MEMORANDUM

To:	Michael O'Dowd Project Manager	Date:	July 21, 2021
From:	Taylor Miller Howard Stein Hudson	HSH Project No.:	2013061.14
Subject:	Massachusetts Department of Transportation I-90 Allston Multimodal Project Task Force Meeting Meeting Notes of 7/15/2021		

Overview

On July 15, 2021, members of the I-90 Allston Multimodal project team hosted a hybrid virtual/ in-person Task Force Meeting to discuss updates to the project. Topics included Federal Highway's floodplain letter, updates to the alternatives for the area of the project known as "the throat," and the Cambridge Street Bridge preservation project.

The project team first discussed a letter received from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) claiming that alternatives positioning I-90 below the 50-year floodplain are in violation of federal regulations. MassDOT needs to continue coordination with FHWA in regard to their guidance since while the proposed location of I-90 within the throat in the Modified At-Grade and Soldiers Field Road Hybrid options is below the level of the 50 year flood, it is not within the river's flood plain as defined by the 50 and 100 year flood levels. Mark Fobert of TetraTech explained that feasible design solutions are available to address this and move the alternatives forward into the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS).

Jim Keller from TetraTech provided an update on the alternatives, which included shoreline stabilization and assessing whether additional Boston University property could be utilized for more space in the Throat area. Task Force members requested that lane widths on I-90 be reduced. They also asked for an update on the advancing design for West Station which MassDOT's project manager, Mike O'Dowd indicated would be provided at the September meeting of the group.

While the Massachusetts Department of transportation (MassDOT) currently plans to spend approximately $75 million to address the ongoing and accelerating deterioration of the existing Allston Viaduct, they have also recently announced plans to rehabilitate the Cambridge Street Bridge over I-90, which would be undertaken separately from the larger I-90 Allston Multimodal project. Task Force members shared their support for the proposed improvements on the Franklin Street Pedestrian Bridge and the mid-block crossing at Cambridge Street near the bridge, however it was suggested that the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) be completed before the team proceeds with designs for the Cambridge Street Bridge. It was also asked that the team consider redesigning the bridge instead of preserving it as they felt it was out of date for modern needs. MassDOT's Administrator, Jonathan Gulliver, explained that work on the Cambridge Street Bridge is time-sensitive given the funds which are currently available for the work through the Next Generation Bridge program.

Agenda

I. Welcome & Opening Remarks 2
II. Presentation 3
III. Discussion 14

Detailed Meeting Minutes[1]

Welcome & Opening Remarks

C: Jonathan Gulliver, *MassDOT*: Good evening. My name is Jonathan Gulliver, and I am the State Highway Administrator. I'm joined by Michael O'Dowd, who's the Project Manager. To my left is the Program Manager, and then the rest of the project team is here as well, who I think you guys all know and will introduce themselves as they start doing their part of the presentation.

It sounds like for those of you who are joining online, you might have missed the statement about the timing on this meeting. We have to be wrapped up completely in here by 7:30, which means, get your questions in to us early. We're going to start calling for last questions around seven and

[1] Herein "C" stands for comment, "Q" for question and "A" for answer. For a list of attendees, please see Appendix 1. For copies of the text questions from the virtual meeting platform, see Appendix 2.

then at about 7:15 we'll wrap up final questions so that we can all exit the building on time. So, with that, I'm going to turn it over to Mark Fobert to run through the presentation.

Presentation

C: Mark Fobert, *TetraTech*: Thank you, Administrator. Here is today's agenda. Welcome and introductions, Federal Highway's floodplain letter, Modified At-Grade cross section and profile, Modified At-Grade shoreline restoration, Cambridge Street Bridge preservation, and questions.

We're starting off with the FHWA floodplain letter. MassDOT is in receipt of two letters on the subject of the 50-year floodplain. The first one was a general letter sent in 2018. The second one is a more specific letter that was received in June 2021, which directly mentioned the Allston Multimodal Project.

He is what the first letter, the general letter, said. "In keeping with 23 CFR 650 subpart A, two lanes of interstate highway shall not be inundated from a design flood of 2% chance of being exceeded in any given year." And so, for your information, 2% chance is the equivalent of the 50-year flood.

The second letter received in late June 2021 reads, "the Soldiers Field Road Hybrid and At-Grade alternatives as currently proposed, violate federal regulations as they lower the interstate below the 50-year flood elevation. This requirement cannot be waived nor are there any means of exception or mitigation. Therefore, these alternatives as currently presented are not viable and will need to be revised to meet this floodplain requirement." We are confident that the feasible design solutions are available to address this requirement for both alternatives such as they can viably move forward in the DEIS.

C: Wendy Landman: This is Wendy Landman from WalkBoston. The existing Turnpike, when it goes under the BU bridge and in the Prudential Tunnel, is already below that elevation.

A: Mark Fobert: Below the elevation, not within the floodplain. And I'll explain that in about three slides.

C: Wendy Landman: Okay, so it's not simply elevation proximity.

C: Mark Fobert: That seems to be the disconnect, actually, between Federal Highway and MassDOT. For encroachment on a floodplain, you have to be in the floodplain. Federal Highway seems to be referring to the elevation of the 50-year flood restriction.

C: Jonathan Gulliver: It's a complex topic, and we're going to come back and start here again when we do questions because I want to add some clarity based on some more recent discussions on it as well. I know it's kind of a heavy subject. So we'll do our best to try to get through it.

C: Mark Fobert: So, there are two parts of this second letter that I want to address. The first part is "there's no way you can do this, it's prohibited. And there's no way around that." If you look at Federal Regulation 23 CFR 650 subpart A, that is the policy that describes this, it applies to all encroachments and all other actions which affect us based on floodplain elevations, except for repairs made for emergency funds. And, in addition, there's this clause in that regulation saying, "a proposed action which includes a significant encroachment should not be improved unless FHWA finds the proposed significant encroachment is the only practical alternative. This finding shall be supported by the following information..." It's saying that you can do an Alternatives Analysis and overcome the presumption that this is not allowed. That is provided for in the regulation.

The second piece of this is the physical encroachment in the floodplain itself. That's that 50-year encroachment. In MassDOT's perspective, all the alternatives as currently designed meet the requirements of 23 CFR Part 650 subpart A as none of these alternatives result in physical encroachment within the 50-year floodplain. If you look at the definitions contained within the federal regulations, it specifically talks about encroachments in the floodplain and so we've seen the disconnect is Federal Highway seems to be pointing to the elevation with MassDOT looking at this and more pointing towards impact to the floodplain. So that's the major difference between the two.

I'll explain that a little more when I show you a few graphics. MassDOT does recognize the possibility of threat posed by climate change and flooding to the State's transportation infrastructure over a long period of time and will review possible measures to mitigate any adverse impacts associated with current and future flooding and resiliency concerns. Those measures will be addressed in the environmental filings.

MassDOT and Federal Highway are continuing to work through these interpretations that I've been talking about tonight, flood elevation versus the flood encroachment that are part of the Code of Federal Regulations and looking towards a possible solution, working together to get there.

Here you have the 50-year floodplain survey. In dark blue you have the FEMA flood boundary, it is the 50-year or 2% flood zone, its elevation is 3.2. For reference, the river basically is kept in an elevation of between zero and two. The 100-year flood is also elevation 3.5. These are numbers according to the FEMA Flood Information Study for Suffolk County. As you can see in gray, this is I-90, located clearly outside of these, the red line being the 50-year flood and the green line, you can barely see that because they're pretty much on top of each other when you're looking at elevation 3.2 versus 3.5. At this scale, it's virtually the same, but the major point is it is contained within the river. We have a section that illustrates that same point. Over here you have the 50-year floodplain, elevation 3.2 and you have land between here and the interstate. The interstate is below elevation 3.2 in this location. So that's part of the interpretation and differences that MassDOT and Federal Highway are both working through right now. I'm going to pass it over to Jim Keller now to discuss the cross sections and constraints.

C: Jim Keller, *TetraTech*: Thank you, Mark. Good evening, everyone. I'm just going to give a quick update on the discussions that have been ongoing with stakeholders regarding the cross section, and then some of the constraints related to them, as well as looking at the profile of I-90 as part of the Modified At-Grade alternative, and some of the constraints with raising the interstate profile from where we currently have it. Here's the current cross section that we presented back at the previous Task Force meeting. It's got the 11-foot lanes on I-90, the additional shoulder width on the right side for I-90, four feet from the two as previously. Then you have Soldiers Field Road (SFR), 24 feet wide, curb to curb dimension of 11-foot lanes and one-foot shoulders. It shows the boardwalk, the shoreline restoration, and there's going to be some more discussion and thought about how to properly stabilize the shoreline to support Soldiers Field Road. We definitely understand if there are questions there.

This is a list of current I-90 travel lane and shoulder widths for the at-grade, viaduct, and SFR alternatives. For the Worcester main line and Grand Junction rail, what we're using is center to center track spacing and horizontal clearance. Buick Street is the constraint on the southern edge of the of the project limit.

For the profiles, again, just to reiterate what Mark Fobert briefly discussed, this letter that was received by MassDOT from Federal Highway brings in a requirement for I-90 to be at or above the 3.2-foot 50-year flood elevation. The rail profile is what we've been using as a maximum profile gradient, through discussions with MBTA, as well as the commuter rail design speeds, 50 miles per hour, and the freight at 20, through the Throat. A one and a half percent grade is kind of where we've set the maximum grade to so that we can tie into the existing crossing where the Grand Junction passes over the Charles River.

Then, here are the vertical clearances. Currently 14 and a half feet is what we're using for I-90. For any structure passing over I-90, there needs to be 14.5 feet of clearance between I-90 and that structure for vehicles to cross under safely. 18'6" is what's being used for the rail currently, for rail going below any structure.

Some of the refinements that have been previously assessed and discussed with the Task Force that are ongoing in discussions with stakeholders, even as recently as this week, include looking at different ways to potentially narrow the pavement section of Soldier Field Road that currently encroaches into the river. It's approximately 600 square feet of area. It's a very small area, but it's an ongoing discussion, and we're attempting to find that additional cross section. Using additional Boston University property without further impacting Buick Street operations has been assessed and will continue to be assessed. Further narrowing of I-90 lane and shoulder width and removal of travel lanes are ongoing discussions, but currently MassDOT's position is those will be held. There'll be further discussions on that in upcoming environmental documents as well as Task Force meetings. Currently the Soldier Field Road curb to curb width of 24 feet is remaining at 24 feet.

Q: Harry Mattison: Will you share with us the assessment you've done of the BU property?

A: Jim Keller: Yes. It's how we've designed the southern limit of the project area and then working north from there with the cross section, but we are still continuing to look at alternative means of the retaining wall that needs to be installed along that southern edge and whether or not it can be more integrated into the edge of Buick Street, whether you can place some of the structure below, some of the footings are going to need to go below Buick Street. On a temporary basis, Buick Street will be impacted during construction. Bringing it back to its existing width, there may be opportunities to bring that retaining wall in a little bit further. It's not a report. We're using the word assess, but we're looking at it from a design perspective. There's not a documented report or memo. That's how we design.

C: Jonathan Gulliver: We'll seek to get it at the next Task Force meeting. We do need to talk to Boston University because part of this is how it impacts their property. We'll share that information at the next Task Force meeting.

C: Glen Berkowitz: Glenn Berkowitz, with A Better City. First of all, Mr. Administrator and the rest of the team, thank you so much for both providing the presentation before tonight and frankly for doing the hard thing to have this hybrid meeting where some of us can join in and others can stay online. It's great to see not only the folks who represent the team, but also to

turn around and see some of the fellow advocates. It's been so long since we've seen each other in person outside of a computer screen.

It's wonderful to see how much has survived COVID. It's not great to see how much of your presentation is the same and frankly unchanged from before COVID. Harry just talked about Boston University. We've never seen any drawing that shows that you've maximized every foot on the Boston University side. A Better City believes there's at least two more feet to be gained without both further impacting Boston University nor impacting the design speed for rail in that section of the project.

We're open minded to be proven wrong, but until you show us something, and here you go again with a slide, if you wouldn't mind just going back real quick Jim to the prior slide. I appreciate that, but none of us have seen anything that says there's not an inch to be gained on Boston University, but yet the project team keeps putting out slide presentations that show it moving on to I-90. You keep insisting that the outside shoulder has to be four feet in both directions on I-90 for the at-grade. It isn't even four feet anywhere between Newton and the Prudential Tunnel today on the outside shoulder. It's not.

We've shown you our work at A Better City several times in Zooms, and here we are and you're still showing slides that show a four foot outside shoulder. If you mean it could be an inside shoulder or an outside shoulder, say that. We already gave you that recommendation twice, but you're not doing that, and what you're showing us now you show a four foot outside shoulder you say can't be touched, that it has to be there. There isn't a four-foot shoulder on the Mass Pike between Newton and downtown. Secondly, MassDOT recently has just approved two air rights projects that are under construction as we speak that don't provide a two-foot shoulder and a four-foot shoulder no matter which side of the road they're on.

You haven't shown us anything about bullet number two, and then the favorite of so many of us in the room which is, as far as we know, you still haven't gone out and measured the existing lane widths of Soldiers Field Road in the Throat. We asked you to invite us, sincerely, if you did. I know we weren't invited, we'd still love to go out with you any night that you want to shut the road down for two minutes with police details at River Street and we'd be happy to help you with a tape measure and understand exactly what's out there today. Our best guess at A Better City through the analysis we've done is there's 10 and a half foot lanes today on Soldiers Field Road, but yet you keep showing 11-foot lanes with one-foot offsets and you say it can't be changed because someone at DCR says it can't be changed.

Here we are at another Task Force meeting and another month that's like Groundhog's Day again, not for COVID any longer, but for I-90 Allston. There is no one we know who thinks traffic drives too slowly on Soldiers Field Road. If they're 10 and a half today, we think at a minimum they shouldn't be increased to 11, but DCR's own guidelines, Ari how long ago was it that you were talking about the DCR design guidelines? Just to keep showing the slides that show 11-foot lanes on Soldiers Field Road for like the 12th time and Groundhog I-90 Allston Task Force is just so frustrating. I'm trying to sound as nice and pleasant and supportive as possible. But please don't make us sit through another Task Force meeting with the same three bullets as if everything we've all tried to talk to you about at countless Zooms and countless meetings before don't seem to have effect.

C: Jonathan Gulliver: Glen, if I could, we want to get through the rest. Part of what we want to do to make this work is try to respect the process, especially for those online. No more interruptions from the audience for the rest of the presentation, which is only about six more slides.

We made a commitment upfront, you might recall a few meetings ago, that we would set a schedule for meetings. That means that even though there's a lot of work to do, we're still holding the meetings even when we don't have a lot of new information to share. I recognize that you guys would like us to be further along than we are, but we are not. A lot of this stuff takes time to work through. So again, I realize the frustration. I know DCR is on the line to talk to this point, and we can certainly get to that point as far as Soldiers Field Road goes, but again, there are a lot of stakeholders involved here. It takes a lot of discussions to work through some of this stuff. I recognize fully we're not as far along as you guys want us to be, but I thought it was important to hold the meeting. I don't think anybody here wants us to do this, but if we want to go back to the old way of just holding off till we have new information, we'll come back in four months. I don't want to do that. I think it's more important to have regular contact with everybody and have these discussions, so that's how we're going to proceed. Again, I appreciate the frustration that people have that we're not further along, but that's where we are. I'd appreciate it if everybody could hold their comments to the end, and we'll work through the rest of this slide presentation, which I think is only about five or six more slides.

C: Jim Keller: Here we are in refinements, which are currently being assessed. Glen, we definitely understand where you're coming from. You made that very clear and the first bullet here is just saying that MassDOT is seeking an option to decrease that cross section. If you interpret the slide to say there's no options, that's not where MassDOT is. The attempt is to find that additional width. And again, just pointing out that it's a pretty small area. We're not discussing the fill that would be required along the shoreline restoration, that's a separate item. In

reference to raising I-90's elevation, thinking in terms of if it did have to come up, currently MassDOT's position is that all three alternative options meet the 50-year floodplain requirement for the Code of Federal Regulations, but essentially, the challenges are listed here, and I'll also go through them.

I just want to take a moment here to let everyone know that MassDOT is creating a 3D visual model for the At-Grade and the Modified Highway Viaduct in addition to what was previously created for the Soldiers Field Road Hybrid alternative. We have a couple of images that we've peppered into the presentation to show the status of that. Some things will change and get updated, but generally it's ongoing, and this is kind of the first pass at it. Thinking in terms of if you had to raise I-90, what's driving the elevation of I-90, and as Wendy brought up, as you come out from under Commonwealth Avenue today, you're already at elevation zero essentially, then you start coming up, you hit the viaduct, and you're shooting up at 4%, plus or minus. Now, for the At-Grade, you have to go down so you can get under the Grand Junction rail bridge that is part of the Modified At-Grade as well as the parkway overpass which is part of SFR Hybrid. To do that, you have to keep at zero and put some vertical curves in to get under there. The current elevation of the rail is driven by the maximum rail grade that I previously mentioned, as well as that existing elevation over at the connection to where Grand Junction passes over the Charles River. Thinking in terms of a new structure going over I-90, you have a structure depth which is currently six and a half, plus or minus. The team's looking at different ways to lower that, make that narrower, and then the 14 and a half feet of clearance that I previously described for the vehicular clearance. The current I-90 profile that the team has developed is about 0.3 or so at the low point. Thinking in terms of going up higher, something has to give. The rail profile is essentially fixed. We're looking at different ways to get that to go up in elevation. That's the current design. Again, we're looking at options to get that higher, if I-90 did have to rise. Another implication of elevating here is Worcester main line and the Grand Junction tracks that would pass under the north/ south Agganis Way crossing. That 18-and-a-half-foot clearance comes in now with the rail, and then the 14 and a half for the interstate. Thinking in terms of a ramp that would have to start here and make its way up, we've kind of maximized that; the length of that is integral to how the Nickerson Field works and operates. Right now everything works, so if you started raising the Grand Junction rail as well as the Worcester main line, they kind of have to rise together so that all the interconnections and switches work. So, you'd have to elevate some of that track in this area which would make the ramp longer and have some additional impacts at Nickerson and we don't want to do that. We want to look at other alternatives essentially is what we're saying. Here is that view looking to the north where the Grand Junction and the commuter rail pass underneath and thinking about the access trapped in Nickerson here and not impacting

that any further by needing to make a ramp that comes longer. That's the discussion on the cross section and profile. Next, we'll get into the shoreline restoration.

C: Mark Fobert: This is the latest version of the shoreline. All this is still under development. We're coming in with a progress print which basically shows where we are at this point in time. What you see on the left is what we had been showing before. On the right is the more engineered solution. 2:1 slope along the shoreline. With a 2:1 slope you can plant but it also reduces the encroachment into the river as much as possible. With a little flatter slope, you're much further into the river. We're trying to keep it pretty close to where the edge of the walkway is. You don't want to encroach too much more on the river. This area in here in yellow needs to be dredged. We've done some borings out there; it's got very soft sediments which go several feet down. We have to deal with that in order to hold up this slope. We would place a steel sheet pile at the toe to help hold up the entire slope. You'd place riprap fabric underneath. This shaded area represents the natural stream bed material that you put in, but we could use it for fish habitat. It's a pretty standard detail and it's been used successfully in other places. There's not a lot of gravelly substrates in the Charles River for fish habitat, and this is the benefit of this area you see in here. Taking a look in the plan view, the purple is the living shoreline improvements, approximately 50,000 square feet. As you can see along here, it is contained mostly to the landward side of the outer edge of the walkway. We also have 600 square feet of Soldier Field Road, in green, that Jim had discussed, in which four feet of space will need to be recovered. Next, we'll move on to Cambridge Street preservation.

C: Mark Shamon, *VHB*: Good evening again, everybody. My name is Mark Shamon. I'm with VHB, and I'm going to talk a little bit about the MassDOT effort to build the Cambridge Street Bridge preservation project. I think many of you probably knew this project existed some time ago. It had been put on the shelf, and MassDOT is currently dusting it off and getting ready to go with the idea of starting to get this thing built independent of I-90 Allston. For those who may not be familiar with the project and the location, Cambridge Street Bridge is on the west side of the project area. It serves as a vital corridor between Allston and Brighton and points to the north or east depending on your point of view, including Cambridge, I-90, the interchange, and Soldiers Field Road.

It is a critical transportation corridor. It carries about 29,000 cars per day, and it is in a state of repair that really does need attention much like the Allston viaduct does. The goal is to achieve a state of good repair. In addition to the state of good repair for the roadway bridge itself, there's also an effort to upgrade the Franklin Street Pedestrian Bridge as part of this project. Here's a closer look. You can see the limits of the project extend from Harvard Avenue on the west side

and up to Lincoln Street on the east side. It does include a full superstructure replacement and deck replacement of the bridge. The girders need to be rebuilt or reinforced. There are problems with the bearings, with the bridge seats, there are pier issues with spalling, concrete deterioration, a number of issues that need to be addressed and are complicated to do. The bridge piers are subject to significant spalling. To fix that, we'll need to get into I-90, chip out a lot of the concrete, replace the concrete, put some additional reinforcing in the railroad side, there's a block masonry wall that needs to be repointed, the abutment seats are in tough shape. So, there's a fair bit of work to be done just to restore this to a state of good repair. The Franklin Street Bridge also has some substructure issues that we would seek to correct.

In terms of what the final roadway cross section might look like, I've got two cross sections that I'll be showing you. One is for the bridge itself and one is for the adjoining sections of roadway. Starting with the bridge, and a lot of this continues all the way through the corridor here, 1500 feet or so, we will be rebuilding the Cambridge Street Bridge roadway to have two 11-foot lanes in each direction. There will be a three-foot shoulder in each direction. A raised median with a steel picket fence to sort of prevent crossovers, people just arbitrarily jumping across the street or crossing wherever they want to.

One of the exciting facts is that MassDOT is going to build a cycle track, seven foot six inches. It's raised and protected at the same height as the sidewalk. The sidewalk on the bridge will be about somewhere between seven and eight feet depending on the availability of space. This section showing seven, nine on one side, and six, nine on the other side. Of course, there are a number of utilities that need to be supported and staged during the construction of the bridges as we build the substructure elements. The other element is the separation between the sidewalk and cycle track. They are at the same elevation, but there will be a stamped concrete printed median between them that will cause a little bit of a rumble. That'll be six inches or so wide just to separate the two. The rumble strip is supposed to be painted white, so there's also a visual contrast to both the cycle track and the sidewalk.

On the roadway, the travel lanes, median, shoulders, cycle track, and sidewalk continue. Sidewalk width will vary a little bit more as you get off the bridge because there are other elements on the side. There are various structures and stoops and buildings and such, so there is some difference in the sidewalk width, but the cycle track generally remains at seven foot six inches on both sides all the way through with an approach ramp at the Lincoln Street side and at the Harvard Avenue side. Bicyclists who are on the street on Cambridge Street when they approach this cycle track will be able to ramp right up and ramp down on the other side, so it is continuous all the way there. The other thing although the cycle track is generally seven, six,

there are a couple of bump out areas. There's going to be new lighting, they'll be putting lighting in that is similar to the lighting that's been built and erected on the Longfellow Bridge. If you're familiar with that lighting, it's fairly attractive and it will illuminate the bridge and give it more of a boulevard feel than the cobra head lights that are out there today. So, some very significant improvements in terms of what this bridge will look like in the future.

Just to summarize here, the bridge work includes the new deck, steel repairs, and we're going to clean and paint the steel. There'll be substructure repairs as I mentioned with the concrete and bridge seats. There will be substructure repairs to the Franklin Street Bridge as well. Roadway work will include new sidewalks, mill and overlay of the roadway, some parts of the roadway as you get closer to the bridge will be full depth construction as well. New cycle tracks and the lighting, as I mentioned. We are looking at the possibility of putting in a mid-block crossing, where pedestrians can cross Cambridge Street somewhere near the bridge. There are some safety concerns that designers have with respect to the sight distance and making sure that if there is a crossing that it is visible and people who are crossing the street are seen by drivers coming up on either side. We're also trying to look at potential conflicts between pedestrians crossing the cycle track as well as the roadway. You've got people who are coming off of the sidewalk who want to cross the road and have to be a little bit concerned about conflict with the cycle track, but we are looking at that mid-block crossing, it is an idea that's out there.

In terms of construction, the plan is to try to get this designed and ready for advertisement next spring and hopefully into construction in late spring or early fall next year. I think it's going to depend somewhat on when the $75 million viaduct repair that's been talked about before is done. Hopefully they can be done at the same time so where there is some impact to I-90, in particular to do those substructure repairs I talked about, there's not one cycle of working on Cambridge Street and then another cycle of working on the viaduct. The idea is to try to see if we can coordinate those two projects and build them at the same time. Cambridge street will remain open during construction, but obviously as we're replacing the deck and the substructure elements that need to be staged the commitment is to maintain at least one roadway lane in each direction throughout construction, as well as at least one sidewalk and one separated bicycle lane, whether it's a bike lane on the bridge today, or the cycle track that's being built in one of the stages. Again, both will be accommodated during construction. There may be some overnight closures and short-term lane closures for the substructure repair at I-90. We'll try to coordinate that with the with the viaduct work so that people aren't getting a new lane and then losing lane and losing and gaining, etc.

I think that concludes our presentation tonight. Since I'm up here, I'll mention that there are a couple of upcoming meetings. The next Task Force meeting is scheduled to be September 15. And the one after that will follow up on October 21.

C: Jonathan Gulliver: If you could go back to the Federal Highway letter for a moment, I just want to offer some point of clarification on this because I know it was a very heavy topic. Let me just clarify some things about the letters that we received from Federal Highway and what they mean. We received two letters, one a couple of years ago at one of our previous permitting stages. What that letter effectively said is we have to be in compliance with the specific regulation. That regulation requires that you not build anything within a floodplain, which we are not proposing. To be clear, when you look at this schematic, the floodplain of the Charles River, both 50- and 100-year floodplain is contained by the bank of the Charles River. It does not spill over that.

The second letter that we just received about three weeks ago said that in addition to the floodplain area being an issue, the 50-year floodplain elevation would be problematic. What that means is this, if you look at the All At-Grade right now the majority of the area through the Throat is about three and a half feet below that specific elevation. It is not in the floodplain, but it is below that specific elevation, which is considered problematic per that letter from Federal Highway. We have since spoken to them about it to try to get some clarity. I hope to get more clarity, so these discussions are ongoing. I understand from them that what they're primarily interested in is making sure that a hydraulic analysis is done to make sure that the roadway is not flooded out during the 50-year flood. That's something that we will need to do as part of our NEPA filing. So that will happen.

Where this becomes problematic, and where these guys have been working hard from a standard resiliency process is getting the entire roadway up above that 50-year flood. We know that we have some opportunities approaching the Throat, but the point that is going to be problematic, especially, is getting under the Grand Junction railroad bridge. You cannot get under the Grand Junction railroad bridge without getting below that elevation. That's where it really becomes problematic. So that is something we're continuing to have discussions with them on. But that is the current state of things from Federal Highway, and we hope to get that cleared up soon. But again, that is problematic for that area of the Throat. With that, Nate, why don't we go to some questions?

Discussion

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis, *Howard Stein Hudson*: Thank you, Mr. Administrator. Based on what we can see from the digital attendance sheet, Representative Hannah Kane is on. There's a Denis G, which I think is probably Denis Giombetti from the Senator Pressley's office. And then Jen Migliori from Representative Moran's office is present, as is Pam Mulaney from Councilor Breadon's office.

Before we do anything else, Jean, can you take a look and see if any of them want to put their hands up and have the first swing at it? And I will gently remind people to make Jean's life easier by lowering your hand when you're all set. Anything? No, okay. Since we've had a couple audience ones, do you want to take a hand or two from here, and then Erin we'll do a couple of yours from over there, and then I'll come out in the audience.

C: Jean Charles: The first person that will be speaking is Jessica Robertson.

C: Jessica Robertson: Thanks, everyone. I'm sorry I'm not there with you in person, but today was my first day going into the office and I couldn't make it back in time. I just wanted to go back to the Cambridge Street portion of the discussion. I was frankly a little bit shocked and appalled to hear the discussion of a mid-block crossing as something that you all are exploring. I know there have been some staffing changes at MassDOT in the seven years since we went through that public process for the Cambridge Street overpass, but we were given a commitment that there would be a crossing installed at the Mansfield Street stairway/ ramp, and MassDOT did whatever due diligence they did to ensure that that was a safe location for a crossing. We were in fact given a commitment that that crossing would be installed at the beginning of the construction phase, so I'm very surprised and disappointed to hear that that's not still on the table and that you're now back to the drawing board of exploring whether or not there can be a mid-block crossing.

The idea of a fence down this entire street is completely unacceptable. There are a very small number of crossing points for people who live in the lower Allston neighborhood to get to the rest of Allston. The perspective of transportation planning that says, "there are so many people that need to cross the street here, but it's dangerous because there are too many cars, and therefore we need to put up a fence to stop the people from getting where they need to go," is a completely backwards way of thinking. What needs to happen is to look at all these people who need to get from one side of the street to the other and figure out how we can make that a safe thing for them to do. I would really appreciate if you could tell me how you're going to accommodate the

extraordinary demand that is clearly there for crossing that street safely in a safe and standards-compliant manner.

A: Mark Shamon: Let me just clarify. The fence is actually only on the bridge section. The roadway section does not have a fence across it, so it's really only the bridge section that has the picket fence. In terms of the crossing itself, we understand the concern. I'm not particularly familiar with the commitment, so if I misspoke on that I apologize, but there is definitely an interest. I know MassDOT is interested in having mid-block crossing, it just needs to be done safely.

C: Jessica Robertson: If I'm correct in my recollection that Mark Gravallese, the former project manager of this project, now works at HSH, perhaps he could remind you of what commitments were made.

A: Mike O'Dowd, *MassDOT*: Jess, this is Mike O'Dowd. I hope all is well. We are still advancing forward to identify the ideal location for that mid-block crossing. It's not on the presentation, but that's not intended to mean that we're not doing it. We are. I've had discussions with our State Traffic Engineer and our Operations Administrator to identify where the best location is for it and what type of equipment is going to be utilized to ensure that the safety of pedestrians and cyclists at that location is going to be ensured given the volumes of traffic, the speeds, and the locations of the adjacent intersections. Once again, it's not on the presentation that we've given tonight. You'll see it in future presentations; this is just a matter of introducing where we're going, what we're intending to do, so rest assured that I know where and how far the working group and Mark brought this before and what some of the concerns were, and we are going to be addressing that.

C: Jessica Robertson: Thanks Mike, I appreciate that. We've heard time and time again over the last seven or eight years, "here's a presentation full of stuff for cars, and don't worry we're thinking about bikes and pedestrians. It's not in the presentation, but don't worry we're thinking about it, we're going to show you that later." At a certain point, we lose faith that you guys are actually working on it, much less prioritizing it, and much less actually thinking about roadway safety for humans before you're thinking about throughput for cars.

A: Mike O'Dowd: Well, just to repeat myself, we are looking at it and we are going to identify where we feel is the best, safest location to be able to incorporate that into the cross section of the roadway.

C: Jessica Robertson: At the next meeting, it would be great if you could show us the options that you're looking at and the pros and cons of each one just to reassure us that you're actually

working on it. Maybe we might have some suggestions to help with figuring out which locations might be best or not.

A: Mike O'Dowd: That works fine for us. We have no problem at all.

C: Erin Reed: Heather, you have several questions. Going back to the floodplain issues, when were FEMA maps for this area last updated? Also, we know that FEMA maps look at historical conditions only, they do not reflect current conditions and definitely do not reflect future predicted conditions. Current data will be necessary to determine present flooding risk, and future projections will be necessary to understand risk going forward.

A: Mark Fobert: This is the current FEMA map. It's based on the 2016 flood information study. There is a preliminary flood study out there that was done in 2020, showing the exact same elevations contained within the flood information study for Suffolk County. There is a table showing the elevations of the Charles River and the various flood stages. It is true that FEMA does not project future floods. This is based on their current model of the flooding, as it currently stands, not a future flood model.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Great. Okay, so someone from the live audience now. Go ahead, Fred.

Q: Fred Yalouris: This is Fred Yalouris, Cambridge community representative. Could you go back to that first page of the FHWA letter for just a little point of clarification? You say this requirement cannot be waived, nor are there any means of exception or mitigation. Yet then further down, you say that we are confident that feasible design solutions are available to address this requirement. I don't understand, you're saying we can't do this, and then you carry on and say we can do it.

A: Jonathan Gulliver: So, to clarify, this is a direct quote from Federal Highway's letter. This is not MassDOT's position. This is from Federal Highway directly.

Q: Fred Yalouris: Right. We had similar situations in the Big Dig where FHWA would tell us these are the rules, but there have in the past been well-designed solutions. Why can't we think about the well-designed solutions here, and not present it as if this is a real problem?

A: Jonathan Gulliver: Again, we are presenting here Federal Highway's position. We gave them the opportunity to come here tonight to talk about this, but I don't believe they did come, although they may be online. But this was the position as expressed by them to us. So, we

believe that we have mitigated any issues related to the first part from the 2018 letter. Again, this new letter just came a couple of weeks ago.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Alright, Jean, let's have another hand from the machine.

C: Jean Charles, *Howard Stein Hudson*: The next person is Emily. Emily, you are free to unmute.

Q: Emily Norton: Great, thank you so much. This is Emily Norton, Executive Director of Charles River Watershed Association. Thank you so much. I do appreciate the regular meetings and keeping the lines of communication open. I wanted to respond about the continued refusal to even consider lane reduction. Glen from ABC referenced the two air rights projects and shoulder widths and other detail about those projects. I-90 is currently down to three lanes, and it will be for four years during construction of this project, and yet you keep rejecting the idea and offering no evidence for why. That is not evidence-based decision making and you just responded to CRWA's Heather Miller that you're using FEMA maps that don't take future climate risks into account. How is that even possible? How is that not anything other than completely irresponsible? I'm just really frustrated.

The last point I want to make is that I would just remind us all that a study commissioned by Governor Baker and released just this past Tuesday said that remote and hybrid work could decrease peak hour automobile vehicle miles traveled by 2 to 9%. So, the only time one could have justified four lanes pre-COVID was the eastbound morning rush hour traffic. We already thought that that could have been dealt with by tried-and-true transportation demand measures, but now we have a projection paid for by this very administration saying that that would not be necessary. I guess I'm just not understanding the lack of willingness to consider a solution that seems to offer such a win-win-win for the ecological health of the river, for access to the river, for climate resilience, and for achieving our already stated and voted on goals of reducing greenhouse gas emissions, including from vehicles.

A: Jonathan Gulliver: So, I'm not sure what we can say to that except for thank you for your comments. We believe we have addressed this issue in prior meetings and I'm not sure what else we can say at this point.

C: Emily Norton: If I could just push back a little bit, we haven't seen any data responding to that. We haven't seen any traffic studies or anything saying traffic lanes are what I heard in the previous meeting, sort of political considerations from Western Mass, but not data.

A: Jonathan Gulliver: And I think as we also said in the last meeting that the analysis piece of this is going to be done as part of our next filing. So again, I don't want to go round and round on this topic. We talked about it last time as well. The response from MassDOT from last time and tonight still stand.

Q: Emily Norton: Just one last thing, the timing then, when would we see that analysis?

A: Mike O'Dowd: Hi, Emily, this is Mike. We're intending to file an NPC in the fall of this year. And we'll touch upon many of the topics that you just mentioned. The full details, analysis of the climate change and resiliency and adaptability, would be in the DEIS document which we anticipate in approximately a year's time.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Okay, Erin, do you want to read one?

Q: Erin Reed: Sure. So, another question from Heather. "On the Modified At-Grade cross section, what is the difference in elevation between the 100-year flood line and Soldiers Field Road? It would be very helpful if the vertical scale was provided in addition to the widths.

A: Mark Fobert: Soldiers Field Road's approximate elevation is eight. The riverbank itself varies along the project area between elevation five to elevation eight. It does change as you go along different locations in the project area. That is why the flood elevation at 3.2 for the 50 year and the 100-year flood elevation at 3.5 are both contained within the banks of the Charles River.

Q: Ari Ofsevit: All right, thanks. Again, I want to thank you for having the meeting and I know that this is an interesting test of how this works, and I'm hoping it works well. I had a couple of questions. I know I've asked this question before. Is there anyone from DCR either in the room or on the line? Any DCR Task Force member?

A: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Thank you, Jeff Parenti is online from DCR. If you want to find him and unmute him, we can ask him for a response.

Q: Ari Ofsevit: Thanks, Jeff, for coming. Do you happen to have the historic parkway preservation treatment guidelines available to you at this time?

A: Jeff Parenti, *DCR*: I am familiar with them.

Q: Ari Ofsevit: On page 63 of that it says, "In areas where travel lanes are wider than necessary, narrow them to as little as 10 feet to slow traffic and increase safety. Reclaim green space and restore historic travel way landscape." It goes on to say that typical roadway width for a pleasure

vehicles-only roadway is 9 to 10 feet. I don't know if it's your purview or someone else's at DCR, but why would you not be following your own regulations and recommendations for this roadway?

A: Jeff Parenti: I will note that elsewhere in the document, it gives a range going up to 11 feet. Keep in mind that we have 100 or so parkways statewide, ranging from roads that are very small park roads all the way up to parkways like our Soldiers Field Road, which is a parkway, is part of the parkways network, but it does function like a limited access highway. It has on and off ramps, it has acceleration and deceleration lanes, and in that way, it's very similar to its next-door neighbor, the Turnpike.

In terms of engineering design, roadway design, I feel very strongly that 11-foot travel lanes are appropriate for this application on Soldiers Field Road. Keep in mind too that the painted travel lane width is only one of many elements of roadway design. We could go in and paint a different width if it makes us feel better, but curb-to-curb, if we leave it at 24 for example, and I wouldn't want to go below that for a roadway like this, you could do say a two-foot shoulder and 10-foot width or 10 and a half and one and a half.

You could do whatever you want, but the driver behavior will be about the same depending on whether it's free flow conditions, or whether it's congested conditions. If the goal is, and I'm not sure what the goal is by reducing travel lanes, to get something else in the project, or we think it will reduce speeds, or whatever that may be, we have other strategies of achieving those goals.

C: Ari Ofsevit: Okay, so here the goal is to increase safety. This is the DCR's words, not mine, "increase safety, reclaim green space, and restore the historic travel way." In this case, we would be increasing safety by designing a roadway that was narrower and traffic would go slower on it. We have nine and a half foot lanes on Memorial Drive and people drive slower there. We would reclaim green space, and we'd actually save the four feet. If we want to get the real history of this, there wasn't a parkway there before there was a parkway, but we're not talking about that. If those are the goals stated in the DCR's guidelines, I think we really should be talking about following them. And if we're going to say we need 11 feet for the sake of 11 feet, even though it says two paragraphs down, "typical roadway lane was for pleasure vehicles only, roadways are nine to 10 feet," we're already at the top end of that range. It doesn't say nine to 10 feet typical, but 11 if you feel like it. If you want to put that, then we should have a new document, we should go through all the hearing processes, and we should have a discussion about that. But for now, I'm reading from DCR's document, and I really think we should all be on the same page and be reading from the same document.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Okay, let's do another. Thank you, Jeff, by the way for jumping in there. Next person is Tad Read. Tad, you are able to unmute yourself.

Q: Tad Read: Good evening, everyone. Tad Read, BPDA Transportation Infrastructure Planning. Good to see everybody in here tonight. Thanks so much for doing the hybrid meeting this evening. Really appreciate that and thanks for the very clear presentation this evening.

I do have a few questions on the Franklin Street Bridge. Do I understand correctly that what we're talking about on the Franklin Street Bridge is simply substructure repairs that apart from substructure repairs, there's nothing else involved on the Franklin Street Bridge? Is that correct? That's my first question. I want to also echo on the mid-block crossings on the Franklin Street Bridge. BPDA, and I think I can speak for the City, and BTD as well, would be very interested in that mid-block crossing. As you know, we just completed the Allston-Brighton mobility study, and we got a lot of comments about that desire line. I just want to echo what Jessica Roberts said that we would be very interested in that crossing.

Finally, I just wanted to say, is there any way we could begin to see some of the results of the options for reducing that four-foot dimension before the fall? Is there any way that could come any sooner? Could we get a previe? That's it. Thank you.

A: Mark Shamon: This is Mark Shamon. I'll address at least the first two. Yes, the plan right now is just to do substructure repairs on the Franklin Street Bridge. I want to also acknowledge your question and comment and support for the mid-block crossing. As I said, it is something that's being looked at and we all just want to make it as safe as possible.

C: Erin Reed: We'll go to John McLean from WalkBoston. Please address the design for the bridge approaches, entrance, and release points for all modes which per APB protocols are part of the bridge scope.

C: Mark Shamon: The lane widths are the same all the way across. We are developing 11-foot lanes, and we're carrying them all the way across the bridge from both sides. There will be a left turning lane at the Lincoln Street as there is today. It'll be developed a little bit better. There'll be some improved striping through here. As I mentioned before, the cycle track is continuous off the bridge and there'll be ramps that are allowing people to get up and on to the cycle track from the roadway, which is the only way to get there on the approach side, on the limits. Hopefully that answers the question.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: We're going to do the next one from the audience. We're going to keep cycling as long as we can. I just want to be mindful of the fact that it is 7:12.

Q: Galen Mook: This is Galen Mook from MassBike, Allston Resident, Task Force member. A couple of points real quick. Administrator, thank you for having this hybrid. We'd really appreciate it if FHWA and DCR could also be participating in these designs of the presentation so that we don't have to have this back and forth where Ari has to call out DCR. If at all possible, for future meetings, we would like to have FHWA participating. That is a request we're making. I know it's hard, and you don't have the say, but that's just a reminder I want to throw out there. We need to have all players in the room in order to have this full conversation. Equally so with Harvard and Boston University, but I'll start with FHWA.

I didn't hear anything about West Station or any transit conversation. For at least the next meeting, let's try to get a little bit of that reiterated and remind us that this is a multimodal project. To not hear anything about the transit and the timing and any sort of update is very concerning, and I just want to know what's up with West Station. If you don't have an answer now, that's fine, but let's make sure that we have an answer or at least some sort of update going forward because this is not just a highway project.

Two concerns, one about the grade of I-90 and how everything needs to be elevated collectively. It was used that the potential for an Agganis footbridge might be a reason to preclude raising the highways. I just want to point out that where the footing would land on that footbridge is at a pretty downward slope already where it hits Agganis. If you were getting a bird's eye view, you don't really see it, but at an at-grade view you would understand that the bridge as shown here has a very steep descent from Commonwealth Avenue, and then you would have a very steep ascent. I would say the footing of that actually, if it extended further, wouldn't necessarily need to be a four and a half grade. That would make it more accessible and not a red herring for why you wouldn't be able to raise the profile. I think you can do a bit more work there to understand that the footing of the bridge as it goes to BU really needs to connect closer to Commonwealth Avenue.

My real point is on the Cambridge Street overpass. I appreciate that you're looking at it now since we've been having it in limbo for seven years. I am very concerned that you're calling it a preservation project because I think it's a badly designed bridge from the 60's and why should we preserve a crappy design that's 60 years old. We don't need to preserve poor sightlines or poorly designed bridges. We're redesigning an entire interchange with a billion plus dollars, let's not make this as crappy as it is today and just remake it as bad. I do appreciate that you're putting

in a cycle track and Complete Streets safety for all users. I do appreciate that. My assumption is by not changing the actual structure of the bridge and you're keeping the same footings, then you can't redesign where the track layout is. If you can't redesign where the track layout is, as we heard in prior meetings, that means that there might not be the space for a pathway, which we've been calling the People's Pike, the linear park we're hoping to get along the southern edge of the project. My question is that an assumption you're running on? Or does the People's Pike have the potential to exist, even if the Cambridge Street Bridge is not rebuilt and the footings aren't replaced?

A: Mike O'Dowd: Hi Galen, good to see you again. So as far as the preservation work that's being undertaken at Cambridge Street in the locations of the footings and foundations, our decision to not move forward with the buffer path is not driven by the location of the foundations of footings of Cambridge Street as it currently stands. Our decision to go forward with preservation and retaining the existing foundations, footings, and the superstructure other than the deck replacement itself is based upon the conditions and the assessment of it, and the ability for it to be able to withstand all the future loading conditions over the next several decades.

C: Glen Berkowitz: Just to be clear, Galen is talking about something called the People's Pike, which is meant to be a multi-use path along the southern edge of this project. It was always able to be provided. I'm told the project team working with the MBTA created this thing called an express track that came midway through the last seven years of planning. Many of us out here in the audience still don't understand why an express track is needed, but we do know this, it's possible to keep the design speed that you all want under Cambridge Street without having the express track if you curve it to the northeast so that it can still maintain a higher rate of speed as it goes through the new West Station. We have been told by some consultants that are not part of the project team but are at least as knowledgeable and as good as those already on the project team, that if you change the location of an abutment and or a pier holding up Cambridge Street, you could increase the design speed as it curves towards West Station. We have talked about this numerous times with the project team, but we've never seen any analysis. That said, you can't do what I just described, and it really behooves MassDOT, Mr. Project Manager, we think, that you give a serious analysis to eliminating the express track, maintain a relatively high speed that is desired for whatever reason, until you then, by your own admission tonight have to reduce it to 50 miles an hour when you go through the Throat. If it takes relocating a pier or an abutment of a really old bridge that was built 100% in mind with opening the Mass Pike and 0% in mind with fitting into the abutting residential neighborhoods, then we would probably all agree that you should include that. Here you are saying you're not going to do any pier or abutment work. You're just going to rebuild to preserve the existing things Galen and

others mentioned and we've never seen any analysis that says you can't keep the high speed, eliminate the express track, and put back the People's Pike if you just do a pier or an abutment change. And that's why I don't think what was said was accurate. Thank you for letting me at least speak to that.

Q: Galen Mook: Mike, are you planning on moving forward with designing the People's Pike pathway?

A: Mike O'Dowd: The buffer path that's been referred to in previous context and previous meetings? We're not anticipating moving forward with that unless there is a change in heart, change in concepts.

Q: No Name Given: Does the existing bridge preclude that?

A: Mike O'Dowd: Now, as I said earlier, it does not.

Q: Galen Mook: What reasons are you not pursuing that pathway?

A: Mike O'Dowd: I will have to consult with the MBTA on that. The MBTA does not want to move forward with that buffered path. The idea that has been presented to us is the location of the express track is in similar alignment to where the buffer path would be. We're not intending to move forward with the buffer path.

C: Fred Salvucci: This is Fred Salvucci, commenting on this same set of issues. You're supposed to do an environmental impact statement to figure out what the vision is, what you're going to do. You're going to work on it for seven years, and then you do a design preserving a crappy bridge, to quote my friend Galen, is nuts. You certainly shouldn't be designing the bridge before you've completed the environmental impact statement.

To echo some of the comments, the People's Pike is a very big deal. The buffer park is a requirement that the MBTA has an obligation to do based on this South Station EIS, to buffer the vibration and noise on the community to the south of this. It's outrageous. The MBTA would zoom in from the moon and say we want a track here, taking no recognition of the fact that they have an obligation they committed in this South Station EIS to do mitigation. That's outrageous. We need a game plan, and that's what the EIS is supposed to provide.

There's a lot of interest, a lot of us believe that the Cambridge Street bypass is essential to make this work. The Cambridge Street bypass has to intersect with the Cambridge Street overpass at a flat grade, or it would be absurd. The existing Cambridge Street should not be preserved. We

need a serious environmental impact statement that includes the buffer park, includes the Cambridge Street bypass, includes the People's Pike and mid-block crossings, and it's got to be integrated into one whole. If it is then possible to extract some action on the bridge for early action, that would be nice.

Glen pointed out the problem of the verticals. It's not just that the verticals in their current locations appear to constrain the kind of speed the MBTA might want. There could be a win-win if this is worked out without the constraints of that, but we've asked going back several years for the constructability analysis. Doing the major project requires that the Turnpike do some complicated acrobatics in order to maintain traffic on the Turnpike while all this other stuff is getting built. It would be a miracle if the current verticals aren't in the way of that kind of relocation. It is in the interest of a serious constructability plan that the Cambridge Street Bridge be reconceptualized with the vertical supports as something that can vary. It may be that miraculously, the Cambridge Street Bridge as was conceived several years ago without changing the verticals, can accommodate all of these issues that were not anticipated 60 - 70 years ago when the damn thing was built. It would be a real miracle. I believe in some miracles; I don't believe in that one.

The EIS has to be done first and then you do the design for the Cambridge Street Bridge. It's got to be done in a holistic way that accommodates the bypass, the People's Pike, the buffer park, and the constructability of the straightening of the existing Turnpike, which, and I'm preaching to the choir here, is atrocious with the spirals and the curves and the reverse curves and the roller coaster.

One of the major Purpose and Need items of this is to fix the Turnpike. If you go casting concrete, the preservation of that crappy old bridge, you're probably constraining the ability to fix the Turnpike which was one of your primary objectives to begin with. Sorry to be long winded, but please do the EIS first and then come up with the appropriate design for the Cambridge Street Bridge, which I strongly suspect would require changing the verticals that support it.

C: Jonathan Gulliver: Fred, thank you for your comments. That was a lot of information. I doubt we'll be able to address all of it at this time. I will tell you that I hear you. Part of the reason why we asked the team to really look at addressing this bridge on a separate path was to get it ahead of the bigger project which was a desire that we heard from this group. Certainly, we can go back and take another look to see if there's a way of doing this differently, but the project funding that we got for this project was specific to this Next Gen Bridge Program, which means we do have some funding limitations that we'll have to take a look at, but that in part was why we were

doing it now, we had the opportunity with the funding that we were presented to move it forward right now. We can reevaluate that, we can go back and take a look to make sure that there's no opportunities that we're closing down by moving forward with this now and maybe we should look at it as part of the bigger project again.

I think we're at that stage where we need to wrap up as we would for any of our public meetings. You can always email us your questions, and we will get back to you on those emails. Unfortunately, again, we have a hard stop tonight that we need to move out of here for. If people want to provide more comments or questions, we will try to address those as quickly as possible. I know there was a lot of information in this meeting, and even then, we had narrowed down the scope quite a bit. We have a meeting coming up on September 15. We'll try to get the room longer for that one. And, again, any questions you get in to us we will try to address as quickly as we can.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: We'll get the written questions from Zoom. Anybody who's still sitting there with your hand up, email those questions to us. Thank you, folks.

Q: No Name Given: Will you send us the questions and responses?

A: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Yes, we absolutely will. Thank you, everybody.

Next Steps

The next two Task Force meetings are scheduled for September 14 and October 21. These meetings will be of hybrid structure where attendees will have the option to join in-person or virtually.

Appendix 1: Meeting Attendees

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Wayne	Amico	VHB
Priscilla	Anderson	Harvard
Jay	Arcand	Community Member
Harris	Band	Harvard
George	Batchelor	MassDOT
James	Blackwell	Community Member
Joe	Blankenship	BPDA
Gregory	Boles	VHB
Ruth	Bonsignore	Fink Consulting
Norman	Brown	Bayside Engineering
Nate	Cabral-Curtis	Howard Stein Hudson
Tricia	Carney	Community Member
Jean	Charles	Howard Stein Hudson
Jack	Corrigan	Community Member
Bill	Deignan	City of Cambridge
Rita	DiGiovanni	Community Member
Anthony	D'Isidoro	Allston Civic Association
Stacey	Donahoe	MassDOT
Tom	Donald	VHB
Dan	Fielding	MassDOT
Mark	Fobert	TetraTech
David	Garriepy	Tremont Strategies
Dennis	Giombetti	RCN
Jacquelyn	Goddard	MassDOT
Mark	Handley	Harvard
Niki	Hastings	VHB
Sandy	Hoover	TetraTech
Marc	Kadish	Allston Board of Trade

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Stephen	Kaiser	Community Member
Hannah	Kane	Massachusetts House of Representatives
Kane	Larin	Charles River Alliance of Boaters
Elizabeth	Leary	Boston University
David	Loutzenheiser	MAPC
Francis	Mahady	FXM
Pallavi	Mande	Urban Idea Lab
Harry	Mattison	Task Force Member
John	McQueen	WalkBoston
Jen	Migliore	Office of Representative Moran
Heather	Miller	Charles River Watershed Association
Galen	Mook	MassBike
Rebecca	Morgan	CTPS
Hayes	Morrison	MassDOT
Pam	Mullaney	Office of Councilor Breadon
Paul	Mulroney	Community Member
Tom	Nally	A Better City
Conor	Newman	Office of Neighborhood Services
Albert	Ng	Harvard
Emily	Norton	Charles River Watershed Association
Ari	Ofsevit	LiveableStreets Alliance
Cassandra	Orszulak	HDR
Etty	Padmodipoetro	Urban Idea Lab
Jeff	Parenti	DCR
Josh	Parkinson	Community Member
Jennifer	Pieszak	Community Member
John	Pourbaix	Construction Industries of Massachusetts
Tad	Read	BPDA
Erin	Reed	Howard Stein Hudson
George	Richards	Community Member

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Olivia	Richards	VHB
Jessica	Robertson	Task Force Member
Bob	Seay	WGBH
Patrick	Snyder	Boston University
Alex	Strysky	DCR
Daniel	Sullivan	MassDOT
Ellen	White	HNTB
John	Wicks	WSP
Katie	Woodcock	VHB
Fred	Yalouris	City of Cambridge Community Representative

Appendix 2: Zoom Text Questions

1. Joe Blankenship - Could folks that are in person speak into a microphone please?

2. Heather Miller - On the floodplain issue: when were FEMA maps for this area last updated? Also, we know that FEMA maps look at historical conditions only, they often do not reflect current conditions and definitely do not reflect future predicted conditions - current data will be necessary to determine present flooding risk, and future projections will be necessary to understand risk going forward.

3. Joe Blankenship - Thank you!

4. Heather Miller - The slide covering "Refinements Previously Assessed" indicates that removal of travel lanes has already been assessed - can you point us to exactly where we can find that analysis?

5. Heather Miller - On the modified at-grade cross section, what is the difference in elevation between the 100-yr flood line and SFR? Would be very helpful if a vertical scale was provided in addition to the widths.

6. Heather Miller - In the current modified at-grade alternative, there doesn't appear to be space for stormwater treatment, either in terms of adequate subsurface space or space between lanes to treat runoff. What are the plans to assure stormwater drainage and conveyance under all relevant river water level scenarios and precipitation scenarios?

7. John McQueen - Please address the design for the Bridge Approaches...entry and release points for all modes...which per APB protocols are part of the bridge scope.

8. Patrick Snyder - I just want to say that I agree with Emily Norton that the lane reduction should be considered, and even implemented, for congestion reduction and climate change mitigation. It would also help with the logistical layout that the project is currently struggling with.

9. John McQueen – Thanks.