MEMORANDUM

To:	Mike O'Dowd MassDOT Project Manager	Date:	January 5, 2018
From:	Jeff Dietrich Howard Stein Hudson	HSH Project No.:	2013061.14
Subject:	MassDOT I-90 Allston Interchange Improvements Project Public Meeting Introducing the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) – Brookline Meeting Notes of December 12, 2017		

Overview

On December 12, 2017, members of the Allston I-90 Interchange Improvement Project team and MassDOT staff associated with the job held the second in a series of public meetings to introduce the public to the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR), and outline the process for submitting comments on the document. This series of meetings has been noticed in local newspapers in Allston, Brighton, Brookline, Cambridge, and Boston. Physical copies of the DEIR, bundled with digital appendices, have been made available for reference in libraries in Brookline, Boston, and Cambridge.

At the time of this meeting, the comment period for the DEIR was scheduled to end on January 19, 2018. On December 20, 2017, MassDOT announced an additional extension of the comment period to February 9, 2018. This represents a total of 72 days since the document was made publically available at the Task Force meeting on 11/30/2017, and a total of 66 days between the official kick-off of the comment period on 12/06/2017 and its closure.

The Brookline Transportation Board hosted the meeting as a special session, with the project as the sole agenda item, and the stated purpose of ensuring that the Board and their represented constituents had an opportunity to ask questions of the project team related to the creation of an official comment letter by the Board to the MEPA office within the Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs (EEA). The meeting was open to the public, but facilitated by the procedures of the board; proceedings were opened by Chair Josh Safer, and after a brief welcome and orienting remarks, the floor was given to the project team for presentation.

The presentation given by Mike O'Dowd and Chris Calnan provided an overview of the structure and high-level content of the document. Subsequently, the floor was opened to discussion, first to questions by members of the Transportation Board, and then to public comment directed at the Board in order to inform their comment letter or ask questions directly of the project team.

While these minutes document the comments given, the project team has stressed that formal comments at this stage, per Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act Office (MEPA) requirements, must be submitted to that agency before the closure of the comment period in order to be evaluated for the purposes of generating a scope of work for the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR).

Comments were focused largely on prioritization of transit elements in the project, and the impacts of a north/south transit or general-purpose traffic connection using Malvern Street. The definition of 'transit elements' varies from person to person, but generally includes some or all of the following:

- The idea that for West Station to be considered "as part of the project" by the general public, it must be built in the project's first phase along with the urban interchange and highway elements;
- The inclusion of a north/south transit connection through West Station using Malvern Street to access Commonwealth Avenue, generally imagined as part of a new MBTA bus and private shuttle route connecting Harvard Square, West Station, the Longwood Medical Area, and eventually perhaps Roxbury, Dorchester, and Porter Square; and,
- The introduction of an urban rail system, typically running on Diesel or Electric Multiple Units (DMUs/EMUs) on the Grand Junction Line, connecting Kendall Square to the Worcester Commuter Rail line via transfers at West Station.

Some commenters expressed alarm at the phasing of West Station that is currently projected in the DEIR; many comments included the statement or direct implication that West Station has been "removed from the project" as a result of this phasing. West Station remains a core feature of the Preferred Alternative, and has not been removed from the project: the expectation that the station will be phased as outlined is based on current direction from MassDOT leadership, available financing and funding, the existing and substantial need to provide layover capacity to support existing commuter rail service, and anticipated short-term ridership projections at West Station before any of the expected development occurs at Beacon Park Yard.

West Station as now conceived has evolved from a Commuter Rail platform and overpass, like Yawkey Station or Boston Landing Station, as envisioned in the 2014 Environmental Notification Form (ENF). This evolution occurred in cooperation with Task Force and public desires for a transit hub that includes both Commuter Rail platforms and bus connections, along with the associated

platforms and layover space; bicycle and pedestrian accommodations to, through, and around the station as well as bike parking including Hubway; and flexibility to not preclude potential services like taxis and transportation network companies (TNCs). The idea of the station being phased to facilitate development of parcels within the Beacon Park Yard was also discussed at length by the Task Force's Harvard University representatives, in a presentation to the group in October 2016.

As in the Task Force meeting on November 30 and the Allston public meeting on December 5, 2017, strong support continues for an interim, "opening day" West Station to be built as a way to achieve some of these goals, in advance of the full-build station that the project will deliver in Phase III.

Based on public comments offered at this meeting and elsewhere in this project, it is worth defining 'mitigation' as used by MassDOT and the MEPA office. . Mitigations are *only* proposed on a project basis, in response to any unavoidable impacts of that project. Projects do not provide mitigations for impacts by other construction jobs, past or present, and cannot provide mitigations unrelated to the impacts of the project.

The second major issue of comment and question concerned the implications of a potential transit or general-purpose traffic connection north/south through West Station using Malvern Street to connect the interchange to Packard's Corner. Residents of Brookline have expressed deep concern regarding the impacts of a general-purpose traffic connection on quiet residential streets, and distrust that a physical 'bridge' connection, even if initially restricted to buses, would not in the future be opened to general traffic by a future administration or in reaction to changing needs. It is important to note that a transfer-style station, similar to Forest Hills or Ruggles, could address these concerns, without precluding coordinated north/south transit service that uses West Station as a transfer hub.

Some commenters also echoed questions from earlier meetings regarding the street grid. Since the early days of the project, there has been near-universal consensus that a suburban-style interchange, like that which exists today, is not appropriate for the context of the neighborhood and the project. As a result, the project instead advanced an urban street grid design. This grid has been sketched out at a planning level of resolution for the DEIR: this includes only foundational items such as lane counts, intersection configurations, and the existence and type of bike and pedestrian facilities. Specific engineering details and the configuration of every street have not yet been finalized. The project team expects that close coordination with the City of Boston, which will ultimately own the streets, will influence these designs, within the bounds of the character of an urban street grid.

The street grid is designed to meet City of Boston's Complete Streets standards, serve the goals of the Vision Zero initiative, provide bicycle and pedestrian facilities throughout the street grid, and appropriately process the vehicular traffic from the Turnpike without introducing unacceptable

levels of congestion and idling. Of particular note is Cambridge Street, which will be reconstructed as a Complete Street with protected intersections, parking-protected bike lanes, integrated bus stops, medians, and improved pedestrian facilities.

Comments on the DEIR must be submitted to MEPA by the close of business on February 9, 2018; comments can be submitted electronically or mailed. Details are available on the presentation given at this meeting and posted to the MassDOT project website at: http://www.massdot.state.ma.us/highway/HighlightedProjects/AllstonI90InterchangeImprovementProject/Documents.aspx (also accessible by Googling "I-90 Allston Interchange Improvement Project").

Agenda

Detailed Meeting Minutes[1]

Note for the reader: this meeting was hosted by the Brookline Transportation Board, and the project team delivered a presentation as the sole agenda item of that meeting.

C: Josh Safer, *Brookline Transportation Board*: Welcome everyone and thank you for coming. My name is Josh Safer, Chair of the Brookline Transportation Board. To orient you all to the process: our agenda tonight is formally for the Transportation Board to hear about the project for the purposes of submitting a comment letter with our thoughts. We'll ask questions of the project team first; then, we tend to be more open and informal. We welcome thoughts from the public, asking questions or mentioning things that you want us to make sure we include in our letter. We need to be especially good about time tonight, since we are on school property with a rigid

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

exit-time rule of 9pm. So, we'll be focused; we'll get our questions answered; and then you can see what we're missing in terms of key points. With that, I'll turn it over.

C: Mike O'Dowd, *MassDOT Project Manager*: Welcome everyone, thank you for coming. I know you all could have other things going on, and we appreciate that you came here. Thank you to the board for setting this up; we know that this is a special meeting that wasn't expected this month, and we appreciate that extra effort. We asked for this to make sure that we could bring people together to discuss the document at this important stage. The Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) was filed on November 30th and the comment period is open. To give a proper introduction, I'm Michael O'Dowd with MassDOT. I've had the pleasure of meeting many of you before, including at another meeting in front of this board. We have received lots of feedback from this group and others, which we sincerely appreciate, and to the extent practicable, we have incorporated that feedback into the DEIR. In writing your comment letters, I will encourage you to focus on the sections that are of the most importance to your particular transportation cause. The document is publically available online, and we brought flash drives with us tonight, if you haven't already downloaded it.

This is one of several meetings to introduce the public to the DEIR and help walk through the document. If you have specific issues of concern, Chris Calnan will point you to the relevant chapter and walk you through it. He is our project manager from Tetra Tech, our lead designer. His team here tonight includes many of the subject matter experts involved with the document. This thing is 600 pages long, without the appendices, so there has been lots of labor and workforce involved. Alex Strysky is also here; he is our Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs (EEA) contact in the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) Office. We file this document through his office at EEA, and he is our designated analyst there. That means you will write your comments to him, and he will have the pleasure of reading all of them. Alex and EEA will take comments electronically as well as by traditional mail. Right now, that deadline is January 19, 2018, although we are aware that some requests have been made of Secretary Pollack's office to extend the deadline. I know that her office is taking that under advisement and will let us know of any changes.[2]

I will ask tonight that you give Chris the opportunity to go fully through the presentation and then if you have questions subsequent to that, then you can fire away.

[2] On December 20, 2017, MassDOT announced an additional extension of the comment period to February 9, 2018. This represents a total of 72 days since the document was made publically available at the Task Force meeting on 11/30/2017, and a total of 66 days between the official kick-off of the comment period on 12/06/2017.

C: Josh Safer: A minor correction of process: they will ask questions of the board, to help inform our comments to you.

C: Mike O'Dowd: Of course, thank you.

C: Chris Calnan, *Tetra Tech*: Good evening everyone. As Mike said, I'm going to step through the organization of the DEIR and highlight some key points. This should be only about a 30-minute presentation so that we have plenty of time for questions and going into further detail. Here are our goals: to explain how the DEIR is organized; provide a high-level overview of the content; and to give you instructions and details for contacting MEPA and offering comments.

DEIR Organization

This is the cover page of the document. This is a very big document: more than 600 11"x17" pages. There are also 115 pages of figures, and it is designed to be graphic-intense, in order to help with reading comprehension. The structure of the document conforms to the scope of the ENF Certificate: it describes the Urban Interchange Preferred Alternative 3K and three throat variations of that Preferred Alternative. The document does not select a variation in the throat; it just describes the impacts of each. Overall, there are 10 chapters in the document:

Chapter 1 is the summary, the 'quick-read' for those who cannot or don't want to read the entire document. This describes the project in overview, outlines its evolution, and talks about the impacts analyzed and the mitigations proposed.

Chapter 2 describes the Purpose, Need, and Goals for the project, including West Station, the bike and pedestrian connections, and the interchange itself.

Chapter 3 provides the alternatives analysis that we've studied, including lots of discussion of the throat variations, as well as the Franklin Street footbridge, various connections to Commonwealth Avenue ('Comm Ave'), and maintaining the River Street Bridge right-turn from Soldiers Field Road.

Chapter 4, "Affected Environment", means the existing conditions in the area of the project. There are more than 20 subject areas in this chapter, and plenty of detail, all describing how things are operating out here today.

Chapter 5, "Assessment of Impacts" is organized in the same way as Chapter 4, but assesses the impacts to all those subject areas described in Chapter 4. This includes analysis of Noise,

Historic concerns, Bicycle & Pedestrian Facilities, Stormwater, the impact of any connections to Commonwealth Avenue, etc. This is one of the largest chapters and includes plenty of detail.

Chapter 6, "Compliance and Consistency with Environmental Laws, Regulations, and Programs," summarizes compliance with the various regulatory concerns, in a tabular format.

Chapter 7, "Mitigation", presents potential mitigations with regard to those impacts. Wherever impacts cannot be avoided, that is where mitigations are proposed.[3] Again, many subject areas, and they match the same organization as Chapters 4 and 5.

Chapter 8 is a determination of the appropriate public benefit associated with affected tidelands.

Chapter 9 is response to comments and public involvement: this is where all comments received on the ENF are formally responded to, and it also includes a summary of the public process undertaken to this point. Chapter 10 is the circulation list for the DEIR.

Then, finally, there are 13 appendices. These are provided electronically and are not a part of the book because they are many thousands of pages. These provide additional detail on their subject matters, to supplement the report.

DEIR Content

Next I'll give you an overview of the major content elements. We'll start by stepping back: in 2014, we held a Public Information Meeting, and this interchange is what we presented. You can see that it's extremely basic, and doesn't have a lot of detail: it shows some tracks to the south, West Station, and a few ramp connections. Later, we filed a Preferred Alternative 3J with MEPA for the ENF process, which includes more detail, including West Station, the rail components, bike and pedestrian elements, and more. Lots of this carries over to where we are now, but not all. With a robust public involvement process, we've made improvements and added further detail, taking us to where we are now: Preferred Alternative 3K. A lot of you probably saw this on the boards coming in. You can see the throat area I've been talking about, in the lower right. The graphics you're seeing tonight are straight from the DEIR, so you can look at them there as well.

[3] Based on public comments offered at this meeting and elsewhere in this project, it is worth defining 'mitigation' as used by MassDOT and the MEPA office. . Mitigations are *only* proposed on a project basis, in response to any unavoidable impacts of that project. Projects do not provide mitigations for impacts by other construction jobs, past or present, and cannot provide mitigations unrelated to the impacts of the project.

This major elements of the preferred alternative include: realigning the Turnpike to the south; providing a context-sensitive urban street grid, connecting the street grid to the highway and to Cambridge Street; making extensive improvements and adding new connections for bikes and pedestrians, including the Franklin Street bridge, a connection on Malvern Street, and connections to the Paul Dudley White Path; expanding rail operations and layover at Beacon Park Yard (BPY); relocating Soldiers Field Road and introducing an underpass that expands available open space along the Charles; and adding noise walls along the Turnpike.

CONCEPT 3K-HV VARIATION (HIGHWAY VIADUCT)

The highway-viaduct variation provides a widened elevated highway with the rail at-grade, very similar to what's there today. It shifts Soldiers Field Road south towards the viaduct which allows us to gain more open space near the river; and allows us to incorporate a widened Paul Dudley White Path and a widened landscape buffer between the path and Soldiers Field Road. Overall, there aren't many changes in this variation from what we've been showing over the past year. Here, you can see a cutaway rendering showing the highway viaduct with the rail system underneath, with Soldiers Field Road and the bike path to the left. These renderings have all been updated for this document. This looks east towards downtown, with the river to the left. Next, here is a conceptual rendering of a view looking east towards downtown, just west of the tightest portion of the throat. This gives you some perspective on the experience of the path, and you can see the viaduct off to the right. I should note that there are lots of other renderings in the DEIR, we've just pulled these out for tonight to give you a sense of what to expect.

CONCEPT 3K-AMP VARIATION (AMATEUR PLANNER)

Next, 3K-AMP, which originated from Ari Ofsevit, throat variation provides an elevated rail with the highway at-grade, flipping the viaduct from what's out there today; it raises Soldiers Field Road in the eastbound direction 4' higher than the westbound direction, in order to help minimize the wheel noise of the road for users of the Paul Dudley White Path. This alternative also incorporates a widened PDW path of 12', and a landscaped buffer between the path and Soldiers Field Road. Unique to this variation is an elevated shared use path connection from West Station to the Paul Dudley White path, along the rail viaduct and above the highway. This variation includes replacement of the Grand Junction Line Bridge over Soldiers Field Road; which also allows for some additional Paul Dudley White path connections near the Grand Junction Line Bridge and the BU Bridge to give direct connections without the boardwalk. Here's the cut-away view; showing an overview of the elements. Then that's follow by, a conceptual rendering, just west of the tightest part of the throat. This wall-like structure is the elevated barrel of Soldiers Field Road.

CONCEPT 3K-ABC VARIATION (A BETTER CITY)

Next and finally, the 3K-ABC variation, which originated from A Better City (ABC). This eliminates the viaduct structures and places the roadway and rail elements at-grade; in other words, everything is on one plane, with no vertical stacking. Similarly to 3K-AMP, this raises Soldiers Field Road eastbound to help with noise. It maintains the Paul Dudley White Path in its currently width at the narrowest point; also includes replacement of the Grand Junction Line Bridge; and provides additional path connections at the Grand Junction Line and BU Bridges. Here is the cutaway view at the narrowest location; you can see everything roughly at the same plane. It does take up a larger footprint as a result of that decision. Then, the conceptual rendering; again, there are no viaducts, but there is a retaining wall from Soldiers Field Road.

Project Phasing

MassDOT currently expects this to be a phased project. Phase 1 is the largest, targeting substantial completion in 2025. It focuses on addressing the deteriorating viaduct, the street grid, and bike and pedestrian connections. It includes: reconstruction and realignment of the Turnpike; the realignment of Soldiers Field Road and construction of the underpass; building the street grid with the bike and pedestrian accommodations including separated bicycle lanes, on-street lanes, shared-use paths, etc.; rebuilding Cambridge Street as a Complete Street, which we've been talking about since day one of this project; building a new two-way shared use path adjacent to Cambridge Street South as an at-grade connection to the Paul Dudley White Path and the river, an idea which was added from the BPDA Placemaking Study; building a new bicycle and pedestrian connection at Malvern Street from the interchange to the south; reconstructing the Franklin Street footbridge; making improvements to the existing Beacon Park Yard to store up to 8 train sets; and constructing noise walls along the Turnpike.

Phase 2 is targeted for completion sometime after 2025, and is focused on Beacon Park Yard: construction of additional layover tracks and switches to store up to 16 train sets, as well as crew quarters, storage sheds, utilities, and other infrastructure to support light maintenance.

Phase 3 is targeted prior to 2040, to evolve based on demand and need. This is all focused on West Station. This includes construction of the station, rail platforms, bus concourse, and bike and pedestrian connections. It will reconfigure the rail yard to store 8 train sets—down from the 16 sets in the interim condition—and construct a new bike and pedestrian connection from West Station to Babcock Street. It will also build out the remaining balance of the at-grade streets to the north of Cambridge Street as well as the Stadium Way Connector, currently shown on the

project plans as being constructed by the landowner. These are the so-called 'orange streets', so named since they are generally shown in that color on our overview graphics.

Construction Costs & Funding

Lots of this data was presented to the MassDOT & MBTA joint board meeting few weeks ago. This is a conceptual cost, presenting an "all-in" if everything is built at once. It includes base construction, contingency, and escalation, all as standard for these projects. The takeaway for this chart is that the no-build is the least expensive alternative, but still $426 million once you factor in contingency and escalation. Of the build variations, 3K-ABC is the cheapest at $983 million; then 3K-HV at $1.05 billion; then 3K-AMP at $1.25 billion. There is no doubt that there will be lots of challenges for funding in this project, and lots of attention is being paid to the issue. MassDOT recently established a funding & financing committee to develop a finance plan for this project; that group is looking at public-private partnerships (P3s), public financing, 3rd party contributions—basically anything that could be used do to fund this massive project. Part of the challenge here is that toll revenues produced by the Turnpike and the commuters who use it cannot go towards other elements, such as West Station or the pedestrian & bike connections: they have to be used exclusively for toll facilities and feeders. Next, I'll hand it to Nate to talk through the next steps and how to comment.

Commenting on the DEIR

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis, *Howard Stein Hudson*: Thanks Chris. I'll be quick, everyone. I'll go through how to comment on the DEIR. It was posted in the Environmental Monitor on December 6, 2017, which was the official kick-off of the comment period. It was also posted in local newspapers including the Brookline Tab. The 45-day comment period currently ends on January 19, 2018.[4] In addition to the libraries visible on the slide, I just put a copy of the document in the hands of the reference librarian at the Brookline Library tonight before the meeting. The document is also available for download on the MassDOT website, which is up here and easily Google-able with the phrase "I-90 Allston Interchange". Most people have downloaded the document without a problem—this is great, because it's about 15 pounds of paper printed with all the figures and text. We've been recommending that people not download it on their cell phones, and get a cup of coffee once you hit start. Download time is about two minutes, in all

[4] On December 20, 2017, MassDOT announced an additional extension of the comment period to February 9, 2018. This represents a total of 72 days since the document was made publically available at the Task Force meeting on 11/30/2017, and a total of 66 days between the official kick-off of the comment period on 12/06/2017.

seriousness. If you have any problems, my contact information is available here and on the site; we can provide a flash drive or help you out.

Where to send your comments: you can send either by postal mail or email. Either way, please make sure that both Alex Strysky and Jim Cerbone are copied. This presentation is heavily recycled from one given to the Task Force and at the last public meeting in Allston, which is posted online on the project documents page, so you don't have to write all this information down right now. It's available online, and with the DEIR itself. We're now in meeting number two of this series; if you want to come again or have more questions, we'll be at the Morse School in Cambridge on January 3, with a pre-advertised snow-date of January 10.

So, what's next? The Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs (EEA) will provide MassDOT with a scope, similar to the ENF process. This will serve as the basis for the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR). MassDOT will use the comments from coordinating agencies and the public in order to continue to refine and improve the 3K concept and select a variation for the throat. This will basically be Alternative 3K-Refined, Refined. Throughout that process, there will be continued outreach with the abutting communities, municipalities, stakeholders, and the universities. I imagine that we'll be back with this body as well.

The schedule of the project requires that we have the MEPA process done in early 2019. In large part, this scheduled is driven by the declining health of the main MassDOT asset in this area, the highway viaduct. Here is the schedule chart: we are here, in the final quarter of 2017. Construction of Phase 1 is expected to continue until 2025. Note that this is our current 'best-guess' pending the FEIR scope.

Discussion

C: **Josh Safer:** Thank you. We'll begin with questions from the Board, to make sure that we're all oriented to the project, then we'll proceed to questions from the public.

Q: **Chris Dempsey:** Thank you all, for the countless hours of effort you've put in so far and for your work tonight—especially, thank you for all the specific Brookline outreach and regular meetings. I have a few questions. First, what is the 'no-build' scenario? Replacing the existing?

A: **Mike O'Dowd:** Yes. It would be a major rehabilitation of the existing superstructure and substructure. It's not a complete replacement: we would build from existing foundations, restoring the deck and the ramps. Basically, it would be identical to what's there today.

Q: Chris Dempsey: Are there any changes to Cambridge Street in the no-build?

A: Mike O'Dowd: There would be some minor improvements, which are long overdue. As well, I know that the City of Boston was progressing a design process for Cambridge several years ago, which was put on the backburner because of this project; they might restart that, in the no-build scenario, but for this project, it would mostly be minor safety improvements at the connections.

Q: Chris Dempsey: Secondly, who will own the street grid created in the build-scenarios? Will MassDOT build it and then turn it over to the City of Boston?

A: Mike O'Dowd: That's the idea, yes. The City of Boston will maintain ownership of all the streets, except the ones closest to the highway ramps.

A: Chris Calnan: From Cambridge Street South, including Cambridge Street South, the streets will be owned by the City of Boston—whether easement or fee, I don't think we know. The legs over the highway would be MassDOT-controlled.

Q: Chris Dempsey: This is a technical question. What is the guardrail-to-guardrail width of I-90 today, and would it change in any scenarios?

A: Mike O'Dowd: The current travelway width is 50', or thereabouts. Including the barrier walls, safety parapets, and infrastructure, the viaduct width is about 109' to 110'. In 3K-HV, we are proposing a 60' travelway: 4' left shoulders on the high-speed sections, four 12' travel lanes, and 8' shoulders up against the right lane to allow for errant vehicles, breakdowns, police enforcement, maintenance flexibility, etc. With the other two variations, the cross-section widths are would be like today. We may have some ability to provide additional offsets or shoulders, but we aren't sure yet. Those are 11' to 11.5' travel lanes, with 2' to 3' shoulders on both sides.

C: Chris Dempsey: I ask because that is critical real estate in the throat. We want to be very careful how we allocate space in that area. We don't want to compromise safety in any way, but it has moved 100,000 people per day in the existing conditions. If it is true that 1' for the shoulders means 1' less for parks, we need to be thoughtful with those decisions.

Q: Pamela Zelnick: Does the no-build keep the same width as today?

A: Mike O'Dowd: To the extent that we could widen the deck, we may be able to squeeze an extra foot or so in some places—we haven't analyzed that level of detail yet. The no-build replaces the deck and the joints, which is where the deterioration is focused; that allows us to replace all the

safety parapets, which right now are substandard (amongst many things that are substandard). We would also upgrade our stormwater and scuppers to provide better drainage and outflow.

Q: Chris Dempsey: Could you describe the connection at Malvern Street in Phase 1?

A: Nate Cabral-Curtis: So if you follow the laser here, you'll take a right turn on Malvern, onto an elevated structure rising from Ashford Street. You'll cross the railroad tracks, cross to the street grid, and then hit the shared use path along Cambridge Street South. This allows for connections towards North Harvard Street, or towards river and the Paul Dudley White Path with newly enhanced green space. This can be an at-grade connection because of the depressed 'boat' section shown in purple where Soldiers Field Road dips down. This comes from feedback from the community and the Task Force to give bikes a connection out to the Charles without an elevated, isolated structure. As a cyclist, you could also connect up the Seattle Street Connector onto Cambridge St, which will be rebuilt as Complete Street with protected intersections per City of Boston guidelines, and from there to River Street. All options will allow for simplified intersection crossings and an overall safer experience that is much less daunting than today.

Q: Chris Dempsey: Stepping back a bit to something I'm not sure the DEIR gets into: can you talk about the scale of this proposed neighborhood? I know that it is mostly owned by Harvard, but it will come into being because of this street grid. Do you have expected square footage, number of residents, number of vehicles… basically, how big are we talking? I'm hearing it compared to Kendall Square, and if that's true, that will be a lot of new neighbors for us. I'm not sure Brookline has thought much about what that will mean, yet.

A: Mike O'Dowd: Sure. In this area bounded by Cambridge Street, Soldiers Field Road, and the tracks, we're talking about in excess of 90 acres. Right now, maybe 26-30 acres of that is the Turnpike as we know it today, so this project would unlock a real opportunity for Harvard, which is the landowner for all of this, to develop that land and create this 'new neighborhood'. We've gotten some questions about whether the street grid and the capacity we're showing is necessary. In any variation, we have to make sure that we can manage all of the current and future Turnpike traffic. That includes people getting off the Turnpike and disbursing into the city—whether to Cambridge, to Harvard Ave and Brookline Village, to Commonwealth Avenue, or somewhere else. That's why these streets are being proposed. After those are taken into account, the actual 'terra firma', the land development area, is about 50 acres. That's approximately 4 million square feet, and maybe more. Then there is also an area to the north, the Harvard Enterprise campus, which will be an additional 3 million square feet. So, Chris and his team,

and the CTPS model, reflects about 7 million square feet of development between now and the project design year, 2040.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: This question is also tied up into the BPDA Placemaking Study created by the City of Boston, which is on our project website and was discussed in many Task Force meetings especially in the first half of 2016. Feel free to ask me for those documents.

Q: Jonathan Kapust: I have a couple of follow-up questions from the last meeting. We had talked about the phasing of West Station, and how much you would need to build of that station in order to provide the bike and pedestrian connections. We also asked if there was any discussion about the temporary station. What were the results of those?

A: Mike O'Dowd: I could talk about this for several hours, but will try to stay precise. We had a meeting of the Joint Board yesterday, which included several hours' worth of discussion. There are a few reasons why the project is phased to do the highway interchange, then the layover yard, then West Station. First, there is a dire need for the MBTA to maintain its service. The Commuter Rail has extended and expanded operations on the Worcester Line significantly, over-and-above even were they were a year ago, by adding a second track and the Boston Landing stop. We need to service those commuter rail customers, but we also need to store the equipment. We store as many consists as we can at South Station. We're moving trains around regularly just to get the room we need at South Station, not even carrying passengers, and then we put them back in service in the evening peak period. We have a layover deficit. There are 42 trains operating in the peak hour in the South Station system, and 28 of those idle in the off-peak periods. We only have space for 22, so there are 6 trains constantly in motion, but carrying no passengers, simply trying to stay out of the way. That's why Phase 1 includes taking advantage of that layover space. Then, in Phase 2, with the service demands continuing to grow, we provide storage for an additional eight consists—one consist meaning 9 coaches and a locomotive. This is a significant chunk of equipment, and there is a demonstrated need for that in this area.

West Station is expected in Phase 3, which the Task Force is very unhappy about and which has sparked some op-eds and social media pieces. This is largely driven by financial constraints. As Chris pointed out, it will be $400 million plus for a no-build, and any of the replacements are $1 billion or more. The Secretary does not have $1 billion available today to commit. As a result, we are obligated to first address what we know is structurally deteriorating. There is also an imminent need for layover, which we can meet in a phased scenario. Boston Landing, we know, is showing growing ridership, which is a good thing: it was originally anticipated to be lower than what it is growing to be. The station is also about ¾ of a mile away from where West

Station will be, and services the North Allston area neighborhoods. Per our analysis, we understand that the demand for West Station will depend in large part on the development in the 7 million square-foot box.

Regarding the interim station: there has been plenty of public and Task Force talk, as well as some questions among our board. An interim station is being considered as a result of that feedback. That said, it will hinder existing Worcester Line operations, so it will be harder to justify if we can't demonstrate a demand for it in this area to offset that burden. It would also mean reducing that layover space: of the 8 being proposed, it probably means losing 4 in order to get that interim station. It will also be a significant amount of money, which we don't know yet. We also don't know how much of that interim structure we could re-use for the full station.

Q: Jonathan Kapust: To be clear, is an interim station in the DEIR?

A: Mike O'Dowd: No. We are reacting to that public feedback now, but the Preferred Alternative in the DEIR does not include any interim stations.

Q: Jonathan Kapust: Second, regarding traffic. Last time, we talked a lot about traffic, but general-purpose and specific to transit. What's the update?

A: Chris Calnan: Chapter 5 of the DEIR includes that analysis, including connections from the interchange through Malvern Street to Packard's Corner. This analysis was scoped in the ENF and provided in this stage. In short, such a connection would help Linden Street traffic, but would add traffic on the Malvern Street corridor. Other alternatives studied included a transit-only connection, which looked at various routing options, including a bus on Commonwealth Avenue turning onto Malvern Street, and connecting to a new West Station concourse that connects people to the upper level to circulate and transfer. Another route uses Gardner to Babcock, and another pops out using Agannis Way. MassDOT is not advocating for any of these: they are categorized as 'Do Not Preclude'. If the neighborhood and the City of Boston want to pursue those options with a separate project, they could, but it is not in our Preferred Alternative for the project. We have some slides specific to this from about a year ago, if you want.

Q: Jonathan Kapust: Regarding construction impacts, can you run through the impacts to users during construction? What kind of induced traffic are you including as part of the traffic model?

A: Chris Calnan: We will need a further level of detail for traffic in order to say how certain streets will be affected. Basically, I-90 will be open with three lanes in each direction, rather than four in each direction like today. This will be similar to the Commonwealth Avenue Bridge

substructure repairs that happened over this summer, and it will mean reduced capacity for several years while the interchange is replaced. We would maintain all the ramp connections from Cambridge Street to the interchange during that time. For rail, there are currently two mainline tracks. That would go down to one track during much of construction, with service bouncing back and forth between the existing tracks depending on the activities occurring.

Q: Jonathan Kapust: Are there alternatives that are worse for construction impacts than others?

A: Chris Calnan: For rail, both the AMP and ABC options require long-term construction closure of the Grand Junction Line Bridge over Soldiers Field Road in order to reconstruct things. In both, it is a minimum of three years out of service. During all that time, the freight service and maintenance moves by the MBTA and Amtrak that uses that line would need to be rerouted, along what I believe is a 100-mile detour.

Q: Jonathan Kapust: And what about induced traffic from construction, from the contractor?

A: Chris Calnan: We'll get to that level of detail as the design progresses. Things like access-points to the workzones are not in the DEIR.

C: Mike O'Dowd: I want to make sure that we all understand the role of the Grand Junction Line. The Commuter Rail needs to run trains between the north and south systems, without passengers: trains go to the Big Blue (Boston Engine Terminal) facility in Somerville for maintenance and repair, and then are brought back onto the revenue lines for the system. There is also the train-borne produce for the Chelsea produce market. Finally, Amtrak's maintenance facility is located near Widett Circle, so Amtrak needs to bring trains like the Downeaster across the Grand Junction Line, and to that maintenance facility through South Station. The line gets daily use, throughout the day and night. This is why it is a critical issue for the state to maintain the function of that line as best we can throughout the construction process.

C: Scott Englander: Again, thank you for this incredible effort of labor. At the beginning of the presentation, I saw the word 'multimodal' in big letters. I have to admit, I'm having trouble understanding how this project is being characterized as multimodal. It started out that way, certainly. The transit components were discussed for a while, and are now deferred to a vague future 20-plus years from now. An interim West Station is not included, and there are no details, costs, phasing impacts, etc. It appears that in DEIR, you have to move one rail line in order to make construction happen. It seems to me that an interim West Station had been discussed as a mitigation of the construction impacts: both for people driving in and for those transferring to

other modes as result of construction. You already mentioned budget. What were the principal reasons other than budget for deferring?

A: Mark Shamon, *VHB*: We've looked a bit at what it would take to accomplish an interim station. One option we looked at was a side platform along the BU side, but the T does not believe that they could run the current two-way service with only a side platform. If there are two platforms, in order to serve both directions, there are implications for the available layover space. Right now, the easement extends 145' from the south side, and we have no rights beyond that, so would have to negotiate. Phase 2 is designed to occur with time for that negotiation to happen.

During construction, staging train traffic through the construction area will be challenging in any case. We believe that train traffic through that area will be one-track, at most, and will probably be in slow-down mode, meaning maybe a 20mph maximum throughout all of construction. An interim Commuter Rail West Station does not qualify as'mitigation' for people trying to get into Boston faster during construction.

Q: Scott Englander: It seems to be that West Station is being thought of primarily as a stop on the Commuter Rail from outlying points into South Station. In the planning community, lots of people think of it as a potential regional transit hub, for a train and urban rail and bus network. Did the demand modeling assess the need primarily on the needs of future development, rather than as a regional transit hub?

A: Mike O'Dowd: Great question. Many of you in the room will remember Governor Patrick's announcement of the new West Station in 2014. The $25 million price quoted at that time has gotten lots of mileage in the press recently. At that time and that cost, the institutions were prepared to contribute: BU, Harvard, and MassDOT were going to split the cost in thirds. That cost was based on a station that would be, architecturally, basically the same as Boston Landing or Yawkey Way. It would function as a Commuter Rail stop, and that's it.

Now, three years later, we are filing DEIR, and the station concept has changed extensively in response to public engagement. It's been expanded to that regional hub, and that's why that $25 million is now in the $90 million range. That full station will be positioned to address the regional needs: whether than includes intercity buses, shuttle services for the universities, private or TMA shuttles from Kendall and Harvard Squares, MBTA buses, etc.

The public, the Task Force, the City of Boston and the BPDA Placemaking Study, are all looking at the station as being a fully regional thing. That means a major concourse, with the ability to service 5 berths for live buses, and 5 layover areas for buses not in service; as well as the

pedestrian and bike movements to come through or near the station. The function of the station is already more regional than it originally was.

Q: Scott Englander: My question was: did the demand analysis assume West Station's use as a regional transit hub, or only as a Commuter Rail stop?

A: Mark Shamon: The model included bus services. That's why the station includes the bus berths that Mike mentioned. The model is set up with 5-minute headways from Harvard Square to West Station, 5-minute headways to Kendall Square, and 10-minute headways from the Longwood Medical Area. All of that is incorporated into the model. As Mike said, we didn't model any new regional bus lines, but we did look at the pathways and how any buses would get in and out of the station, to and from the highway, and on to western Massachusetts.

Q: No Name Given: Sorry, what is headway?

A: Mark Shamon: Good question, thank you. Headway is basically the time between two buses.

C: Scott Englander: I'm not sure that that answered my questions, but I'll yield back to the rest of the board.

Q: Josh Safer: I would guess that the majority of the people here tonight are responding to the deferral of West Station, so all of my questions are focused on that issue. What will it take to get that back into the project? If the problem is that the scope of the station increased to being a regional hub, then that would suggest to me that there is demand for such a thing.

Even assuming zero growth, I-90 inbound in the morning rush, Beacon Street, and Route 9, are all overwhelmed as-is. We have to look for opportunities to add extra capacity, and that could mean getting into an argument about transit versus expressways. We could deck the Pike and make it eight lanes in each direction, even, but no matter what we do, increased capacity is needed. West Station was going to accomplish that for transit. So how can we be creative and think about that? Would it make sense to treat it just as a Commuter Rail stop in Phase 1? And if the purpose of this document is to comment on the throat variations, I noticed that the listed cost for West Station is $90 million in one, and hugely different in another. It could be that we would favor one if it's lower-priced, in order to bring it back into the conversation. Can you give us any strategy in that regard?

A: Mike O'Dowd: There are several ways that we've looked at this over the course of the project. I'm not suggesting that West Station isn't being built. We are saying that it will be deferred, but

it is a part of the program that we are advocating for in this project. This project is not just the interchange: it is the placemaking, and the street grid, and the layover, and the station. What you see is that we are anticipating the full station complete by 2040. We're not committed to one date—whether it's 2029, 2030, or 2035. It will happen at some point over those 15-20 years, after we address the highway and the layover needs. We know have a station online and functioning at Boston Landing, and there's some growth is starting in demand for that station, which is great. In our first analysis, though, the travel demand model did not anticipate a lot of demand being placed here. It took the development into account, but the land use of that 50 acres is so widespread based on what Harvard is projecting: lots of housing, employment, study and graduate assistance, retail, commercial... it's a diverse land use package. The trip generation into and out of the area is based on those uses, as you might assume. Most of the volume and demand we see is servicing developments in Cambridge, East Cambridge like Lechmere and North Point, Somerville like Assembly Row—areas that are already serviced by transit.

C: Mark Shamon: It just wasn't there in the CTPS numbers. With development, and with bus and train ridership, it showed only 250 daily Commuter Rail ridership. People have problems with that number, but it's what the model shows. As the Secretary said yesterday, there is one model for the state, and everything is projected in it. Apples-to-apples, it's what came out. We know that Boston Landing is at 400 where it was expecting 200, so there is something conservative in that model. But it only showed 250 people, so even if you assume Boston Landing's doubling, that only gets you 500 people. Bus service, though, showed 3,000 people. To get back to Scott's question a bit: We have a platform and two tracks dedicated to the potential future urban rail service over the Grand Junction Line, integrated into the design for West Station.

C: Josh Safer: I asked for strategy to make this happen; instead, you told me reasons why it might not happen. I'm looking for strategy.

C: Mark Shamon: The Board and the Secretary are interested in your comments; the fiscal questions are a matter of whether money can be found, and how to address the layover need.

C: Scott Englander: If one possible funding scheme is a regional transportation / transit funding referendum, one can imagine that if the project were detailed for the near-term, that funding could be utilized for that. In Brookline, it would be easier to get people to vote for such a thing if there were a concrete project. If it's not in the DEIR, is there any possible way that a referendum would be approved?

C: Mike O'Dowd: I assume you mean interim. The full build station is already in the project. If we continue to get this feedback coming in that interim station is desired and will service

neighborhood needs—not just the development needs that don't exist yet—the Board would have to take into account. If moneys became available, they'd have to consider that as an option.

C: Josh Safer: Alright, we'll move into public comment now. Again, I'll stress that you are giving your comments to us, for us to integrate into our comment letters. We have the team here, so if there are direct answers to questions, maybe they can provide them.

C: Bob Weinburg: In previous meetings, there have been concerns voiced by North Brookline that a vehicle connection on Malvern Street would spill vehicular traffic into North Brookline, specifically along streets like Pleasant, Babcock, and St. Paul Street. This would become a conduit for people from the Turnpike to get to the LMA. This was not addressed tonight: I heard "Do Not Preclude", which depending on your perspective is either reassuring or distressingly vague. It would be useful for us to discuss the vehicular traffic impact of these options. Traffic down Gardner Street will impact Commonwealth Avenue more—never mind the north/south impacts into Brookline. I assume that you have taken ridership changes into account as well.

C: Anne Lusk: Brookline has been extremely progressive in its transportation design, with a highly sophisticated use of state-of-the-art bicycle facilities. Brookline knows not to use shared-use paths. Runners with earbuds, and baby carriages, make them highly, highly unsafe. They shouldn't be built, and are very unsafe in highly congested areas. I've gone to all these meetings, and I know that the People's Pike has requested many things and the Charles River folks have requested many things, but we in Brookline will be negatively affected by vehicular traffic. Brookline used to go all the way to the Charles. In the no-build or in the ABC option, could Brookline have the park that I've been requesting, as a lid over the throat area? This would mean more green space for Brookline, and it would be mitigation for the negative traffic impacts.

C: Tom Nally: I am pleased to see the analysis to date. I am concerned that there is not enough time to review the document, and am hoping for an expanded comment period. In the meantime, we will continue to review, and will have additional comments later. For now, in particular, I have comments on the construction phasing for all variations. Like others, I believe it is essential that that the first phase include, at a minimum, an interim West Station similar to Yawkey. This would provide improved transit service for neighborhoods, and would be a first step to support future development and transportation improvements in the future for both buses and urban rail.

I will focus mainly on the at-grade alternative since I know it so well. We think that ought to be considered as the Preferred Alternative for a number of reasons. First, it is the lowest cost, both in initial and lifecycle maintenance costs.

As a side-note, the dimension for the roadway that we proposed is 48' in each direction: this is the same dimension as what exists to the east, which was recently reconstructed and the median rebuilt. It is the same shoulder width, and the same lane width.

The construction sequence that we propose is straightforward and simple, with minimized traffic disruption. As Anne suggested, it is critical that there be connections made with decks and pedestrian bridges from places like Pleasant and Amory Streets, connecting to the edge of the river at locations where the spread between the edge of river and the transportation elements is wide enough to allow columns to be placed. Ours is the only alternative that provides for this, because without the viaduct, you can build a bridge across the highway. This is easiest at the eastern and western ends: I believe that in the eastern end, near BU Bridge and as part of the reconstruction of the Grand Junction Line Bridge, there is an opportunity to accommodate a wider Paul Dudley White Path, even if we are constrained in the middle.

A flat and straight roadway on the Turnpike is much safer and quieter, because there will be no trucks shifting gears in order to climb the viaduct incline. We suggested raising the eastbound Soldiers Field Road to shield the edge of river and Magazine Beach from noise. We believe—though not all the analysis has demonstrated this—that noise will propagate more so on a viaduct than if the highway is at-grade. There have been other enhancements along the edge, which is much improved, and we are very open to other suggestions. In sum: we believe that ours is the best option, and we hope that the board will support it in your comments.

C: Jules Miner-Brage: I commute daily around the Beacon Park Yard, mostly by biking, but also sometimes driving and on the bus. I am flabbergasted that the Pike itself isn't viewed as something that needs to be mitigated. It is a barrier that diverts all traffic west and east, creating traffic at Harvard and BU Bridge. This whole area is development on the other side of the wall for me. I don't care if you call it a station or something else, but it needs to be permeable to pedestrians and bikes as well as vehicles. You need to connect Brookline to this new development. I believe that there will be local and negative impacts as a direct consequence of this impermeability. Folks view this whole region as needing mitigation, and West Station could be one part of that, including a bus connection. Bike connections are also great and you should include more of those if at all possible. There would be a substantial reduction in vehicular traffic if it were possible to ride a bus that wasn't the 66.

C: John Bowman: I have two issues that I want to highlight, and while MassDOT is here, I would love to hear their response if possible. But first, there have been three years of design and planning for multimodal elements including West Station. Yesterday at the Joint Board meeting,

I learned that neither MassDOT nor the MBTA, during those three years, has done any priority planning or financial planning for the West Station component. That's why money is an issue, because it's not in the budget. A process would be needed to elevate West Station in the priorities to make funding available. So, my request to the Brookline Transportation Board is for you to request that MassDOT and the MBTA fast-track funding prioritization and create the funding process that is necessary in order to make West Station happen in the first phase.

Second, assuming that West Station remains in Phase 3: I learned yesterday that Phase 2 implements 8 tracks for 16 consists for mid-day storage. Then, Phase 3 reduces that to 4 tracks for 8 consists. In my mind, that dooms West Station for Phase 3. At the meeting yesterday, it was identified that storage locations are crucial for future operations. If the space is raised to 16 consists in Phase 2, how will there be the political will to reduce it to eight in order to implement West Station? I think it is irresponsible for the presentation given not to say why you believe you can reduce it to eight consists in the face of that urgent need.

C: Josh Safer: We don't have much time, but do you have a quick response?

A: Mike O'Dowd: That question was raised by the Board of Directors, who are ultimately responsible for oversight. The question will come down to: the MBTA, MassDOT, and the Board, need to prioritize investments with the available funding. Right now, there is a critical need for layover. At a future point, West Station will be the demand, at which point, we will have to rescind that layover. In the meantime, we will need to plan the replacements for what know we will lose here. This could mean Readville, Widett Circle, or others. We are forced to try to maintain, expand, and improve all of our services within limited dollars and real estate.

C: Josh Safer: Totally clear, thank you.

C: Jacob Meunier: I am a resident of Brookline. I have three things that I would like to impress on MassDOT tonight. First, West Station should be built now, not a quarter-century in future, in order to pursue transit, not traffic. If you plan for traffic as MassDOT wants to do, you'll get traffic. The region is growing, and if you delay the station, you will get more traffic which will suppress economic growth. The construction phase itself is five years, which will create more gridlock, more bottlenecks, and more commuters on our streets because we are not giving them any alternate routes. By not providing transit options like West Station, MassDOT is asking us to accept longer commutes, increased pollution, and decreased future economic growth. Failing to build West Station will delay service and drive up the costs of the station: it will not be cheaper or easier to build in 25 years. This is an opportunity to meet MassDOT's, the MBTA's, and the Governor's goals for the state.

Second point: West Station is just as important as a transit hub to connect Cambridge and the LMA as it is for train service into Boston. The modeling doesn't really reflect that, and I've heard some hedging on the model tonight. I've not read the document, but the conversation suggests that they've done rigorous modeling. They are describing it as a ¼ walking radius station. That needs more information.

Third, I would urge MassDOT not to build the viaduct. There are other great alternatives, and the at-grade proposal is like the surface option here. It would be cheaper, and more practical, so you can use that money for multimodal improvements.

C: Josh Safer: Excuse me. You're repeating what others have said, so I'm going to have to cut you off so others can speak.

C: Robert LaTrémouille: I am active in Cambridge and have 20 years of railroad experience. I would disagree with the points about delaying West Station because I would trash West Station completely. As a railroader, it makes no sense. People want, and this area needs, rapid transit, but a Commuter Rail stop makes no sense with Boston Landing this close. I have given you plans for a Green Line spur to service this area coming off of the Commonwealth Avenue Bridge, run between the viaduct and BU, stop here, stop at Cambridge Street, stop at the neighborhood, stop at Harvard Business School, and stop at Harvard Square. People are talking about buses—Longwood Ave to Kenmore buses, and eventually the urban ring will connect Kenmore the LMA to the Orange Line. It strikes me as silly.

Q: John Harris: Quick question. The last time the team was here, the estimate was that if Malvern is built as more than a pedestrian and bike connection wide enough for cars and trucks, it would lead to an extra load of 20,000 cars per day. Is that still the estimate?

A: Mike O'Dowd: Yes.

C: Frank Carroll: I would built on what Anne Lusk has said. I'm pleased to see attention to pedestrians and bikes, but the idea of a shared use path is an invitation for trouble. There is enormous money being spent here, and we can anticipate that there will be even more demand for bike tracks, so we need to be building separated infrastructure.

C: Mike O'Dowd: I just want to clarify: there are separated bike and pedestrian facilities throughout the project.

C: Lee Biernbaum: I have worked in Kendall Square and I have worked downtown. My whole transportation life is centered around this area here. True north/south connections—bus, rapid transit, rail, regional, urban rail, whatever it is—via West Station are absolutely crucial for this to be a vital neighborhood. We want this to be a place where everyone can come together and enjoy river. This has to happen. The idea that we'd wait 25 years just to hope that MassDOT will find somewhere else to park their trains is infuriating. To Scott's point, MassDOT is trying to have it both ways in their model: they're saying it's too expensive to build now because it will have both bus and rail operations; but then also, the model says only 250 people will use it so there's no reason to build together. Both cannot be simultaneously be true. I have an economics background, I love models. But models only work if we put the right assumptions into them and if we are intelligent about the answers that come out.

C: Michael Small: regarding greenhouse gas emissions. Section 7-10 and Appendix F state that the preferred alternative creates 17% more pollution than the no-build, which is $500 million less. Why is the preferred alternative preferred in that case? One of the questions asked in the ENF, I believe in section 9.1.22, was regarding how MassDOT would meet the commitment to 7% reduction given in Executive Order 569. The answer there referred other sections, and it seems to be relying on the emissions reductions from West Station to come at a number of 19.8% emissions reductions. If that's deferred, we can't meet that commitment.

Q: Abby Swaine: I'm on the Transit Committee. You've gone on record asking for bus-only connections on Malvern Street. As I listen tonight, I'm wondering if there is a scenario by which an interim station could be built that does not impinge on layover—since I would echo that it is very important for the operations we depend on, and if you don't have layover space that means excess emissions from idling trains. So, could an interim station be built to serve only bus traffic from, and then find the money for the train platforms later?

A: Mike O'Dowd: Please, send that comment in.

C: Hugh Mattison: it looks to me as if there is enough space at Allston Depot near the Pizzeria Regina to have an outbound platform there that could be 20' wide, and which used the existing platform for inbound service. Could that be an interim station? I also want to point out that having a raised viaduct could affect services for the central artery: this does the same thing between Brookline and the Esplanade.

C: Karen Smith: I live on Babcock Street, right at this project. The residents on this half of the street are the only ones who will be affected by the project. There will be 24-hour noise. Hopefully we'll get to move out in a couple of years. As you know, Allston doesn't want a

Commuter Rail station. BU has built themselves into the neighborhood—they even want the name. Let's be honest that West Station is for BU. A transit ring would be more efficient, so we wouldn't have to go to the center of town and then back out. This ring should be at Agannis Way because that's where the big arena is. All of us residents are very concerned about noise. It starts at 5am, six days per week, all day every day. I have studied Urban Planning for 5 classes, and I have an idea. If the Turnpike is cashless, why can't people use their T pass for payment? That way, it would note be attached to a bank account, and people could choose to purchase their passes at a gas station, get a receipt with a bar code, then go through the tolls. Also, the Commuter Rail shouldn't be cashless, it should be about validation and verification.

C: Clint Richmond: I represent Precinct 6, and I am the Sierra Club Transportation Co-Chair. I will echo that I would prefer an at-grade if all is equal. I would echo the noise comments (no pun intended), and add that there are also particulate and greenhouse gas impacts for a viaduct. It sounded like you said it would be only one train track during construction? That would be crazy: if you're reducing Turnpike lanes, the rail demand will go up. You should work to preserve more train traffic.

C: Bob Sloane: I am a member of the pedestrian advocacy committee, represent WalkBoston, and am on the Task Force. Regarding Brookline, we don't always recognize that precincts 1, 2, and 8 are only three blocks from West Station. This is eminently walkable, so lots of those people will use the station. This is important for Brookline to acknowledge. I should also say, at the Board meeting yesterday, they talked about a couple of things. The Secretary said, "the only way to get West Station funded is to have it be mitigation for the highway" – if that will be the case, we will have to build a case for how it would work as mitigation. If the station is built first, you could encourage mode-shift before construction begins. I thought they said "there will never be general purpose traffic through Malvern Street." I don't want Brookline upset if it's not even an option.

C: Mike O'Dowd: There is analysis in the document done to reflect the work that Chris and the team did to study the traffic impacts of a Malvern Street connection for general purpose traffic, for bicyclists and pedestrians only, and for bus-only. Regarding mitigation: that's partially true but you've spun the words a bit. What the Secretary said was "all the analysis my team has done over the last several years would state that West Station is not mitigation of construction impacts."

C: Bob Sloane: If Malvern Street were pedestrian, bus, and bike, that would satisfy everybody. That bus could run to the LMA, which would be a perfect cross-town bus route. All it needs is the Malvern Street connection. That must be in Preferred Alternative.

Q: Rebecca Stone: I represent the Town Meeting Precinct 3. I would like to associate myself with the comments regarding frustration North Brookline feels about being walled off from the Charles. Getting out of Brookline is very difficult, and there are bottlenecks at both ends. It is frustrating not to get any permeability. Second, I am feeling frustrated because I heard Scott ask very good questions about demand studies that were only answered later. The demand studies are taking only new development into account, and those same assumptions when used on Boston Landing were way underneath what they needed to be in order to anticipate demand. I would suggest another pass at the model using better assumptions than I have heard tonight. I'm reading a lot about sea level rise impact. Do any of these have overlay of likelihood of sea level rise, and impacts?

A: Mike O'Dowd: Yes. The two at-grade options do compromise a bit on the resiliency aspects because, in order to get down to-grade quickly enough to maintain the Grand Junction Line, they have to bring I-90 into a cut section below the water table. This creates a bit of a problem for us—we have to pump water up high, and then drain it down, all while meeting clean stormwater standards. So there are concerns there for the at-grade options. That is one of the reasons why the costs are higher. The details of all that analysis are in the DEIR.

Q: Isaac Silverberg: I am on the town meeting precinct 14. I would build off of Rebecca's comments. Are you using a bathtub model or something similar for these models?

A: Mark Fobert: We used a dynamic model for the Boston Harbor:the Wood's Hole model.

C: Isaac Silverberg: I am really confused why MassDOT is paying a lot of money to diminish the layover slots in the railyard, when it needs more railyard. Why would you give all of that prime land for development to Harvard, without putting transit service in for the neighborhood that will actually be affected by the development? We've heard the same promises regarding the Silver Line and the reoute of the Orange Line. You can to prioritize people, not institutions.

A: Mike O'Dowd: We always prioritize people and safety.

C: Jim Franco: I'm from Precinct 1. I would like to associate myself with the West Station concerns. I don't want people to forget that the Charles River is a real jewel. I've walked it, and that choke area is very narrow. I have two comments. First, please consider residue during construction and afterwards. Second, I like the idea of putting Soldiers Field Road at two levels. Third, I really would like that path to be wider. It is really narrow when running, and it is used from used 4:30am to 9pm. Any width at all that you can add would be great.

C: Josh Safer: Thank you all. Unfortunately we are over time, so we have to end it here. We have heard your comments, and there will be future opportunities for you to continue your comments. This has been very informative for us in writing our letters. Thank you all for coming.

Next Steps

The final public meeting of the DEIR comment period is scheduled for January 3, 2018, at the Morse School (40 Granite Street) in Cambridge, with a pre-advertised snow-date of January 10, 2018. In addition, one additional Task Force technical working session is scheduled for January 11, 2018.

Appendix 1: Meeting Attendees

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Josh	Benedikt	
Lee	Biernbaum	
John	Bowman	Brookline Bicycle Advisory Committee
Nate	Cabral-Curtis	Howard Stein Hudson
Chris	Calnan	TetraTech
Donny	Dailey	MassDOT Government Affairs
Jeff	Dietrich	Howard Stein Hudson
Guus	Driessen	Town of Brookline
Mark	Fobert	TetraTech
Jim	Franco	
David-Marc	Goldstein	TMM, AC
Grant	Hauber	
Ed	Ionata	TetraTech
Linda	Jason	PTAC
Jim	Keller	TetraTech
David	Kroop	Resident
Robert	LaTremouille	Friends of the White Geese
Werner	Lohe	
Anne	Lusk	Harvard School of Public Health
Jacob	Meunier	Bicycle Advisory Committee
Jules	Milner-Brage	Resident/Commuter
Meredith	Mooney	Boston University
Tom	Nally	A Better City
Mike	O'Dowd	MassDOT Project Manager
Linda	Olsen Pehlke	TM, Precinct 2, Selectmen's Climate Action Committee
Jane	Piercy	TM Precinct 2
Fred	Pinches	
Yolanda	Rodriguez	
Bob	Sloane	WalkBoston
Michael	Small	
Cynthia	Snow	Bicycle Advisory Committee
Alex	Strysky	MEPA
Abby	Swaine	Brookline Public Transportation Advisory Committee
Casey	Uy	