
To:	Michael O'Dowd Project Manager	Date:	March 16, 2021
From:	Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis Howard Stein Hudson	HSH Project No.:	2013061.14
Subject:	Massachusetts Department of Transportation I-90 Allston Multimodal Project Task Force Meeting Meeting Notes of 2/23/2021		

Overview

On February 23, 2021, members of the I-90 Allston Multimodal project team hosted a virtual Task Force Meeting to discuss updates to the project. The specific topics include an update to NEPA/MEPA, an overview of the contents of the Notice of Public Change (NPC), and discussion on how to submit comments to the NPC. The project as presented in the NPC is familiar to the Task Force and general public having been presented in the end of 2020 in the Scoping Summary Report. The NPC is needed, however, to bring the project's state and federal environmental filings into alignment. Currently, the project's federal environmental filings contain the design developments made in the years 2018-2020, whereas the state filings are now a snapshot of where design stood in 2017. As a result, the Secretary's certificate from the Commonwealth's Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs issued in 2018 is out of alignment with the project as it now stands. The NPC will address this issue, allow for the issue of a new certificate, and align the state and federal environmental processes to allow the project's future environmental filings at both levels to be done jointly, streamlining the process and ensuring that all members of the community see up-to-date information at the same time. The NPC will update the Purpose and Need of the project, the current alternative, qualitative discussion on air and noise, analysis on resiliency, utilities and construction impacts, and construction phasing.

The meeting also served to introduce Ken Davidson as the I-90 Allston Multimodal Project's new manager. The introduction was made by Highway Division Administrator Jonathan Gulliver who attended the meeting. Mike O'Dowd who has managed the project for MassDOT since its inception in 2014, has been promoted to be the Highway Division's Head of Major Projects, and while he will continue to oversee I-90 Allston in that it is a major project, Ken Davidson will take over daily management. Administrator Gulliver opened the meeting by asking how the Task Force process could be made better and member's commentary chiefly focused on this point following the presentation of materials about the NPC. Suggestions from the Task Force included receiving presentation materials in advance to allow them to ask more focused questions at meetings or to communicate questions in advance to ensure that they would be answered at the meeting, conducting more workshop style meetings as has been done in the past, and conducting a site walk with the Administrator and new project manager. Several members also suggested that MassDOT abandon analysis of the Soldiers' Field Road Hybrid and Modified Highway Viaduct and simply proceed with the All At-Grade option.

Agenda

- I. Welcome & Opening Remarks 2
- II. Presentation Error! Bookmark not defined.
- III. Discussion Error! Bookmark not defined.

Detailed Meeting Minutes¹

Welcome & Opening Remarks

C: Jonathan Gulliver, MassDOT: All right, good evening everybody on the Task Force. Thank you for joining us tonight. I know many of you here, and I hope you're all doing well. For those of you who do not know me, my name is Jonathan Gulliver, and I am the State Highway Administrator at MassDOT. You may have heard me on the radio a number of times these past weeks talking about snow and ice, but that's certainly not in my discussion points tonight. Although I don't attend these meetings very often, and certainly not in a participatory mode as I will be tonight, the reason I'm here is for a couple of critical issues. As all of you are undoubtedly aware, we are quickly approaching a couple of critical milestones, which our team is still going to run through tonight as part of the presentation, but the reason I am attending here tonight is twofold. First, I want to introduce our new project manager for this project, which I will do in a moment. More importantly, what I want everybody on the task force to do, as we're going through this, is think about a couple of different questions that I'm hoping we're going to get your answers to at the end of the Q&A session.

The first question is how do we make these Task Force meeting better? I know all of you have done just an incredible job over the last few years. I know a lot of you have put a lot of hard work into it, and a lot of that hard work has directly resulted in us forming many of the plans that we are currently considering. They really do look much different now than they did when we originally proposed them. I thank you all for all that hard work.

With that said, I know I've heard from many of you as well as many of our staff, and I know that over this past year, the Task Force meetings have not been nearly as productive as they once were. Part of what I would like to hear from you tonight is on how we can do better, what we're doing well, and what we should be doing better in the future. We want to make the Task Force meetings much more productive into the future. I want you to think about that question as our team runs through the presentation, and then when we open for comments, please let us know what you think about it.

Before we go any further, I want to introduce our new project manager on this job. For those of you who know how the inner workings MassDOT works, Mike O'Dowd has been the Project Manager on this job for a very long time, since the beginning. Mike handled many of our major projects, and he does a great job on them. We gave Mike a pretty good upgrade with MassDOT this past year, and now all major projects run under Mike. That has meant Mike has been doing a lot of double duty over this past six months, where he's been doing not only that job of running all major projects, he has also been directly managing this one and the team that we're going to be talking to you tonight has been supporting him. We're at that point where Mike really needs some extra help. We have

¹ Herein "C" stands for comment, "Q" for question and "A" for answer. For a list of attendees, please see Appendix 1. For a list of questions received via the typed question feature, please see Appendix 2.

brought in Ken Davidson to fill that role for us, so Ken why don't you just say a couple of words and we will continue?

- C: Ken Davidson, MassDOT:** Thanks, Jonathan. I've been very fortunate to be asked to help Jonathan and Mike with this great project and great team. I have been involved for the last month trying to come up to speed with everything that's been done for the last seven years. It's just amazing what this project will be doing for Boston, and I'm very excited to be part of it.

I'm recently coming off of a Red Line/Orange Line transformation program. I've worked on some interesting projects in my career, but this one looks like it has the potential being the best one. I'm excited to keep the job going. Thank you very much.

- C: Jonathan Gulliver:** All right. Thanks, Ken. Again, as our team transitions in a few minutes to do the presentation, I want everybody in the audience tonight to think about what you think we can be doing better, and what we have been doing really well, so that we can build on as our good foundation. I'm going to be here to listen tonight. I'm not prepared to get into a big discussion with everybody. Certainly, if there's any basic questions that we would typically answer as part of our presentation, or as we would typically answer as part of these meetings, you're more than welcome to ask them, but primarily, Ken and I are going to be here to hear your constructive comments on how we can make this process better.

Before I turn it over to the team, I do want to acknowledge some of our elected officials that are with us tonight, that continued to really make this a really good project. First off, Senator Karen Spilka, of the Senate President's office, is here tonight. Secondly, Senator Brownsberger is here, Representative Robinson, Representative Moran, Representative Dykema and Representative Hannah Kane. With that, I'm going to turn it over to our team to start the actual presentation.

Presentation

- C: Mark Fobert, Tetra Tech:** Thank you, Administrator. Jim, we will go to the first slide, please. Okay, here's an overview of tonight's PowerPoint show. We'll be discussing our NEPA/MEPA schedule, conduct an overview of the contents of the NPC, and discuss how to submit comments on an NPC. Next slide, please.

Before I dive into this slide, I want to do a quick overview as you will see a lot of acronyms and initials on this slide. First, MEPA, is the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act, which requires state agencies to study the environmental consequences of their actions. It is modeled after NEPA, the Environmental Policy Act, in which we're also in the middle.

There are a few major types of filings with MEPA that are based on the review thresholds outlined in the regulations. They include the Environmental Notification Form for projects that exceed the ENF threshold. The project has already filed one of those. There are Environmental Impact Reports (EIRs). There are three kinds: you have draft, final, and supplemental EIRs. We have already filed our Draft Environmental Impact Report. Another type of filing, which is the subject of tonight is the MEPA Notice of Project Change (NPC). There are two major reasons to file a Notice of Change: either a lapse of time, or the if there's any material changes to the project that have occurred since the last MEPA filing. In our case, there have been several material changes that have occurred since the 2017 DEIR. That is the reason we are filing the NPC, which is planned for an early spring filing.

The next filing after that will be a joint MEPA Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Report and that's what the SDEIR is. Then there is the NEPA Draft Environmental Impact Statement,

referred to as the DEIS. This is a joint document to be filed in the Summer of 2021. Sometime after that filing, a joint SDEIR, the Supplemental DEIR and the DEIS document, the preferred alternative will be identified. That is expected to be in the Fall of 2021. Just to be clear the SDEIR and DEIS will not have it for a preferred alternative identified in it. That will happen as part of the final. Then finally we have the MEPA Final Environmental Impact Report, which is the FEIR, and the NEPA Final Environmental Impact Statements, or the FEIS. The FEIS will result in a Record of Decision, which is known as a ROD on the federal side. That's currently scheduled for Spring of 2022.

As mentioned in the previous slide, the selection of the preferred alternative in the throat area will occur after the SDEIR/DEIS joint filing has been filed. This allows MassDOT to analyze and present the throat area options in the joint document, advance the multimodal mitigation planning for the project, and develop a financing plan.

I'll now go through a brief overview of the contents of the NPC. I want to stress the purposes NPC filings is to catch up the State MEPA process to everything that has happened since the filing of the DEIR in 2017. The NPC filing is generally consistent with the information presented at the October Task Force meeting. What you will see in these NPC is going to look very familiar to you, content which is also in the Scoping Summary Report. The NEPA process has gotten ahead of the state process and we had to bring those two together. That allows us to file a joint document, under both MEPA/NEPA, so we don't have that disconnect anymore. The goal is to have a joint document.

The major updates include the project purpose and need and updates to the project alternatives, associated impacts compared to those that were presented in 2017. The filing will also include a response to the Secretary Certificate and response to the public's comments on the DEIR. Mitigation measures and resource area impacts are not included in the NPC but will be addressed in the joint SDEIR/DEIS filing.

The NPC will include an updated discussion on major project elements. Again, it is important to remember the intent is to bring the state process up to date. Some of the major project elements being updated include: Purpose and Need to align the one presented during NEPA scoping process, that you should all be familiar with hopefully; alternatives, the DEIR included a very different at-grade design and also proposed the amateur planner alternative, which has been replaced by the SFR hybrid. The NPC will also include a qualitative discussion of air and noise; resiliency analysis based on an updated flood risk model; utilities and construction impacts; and construction phasing. These items will be expanded upon in the joint SDEIR/DEIS.

As I mentioned, the Purpose and Need included in the 2017 DEIR will be updated to be consistent with the one presented in the NEPA Scoping and Scoping Summary reports that were recently published. Compared to the 2017 Purpose and Need, the updated Purpose and Need places a greater emphasis on improving mobility, transportation access within the project area, not precluding connection from Agganis Way to Charles River Reservation and upgrading the Paul Dudley White Path to provide a two-way pedestrian and bicycle facility. The Purpose and Need also includes rail improvements such as the construction of West Station, and other rail infrastructure. There's also language addressing roadway deficiencies in that Purpose and Need.

Here's a visual representation of that Purpose and Need. Major items include traffic and safety, replacing the viaduct, pedestrian and bicycle improvements, and rail improvements. We have used this slide in the past, so you are probably familiar with it, but I'm going to hand this over to Jim now to talk about the No Build alternative.

C: Jim Keller, Tetra Tech: Good evening, everyone. Again, the purpose of this is to give a brief summary of what is going to be contained in the Notice of Project Change for the alternatives. Currently, these are the alternatives that have been as described in the Scoping Summary Report, the latest public document, as well as the Task Force meetings and public meeting in October.

The No Build is being called the Major Preservation. It describes the conditions that would exist should the project not be implemented. Essentially, the existing deck of the viaduct would get replaced. There would be deck joint repair, bridge railings replacement, and substructure work repairing the columns and piers. It would also include the rehabilitation of the Cambridge Street Bridge project that has been described previously, as well as a preservation repair of the Franklin Street pedestrian bridge.

Addressing the build alternatives, we have moved on from the DEIR preferred interchange 3K and throat variations, to the NPC's interchange 3L realigned and three throat variations: The Modified Highway Viaduct the Modified At-Grade, and the SFR Hybrid. The Modified Highway Viaduct and Modified At-Grade refinements will be described as well as the new SFR Hybrid Variation that has been presented since the DEIR. There will also be discussion of the improvements to the West Station layout, and the rail layout under the Modified Flip.

This is currently the 3L Re-alignment Alternative the preferred interchange and street grid alternative that was described in the Scoping Summary Report, as well as presented to the Task Force and public in October. There were many alternatives studied between the ENF and the DEIR, and then refinements post-DEIR through the Independent Review Team process. There were also multiple meetings with the Task Force and public, stakeholders, City of Boston. Some of the noteworthy changes include: the addition of the Malvern Street Transitway with an enhanced pedestrian and bicycle connection to West Station from the Commonwealth Avenue area; restoring the Soldiers Field Road outbound off ramp as single right turn only to River Street. There would be improved pedestrian and bicycle facilities in this area, but it would not remove the ramp as it was in the Draft Environmental Impact Report. The north connector has been removed and essentially replaced with Hotel Way that would allow moves from Soldiers Field Road inbound to the I-90. There would be grade separation at Stadium Way and Cambridge Street South, removing a signal and improving the pedestrian connections and bicycle facilities leading out to the at-grade connection to the Charles River Esplanade. The west connector has been removed as well, removing an additional signal on Cambridge Street to improve pedestrian connections there.

The Modified Flip West Station and rail layout includes from north to south: a three-platform station, the rail yard, and an express track that has been added to accommodate more express trains in the future. It also allows for a future two track urban rail service to Cambridge.

For the Modified Highway Viaduct. As compared to the DEIR viaduct option, some of the refinements include: the overall width of the viaduct has been decreased by eight feet; the arrangement for the piers has gone from four columns to three columns, which allows for further re-alignment of Soldiers Field Road to the South to create more open space along the Charles River. This allows us to provide a greater limit of separated bicycle and pedestrian facilities on the Paul Dudley White Path; and it also accommodates a future Agganis Way connection from the south to the Charles River Esplanade, as well as potential for an additional connection from the Agganis Way area up to the West Station Bus Concourse. This is feasible for all three alternatives and is a noteworthy change since the DEIR.

Here's the cross-section of the Modified Highway Viaduct alternative: there's eight-foot reduction in width and the three-column arrangement versus the four. There is also the relocation of Soldiers Field Road to the South and the separated Paul Dudley White pedestrian and bicycle facilities. The cross-section changed mainly for the outside shoulders in this area, from eight feet down to four feet.

The inside shoulders remain the same. The travel lanes are 12 feet and remain the same as they were in the DEIR. The cross-section for Soldiers Field Road remains unchanged.

Here was the rendering from the DEIR. It shows the Paul Dudley White Path, a single, mixed use path and 12 feet wide. That's wider than the existing 8.5 ft wide path, but not the separated facilities that the Modified Highway Viaducts Variation has. Here's the current rendering showing the separated bicycle and pedestrian facilities along the Paul Dudley White Path. The new viaduct would include architectural improvements.

Here's the current Modified At-Grade plan view. The Paul Dudley White Path has been shifted to the north onto a boardwalk over the Charles River. Off that boardwalk, this alternative allows for separated bicycle and pedestrians facilities for the Paul Dudley White Path along the entire length to the throat area. It also accommodates a future north-south pedestrian connection from Agganis Way over to the Charles River esplanade, as well as a potential future connection from Agganis Way to the West station.² It also allows for the Paul Dudley White Path to continue below the Little Grand Junction Bridge to connect to the existing Paul Dudley White Path without going out and under the Boston University bridge as it currently does today. This is also possible with the Soldiers Field Hybrid.

Here's the revised cross-section. The DEIR essentially placed the path 8.5-foot-wide path against Soldiers Field Road and now, it places Paul Dudley White Path on a boardwalk. The shoulders have been increased slightly from two feet to four feet on the outside of I-90. The inside shoulders remain the same as they were in the DEIR, as well as the travel lanes are 11-foot travel lanes which are the same. The rail dimensions are the same for all three alternatives.

The Soldiers Field Road cross-section has 11-foot lanes versus the 10-foot lanes that were in the DEIR. Here's a blow up of the boardwalk. This would also allow for a soft riverbank as part of the Modified At-Grade. Here are the renderings from the DEIR which should show the narrow 8.5 foot, Paul Dudley White Path right up against Soldiers Field Road and here's the current rendering. The removal of viaducts resulting in improved views of the Charles River from the backs of the Boston University Buildings. There are separated bicycle and pedestrian facilities in the throat except on the boardwalk which is shared use. Users on the path would be able to see over the transportation assets in the throat to the Boston University buildings and Nickerson Field. This would also include the enhanced riverbank.

Here's the Soldiers Field Road Hybrid, which has replaced the DEIR 3K Amateur Planner throat variation. It places Soldiers Field Road on a viaduct over Interstate 90 Eastbound. As a result, Interstate 90 has to go at, and in some locations substantially below existing grade, to allow for the parkway's viaduct to come up over I-90 and then drop back down to the west with acceptable grades. The Paul Dudley White Path location is similar to the existing, and as a result of placing Soldiers Field Road over I-90, it opens up enough room to provide separated bicycle and pedestrian facilities for the Paul Dudley White Path throughout the throat area. As with the Modified At-Grade, it allows for the connection below the Little Grand Junction and the Boston University bridges to the existing path to the east of the throat area. It also allows for the Agganis Way connection. However, it is much higher to get over the Soldiers Field Road viaduct, but it does allow for that connection like the Modified Highway Viaduct and the Modified At-Grade. It also allows for a potential future connection to West Station. These elements of the alternatives will be described in the NPC, and then further described with more detail in the combined DEIS/SDEIR document.

² This connection is possible with all three throat variants with differing degrees of impact to Boston University property.

Here's that Soldiers Field Road Hybrid cross-section, which shows Soldiers Field Road on a viaduct, over I-90 Eastbound with a similar rail layout as the Modified At-Grade. I-90 Westbound as you can see looking at the existing grade line is at a substantial cut for a good portion of the throat area and as a result, has the greatest impacts on utilities. The Modified At-Grade has less of a cut with fewer impacts to utilities. Here is a rendering of the Soldiers Field Road Hybrid. There would be a wall or a fence at the back of the open space to separate pedestrians from the interstate. Looking towards the river, you can see the separated walking and cycling facilities.

- C: Mark Fobert:** We will now get back into what is in the NPC filing itself. The NPC traffic section provides a summary of new traffic counts since the filing of the DEIR in 2017. It includes the latest CTPS modeling assumptions consistent with the updated land use assumptions provided by MAPC. There is a discussion of lane requirements based on traffic volumes and speed data for the operation of I-90 in the throat area. The NPC provides an update of the rail and West Station layouts so they are consistent with the NEPA Scoping Summary report, which was recently published.

The NPC does not include new rail modeling results. Those will be presented in the SDEIR. The NPC will include a qualitative discussion of air, noise and vibration impacts with detailed analysis to following the in the SDEIR. The NPC will include an air quality screening level analysis. It shows that the air quality emissions for 3L will be up to 11% lower than 3K in a 2040 built analysis.

For noise and vibration, a preliminary analysis based on the same assumptions used in the DEIR, is included in the NPC. Again, air, noise, and vibration analysis will all be updated based on the latest CTPS modeling and included in the SDEIR. Regarding the natural resources impacts, what will be included in the NPC is consistent with what was presented in the October 2020 Task Force meeting.

The NPC will include an updated vulnerability assessment based on the updated Massachusetts Coastal Flood Risk Model. This would be the first time we presented this assessment. It was not included in the October Taskforce meeting. Any required future flood mitigation because of this study will be addressed in the SDEIR.

- C: Jim Keller:** The NPC will also include a section for construction phase and costs. One of the noteworthy changes since the DEIR, and this has been discussed at recent meetings as well as scoping Summary report, is that the DEIR had the project occurring in three phases. Phase one was targeted for 2025. It included the interchange, the new street grid between the interchange and Cambridge Street, rail layover for up to eight commuter train consists, and noise wall installation. Phase two was targeted between 2025 and 2040 and would have expanded the layover up to 16 consists. Then, in phase three, the layover would have dropped back to eight consists to allow for the construction of West Station including the platforms, bus concourse, and the bicycle and pedestrian connection from Babcock Street to West Station.

As you saw in the scoping documents, and will see in the NPC, the project will now be constructed in a single phase, and the timing of the some of these major events will be determined based on the construction staging requirements and the constraints presented by staging. All these elements that are shown in the interchange 3K alternative, the modified West Station Flip would be constructed in a single phase, except for the Agganis Way pedestrian connections and the potential connection from Agganis Way to the station bus concourse. There will be preliminary construction costs that will be included in NPC, with a detailed cost breakdown for each variation by major elements, including base construction contingency. Life cycle costs will be included in the SDEIR.

The NPC will include discussion of the utility and construction impacts. We've presented some of these utility impacts, but to line up the MEPA process with the NEPA, through the Notice of Project Change Document, we will be describing these utility impacts and the general sequence of

construction for the throat variations. Then we will describe construction of the elements such as the Worcester Main line, Grand Junction Rail, Paul Dudley White Path, highway operations, and travel lanes. That said, the SDEIR and DEIS will provide more detailed staging plans and descriptions of these utility and construction impacts.

- C: Mark Fobert:** Here's a slide of the public outreach since the DEIR was filed in 2017 most of you who participated in many of these meetings. There were 17 task force meetings, a five-hour workshop, a site walk, and five public information meetings. There have also been several targeted meetings, including briefings with Cambridgeport, Brookline, and the Allston Civic Association. The NEPA documents have been made available digitally and hard copies, and we plan to do the same with the NPC. The NPC will include a response to the approximately 575 public comments, letters, and e-mails received. Frequent comments have been identified and responded to in a separate appendix. As noted earlier, many of the comments on the DEIR were based on earlier designs and did not reflect current designs, but we'll still respond to all the comments.

Finally, just commenting on the NPC, the NPC will be noticed in the Environmental Monitor spring of 2021. It will then be followed by a three-week comment period. As usual, the NPC will be available for download at the MassDOT Web site on submission to MEPA. Hard copies will be available at various libraries for checkout, as we have done in the past. Here is a list of the libraries.

- C: Nate Cabral-Curtis:** There will actually a few more libraries than what's shown there, Mark, we grabbed a few more sites.
- A: Mark Fobert:** Great, and we'll make everyone aware of that when it's done. The final slide is where the comments are submitted to, Alex Strysky at the MEPA office. That will be in the public notice. That wraps up our presentation. Back to you, Nate.
- C: Nate Cabral-Curtis:** You can keep it where it is. I can run the Q&A like this. I think just leave the contact info up so folks can capture that if they want to.
- C: Jonathan Gulliver:** OK, so, thanks guys. Before we get into the Q and A, again, I just want to re-iterate and clarify a couple of things. At the beginning of this presentation, and the second to last slide here, you saw some of the upcoming important dates. One thing, I wanted to note regarding the Notice of Project Change, is that I have asked this team to come back and do another update to the Task Force prior to that filing in the early spring. There's going to be one more meeting before that point, just to provide you with some more information. Again, I want to re-iterate we appreciate the work that the Task Force has done. You have all volunteered a great deal of time to get to this point today. I know that this is not easy. I know these presentations are heavy and they're not the easiest thing to get through. This project is obviously big and it's technically complicated, so it makes for very difficult presentations for everybody. Hopefully, you're getting what you need to out of them. Again, I know they can be difficult to go through.

As the project moves out of this conceptual stage and the design is refined, we all want this to be a productive process on both sides. So, please, we're going to open it up to questions now. I'm going to hand it back to Nate in a moment so you can ask your questions. Again, think about those two questions I asked at the beginning. We are interested in your feedback on how we can make this process better in the future. Both Ken and I are going to be here listening, and the team is going to be available to answer some of those questions. Nate, why don't you take it away?

- C: Nate Cabral-Curtis:** Thank you, Mr. Administrator. I know, we have a couple of text questions, which I'll be inviting Erin Reed to read out loud to all you folks. Prior to us getting to that, I would

like to do what I customarily do under Donny's direction and ask if there are any elected officials or members of their staff who would like to speak first.

If that is the case, please put up your hand now, so that I can unmute your microphone and call on you. Otherwise, we can go right to those two text questions and then get to hands. Or if you want to reserve your time until later, that's also good.

I do see some hands up, no elected officials yet that I can tell. Since we have a couple of people who asked their text questions during the presentation. Erin, would you like to come on and just read those briefly?

C: Erin Reed: Nate, I can't actually see them as a panelist.

Q: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Oh, all right. I'll take of care that for you while I read the first question. The first question comes from David Loutzenheiser, who is a member of the task force. He says, this is a Jim Keller question, "under the no build option, what is the scope of the Franklin Street pedestrian bridge modifications? Will it be made accessible?"

A: Jim Keller: Thank you for the question. It is a preservation. That means there would be a repair, but it would not be a substantial change to the structure itself. To make it accessible, requires structural replacement.

Q: Nate Cabral-Curtis: OK, and Erin, while that goes through. I will go through the next ones. The next one comes from Heather Miller who is also a task force member, and she asks, "with respect to the resiliency and climate change analysis, will the project be run through the Resilient Massachusetts Action Team's Climate Risk Screening Tool that is being developed for state agency projects?"

C: Mark Fobert: Yes, it will. We've actually had some discussions with MEPA on that I knew is being developed. The climate tool is coming out very soon if it hasn't already. We are going to utilize that for DEIS analysis. It will not be in the NPC, but it will be in the next filing.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: All right, so let's go to some hands. OK, Galen Mook, you are good to go.

Q: Galen Mook: I appreciate the time and the information here. Welcome, Ken, as well as the Administrator. My name is Galen, I am one of the Task Force members and also Director of MassBIKE, but I'm also an abutter, I live in Lower Allston. The Pike is also a block and a half from my house. I can see it from my backyard. I appreciate the time that we put into this and then thank you and welcome to the project. Great to have you. I also appreciate the fact of that transformational possibility that you're going to bring to the project. I'm sorry we can't see Mike to send him off. I'm sure he's busy on another project, but I wish him well, and I thank him for all the work that Mike put into this, too. I just want a preamble with that, thanks. I have two questions, and then to the Administrator's point thoughts on the Task Force.

So just to clarify, the Franklin Street footbridge or any of the foot paths leading out of Allston on the No Build, would they be made ADA accessible? Because right now they're not. We don't have an accessible way to leave the neighborhood. I just want to clarify that is not going to be part of that alternative. Is that true?

- A: Jim Keller:** Currently, Galen that is correct. The No Build would repair the Franklin Street footbridge to the maximum extent practicable. Major structural components would have to change for it to become accessible.
- Q: Galen Mook:** OK, well, I just want to voice that is not okay. That's not acceptable, almost reprehensible to say that you're going to invest all this stuff in this and not make it possible for people to use it. But that said, I also want to point out like the connection over Agganis Way, that's my second question. Does, "do not preclude" does that mean does not include? Does that mean does not include like a bicycle and pedestrian connection from Agganis Way down to the Charles River? In any of these scenarios, that is not included?
- A: Jim Keller:** Correct. It is accommodated in the future, yes. Each variation can accommodate it. It is feasible for each variation for that to be clear as a future connection, but it is not built with the project at this time.
- Q: Malek Gook:** Okay, not included. My last question is the express track south of the station, is that included in all of them, or is that not precluded.
- A: Jim Keller:** That is included, currently. Yes.
- C: Galen Mook:** Great. Thanks for clarification. I want to make a quick comment on that then, because I think that the ideals of what you're trying to build do not match accessibility for people who will be using it and needing it immediately on day one.

I think there's a difference between does not preclude, and then does not include. To not include a footbridge or a connection down to the river, which literally before it is even opened, people will be using versus the priorities of putting down an express track for a train that may one day exist is a difference between does not include and does not preclude. I think that the fact that some of this infrastructure being left as not precluded, in the interest of time, cost, and efficiency, I think as much of it as you can include should be to the fullest possible. Particularly for those who need it to get across the project, connect down to the river and out of the neighborhood. So that's my comment there and I thank you for letting me say that.

To the Administrator, thank you so much for joining us as well. It's a great, actually very encouraging and welcoming to have you lead with these two questions. It shows that you're thoughtful and your department is taking this very seriously. This is great. On the good side to the Task Force has been a force for pursuing alternatives and presenting them to the project team to make this a better project. That has been taken by the project team seven years ago, and we have done great work through the Task Force, that's great to continue that. The concept that the Task Force then brings a lot of people together, people who represent the river, people represent the cycling community, people who represent transit, people who are doing it to engage with the project team, is also a great benefit. I don't want to use the term stakeholder. I think they're so invested these people who have been on the Task Force, somewhat like, they're really engaged in the work of the Task Force. I think this has been, in my experience, advocacy, one of the greatest formations of a coalition to work with the project team. I think that's also a great benefit of the Task Force, I appreciate the idea of continuing it and moving it forward to make it better.

To make it better, I would say that we would need to grow that engagement as much as possible. We need to combine the Task Force with a robust public process, which I would admit that the public practice has been sorely lacking, though the project team has been putting a lot of time and energy into it. If you had five meetings in four years and only one of them in Brighton in four years and only in English by the way. Also, with materials that aren't really presented and understandable and

I appreciate the fact that the library is being repository for the project, but Nate, do you have any idea of how many checkouts, in each library, these plans are getting? Do we know how that is hitting people? I would assume that most people are not engaged in it. I would say the betterment of the Task Force to combine it with a public process.

That's very robust, and I'd be happy to help out with that, and I'm sure resident advocates would be very happy to help out with that profit, too. Also, along that line, too, make the communication more open and accessible, we've been having trouble engaging with the project team to a certain point of even taking a year sometimes to get notes from Task Force meetings.

It's been very hard to get some of the engagement down, including this meeting, and no offense, I appreciate the offer here, but it would be much more beneficial to have been provided the slides or recording of your reading these slides in advance. It could have saved us half an hour, and then we could address this, but I understand maybe for Future Taskforce meetings, I would suggest that as a, a tool of engagement to make a better task force meeting. I do appreciate you having the slides full of information and very dense. It could be provided in recording with Mark reading them in advance.

That is a very direct ask there, so I appreciate that. One more suggestion, and I appreciate the opportunity to have this forum. I know I'm rambling, but my last offer of suggestion here is to engage in the overlap of the constituencies, especially on the administration level. Administrator Gulliver, I think the idea of working closely with the EEA and using the MEPA process is great, but we don't hear much from the DCR admittedly at these Task Force meetings and it's very siloed. I would recommend that the task force, maybe less on the public side, but the task force process be more engaging to overlap those who are going to be making decisions on this project. Maybe bring in secretary, FHWA, the MBTA, and everybody else so that we can more robustly jointly make this presentation. Especially as it involves restoring the riverfront and building out the transit system.

It would be nice to know that we are all at least talking and able to speak to each other collectively at the same time at these task force meetings, and that has been hard over the past seven years. With that, I also want to thank you again for the opportunity to speak all this, and all the work that we are putting into this, and I look forward to continuing this process. Thank you for keeping this going.

- C: Nate Cabral-Curtis:** Thank you very much, Galen. All right. We'll do Glen Berkowitz and then I'll have Erin, who is now, I'm aware, able to see the written questions read a few more. Glen, you have control of your microphone.
- C: Glen Berkowitz:** First, it's just so great to see the project team. I am glad everybody is well something we should all acknowledge in these times. Mr. Administrator, I just want to start off and thank you personally on behalf of A Better City for attending tonight. As several people noted, that's a wonderful thing thank you Mr. Administrator and the rest of MassDOT for both selecting Ken Davidson and for bringing him to the Task Force meeting tonight. I applaud you on fantastic selection.

Without beating around the bush, Mr. Administrator, just to directly go to answer your question, how can the process be made better? I'm just going to make one point of how it could be made better. I've got a list of 100, but I'll just focus on one right now, which is for MassDOT to acknowledge and build off of the tremendous, large stake holder consensus for one of the three build alternatives. We all know that MassDOT received over 500 comments back in October. Almost 496, or 93% of those comments supported some version of the Modified At-Grade. Only four, less than a handful, of the 500, said, "yes, let's keep a viaduct up in the air for the next hundred years." That is after 6 years of tremendous hard work by every member of this team that's on the zoom tonight and by all the

hundreds of stakeholders that have been involved. 93%, three months ago said, "let's do some version of the Modified At-Grade." Mr. Administrator, "how to make the process better?" Acknowledge that strong consensus and build off it. The Modified At-Grade that we were shown this past fall that I believe is the same one that was shown on the slides tonight but having not seen them in detail. I am 100% sure but will look the same, it's got a portion of Soldiers Field Road in the river.

It also has the Paul Dudley White Path and the river, but let's separate the two. Everybody wants to see the Modified At-Grade, modified. So that there's no roadway in the river. We all know that there's several different ways to pull that piece, that small piece of Soldiers Field Road that's currently in the river in the Modified At-Grade to pull it out of the river. I won't go through the list here but happy to go through with the Administrator, Ken, and the rest of the team.

In summary on this one point, Mr. Administrator, how to make the process better? Don't file a notice of project change that has the old fall version of the Modified At-Grade that has parkway in the river. Everybody wants to see that refined so that Soldiers Field Road is pulled out of the river. With that, I thank you again, Mr. Administrator, Ken, and the rest of the team. I'll stop my comment number one, right there thank you.

- C: Nate Cabral-Curtis:** OK, thank you Glen. Erin, before I turn it over to you for a minute, I'm told that Senator Brownsberger is trying to reach us. I'm going to turn his microphone on. Senator, you are self-muted currently, but you have control over your own microphone if you want to say something.
- C: Senator Brownsberger:** just wanted to thank you, Administrator, for coming to this meeting and for setting the right tone, which is to talk about the process. There have been a lot of, well, it's been a lot of back and forth about the process. A lot of the conversations in this meeting has been about process.

Asking that question at your level I think is a great thing to do. I want to thank you for doing that. There are so many hard-working people that have been part of this process both on your side and on the Task Force membership side. Trying to bring the process into a focus that everybody's more comfortable with is a great thing to try to do. Thank you for your efforts on that.

- Q: Nate Cabral-Curtis:** Thank you very much, Senator. All right, Erin, can you read the text comments?
- Q: Erin Reed:** Sure, so this question is from Harry Mattison to the Administrator's question, he's echoing part of what Galen just said, to improve the process, "could you please prerecord presentations, like the one we just heard and send it to us a few days before the meeting? This would let us spend more meeting time having discussions."

The next comment comes from John Read: "The three-week NPC comment period is very brief for what is likely to be a very lengthy and complex document, would MassDOT consider, a 45-day comment period?" Those are all the unanswered, or unspoken comments that have come in so far.

- A: Administrator Gulliver:** On the comment period, I'll just say that I'll bring that back. I'm not sure, offhand, what that does to schedule and such, but we'll bring that back and certainly discuss it with the team.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: All right, Very good. So since then, down at the bottom of the alphabet on my screen, Wendy Landman the floor is yours.

Q: Wendy Landman: I want to echo the comments that we've already heard. Administrator Gulliver, thank you so much for asking the question of all of us.

I'd like to echo the thanks that Galen and Glen mentioned. I think Glen's question is an excellent one. My basic comments as to the process are, I'm going to repeat the issue of getting information in advance, which would allow us to give you questions in advance.

My second biggest comment about the process would be, we have, over the years, asked many questions, which have not been answered. We have often gotten answers, but often not. There's also been a long delay in getting those answers. I think allowing the task force members who are very educated about the project to see the information in advance and then provide at least some of our questions in advance to you. That could actually lead us to have more productive meetings where there's actually a give and take of information rather than us quickly absorbing things, and often, the team not really being able to answer them, or feeling like they don't have the time to answer them.

Thank you for answering to the best of your ability, the question about the comment period. We know that you have to go back and discuss it, but that is the kind of thing that you would have had a question in advance, and you could have come to the meeting with an answer ready for us. One thing, and perhaps I missed it in the presentation of all of the elements in the Notice of Project Change, and then the upcoming Supplemental DEIR, but will there be a finance plan or at least an outline or framework for the finance plan in either of those documents or in another document that is not an environmental filing? One that the public gets to see at more or less, the same time, as the environmental filings? Thank you very much.

Q: Administrator Gulliver: In the finance plan, I'm not sure. Has anybody on the project team able to answer that one? That's something we have available. Also, Wendy good to hear from you, I hope you're doing well you're doing well.

A: Chris Calnan: Mr. Administrator, as far as what gets filed, the NPC will not be a finance plan. A component of that, this is with MEPA, it's environmental, and not meant to detail the different funding sources. So, that will all happen after the filing of MEPA talking to the NPC.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Folks, just a quick reminder, and Wendy just did it beautifully, kudos to her, please pull your hands down after we provide an answer so that I can accurately gauge who still needs something answered. I'll come back up the alphabet. Jessica Robertson, you are live.

C: Jessica Robertson: Thanks for the opportunity to comment here. I want to emphasize everything that Galen, Glen, and Wendy have said. I actually think that last exchange with Wendy is a great illustration of one of these related points which is that when we are given answers to the questions we ask and were are often given non-answer answers, such as it's not part of this particular filing, or that discussion happens at a later stage of design.

I think many of us were a frustrated at the discussion happening over the last couple of months where the state was taking the project hostage trying to get commitments for funding out of other agencies and institutions, and so there has been discussion about the financing of the project. There have been many conversations over the years about what is the finance plan. There's been discussion that MassDOT is going to start a separate working group to work on the finance plan. That's what Wendy meant when she asked, "is there a finance plan?" I just wanted to chime in on that point.

The overall point that I want to make about the process is that it connects many of the different things that people have said that are more specific, which is that I think there was a real difference between the early years of the project. Sorry, I totally forgot to introduce myself. For those of you who don't know me, I live in Allston, have been a member of the Task Force since the first task Force meeting.

In those very early years, it did feel like a much more productive relationship between the Task Force and the project team. I think that has really gone downhill in the last couple of years. The overarching reason is, in my opinion, just a different perspective about whether the Task Force is a partner, a collaborator, sounding board, or whether the Task Force is a box that has to be checked. We have many times requested that the project team recognize the huge amount of expertise and valuable input that is available in the Task Force.

Some of us are on the Task Force as residents or concerned citizens, but many of us have actual professional expertise, or are former transportation secretaries, and have real things to offer. Even though even those of us who haven't had any other external professional training have gotten an honorary Master's in Highway Engineering, I think, in the length of this process. We have often requested that rather than the project team, working through problems, deciding on their best way forward, and then coming to the Task Force to us about it and then us making comments that are listened to, but not incorporated, we've requested that the project team come to us, as they are working through those problems and say, "these are the options." These are the pros and cons of each option, now is the time to weigh in and give us your stakeholder feedback about "which of these pros and cons are most important"? "Is there any other way that we're not thinking of, that we could resolve some of these issues?"

Then we would actually be collaborating on figuring out how to solve some of these issues in this very complex project. There's really been a pattern, especially over the last couple of years, of coming to us, and presenting things that are already finished. The pattern is always, there's a Task Force meeting the day before or the day after a major document gets filed. The point of the Task Force meetings is just to go through the slides, summarizing what's in the document, and there's no meaningful opportunity for input. The actual meeting is kind of a waste of everyone's time, because the response to any comments in the meeting is, "put that in your comment letter."

What we would really like, and what we've requested in the past, and what we had in the early years of the project, is to be brought under the hood and allowed to give our input and our expertise when the project team is still wrestling with those decisions, because we're all working towards the same goal. We all want to make the project better, and we all want to make it happen.

It would be great to have that collaborative attitude back, and I think you, Administrator, and Ken, you know, being part of this meeting and kicking off with that, that point to all of us, is a wonderful indication that makes me very hopeful that we can hit the reset button. So, I just hope we can carry that more collaborative spirit forward.

- C: Nate Cabral-Curtis:** Thank you very much, Jess. That was much appreciated. What I'm going to do is, because I can see there's a written question. I think his hand is still up. I'm going to pop up through the Js briefly, and I'm going to unmute task force member, Harry Mattison.
- C: Harry Mattison:** Great, it's nice to meet you Ken, to the extent that this actually counts as meeting you, but welcome to the team, and thank you Administrative Gulliver for joining us tonight. I really appreciate your interest in how this project can move forward more successfully.

The point I wanted to make is that it actually ties in well with the question that David started us off with about the Franklin Street footbridge, which is there are a lot of issues that, at least from the standpoint of, most everyone on the Task Force and our neighbors in Allston, there are still important open issues that have we've been asking about for years. We need to look at the design you guys have put forward for the Franklin Street Footbridge, which some people have compared to a constipated snake. They did not mean that as a compliment.

At the same time, we know that MassDOT has done very nice bridges recently like the New Appleton Bridge connecting Beacon Hill neighborhood with the Charles River. We would very reasonably expect the same level of design and excellence when you come to build a footbridge in Allston, as you've shown recently on other projects.

Those requests have gotten lost in the mail or whatever you want to call it, but they have certainly never been addressed. I think that there's universal agreement that we want excellent transit service for you, both connecting Allston, with Kendall Square and Downtown, as well as Newton, Framingham, Natick, Worcester, etcetera.

It's also really important to folks in the project area to have the linear path behind the Wadsworth Street homes that we've been discussing. I think the last time, maybe a year and a half ago, it was discussed at the Task Force meeting. I think there were some pretty clear consensus in the room, this is important with MassDOT and the team, to try and figure out how this can work, and come back and talk about it again. It's never been talked about again.

There are a whole lot of issues. Glen's comment about the throat, I agree with completely. At the same time, it's really important to figure out how all those other issues about the design of West Station, issues about the new city streets that are being planned, and how those can be safe for people to walk on and bicycle on. In addition, how cross the street without feeling like you're putting your life at risk, literally. These all need to be part of the conversation going forward. Figuring out how we can both talk about improving things in the throat, about adding the Agganis as footbridge into the project and not being satisfied with "maybe Boston University will build it in the year 2075."

We need to figure out a way to make progress on all these issues simultaneously. In addition, thank you for starting the discussion about mitigation and having that start to go forward more seriously. You should be applauded for that. That's also on the list of things that you've heard from elected officials and you've heard from local residents, all across the region, this is really important. Hopefully that process is also going to kick off in earnest real soon because whatever you decide to do with this project, there's going to be major impacts on transportation during years of construction. So we hope that will also start to be something we can talk about.

And then just one specific question to end with, which is when will MassDOT share the construction staging drawings for the major rehabilitation option that there have been questions about and how that can be built? There have been requests for whatever analysis you've done of that. I'm wondering when that will be shared with the Task Force?

A: Administrator Gulliver: I'm honestly not prepared to get into that question, but, again, we'll certainly take that back and talk to these guys. We will see if we can get an answer for that.

C: Harry Mattison: All right, folks, thank you very much.

Q: Nate Cabral-Curtis: All right, I'll move down the alphabet a little bit. Erin just confirming that there are no additional text questions currently?

A: Erin Reed: Correct.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: This is somebody who I skipped over earlier, this is forgive me, mispronouncing your last name as my hobby, but I believe it's Jamie Maughn

So sorry if I got that wrong, but your microphone is, it's up and running. So you're good to go whenever you're ready. Thank you very much.

C: Jamie Maughn: This is Jamie Maughn you pronounced it correctly. Thank you to the project team. That was an excellent presentation, it brought me up to speed on the project. I'm not a Task Force member, I'm a longtime resident of the Boston metropolitan area, and I teach a course at Harvard Extension in sustainable transportation, and, thus, I have a continuing interest in this project. I just have a suggestion, which I feel could help with public input and public understanding of this project.

I applaud you for including the construction cost and the notice the project change, because it helps us understand the difference in the alternatives. I would like to suggest that you also include a similar statement of the major benefits, issues, or negative impacts, that are not monetary that are, that are externalities for each of the, each of the alternatives. We can understand the differences and start to form an impression of what we're looking for in this project. An example would be that Modified At-Grade alternative that includes as planned, or as is currently exists, filling of part of the Charles River. That is a major issue and that could be identified as a Dan side of that alternative. Other alternatives and include a separated bicycle and pedestrian ways could be a positive. It would just help the public understand these alternatives without having to read through years of documentation or understand construction drawings. Again, thank you for this meeting. It's excellent, and the presentation was very good and clear. Thank you.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: All right. Moving on, we have a hand up from Jack Wofford. Go ahead, Jack. You're live.

C: Jack Wofford: Administrator Gulliver, thank you so much for being here and welcome, Ken.

I'm Jack Wofford. I live in Cambridgeport. I'm an alternate for the Cambridge Community Representative. I also directed the Bus and Transportation Planning Review more than 40 years ago. I was also the facilitator of the scheme Z issue with the Bridge Design Review Committee. I want to follow up with a very brief suggestion, but I think it's significant. Following up with what Wendy, Jessica, and Galen have said, namely, how to make the Task Force better. I think there are several really difficult issues still to be faced. There is enormous talent within the Task Force, but the Task Force should not be forced to wait to be called until it gets to the point of "we're going to schedule a meeting at thus and such a time because we have information to present to you." The Task Force should be engaged in a collaborative way, because so many of us are eager to work with you to resolve some of these issues. One way, in both the TPR, and the Bridge Design Review Committee, that we accomplished that was to put together small groups of maybe 3, 4, 5, 6, or 7 people were really concerned about challenging issues like the riverfront, or the pedestrian and bicycle connections to Commonwealth Avenue, or 3 or 4 other issues that you could assemble, even with the limitations and opportunities of Zoom, to how to really a collaborative process. Where to use a diagram that the late Roger Fisher, who wrote *Getting to Yes*, frequently drew, which was in negotiating, you ask people to draw a table of negotiation and they typically draw people facing each other across the table. His drawing says, "what if we're all on the same side of the table, and we're trying to face the problem?" That is such a key concept of joint problem solving, collaborative problem solving, and all kinds of names you can put on it. In my experience, in about seven years of attending the Task Force meetings, there has been only one session where staff came, as Jessica

said, to share these are some issues that we really don't know. We were asked "what the final results should be? What do you think?" The staff presented several options. I think that that is a lesson in what you could do much more of.

I think you will find that instead people simply writing comments that get ignored in sort of formalities, you could really assemble people sitting around the table and trying to acknowledge each other. These are difficult issues. Maybe together we can be more creative than any one of us alone.

I just suggest you create some working groups that are task oriented and focused and take it seriously in a timetable makes its product useful to the project rather than comments after the fact. Thanks.

- Q: Nate Cabral-Curtis:** Thank you, Jack. Erin, any new text questions coming in, or can I keep going on hands?
- Q: Erin Reed:** Mary Connaughton, I apologize. If I got that wrong, "I'm with the Pioneer Institute and a Framingham resident. I'm in agreement with Glen's comment on the overwhelming consensus of a Modified all At-Grade option. A question, will the finance plan include life cycle costs? It should."
- A: Jim Keller:** Yes, in the SDEIR there will be a section that will include the life cycle cost, but not in the Notice of Project change.
- Q: Nate Cabral-Curtis:** I think, Mark Fobert, can you just give folks just one more round of clarification, because it seems to have come back up a couple of times just to give you folks a sense of what the NPC's going to do and to some extent, what it doesn't do? Because it's a fairly straightforward document as compared to some of the big lumberers we filed before.
- A: Mark Fobert:** It's a procedural document. It will get everything up to speed. Right now we have a secretary's certificate from 2017. It has little relevance to the project as it exists today. In order to write an SDEIR, you need a secretary's certificate that applies to your project as it currently is composed. That's what the idea of the NPC's and that's why we don't want to get people's expectations up too high because it's going to be a lot of things you've seen in the last a year or so either through the October Task Force meeting or Scoping Summary report.
- It's that information being formalized and presented. We can meet the staff reviews. It gives us a scope on what we should study in our next document, which is that supplemental SDEIR or DEIS in this case. I think one of the values of this, I probably mentioned it before, is it if we can file a joint document. We are not going to have this disjointed review, which is the issue we have now and why you're seeing things you have seen before. Going for that joint document is going to let us do one presentation that is consistent, everybody sees new information presented at the same time and a thorough analysis. That is basically where we're at. I hope that answered the question.
- C: Nate Cabral-Curtis:** Thanks, Mark. All right, I have got Fred Salvucci.
- C: Fred Salvucci:** I want to say administrator Gulliver thank you for coming in person. That is really terrific, and I want to welcome Ken. It's good to meet you, even if it's just over a screen.

This can be very productive, happy you're doing it. I'd like to say a couple of things. We've all been in this process for a long time. It's important to recognize how much improvement has been. I think since the initial proposals, this process has been lengthy, sometimes frustrating. What's on the table now is substantially better than what was on the table some years back. I think we have to

acknowledge that it's been really a lot of good work for us, but also very good work by Michael O'Dowd and the team of consultants. While all of us, including me, will complain that the glass is half empty, and we want to see it fuller, it's really important to acknowledge there has been terrific progress and that's very much appreciated.

Second point I want to make is I agree with just about every point that's been made by others. So, I'll try not to be repetitive about funding. There is a new elephant in the room or maybe we should say a new donkey in the room. President Biden is, thank God, our new President, he is talking big on infrastructure. This is the chance of the decade or maybe of the century to really do this project right. To remind everybody when the turnpike was built with all its bad reverse curves, and steep slopes, roller coaster profiles, and barriers cutting the community off.

All that stuff was done with no federal money. It has got an inter-state number. It is I-90, but we did not get a penny of inter-state highway funds. There is an excellent case to be made fixing this mess in the manner that new Secretary Buttigieg is talking about, eliminating barriers in the community and really being that transformative project. That describes the opportunity we are looking at here.

The fact that there was no federal money first time around, really, I think, makes a very strong case for 80 or 90% funding for this project. We should not be shy about that. We need to remember the ancient history that there was no federal money on this project to begin with. That's part of the reason it was built in such a lousy manner with all the constraints that were put in, it's not just the people building it were evil, although, occasionally, they were a bit nasty, but they also were trying to build something in a very austere financial, environment that caused a lot of the problems. It doesn't have to be that way we're sitting on a real opportunity related to that. It's extremely important that this process would be expeditious.

I think that the Notice of Project Change should fix some of the obvious flaws in what was shown last November. You really don't need another 500 letters telling you that since the Agganis Way connector is part of the Purpose and Need of the project, it should be part of the project. The very first comment, made by Representative Honan, at the very first public meeting was we have to connect the neighborhood back together. It was badly divided by the road that was built. Yet, we're still hearing and no disrespect to Jim, he's repeating what he's been forced to repeat several times: the Agganis connector is to be added afterwards. That's ridiculous. It's necessary mitigation for this project. It's part of this project and it's been part of the project's Purpose and Need.

Purpose and need that flaw should be fixed in the notice of project change before it goes up. To agree with Glen, how many letters do you need to say, you're only four feet into the river with Soldiers Field Road, you got five different ways to get those for feedback, get it out of the river before it goes into the notice of project change. You don't need another 500 letters saying to get it out of the river. I think there are some obvious flaws. Agganis is part of the project. It should not be added later. We also need to get Soldiers Field Road out of the river from the get-go, include the buffer park and the people's pike connecting from Agganis over the well-done Franklin Street Bridge, not a piece of junk that's there. That all ought to be in the Notice of Project Change. Those issues, you've heard them several times. They have been written in all number of comments. If you can clean up the Notice of Project Change to deal with all the stuff, then that'll cut down the amount of work required to get from the Notice of Project Change to the final EIS. We need that final EIS in order to be eligible for the federal funds. While we all like process, it shouldn't take forever, or we're going to miss the opportunity to get them on it. We're going to keep this on schedule. The way it is to get it on schedule is to begin in the right place and not waste the whole cycle with issues where you know very well what the answers are. You have already got plenty of letters on it.

I would also say in welcoming Ken and saying, again, how much I appreciate all the work of Michael O'Dowd on this project. On some issues, Mike was trapped. He was getting dictators out of the MBTA, that foreign territory that has nothing to do with MassDOT. Then all of a sudden, whereas the project originally had 50 mile an hour designed speed rail, suddenly it had to be 79. That came out of nowhere, with no explanation why. Therefore, there must be a bypass track. The bypass track displaces the buffer pack, which is an essential part of this project.

In the Environmental Impact Statement on South Station, MassDOT committed that there would be mitigation for the noise and vibration caused in Allston with some project elements in Allston. These elements being the buffer pack and then in some of the decking provides that mitigation. It ought to be there, but it got displaced through no fault of Mike's by this bypass track. Some of us have some background in transportation, we can't figure out any use for it.

Ken, to position you a bit on your first meeting, you came out of that foreign territory called the MBTA. Maybe you won't suffer with the position that Mike was stuck in, having to defend stuff that had no defense, other than he had been told it's got to be this way, and that really block a serious, honest discussion. I think that I'm looking forward to this being really productive and moving this expeditiously and making a project that's been getting better. We really can make the excellent case that for a transformative project to get the federal money. I think that the I'm making the process better, getting the NPC into the right places is a good beginning.

But I also want to say there were some very good workshops that were conducted. Where consultants, MassDOT staff, and various Task Force participants working around tables and jumping from table to table. We were able to get into the nitty gritty of some of the constructability issues and understand what some of the challenges were. It has been too long since those were really productive. It has been too long since those happen.

We do have this COVID problem of trying to do this stuff with zoom, which isn't user friendly, is what we have around the table, but I think that trying to approximate that, as Jack Wofford said, would also make the process more productive. But, again, I just want to close by saying this project has gotten a lot better, because a lot of very hard work by people around the table, from the Task Force and from MassDOT, but it can be better still so that we can compete for the federal funds to make this project real instead of a dream.

- C: Nate Cabral-Curtis:** thank you very much for the chance to make those comments. Thank you, Fred. All right, so I'm going to do Fred Yalouris and then I'm going to drop back down to the bottom end of the alphabet where I see Tom Nally has his hand up.
- C: Fred Yalouris:** Thank you and thank your Administrator Gulliver for joining us and welcome Ken Davidson. I'm one of the Task Force members from the City of Cambridge and some of you may know me as the former Director of Architecture and Urban Design for the Big Dig. I just want to follow up on and agree with what Harry, Jessica, Jack, and Fred Salvucci, said, and that is, that, you know, once we get on, to decide on the, hopefully, the at great option, there will be a whole world of design opportunities that will explode and multiply regarding bicycle-pedestrian connections, river, edge, treatments, mitigation related things. There is a lot of talent in the task force.

This issue of collaboration will be beneficial because I can think of 40 or 50 contracts that I was part of in the Big Dig. Every time we got to the point of getting the client, the designer, and the community together at the table, new and better things have emerged. I think that is on a project like this, with a fantastic potential. That is also the possibility here. I'll keep it brief. Thanks, everybody.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: All right, Tom Nally.

Q: Tom Nally: Thanks very much. Here are a few comments. First of all, I say sincere thanks to Administrator Gulliver, the Administrator for the Highway Division for joining us tonight and for really helping us to kick off a new approach for this Task Force. As my colleagues have been saying, we've had some good times and so not so good times, but I think there is a lot of potential for moving ahead with the spirit of collaboration as we have just been discussing. I also wanted to give thanks to the team for going through the alternatives that will be included in the Notice of Project Change.

I think they're very familiar, we've seen them before, but it's good to make sure that we're all on the same page with what they mean. I will not repeat the comments that my colleagues have made, but we think one of these is a lot better than the others. The all at grade alternative should be refined to make it even better. Recently, the public has been shown a substantial repair option. I wonder what the status is of that concept?

A: Jim Keller: It's similar to what we are currently carrying forward into the Notice of Project Change document: the No Build alternative, the major preservation, like what was presented in the Scoping Summary Reports. That is the current No Build alternative that is being published in the environmental documentation.

Q: Tom Nally: That assumes a 10-to-15-year lifespan. Is that correct?

A: Jim Keller: 20-to-25 is what we're describing in the Notice of Project Change. However, in some meetings, with the Board of Directors, at some public meetings, there have been discussions of alternatives that would be 10 to 15 years. The differences would be minor, between that No Build alternative and the one that we're currently describing in the environmental documentation.

C: Tomy Nally: A concern that people have had, and I want to articulate tonight, is that no one likes the idea of having a short-term substantial repair option.

That is really the first phase of a two-phase approach. It will have its own set of impacts for repairing the viaduct that may not last a long time, and the way it's been described, in some places anyway, there needs to be a second phase to extend the lifespan of whatever solution is incorporated. That would include elements that are left out of the repair solution. This includes relocating the turnpike and Beacon Park Yards, building new ramps, streets, service roads, implementing final railroad improvements, and clearing the way for new development, which cannot take place unless those other elements are executed. The strategy really seems to require two steps. That means you have repair first and then do it again in a short period later. So, a short timespan for the useful life of any of these repair options is not desirable, because it would not be a permanent solution for the long run. We need to see a long run solution for this opportunity. That's my only comment.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Thank you, Tom. All right. So, I'm going to do exactly what I just said I was going to do. I'm going to put down all the hands, because the ones that are up are from people who have spoken already. So, right now, the board is clear. I don't see any additional text questions. OK, so, David Loutzenheiser, as you put your hand back up again, so you are good to go.

Q: David Loutzenheiser: Welcome project team and Ken. Just a quick comment. I want to push back a little bit on Glen's comment and say that we do have several concerns about the at all-grade option. I just want to note that there's not universal acceptance of that option, but I do want to ask about the No-Build options when I'm picking up more on what Tom Nally was saying. Let's say that option is selected. If that is selected when the opportunity is to make additional, I would say scope creep or

additional modifications to that option, if that were selected. When do we get to the point of for example having a new Franklin Street Footbridge or sound barrier on the viaduct in the No-Build?

Q: Jim Keller: You're asking if additional elements could be added to the No-Build that are not currently part of it? Is that what you're asking?

Q: David Loutzenheiser: If that [the No-Build] were selected in the fall, what's the opportunity to request to add some of those elements that may be \$50 million change but are not \$300 million changes?

C: Jim Keller: As Administrator Gulliver opened tonight, bring your comments and questions like you are currently. We can take note of that. Then we can discuss how some of those elements could fit.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: We have Bill Conroy from the City of Boston with his hand up and Wendy Landman. Wendy since we have heard from you once, I'll go to Bill and then I'll come back to you. Bill, go ahead. You are self-muted.

C: Bill Conroy: Thank you for joining us, Secretary Gulliver. I am Bill Conroy from the City of Boston. I just want to weigh in that I am happy that Ken Davidson has joined the team, I have had a long history here working together with Glen Berkowitz and others.

It seems like we are getting back the team that really made things happen back during the Big Dig. As Fred alluded to, there was a lot of changes that we made several times to certain plans, even when they were almost finally designed. We came up with some good solutions and put our heads together.

We have a lot of smart people in the room. As far as getting federal funds, or another type of funding for the project, and a lot of creative solutions were put on the table. What I learned over the years is that some of the solutions came from people that weren't engineers themselves. Which I look forward to working with everyone, and glad to see that Ken is on board. Thank you.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Thank you, Bill. OK, go ahead, Wendy.

C: Wendy Landman: Great, thank you so much. Jonathan, thank you for the greeting before. Very nice to see you. Thank you for being here. I just wanted to say that I think the give and take this evening is a perfect illustration of the requests that many of us made about getting information in advance, and also then getting answers. Obviously, some of the questions have big, long term "we need to actually study it," answers, but other things like the question that David Loutzenheiser just posed, is the No Build just a minimal build or could one provide the Franklin Street bridge which is not actually a connected project to this. That could be done, no matter, how the big project is done. I think the question about funding, when we are going to hear about how the funding might work, that is good to know. It turns out in the later answer was not in the NPC but later, although the answer wasn't very complete.

This issue of back and forth, and even in this time of COVID, I've participated in a lot of meetings where there actually is back and forth, and one of the things that happened this evening is when I asked a question, I actually tried to keep my hand up and have a continuation of the question. And that didn't happen. If we're having these COVID meetings, I think it's really important to allow there to be give and take and, and to actually try and get a better set of answers. I think many of the people on this call, it is true, there's a certain reprise of the Big Dig team, many of us, myself included, were part of that in one form or another.

There is an awful lot of expertise in the room on both sides of the table, from MassDOT, your extensive team, from members of the Task Force, and members of the public who are participating. I think the next meeting I hope will have information in advance. We will be able to send you some questions in advance, and the team will come back and answer those questions and engage in a dialog with us. Thanks very much for giving us the opportunity to put that on the table. Now I am done. So, go ahead and mute me. Thanks!

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Wendy, you can always, if I am a little too zealous with the control you can always drop something in the questions, and I'll see that. That is why I know that Glen Berkowitz up at the top end of the alphabet has his hand up, as well.

I'm heading back up there, but feel free to dig us in the in the chat, and we'll take care of that. All right. Here I go, back to Glen, and then back to Harry.

Q: Glen Berkowitz: Well project team and Mr. Administrator, it's now an hour and 45 minutes later, and I think it's fair to say that this is a huge improvement over the last Task Force meetings. Again, thank you very much, Mr. Administrator, and the rest of the team for helping with tonight. A quick comment, and then two quick questions. If I wasn't clear earlier, I just want to be crystal clear right now.

I agree completely with David's comment from about 10 minutes ago, that there is not unanimous support for any option with this project. I think one of the problems is that there is never unanimous support for any project, but who among us can doubt what I tried to say earlier, which is that there is a strong consensus for one of the three build alternatives? 93% of the 500 plus comments just a couple of months ago, said, "please do some version of a Modified At-Grade." Only four out of five hundred comments, spoke in favor of keeping a highway, elevated viaduct in place for the next century.

Two quick questions: I'll just put them both out there and then then mute and wait for the response. First question is: In November, the presentation to the MassDOT board in the FMCB, the project team announced that they were doing a new structural review of the existing viaduct and that it was going to take I believe something like six weeks to do. I was wondering if you could give us a status update here tonight? Even if it's just a quick field work. Has it been completed or are there any initial results? If not, when do we expect the initial results will be shared? Then the second, which is just a comment, Mr. Administrator and others, we understand that at A Better City that there's work on a mitigation plan, separate work on a finance plan that MassDOT will be doing for this project. We just wanted to make the comment here tonight that we hope MassDOT will include the vast number of interested stakeholders from the Task Force on those two committees. We know certainly at A Better City that we would love to participate in those and lend our expertise wherever it can be helpful. Thank you.

A: Administrator Gulliver: I'll answer in reverse order, Glen. Yes, there's some work right now being done. I don't have a timeframe on when we're going to be able to share more information on it, but there is work being done on trying to figure out how we're going to approach mitigation and finance. We'll have more information on that that part soon, I hope. On the actual inspection if Mike O'Dowd, I believe may still be on. My recollection, speaking to Mike about this, is that the fieldwork is underway. Some of the initial work was done, in fact, I think most of it was. The inspection results and the write up of it is still several weeks away. Is that correct, Mike?

C: Mike O'Dowd: Yes, that is correct, administrator.

- C: Administrator Gulliver:** Alright, thank you, Mike. So that's the answer on that. As far as what we can share on this, I will tell you in advance, certainly, we can share some of the results, but I know that our bridge inspections can be frustrating for the public because we have restrictions. We do not share certain information about structures that are deemed security sensitive, and the Allston Viaduct is one amongst other major bridges in Boston that are in that category. There are certain things that we will not be able to share, but we can look at what could be shared with this group.
- C: Nate Cabral-Curtis:** All right, so I got Harry Mattison his hand back up again, and then I got a Fred Salvucci with his hand back up again. Go ahead, Harry.
- C: Harry Mattison:** Quick things, maybe I wanted to mention the status of the sidewalk on Cambridge Street. As many of you know, that sidewalk was closed. I don't know when. Maybe five, at this point 10 years ago. Although MassDOT has put a temporary sidewalk, it's really narrow and not really sufficient for the amount of use on that sidewalk. Given that construction on this larger project is still years into the future could we entertain the notion of doing whatever repairs are needed so that that sidewalk can get opened. Obviously, that sidewalk can withstand dead load of a foot of snow, so I'm not sure what additional work would be needed to make it be able to withstand the weight of a few people walking on it, but is that something that could look into, Administrator?
- A: Administrator Gulliver:** Yes, so my understanding is that we're actually incorporating that into one of our preservation projects. I don't have an exact timeline on that for you, but we can certainly look that up. I understand that it is progressing at a different pace than the larger projects. That's something we recognize needs some additional work. We'll find out exactly when, but I think we are actually pretty close. I think it's a next year kind of project at this stage.
- Q: Harry Mattison:** Next year, meaning 2021 or 2022?
- C: Administrator Gulliver:** Probably the 2021 to 2022 season. The way we do our preservation if it's something next year we could go into the field for next spring, however, we can get confirmation on that one.
- Q: Harry Mattison:** The other comment is, I know time is short, so maybe not in this meeting, but you can share with us in advance of the next meeting, some summary of what design work the team has been working on since last fall? We would really appreciate it. I know a lot of time is going into preparing your filings, but we know that there's also been a lot of consultants doing a lot of work on something, but I don't know if anyone on the Task Force really knows what. We would just appreciate some update on what those different work items and design tasks are. Thank you.
- A: Administrator Gulliver:** Harry, I just got confirmation. It is actually the 2022 season that the preservation will start. That is when the sidewalk will be incorporated.
- C: Nate Cabral-Curtis:** OK, great, thank you everybody for that one. We're approaching eight o'clock, Mr. Administrator. Whenever you're ready to call it, but I've got Fred promised. Galen has his hand back up. Then the other hands that I have are ones that have been hanging. I may do the drop everything again then see who pops back up, but for now Fred then followed by Galen.
- C: Fred Salvucci:** Still in the spirit of making the NPC as productive as possible, so that you don't have 500 letters asking the same questions that were asked last November. The status of the mid-day layup hasn't been discussed at all today. I'm assuming that the mid-day layup is still part of the three build options, but not part of the No Build option, but in some past filings the No Build has included building a whole new mid-day layup that doesn't exist.

That seems totally at odds. We're all against the No Build anyway, but it should not include a mid-day lay up in a No Build because it is a totally new facility to this area. It's totally at odds with that idea. It would make a lot of sense to include it in the Purpose and Need to clarify which options include a mid-day layup and which do not.

Secondly, to re-iterate a point that I think Harry and Glen both made. Constructability analysis is really needed to comment intelligently on some of these. I understand the point about security and terrorism and not wanting certain kinds of information to go out, but many of us are dubious that the No Build, the minimum build, and for that matter, the highway viaduct can, in fact, be built while maintaining two tracks of the Worcester branch service through construction. While also maintaining three lanes of turnpike each way, Soldiers Field Road each way, and the continued existence of the Paul Dudley White Path. These are the key elements that are supposed to be continued.

We are quite certain those work with the All at-grade. We are quite sure that they do not work with the Highway Viaducts plan or the Hybrid plan, I am not trying to debate that at exactly eight o'clock. I am suggesting that that is a point or serious difference. It would help if the information shared on those ahead of the next meeting and set aside to settle those issues so that they can appear in the most correct forum in the Notice of Project Change to avoid unnecessary comments. So, thanks for letting me make those two points.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Mr. Administrator if you'd like, Mark Shamon is here from the VHB rail side. If you want to have him speak to any of Fred's points he can. I know we're almost at the end here. If you want to let the comment stand and move ahead, we can do that to your choice.

Q: Administrator Gulliver: I personally need to wrap up. I am sure many of the people here do, as well. I think you said you had Galen on. We will get back to the Secretary on these questions, certainly as quickly as we can, but why don't we move on to Galen and then wrap it up?

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: I'll have Galen have it and then we'll have closing remarks by the Administrator, which I think will be "have a nice night, but we'll give it back to him after you gave Galen, you're good to go, sir."

C: Galen Mook: OK, I want to thank you for allowing me to bookend the public comment period. Thank you. To start off, I was very inspired by all the comments and thankful to you administrator for your time and attention. It is very showing and we're very appreciative. I want to reinforce that. We're grateful for the process. Though much has to be improved, and we're happy to improve it. I was particularly inspired by what Harry was mentioning about the particulars of how dangerous it might be out there currently, and shared responsibility that we all have out there.

The answer you were able to give, Administrator, in real time I appreciate that. I want to take the opportunity. I was inspired to then also play off what Senator Markey did for the confirmation hearing of Secretary Buttigieg, he invited the secretary to visit the Cape Cod Bridges. I want to personally invite you to the neighborhood, not just the project, but the area of the neighborhood. Also, Ken, you and your team to visit the site and have a good site visit to talk through what we're actually looking at. I think we get caught up in the weeds so much about this track and this width and that layup. To Harry's point, we have serious dangers and needs that we want to solve, that we've been delaying for years and years, which MassDOT has responsibility to take care of: these include lights that are out along speedy highways, where parents push their baby strollers, and kids ride their bicycles. It is very hazardous.

We do not want to just point out just the bad. I also want to point out that good connections to the river, and the beauty of the neighborhood, and how nice walkable and bikeable it is here. I want invite you Administrator, Ken, and the whole team to a good, bad, and the ugly tour of the I-90 project. This is something that we had done years in the past with Mike and the team. Those were some of the most productive on-site visit meetings where we could, in real time, in the real world, talk about this in a very collaborative way. I want to take the opportunity to invite you, maybe, this is something you want to answer now, but would you join us for a site visit of the Allston Project. It would be productive. Thank you for your time.

A: Administrator Gulliver: Thank you, Galen. I think we can take you up on that offer. I think I've certainly been onsite a number of times but think everybody who's been to the site appreciate the fact that it is much different when you're on the ground looking at the site, versus when you're walking the streets. You get to see how the entire site fits in with the rest of the city. I know that it's a very eye-opening experience versus looking at it as you're either driving or biking, or even looking at on a set of plans. Certainly, a sitewalk, I think is in the cards.

Just as a quick closing, you know, really, I do appreciate everybody's comments tonight. Thank you all very much. I think that I certainly made a lot of notes myself, and I know the team has, as well. I heard a lot of good constructive comments from all of you. Again, very much appreciated. We will get answers to those questions that we weren't able to get to tonight.

Again, we heard you all loud and clear on some of the constructive comments that you did make, and we're going to regroup and see what we can do to make changes as quickly as we can to try to make this a better process. I look forward to talk to you all more. Thanks.

Next Steps

The project team will be filing the Notice of Project Change for the Allston in the Spring, which will kick off a three-week comment period. The project team plans to host a Task Force meeting before the official filing of the NPC. Administrator Gulliver will also be following up with some of the questions posed during the meeting.

Appendix I

Attendance List

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Meredith	Avery	Tetra Tech
Harris	Band	Task Force Member
Joe	Beggan	Harvard University
Glen	Berkowitz	Taskforce Members
Joe	Blankenship	City of Boston
Gregory	Boles	VHB
Ruth	Bonsignore	Community Member
Scott	Bosworth	MassDOT
Liz	Breadon	City of Boston
Troy	Brogan	Community Member
Norman	Brown	Community Member
Representative Will	Brownsberger	Massachusetts Senate
Gary	Bua	HNTB
Steven	Byrne	Community Member
Donny	Dailey	MassDOT
Ken	Davidson	MassDOT
Stacy	Donahoe	MassDOT
Chris	Calnan	Tetra Tech
Leigh	Campetti	EPA
Jim	Cerbone	State of Massachusetts
Dennis	Coffey	HNTB
Nick	Cohen	VHB
Mary	Connaughton	Pioneer Institute
Willi	Conroy	City of Boston
Jack	Corrigan	Community Member
Ken	Davidson	MassDOT
Bill	Deignan	City of Cambridge
Jason	Desrosier	Community Member
Kate	Dineen	A Better City
Thomas	Donald	Community Member
Mark	Fobert	Tetra Tech
Richard	Garver	Community Member

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Lisa	Gianelly	CLF
Dennis	Giombetti	Massachusetts Senate
Administrator John	Gulliver	MassDOT
Ed	Ionata	Tetra Tech
Meghan	Haggerty	State of Massachusetts
Morgan	Harris	Harvard University
Nicolette	Hastings	VHB
Bruce	Houghton	Community Member
Sandy	Hoover	Tetra Tech
Jessica	Hughes	Community Member
Laura	Jasinski	Charles River Conservatory
Marc	Kadish	Community Member
Ritu	Kalra	Harvard University
Representative Hannah	Kane	Massachusetts Senate
Owen	Kane	MassDOT/MBTA
Kathleen	Keen	Representative Khan's Office
Jim	Keller	Tetra Tech
Todd	Kirrane	Town of Brookline
Wendy	Landman	Walk Boston
Carrie	Lavallee	MassDOT
Elizabeth	Leary	Taskforce Member
Jon	Lenicheck	MassDOT
Rich	Lenox	WSP
David	Loutzenheiser	MAPC
Pallavi	Mande	I-90 Allston Task Force
Harry	Mattison	Task Force Member
Jamie	Maughan	Community Member
Tim	McCarthy	MassDOT
Moirra	McCrave	City of Boston
Edward	McMahon	City of Boston
Jennifer	Migliore (Rep Mike Moran)	Massachusetts Senate
Heather	Miller	CRWA
Julie	Miller	Community Member
Galen	Mook	I-90 Allston Task Force Member
Madeleine	Morgan	Community Member
Hayes	Morrison	Massachusetts Senate

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Paul	Mulrone	Community Member
John	Murphy	Community Member
Thomas	Nally	A Better City
Mike	O'Dowd	MassDOT
Etty	Padmodipetro	Community Member
Jeff	Parenti	DCR
Kristen	Pennucci	MassDOT
John	Pourbaix	Community Member
Maeve	Ragusin	VHB
John	Read	City of Boston
Erin	Reed	HSB
Shannon	Reilly	Community Member
Jessica	Robertson	Task Force Member
Maria	Robinson	State of Massachusetts
Jason	Ross	VHB
Staci	Rubin	CLF
Frederick	Salvucci	I-90 Allston Task Force Member
Bob	Seay	WGBH
Mark	Shamon	VHB
Steve	Silveira	Community Member
Robert	Sloane	Walk Boston
Christopher	Smith	Massachusetts Senate
Frank	Tramontozzi	Community Member
Austin	White	VHB
Ellen	White	HNTB
Jack	Wofford	Harvard / I-90 Allston Task Force Member
Fred	Yalouris	I-90 Allston Task Force Member
Carl	Zimba	CRAB
Catherine	Zusy	Cambridgeport Neighborhood Association
Harris	Band	Task Force Member
Joe	Beggan	Harvard University
Glen	Berkowitz	Taskforce Members
Joe	Blankenship	City of Boston
Gregory	Boles	VHB

Appendix II

Text Question and Answer

First Name	Last Name	Question Asked	Answer Given
David	Loutzenheiser	I wish there were a chat session enabled for these meetings to provide productive back and forth and ability to pose public questions. thanks.	Good evening David. GoTo Webinar uses the raising hand feature for verbal questions, which I believe you've used before, and this function. Erin will be reading any questions outloud asked this way once we get to Q&A.
David	Loutzenheiser	Under the no build option, what is the scope of the Franklin St ped bridge modifications? Will it be made accessible?	Good question. Erin will read this aloud once we get to Q&A and we'll get you a reply.
Glen	Berkowitz	Erin: Hi! I wonder if you could just pass this along to Nate, but no need to read it out loud. If possible, it would be great if Nate could name the person who will speak next but also announce the person would will then follow on deck. That will help the 2nd person get ready and help things move even more smoothly. Thanks Erin and Nate. Glen	I can see these too, Glen. I will see if we can make that happen.
Glen	Berkowitz	Nate: You hopefully see that I also have my hand back up....Glen B.	I'll be scrolling back again soon.
Harry	Mattison	To improve the process, could you please pre-record presentations like the one we just heard and send it to us a few days before the meeting? This would let us spend more meeting time having discussions.	

Harry	Mattison	When will MassDOT share construction staging drawings for the Major Rehabilitation option?	Thanks Glen for the comment. I'll be sure to send it along as I was just thinking the same thing.
Heather	Miller	With respect to the resiliency and climate change analysis, will the project be run through the state's RMA (Resilient MA Action Team) climate risk screening tool that is being developed for state agency projects?	
John	Read	The 3-week NPC comment period is very brief for what is likely to be a very lengthy and complex document. Would MassDOT consider a 45-day comment period?	
Mary	Connaughton	"I am with Pioneer Institute and a Framingham resident. I am in agreement with Glenn's comment on the overwhelming consensus of modified all at grade option.	