
To: Mike O'Dowd
MassDOT Project Manager

Date: December 8, 2019

From: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis
Howard Stein Hudson

HSH Project No.: 2013061.14

Subject: MassDOT
Allston I-90
NEPA Brighton Public Information Meeting
Meeting Notes of November 7, 2019

Overview

On November 7th, 2019, a public meeting was held for the I-90 Multimodal Project. The meeting took place between 6:30-8:30 p.m. in the Brighton High School which has been used by the I-90 Allston project teams for meetings in past in recognition of the fact that the project has impacts on Brighton as well. The meeting was originally slated to run from 6:30 p.m.-8:30 p.m. but was cut short by a power failure which left Brighton High School and several surrounding buildings without electricity. While all attending members of the public had enjoyed an opportunity to speak, commentary by attending members of the I-90 Allston Task Force was delayed until a multi-hour, daytime workshop the following week. The meeting was held to introduce meeting attendees to the contents of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) Scoping Report, provide an overview of the ongoing federal environmental permitting process for the I-90 Allston project, and outline the process for members of the public to comment on the report document.

Public comments from the audience were concerned with several topics including concerns over impacts to the Worcester Mainline and Grand Junction Line with particular focus on the possibility of needing to reduce the Worcester Mainline to a single track through the project zone during a significant part of construction. Several audience members offered possible mitigation strategies for the period of single tracked service. Other comments focused on impacts to the Charles River and air quality during construction. Many public comments did however strike a relatively positive tone thanking the project team for their work in evolving the design since the last time it had been shared with a broad range of community members during presentation of the DEIR in 2017 and 2018.

Agenda

- I. Opening Remarks
- II. Project Background
- III. Alternatives Under Consideration
- IV. Construction Impacts
- V. Next Steps
- VI. Question and Answers

Detailed Meeting Minutes¹

Welcome & Opening Remarks

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Good evening everyone. If folks can take their seats folks. So, thank you for being here with us. The technical difficulties are building wide according to the janitor. So, some of this buildings' electric systems are not on, but we've managed to find enough of them that are that we could do this meeting. So, before I begin, I would like to recognize the following officials: Senator Brownsburg, thank you for being here. Representative Honan, thank you for being here. And also standing, Representative Kane. Thank you for being here. Okay, so I have the first couple of slides. Let's make sure this is on.

So, while I'm making this work, my name is Nathaniel Curtis. I am the project's Public Involvement Specialist. I work for Howard Stein Hudson. We are under contract with MassDOT to provide outreach services. This is the agenda for tonight. We're going to go through the scoping report, what's in it, how you interact with it, and how to leave your comment on it. The meeting tonight is intended to introduce the scope of the report to the public. The scoping report is available for download on the MassDOT's website on the 2019 documents page. It has been present there since yesterday. It is for this project, a shorter document. So, you could have gotten through all of 130 pages yesterday if you wanted to, but you do not have to have done so to participate tonight. So, nobody's expecting everybody to have read the whole thing or necessarily part of it.

You're welcome to provide questions or comments about the scoping. We're going to do one of these again in Framingham on the 4th of December. So expect to see some outreach about that. We'll be going out a week after next just so that folks don't forget it. We'll put up the ways you submit them we'll get to those at the end. Those will be responded to after the conclusion of the scoping comment period. And scoping comment period closes on December 12th. That's when it ends.

So, the ground rules for tonight: we're going to ask you to hold your questions and comments to the end of the presentation. We do have a microphone here because it is a big room. So, for those of you who filled in the I Wish to Speak column at the end of the sign-in sheet, once we get to the end of this presentation, we'll ask if any elected officials would like to speak. Then we'll go through the yeses in the, "I Would Like to Speak" column, and then we'll go through hands. We have four, maybe five Task Force members for the I-90 Allston project present tonight. I'll ask

¹ Herein "C" stands for comment, "Q" for question and "A" for answer. For a list of attendees, please see Appendix 1. For copies of meeting flipcharts, please see Appendix 2.

Task Force members, just like we do in the general public meeting, we are going to hold you to the end just because we get to hang out with you for a solid four hours next week. So, in any case, I'm going to move this right along and then hand it off to Cassie Ostrander from Federal Highway who's going to walk you through the first part of the substance of the presentation. Looks like Cassie is passing this off to Melissa Toni, so it's actually going to be Melissa.

C: Melissa Toni: Hi everybody, my name is Melissa Toni I work for the Federal Highway Administration. And this is part of our scoping process. As Nate said, we are kicking off tonight and you see what we're going to be doing through this outline. We're starting with the introduction. This is what we'll be covering between me and Cassie Ostrander. We're going to be tag teaming this part of the presentation. These are the questions that we're going to answer: What is the purpose of scoping? What is the project? What is the project history? And then we'll go over a couple of other points. So, what is NEPA? It stands for the National Environmental Policy Act. It's a Federal Law that requires Federal Agencies to conduct environmental reviews and to consider the environmental effects of our actions.

The Federal Highway Administration as part of the United States Department of Transportation, is the lead Federal Agency for the project. So, we will typically establish a lead agency, which agency has the highest amount of responsibility. In this case it's an interstate highway, so that points straight to us. The regulations that we're following are twofold. There's the council of environmental quality's set of regulations. Those are the basic NEPA rules and there's Federal Highway regulations, the CPQ. It's a Council of Environmental Quality dictated to all Federal agencies that we have the set of our implementing regulations on how we individually as an agency handle NEPA, and so, we have Federal Highway regulations that spell out exactly what we're doing and how we're going to follow this procedure from start to finish. So, tonight again is the start of scoping. The NEPA Class of Action for this project is an environmental impact statement. That environmental impact statement involves several vooperating agencies and you can see their logo at the bottom of the page. I'll tell you what they are: Federal Highway, that's on the left, and then you have the US Army Corps of Engineers. They're responsible for issuing permits and regulating placement of fill in waters and placement of structures in waters. Next is the Environmental Protection Agency. Their main focus on this project would be the Clean Air Act. The ECP we may see as the advisory council on Historic Conservation. Then we have the US Coast Guard. Again, they're similar to the US Army Corps of Engineers in that they focus on bodies of water that have navigation in them and that would be the Charles River in this case. And then the U S Fish and Wildlife Service which we don't have up there, and the National Marine Fisheries Service, those two agencies in this case regulate endangered species.

These agencies are important for Federal Highway Administration in particular because we're operating under a different set of procedures that are fairly new. It's called One Federal decision. It's where we, as the lead agency, will be issuing a single Environmental Impact Statement culminating with what's called a record of decision or ROD. These cooperating agencies, if they have a permit to be issued, or not, like EPA isn't going to have an actual permitting being issued but they have comments to give us, they will be following along with us throughout the entire process. Before this there used to some separation in the processes. The One Federal Decision procedure unites all of the decisions of the agencies together as we move through the entire NEPA process. Now I'll pass it to Cassie to talk to us about the Scoping Document.

Review of the Scoping Document

C: Cassie Ostrander: Thank you Melissa. Good evening, I am Cassie Ostrander. I am an Environmental Protection Specialist with the Federal Highway Administration and as Melissa mentioned, I will be talking about scoping. So, let's just talk about NEPA. So, where did scoping come in? Scoping is required as part of the NEPA, National Environmental Protection Act whenever we're preparing any document or Environmental Impact Statement. For this project for here tonight we are kicking off the scoping process. I believe that report was published just yesterday so you all are just probably getting it in your hands for the first time.

As you'll see in the scoping record when you review, it includes information like the purpose of need, the preliminary alternatives considered, the project history and background. It will include information on state environmental processes that have occurred and the presentation will go into more detail on that. Essentially the scoping report outlines the central elements of the project and we're looking for feedback from you on the information in that report. We want help identifying any concerns, any issues, maybe any environment impacts that we missed. Maybe, something that we didn't see, that we didn't adequately address, and we want you to bring that to us now so that we can incorporate that and make sure that we're doing our due diligence as part of the Federal process.

In this slide, what I really wanted to show you was kind of where we're at right now in the NEPA process and development process as a whole. Step 1 of our job is to prepare a scoping report and seek public and agency comment. So that's where we're at today. We prepared that document, we're here, and we're asking for feedback. Step 2, we're going to take all your feedback into consideration, review it and then ultimately prepare a scoping summary report. So, those are very two different things. I know they sound pretty similar, but the scoping report initiates the scoping process and the scoping report technically includes the process, the scoping process. And now it's anticipated, I think for some time in March 2020 give or take. So again, this flow chart that you see with the two arrows that are on the screen that is where we're at. So, the point I'm making here is that we fit into the NEPA process and scoping is preliminary design. We are at conceptual phase of product development and we will be throughout the entire NEPA process. So, over the next two years we will be at the conceptual stage preliminary design. We're technically not allowed, Federal Highway, is not allowed to go to final design until we complete NEPA. So just wanted to make that point and that is all I have for scoping. So, I guess from here I will turn it over to get into detail of the actual report.

C: Sandy Hoover: Hi everyone. My name is Sandy Hoover, Project Environmental Scientist with Tetra Tech. So, I'm going to continue with the introduction of the Scoping report; I'll be walking you through most of it. This is our project area. The project is located in the Allston neighborhood of the city of Boston. So, this aerial is looking East and on the Western part of the project area you can kind of make out the project boundaries. We have the Franklin street pedestrian bridge as our boundary to the West, MBTA commuter rail to the South, way in the background where you just barely make it out if you can is the Commonwealth Avenue bridge which is our boundary to the East, and Cambridge street to the North. The major infrastructure elements to the project area include I-90, which carries around 40,000 vehicles every day, you also have Soldier's Field Road adjacent to the Paul Dudley White Path along the Charles River, within the Charles river reservation, and finally we have the Worcester mainline tracks, and the Grand Junction railroad within the project area as well and they serve as critical infrastructure for MBTA commuter rail and Amtrak operations.

As Cassie mentioned, scoping is kind of the 1st step in the NEPA process, but the state environmental review process has been ongoing for several years now. So still under MEPA, the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act, an environmental notification form was filed to the public on October of 2014. A certificate was issued in December of that year requiring MassDOT to prepare an environmental impact report for the project. That report was published in October of 2017. There was a coordinated place-making process with the Boston Planning and Development Authority (BPDA) which provided recommendations that the new interchange design would provide regional connections but also serve institutions, neighborhoods, and businesses. So, the recommendations from the BPDA report and public comment were used to further refine the design of the interchange that was analyzed in the Draft Environmental Impact Report, which was published in November of 2017. After publication of the DEIR, MassDOT convened an independent review team to prepare additional analysis of the throat area. I'll turn to that now.

The report of the independent review team was published October of 2018 and throughout the State Environmental Review process and moving forward in both the Federal and State Environmental Review processes, MassDOT has been and will be committed to a robust public involvement process, including public information meetings like today, as well as, meetings of the project Task Force. Nate kind of mentioned the Task Force a little bit. So, for you who don't know, the Task Force is comprised of state and local elected officials, representatives of key institutional stakeholders such as Harvard and Boston University, members of the Allston business community, local residents, and activists.

So, section 2 of the scoping report covers the purpose and need. So, before we go into the project specific purpose and need, I just want to outline what NEPA's purpose and need is and why is it important. The lead agency has the authority and responsibility to define the purpose need for purpose of the NEPA analysis. The purpose and need briefly specifies the underlying purpose and need to which the agency is responding and proposing it for, addressing the transportation deficiencies within the project area that will be addressed by the project and answers the question why this project is needed. So, without establishing a transportation need a project cannot be justified. It's the basis for the alternative assets and helps to find a reasonable range of alternatives to analyze, but it should not discuss or propose alternatives.

So, we'll start with the project need. These needs are divided into a couple different categories on the scoping report: roadway deficiencies, safety issues, rail limitations, mobility limitations, and transportation access. The project needs are those things that the proponent, MassDOT, proposes to address. On the roadway deficiencies, bridge inspection on the I-90 viaduct has shown that it is structurally deficient and there are interchange connections that are obsolete and not in conformance with current design guidelines. Safety issues include crash rates on I-90, the project area, which are higher than the statewide average for urban interstates. They are likely due in part to the substandard layout and geometry. Also, the intersection of Cambridge and Soldiers' Field Road is in the top 5% of the crash locations in the city. For rail operations, they are existing but functionally obsolete. They also constrain and limit commuter rail and Grand Junction Operations. There is a lack of multimodal connections on the Worcester mainline and other existing transit modes, while short and long-term ridership is increasing, existing layover capacity on the MBTA South side system is currently deficient.

Mobility limitations and transportation access. There is a deficient level of service, delay or queuing at many intersections. The Paul Dudley White Path has sections that have substandard widths to accommodate the increasing mixed bicycle and pedestrian use on the path. The height and position of existing I-90 viaduct limits opportunities for the public to access the Charles River

Reservation and existing infrastructure multimodal access to the rest of project area. So, our project purpose then is to address the overall deficiency and the safety issues of I-90 mainline and the interchange. The project will also include rail infrastructure and multi-modal access within the project.

Section 3 covers project alternatives. Before I get into project specific alternatives, I want to go review the alternative development process in NEPA. So, starting with the top box, with the scoping, that's where we are today. During scoping MassDOT developed its screening process and criteria for proposed alternatives. We then solicit public comment on scoping report, including alternatives therein. Step 2 would be to develop a Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the project. So, based on the public comments that we received during scoping, we'll identify what alternatives were to carry forward into the DEIS for further analysis. At this point in the DEIS MassDOT is selecting its preferred alternative. When the DEIS comes out, MassDOT look to solicit public input and comment through public hearings.

The step after that to develop a Draft Environmental Impact Statement and recommend a decision for the project. In that document, MassDOT would identify the multimodal alternative for the project. Then, in accordance with One Federal Decision that Melissa mentioned earlier, we would work to acquire public input within 90 days after publication of this document. At this time, MassDOT and Federal Highway have now developed evaluation criteria for the project or proposed alternatives. The primary criteria are the purpose and need. If a proposed alternative doesn't meet the purpose need or only partially meets the purpose and need, if it only addresses a couple of the needs, but not all of the needs in the purpose need, then it would be deemed unreasonable for the project and we will not carry that forward into the DEIS for further analysis. If a proposal does fully meet the purpose and need, we would evaluate it against the secondary criteria and alternatives that meet both purpose and need. For the second criteria, we would carry it forward to the DEIS for further analysis. So, secondary criteria include construction logistics, environmental impacts, traffic operations, rail operation, cost, and schedule. So, there's a lot more detail on this than the report itself, about all the alternatives and the screening criteria.

Our preliminary alternatives for the project, and again, this is for the entire project area, include the no build, the major rehabilitation alternative, and the re-aligning alternative with options which we've dubbed 3L. So just really briefly as to why this is called 3L. As I mentioned earlier, with State and Federal Environmental Review process has been ongoing for several years and that includes along these 3-alternative developments in refinement. I'm starting way back with ENF back in 2014. So, the last interchange design alternative that was reviewed was the 3K. Some further refinement has been made to the 3K alternative and that's why it's now the 3L. Again, there's a lot more about the history of that evolution. This re-alignment alternative includes two infrastructure elements with design options near the throat area. For West Station rail options, which I'll get to in a minute.

First, the no-build option: this preserves activities such as safety and maintenance improvements to maintain continued operation of the existing interchange. So, this is exactly what's being done today. I can tell you right now that doesn't meet our purpose and need. However, it's a really important part of both the NEPA and MEPA processes, and certainly the baseline for which the impacts of other alternatives can be compared.

Next up is major rehabilitation replacement alternative. So, this includes structural replacement of the I-90 viaduct. Additionally, we are looking at a rehabilitation of the substructure resulting in similar structure as the existing conditions. So, with this alternative the highway will not be

realigned and the interchange will not be reconfigured. In this alternative the project has West Station located on the existing Worcester mainline tracks on the Southern end of the site, the layover area, which is to the North of West station. We'd reconstruct Cambridge Street as a complete street, provide dedicated pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure, realign Soldiers' Field Road to open more open space on the river and Paul Dudley White Path, reconfigure the railroad, and implement a multi-modal bus station.

This is a draft figure of the overall 3L alternative and like I said, there's a lot more details regarding this alternative and all the other alternatives in the scoping report. But I kind of want to draw your attention to two specific areas right now. These are the throat area and the West station. So, this is the area and you can tell why it's called the throat, it's the very narrow section of the project area between the Charles River and Boston University. We're currently have the Worcester Mainline, Grand Junction Rail, Soldiers' Field Road, and the Paul Dudley White Path all Sandwiched between the Charles River and Boston University with I-90 elevated over the rail. The entire area is about 210 feet wide, and therefore presents a particularly unique and challenging design constraint on the project. Then this area here, which is where West Station will be located. Each station option within the 3L alternative will provide the station with access to Worcester Mainline Tracks and provision of layover space.

So, we'll start with the throat area. There are 3 design options here: the highway viaduct, the at-grade, and Soldier's Field Road hybrid. The highway viaduct option is most similar to what's out there today. You have I-90 elevated over rail adjacent to Soldiers' Field Road and the Paul Dudley White Path. The at-grade option consists of all of infrastructure elements I-90, rail, Soldiers Field Road, and Paul Dudley White Path at, or below grade. Then finally you have the Soldiers' Field Road hybrid option, which is kind of the middle ground between the highway viaduct and the at grade. It consists of Soldiers Field Road on a smaller viaduct, at or below grade I-90 and all other infrastructure elements will also be at or below grade of I-90. So, this would result in several infrastructure elements being lower from what's out there today.

Next slide is West Station. There are 3 design options here as well. The DEIR layout, the Flip Layout, and the Modified Flip. The DEIR layout is actually what I described for the major rehab alternative for the whole project. West Station would be located on existing Worcester Mainline tracks. With the rail layover yard area located to the North of West Station. So, the flip version reverses those two positions. This is West Station in the North. The rail layover yard to the South. This also includes a Cambridge Street bypass. The modified flip sort of splits the difference between those two options and puts less of extreme bend in the tracks. It offers two express tracks which allow trains to bypass West Station and universal access into the layover yard. There's a lot more information in the scoping report. There is also more information about all the alternatives and options for both West Station and the Throat Area.

The purpose of Section 4 of the scoping report is to describe the methods that will be used to assess the impacts of those alternatives we've deemed to be reasonable. In section 3, when we discussed alternatives, I mentioned screening criteria. The criteria are used to determine of what propose alternatives are reasonable. These methods are going to be used to assess the potential impacts that those reasonable alternatives. Okay, so this section is organized by research categories that we'll be considering doing and environmental. Some of which I have included here, this is just a small sample. I think the scoping report covers around 20 resource categories, to give you an idea of what's included. This section also describes Federal and State legislation that will be satisfied by the environmental review, and Federal and State permits and approval that will be required for the project.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Thank you very much. We are very close to the end now. There is an agency coordination plan as part of the scoping document should you want to look at it. Basically, what that does is outlines how the various agencies MassDOT, FHWA, and other State and Federal Agencies are going to coordinate their efforts during this process. There is a public involvement plan which lays out what we'll be doing in terms outreach during the Federal process in which we are engaged, that's appendix C. The plan describes the policies that guide public involvement and lays out what we'll be doing in terms of meetings, where documents will be available, etc.

I'll next discuss some project milestones. The most recent one that took place is on November the 6th, which was yesterday. That's when the scoping report was published on MassDOT's website. The completion of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement is anticipated in January 2021, which will be followed up by the Final Environmental Impact Statement and record of decision in October of that year. Then the various permits, licenses and approvals that are dependent on the Record of Decision follow in January of 2022. So, what comes of next? We will collect all comments between now and the 12th of December. MassDOT will be able to summarize and respond to them in the Scoping Summary Report, which falls after the conclusion of the scoping comment period.

For those of you who've been in this process since the start, the DEIS will read a lot like the DEIR, but to give you a preview, what the DEIS does is it describes potential impacts of the alternative that are being looked at. It looks at mitigation strategies for impacts that cannot be avoided. It identifies as the preferred alternative and there will be an appropriate, public forum associated with giving comments on that as well as the comment period. Then the Final Environmental Impact Statement and the record of decision comes towards the end of 2021, which identifies a selective alternative and expands on the plans for mitigation.

We do have additional meetings coming up. There are 2 Task Force meetings that are scheduled. Those were scheduled already. If folks would like to attend one of those, they're welcome to do so. Those are open to members of the public. However, we tend to use them for Task Force businesses since they are task force meetings. There will then be a sort of re-run of what we're doing tonight on Wednesday, December 4th. In the same 6:30 to 8:30 time frame being done in the Dunning Elementary school at 48 Frost Street in Framingham.

Don't feel compelled to hastily take photographs of the link or try to write it down. If you Google I-90 Allston, our site is the first thing that comes up. Just look for the 2019 the documents page, this is at the top. There is also a copy of the scoping FAQ, which you could pick up on your way in and then a link to a FHWA page explaining what One Federal Decision is and how that works. There are also hard copies of the Scoping Report available. There's one at the Copley Library downtown, the main branch. There's one in the Brookline branch library near City Hall. The one closest to the project site is at Honan-Allston. There's one in the Central Square Branch, in the Cambridge Public Library, which is the closest location to the project in Cambridge. There's one at DCR's offices on Causeway Street. We have put a copy in the Framingham Public Library and a copy in the Worcester Public Library. There is also a copy in the Brighton-Faneuil branch as well, which is just up the road from here.

So again, as we've mentioned a couple of times, December 12 is the end of the comment period. It is a 37-day comment period. Comments can come to the I-90 Allston email address, which is right there on the screen behind me. Or if you want to send them in by mail, you can send them to one of those two addresses, to Federal Highway's Jeff McEwan or to our project manager at MassDOT, Mike O'Dowd. So, I'm going to leave that one up, because at this point, we are moving

on to question and answer. Before we do, I will offer elected leaders a chance to speak. There's a microphone at the front of the auditorium so come on down to make your comments since this is such a large space. So, Senator or Representatives?

Public Comment Period

C: Representative Kevin Honan: Thank you very much. I appreciate you having the meeting here. I also want to welcome my colleague from the 11th Worcester district Representative Hannah Kane. Thank you for all your work on this project. I've had the privilege of testifying on this both in writing and at public forums with my colleagues Senator Brownsberger, Representative Moran, and Councilor Mark Ciommo. One of the issues we've always prioritized is West Station. You mentioned that we have a 150,000 cars coming through our neighborhoods of Allston and Brighton and there is so much more development, obviously proposed once the I-90 is straightened out. So, it's going to be a lot more people working in this area, living in this area. So, it's pretty critical, as Secretary Salvucci would tell you to upgrade public transit in our neighborhood. We're also very excited about the opportunities along the Charles River, the park, the path, and those locations would be a tremendous benefit for our community.

But again, with all those cars coming through our neighborhood and the capacity for more cars to come through with the additional development, we'd really like to see some mass transit improvements in the area, with the West Station. Thank you so much.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Thank you very much. Okay. All right, so, unless any of our other two elected officials would like to take a swing at it, I'm going to start calling folks down to the microphone. And again, as just say we're going to go with four members of the general public first and then we'll move on to taskforce members and then we'll move on to folks who maybe decided if they wanted to speak after they filled in the sheet. Let's start off with Steve Kaiser, Anne Lusk, and Fred Salvucci.

C: Steve Kaiser: Okay. I'm Steve Kaiser and I'm from Cambridge. I'm impressed by many of the organizational elements that you showed us tonight in your review process. But there are some rough edges I'd like to point out.

The next task force meeting is the December 11th, which is one day before the deadline for comments on the scope. What I'd like to request is that Federal Highway to just give one more week of public comment so that the Task Force on the 11th can talk about what's been said here tonight, at the Dunning School in December, and then receive really informed comments on the 19th. I think that would be a useful change in the schedule. The scoping report refers to evaluation of the alternatives based on their permanent impact. Permanent. So I ask what about the temporary impacts? Such as the viaducts, such as single track Commuter Rail, or shutting down the Grand Junction Line, those are all temporary but are very, very important and should be included in the EIS.

Finally, I think your alternatives as you've written them out in the Report, are very muddy and unclear. You really have to study them as to what's being recommended here as part of the EIS. Now maybe I read this wrong, but what I mean is that there's only two alternatives here. One is the shows one version of the wall and the other is called the hybrid version, which has the Soldiers Field Road over the Eastbound turnpike. Now in effect, you are abandoning the outbound/Westbound version, which I think makes sense. The Westbound version had signing problems. I don't see a real value of including it here since Eastbound has the biggest advantages.

What the fascinating thing is that the preferred alternative of the draft EIR from 2 years ago is not recommended for the study. That was the original viaduct. I think that's solid change, but I'd like to see it included because if it's in the EIS it would demonstrate why we are desiring to go from another plan with the highway viaduct. So keep that widened because it was preferred the last time around. And other thing is in this lengthy debate, some of us have had, Fred has mentioned it, Jack Wofford has the difference between 6 versus 8 lanes on the turnpike. I've never, never seen traffic congested in those lanes. The bottle necks out there, they are at 2 other locations. I think, in particular Newton Corner, which is only 6 lanes. There is enough space to merge. So, if you take out two lanes, you've got enough room to continue traffic as is. Therefore, I would like to see the lane reductions alternative included in the EIS. Thank you.

C: Anne Lusk: Anne Lusk, Harvard School of Public Health. I want to challenge all of you when you go forward with this plan. Many of us in this room are old enough that we were around NEPA was created and also when the EIS was created, so we know those very difficult beginnings of those regulations and also the intent of the regulations. We all recently heard that climate change has now been upgraded to an emergency, and I urge all of you to take that siren call and be extremely progressive. Look beyond NEPA, look beyond the EIS, pretend that you're the authors of those early documents and understand that you have a new challenge because climate change is an emergency.

I saw air quality was in one of the boxes in the criteria, but now we have completely different issues about air quality than we did before. It's a critical issue. Can we lessen the number of lanes? All of us in this room are also trying to increase the numbers of electric vehicles but we have a huge issues of where do we have the electrical vehicles recharged, because we have so many cars parked on the side of the road. Many of us would like to have bus rapid transit, but we have so many cars parked on the side of the road. We would like to have cycle paths, but we have so many cars parked on the side of the road. So again, I challenge all of you. Imagine that you're writing beyond MEPA, beyond the EIS, and authors in Boston have new guidelines that respond to the emergency of climate change. Thank you.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Fred, you got it.

C: Fred Salvucci: Before I make my public comment, I want to congratulate the presenters tonight. You took something really complicated and explained it tonight so that you can understand it. And I think the written document is very good in terms of making it clear and what we're. And we can commend the quality of the work in that sense. There are a couple of inconsistencies that I have to ask you to clarify, but let me talk through the basics. On the purpose and need, there are things left out on the purpose and need that I think really belong there. At the very first meeting beginning back in 2014 at the Jackson Mann, the very first speaker, Representative Honan, said in his first point said that we need to reconnect Allston to Allston. This community's been divided by the railroad line for about 150 years and another 60 by cars. This is a chance of two centuries to fix it and fix it right and I think that connectivity issue needs to be in the in the purpose and need. There's a hint of in terms of needing to connect the need to connect to the river, but the community needs to be connected. I think that needs to be added to the purpose and need. The second issue that needs to be in the purpose and need is to look at a need for a program to maintain mobility throughout the construction program. Generally speaking, people think that the Environmental Impact Statement as something where you're trying to deal with and now, we're telling you in the future, before and afterwards it's important, but with a project this complex, the situation has much more importance than it does on many projects. So, things like reducing rail to a single track. We lived with a single track for about 50 years since the I-90 was built and it hasn't been nice. It was the most unreliable

commuter rail line that the MBTA operated because of two factors: the single track only able to move trains in or out, but not both, and the use of CSX as the dispatcher. They thought it was cute to send the freight trains out during peak hours. So they were really the two factors, the single track was a terrible curse, but the lack of control dispatcher was a problem, too. That got fixed a few years back by cooperative effort: MassDOT, Harvard University, the then Lieutenant Governor Murray, who put a lot of work in Worcester. We ended up with a win. Worcester wanted a relocated train yard. Everyone here wanted it out of here. By moving the freight yard it was possible to get two track operation and MBTA gained control of dispatching. And as you do note in this report, ridership has grown dramatically since. You don't cite the change in the single track and the dispatching, but it is the fastest growing commuter rail line in the system because that was corrected.

That applies to this situation I think in two ways. One, it's important to sketch the trajectory to see how many more people in the normal course would be using rail 8 to 10 years from now. It's at least another 25%, if you just do a straight-line projection, it's probably closer to 50% more people. So, the disruption in going to a single-track operation for close to a decade is horrendous to think of in terms of the existing when you think about the growth, it's really a big, big deal. So, I think that the purpose of using the term making it into a mobility program as opposed to a mitigation program. Because mitigation is used for a lot of things that, you know, propagates aesthetic, propagates ecological issues in the river, I think these issues are important, I'm not trying to downplay that, but the maintenance of mobility is critical. I think it needs to be in the purpose and need.

The one thing I think that does not belong in purpose and confounds for a lot of objectives is the layover. We've had for 150 years the freight yard that ruined our community. We don't want it back. It is not simple from an operational point of view, every train that's going to the layover needs to have the equipment to provide service, and then extra switching that makes the rail less efficient than it would have been. So, layover is a direct attack on the quality of service. I believe anybody who's got their head around a difficult system would not dream to allow the layover to operate until the project is done because it would so screw up the construction. I haven't seen that in writing. I've had a lot of side conversations, with people that have said "yeah, that would be nutty." But I'd like to see that in writing. If you're not going to do it for 10 years and solve the problem some other way, then you can live without forever.

The Fiscal Control Board last week basically shifted in the direction of an aspirational 15-minute frequency. I'd like to that aspiration achieved. As my friend Ari will share later let's spend the money moving trains that serve people, not parking trains. It's not just the money that the layover costs. It's so complicates the operation and it screws up a lot of the other objectives that you're after. There is also another statement that's inaccurate. It's not quite accurate. It talks about MBTA's easement rights to a certain amount of land in an agreement with Harvard. That is accurate. That is not the right to build. The South Station Environmental Impact Statement from a few years ago, laid out very clearly that layover in Allston was going to have an environment process that would be separate. That still hasn't happened yet.

I think we should keep our eye on the ball here. By dropping the layover we should be able to accomplish some intermediate objectives that are very, very important. One is you can get an at-grade six lane temporary turnpike much sooner than if you didn't do that. That means you can tear down the viaduct before it falls people. And that viaduct in in terrible shape. So, by doing it in a manner that makes you construct it more reasonably would greatly help you achieve major milestones. It would also spell out in terms of its timing implications; I think in the purpose and need. It also I suspect being able to return a connection to the Grand Junction earlier and to

West Station earlier if you follow through on the construction sequence to be shown for the throat.

Those are also very important milestones. The early that you can return the use of Grand Junction for the rail budget and for the operations of the T. And while Grand Junction is suspended is now the time to get the Grand Junction across the Charles, build the two tracks, and bicycle and pedestrian connections so that when the project construction is done, it's really done and you set it up for a future where rail can carry a much greater number of people. The much greater number of people who want to use it. For a Highway Project there's no projection here on what happens to demand? The city's growing. The government is growing more and as more people try out their trips, they don't fit on the roads, they have to fit on the rail and that analysis I think will help inform problem before us. I would strongly suggest that the Grand Junction connection needs to be part of this project and built at the same time so that it's effectively integrated and you can run some really good service maybe before the construction but certainly afterward.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Thank you sir. Okay, so, it's a remarkably small number of general public folks who have elected to speak. Are there any members of the general public, not Task Force members, who would like to say something before I start bringing Task Force members down to the microphone? Now would be the time to put your hand up if you would like to. Otherwise I can take the Task Force members now.

C: Wig Zamore: I can wait.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: No, it's all right, this is the way we do it.

C: Wig Zamore: All right. Thank you. My name's Wig Zamore and I'm from Somerville.

I defer first to local folks in with regards to impacts around this project. I've been involved in regional planning oversight at the T and MassPort for quite a few years. As a citizen member of the oversight board I wanted to make a few comments, mostly on the environmental aspects that are being considered. So, I've got them ordered. So, the first one, I just want to make a brief comment, on noise. Noise has been an issue in the US pretty much since the EPA was handcuffed in regard to it many decades ago, but that's not true in rest of the world, and there's an excellent World Health Organization Europe report on noise and it has great guidance on noise impacts and what limits should be considered with regard to the impact on the public and it's easily found by Google. It's only a year or two old and it's really a success. A lot of systematically awful cardiovascular impacts, learning disabilities, sleep disturbance. So, I'd urge folks working on the project to look at that now. Now I'm going to switch to air pollution a little bit, which I focused on as an Environmental Epidemiology Scientist working with the research universities here for little over a decade.

So, the first thing I want to say is that there's a lot of confusion about the difference between regional fine particles which are PM 2.5 and regional ozone and local level fine particles. They are completely different, and the concentration patterns are completely different. Fine particles are regulated, and they have a regional pattern not a local pattern and we've done fairly well at getting them under control. Ultra-fine particles that are not regulated however, and they're measured in billions of a meter instead of millions of a meter that only exist in very high concentrations near large transportation sources that burn petroleum, so, gasoline or diesel. There are real health effects from those. We have shown statistically significant relationship between all the fine particles from transportation in the Boston area and bio-marks of cardiovascular problems. So that science, it's not a regulatory thing, but that is the case. So, I

just wanted to bring it up and make sure that people do not confuse those two because they are completely different.

A footnote to that is that the EPA, a particulate matter integrated science assessment has been on the street for a couple of months. This is part of the five-year-old review particulate matter standards. It's a staff produced document and very thorough at 1,881 pages. They have suggested that ultra-fine particles are likely to be causal for neurological effects. So, if you combine the known cardiovascular relationships and now the more emerging science of the neurological effects, it's something that you really should be considering. So, diesel and gasoline, both generate toxic particles. I assume the commuter rail has been diesel for a long time here and like Fred I applaud the move to try to get to an electrified commuter rail that is more frequent. It would be spectacular. At the same time, diesel is a problem on both ends of the spectrum. It generates toxic particles. Gasoline generates a lot of toxic particles in the winter, not so much as diesel in the summer. Just to conclude that certainly we here in Boston and others that emphasize walking and biking include locations as possible of electrified trains must be our number one goal for the state. Thank you.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Okay, very good. That's everyone who checked the "I wish to speak box" who is not a task force member. Any hands? Yes, Mary go ahead and after that we'll have Pallavi, Jessica, and Glen.

C: Mary Connauton: Thank you very much and thank you for preparing this scoping document. It's really valuable to have that information available. There are a couple of questions that I have though. One, when we talked about that there'll be some construction phases where we'll be down to a single track, the Worcester line down to a single track. I was hoping you'd be more specific in actually what that meant in terms of prior to that so people that get the constraint. Honestly, people from MetroWest, Worcester, and Central Massachusetts that pick that line will see a major impact on our ability to work. Understanding what that would mean in the document would be great. Additionally, the document doesn't disclose the construction duration period for each of the alternatives.

The document doesn't include any estimation of the cost of each of the various alternatives. I think that's important to be in consideration as cost can conflict with construction and the life cycle costs of the assets. So, understanding the duration of each alternative, their cost, life cycle cost, and what these elements mean for when the construction phases bring us down to a single track.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Having conferred with our friends from FHWA, this document does not contain that information, but future documents will. So, we are capturing that. I know you've spoken at our public information meetings over the summer. I know those are things that you're interested in. So that's not in here, but it will be in the future documents that I mentioned, subsequent to this.

C: Pallavi Mande, Charles River Watershed Association: One piece that I want to hopefully see in the scoping determination is how NEPA is going to be looking at a project that includes 8 to 10 years of temporary pack versus a permanent condition. Because in our view those two pieces are intrinsically interconnected in terms of when transitions go from being temporary to permanent. When you do look at a permanent condition for the river there has to be a different level assessment of what that means. So that was my first piece. I was pleased to note that in the

purpose of need we have the access to the Charles River reservation as an explicit articulation of what we would expect to see as part of this project.²

Next Steps

The next public meeting to discuss the Scoping Report will be held on December 4, 2019 at the Dunning Elementary School in Framingham. The next meeting of the I-90 Allston Task Force will be on November 13, 2019 at the Fiorentino Community Center at 123 Antwerp Street in Brighton. This will be a four hour, daytime workshop from 2:00 p.m. to 6:00 p.m.

² At this point, power to Brighton High School and several surrounding buildings was lost and the auditorium had to be evacuated.

Attendees

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Shannon	Alessandroni	Office of Rep Robinson
Kevin	Casey	Harvard
Anthony	D'Isidoro	ACA
Jeff	Dietrich	HSH
Catheme	Donaher	
Donny	Drileu	
Neil	Guertin	
Karl	Haglund	
Kevin	Honan	State Rep
Cliff	Kensington	City Realty
John	Kyper	
Elizabeth	Leary	BU
Anna	Leslie	
Anne	Lusk	HSPH
Pallavi	Mande	CRWA
Heather	Miller	CRWA
Andrew	Minnla	Non-Profit-Social Research
Thomas	Nally	A Better City
Daniel	Polanco	Mark Ciommo
Jean	Powers	Councilor Essaibi-George's Office
Fred	Salvucci	MIT
Rani	Schloss	Resident
Jamie	Simpson	
Bob	Sloane	Walk Boston
Arthur	Strong	
Timothy	Timmerman	EPA
Jack	Wofford	Cambridge
Courtney	Worhunsky	MassDOT D6
Wig	Zamore	