

PUBLIC HEARING

The Public Meeting on the South Station Expansion Project
Final Environmental Impact Report

Wednesday, July 20, 2016

APPEARANCES:

Nancy Farrell, (Presenter / Moderator)

David Mohler, (Presenter)
Executive Director, Office of Transportation Planning

CAMBRIDGE TRANSCRIPTIONS
675 Massachusetts Avenue
Cambridge, MA 02139
(617) 547 - 5690
www.ctran.com

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

P R O C E E D I N G S

MS. NANCY FARRELL: Good evening, everyone. Thank you for coming to this public meeting on the South Station expansion, final environmental impact report. We are taking -- we are going to produce a transcript of this meeting, so I just want to advise you that the meeting is being recorded, and the transcript, when it's available, will be posted on the project website. And there's -- there will be information on the project website during the presentation. The presentation will also appear on the project website after we have made it accessible.

Thanks for joining us this evening. It's a pleasure to have you on a lovely summer evening. We are going to do a fairly short presentation, detail the highlights of the FEIR. David Mohler is going to do the presentation. David is the Executive Director of the Office of Transportation Planning. Holly Johnson is here from the MEPA office to listen to your comments.

After the presentation, we'll invite you to make comments. We have a microphone. We'll give you the microphone. Because we are recording, you will have to speak into the microphone. We ask that you identify yourself when you start our remarks so that we can include your name appropriately in the transcript. Feel free to spell it if you haven't -- if you don't have very good

1 handwriting. And if you do want to make remarks, please
2 sign in with Regan at the sign-in desk, because she has --
3 is that you?

4 MR. DAVID MOHLER: -- my phone, yeah --

5 MS. NANCY FARRELL: Okay. Oh.

6 I was going to say. Whew. Okay. Let's see.
7 Written comments are welcome to MEPA and to MassDOT.
8 There's a sheet at the sign-in table with the address. You
9 can email, fax, or postal mail your comments. They are due
10 to MEPA by August 5, and a week later there should be a
11 certificate and a decision.

12 We have CDs available this evening of the FEIR.
13 So if you're interested, again, check in at the sign-in
14 table, and we can give you a CD.

15 And with that, I'm going to welcome David to make
16 the presentation.

17 MR. DAVID MOHLER: Okay. Can everybody -- now
18 try. All right. I had to give it time. So hello
19 everyone. As Nancy said, I'm David Mohler. I'm the
20 Executive Director of Transportation Planning for MassDOT.
21 If you need to reach me ever after this about this or
22 anything else having to do with transportation planning, my
23 email is david.mohler -- m-o-h-l-e-r -- @state.ma.us. You
24 could also always just call me. My phone number is 857-
25 368-8865. And if I don't answer, either my secretary will

1 pick up, or it will go to voicemail and I'll call you back.

2 So this is the agenda about what we're going to
3 cover today. I won't read it because that's kind of a
4 waste of all of our time.

5 So this is South Station today. You've been
6 there. You've noticed how crowded it is. It is the second
7 busiest transportation center in New England, 112,000 daily
8 passengers. Outdated, undersized, doesn't adequately serve
9 the customers we have, and certainly doesn't serve our
10 project growth.

11 Current MBTA daytime layover, which we'll talk
12 about in more detail in a minute, there are 28 spaces
13 needed, and we have 22 existing. So today, there are six
14 train sets that we don't have a midday layover for, so they
15 park at platform, and we move them out of the way as trains
16 come in.

17 There is the station, the bus terminal, the
18 station, the tracks. Right next door is the general mail
19 facility, the post office. Okay.

20 Obviously, South Station serves south side
21 commuter rail lines, as well as the Northeast Corridor for
22 Amtrak.

23 So in the future, obviously, Boston is growing.
24 Boston is growing faster than the suburbs. That's a
25 wonderful thing for those of us who care about compact

1 development and land use planning. Not that I don't like
2 the suburbs, okay.

3 South Station is projected to serve 32 percent
4 more rail passengers in 2035 than it does today. It's
5 already the second busiest. It's just growing.

6 So obviously, expansion of South Station requires
7 additional use of planning, permitting, design, and
8 construction. It's not like when we get through what we're
9 doing today, and we get through the EA, that we'll be
10 building next year, okay. It's an expensive project, and a
11 complex project.

12 So 2011, we applied for a discretionary grant
13 from the Federal Railroad Administration, and they gave us
14 a grant. They gave us \$32,500,000, which we match with
15 \$10,000,000 of our own money.

16 We filed a draft EIR, environmental impact
17 report, in October of 2014. Holly took comments.
18 Secretary scoped us for a final. We've now filed a final
19 on June 30. We're here to take your comments, and get your
20 comments to Holly afterwards as well.

21 On the federal side, we also had to go through
22 the MEPA process. So the MEPA process is the federal
23 permitting -- federal -- I'm sorry, Massachusetts
24 environmental permitting process, and MEPA is the federal
25 permitting process. FRA will lead the MEPA review.

1 We expect to provide an environmental analysis
2 sometime in the fall. As it says here, we will begin it in
3 the summer, which I guess is right now. I think we've
4 already begun it. It will be out in the fall. Hopefully
5 they will release it sometime this year, maybe be done by
6 next year. And then we will go into preliminary design,
7 because part of our grant is to get to 30 percent design.

8 So this project is big, it's expensive, it's
9 difficult. We may ultimately phase it. One of the things
10 -- first things we have to do is acquire the U.S. Postal
11 Office and move them, assuming they still want to be moved,
12 which they do. So let me go back for a second.

13 So this is the post office. This is where I want
14 to put seven new tracks. The post office has to get out of
15 the way. So when and if we acquire the post office, we
16 will relocate them. One of the first things we'd like to
17 do is then reopen Dorchester Avenue to public use, as well
18 as extend the Harborwalk.

19 Second phase would be seven new tracks, four new
20 platforms, expanded station and passenger waiting areas,
21 improve the passenger amenities. And the final phase will
22 be construct or expand facilities for midday layover.
23 We'll talk about that again in detail in a minute.

24 So this is the process. You know, this is where
25 we started, went through all of this. That's where we are,

1 okay. That's what the MEPA process is for, so everybody
2 can talk about their concerns, questions, comments.

3 So, file our DEIR, the FEIR is subsequent to the
4 DEIR. There have been changes made, and that's notices in
5 the D -- if the FEIR. One of the changes is this project
6 is now a transportation-only project. As scoped in the
7 DEIR, we were considering possible overbuilt scenarios.

8 We have not walked away from the potential for
9 overbuilt or the potential for development -- economic
10 development at South Station. It's just not part of this
11 project. If and when it ever happens, it will be part of
12 its own MEPA process.

13 Slight reduction in the headhouse. We had
14 selected our preferred alternatives for layover. So there
15 are actually three. There are two in this document as
16 Widett Circle and Readville Yard 2. There's also an
17 alternative future layover site in Beacon Park Yards, which
18 is part of a separate process going on in concurrently, and
19 that process is around the Allston Interchange. Obviously,
20 we've updated all of the information that would be required
21 in the MEPA document.

22 So again, that's what it looks like. That's what
23 it will look like. So -- post office is gone, there are
24 seven new tracks, that's the headhouse expansion. There's
25 entry points there. Okay.

1 Dorchester Avenue, reopened to traffic, including
2 bike, ped, and pedestrian.

3 So benefits. For rail service, it improves
4 reliability and service. It increases operational
5 efficiency. It supports increased ridership, and it
6 addresses our current and future projected midday layover
7 needs. Oops, I'm sorry. That was me hitting it on play.

8 Obviously, new facilities, updated ADA
9 accessibility, improved passenger amenities, and improved
10 connectivity between the bus station and the rail station.
11 More sort of ancillary benefits, extend the Harborwalk,
12 improve pedestrian connections, provide bicycle track on
13 Dorchester Avenue, reopen Dorchester Avenue for public use.

14 Environmental benefits. Reduce greenhouse gas
15 emission, because more people on trains means less people
16 driving their cars (indiscernible) vehicles. It will
17 improve storm water management, improve resiliency, restore
18 the open space, restore the public waterfront access.

19 So layover. What we're talking about is midday
20 layover. So we run a lot of trains in the peak. We run
21 less trains in the midday. We've got to store those trains
22 somewhere, okay.

23 So, currently -- so again, we are projecting
24 increased service at South Station. That, by definition,
25 means a need for increased layover for the midday layover

1 service, potentially as many 33 additional trains in and
2 out of South Station.

3 So we looked at 28 potential layover facilities,
4 okay. Of those, 10 met the minimum requirements -- we've
5 got a little bit more of a detailed analysis -- and
6 ultimately three were chosen as really doing what we needed
7 to get done, okay. And that supports them. That's our
8 criteria about which we select -- through which we screened
9 these sites.

10 There's the sites, 24, a total of 28 because
11 there were four variants on various ones of these sites,
12 okay. Lots of sites looked at. They were all in the city
13 of Boston. It makes no sense to have midday layover if
14 it's not in the city of Boston. We'd be dead-heading
15 trains back and forth.

16 So again, this is the cross here, is the
17 criteria, these are some of the examples. So as an
18 example, you'll notice that Beacon Park Yards is favorable
19 or neutral, and therefore we recommended advancing it.
20 Same thing with Readville Yard 2, and I don't see Widett on
21 here. BTM Tow Lot is on here, but actually Widett ended up
22 being advanced.

23 So here we go. Beacon Park Yard. If you're
24 familiar with Allston, it is where CSX used to store its
25 trains. CSX has moved west. It is a vast open space right

1 now. It still basically looks like an industrial railyard,
2 it's (indiscernible), although a lot of tracks are gone.

3 So it's now included in the Allston Interchange
4 Project, so we are still pursuing that (indiscernible), but
5 its environmental review is happening in the Allston
6 Interchange Project, because the Allston Interchange
7 Project is looking at the unified project in the Allston
8 neighborhood and it's on a separate track than our project.
9 So anybody who wants to comment on Beacon Park Yard can
10 certainly comment to us during the South Station review,
11 but you should also get yourself involved in the Allston
12 Interchange Project.

13 Widett Circle, where the Boston Food Market is,
14 it's an industrial site. Readville Yard 2, where we
15 currently store tracks in the Readville neighborhood of
16 Boston. I mean, store trains.

17 So Beacon Park Yard. This is the main line, as
18 well as tracks leading over the Grand Junction Bridge to
19 get trains to and from the T. This is the proposed
20 storage, midday layover, okay. And as part of the Allston
21 Project, which is not on here, the Turnpike, which
22 currently is up here with an interchange, is going to be
23 straightened, become that way, okay. It also has a new
24 commuter rail station proposed for it. But that's all part
25 of a separate process that anybody who is interested in

1 should get involved in.

2 This is Readville, 17.5 acres. It's 8.8 miles
3 south of South Station. It's about as far as you'd want to
4 go for midday layover. If we were starting with a blank
5 slate, we might not actually store trains there, but we
6 store trains there today, and we think it makes sense to
7 possibly store additional trains there. But of course, any
8 potential use of the site would be preceded by
9 coordination with local elected officials and a public
10 process.

11 Widett Circle. So here is the cold storage
12 building. There's also -- Boston Food Market is all down
13 here. It's 30 acres. It's within -- almost within a mile
14 of South Station. It's a really great place for midday
15 layover, and could obviously -- it was identified in the
16 Olympics, so when we were talking about having the Olympics
17 here it was identified as, I believe, the big stadium was
18 going to be about here, and the Olympic Boulevard was going
19 to go down, and they were going to ultimately deck over it,
20 and in future they would develop it. I believe the city
21 still has interest in possibly future -- a future
22 development at this site, so we would make sure that
23 anything we do will not interfere with the future deck
24 which would provide development potential here.

25 So here's the federal environmental process.

1 Now, all of this we've done. We're now here. This is
2 winter of 2017. We will have -- winter of 2017, which I
3 guess is January-February. We will have an EA circulate.
4 That's another point for people to make comments. At that
5 point, you would be making comments to the federal
6 government, not to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. It's
7 another point that everybody who cares about this project
8 and wants to make their comments should stay involved.

9 The project requires approval for FRA to use
10 federal funds. This is basically all the things they look
11 in the EPA. And again, plenty of opportunity for people to
12 comment, okay.

13 Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation
14 Act requires federal agencies to take into account the
15 effects of their undertakings of historic property. The
16 Michael Dukakis South Station Center is clearly an historic
17 property, very important.

18 Section 4(f) requires consideration of park and
19 recreational lands, water -- wildlife and waterfowl
20 refuges, and historic sites. So those are additional steps
21 in the permitting process at the federal level.

22 So 700 feet of Dorchester Avenue and the sea wall
23 is to be elevated approximately two feet. I'm assuming
24 this is here because 4(f) is in play, because of waterways,
25 okay. So it will improve resiliency from future sea level

1 rise and coastal flood storming, and will help make the
2 gradient level for Dorchester Avenue and the Harborwalk.

3 The next steps, continuing to work with the city
4 and the post office, see if we can get them moved. We'll
5 be filing the EA by June, which is when our -- June 2017 is
6 when our federal grant expires, so we will have spent,
7 hopefully by then, \$32,500,000, we will have, plus our own
8 \$10,000,000. We will have gotten through all of the
9 environmental permitting process, and we will have gotten
10 to 30 percent design, because that is the scope of the
11 grant we were awarded. Then we will, of course, talk about
12 how do you fund a project that costs northwards of
13 \$1,500,000,000.

14 So comments are due on August 3.

15 FEMALE: Fifth.

16 MR. DAVID MOHLER: Fifth. August 5. I keep
17 saying the third. August 5. Comments are due on August 5.
18 You make your comments to Secretary Beaton at this address,
19 or you can always just email Holly, okay. If you want to
20 make comments to MassDOT, you can always just reach me at
21 my email address. I gave you that earlier. Or Steve
22 Woelfel is actually the project manager, and you can reach
23 him at this address.

24 So now that's enough of me talking, and we're
25 going to let Governor Dukakis kick off the public comment,

1 I think.

2 GOV. MICHAEL DUKAKIS: Thank you, Dave. Thank
3 you. Thanks for that presentation. This is going to be
4 very brief. I've got an ailing wife who's got serious
5 dental problems, who is in pain, and she needs her husband
6 home. And since Kitty is going to be 80, if you can
7 believe it, in December, still is the best looking Medicare
8 recipient in America --

9 AUDIENCE: (Laughter).

10 GOV. MICHAEL DUKAKIS: As you both know, Governor
11 Weld and I have been working on an alternative, and now
12 have a working group of about 60 which meets on a regular
13 basis. A number of them are here and want to address
14 specific aspects of this.

15 But I just want to tell a quick story by way of
16 illustration. Back, many years ago, I decided to go to
17 school outside of Philadelphia, at a small Quaker
18 institution, Swarthmore College. I'd never been out of New
19 England. I didn't know a Quaker from a Shaker. I had no
20 idea where I was going, and I spent four years there.

21 In those days, not surprisingly, like many other
22 cities, Philadelphia had two stations. One was the
23 suburban station, and one was the Amtrak station. They
24 were separated by a half a mile. If you wanted to go home
25 to Boston from Swarthmore, you took the commuter train to

1 the suburban station, and then walked a half a mile, or do
2 whatever you did, and get on the Amtrak train.

3 In the 1980s, Philadelphia connected those two
4 stations. On Wednesday, when Kitty and I get on an Amtrak
5 train and go to the Democratic convention for a couple of
6 days, we'll take the train from here. We will arrive at 33
7 Station. We'll go upstairs and take whatever we've got to
8 take, both transit and commuter rail, and proceed to our
9 destination.

10 All of that in Philadelphia takes eight tracks,
11 for both transit and commuter rail. It gives you some
12 sense of the advantage of connecting stations, something
13 that city folks are doing all over the world. In fact, so
14 far as I know, there is no city on the Planet Earth that is
15 planning to expand nineteenth century stub end stations.

16 So while I understand, Dave, from our conference
17 -- and it was a good one, with the Secretary, that the
18 terms of the grant require that you continue to do this,
19 otherwise I guess you've got to give them all the money
20 back -- and I understand that's not feasible -- I hope
21 we'll really start getting serious now. And I'm pleased
22 with the fact that the Secretary has said that we're going
23 to proceed on that \$2,000,000 study or north-south rail
24 link. I look forward to working with you on that. And I
25 think it's just very important that we focus on that,

1 because the benefits of north-south are just so
2 dramatically greater than this project that there's no
3 comparison.

4 May I just say one other thing? Harold Widett
5 was a supporter of mine.

6 AUDIENCE: (Laughter).

7 GOV. MICHAEL DUKAKIS: And I really -- it's not
8 that I'm annoyed, but I'm getting frustrated because people
9 keep referring to this as Widett Circle. It's Widett, with
10 the emphasis on the second syllable.

11 Anyway, thanks for doing this. Thanks for giving
12 me an opportunity to speak with you. We've got lots of
13 people here that know a lot about this and want to share
14 that with you. So thanks very much.

15 MR. DAVID MOHLER: Thank you, Governor.

16 MS. NANCY FARRELL: Thank you, Governor.

17 MR. DAVID MOHLER: And I will try to say Widett
18 Circle --

19 AUDIENCE: (Applause).

20 MS. NANCY FARRELL: I do want to say, before we
21 get started on the general comments, that we have David
22 Beal here from Representative Nick Collins' office. David,
23 over there, if anyone wants to chat with him. And Jack
24 Toomey is here from the office of Representative Eileen
25 Donoghue, right here, this young man right here. Everyone

1 looks younger than me all the time.

2 AUDIENCE: (Laughter).

3 MS. NANCY FARRELL: And if -- are there any other
4 elected officials or representatives of elected officials?

5 MALE: Seth Moulton --

6 MS. NANCY FARRELL: Oh, all right. Seth --

7 MR. LUCAS SANTOS: Lucas Santos from --

8 MS. NANCY FARRELL: Lucas, thank you for coming
9 as well. So I will ask you to try to keep your remarks
10 temperate and not so long, because you can send them to
11 MEPA, and with a copy. And I guess Jim RePass, you know
12 that you're next. Hold on. Over there?

13 MR. JIM REPASS: -- I'm going to read some of
14 what I've got, not too long, so I'd like to swap places
15 with --

16 MS. NANCY FARRELL: Use the microphone, please --

17 MR. JIM REPASS: Better this one? Can you hear
18 me, folks? Okay. All right. Well, I'd like to use the
19 platform anyway. It gives you more status anyway, so. Now
20 I look semi-official.

21 I am Jim RePass. I'm -- have been long involved
22 with transportation issues around the United States. Among
23 other things, I was able to negotiate the funds, for those
24 that don't know me, from George Bush to electrify the
25 Northeast Corridor between New Haven and Boston in 1991,

1 which is a project he opposed, but which he eventually gave
2 way on. We put a bipartisan group together, and that had a
3 lot to do with it. So I'm very much interested in, from
4 that point of view.

5 I'm a resident of South Boston, so that's really
6 important to me. This whole process is important to me,
7 because I am very, very worried and upset about the plans
8 that are presented here tonight. With all due respect, I
9 know that's a lot of work that everybody has put into it,
10 but unfortunately, even though I am very pro-rail, I am
11 here to ask that this project be stopped now, before it is
12 so far along in the process that it cannot be stopped.

13 At the very least, the consultants writing this
14 report for the MassDOT, under the supervision of senior
15 staff, should begin to not only report what opponents say,
16 like me, but address the issues they raise, which this
17 report does not do.

18 I'd like to cite the following issues as well.
19 Can you hear me? Is this going in and out, or is it --

20 AUDIENCE: -- we hear you.

21 MR. JIM REPASS: All right. From the DEIR that
22 some of you have gotten, I hope, and read -- wonderful
23 reading -- EAD 1502A, pages 3-65 to 3-66, it says, "Because
24 the proposed new South Station platforms will not be
25 enclosed," and I quote, "analysis of air pollutants within

1 the platform and track area at South Station is not
2 required." Now that's from the DEIR that we all have.

3 No, the pollutants, will rise into the air, and
4 then the particulate matter, which is known to cause asthma
5 and cancer, from diesel, will drift into South Boston,
6 Dorchester, and Roxbury, where it will descend to breathing
7 level, before hitting houses and the ground in the form of
8 a carcinogenic dust. It is outrageous that Governor Baker,
9 a former health industry executive well-versed in this
10 subject, would entertain such a project at all, which by
11 adding diesel particle pollution to a non-attainment area,
12 which Boston is, directly violates the Clean Air Act of the
13 United States. I will specific citations to you on that.

14 From page 3-67, regarding layover facilities --
15 and I'm almost done, believe it or not. I know it sounds
16 ominous when people begin writing page numbers down.
17 "There would be no noise impact from the train operations
18 at the Widett Circle layover facility site. The near noise
19 sensitive receptors, located along Albany Street, are
20 approximately 1,300 feet from the acoustic center of the
21 site." That's in the report.

22 That statement about Widett is deceptive. And in
23 any event, the real noise sensitive receptors are the
24 actual human beings who live in South Boston, and Roxbury,
25 and Dorchester, who have been listening to those diesels in

1 the Widett area -- because Southampton Yards is the same
2 area -- for the better part of 75 years. I've been one of
3 them, since 1980.

4 Adding a daytime diesel layover facility for MBTA
5 locomotives needed for the expanded South Station dead-end
6 service as it's planned here, instead of simply building
7 the North-South Rail Link, which will actually be cheaper
8 than the combined costs of the South Station expansion and
9 the layover facility that it requires, by the way, as well
10 as removing concentrated pollution sources from Widett --
11 to do this is just insane, not to mention being a direct
12 violation, again, of the Federal Clean Air Act.

13 From page 3-84 regarding idling, the report that
14 you have says, "When plugged in, the train can shut down
15 the head end power" -- that's a generator on the
16 locomotives -- "for the duration of the layover."
17 Regardless of whether or not a train gets plugged in, there
18 is still a possibility of time spent idling on the diesel
19 engines. This idling time can be -- equate up to one hour
20 when plugged in with 30 minutes upon entering, and another
21 30 minutes before departing.

22 Yes, the head-end power, which means the small
23 engine used to provide light and heat in the passenger
24 cars, could be shut down part of the time, using plug-in
25 power. But that ignores the much larger and more polluting

1 diesel locomotive engine or prime mover, which in practice
2 in railroad yards -- and I have been involved in this field
3 for 35 years, so I think I'm qualified to speak on the
4 subject -- in practice in railroad yards across the country
5 are left idling 24-7, because they are a nuisance for
6 railyard personnel to shut off and then restart, especially
7 in cold climates like New England, where starting up a
8 large cold locomotive diesel engine takes considerable
9 effort.

10 And finally -- yes, finally -- under the historic
11 properties section on page 3-88 of the report, "Widett
12 Circle, existing food processing, food storage, and food
13 logistics buildings to be demolished are located within the
14 Widett Circle APE, but they are not historic properties."
15 That's what the report says, so that's not a problem right.

16 No, they're not historic properties, but they
17 employ 700 to 900 people and pay taxes to the city of
18 Boston. The businesses are valued at around
19 \$1,000,000,000, and are taxed at the city of Boston's
20 healthy commercial rate. But if the South Station
21 expansion goes forward, that revenue to the city of Boston
22 will disappear forever, in favor of increased air and noise
23 pollution.

24 Has anyone asked Mayor Walsh about this? Does he
25 want to be the mayor that sends 700 to 900 well-paying food

1 processing jobs, the kind that offer new residents and
2 immigrants a chance to make a decent living, to the suburbs
3 or New Hampshire? I hope not. I voted for him, and so did
4 most of my neighbors last time around, because South Boston
5 people vote early and often, as you may have heard.

6 In conclusion, as a resident of South Boston and
7 a member of Governor Dukakis and Bill Weld's North-South
8 Rail Link Working Group, I ask that the enormous amount of
9 money being spent on this clearly illegal project be
10 stopped at once, and that the Commonwealth begin to take
11 seriously the really cost-effective North-South Rail Link,
12 which they have not included in the scope of the study,
13 despite many years of being asked to do so by us.

14 So thank you very much for allowing me to exceed
15 my time, probably. All right. Thank you.

16 MS. NANCY FARRELL: You're welcome. Our next
17 speaker is Jong Waitommee. Sorry if I mispronounced it.
18 Could you spell your name for the transcript?

19 MR. JONG WAITOMMEE: Yes, yes.

20 MS. NANCY FARRELL: Oh, we have it. Okay.

21 MR. JONG TOMMEE: Actually Wai and Tommee is
22 separate. It's my middle and last names. Hi, good
23 evening. Jong Waitommee is my name. I work in the South
24 Boston waterfront. I am a daily commuter who makes use of
25 South Station every day. My comment, which I hope will be

1 brief, is a little more technical, and it's on the subject
2 matter of active pick-up and drop-off, particularly on
3 Summer Street, as well as on Atlantic Avenue.

4 For those of us who were -- take commutes through
5 South Station, we observe on a daily basis that a lot of --
6 there's an increasing amount of drop-off traffic that's now
7 piling up, doubling up on the lanes, making illegal stops,
8 illegal parking, and it's all because there's not enough
9 space right now with the current design of South Station to
10 accommodate so many vehicles picking up and dropping off
11 passengers.

12 With an anticipated increase of passengers and
13 commuters using South Station, we can expect there will be
14 even more of an increase in active pick-up and drop-off,
15 not just personal vehicles, taxicabs, but also
16 transportation network companies, the Ubers and Lyfts of
17 the world. They're all going to converge into South
18 Station, whether we like it or not. They're going to --
19 they're coming.

20 And what I want to say is this project is a great
21 step in solving that issue. With a redesign -- expansion
22 or not, but with a redesign of South Station, we have an
23 opportunity here to provide the adequate space for the
24 active pick-up and drop-off vehicles.

25 Logan Airport has been mentioned as the busiest

1 hub in New England. Logan Airport has everything, all of
2 the accommodations needed for active pick-up and drop-off
3 for all vehicles. It is time that South Station has the
4 same. Thank you.

5 MS. NANCY FARRELL: Thank you. Next we have
6 Frank DiMasi.

7 MR. FRANK DIMASI: My name is Frank DiMasi. I'm
8 a resident of Wellesley, Massachusetts, formerly a chair of
9 the Association for Public Transportation of last year,
10 formerly a chair of a freight committee in support of the
11 Boston MPO Advisory Consult. I have some written comments
12 that I will provide to Holly, but if you don't mind I'll
13 just read some of this.

14 Thank you for considering my comments on South
15 Station expansion. As member off the Association for
16 Public Transportation and the North-South Rail Link Working
17 Group, I do not support the South Station expansion, but
18 rather the alternative of a North-South Rail Link. I
19 believe an updated summary of the findings of the MBTA
20 North-South Rail Link draft EIR, EIS, MIS should have been
21 included and considered in the final environmental impact
22 report for South Station expansion.

23 I believe MassDOT should not have withdrawn its
24 sponsorship of the project in May 2006, due to its
25 perception that the capital cost projected at several

1 billion dollars back then was prohibitive. The April 2007
2 document, Journey to 2030 Transportation Plan, of the
3 Boston Metropolitan Planning Organization, said, "The MPO
4 feels that a study of the right of way requirements should
5 be conducted for preservation of that right of way, so as
6 to not preclude the projects going forward in the future."

7 In December of 2007, the Federal Railway
8 Administration was interested in funding this project if
9 the Massachusetts Executive Office of Transportation was
10 interested in sponsoring it. As of August 2009, the
11 project was brought back into the spotlight as a component
12 of the New England transportation plan, a coordinated
13 effort by the six New England states to improve rail
14 transportation infrastructure by competing for the
15 \$8,000,000,000 allocated for high-speed rail in the
16 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act for 2009, indicating
17 the strong support that exists for this vital railway to
18 the Northeast Corridor and MBTA commuter rail lines.

19 As a result of conducting legislative and public
20 support for the North-South Rail Link and the positive
21 impact the link would have on the environmental and
22 mitigating the lack of expansion space for current and
23 future regional and commuter rail track capacity and
24 layover facilities, a new EIR, EIS, MIS for the north-south
25 rail like should be included and considered in the final

1 environmental impact report for South Station expansion.

2 Major cities are connecting outdated, stub-ended
3 terminals with underground rail tunnels in most cases, and
4 with surface lines in other cases. Building a North-South
5 Rail Link would result in a surplus of tracks in South
6 Station. Spending \$2,000,000,000 to add tracks to South
7 and North Stations does not make sense, when that
8 investment towards building the North-South Rail Link would
9 create millions of dollars of operational savings once the
10 two stations are connected, and facilitates use by
11 thousands of rail passengers.

12 The North-South Rail Link will take an estimated
13 60,000 cars off the road every day. South Station
14 expansion will have little or no impact on the effort to
15 reduce the impact of vehicular congestion and emissions in
16 Boston.

17 Also, as a member of the Eastern Massachusetts
18 Freight Rail Coalition, I would like to express my concern
19 for the impact revision of interlocking and layover yards
20 south of South Station, and that impact it may have on
21 freight and passenger rail access to the Port of Boston.
22 There is growing concern regarding road congestion at the
23 Port of Boston in the new Seaport District. The port has
24 very limited freight rail access as a result of an adverse
25 rail connection at Bay Junction, south of South Station.

1 At that location, freight use -- I'm sorry -- freight use
2 of Boston Terminal running track that connects to
3 Massport's Track 61 requires freight trains to be of
4 limited length and to perform a back-up move to get into
5 the port, which is a very efficient operation.

6 The FEIR addresses relocating some of the
7 interlocking at or near Bay Junction, and that -- in the
8 MBTA and Amtrak Southampton Street yards. Required
9 construction of critically needed track improvements for
10 freight and passenger rail access to the port, improvements
11 for train access from the Fairmont line are especially
12 needed coming north from and across the Braintree main line
13 at Bay Junction. The Fairmont line provides a direct link
14 for freight rail access to CSX, Readville Transfer Rail
15 Yard, and all points west via the Franklin line to Walpole,
16 and the Framingham line to Worcester, and the CSX
17 Intermodal Terminal at Worcester.

18 Also, direct access to the Boston Terminal
19 running track to the port is needed for trains coming south
20 from the Y at South Station, and along the reverse loop at
21 Bay Junction. The South Station interlocking and layover
22 yard improvements also provide an opportunity to improve
23 port rail access, and this need should be included in the
24 FEIR.

25 Massport and the city of Boston have

1 unsuccessfully submitted targeted grants proposed to
2 improve the port rail infrastructure. With the proposed
3 rail link improvements and extension of as many as 6,000
4 rail car loads a year could be brought into the port for
5 bulk and other kind of commodities, which would take 24,000
6 truckloads off our roads.

7 In view of proposed investment in dredging and
8 other waterside improvements, I think it's very important
9 to include in the FEIR provisions for maintaining and
10 improving freight rail access to the port at Bay Junction.
11 The limited highway access into the port and Seaport
12 District and growing congestion make utilization and
13 expanded use of the existing rail corridors for freight and
14 passenger service essential to future growth.

15 I will also mention that the Grand Junction
16 connection to North Station should be considered in the
17 FEIR as a mitigating factor for reducing the number of
18 trains terminating at South Station. A number of inland
19 route and MBTA commuter trains should be diverted from
20 Boston line to Cambridge and North Station to mitigate the
21 impact of the possible addition of as many as 16 trains on
22 the inland route to South Station as a terminus.

23 Being a reside in MetroWest, I know many people
24 coming out from Worcester and MetroWest would like to go to
25 Cambridge and North Station directly. With the new West

1 Station coming along and multi-unit trains planned for more
2 local commuter service, I believe that a discussion of
3 these initiatives and their positive impact on track
4 capacity should be included in the FEIR. But of course,
5 there will be a tremendous impact in Cambridge, and the
6 FEIR should evaluate the impacts to Cambridge and
7 Somerville as a result of use commuter rail and regional
8 rail on the Grand Junction line.

9 Returning to a major concern for a logistic
10 impact on the port, I believe the ultimate site for the
11 postal annex, other than within the Seaport and port area,
12 needs to be considered in the FEIR. There needs to be
13 consideration for the negative impact to the port if the
14 annex is to be moved in to a designated port area or a
15 property within the Seaport area. Massport needs as much
16 lay-down area as it can get or retain for its planned
17 expansion for trucking, container storage, and in the
18 future, rail and dock, bulk freight, and intermodal
19 interchange. Sorry --

20 MS. NANCY FARRELL: Thank you, sir.

21 MR. FRANK DIMASI: Thank you.

22 MS. NANCY FARRELL: Our next speaker is Norman
23 Gorin.

24 MR. NORMAN GORIN: Thank you. Hi, my name is
25 Norm Gorin. I'm a businessperson with a long background in

1 transportation and environmental planning. I actually
2 conducted the first environmental impact statement
3 community meeting in 1973, when MEPA was passed. It was
4 for Route 20, out in Western Massachusetts, and I worked
5 with Guy Rosmarin and Fred Salvucci in the Governor's
6 office in the Sargent administration.

7 Since that time, I have diverted my activities to
8 being a businessperson, and I approach the issues here from
9 a businessperson's perspective. The first question I have
10 is just a process question, which is having reviewed the
11 environmental impact report, there in the appendix are a
12 series of comments, environmental and otherwise, raising
13 issues.

14 But my reading of the report is that none of
15 those were responded to in the report itself. And so from
16 a process question, I ask the question of what are we doing
17 here today? Is that same thing going to happen when very
18 good testimony is raised and issues are raised? Will this
19 final study ignore those as the preliminary study did, or
20 will, in fact, we have a response to each of the issue
21 raised? And I hope that there's an opportunity for Mr.
22 Mohler to respond to that.

23 The second question I have is, you referenced in
24 your presentation that the federal environmental impact
25 study will require a review of alternatives. And as has

1 been represented today, the North-South Rail Link is a very
2 viable alternative, which eliminates the need for
3 additional tracks because rather than the stub-end
4 structure that you have, it eliminates certain
5 environmental impacts, or certainly mitigates them.

6 And so my second question -- process question is
7 where is, in this impact report, a study of the
8 alternatives that really addresses those alternatives in a
9 -- on a point by point basis? Why spend the billions of
10 dollars to support and continue to support a stub-end
11 approach, which worldwide is considered an antiquated
12 methodology for transportation planning, when in fact we
13 have an alternative with rights of way sort of laid out in
14 prior studies, that would eliminate the need for those
15 additional tracks?

16 The last point I'll make is, as a businessperson
17 I see the South Station expansion, as it's currently
18 perceived, to be in a major grab of land in the inner city,
19 some of the most valuable property, that provide
20 development rights and economic returns to the city and the
21 state that will not be feasible or possible as a result of
22 the South Station expansion, but in fact could be possible
23 in the event of the North-South Rail Link.

24 Again, I grew up in a time -- and I was actually
25 very young -- when the city, in its infinite wisdom, took

1 the rail tracks that are now the Prudential Center in the
2 Back Bay. And if you think about the economic development
3 opportunities that that created for the city, we have a
4 vibrant area of the city that is in place of rail tracks
5 that were there once upon a time. Why do -- why not follow
6 that wonderful example, as opposed to doing this expansion,
7 adding all of these additional tracks, taking the post
8 office space, as opposed to using those spaces for economic
9 opportunity and development? Thank you.

10 MS. NANCY FARRELL: Do you want to answer any of
11 those questions, David?

12 MR. DAVID MOHLER: So -- I thought you wrote them
13 down. So I think we're going to have to disagree on
14 whether comments were addressed that were made in the EIR.
15 So I, obviously -- the consultants work for me -- I believe
16 they've done a good job of addressing the comments.
17 Typically, we address the comments in an appendix in most
18 of our EIR's. Obviously, if a comment results in a change
19 to the plan or the document, that's addressed in the
20 document itself.

21 But the fact that the answer is no doesn't mean
22 that the comment wasn't addressed. It means that you got
23 an answer -- not you personally, but the commenter may get
24 an answer they didn't want, or don't like, or don't agree
25 with, and they should note that fact and raise it again

1 when they send their comments to Holly, okay.

2 So I don't think it's -- I don't want to be
3 argumentative, but I think we've answered the comments. I
4 understand that a lot of people don't agree with our
5 answers, but I think we've answered the comments.

6 The EA, again, I do not expect it to include an
7 analysis of the North-South Rail Link. But we are in the
8 process, and if people want to make comments to the Federal
9 Railroad Administration about whether the North-South Rail
10 Link should be included in the EA, they certainly should.
11 Okay. I don't expect they're going to require us to
12 include it. Frankly, I'd be shocked if they do. But you
13 should make -- nonetheless make your comments, because if
14 they require it, we will do it. We won't be able to do it
15 with the money we have left, and we'll have to figure that
16 out. But you should comment to them on their process,
17 because it really doesn't do you much good to comment to
18 me, okay.

19 And then again, I think your comment about
20 development potential -- clearly, yes, if you have
21 transportation infrastructure, it makes development hard.
22 There is overbuild, obviously, potentially. But it does
23 take some level of terra firma development out of the mix.
24 We clearly believe that this project and that use is
25 appropriate and is worth the trade-off of losing some

1 future potential development sites.

2 MS. NANCY FARRELL: Thank you. Our next speaker
3 is Andrew Jennings. The mic is over there, Mr. Jennings.

4 MR. ANDREW JENNINGS: Good evening. My name is
5 Andrew Jennings. I live in North Billerica, Massachusetts.
6 I'm retired, but I have many years of experience in the
7 transportation industry.

8 As I look at -- and I'm late to this process, as
9 I look at -- is this working consistently?

10 Okay. As I look at the need -- as I look at --
11 I'll never be a rock star.

12 AUDIENCE: (Laughter).

13 MR. ANDREW JENNINGS: As I -- I don't understand
14 how the need for the layover facilities, and the number of
15 layover facilities was calculated. Is this -- as we look
16 at other cities, we are cities increasing reverse commutes.
17 And in many respects, I would think that an alternative,
18 which I don't see as being evaluated, is to run many more
19 trains out to their end platforms. And I don't see the
20 economics, I don't understand the economics of how the
21 number of major layover train sets were made. And clearly,
22 this is a very different project, if you look at end of
23 line layovers.

24 MS. NANCY FARRELL: Thank you for that comment.
25 There is, in the DEIR, an appendix which shows you the full

1 assessment of the layovers. I think it's Appendix C. Is
2 that correct? ENF, sorry, in the ENF document, I'm sorry.
3 John Kyper.

4 MR. JOHN KYPER: John Kyper, Massachusetts
5 Chapter of the Sierra Club. I am -- I'll read briefly from
6 comments from a letter that we recently sent to Governor
7 Baker on the subject.

8 The Massachusetts Sierra Club believes that the
9 South Station Expansion Program, Project SSX, is an unsound
10 investment. It would divert well over a billion dollars to
11 achieve only a short-term gain, and the capacity problems
12 now affecting South Station would simply recur in another
13 decade or two. North Station also faces similar capacity
14 constraints.

15 The SSX would neither accommodate the anticipated
16 growth in MBTA and Amtrak passenger volumes, nor would it
17 alleviate the increasingly automotive congestion that
18 undermines the Commonwealth's greenhouse gas reduction
19 goals. It would provide no benefits to the gateway
20 communities north of Boston, as Congressman Moulton has
21 noted, and only temporary relief for the communities to the
22 south. Also, it would require the taking of yet more
23 valuable land for train yards. The current SSX stub-end
24 proposal would significantly limit development
25 opportunities around South Station, since much of the land

1 in the area is now consumed by equipment operations, and
2 layovers.

3 The Sierra Club has long supported the North-
4 South Rail Link. And I have a -- read briefly from a
5 statement that the resolution the Chapter's executive
6 committee approached in May of 2014.

7 The Massachusetts Chapter of the Sierra Club is
8 opposed to the expansion of South Station as a stub-end
9 terminal as currently proposed. Completely absent from the
10 present plan is any recognition that building yet more
11 dead-end tracks into South Station is, at best, a temporary
12 solution, a billion dollar Band-Aid.

13 It was then -- the price was originally
14 calculated at, I believe, \$850,000,000, when it was first
15 publicly announced almost four years ago. It has now
16 practically doubled to \$1,600,000,000 and counting, that
17 will eclipsed once again by the anticipated growth in rail
18 passenger traffic.

19 Instead, MassDOT must revisit its long-shelved
20 plans for a direct rail connection between South and North
21 Stations, that will allow for through running of Amtrak and
22 commuter trains, eliminating the wasteful back-up moves
23 that are now a major cause of congestion at both terminals.
24 A first step would be to build underground station
25 platforms at South Station, as Phase 1 of the North-South

1 Rail Link, thereby accommodating service on Amtrak's
2 electrified Northeast Corridor, while allowing the tracks
3 to be extended north at a later date.

4 The current proposal, moreover, fails to address
5 the issue of greenhouse gas emissions and climate change,
6 the central challenge of our time. We must make bold moves
7 that heretofore seem beyond our means, which would maximize
8 reduction of these emissions while creating more efficient
9 transportation options.

10 According to its -- the original DEI summary,
11 written a decade ago, the rail link would result in over
12 55,000 auto trips diverted daily into public
13 transportation. An expanded South Station, with a
14 connection to North Station, would be more efficient and
15 less polluting than the current plan.

16 MS. NANCY FARRELL: Thank you, Mr. Kyper. Great.
17 Great, thank you. Thank you. Councilor Jackson, I have
18 three people to speak, or do you want to jump in front?

19 COUNCILOR TITO JACKSON: I don't want to lose
20 three votes.

21 MS. NANCY FARRELL: Okay.

22 AUDIENCE: (Laughter).

23 MS. NANCY FARRELL: I can't guarantee they all
24 live in the city of Boston, but here's Franny Osmond is
25 next.

1 MS. FRANNY OSMOND: I heard you the other day at
2 the city council meeting with the North-South Rail Link
3 Working Group, so you would have my vote, but --

4 COUNCILOR TITO JACKSON: Not if I skipped it.

5 MS. FRANNY OSMOND: -- I'm a selectman --

6 AUDIENCE: (Laughter).

7 MS. FRANNY OSMOND: You would have my vote, but
8 I'm a selectman in Acton, and I see the great importance of
9 this -- the alternate project, as I see it, of the North-
10 South Rail Link.

11 I went to the hearings in Readville and South
12 Boston, and I hear a lot of very reasonable concerns about
13 the effects on the neighborhoods, and the elimination of
14 the food jobs that were moved from Haymarket to Widett
15 Circle area. It just doesn't seem wise.

16 And I also heard, alternatively, answers to
17 questions sometimes being, "Oh, we're right at the
18 beginning. Don't worry," and alternatively, sometimes,
19 "Oh, we're so far along." And I guess it might be this
20 way, often, with these projects, but I don't think we're
21 far enough along that human beings can't see if we made a
22 mistake.

23 And I noticed one of the goals of the EIR was to
24 determine whether this should be done. And sort of, we are
25 to include 30 percent work on it, and the question of

1 whether. And someone raise, at one of those meetings, the
2 question of what were the measures by which you would say,
3 yeah, it's not the right thing.

4 And so I do think that, looking at the North-
5 South Rail Link as part of this is really, really
6 important, because most of those issues -- and I haven't
7 read the whole report, but the parts I was reading, every
8 time I saw issues that would be mitigated by this project,
9 I was very often thinking they would also be mitigated by
10 the North-South Rail Link, which would also make it a lot
11 easier not to drive in, and to be able to look for
12 employees and jobs from the suburbs, and it would also help
13 other states.

14 And just, it doesn't seem wise. I say give back
15 the money. You know, the federal government is not -- it
16 is people. And so they can also look at the results, and
17 look at the study of the North-South Rail Link, and say,
18 yeah, it doesn't look wise.

19 My analogy is a medical one that I gave at one of
20 those last meetings, which is when you're studying a new
21 drug, if you start to see -- if you randomize people and
22 you start to that its helping -- or it's -- let's say you
23 start to see it's helping one group. It's immoral to go
24 through and keep on testing, and I think we're coming to
25 that point.

1 I just wanted to also just say that if you
2 haven't looked at all of this demonstration of the
3 tunneling, the amazing tunneling technology, go to the
4 northsouthraillink.org and look at it.

5 I'm inspired by listening to all of this and
6 reading, to get some kids in a room and lay out our rail
7 system on a toy rail system, you know, with the tracks
8 coming in from the north, stopping, the tracks coming from
9 the south, stopping, and see what they do. I think we
10 could look to them.

11 MS. NANCY FARRELL: Thank you. Our next speaker
12 is Brad Bellows.

13 MR. BRAD BELLOWS: Thank you. So I'm Brad
14 Bellows. I'm an architect in Cambridge, and I have been --
15 I'm a board member of the Association for Public
16 Transportation with Frank, and a member of the North-South
17 Rail Link Working Group. And I got started looking at this
18 North-South Rail Link project back in 1993, when Governor
19 Weld put me on a task force for that purpose. And I then
20 spent eight years looking at the engineering that was done
21 as part of a citizens' advisory committee -- as a citizens'
22 advisory committee member.

23 So let me just read a few notes that I put
24 together this afternoon on this project, if I may. So a
25 number of us, as Norm mentioned, have on prior occasions

1 spoken, expressed our reservations about the South Station
2 Expansion Project, not because we don't support rail; we
3 do. We're all on the same page there. Not because we
4 don't recognize that there is a vital need for more
5 capacity; there absolutely is.

6 Our opposition and our questioning of this
7 project has been based on the fact that it's an obsolete,
8 incredibly expensive, and ultimately ineffective way to
9 solve the problem. And we have suggested that unification
10 be seriously considered in the scoping process, and the
11 prior secretaries have set aside that recommendation, and
12 they did it in a very perfunctory way and without really
13 addressing the underlying arguments. And so we do feel
14 that the scoping process is proceeding under sort of an
15 erroneous premise, and we are still hoping to see that
16 corrected.

17 One of the things that has been interesting is
18 that reality has been marching ahead as this project has
19 been slowly unfolding. And some of the changing realities
20 are that the project cost has doubled and continuing to
21 rise. The value of the urban real estate that the property
22 will displace has expanded by an even greater amount, and
23 that became clear during the Olympic discussions. None of
24 that has really been reflected in this kind of mechanical
25 turning of the crank, and out comes the study.

1 When Governor Dukakis and I met with Secretary
2 Pollack a few weeks ago, she reassured us that the state is
3 not committed to the project, and the only reason that
4 these -- we're going through the FEIR process is because
5 the money will have to be returned in the project isn't --
6 if the study isn't completed, and that seems reasonable but
7 not entirely satisfying for various reasons that have been
8 mentioned earlier. But we certainly don't want to have to
9 reimburse the state.

10 But having said that, our recognition of that is
11 definitely tempered by ruing the fact that this wasn't
12 really done in a much more comprehensive way from the get-
13 go. Let me turn the page here.

14 MS. NANCY FARRELL: Can I help?

15 MR. BRAD BELLOWS: Thank you, yeah. I've gotten
16 this in 14-point type so I can read it, and then it's a
17 struggle, so. The -- yeah, actually I think I'm going to
18 skip to the last page. That's good news. There are only
19 three of them. Don't worry.

20 So if there is a purpose to these kinds of
21 studies, it should be that they're trying to discover
22 something, not prove something. And that means that you've
23 got to follow the evidence, you know. This should be a
24 reality-based process. And just because you have to
25 complete the study -- which makes sense, honestly, you

1 know. What good is a half-finished study?

2 But the outcome of the study should be in doubt,
3 and it should be reflecting the reality. It shouldn't be
4 driven by a pre-conceived policy. This thing started in a
5 prior administration, when things were quite different. We
6 were in the middle of a recession. Interest rates were
7 twice what they are now. We'd just come out of the big
8 dig, you know, the sort of terrifying cost escalations of
9 that project. There was no consideration -- I mean,
10 tunnel-boring technology has advanced at a dramatic rate
11 since then. We now have cities all over the world building
12 these urban rail links and shows just exactly how it can be
13 done and how affordable it can be.

14 Just as one example, Zurich has just completed a
15 three-mile rail link for \$2,000,000,000, and this is a city
16 that's a lot more expensive than Boston, with old
17 buildings, rivers, great labor unions, super benefits. I
18 mean, it's not a cheap place to do anything, and they've
19 done a rail link there for \$2,000,000,000. Malmo did one
20 for \$1,000,000,000.

21 Now, I don't think it's going to cost that here,
22 and we need to really look at our procurement and get a
23 handle on these numbers. But this is something that really
24 needs a serious look, and not just being dismissed out of
25 hand as it has been.

1 Some of the many benefits of this project that
2 have been alluded to are -- excuse me -- the real estate
3 implications. The city of Boston estimated \$100,000,000 in
4 potential annual tax revenue from development in Widett
5 Circle. You've got similar properties at North Station and
6 North Point, Beacon Park Yards.

7 One of the consequences of a unified system is
8 you have a lot more flexibility about where you put your
9 layovers. The southside layovers, which are so dominant
10 now, because that's two-thirds of our fleet, would be on
11 the north side, where there actually is more property
12 available at lower value.

13 There is also a point that was mentioned by an
14 earlier speaker. We need to be taking a much harder look
15 at how to encourage the mid -- diminish the need for
16 layover by doing more off-peak service. Metro North has
17 now gotten their off-peak ridership to be more than 50
18 percent of total, and these are things that really need to
19 be look at critically, and not just proceeding with the
20 same sort of tired assumptions that we're parking half our
21 fleet for half the day. That's a really valuable thing to
22 be just leaving, sitting around someplace, quite aside from
23 the real estate implications of it.

24 One of the things that was identified in the
25 study that we oversaw from '95 to 2003 was that the MBTA,

1 even back then, could save up to \$100,000,000 a year by
2 just the efficiency of being able to do run-through
3 service, and not have to back their trains in and out of
4 these stub-end terminals all day long, with all the labor
5 and extra equipment that takes. This was actually one of
6 the drivers -- one of the big things that was pushing the -
7 - for the unification of systems back in 1900 was that.
8 Even when there wasn't a surface rail link, an elevated
9 rail link along (indiscernible), the thing that was really
10 pushing the project forward was the inefficiency of stub-
11 end terminals. This has been cited time and time again in
12 the international precedence that we're of, so.

13 We strongly encourage MassDOT to take this final
14 opportunity to rethink the scoping, and that the FEIR
15 should not be considered complete until the changed
16 realities of our current situation have been fully
17 reflected in the study. Thank you very much.

18 MS. NANCY FARRELL: Thank you. Wig Zamore.

19 MR. WIG ZAMORE: Thank you. I'm Wig Zamore from
20 Somerville. I'm the founder of STEP. Not nearly as well-
21 versed in some of the rail details as many of the speakers
22 before me, so I apologize for that.

23 I do do a fair amount of environmental health and
24 environmental epidemiology in environmental science. I'm
25 published in Atmospheric Chemistry and Physics, Atmospheric

1 Environment, Environmental Science and Technology, which is
2 the top journal in the world.

3 And I'm concerned about any diesel rail
4 expansion. I'm not concerned about rail expansion. So to
5 the extent that things could be electrified, certainly
6 would be in support of that.

7 Somerville has the most highway vehicle miles
8 traveled per square mile in the state, as well as the
9 densest population, as well as the most diesel commuter
10 rail miles traveled per square mile in the state. And we
11 don't want any stop.

12 So when I just briefly glanced at this, I see
13 track expansion, and to me that means that there's going to
14 be more diesel rail consumption. The T is already the
15 biggest diesel consumer in the state. It seems pretty
16 close to Neanderthal to me for us to be considering any
17 kind of diesel rail expansion or diesel rail continuation,
18 as opposed to electrification.

19 So if you think about Switzerland, I think 99
20 percent of their transit is electric, whether it's in city,
21 between city, between countries. They're not opulent.
22 It's not gold-plated. It's just very high track usage,
23 very high transit usage.

24 So just a couple more points. Right now we're in
25 the comment period for the partial diesel settlement for

1 the Volkswagen for the two liter engines. So that's
2 \$14,700,000,000, and anybody can put forward any proposal
3 will reduce diesel emissions, okay. So -- and it is true,
4 as mentioned before, that two to three years ago, IARC,
5 which is the World Health Organization's cancer branch,
6 declared diesel to be -- diesel emissions to be a Class 1
7 carcinogen. So they are right there with asbestos, with
8 cadmium, and with tobacco smoke, Class 1 carcinogen. That
9 was reconfirmed April a year ago by Health Effects
10 International Review. So there is no question about that.
11 Diesel is a Class 1 carcinogen.

12 On the other end of the spectrum, diesel
13 emissions and black carbon in them are 3,000 times as
14 potent at CO₂, as --in their climate impact. We don't even
15 have short-term climate pollutants in our climate model in
16 Massachusetts, because we don't have science capacity in
17 the government here. It's not the fault of anybody in
18 government. We simply don't have the personnel.

19 So California and its Air Resources Board is in
20 charge of the diesel settlement, and the technology behind
21 it, and the calculations behind it. They have capacity
22 that EPA does not have. They have almost 2,000 employees,
23 between California Air Resources Board and South Coast Air
24 Quality Management District, over 1,800 employees. So they
25 framed that settlement, and they framed the list of targets

1 for the mitigation that Volkswagen, and Porsche, and Audi
2 will pay for.

3 Then I guess that's probably what I wanted to
4 say. But you know, if with North-South Rail Link we can
5 electrify at least in the denser parts of the city, not
6 just in Boston but wherever the dense populations, then
7 certainly I would be much more in favor of that. Thank
8 you.

9 MS. NANCY FARRELL: Thank you, Wig.

10 MR. BRAD BELLOWS: Can I say one thing --

11 MS. NANCY FARRELL: Mr. Bellows, it would be
12 recorded, so can it wait?

13 MR. BRAD BELLOWS: -- I'll tell Wig.

14 MS. NANCY FARRELL: Okay. Thank you. Councilor
15 Jackson?

16 COUNCILOR TITO JACKSON: Thank you so much.
17 Thank you for putting me behind the Ph.D. in physics. I
18 truly appreciate that. I was not -- they actually didn't
19 take the paper that I actually sent them.

20 I want to greet you in the words of Dr. Ian
21 Malcolm. And many of you might know him as Jeff Goldblum
22 in the movie *Jurassic Park*. And famously he said, "Your
23 scientists were so preoccupied with whether or not they
24 could, they didn't stop to think if they should." "Your
25 scientists were so preoccupied with whether or not they

1 could, they didn't stop to think if they should."

2 We have not recreated the dinosaur here yet, but
3 if we move in the right -- the wrong direction, the
4 dangerous direction, we could recreate a dinosaur. And I
5 think we actually have to ask this question in government,
6 because oftentimes in government we get going on stuff,
7 right. I'm -- urban ring and all that other cool stuff
8 that were supposed to happen. And we sometimes fail to
9 think of the practical aspects.

10 And also, when we ask a question that potentially
11 there is another answer that we didn't think of that could
12 come forward. And I think this is one of the cases here.
13 When I hear 60,000 cars off the road on a daily basis, when
14 I hear thinking about this through the lens -- and I don't
15 know if this has been spoken about earlier -- of equity in
16 the city of Boston.

17 We are the economic engines, but the most
18 inequitable part of the city of Boston is actually not
19 where we're talking about right now. It's our friends in
20 Mattapan, where people are actually considering taking away
21 the rail that they actually have there, and it takes --
22 most of those people work at hospitals. It takes an hour
23 and half for them on a bus to actually get to Longwood and
24 Boston Medical Center. So that's another perspective that
25 we actually need to be thinking about this through the lens

1 of equity. And I would say as a councilor who represents
2 the core of the city of Boston and an inner city
3 neighborhood, that's something that we should focus on.

4 And I think lastly we should focus on our legacy,
5 the legacy of leaving it better than we found it. And we
6 potentially could make a decision that could make the
7 future of transportation and this rail link in the city of
8 Boston actually an impossibility by the things that we
9 decide in this process.

10 So I would ask that we slam on the brakes, that
11 we take the time and actually think about a better idea.
12 And I believe that better idea is a North-South Rail Link.
13 It actually gives another component that I also believe
14 that we need. The least amount of transportation
15 infrastructure in the city of Boston is in that place that
16 we call the Innovation District. Because there's nothing
17 innovative about the transportation infrastructure there.
18 You can get in. Really, really hard to get out.

19 This gives us an opportunity to actually move
20 forward, and actually be more thoughtful, as our friends up
21 in Somerville have been relative to how we built that
22 transportation infrastructure. So I actually implore the
23 Commonwealth to actually stop, do the right thing here, and
24 actually listen to many of the experts, but also listen to
25 very important ideas about another way to think about this,

1 and another way to do it that actually has better results
2 and better outcomes, and actually gets us further towards
3 the environmental goals that we all have in the city of
4 Boston, as well as the state of Massachusetts.

5 And I want to thank all of the folks who spent a
6 lot of time on this, but that time actually doesn't give us
7 the right to step over the line in areas that we probably
8 should not move towards. And again, I appreciate the
9 experts, but I believe there are as many experts on the
10 other side that say don't move in this direction.

11 So again, let's leave it better than we found it.
12 Let's pass this transportation infrastructure to the next
13 generation in a better shape and fix the things that we
14 have not fixed in the past. We know that we have -- we
15 should be making these connections, like every other major
16 city in this -- in the United States of America and also
17 beyond. Thank you so much for the opportunity to speak
18 tonight.

19 MS. NANCY FARRELL: Thank you, Councilor. That's
20 the end of my list of speakers. So I will remind you of
21 the comment period, which closes for MEPA on August 5.
22 There is a sheet of paper at the sign-in desk, which has
23 all the information. You can email, postal mail, or fax
24 Holly with your comments of any length. No one will cut
25 you back, like I might have tonight.

1 So I really appreciate everyone's participation
2 and your thoughtful comments. And again, we do have copies
3 of the FEIR on CD here. Otherwise, I bid you good evening
4 and hope you enjoy this lovely summer evening. Thank you
5 for coming.

6 MR. DAVID MOHLER: Thank you.

7 AUDIENCE: (Applause.)

8 (Meeting adjourned.)

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25