the project team are making a policy decision, but what Glen just said was very important. In this economy and looking at what we need in terms of transportation in this state to propose a station for millions of dollars, that if somebody just sees a ridership model and sees that it serves a hundred people a day, then that points in a particular direction. What this does is it sets up exactly that. So, I'm not saying that you or the project team did this, but it is kind of a crazy thing. Boston Landing was projected to have much more ridership than it already has.

A: Mike O'Dowd: No question, it saw a significant amount of growth.

C: Wendy Landman: That was built entirely with private money so nobody worried about it, but the way this is being done is setting West Station up to fail.

Q: Mike O'Dowd: Scott, how has the growth at Boston Landing informed you on the potential ridership for West Station?

A: Scott Peterson: We have the commuter rail counts. We check out on a regular basis and the whole point of calibrating and validating is seeing where the model was working and where it doesn't. No model was perfect. And understanding where people are walking to the station or getting off at the platform and going to an employment site, those things help inform the connectivity to the zones that I was showing. So, understanding what the employment is and the residential population support that employment is an important factor.

C: Tad Read: There is another implication here, a very practical implication and that is these assumptions, these numbers would guide us to under-building. For example, building three tracks, right? So, we under-build the station now, then 30 years from now we realize we needed that additional service. Now we must go back in and retrofit the station if that's even possible for additional service. It makes so much more sense now to design and build that station for that additional service. It's going to be a lot cheaper in the long run to do that now then to fail to do that and then go back and retrofit the station. Stations like this get built and rebuilt every couple of generations, not every 10 or 20 years. So, if we don't build it right now, we're stuck with it for decades. It doesn't make any sense and this modeling leads us in that direction.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: So, Mike like Jessica asked what's the purpose and the why we are doing this model? And it's almost like we're touching upon the Task Force asking itself out loud and trying to guess what some of the answers are to that question is. We're asking are we doing this model to say West Station only needs to be 3 tracks, not 4? Are we doing this model to say the total demand at West station is 400 people a day? It's peanuts. It's a drop in the bucket compared to the 14,000 a day that they have on the Worcester branch. Therefore, we don't want to slow them all down 12 seconds. Therefore, we must have 2 express tracks because the demand for a station so minuscule, that the greater good requires 2 express tracks, which then affects every single person who lives in the abutting community, because those 2 express tracks, and you know what I'm about to say, kick out the 35-foot-wide People's Pike Multi-Use Path and Park. So, are you doing the model to justify getting rid of the People's Pike Path and Park?

A: Mike O'Dowd: Absolutely not, not at all.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: Well, then why are we doing a model that that's coming up with what we all must agree is a dramatic under reporting of what we all either hope or would expect in the year 2040 would. So why are we doing the model?

A: Scott Peterson: I've gone through 3 peer reviews of this model in the last 10 years. One was to support the Green Line. The Federal Transit Administration came in with a consultant team and

dissected every component of the model, every dataset, and we got almost a billion dollars for that project. So, I feel good that the fundamentals of that model work.

C: Jessica Robertson: But your assumptions that you're plugging into it are completely flawed; that's what we've been telling you for the past two hours.

C: Glen Berkowtiz: We appreciate that Scott, and I don't even know that we're necessarily questioning the model as opposed to the assumptions that you're using.

C: Wendy Landman: And we've known for decades, that if you run transit service infrequently, it's not a linear progression. It's a geometric progression. If you, if you have lousy trains service, nobody uses it, and with good service lots of people use it. I worked on that 35 years ago looking at ferries in Boston Harbor. Basically, if you ran it on hourly service, nobody took it. If you did 15 minutes service, you generated lots of trips. The fact that we're doing a model that's based on hourly service in 2040 is a guarantee that there won't be any riders and that has all these repercussions that all of us are talking about. If you run this model, it's going to show that nobody's using the station. In fact, we know that that's the case and that's exactly what we're worried about. This is setting this up to make all sorts of incorrect decisions about the future that we have been saying for years, but now the FMCB has been endorsing a different kind of service. The fact that we would use this as the basis for the decisions we're making about this project doesn't make any sense. It will show us that the transit won't work.

C: Jack Wofford: Now it's really been made concrete by the Fiscal Management and Control Board adopting a vision. I think the focus of this project is on what you want to build and none of us want the turnpike to fall so the trucks are spread out around all the neighborhood streets. So, we're all here to help figure out what should we build in the next 10 years. But to do that in an intelligent way that then doesn't have to remake things in 15 years means that the modeling must accommodate to these larger issues of scope. I'm hesitating to use the word vision even because it makes it sound so off into the future. But some of these issues, if you make a design decision on number of tracks, or the configuration of the station, or the location of the track, or Grand Junction service, you're going to be making those decisions in the next year. So, I think it's a here and now issue.

Q: Dick Garver: Maybe the conversation has gone by, but I'm sitting here guessing that the reason you use this model repeatedly, you've touched on FTA or the Federal funding agencies, is that this is the model and the procedure, and the way to go at it, which they have accepted if they're going to fund Massachusetts' projects. And you don't have, you probably in your heart wouldn't love to do what's being requested, but if you submitted it as a basis for FTA proceeding with approving the designs of these roadways and these stations, they wouldn't accept it because it's not the way it's done. I don't know whether that's true or not, but that's certainly the way I look at it. So, you're stuck building a worst, you're starting in on design process od the worst case here. To get some handle on the aspirational side though, just a question for you. Does your regional rail study of the Worcester Mainline include the station?

A: Mike O'Dowd: Yes, it does.

Q: Dick Garver: Does that study allow you to project ridership coming out of that? I assume it does at the station.

A: Scott Peterson: Rail vision has an estimate of West Station demand.

Q: Dick Garver: So, you could compare that outcome with what's in your present model, which is just running them at these slow headways. You'd get a delta between regional rail and what's in your model, right?

A: Scott Peterson: Yes, but with the caveat that the land use assumptions for this area are based on the long-range transportation plan that don't have the full growth or build up that I showed earlier.

Q: Dick Garver: They won't have what's in your model for this?

A: Scott Peterson: Exactly the land use assumptions are different and it's a lot less developed in the rail vision version.[2]

Q: Dick Garver: Well to use an overused phrase this evening, does that make any sense? If you're going to do that study and you're proceeding on a project here to build a station, then use the same land use assumptions you've developed for that station. We didn't have the insight of the communications between MAPC and Harvard. Those weren't complete at that point in time.

A: Scott Peterson: The rule of thumb is basic outputs of just traffic volumes without going into air quality or detailed station boarding and lightnings. For just line level, it takes 10 days to 2 weeks to get results.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: The model runs for 2 weeks?

A: Scott Peterson: Well it runs for maybe 3 days. Preparation time is a couple of days and extracting the data out and interpreting it. So, 10 days total.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: If the Task Force and the Project Team tried to partner with each other instead of doing whatever we've been doing for the last two hours and we wanted to pay you ourselves collectively to have you make just one change to the model as a friendly gesture, not because you required to do it. Could we request you to change the frequency of the service to the station?

And then I guess we'd also want you to change this assumption of zero Grand Junction to something larger. How much, how much human being time does that take, those changes? Is it one staff person for half an hour or one staff person for 2 days? What does it take?

A: Scott Peterson: Changing the headway is probably the easiest. It's just changing one variable, but coding Grand Junction is more complicated because it's a new line and you're adding other variables. For example, is it a shuttle between West station and Cambridge, North Station? Then there's several grade crossings you need to understand, for example, is there a new station in Kendall? That's another variable that needs to be understood. I think there's a fair amount of work on the backside that would have to be developed to link it with this Worcester Line service. I would need outside support to get to that point. To understand the Grand Junction Line is a significant effort, but if it's just a frequency improvement on the Worcester Line, that's very easy.

Q: Mike O'Dowd: Did the rail vision consider all those challenges or hurdles? Stations, crossings, things of that nature?

A: Scott Peterson: At a very high level. It didn't go into each grade crossing.

Q: Mike O'Dowd: And did it go into whether a 2 track right away was available?

A: Scott Peterson: I don't know.

C: Travis Pollack: I think rail vision did look at on a broad level in terms of right-of-way and track capacity needs to develop the capital costs. I don't know if into that level of detail. In terms of the exact, right-of-way needs on Grand Junction I'm not sure. That's just my understanding of it.

Q: Mike O'Dowd: So, does this track right-of-way exist for the purposes of the planning study?

A: Bill Deignan: Yes.

Q: Mike O'Dowd: Does the city own it?

A: Bill Deignan: No, that it's a combination of the state and MIT. We have actually just sent a set plan showing the right-of-way with a path right next to it. 2 tracks can exist the entire way.

Q: Mike O'Dowd: Between Kendall and West station?

A: Bill Deignan: Between the river and the Somerville-Cambridge city line.

Q: Henrietta Davis: I have a more general question, but just what provision is being made in this whole study for trying to divert from single occupancy vehicles to mass transit or other modes? It seems like the assumption is you make all capacity for automobiles available that's needed. It doesn't seem to emphasize having the goal, which generally was the case in transportation in the state and certainly is in the cities of Boston and Cambridge, to divert people from driving single occupancy vehicle. So, I don't know where that fits into all of this. We're down in the weeds in a thing, but where's the part about diversion? Where does that come in?

A: Scott Peterson: That is called mode choice. Which is the 3rd step in the modeling chain and there's several variables that could drive people to taking more than transit than the auto. This slide represents parking assumptions. If people have a parking space, either in a residential building or on the employment end, they're more likely to drive. So, in this study we're reducing the parking spaces, which result in auto ownership being reduced at residential locations and we're attaching a cost of $22, for employee parking in that Beacon Park Yard so that's a disincentive to drive right there.

Q: Henrietta Davis: So the overall, this is actually the first thing I heard you really say tonight and I'm not going to say views specifically, but that talks about that being a goal for this multi-modal model project that's looking of into the future. Where I assume, and I guess I know some people probably know where this exists and state goals, that the idea is to get people to be using other modes and there's a lot of talk about it, but I haven't seen it really discussed here as a goal and how this project is going to try to get some of those people who are now driving in not to drive. Here's what terrifies me, the construction because I think there's just totally no thought at all about how when there's constraint capacity there are going to be people getting anywhere. And so, let's talk sometime about the construction period and what we're going to do about that. Even though it has that wonderful name, multimodal, it doesn't really seem like we're trying to get people out of cars. We're more like be trying to offer them the amount of capacity that they have now and more as your employment grows. Am I hearing you wrong or is that, we notice that? Where does that come in fit into this whole thing?

A: Mike O'Dowd: We'll be consulting with Scott's group again and using his model to help inform what we need to do to address the traffic related impacts during construction.

C: Henrietta Davis: I'm not talking about that fundamentally. That's a very important concern. I'm saying in the project, are we assuming everybody is going to keep on doing what they've been doing or are we going to try to change behavior? Is that part of what this project is about or is it not?

C: Mike O'Dowd: Having worked with Scott and other veterans of CTPS for many years, I think we've all discovered collectively that it can be very difficult for us to change human behavior.

C: Jessica Robertson: Can we pause and let that sink in? You could not build a highway and build a ton of trains and that will change behavior. Your actions do influence people's behavior. And if you don't think that's true, you need to quit your job and let someone else do it.

C: Henrietta Davis: It really is a problem. It's a problem, especially when we know that during construction that there's going to be constraints on the capacity, but overall as a goal for the state it's another problem. I think that's a big problem with this huge project isn't going to try and do anything to change behavior. Cambridge was under the under the federal guidelines that we had to reduce single occupancy vehicles and we did it over a period and it didn't seem like it was rocket science. It is a matter of steps that you take to make changes, to offer opportunities to get around in other ways. Sx=[I guess that's why the commuter rails conversation so disheartening because obviously it would be one obvious way to get people out of cars is when you can get into a train and get to their work site. But if you don't have the trains running, it's not going to happen. So, I just thought it was part of the goal of this project and I sat here assuming this all this time. Maybe because it was advertised as a multi-modal project.

C: Scott Peterson: This is my last slide. I was trying to end on a positive note on the model between the parking and the land use. As Travis said, a lot of the land use has been designed to be located right around the transit station.

Q: Jessica Robertson: What good does it do if there's only 1 train an hour?

Q: Glen Berkowitz: Can we have him at least finish the slide?

A: Travis Pollack: Let me just chime in and say that one thing that MAPC is doing a visioning study for West station, called West Station Area Transit Study. We are trying to look at some of the scenarios that you mentioned and see what the different transit options would do, whether it's the frequent service on the Worcester Line, the Grand Junction, some of the bus services. Whether those bus services, all terminate at West station and turn around or some of them go through like all the way from Cambridge to Longwood and whether there might be BRT operating in dedicated lanes. Based on those, we would then looking at also different land use scenarios in terms of what the land use would have, maybe a higher density or a higher concentration of housing or the work you know forces at a different level.

So, we're at an early stage in that. But trying to look at some of those scenarios because we understand that they can't look at all the scenarios and we have a different modeling system that looks to try these accessibilities at the of those different options for both land use transportation. We use it to try to then make sure that things are done so that if that West Station grows differently or there are different situations for West station, we can have the infrastructure in place with the services in place at a later time in the future. But that study is just now early on and we have as we are trying to coordinate with Mike and his group on that study as well as others and municipality.

C: Galen Mook: Based on the timing of that Travis, do you believe that that study will have any impact or weight on this project as it's designed?

C: Travis Pollack: Well, I would hope so. I mean I really do.

We have the same concerns about ensuring that the track and platform arrangement does not preclude future improvements. Is the Grand Junction double track that's something that's needed? Maybe like the bus services would move the needle more? Or is it something like the parking cost

that might move the needle more? We think those are really important pieces of information to have so that we can make sure that the station design supports future improvements or at least doesn't trap us into a bad corner where we cannot make them in the future.

Q: Galen Mook: Do you have any idea when it might be presentable or defined enough to be incorporated in this project?

A: Travis Pollack: For our study we'll do the scenarios in early to mid-2020, I think we should be finished by the end of 2020. November or December 2020.

Q: Sarah Hamilton – Task Force Member: So, this may be a question for you, Mike, but I believe we heard one or two meetings ago that the NEPA scoping document will take about 2 years to complete. If that is so how would a study like Travis's or other studies be able to be folded into that evaluation during that 3-year period?

A: Mike O'Dowd: Travis and I would need to discuss this a bit further to give you a detailed answer, because I don't know exactly what he is doing in depth other than that he is doing it. I'm not 100% sure what his results and outputs are going to be and how they might inform this project. What I can tell you is that from the NEPA schedule that we are communicating out to the public through the scoping document is that in January of 2021 we are intending to file the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. As you can imagine, it's going to take several months to draft up the documentation and the analysis and the environmental impacts associated with it to get it to a point where it could be filed.

Q: Galen Mook: So given Travis's timeline, what we're assuming is that it will be too late for MAPCs modeling to be incorporated into what you are planning?

A: Mike O'Dowd: Yes.

C: Galen Mook: I just wanted to make sure that's clear.

Q: Dick Garver: It's too late to be in the draft EIS?

C: Mike O'Dowd: It's too late to be in the draft EIS, correct.

C: Mike O'Dowd: What Travis is doing is not an alternative to the CTPS model; I just want to make sure everyone knows that.

C: Scott Peterson: It's not an alternative.

C: Galen Mook: My apologies. I misspoke. It should help influence the project's design by what you're telling us, Mike, but it seems like the release of those studies will be too late to really make a fundamental difference to what you design.

A: Mike O'Dowd: On the schedule that we are tracking right now Galen, that is the case. Yes.

Q: Galen Mook: Do you see this as a concern, or can we change that, or are you just okay with that being how it is? I don't mean to be distrustful here.

A: Mike O'Dowd: How and when the initiation and the implementation of the various studies were undertaken is beyond my control. I would imagine they were initiated by the planning office. As such, I don't exactly know what the timeframes are or what they were intended to be, but I've certainly been clear on what our project timelines have been or at least what we are striving for them to be under the direction of the Secretary of Transportation.

C: Galen Mook: Okay.

C: Mike O'Dowd: Let's put it this way, this project was well on track with the MEPA and NEPA filings that we were anticipating to support a construction sometime starting 2022. I'm not exactly sure what the timeframe was for these other planning studies that are being undertaken or when those were first conceived.

C: Jessica Robertson: I think this is a really important point and, and we all know and understand that there's a lot of urgency associated with getting the Turnpike part of the project going. And so, I don't think we're anyone suggesting that we would want to delay that process. I think, Travis, I know you've heard this from us before, but I think you need to take it back to your team that they need to speed up or else their work is kind of pointless. I work in a consultant business, if someone tells you need to do this project faster, they can do it. They can put more people on it, they can work harder. Yes there's a lot of work to be done but there are ways to speed that up and I think if you want the study to have any impact and I think a lot of us would want your study to have impact, you need to make that happen.

C: Galen Mook: I think that's crucial for us as we've understood this entire meeting and from a year and a half ago when the Task Force members said they didn't believe the numbers is that we need more robust analysis. I did not mean to say it's a replacement for the CTPs or a change for it. I want it to be augmented, but we are obviously seeing some serious flaws in the assumptions you are making and we've been saying this for over a year very clearly that we want more. We're not trying to delay. We very clearly want this project to go ahead. We were there at the platform with the former governor saying that we were getting the station opened in 2020 and we were very much on board with fast tracking and making sure that it goes, but we don't want this to go in such a way where we basically cut off our nose to spite our face and create a station that doesn't actually serve the purposes of giving a mode shift.

To Hentrietta's point, under the Patrick Administration, the DOT was very clear about GreenDOT policies. It was very clear about that. So, hopefully we're not abandoning the progress and forethought that was laid in prior administrations. We need to shift modes. We can't assume that 30% growth of automobiles on the turnpike in 2040. It's just not feasible. We don't have the space; we don't have the greenhouse gas emission capacity. It's getting drastic and if we don't do this the way this Task Force has said it needs to be done and allowing an analysis of what we've been asking, then what's the point?

C: Jessica Robertson: Travis works for MAPC. They don't report to the project team.

C: Glen Berkowitz: On This project they report to the project team. Until someone teaches me otherwise, based on my 19 years of experience with doing this as a public official, they all take direction from the project management team of this project.

C: Jessica Robertson: But this is an independent study. They can move as fast as they want.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: We should not have had to gone through the past two hours. Is West Station going to happen? Yes or no? Is West station going to be 4 tracks or 3 tracks? Is it going to be 2 express tracks? Do the 2 express tracks mean more to the people coming from Worcester then a 35-foot-wide People's Pike and park would mean for true multi-modal configuration?

Q: Jessica Robertson: That's not actually the tradeoff. Its are express tracks more important than getting off at West Station? People in MetroWest said they would prefer to get off at West Station.

C: Glen Berkowitz: Based on the draft scope that we're all commenting on tomorrow, everything we're looking at in 3L is just one of two options that they plan on moving forward. The other option they plan on moving forward with is a no-build, but don't be confused by the word no-build because they

don't intend to let the viaduct fall under the no-build. They're going to spend lots of money to keep the viaduct up. I mean they must. A no-build that allows the viaduct to disintegrate wouldn't be a valid option. So, what's going to happen in 1 or 2 or 3 years from now? Unless things change, there's going to be a 3L scenario with this thing called West Station that has 410 people a day wanting to use it instead of 5,000 a day because of everything we just talked about, but then the people in charge of the state, whoever those people are 2 or 3 years from now, will compare that multimodal project to a no-build and say, "well gee, why should I bother?"

What we've been talking about for the last two hours is going to affect the decisions that really get made by the people who are going to be faced with a 1-point something billion dollar bill for 3L with a West Station, but the modeling for West Station is including 1 out of 10 people who might use it or they're going to be faced with making a choice for no-build to spend a couple hundred million to just make that viaduct last another 20 to 40 years. And it all comes back Scott to the stuff, what I'm predicting, is it all comes back to the outputs from your model. I'm not questioning your model; I'm questioning the assumptions in your model. Is there anyone on the project team who thinks we haven't talked at length with you about this? And so, in conclusion, how do we go forward and not repeat this? How do we have a different forward outcome then a model with assumptions that we all have to agree in our hearts that don't make any sense in the year 2040?

C: **Jack Wofford:** Can I just build on what Glen and Jessica just said? Note two anniversaries briefly; December 1969 exactly 50 years ago, congress enacted NEPA. We're here to see the process and comment on it. The same week in December that the congress enacted NEPA, I, as the Executive Director, met with Governor Sargent exactly 50 years ago. It was clear at that point that his decision about a multimodal study, he said we're going to have a multimodal study. Then we're going to decide what to build whether it was transit or highway. When he decided in November 1972 not to build the Southwest expressway, but instead to relocate the orange line from its elevated and build a corridor park. Then a year later, there came the decision to extend the red line through Davis, Porter, and Alewife and Braintree, there was zero money available to develop those kinds of projects.

And so, what did he direct his highway staff to do? He said, "I want you to go to Washington and change federal law so that we can transfer the highway money to build transit instead." And he put $1 billion in highway construction money at risk. So, when there was 14% on employment in the construction industry and the billion dollars that was then used which built the red line Alewife, relocated the orange line, and it was aspirational. It comes back to the essential point that he wanted to change behavior. I was in the room when he was deciding not to build the Southwest expressway and he looked at about five of us and he said "you know, all those people stuck on the Southeast expressed way, I am determined not to repeat that." And that was kind of his really gut human instinct on how he was going to do this.

One of the assumptions they made was instead of designing to meet demands, you reverse the process and you try to design things in order to shape the demand and it was the essential ingredient of what MEPA was all about. I don't know if you're aware, but I was the first director of CTPS, and we were instructed by the Sargent Administration and while CTPS was created in the Dukakis Administration to kind of undertake long range visionary modeling that would support basic changes in the transportation system in order to affect behavior. So, 50 years, a lot of us talk about the good old days, but it just occurred to me sitting here that this conversation sounds very similar to the conversations that we had 50 years ago. And I think there's an opportunity here to once again make some changes that will affect the details of the project as it moves forward so that it can move forward in an intelligent way.

C: **Ed Ionata:** Scott, I think that's a wrap.

C: Scott Peterson: Thank you.

NEPA Q & A

C: Ed Ionata: Okay, we were going to have Nate give a quick review of a whole series of meetings that have happened in other forums and I think what we should do is let Nate publish those summaries.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis – Project Team Member: It's about 7 or 8 slides. I'll email them all out to everybody tomorrow. We'll title VI it on the backend, and we'll send it to everyone on the Task Force.

C: Ed Ionata: Unless there's major opposition that, we'll have Mark come up and answer any last-minute questions? We'll take any last-minute input on the scoping document.

Q: Galen Mook: Just because it was so hard to read the CTPS slides can we get those mailed out as well?

A: Nate Cabral-Curtis: I'm going to do the whole thing, Galen. It's going to be the whole presentation.

C: Ed Ionata: I think you see slides that are self-explanatory, the workshops that were held that a lot of you came to. Nate can you just go through the list of the meetings.

C: Nate Cabral Curtis: The 2 meetings that are written up in this are the result of an email we sent out a few weeks back saying if anybody wants to come in and look at the plans that we showed at the workshop, again with the engineers in the room, please come and do so. We ended up doing that twice. The folks who availed themselves of it were Jack, Glenn, Harry and Ari. So, we had 2 sits 1 for about 4 hours and one for about 2 at MassDOT and we crunched through a whole bunch of rail stuff. The results of those conversation are laid out in these slides.

C: Ed Ionata: I think the slides do a good job of summarizing those discussions. Unless there's any opposition to not hearing that summary from Nate, I'd like to move to Mark. The intent of bringing up Mark is if you have last minute questions, process questions, et cetera on the scoping document, now's your time to ask them as we have no further formal presentation. Go ahead Glen.

C: Glen Berkowitz: So of course, it would be more informative if Harry and Ari were able to make tonight, but they weren't, but I talked to both. While I can only guess what Nate has summarized, but what it may not include were things that we learned that were a surprise to us from those discussions. We learned there was no modeling. Those are the kind of things that came up.

Q: Ed Ionata: Do you want to take a minute or 2 to get those out there?

A: Glen Berkowitz: We learned that the only detailed full analysis that's been done today of anything related to rail was the original Harvard Flip. We were very surprised to learn that. The thing that's currently in the scoping document as the recommendation as we understood it has not even had full modeling done to it to date. That as we understood it, that modeling wasn't going to be done until next year, but in the scoping document there aren't declarative statements made like, the modified flip doesn't work, and this current design does work. But we learned there was no modeling. So, in order to keep it to two minutes, I'll stop at that. Those are the kinds of things that came up.

C: Ed Ionata: Certainly, that discussion will inform how we interpret the comments we receive, but are there process questions? Questions like, "where do we go from here?" What does scope mean? That's what Mark is here to answer.

Q: Wendy Landman: So rehashing Jack's discussion of a global understanding of what you might do. Can you describe a little bit, given what you guys all heard tonight about the problem with the

modeling, and we talked a lot about what that means for transit stations, but I am also extremely concerned about what it means for the road network and all the other pieces of design. How is that going to be included in the scope? Because if we're just having the modeling as described then the underlying information that's feeding into other aspects of design will be flawed or at least will be suspect.

Can you talk a little bit about how you can take back what you heard tonight?

A: Ed Ionata: I think we have to say that there needs to be some more modeling work done be included in a draft and final EIS that addresses these concerns. In the process of scoping, I think that's how you address it. What we're trying to do now is scope and the question of scoping is what should the analysis be, what should the alternatives looked at be? And what you're talking about is there needs to be more analysis work to justify looking at the various alternatives.

I think Federal Highway will hear that the modeling, or at least as it's understood now, needs to be modified and investigated in greater detail. This will be part of the EIS process, which would also obviously be included in the EIR process as those two process processes become parallel.

Q: Wendy Landman: Can you send us all, the Task Force, something that gives us some reassurance? Until this evening I did not understand that that was going to be the information that's going to feed into all these other things. And I think that's what we were all hearing tonight and really understanding that the modeling process, the output of that is going to have a huge impact on all sorts of decisions about the project. And I think, I don't know that we can all go back and write comment letters tonight.

A: Ed Ionata: No, I understand and that's why I'm saying because it's less than a day before the deadline. I guess the deadline is five o'clock tomorrow. But I think certainly Mike and Federal Highway will look to some of the people on the team to interpret all those comments, to summarize all the comments, and to say what the key themes are as part of that process.

Q: Wendy Landman: So, the comments that we give you can somehow be in that?

Q: Ed Ionata: Yes. In addition to taking those written comments, what people often ask us to do is say, "what does this written comment mean?" And I think Mike, we can commit to writing that up for Federal Highway, particularly around the modeling issue and sharing what we sent in Federal Highway? Is that okay?

A: Mike O'Dowd: We've already had dialogue with Federal Highway regarding how we'll be relying on the CTPS model, good, bad or indifferent, however its viewed by the public or the Task Force here, because it updates the traffic data that was presented to us in our DEIR and is considered to be the latest and most accurate.

C: Wendy Landman: I'm not at this point questioning how you run that through the model, but back to Henrietta's big question and the question that's been coming up all night. If you model lousy transit service, the output will tell you that they're going to be a lot more cars. If the output tells you there's going to do a lot more cars. That means that your design of the roadway, network, traffic, signal timing, et cetera will be based on that. The question I'm asking is that there needs to be a set of assumptions that are based on this idea that what we are trying to do is shift more people out of single occupancy vehicles into transit use. The reason we're going to build a station, the reason we're asking for the Grand Junction connection, the reason we're asking for good bus service, all of that is to start to make that shift.

A: Mike O'Dowd: What I'm going to ask you today and everybody else in the room is, please comment on the fact that you want us to run a model that clearly is outside, over, above, and beyond what a service policy that currently exists and that you all want it.

C: Jessica Robertson: And we did a year ago and are doing it tonight and it's just frustrating.

A: Mike O'Dowd: And you know something, Jess is that sometimes you need to keep a repetition for things to happen and for executive leadership to make some changes. You saw that in the actions and results of the Independent Review Team. What I am going to do, as I told you all earlier is that I will go back and I will relay what I've heard tonight to that DOT leadership so that they'll be getting it both from me relative to what was said here tonight at the Task Force and then they will be able to read it yet again when the public comments are received.

C: Ed Ionata: Here's how I'll phrase this to Federal Highway in our coordination with them. NEPA looks at the goal of full disclosure of all impacts and an explanation of how you arrived at those impacts. So, what you're touching on is what is the methodology that you've used to develop designs that produce impacts? In their terms and in all of the review that will happen at federal highway in their legal department or whatever. Is this document sound and adequate? Are your methods sound? Are your assumptions adequate toward that goal of full disclosure of all impacts? Because NEPA is a disclosure document. Disclose the impact, disclose your decision making. So, I think phrased in those terms, they'll understand it and what we're questioning here is the adequacy of the methodology that drives the analysis. And I think, I know there's not much time but a quick email comment that says something like that to add to the written record, I think would with some interpretation and some, you know, some, some additional embellishment added by the people who here tonight. We'll get that message across. I'm confident.

Sorry to take over Mark.

Q: Laura Jasinski – Charles River Watershed Association: This is more of a process question. Can you tell us how our comments are gone through? I'm assuming you're going to get many, many comments. You said we've looked at them?

A: Nate Cabral-Curtis: We have about 300 comments at this time for what it's worth.

A: Ed Ionata: Many of them are, are identical, repetitive. So, we take them all, categorize them into a giant matrix. We're careful to not paraphrase them; we take the actual language, categorize them. So, if someone writes a letter and it's made up of 6 or 8 distinct comments they go into the, into a matrix for response that separates them into individual comments. So, we'll usually take a letter and say this paragraph is comment letter 1-1 and then respond to each one of those. So, in the process of doing that, there are often comments that are repeated or there are comments that you can lump into a single answer.

So, generally there are a whole series of frequent comments and frequent and responses. So probably of all the 300 letters, 2000 comments, something like that, a good chunk of them can be answered by 15 or 20 succinct responses and, in the document, we will key that to say, here's the comment. If it's an individual response, here's the response. If it is covered by one of the frequent responses, then this is that frequent response. I hope that answered your question.

A: Mark Fobert: All that gets pulled together into the scoping summary report. There's another report.

C: Ed Ionata: And will be published.

A: Mark Fobert: It'll be published in a February timeframe, maybe into March.

Q: Laura Jansinski: How does it influence that document?

A: Ed Ionata: How it influences a document will be in the response to comments. So, if it's yes for the modeling will be done, it will be in the draft EIS. Or this comment is irrelevant. We don't plan to do anything with it. That could be the other extreme.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Everybody knows HSH is receiving those comments. We're already putting them into the matrix that Ed talked about to make sure that there's, to the best of our abilities, that's not causing a holdup.

C: Glen Berkowitz: This is just one follow up to Ed. So, Ed, can the task force right now ask you all to, I apologize, I don't know your name.

A: Jean Charles: Jean.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: I'm assuming you've been typing away taking notes of what everyone has said?

A: Nate Cabral-Curtis: He has.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: Can we ask you now to take this document that exists in digital form right there and submit that for us as a comment by the deadline tomorrow so that the transcript of everything that got discussed tonight was submitted as a comment, as part of the process? It's a simple question. Please try to give me a simple answer.

A: Ed Ionata: Why don't I suggest? And you can disagree with it if you want. I think the task force can say, we would like to submit the transcript of this meeting as a comment.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: Do you want us to take a vote right now?

A: Ed Ionata: No, you don't have to take a vote. Unless Mike you want them to? I might be out on thin ice here a little bit. Unless, Mike disagrees, we would go through that transcript. We would extract the correct parts, turn them into succinct comments, and respond to them.

A: Mike O'Dowd: Let me interrupt one second, I'm sorry, but I have asked Ed's question of Federal Highway, remember, they are managing this process. The short answer is no, you cannot. I guess the long answer is we need to have written documents from the individuals that are making the comment.

C: Ed Ionata: They don't like to use meeting minutes of non-Federal meetings.

A: Mike O'Dowd: correct.

C: Ed Ionata: Because they're very careful in those meetings, hearings, et cetera to have transcripts. But I think people from the Task Force, and I might be on thin ice here, can write a comment that says, "our comment includes the discussion that was recorded on this date. Please refer to it." How's that? Mike

A: Mike O'Dowd: It's on thin ice.

Q: Jessica Robertson: Can HSH send us the minutes before noon tomorrow?

A: Nate Cabral-Curtis: No, that's doubtful given that Jean probably already has over 40 pages of raw notes. I've got pages and pages of pencil notes here. We want these minutes to be accurate so that at our next public meeting when Galen prints them all out again, for which I commend his heroism, they'll be right.

What I will do is I will tomorrow morning, first thing, I will look at Jean's rough notes, I will look at my pencil notes. I will generate a statement to send to Mike, Ed, and Chris to say, "do you believe this is an accurate depiction of what was said at the Task Force with regards to concerns about the model." They can turn it over to federal highway in such a way that Mike works out acceptable with Melissa. I think that's, that's our best bet given the timetable that we're under.

C: Glen Berkowitz: I guess there's just not a simple answer to my question?

A: Ed Ionata: I'm trying to find a way to make it work. If we got a few comments or even one comment that said in a couple of sentences what your concern is, and you say this comment is further informed by the discussion and the notes that are available of this meeting. I can make sure that people look at those notes and so you could say succinctly your concern with the model for example. Then finish your comment by saying this, this issue is further informed by the discussion that occurred here and that'll get that considered, I think.

C: Galen Mook: First, I think that's wise, I think that we should go ahead and do that. Maybe we could phrase it as pending future clearing by the project team, the notes that gets submitted, if that gets in so we don't get the final notes in by 5:00.

C: Ed Ionata: It is sort of like "here's the succinct issue. There was a detailed and complex discussion about it. We encourage you to further form your knowledge by looking at the meeting minutes.

I think that's why we came to general. Good conversation, consensus of concern. So, the notes do not become a comment. Your comment is your comment and it's a reference document to that comment or something like that.

C: Mike O'Dowd: It's thin ice.

Q: Galen Mook: Mark, this one's for you. So, considering that we're on 2 parallel tracks, right, why is FHWA not involved in the Task Force process? Why are they not here tonight? Why are we having 2 public processes? How come the federal process is not overlapping with us and why are they here not here tonight for themselves? Why do you act as a filter for our comments?

A: Mark Fobert: First, that's why it's important for you to write it in your comments. We re-requested that they come, and their legal counsel said that didn't fit into the NEPA process. The formal NEPA meetings that Federal Highway runs not are Task Force meetings, because there must be equal representation for everyone. That's the answer we got.

C: Jessica Robertson: But members of the public can attend Task Force meetings. And you guys don't privilege Task Force members over a member of the public when they raise their hands.

A: Mike O'Dowd: We strive to, Jess, but we also attempt to give everybody an equal opportunity to ask a question.

C: Galen Mook: There's a grave concern that these agencies are not participating in a Task Force process and are not here to witness these conversations.

A: Mike O'Dowd: I asked them that yesterday as to whether or not they will participating in future task force meetings, including the one this evening and they said that they had gotten direction from their leadership and I don't know how far the leadership extends, whether it's just divisional or whether it's regional, but whatever the case may be, they said that they would politely decline the offer.

Q: Galen Mook: Could this be something that should be mentioned in the comment?

A: Mike O'Dowd: Sure.

C: Mark Fobert: You can comment on anything.

Q: Galen Mook: I mean how do you all feel about that from the state side?

A: Mike O'Dowd: I think you're going to get a response from federal highway that this is their legal process. I think you should put the comment in if it's something you feel strongly or anybody else around you feels strongly about that Federal Highway needs to be engaged in the Task Force meetings, put the comment in.

Q: Pallivi Mande: Quick question. What's to be expected? Is there a meeting in January or I guess there is one in February?

A: Mike O'Dowd: There will be one in February. Not in January.

Q: Pallavi Mande: And then just last piece because I believe the NPC for this is going to be filed at some point after the scoping is pulled together. What is the interface between the two from the perspective of NEPA receiving feedback from MEPA?

A: Mark Fobert: We want to be consistent between the two documents. We must be consistent as we move forward through the processes. We can't have different information on the NEPA process that we have on the MEPA process.

C: Ed Ionata: It is MassDOT's responsibility to make sure that whatever's happening in MEPA informs MEPA and vice-versa.

Q: Jessica Robertson: When are you filing the NPC?

A: Mike O'Dowd: End of February.

Q: Jessica Robertson: So, you all have time to absorb all the comments and make all the changes to the project that we're requesting and then file it in February?

A: Ed Ionata: Yes, because in terms of what is the notice of project change, it's not that wildly dissimilar from scoping. It says, "here's what the plan looks like going forward."

Q: Jessica Robertson: And we have a lot of issues with what's in the scoping report that you'll read about tomorrow. So, are you going to be able to actually address any of those things in time to file your NPC?

A: Ed Ionata: We will have to.

Q: Pallavi Mande: I don't know if it's just me, but the NEPA seems to be pretty kind of big picture non-detailed, whereas MEPA has been detailed. So, I'm just in my own head thinking, our comments also sort of a big picture but also detailed. So how are you planning to do that in February?

A: Make Fobert: We're at the beginning of the NEPA process and the NEPA process in the beginning is a very general process. It's an identifying alternative. On the state side for a lot further along, but we can't afford to stop either process and make the project work from a schedule standpoint when we go to get permits and that's what's driving the separate processes. We'd love to have a joint document, but it just doesn't work with this schedule.

Q: Pallavi Mande: I think the way I'm understanding is that you've probably already in the process of drafting that NPC like today. How do our comments play into that?

A: Ed Ionata: So, here's how we would do it. We've got all these comments in a matrix, right? Some smart people will say which ones of these pertain to at the level of detail that were added in MEPA and would affect what we're saying in that notice of project change to set up the scope for the final EIR and try to capture all of those. It's a chunk of work, but we understand that the most likely challenge point for a MEPA or a NEPA document is on process more so than on content.

Q: Henrietta Davis: On alternatives too?

A: Ed Ionata: If you don't have almost perfect parallelism, you put both processes at risk. We understand The NPC will reflect everything we learned from the federal scoping and if an alternative pops up out of federal scoping, we're going to have to disclose that and look at it both in the draft and final EIS and in the final EIR or whatever results from the NPC.

C: Mark Fobert: And we must respond to the secretary's certificate on the draft.

C: Ed Ionata: Okay folks, if you want to leave, could you do so quietly so if we have any more process questions or last-minute questions, we can answer them.

C: Glen Berkowitz: I have 2 questions on the no-build and the scoping document.

Q: Ed Ionata: Folks, could you go outside with your discussions please? So, we can continue.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: I have two questions on the no-build in scoping document. The first question, I'm going to read you a quote from the scoping document. I'm going to ask you to just tell me what this means in plain English.

The first question is, in quotes, the no build alternative consists of frequent and continuous preservation activities. End quotes. What does that mean in plain English?

A: Mark Fobert: It means we keep it fixed and usable.

A: Mike O'Dowd: It's what I refer to as perpetual maintenance. As you know, every bridge the Commonwealth owns needs to go through regular inspection cycles. As we identify a deficiency that may limit the carrying capacity of that structure, then we must prioritize it, and then we will address it. It's a maintenance issue. If something comes up, either our maintenance crews or contracted crews will address those issues.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: What's the time duration that this is referring to? 20 years, 40 years, 75 years. Which one? What's the temporal nature? It says no build, for what length of time? Well, please just give me a simple answer to the question.

A: Mike O'Dowd: I can't you a simple answer, because how bridges may deteriorate over time isn't a linear progression, as they get into bad shape, they tend to run down faster.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: What is the closest 25-year period that this sentence applies to?

A: Mike O'Dowd: I could be wrong, but a no-build preservation would probably see us through about 20 years given the current thinking on this project.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: Even though what you're going to build on the other alternatives would have a useful life of 60-75 years?

A: Mike O'Dowd: Typically, it's 75.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: But the no build would only have a useful life of 20 years instead of 75?

A: Mike O'Dowd: Because I don't know what the useful life expectancy of the Allston viaduct is. This structure is 60 years old. Potentially, could we get another 40 if we perpetually maintained it? It is quite possible, but it's a difficult question to answer.

C: Glen Berkowitz: Just as a reader of the document. It's impossible for me to know what you mean by no-build with the description of it in section 1.9, but you say it's got a 50% chance of getting selected because it's only one of two options that you recommend carrying forward. So anyway, that was my first question.

C: Mike O'Dowd: It's 1 of 3.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: What were the other 2?

A: Mark Fobert: There's also total rebuild in place.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: You mean major rehabilitation and replacement, is recommended for further evaluation?

A: Mark Fobert: Correct.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: I missed that. Thank you. I'm glad I asked that question.

So, I have 2 questions remaining. I apologize. Under the no build it says, I'm going to paraphrase what it says. 4 lay down tracks to accommodate 8 consists is included in the definition of no-build. And my question is how could that be? There aren't layover facilities there today for 8 consists. How could that possibly be included in the definition of no-build?

A: Mike O'Dowd: My understanding coming from the General Manager of the MBTA is that the MBTA retains rights to be able to place consists out there at such time as the agency wishes to do so, regardless of what Highway Division builds.

C: Glen Berkowitz: That's a legal right of way question. It has nothing to do with a no-build, Mike, this is about what exists today. I understand what you mean legally and from a right-of-way perspective.

A: Mike O'Dowd: They physically have access and they physically own the rights to utilize it.

C: Glen Berkowitz: But they don't physically exist today.

A: Mike O'Dowd: That's what I'm saying that they physically have the rights to be able to utilize those tracks that are currently out there for consists, they choose not to at this time, but they do have the ability to do so.

C: Jessica Robertson: The purpose of an environmental report though is to evaluate the environmental impacts of different courses of action. They are not currently using that for layup, which means there are currently zero environmental impacts of layup use in Allston, so a no-build that assumes that they are using those tracks is introducing more environmental impact and therefore it's not a no-build.

C: Glen Berkwotiz: Under the no-build it says 4 lay down tracks to accommodate 8 consists is included in the definition of no-build. There aren't any layover facilities included.

A: Mark Fobert: It would be analyzed in the DEIS. These are carried forward to be analyzed. If you wanted to put those tracks in, you must go through that process; analysis in the NPC and the DEIS.

C: Jessica Robertson: I agree that those should be analyzed, but as a build alternative, not as a no-build.

A: Mark Fobert: Maybe it's semantics.

C: Jessica Robertson: No, it's not semantics, because there's no option in the scoping report that doesn't have the layover.

A: Mike O'Dowd: Independent of any projects that may or may not have taken place, the MBTA, they have physically, they have possession of and rights to utilize the yard tracks out there.

C: Jessica Robertson: So therefore, it's not a no-build cause it's introducing a new use and new impacts.

A: Mike O'Dowd: Well their argument it's not a new use because there has historically been a rail facility in this part of Allston.

C: Jessica Robertson: But it's a new use.

C: Mike O'Dowd: I understand where you're coming from, I'm telling you how the General Manager of the MBTA looks at this and how he, in conversations with other MassDOT leadership, has directed us to discuss it. It's in the no-build because if we do nothing at all, the MBTA could still lay over trains out there.

C: Jessica Robertson: Right, but they're wrong, and if you ask the people who live on Wadsworth Street, whether they're breathing the fumes of idling trains, they're clearly not.

A: Chris Calnan: It would be analyzed.

C: Jessica Robertson: Right, but you're not analyzing it against the current state.

C: Glen Berkowitz: You're calling it the baseline that you're going to analyze anything else from, right? But you're including something that doesn't exist in your definition of the baseline. It absolutely makes no sense. I don't understand how you guys could fall asleep at night feeling that you're being consistent with what you say to us and what you put in writing on this.

A: Mark Fobert: What's in writing everyone sees. If it wasn't in writing. I'd be worried about it.

C: Glen Berkowitz: The no-build is required and will be the thing in which everything else is assessed against and you're including a major function in it that doesn't exist today?

C: Chris Calnan: Put it into your comment.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: My last question relates to I guess the second of the 3 options to be evaluated: Major rehabilitation and replacement. If I understand this, that's not HV from the DEIR?

A: Mike O'Dowd: No.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: It's just rehabbing and replacing the Viaduct but then leaving the rest of the interchange the same?

A: Mike O'Dowd: The existing ramp connections to Cambridge Street as they are today, yes.

A: Chris Calnan: It's the same number of lanes.

A: Mike Fobert: Nothing changes.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: Under this option, how are you going to perform major rehabilitation and replacement to the viaduct and maintain 8 lanes or however many lanes of turnpike traffic? How are you going to do this? You don't say anywhere in the document, in the scoping document how you are going to do this. So, could you tell us now how are you going to do this?

A: Mike O'Dowd: It would be painstaking.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: Separate from that. How literally are you going to do it?

A: Mike O'Dowd: There would be a lot of staging. We haven't identified how we would address staging this option any more than we have addressed staging the other options in the scoping documents.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: Really? You haven't got a good handle on how you're going to stage the other alternatives.

A: Mark Fobert: In the Scoping process you're picking an alternative. In the DEIS is when you explain how you're going to build that alternative. In a NEPA process, you don't usually explain how you're going to build something before you've selected it. It's the first screening criteria. It's hard to grasp because we've been doing this for so long that. We're going back 3 or 4 steps, with the NEPA process, which we'll then catch up.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: How do you make the determination? What meets your threshold to qualifiy for further study when you're now saying you literally wouldn't have a clue as to whether it's even possible to rebuild this?

A: Mike O'Dowd: No, I'm not saying it's impossible to know. I said it would be painstaking and that we haven't gone into the full details associated with doing it in the scoping document. That's what I said.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: I'm not asking you for the full details. Mike, I'm asking you for any pencil point of details. How would you maintain traffic and undertaking this option?

A: Mike O'Dowd: I'll give you a couple of comps. How's that?

A: Glen Berkowitz: No. I want you to be specific about the scoping document that I'm supposed to comment on by tomorrow. Here it is. I'm looking at, it doesn't tell me anything.

C: Mike O'Dowd: DOT would generate a viable alternative for staging the projects to retain the structure in this place. Like what we've done on Route 1 on the Chelsea Curves, like what we did on I-91 in Springfield. How we've worked on those structures would be quite similar to how we'd address what we have out here in Allston.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: So, you're saying you'd take 1 out of the 4 lanes at a service in each direction. Is that what you just said?

A: Mike O'Dowd: In order to reconstruct something that is currently there, I would need to take lanes out of service. What number and what direction? I don't know yet, but yes, we would have to.

C: Chris Calnan: That sort of information comes out in the DEIS.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: Then how am I supposed to comment on this document?

A: Chris Calnan: You comment on it and you say, "please provide us details that show how you are able construct that." We're not coming to the table with answers in the scoping. We're asking for you to comment on what you want to see included in the DEIS. It's a perfect example to say, show us the detail on, how you would construct that.

C: Glen Berkowitz: It's a farce. You can't just say there's a concept and then pretend you don't have to provide nary a scintilla of how you would implement that concept. And then tell the public they're supposed to provide substantive and adequate comments. That's just a farce, but then you go on with 40 pages of details on 3L. And the very thing that may likely get chosen 2 years from now, you don't have

any back up except to say, “it’s an option that we now know enough about that warrants further evaluation.” But you don’t provide a scintilla of how you would do it. It just makes no sense.

Ed, it just makes no sense. Thank you.

C: **Ed Ionata:** Okay. Next step is getting a date for February. Thanks folks.

Next Steps

The I-90 Allston Task Force will next meet when MassDOT is ready to issue the Scoping Summary Report based on the comments received during the scoping period. This is currently anticipated for early spring, 2020.

Appendix 1 - Meeting Attendance

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
George	Batchelor	MassDOT
Joe	Beggan	Harvard University
Glen Berkowitz	Berkowitz	A Better City
Andrew	Bettenelli	Office of Senator Brownsberger
Jorge	Briones	MBTA
Nathaniel	Cabral-Curtis	HSH
Chris	Calnan	Tetra Tech
Jim	Cerbone	MassDOT
Paul	Christner	MASCO
Nick	Cohen	VHB
Alex	Cornacchini	Allston Village Main Streets
Rick	Corsi	DCR
Deneen	Crosby	CSS
Bill	Deignan	City of Cambridge
Jeff	Dietrich	HSH
Anthony	D'Isidoro	Allston Civic Association
Guus	Driessen	Town of Brookline
Mark	Fobert	Tetra Tech
Karl	Haglund	Department of Conservation and Recreation
Jack	Halverson	Boston Planning & Development Agency
Sarah	Hamilton	MASCO
Ed	Ionata	Tetra Tech
Laura	Jasinski	Charles River Conservancy
Stephen	Kaiser	
Jim	Keller	Tetra Tech
Wendy	Landman	WalkBoston

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
David	Loutzenheiser	noMAPC
Pallavi	Mande	Charles River Watershed Association
Harry	Mattison	Allston Resident / Charles River Conservancy
Galen	Mook	MassBike
Alejandro	Moore	
Tom	Nally	A Better City
Michael	O'Dowd	MassDOT
Ari	Ofsevit	Livable Streets Alliance
Beth	Parent	Tetra Tech
Jessica	Robertson	Allston Resident
Mark	Shamon	VHB
Bob	Sloane	WalkBoston
Alex	Strysky	Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs
Jack	Wofford	Resident
Courtney	Worhunsky	MassDOT D6
Fred	Yalouris	