



STAKEHOLDER TASK FORCE MEETING

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 15, 2018 AT 6:00 P.M.

AT

THE FIORENTINO CENTER
123 ANTWERP STREET
BRIGHTON, MA 02135

FOR THE PROPOSED

ALLSTON I-90 INTERCHANGE IMPROVEMENTS PROJECT

IN BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
HIGHWAY DIVISION

JONATHAN GULLIVER
HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATOR

PATRICIA A. LEAVENWORTH, P.E.
CHIEF ENGINEER

Arlington Reporting Company
(339) 674-9100

SPEAKER INDEX

<u>Name</u>	<u>Page</u>
Donny Dailey, Legislative Liaison, MassDOT - Highway Division	90
Michael O'Dowd, Project Manager, MassDOT - Highway Division	68
Ilyas Bhatti, Civil Engineer, Professor, Wentworth	6, 8, 17, 18, 19, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 32, 35, 36, 38, 39, 40, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 57, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 74, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 93, 94, 95
Jack Wright, Weston and Sampson	9, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 49, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 69, 70, 71, 82, 94, 95
Keri Pyke, Howard Stein Hudson	16, 17, 21, 23, 54, 64, 65, 69, 70, 71, 80, 94, 95
Jay Wickersham, Noble, Wickersham & Heart	83

<u>Name</u>	<u>SPEAKER INDEX</u>	<u>Page</u>
Kate Fichter, Assistant Secretary, Policy Coordination, MassDOT		91, 92
Harry Mattison, Charles River Watershed Conservancy		8, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 79, 80, 81, 82 85, 90, 92, 983, 94, 95
James Gillooly, Boston Transportation Department		16, 17
Stacy Thompson, LivableStreets Alliance		17, 18, 51, 87, 88, 89
Wendy Landman, WalkBoston		18, 19, 40, 41, 53, 71, 82, 85, 86
Jessica Robertson, Allston resident		20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 63, 66, 72, 78, 90
Bill Deignan, City of Cambridge		21, 22, 67, 68
Glen Berkowitz, A Better City		24, 25, 60, 62 76, 77
Fred Salvucci, former Transportation Secretary		26, 27, 29, 74, 76
Jack Wofford,		36, 45, 46

City of Cambridge

<u>Name</u>	<u>SPEAKER INDEX</u>	<u>Page</u>
Ken Miller, Federal Highway Administration		48, 49, 50, 72, 80, 81
Margaret Van Deusen, Charles River Watershed Association		50, 51, 84
Pallavi Mande, Charles River Watershed Association		51, 52, 65
Joe Vega, Harvard University		53, 54
Galen Mook, Massachusetts Bicycle Coalition		54, 55, 57, 58, 59, 70, 76, 77, 86, 87
David Loutzenheiser, MAPC		59
Tad Read, Boston Planning and Development Agency		62, 63, 64, 65, 84, 85
Guus Driessen, Brookline Transportation Board		68, 69, 70
Dick Garver, Charles River Alliance of Boaters		71

<u>Description</u>	<u>EXHIBITS</u>	<u>Page</u>
Sign-In Sheet		97-
Public Comments		

1 **P R O C E E D I N G S**

2 ILYAS BHATTI: Welcome to this meeting
3 of the IRT, which is the Independent Review Team. And
4 my name is Ilyas Bhatti. And, you know, many of you I
5 have had the privilege of working with in the past.
6 So, I'm not going to give you a long introduction
7 other than saying that I'm a professor at Wentworth
8 Institute of Technology. I have had the opportunity
9 of working with many of you in my previous live as MDC
10 Commissioner and Director of Water Supply for what
11 used to be DEQE -- I'm dating myself -- it is now DEP.
12 And, actually, started gaining interest in the Charles
13 River at the MAPC. That's late '70s under the federal
14 tool where it was actually doing a wastewater
15 management study. So, it's wonderful to see that
16 Charles River has some natural life; it's swimmable
17 and fishable.

18 So, tonight, we are going to be giving
19 you sort of an update as to where the Independent
20 Review Team is in terms of the work. They've been
21 working very diligently and intensely. And, we have a
22 product to share with you, which will be done later
23 on.

24 But, with me is Jack Wright. He is the

1 project director. And, Keri Pyke, a principal with
2 Howard Stein Hudson. And we have Sarah Davis, also
3 from Howard Stein Hudson. And, also Jay Wickersham
4 from Noble, Wickersham & Heart. And, also, Anthony
5 Bruzzone from Arup is here.

6 So, tonight, as you know, the last time
7 we met at the task force meeting, the Secretary
8 announced that she was forming an Independent Review
9 Team to look at the design of the so-called throat.
10 Okay? And, we were given a 90-day period to develop a
11 matrix for the comparison of various alternatives, at-
12 grade as well as the viaduct. Okay? So, this team
13 had been working an enormous amount of hours.

14 So, tonight, what we will be doing is
15 Jack Wright is going to go through the matrix that has
16 been developed, which looks at the constructability
17 issues on a whole range of things, including the
18 environment, permitting, resiliency. And we
19 definitely welcome your feedback, your comments.

20 But, also, I have to let you know that
21 we have limited time. This hall has to be locked up
22 by 8:30, but there's a meeting at 7:30. So, we'd like
23 to finish ours by 7:30. But you do have time to send
24 in your comments and thoughts. We have until, what,

1 one week, Harry?

2 HARRY MATTISON: One week from today.

3 ILYAS BHATTI: One week from today.

4 So, you can still send in your comments and we'll
5 definitely welcome that.

6 So, with that, I think that tonight's
7 scope is, as I mentioned, our scope is very narrowly
8 focused on the so-called throat area, 90-day review
9 that ends on September 28. And, today, is actually
10 the 49th day. Okay? So, we've got roughly 41 days or
11 maybe six weeks, okay, whichever way you want to look
12 at it. So, we were charged with the creation of an
13 evaluation matrix, as I mentioned. A number of
14 categories have been evaluated. And, still, the work
15 is in progress. And we just wanted to give you that
16 snapshot and give you a progress report as to where we
17 are right now.

18 And then we'll be -- we'll start
19 assembling the best at-grade and viaduct options. And
20 those options will be presented to the Secretary.
21 Okay? It's like a fact-finding mission, if you will.
22 And, obviously, the decision is up to the secretary.
23 But we want to gather as much information as possible
24 under these various categories of the matrix that I'm

1 talking about. And then it will be up to the
2 Secretary. Our work concludes on September 28th.

3 So, I will also ask you, if you have
4 questions, please do ask those questions, but keep it
5 brief. Okay? If you want to share more information,
6 obviously, send it in. Okay? The committee members
7 will be very, very happy to look at that and we
8 appreciate that. Okay?

9 Now, with that, I am going to introduce
10 Jack Wright. He doesn't need any introduction. He's
11 been a public servant on various things and right now
12 with the Green Line and all of that. And he's vice
13 president of Weston and Sampson. He is the project
14 director for this particular project.

15 Jack?

16 JACK WRIGHT: Thank you, Ilyas.

17 So, as Ilyas mentioned, we are
18 constrained in time both tonight and in the overall
19 effort. It's six weeks to do an awful lot of work.

20 One thing I do want to clarify is we've
21 been saying quite a bit that we're going to come up
22 with the best alternative, the best at-grade, the best
23 viaduct. I just want to clarify what we're talking
24 about when we say that. We're going to find an at-

1 grade version, a viaduct version, you know, a rail
2 viaduct version, that does not have any apparent fatal
3 flaws. It doesn't mean that that is going to be, at
4 the end of the day, like the -- you know what I mean -
5 - like the only at-grade version that's possible.
6 Design development will happen. These are going to be
7 sketch designs that we're doing this process for.
8 They're just schematic. So, I don't want to make
9 people, you know, give people the impression that
10 there won't be design development happening. That all
11 happens later anyways. But for the FEIR, the
12 preferred alternative that needs to be selected, that
13 will be off these plans.

14 So, we obviously -- we've been doing a
15 lot of meeting in the past six, seven weeks. We've
16 met with most of the groups here I think. But,
17 tonight, like I said, what we did promise, and we have
18 for you, is a -- the criteria that we're going to do
19 an evaluation on.

20 I want to, again, emphasize, we're
21 going to do an evaluation on these criteria. We're
22 going to give the criteria -- we're going to set
23 criteria. We're going to set measurements of those
24 criteria. And we're going to look at schemes and

1 we're going to say how they -- how they rate within
2 those criteria. We are not going to -- it's not a
3 yes/no. It's not going to add up to a score in the
4 bottom right corner that says this one is going to be
5 the best of the three different options. It does not
6 work like that. This is just kind of a fact sheet.
7 In order to do anything with the fact sheet at the end
8 of the day, with this as it's filled out, you'll still
9 need to be very familiar with the three plans. You'll
10 have to be looking at the three plans to understand
11 what it means because there's going to be degrees of
12 things.

13 When the Secretary looks at, you know,
14 a better configuration for the Paul Dudley White Path,
15 how much better is going to be a part of that issue,
16 and that has to be looked at. So, there's lots of
17 pieces to that.

18 The other piece I just to mention is it
19 is, at this point, very likely that when we say we're
20 going to look at the three options, and we say the
21 ones without fatal flaws for those three, there will
22 probably be sub-options. So, because you have a
23 particular -- any one of those three plans, for
24 example, you can still do certain things say at the

1 river's edge that doesn't necessarily change the rest
2 of that plan. So, some things will get fixed by it,
3 but there will be options to do other things as well
4 that will be decisions, again, for the people who get
5 paid at that pay grade, primarily the Secretary.

6 One thing -- what we do have in here,
7 we had certain limits. We tried to take as many
8 limits out as possible so that we're looking at many,
9 many different iterations. That makes for, you know,
10 a good part of the work. But there were certain
11 things that we were given that we could not violate.

12 Four lanes of travel in each direction
13 on I-90 will be -- that is a given.

14 Two lanes of travel in each direction
15 on Soldiers Field Road.

16 Two tracks going down out to Grand
17 Junction.

18 Two tracks for the Worcester main line.

19 And, multimodal connections and
20 facilities are all, you know, part of this effort.

21 So, these things are going to be
22 included in the schemes.

23 I would clarify that one point that is
24 we say two tracks for Grand Junction, two tracks for

1 Worcester line. There is a look at can -- you know,
2 can that narrow to three tracks just through the
3 throat area, but still have two tracks going out to
4 Grand Junction given the proposed headways and stuff.
5 Again, we will weigh what that means. If it limits
6 things in the future, that will be recognized. But
7 those things can be looked at but within the fact that
8 there will be accommodation for two tracks crossing
9 the Grand Junction Bridge.

10 The evaluation criteria categories.
11 These are not in any particular order of importance or
12 significance. They are -- they were all simply listed
13 as alphabetically. There was one change to that. And
14 I will say permitting risk was just moved up. That
15 was only moved up because it's tightly connected to
16 the environmental, you know, to the environment. So,
17 it was just put next to that on this sheet, but it
18 does not change the weight of the category. This does
19 not represent the weighting. You'll notice
20 constructability, a very important issue here
21 certainly, safety and operations very important
22 issues, they're at either end of the spectrum. So,
23 there's no easy way to say this is rated higher than
24 anything else. It is deliberately not doing that.

1 So, the criteria. Under
2 constructability, construction timeframe, the number
3 of years and months. So, it's a pretty simple
4 exercise. What is the timeframe to actually, you
5 know, to achieve a particular scheme.

6 Maintains ramp connections from I-90
7 and Soldiers Field Road. So, actually, we start off
8 with a yes/no.

9 Service interruption, duration, user
10 delays. So, it's going to be, again, there's likely
11 to be, you know, even in off-peak hours whatever,
12 there will be some interruptions to things, as you're
13 familiar with construction projects, but how much of
14 that interruption, how much impact, how many travelers
15 are impacted by those kinds of things. That will be
16 looked at.

17 Maintains current rail service to
18 Framingham and Worcester. There's been a lot of
19 discussion about single- versus double-track
20 operation. Obviously, there's an impact to go back to
21 single-track operation, double-track is -- so, you
22 know, how much of that, how much, you know,
23 degradation of the commuter rail service is going to
24 happen with a particular scheme. Again, it will just

1 be looked at. We will be putting an assessment in
2 there of what it is not how important that is, not
3 whether that means that a particular scheme should be
4 not considered or anything like that.

5 Maintains current rail service to Grand
6 Junction. So, there's definitely an impact to MBTA if
7 Green Junction closes. Again, likely Green Junction
8 will close at some point in every scheme, just to redo
9 connections. There's bound to be -- how much of that,
10 however, will be something that will be looked at.

11 Continuing constructability, maintains
12 access to Paul Dudley White Path during construction.
13 Again, yes/no, the disruption, the impact, how much,
14 how many hours, only at night, during the daytime.
15 You know, it would have different impacts. We're
16 going to try and measure what the impact is.

17 Complexity of staging, number of
18 stages, duration, interruptions to service, temporary
19 structures. So, complexity of staging, it's more than
20 just schedule. If, you know, a particular scheme has
21 a bunch of small stages, even though it ends in the
22 same timeframe as a scheme that has two very
23 substantial stages. There's going to be, you know, it
24 is less risk, better working conditions to have two

1 stages rather than 14. I don't think anything is
2 going to be that dramatic, in any case. I'm giving an
3 extreme example. So, that will be looked at also.
4 Again, the intent here is for us to kind of just lay
5 out the facts as to what it is. And, again, the
6 Secretary at some point will be the one deciding how
7 important that is.

8 JAMES GILLOOLY: Are you going to take
9 --

10 JACK WRIGHT: I was doing so well, Jim.

11 JAMES GILLOOLY: No, but this is
12 important I think. Constructability. I don't see
13 anything here that says maintain the current lanes on
14 the highways during construction. You have
15 connections via ramps, but I don't see maintaining
16 lanes.

17 JACK WRIGHT: Okay. So, the maintains
18 rear connections in Soldiers Field Road would need to
19 include also the I-90, the mainline as well, yes.

20 KERI PYKE: Yeah.

21 STENOGRAPHER: Could we just have your
22 name for the record?

23 JAMES GILLOOLY: James Gillooly.

24 STENOGRAPHER: Thank you.

1 JAMES GILLOOLY: There's an E in the
2 middle. Don't take that away.

3 JACK WRIGHT: Okay. And I think Ilyas
4 mentioned this. I just want to be clear. We are
5 pressed for time. We are going to go through this.
6 There's a lot here. We just got it out yesterday I
7 guess -- today.

8 KERI PYKE: Yesterday.

9 JACK WRIGHT: Yesterday, I'm sorry.
10 I'm losing my days. It was yesterday. We did get
11 this out yesterday. You know, some people may not
12 even have had a chance to look at it yet. There will
13 be seven days till 5:00 next Wednesday that we'll be
14 taking comments, written comments, to a website.

15 ILYAS BHATTI: We're also putting these
16 comments right here on the --

17 JACK WRIGHT: Yes, and we're trying to
18 keep up with comments, too.

19 I'm sorry. Go ahead.

20 STACY THOMPSON: Stacy Thompson,
21 LivableStreets, attending for Ari.

22 I'm actually just curious if we could
23 poll the room and find out if people have had time to
24 review this. I know that there are lots of questions,

1 and if people feel like maybe we could go through the
2 categories a little more quickly. I think we only
3 have about 40 minutes left. So, I'm just wondering if
4 people feel like they've had time to review it and if
5 we could just go category by category and jump into
6 questions.

7 JACK WRIGHT: Isn't that what we're
8 doing, category by category? I'm sorry.

9 STACY THOMPSON: I mean maybe not
10 reviewing each, sort of reading through them. If
11 we've all read them, maybe we can just --

12 JACK WRIGHT: Oh!

13 STACY THOMPSON: I'm just curious if
14 that -- I know that folks have a lot of questions, and
15 I certainly do with this.

16 JACK WRIGHT: So, potentially just
17 skipping entire categories of something?

18 ILYAS BHATTI: Accelerating the pace.

19 JACK WRIGHT: Okay.

20 ILYAS BHATTI: So there will be more
21 time for questions and answers. Okay.

22 STACY THOMPSON: Yeah.

23 WENDY LANDMAN: I'm Wendy Landman from
24 WalkBoston.

1 I want to agree wholly with Stacy. I
2 think we only have an hour.

3 JACK WRIGHT: Yeah.

4 WENDY LANDMAN: Many of us came
5 prepared with actually a lot of comments about the
6 criteria, and I think we'd like the opportunity, which
7 is why we actually asked to have two hours to work
8 with you guys. We didn't really get a response. But
9 I think many of us on the Task Force feel like it's
10 important not only for you to hear the comments, but
11 for other members of the Task Force to hear the
12 comments because that's, you know, as a public
13 process. If we're sending you written comments, it's
14 really a burden. So, I think I would agree that we
15 should move into -- allow people to --

16 STENOGRAPHER: And could you identify
17 yourself for the record?

18 WENDY LANDMAN: Wendy Landman from
19 WalkBoston.

20 STENOGRAPHER: Thank you.

21 WENDY LANDMAN: Thank you.

22 JACK WRIGHT: So, is it --

23 ILYAS BHATTI: We can go faster through
24 the --

1 JACK WRIGHT: Well, the idea is we'd
2 skip right by it.

3 AUDIENCE: Jack, we can read them.

4 AUDIENCE: I think we can read this.

5 AUDIENCE: Please don't read it to us.

6 AUDIENCE: Yeah, you don't need to read
7 it to us.

8 JACK WRIGHT: Right. Okay. Right.
9 That's what I'm saying. But does anybody have concern
10 with that change in the process to just go ahead and
11 we'll start taking comments?

12 (No response.)

13 JACK WRIGHT: No concerns?

14 AUDIENCE: Well, comments by category
15 or how do you want --

16 JACK WRIGHT: Well, obviously, if you
17 could do it by category that would be helpful. So,
18 I'll just name the category and we'll go to that.

19 So, under constructability, does
20 anybody have any comments to the -- yes?

21 JESSICA ROBERTSON: My name is Jessica
22 Robertson. I'm an Allston resident. I was wondering
23 why user delays were not included in the rail service
24 to Framingham and Worcester.

1 JACK WRIGHT: Framingham and Worcester
2 does --

3 JESSICA ROBERTSON: All the others
4 include user delays except for that one.

5 JACK WRIGHT: So, again, I think it --
6 that was implied I guess.

7 KERI PYKE: Apologies. I think it was
8 just an oversight.

9 JACK WRIGHT: Yeah, I mean -- yeah,
10 we're developing this things, you know, hard and fast.
11 But that's a good comment. We will -- we will add
12 that to make sure that it's --

13 JESSICA ROBERTSON: Thank you.

14 JACK WRIGHT: Yes?

15 BILL DEIGNAN: Yes, it's Bill Deignan,
16 City of Cambridge.

17 Access to -- maintains access to Paul
18 Dudley White. I mean in some ways I think everyone is
19 expecting Paul Dudley White to be completely
20 reconstructed and be a much better version of what it
21 is. So, it seems as though it should be focusing more
22 on what do you end up with rather than what are you
23 losing in terms of use during the construction time.

24 JACK WRIGHT: I think that's here also.

1 It's not in --

2 BILL DEIGNAN: But I'm not sure like

3 losing use is actually the most important thing.

4 JACK WRIGHT: It may not be the most

5 important --

6 AUDIENCE: That is an important thing

7 though.

8 BILL DEIGNAN: It is, but isn't the end

9 product even more important.

10 JACK WRIGHT: But you're into weighing

11 the criteria. You know, you may well be right. But

12 it's -- but we're not weighing the criteria. We're

13 just kind of looking at all the things. Somebody

14 might say, "You're right. This one has more delays

15 during construction, but it's overwhelmed by the fact

16 that it has a better product at the end." That is all

17 fine. We're not making that decision though.

18 BILL DEIGNAN: Okay.

19 JACK WRIGHT: You know, we're very

20 carefully not making that decision.

21 JESSICA ROBERTSON: If I could chime in

22 though. Maybe it's also the confusion is around

23 specifically saying access to the Paul Dudley White.

24 And it might be, you know, a temporary boardwalk

1 facility that allows, you know, access to the place
2 where you can get on and off the Paul Dudley White,
3 but it's not actually the existing path that's there
4 today.

5 JACK WRIGHT: There's lots of options.

6 KERI PYKE: The point of this criterion
7 was that we heard in our meetings with some folks that
8 there was concern that the Paul Dudley White would be
9 completely closed for the entire duration of
10 construction.

11 JESSICA ROBERTSON: Right. Right.

12 KERI PYKE: That's what we were trying
13 to get at was to how much time -- because, yes, if
14 we're rebuilding it, probably there's going to be time
15 when it's going to be like, "No, I'm sorry. We have
16 to detour you," so we can rebuild it. But we were
17 trying to get at if there's a scheme where we can
18 minimize how much that is and not just be, "We're
19 closing it. Go to Cambridge. You know, go across the
20 river and then come back." So I think that's what we
21 were trying to get at.

22 JESSICA ROBERTSON: Yeah, absolutely.
23 I think that is important.

24 JACK WRIGHT: So, we're committed to

1 look at --

2 JESSICA ROBERTSON: I think it is very
3 important to keep that access on the Boston side of
4 the river between River Street and the BU Bridge.
5 But, maybe we can just sort of phrase it that way
6 rather than saying specifically the Paul Dudley White.

7 AUDIENCE: We'll definitely take that
8 comment.

9 JACK WRIGHT: The Paul Dudley White --
10 right, we'll address that.

11 ILYAS BHATTI: Any other question on
12 constructability? Yeah? Glen?

13 GLEN BERKOWITZ: Glen Berkowitz with A
14 Better City.

15 So, on the constructability, the
16 columns, so there's a column -- the fourth column
17 brings up the word risk, but it only refers to
18 permitting risk. But we all know there's tremendous
19 risk associated with constructability and cost. And I
20 didn't see any reference to risk under the column of
21 constructability for cost. So, for example,
22 constructability risks like risks to the safety of the
23 traveling public, like worker safety risks, like
24 qualitative risks versus quantitative risks. We're

1 all very familiar I think with the constructability
2 risk, for example, of the Longfellow Bridge and how
3 many years longer than its original schedule it took.
4 We could refer to other large projects like the
5 Whittier Bridge or others. But different types of
6 options will have different levels of constructability
7 risk. I'm trying to keep this, you know, at a general
8 level. I've got tons of specifics, which we'll put in
9 writing to you, as you said, next week.

10 ILYAS BHATTI: Yeah, that would be
11 great.

12 GLEN BERKOWITZ: But just the whole
13 notion of risk associated with both constructability
14 and cost seem to be absent, and I didn't understand
15 why.

16 JACK WRIGHT: But it's not absent.

17 ILYAS BHATTI: It's not. It actually -
18 -

19 JACK WRIGHT: Constructability risk
20 clearly includes safety, worker safety, you know, the
21 traveling public safety. Those things are part of --

22 GLEN BERKOWITZ: I guess I'm looking
23 for the boxes in the rows and I didn't see them.

24 JACK WRIGHT: We would have 200 items

1 if we did every -- you know what I mean? We're trying
2 to keep it so -- so, again, the discussion will have
3 to address it.

4 ILYAS BHATTI: Yeah, cost and schedule,
5 very important. We know that. The Longfellow Bridge
6 is an example. I left the Commission, and look how
7 long it took after I left.

8 Fred Salvucci.

9 FRED SALVUCCI: I have a few comments
10 on the constructability. The river edge, I don't
11 think it's possible to answer the prior question about
12 what period of time you would not be able to use Paul
13 Dudley White because the level of rebuilding at the
14 edge of the river that probably requires much greater
15 than -- which many of us think is much greater than
16 what was described in the Draft EIR. And, if that's
17 the case, there's got to be -- there will be much more
18 disruption of that path than in the world we imagined
19 it would be with three yellow booms floating in the
20 river and not deal with anything out there. If you
21 can deal with that, that's a very different situation
22 and there will be a need to close -- you won't be able
23 to let the public use the Paul Dudley White during
24 that period. If you really do, as Jessica suggested,

1 a floating --

2 ILYAS BHATTI: Yeah.

3 FRED SALVUCCI: -- temporary or

4 permanent, or you do let people go over to the

5 Cambridge side, which requires building some bicycle

6 ramps and pedestrian ramps from the Paul Dudley White

7 by BU up to the BU Bridge because it's impossible to

8 make that move safely today. That would have value

9 afterwards. There's no question it's a big

10 inconvenience. But you can't answer that question

11 without getting at the basic fact of how much

12 disruption of the bank is going to require you to deal

13 with that. And I think that's -- you are real miracle

14 workers if you can come up with an answer to that

15 question in the next 40 days.

16 ILYAS BHATTI: Yeah.

17 FRED SALVUCCI: Because the basic

18 information is not in the Draft EIR for some of that.

19 So, that's one issue.

20 The second issue is I'm very disturbed

21 to hear the suggestion of a three-track right of way

22 rather than four-track. We've been over that ground.

23 If you open that ground, lots of people are going to

24 say we don't need eight lanes in the end state, and

1 other people are going to say we don't need layup.
2 We've sort of had a truce on throwing someone's
3 important issue out of the bus in order to make things
4 fit. And going back to the original scope and in the
5 prior administration, this has been stable with a
6 four-track, two to the Grand Junction. Anybody who
7 thinks you can get decent frequency on the Grand
8 Junction to Kendall with a single track is just plain
9 wrong. We went over that. And that was settled. So,
10 if you're going to reopen that, then you've got to
11 read the language in the MEPA statement that says,
12 well, consider narrower standards for the
13 transportation facility. So, well, maybe six lanes
14 instead of eight. I'm not advocating revisiting six
15 lanes instead of eight. I think we saw what happened
16 in Genoa. This damn thing is going to fall in. We've
17 got to get moving on it. But we're not going to get
18 finished by reopening issues that were settled six
19 years ago.

20 ILYAS BHATTI: Jack?

21 JACK WRIGHT: Again, we have 90 days.
22 So, we're going to get finished with it in 90 days.
23 You know, we promised that we would look at things
24 that were, you know, maybe not looked at before.

1 Right, wrong, or indifferent, we included this as a
2 look because it may make a difference. If it has no
3 legs, if the issue is, you know, the anticipated
4 future throughput is so important, then it won't go
5 anywhere. But we're just going to listen on there
6 like we're listening on so many things.

7 There's lots of things that people
8 think that we are now doing that we said we weren't
9 going to do before. That was kind of our commitment
10 coming in. We're independent. We're going to just
11 take a look at things. You know, I'm not handicapping
12 anything. If you're confident that three tracks won't
13 work, I would stay confident because we're not going
14 to be able to change the reality.

15 FRED SALVUCCI: And because it's a
16 limited time, it's a huge mistake to revisit issues
17 that have been settled. We begged several times for
18 the kind of public transit analysis that would
19 indicate how much frequency is needed to serve Kendall
20 Square and the function of West Station. We haven't
21 gotten that. You can't do that in the next 40 days.

22 JACK WRIGHT: All right.

23 FRED SALVUCCI: So you cannot do a
24 decent analysis of the need for the two tracks.

1 That's settled. If you view it as settled, you might
2 be able to make some recommendations within the
3 timeframe you've got. If you start opening that, if
4 you're going to open the number of lanes on the
5 roadway, you've got to open whether we need layup, and
6 how much layup. And this whole thing will totally
7 unravel in terms of timetable.

8 ILYAS BHATTI: Thank you for the
9 comment. Yeah, thanks.

10 JACK WRIGHT: We heard that.

11 ILYAS BHATTI: Correct. Any other on
12 constructability?

13 Okay. We'll move to cost. Oh, you
14 have a comment. Sorry.

15 HARRY MATTISON: Harry Mattison.

16 ILYAS BHATTI: Harry, yeah.

17 HARRY MATTISON: Allston resident and
18 Charles River Conservancy. I've got a few points.

19 One is the changes to the highway and
20 to the Worcester line. They have a sort of
21 multiplying effect. And so I think that there's a
22 problem with independently just saying, "Oh, this is
23 closed for six months, and this is three lanes for
24 whatever it is." We need to know simultaneously

1 because there's a big difference between having two
2 tracks running on the train and then having the
3 highway at reduced capacity versus having both
4 constrained together.

5 JACK WRIGHT: Which is exactly why
6 those can't lead up to a score. I agree with you
7 whole-heartedly. So that's why you couldn't put
8 numbers in each category and then have a bottom right
9 answer. You know what I mean? There's so many things
10 that are independent. However, when the Secretary
11 looks at the schemes, she's going to look at the
12 impact of doing, you know, doing work on I-90 and, at
13 the same time, you're decreasing the throughput on the
14 corridor, on the rail corridor that runs alongside.
15 That's obviously a concern that she would understand
16 and would look at.

17 HARRY MATTISON: Right. So, just the
18 way it's written here, it's not clear that that
19 simultaneous impact is something that's being reported
20 on.

21 I think a big thing that needs to be
22 added here is the spillover traffic impacts on the
23 abutting neighborhoods, certainly including Allston,
24 and Brighton, and Cambridge. Right? Because we saw

1 as a baby example how much more traffic there was in
2 our neighborhood during two weeks of Comm. Ave.
3 bridgework.

4 JACK WRIGHT: It's not a
5 constructability issue. It would be --

6 HARRY MATTISON: Well, but when you're
7 talking about shutting down -- I don't see a place to
8 put it anywhere else. And when you're talking about,
9 well, this is going to be one track for x months, or
10 this is going to be two lanes or three lanes for
11 however many months or years, the impact on us is,
12 okay, well, now all your roads are completely
13 overwhelmed because everyone is getting off the
14 turnpike in Newton and taking, you know, other routes.

15 ILYAS BHATTI: The volume is getting
16 shifted.

17 HARRY MATTISON: Yeah, and coming onto
18 our neighborhood streets. So, if you don't want to
19 call it a construction impact, it needs to go
20 somewhere.

21 You mentioned at the beginning, Jack,
22 two tracks through the Grand Junction as being a
23 requirement.

24 JACK WRIGHT: Yeah.

1 HARRY MATTISON: Is that for the
2 entirety of the project area?

3 JACK WRIGHT: No. Again, we were only
4 dealing with the throat. So, the availability to turn
5 two tracks -- you know, the scheme has to allow for
6 two tracks to go. It doesn't mean it's going to get
7 built. It doesn't mean we're -- but the fact that it
8 has to have the ability to get two tracks out to Grand
9 Junction is a given.

10 HARRY MATTISON: Can you clarify what
11 that means because the -- one sounds like the ability
12 to do it in the future is different than actually
13 including it in the option itself.

14 JACK WRIGHT: So I don't believe, you
15 know --

16 HARRY MATTISON: Maybe this is more of
17 an operations issue.

18 JACK WRIGHT: I don't think that's a
19 scope -- I don't think that's in the scope. I don't
20 know. No, we're just looking at the throat. We're
21 looking at the ability. We're not making any
22 decisions on what the project will entail or not.
23 That's going to be beyond our scope. Our 90-day
24 review is just looking at whether or not you can do

1 things.

2 HARRY MATTISON: Right. But the issue
3 is that the at-grade option currently includes
4 replacing the Grand Junction Bridge over Soldiers
5 Field Road and actually building the second track for
6 the Grand Junction. Right? The viaduct option that
7 was in the DEIR does not replace that bridge and has
8 two tracks through some of the throat and then merges
9 them into a single track for the rest of the throat.

10 JACK WRIGHT: Okay.

11 HARRY MATTISON: So, I don't -- so when
12 you say two tracks for the Grand Junction is a
13 requirement, does that mean you're going to modify the
14 viaduct option to actually have the construction of
15 the second track?

16 JACK WRIGHT: It was not intended to
17 mean that we're building track. It was intended to
18 make sure the alignment is there so you can get the
19 two tracks through. So, if the scheme prohibits the
20 ability to get two tracks to Grand Junction that would
21 be a fatal flaw I guess is what we've said.

22 HARRY MATTISON: Well, then I think the
23 constructability then needs to include the ease or
24 complication of building elements in the future that

1 you say you're allowing space for because there's
2 certainly a difference in constructability and impact
3 and cost of building the second track here while we're
4 in this project and leaving space for it and causing
5 disruption to the Grand Junction, and Soldiers Field
6 Road, and who knows what, the river, and whatever else
7 if you're saying, "Oh, yeah, someone can come back and
8 build it in ten years."

9 ILYAS BHATTI: Okay. I think we should
10 definitely take that comment. Yeah. Okay.

11 HARRY MATTISON: And then I just also
12 wanted to agree with Glen's comment from before. What
13 you've done with permitting is you've broken out all
14 the risks. And if this is going to be an apples to
15 apples kind of comparison, if you're going to list
16 risk of permitting delay, I think you have to list
17 risk of construction delay.

18 ILYAS BHATTI: Okay.

19 JACK WRIGHT: Risk of -- okay, I --

20 ILYAS BHATTI: Will have an impact on
21 construction as well, delay in construction, right?

22 JACK WRIGHT: Yeah, but he's talking
23 about the complexity of construction. And I think we
24 covered that in staging and other places. But, yes,

1 it will be considered.

2 ILYAS BHATTI: Yeah.

3 JACK WRIGHT: But we'll take the
4 comment.

5 ILYAS BHATTI: Okay. Jack?

6 JACK WOFFORD: I'm Jack Wofford from
7 Cambridge. I think there's a larger process point in
8 what Fred and Harry were saying. Namely, Jack, you're
9 setting it up to measure by some -- the alternatives
10 by these criteria. But, there are also issues of what
11 the alternative is made up of. And I think -- and
12 you've said that you're doing some conceptual steps
13 planning or something like that to improve the
14 alternatives as the Secretary indicated at the June
15 Task Force. I think it would be very valuable for you
16 to share the definitions of the alternatives that
17 you're looking at at a Task Force meeting in draft
18 form so that there should be time right after Labor
19 Day, before you begin to -- or during the measurement
20 to share what it is you're measuring because there is
21 a great deal of uncertainty, and flexibility, and many
22 suggestions about changing this, that, and the other
23 that came out in the comments to the DEIR. And I
24 think a process that crystallizes those in a way that

1 the task force could respond to would be really
2 useful.

3 JACK WRIGHT: So, I hear him. I guess
4 I hear the comment. I'm going to -- I tried to say it
5 earlier. I'll try to say it again. The idea of this
6 matrix is just to kind of list out stacks. The idea
7 of the alternatives that we're going to look at, if
8 we're going to try and get rid of any fatal flaws,
9 we're trying not to kill something because -- and I
10 used an example. An issue was brought up with, you
11 know, no settling, no phosphorous removal was apparent
12 in the at-grade scheme. It just wasn't shown. So,
13 our version would include that that's being done
14 because it would need to be done to get permitted.
15 So, we will do that. It doesn't mean that whatever we
16 come up with, like where we put that, will be the
17 final thing because design development will have to
18 happen with the option once we're done.

19 What we've been calling the best of
20 each option isn't necessarily the final of each
21 option. I would not take it that way. It's going to
22 need to be developed further. I mean that's part of
23 the process still.

24 JESSICA ROBERTSON: To Jack's point,

1 and it's a very good one, is that if you are
2 developing new versions of these alternatives that you
3 will then evaluate based on these criteria, if we see
4 -- if the first time we ever see those updated
5 versions of each alternative is at the very end when
6 you've already evaluated them, there might be things
7 that we say, you know, that's not what should be in
8 that alternative and you've evaluated the wrong thing.
9 So, it's a very good point that we should see what
10 you're evaluating before you evaluate it.

11 ILYAS BHATTI: Well, this is going to
12 be applied equally to other alternatives, you know,
13 whether it's the viaduct or it's the at-grade. Right?

14 JACK WRIGHT: Yeah.

15 ILYAS BHATTI: And that's the whole
16 purpose.

17 JESSICA ROBERTSON: So, you're going to
18 -- so we're going to get a giant matrix of the three
19 options that were in the DEIR, plus however many new
20 options, all evaluated by these criteria?

21 ILYAS BHATTI: Improvements that may
22 have become visible, yeah.

23 JACK WRIGHT: We're going to try and
24 fix fatal flaws. I think what people are thinking is

1 this is the new plan. And I would -- I think that's
2 taking a leap. I don't think it's that far. I think
3 we're going to try and address issues that would cause
4 it to be flawed.

5 JESSICA ROBERTSON: Right. I just
6 asked a very simple question. When we next see you
7 all --

8 JACK WRIGHT: Yeah, September 26th.

9 JESSICA ROBERTSON: -- there will be --

10 ILYAS BHATTI: The 26th, yeah.

11 JESSICA ROBERTSON: -- a filled out
12 matrix with all these criteria and a score on each of
13 these criteria for --

14 JACK WRIGHT: No. No there will not.

15 ILYAS BHATTI: No.

16 JACK WRIGHT: No, the only thing you'll
17 see on September 26th will be what the -- the schemes
18 that we are going to score high.

19 JESSICA ROBERTSON: Oh, okay.

20 AUDIENCE: And then when will you have
21 the scores done?

22 JACK WRIGHT: We are supposed to have
23 the scores done in a draft report into the Secretary
24 on the 28th of September.

1 JESSICA ROBERTSON: So we're never
2 going to see what the scores are?

3 ILYAS BHATTI: We are going to meet
4 with the Task Force on the 26th, right?

5 JACK WRIGHT: Yes, we are going to meet
6 with the Task Force on the 26th.

7 WENDY LANDMAN: Can I make a very
8 specific --

9 ILYAS BHATTI: Yeah, Wendy.

10 WENDY LANDMAN: -- piece that I think
11 illustrates this issue? So, as presented in the DEIR,
12 the parkland that is taken adjacent to Soldiers Field
13 Road, between Soldiers Field Road and the turnpike,
14 has been proposed to be "replaced with more parkland"
15 2,000 feet away up the river. Many of us from the
16 environmental side of the world look at that and say
17 that is actually not permittable under 4(f), Article
18 97, etc. So, in order to understand whether there's a
19 fatal flaw, what you're looking at needs to say
20 something about where parkland would be replaced
21 within the -- nearby to the place where it's being
22 taken. So, the question is do we just -- if you say,
23 "That can be done," as a Task Force do we just say,
24 "Oh, okay. You said it can be done. We don't know

1 how you're going to do it. It might be magic." But
2 just that's the assumption? Or -- I think that's one
3 of those --

4 JACK WRIGHT: So, the report we're
5 going to produce is going to be, you know, a
6 professional report --

7 WENDY LANDMAN: Right.

8 JACK WRIGHT: -- produced by this team.

9 WENDY LANDMAN: Right.

10 JACK WRIGHT: Right. So, we, you know,
11 so we have, you know, environmental lawyers on the
12 team. We have engineers to do constructability
13 reviews. We have, you know, that's all going to be
14 put together and the report will be based on that. It
15 will only be as good as that team is. I agree with
16 you. That's a given. But it will just be a report.

17 JESSICA ROBERTSON: But there's an
18 verification question of on September 26th -- in that
19 report, you will answer each of these yes/no questions
20 for all of the alternatives, correct?

21 JACK WRIGHT: In that report. There
22 will be a whole report with a write-up.

23 JESSICA ROBERTSON: I understand. I
24 understand.

1 JACK WRIGHT: This is only a piece of
2 the report, yeah.

3 JESSICA ROBERTSON: I know. I
4 understand. Will you be answering these yes and no
5 questions for three alternatives or more than three
6 alternatives?

7 JACK WRIGHT: As I mentioned earlier,
8 my guess is three main alternatives with some sub --
9 you know what I mean? Because we need to get through
10 them. We need to --

11 JESSICA ROBERTSON: Can I just finish
12 my question?

13 JACK WRIGHT: Okay. But I'm just
14 trying to --

15 JESSICA ROBERTSON: Are those three
16 alternate -- we're just trying to clarify --

17 JACK WRIGHT: But I don't know yet.
18 That's what I was trying to get to before.

19 JESSICA ROBERTSON: Yes, let me finish
20 my question.

21 JACK WRIGHT: Sure.

22 JESSICA ROBERTSON: There were three
23 alternatives in the DEIR. There are some unknown
24 number of new things that you will propose that

1 potentially fix some of those things in the DEIR.
2 What Jack was trying to ask, and what is still
3 unclear, is whether we will get to see what any of
4 those fixes entail before your report is already
5 written and complete.

6 JACK WRIGHT: And -- before the report
7 is written and complete -- you'll see it -- I don't
8 know if the report will be written and complete, but
9 the report will be -- but we'll be progressing based
10 on it. We will have done a lot of work.

11 ILYAS BHATTI: And, also, I think I
12 mentioned earlier, we do have one week, okay, that you
13 can really send these comments in because that is
14 definitely going to influence in terms of the
15 criteria, the point about the evaluation criteria and
16 how is it yes or no and what more information will be
17 there. Okay?

18 JESSICA ROBERTSON: But this is a
19 fundamental question about what are you evaluating.

20 ILYAS BHATTI: Well, this criteria, I
21 mean we really kind of labored over it. Okay? What
22 items do we want to look at? So, we came up with
23 these categories --

24 JESSICA ROBERTSON: Right. I'm not

1 even talking about the criteria. I'm talking about
2 what you apply the criteria to.

3 ILYAS BHATTI: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah.

4 JESSICA ROBERTSON: Whether it's the
5 three designs that we have in the DEIR or other
6 things.

7 ILYAS BHATTI: Oh, I see. Yeah.

8 JESSICA ROBERTSON: And, if it's other
9 things, when do we get to see what those other things
10 are?

11 ILYAS BHATTI: Right. Right. Exactly.

12 JESSICA ROBERTSON: And I still don't
13 have an answer to that question.

14 ILYAS BHATTI: Well, we are -- I think
15 the next meeting is going to be on the 26th. But
16 that's like towards the end.

17 JESSICA ROBERTSON: Right.

18 JACK WRIGHT: Can I answer the
19 question?

20 JESSICA ROBERTSON: I would like to
21 know.

22 JACK WRIGHT: Okay. I'm not sure what
23 you didn't hear.

24 JESSICA ROBERTSON: No, I heard

1 everything. You just didn't answer my question.

2 JACK WRIGHT: On the 26th is where we're
3 going to show you the scheme.

4 JESSICA ROBERTSON: Right. Okay. So,
5 what Jack's point was that that's too late.

6 JACK WRIGHT: That's not a question. I
7 heard him on that.

8 JESSICA ROBERTSON: Okay. So, we've
9 clarified.

10 JACK WOFFORD: So, to the extent that
11 you're benefitting from this conversation --

12 JACK WRIGHT: Sure.

13 JACK WOFFORD: -- you realize these are
14 50 or so people who know a great deal about each
15 alternative in great detail. And some of those
16 details are viewed by some as fatal flaws. Some are
17 considered as benefits. I think you would benefit,
18 your team would benefit, by sharing your description
19 of those alternatives at a Task Force meeting shortly
20 after Labor Day so there's time for those alternative
21 descriptions to be critiqued. And I think you will
22 find that you'll benefit from that. It's not a
23 roadblock. It's not trying to delay anything. Ilyas,
24 you were on the bridge design review committee that I

1 facilitated. You know that we, within 60 days --
2 ILYAS BHATTI: Yeah.
3 JACK WOFFORD: -- had come up with a
4 new alternative that is those loop-de-loop tunnels
5 under North Station.
6 ILYAS BHATTI: I remember that, yeah.
7 JACK WOFFORD: And 42 members
8 unanimously recommended that Scheme Z be abandoned.
9 STENOGRAPHER: Can you identify
10 yourself for the record?
11 JACK WOFFORD: Jack Wofford.
12 STENOGRAPHER: Thank you.
13 ILYAS BHATTI: That is Jack Wright.
14 This is Jack Wofford. There's two Jacks.
15 JACK WOFFORD: This kind of process can
16 be done in short order. You have people around this
17 table here prepared to intensely work with you.
18 JACK WRIGHT: I don't think we're -- I
19 do not anticipate that we would be at that point
20 shortly after Labor Day.
21 JESSICA ROBERTSON: But whenever you
22 are --
23 JACK WRIGHT: Shortly after Labor Day
24 is three weeks away.

1 ILYAS BHATTI: Yeah.

2 JACK WRIGHT: We need the time that we
3 have to get through the tasks. We are going to be
4 racing to the end. I just don't think that that's --
5 you know what I mean? It would be nice if we could do
6 it, but I understand the frustration with it. But I
7 don't -- we won't be there. That's the real problem.
8 We're going to finish this thing. The ranking of --
9 the filling out the matrix will be rather, you know,
10 will be rather quick once you have the scheme. Most
11 of this time remaining is developing what it is we're
12 going to rank.

13 ILYAS BHATTI: Yeah. I really do
14 appreciate the comment. I know the history, what we
15 did with the bridge design review committee. But
16 that's why it's urgent that we can get your comments
17 in, you know, one week. Okay? Make sure that those
18 comments are taken into account as we labor through
19 the described evaluation, Jack, right?

20 JACK WRIGHT: Yeah, those are the
21 comments on the criteria. This is just --

22 ILYAS BHATTI: Yeah. Yeah.

23 JACK WRIGHT: We just don't have the
24 scheme. I don't think we'll have the scheme to do

1 that in a 90-day --

2 ILYAS BHATTI: Okay. So I think we've
3 got about 10, 12 minutes left.

4 Ken?

5 KEN MILLER: Ken Miller, Federal
6 Highway Administration.

7 Just not to belabor the point about
8 alternatives, but in terms of following on, I thought
9 I had heard earlier that Jack or Ilyas, you said that
10 there will be the same basic three alternatives maybe
11 with some variations. So, for example, if you came up
12 with an at-grade alternative that addressed the
13 riverbank that was, you know, different than the one
14 that ABC proposed and that is in the DEIR, and it was
15 different and had, you know, different -- that may
16 have merit --

17 ILYAS BHATTI: Right.

18 KEN MILLER: -- would you be replacing
19 the one that ABC -- that is in the DEIR, or will you
20 be -- how many alternatives are you -- because if you
21 come up with another feasible alternative -- by the
22 way, the ABC alternative is a feasible alternative.
23 If you come up with another feasible alternative,
24 whether it's a different viaduct approach or whatever

1 it may be, wouldn't that warrant carrying that through
2 the environmental process beyond just this 90-day
3 evaluation?

4 JACK WRIGHT: It will not be a
5 different alternative. It will be an adjustment to
6 the alternative that's in the DEIR. Again, in five
7 weeks, we couldn't possibly come up with new
8 approaches.

9 KEN MILLER: No, I know that. I'm
10 saying at the end you may come up with a grade or at-
11 grade alternative that's substantially different from
12 the one that's in the DEIR, which may also have merit,
13 and people think have merit. And each one -- and
14 every alternative has some people like certain things
15 about some and dislike other things. People value
16 things very differently. I'm from Federal Highway. I
17 may value things differently than LivableStreets or
18 whatever. So, wouldn't that -- if you do come up with
19 it, wouldn't that warrant the same level of scrutiny
20 or evaluation or analysis that like being carried
21 through the environmental process would, whatever that
22 may be.

23 ILYAS BHATTI: Okay. Okay.

24 JACK WRIGHT: It would if it was

1 different, yes.

2 KEN MILLER: Right. Well, yes. Yes.

3 ILYAS BHATTI: I hope we have a little
4 bit more flexibility than they told me ten minutes,
5 okay, because we haven't even gone through one
6 category.

7 MARGARET VAN DEUSEN: I'm trying to go
8 in order, but I was trying to get to environment
9 before we end.

10 ILYAS BHATTI: Sure.

11 MARGARET VAN DEUSEN: Margaret Van
12 Deusen, Charles River Watershed Association.

13 On the matrix under environment, I
14 think one thing that's missing is environmental
15 benefit for habitat, water quality, flood storage,
16 floodplain connectivity. And I put this also in the
17 resiliency category as well.

18 ILYAS BHATTI: Okay.

19 MARGARET VAN DEUSEN: And I'm not going
20 to spend time talking about the memo from WalkBoston,
21 Charles River Conservancy, and CRWA, which we sent to
22 everyone yesterday. I'd refer you to that. But that
23 seems to me to be a glaring --

24 ILYAS BHATTI: We did get that, yes,

1 Margaret. Yeah.

2 Okay.

3 STACY THOMPSON: Yeah, I just want to
4 echo that. That actually stuck out to me that there
5 was a huge amount -- it felt like you guys, not to
6 belabor a point, but to echo, extracted the risk of
7 all of the environmental stuff and didn't put any
8 benefits in. So, I just want to echo and say that
9 LivableStreets is entirely --

10 MARGARET VAN DEUSEN: And I'd say that
11 for permitting as well, the whole risk thing.

12 ILYAS BHATTI: Okay. We'll put that.
13 Okay. Any other questions? Yeah. Sure.

14 PALLAVI MANDE: Just to add on because
15 I want to consolidate our comments.

16 STENOGRAPHER: Identify yourself.

17 ILYAS BHATTI: Yeah, name please.

18 PALLAVI MANDE: Pallavi Mande, Charles
19 River Watershed Association.

20 To echo Margaret's point --

21 ILYAS BHATTI: He didn't get your name.

22 PALLAVI MANDE: Pallavi Mande, Charles
23 River Watershed Association.

24 Just to echo Margaret's point and sort

1 of dive into the resiliency conversation, which I
2 think sort of overlaps not only the environmental, the
3 permitting, the public realm, I just wanted to put out
4 there that the conversation is more about asset
5 management, are we protecting the highway, whereas
6 everybody in this room who has worked in this
7 neighborhood knows that there's a lot more protection
8 needed for inlet flooding. The conversation needs to
9 be at a larger level.

10 I know that the team is tasked for
11 looking at just the throat area.

12 ILYAS BHATTI: Right.

13 PALLAVI MANDE: But, in some ways, it's
14 hard to have that conversation because you know the
15 impacts are at the larger level, the mitigation also
16 needs to be at a larger level. So, I just want to put
17 that out there that, from our perspective, the
18 criteria kind of doesn't make sense even if you're
19 considering it equally across alternatives unless you
20 can give us some sense of how this plays out in a
21 larger scale.

22 ILYAS BHATTI: Good comment. We'll
23 take it.

24 Okay, Wendy?

1 WENDY LANDMAN: Thank you. I wanted to
2 note under multimodal connectivity there's a category
3 that says provides desired 79-mile-per-hour railroad
4 side speed. We think it's really important to talk
5 about whether that's a reasonable criteria because as
6 far as all of us in this room know, trains can't go
7 that speed on either side of the throat. So, to set
8 it -- to put it in here as a design criteria would
9 seem to set the stage inappropriately so. I hope that
10 in your setting of the criteria you are actually
11 applying your own professional judgment. And I think
12 we need to be thinking about that, you know, in each
13 of them, but that's the one that sort of stands out.

14 ILYAS BHATTI: Okay.

15 WENDY LANDMAN: Likewise, and I'm not
16 the right one to actually ask this question -- I
17 should turn it to Joe. But I think one of the things
18 that we've been hearing a lot about is what happens in
19 the throat has a huge impact of whether the flip
20 alternative is feasible for the rail. And maybe I'll
21 turn it to Joe to say I think that -- as far as I can
22 tell, that's not in here as a criterion.

23 ILYAS BHATTI: Joe? Your name, Joe.

24 JOE VEGA: Joe Vega, Harvard

1 University.

2 And I guess that's what I was wondering

3 is that what you were attempting to capture in the

4 criterion?

5 KERI PYKE: Yeah. Yeah.

6 JACK WRIGHT: And anything else.

7 KERI PYKE: And anything else that

8 might need flexibility.

9 JOE VEGA: And maybe just a little

10 clarity on that would address that issue.

11 GALEN MOOK: And if I could jump on

12 that.

13 ILYAS BHATTI: Sure.

14 GALEN MOOK: Galen Mook, resident and

15 with Massachusetts Bicycle Coalition.

16 This kind of gets down to the point of

17 what are you evaluating in terms of that criteria.

18 ILYAS BHATTI: About the?

19 GALEN MOOK: Designs, because we did

20 not see, as I understand it, and from what I remember

21 from reading the DEIR, we did not see a flip that was

22 designed. So, if you're saying you're looking at

23 that, we don't know what you're looking at.

24 JACK WRIGHT: The flip, that whole

1 thing is beyond --

2 GALEN MOOK: I understand it's beyond
3 what your edge is. But there are certain schematics
4 that depend or could make or break some things that
5 happen just to the west of your project.

6 So, actually, just to tack on that,
7 Jack, for instance, the highway viaduct plan, which is
8 called the amateur planner in the DEIR, seems to be
9 less talked about for the most part in a lot of these
10 conversations. And from what I recall from the DEIR,
11 one of the issues --

12 JACK WRIGHT: Do you mean the railway
13 viaduct?

14 GALEN MOOK: Yes, the railway viaduct.

15 ILYAS BHATTI: Yeah. Yeah.

16 GALEN MOOK: That's what I meant to
17 say. Sorry. The railway viaduct, where that lands as
18 it comes down is outside the scope essentially of
19 where your project is and how that interfaces with the
20 switches. So, to say that that's not part of your
21 scope is not an effective argument to say that you're
22 evaluating the railway viaduct in such a way that
23 would, you know, not impact West Station, Beacon
24 Yards, the layup yards, etc., etc.

1 JACK WRIGHT: So, we are carrying to --
2 we, actually, you know, we're going to look at Agganis
3 Way, for example. You know, it's kind of beyond where
4 the throat -- if you look at the throat, very widening
5 at Agganis. So, we are going to look at that because
6 Agganis has, you know, there's proposals that make big
7 impacts. We step over into where we need to to like
8 make I think what I would say is a sensible definition
9 of the issues. And we are trying to look at what
10 these realignments will do as to whether or not
11 they'll have flexibility for things like the flip, you
12 know, other things like that. So, they make hard --
13 hard points. Structures create hard points. You
14 know, that's less desirable than something that
15 doesn't have a hard point in it. That's I think what
16 we're trying to capture there.

17 I don't -- again, until we get further
18 into this thing, I don't really know what all of it
19 will be or mean yet. And that is one thing -- I mean
20 like so we have criteria, we have measurements. We
21 don't have plans exactly. What we're trying to
22 measure is the differences between the plans we do
23 need to get. And to do that, we may want to, at some
24 point in the process, we may want to add a criteria

1 that we think was missed because we noticed there's
2 something different about the plans. I wouldn't be
3 shocked if at some point we make a recommendation like
4 that.

5 GALEN MOOK: Great. Well, to just to
6 tag onto there, just while I have the floor for a
7 second, I don't envy your task. And I'm sorry that
8 you only have this timeframe in order to implement.
9 And it's not nothing, frankly. But we've been at this
10 for four years, and it's not even long enough for us
11 to digest a lot of this stuff.

12 ILYAS BHATTI: Ninety days is the
13 throat.

14 GALEN MOOK: I understand. Will we
15 have the opportunity to suggest alternatives that were
16 not in the DEIR to be evaluated as part of what's
17 looked at with this criteria, for instance, the flip?

18 JACK WRIGHT: I cannot answer that
19 question. Not as part of this study.

20 ILYAS BHATTI: No.

21 GALEN MOOK: Well, then -- okay. I
22 don't know if I understand the purpose then.

23 JACK WRIGHT: The purpose is, again,
24 the Secretary presented at the last meeting. She's

1 looking at the whole project. But she's -- this is
2 one of three kind of efforts that are ongoing to look
3 at the project. We are only focused on the throat.
4 That's what this group is doing.

5 GALEN MOOK: Yeah, but --

6 JACK WRIGHT: There is other looks that
7 she's relying on other people to look at other than --

8 GALEN MOOK: Fine. We'll use another
9 example, Agganis Way, which essentially could be part
10 of the throat conversation, which was not described in
11 the DEIR, has a connective, you know, node there.
12 Could that be something that we ask be included in
13 what you are looking at in order to assign the
14 criteria to? Is that some part of -- my ask is a
15 process question here.

16 JACK WRIGHT: So, like I said, if it is
17 apparent to us that a scheme makes a difference in
18 something that is important to the group, we will try
19 to include it. So, that's why I said Agganis Way,
20 we're going to try to include that even though it
21 appears to be beyond our bound a little bit. But it's
22 -- you know, we will look because it's been brought up
23 as that connection would be very, you know, important
24 to people. But, again, how far -- you know, we can't

1 just creep all the way through the project.

2 GALEN MOOK: Oh, I understand.

3 JACK WRIGHT: We're trying to define

4 it.

5 GALEN MOOK: Yeah. Okay.

6 STENOGRAPHER: Can I ask for your name

7 one more time?

8 GALEN MOOK: Galen Mook, resident and

9 with MassBike.

10 DAVID LOUTZENHEISER: David

11 Loutzenheiser, MAPC.

12 On your environmental last category,

13 maintains or improves air quality, I disagree with the

14 measures that mention roadway congestion and stopped

15 traffic in terms of air quality. Right now,

16 increasing number of vehicles, the engines cut off

17 when they're stopped. And, in ten years, probably 90

18 percent of vehicles will be hybrid or all electric

19 anyway. So, I think we should eliminate the issue of

20 stopped traffic congestion as a measure of air

21 quality. I think we should -- the measures look more

22 at mode shift as part of the air quality.

23 JACK WRIGHT: Okay. I think that's a

24 good point.

1 GLEN BERKOWITZ: Glen Berkowitz with A
2 Better City.

3 ILYAS BHATTI: Yes.

4 GLEN BERKOWITZ: Thank you, Ilyas. Two
5 quick things on the first row on the cost. I could
6 only assume that the review estimated construction
7 cost, you're going to be doing the risk based cost
8 estimating. I hope that's true. Could you add the
9 word risk somewhere in your written description
10 because I think it's important to include in this?

11 ILYAS BHATTI: I thought we had the
12 risk included in here.

13 JACK WRIGHT: In cost estimating,
14 there's always risk.

15 ILYAS BHATTI: Yes. Yeah.

16 JACK WRIGHT: So, I don't know -- I
17 don't know how you would do it professionally without
18 it, but --

19 GLEN BERKOWITZ: Well, in permitting
20 there's always risks, but yet you chose to put it in
21 the headline.

22 ILYAS BHATTI: Sure.

23 GLEN BERKOWITZ: So, to be fair, to say
24 that something always involves risk I don't think is a

1 sufficient answer. So, we all know that there's a big
2 difference, or some of us think there's a big
3 difference, in the risk associated with some of the
4 options. And so some of us are trying to just make
5 sure that the criteria adequately shows that.

6 ILYAS BHATTI: Okay.

7 GLEN BERKOWITZ: The second quick
8 comment, Ilyas, is the parenthetical that says
9 "including non-capital construction costs such as
10 detours." If there's -- if all three options, for
11 example, just as an example --

12 ILYAS BHATTI: Yeah.

13 GLEN BERKOWITZ: -- if your team
14 concluded all three options required closing the Grand
15 Junction for one year during construction, and you
16 would either detour vehicles via the Pan Am route, or
17 you would pay money to Amtrak to service those
18 vehicles in South Bay like has been done before, those
19 costs would be included or could be included in the
20 construction cost, and they would be capitalized if
21 you're capitalizing --

22 ILYAS BHATTI: Right.

23 GLEN BERKOWITZ: So, they're not
24 necessarily non-capital. So, there was some issue I

1 had with the way the language was written in that
2 sentence.

3 ILYAS BHATTI: Yeah. Okay. Good.

4 GLEN BERKOWITZ: Does that make sense?

5 ILYAS BHATTI: Yeah. Sure.

6 STENOGRAPHER: Just spell your name for
7 the record.

8 GLEN BERKOWITZ: Glen Berkowitz.

9 TAD READ: Tad Read with the Boston
10 Planning and Development Agency.

11 Under environment, I don't see noise
12 for an environment study. Am I missing something? I
13 believe that has been an issue in public
14 conversations.

15 ILYAS BHATTI: It was there somewhere.

16 TAD READ: Oh, it's under public. Oh,
17 okay. There we go.

18 And then under, speaking of public
19 realm, I notice there's reference to a visual quality
20 of the riverfront and there's reference to enhancing
21 the quality of open space. But what about enhancing
22 access to the riverfront specifically, access to the
23 riverfront.

24 I'm sorry. Did you already mention

1 that?

2 JESSICA ROBERTSON: No, I wrote down
3 exactly the same thing.

4 ILYAS BHATTI: Okay.

5 TAD READ: And then the other question
6 I have on public realm is it says accommodates filed
7 land use plans. And could you define the filed land
8 use plans? Filed with whom? What does that mean
9 exactly?

10 ILYAS BHATTI: Okay.

11 TAD READ: And along those lines are is
12 the future -- or the air rights development plans.

13 ILYAS BHATTI: Okay.

14 TAD READ: What is the word plans
15 there?

16 JESSICA ROBERTSON: I have a comment
17 about that one as well, just that it's -- to say only
18 the filed land use plans, wherever they might be
19 filed, is much too limited. And I'm sure that Joe and
20 his colleagues at Harvard would want a little more
21 flexibility than that. And so I think that needs to
22 be rephrased to say something more like, "Maintains
23 flexibility for, you know, future development,
24 including air rights." And we're sort of evaluating

1 it on how much flexibility remains rather than
2 accommodating anything specific that has been
3 proposed.

4 ILYAS BHATTI: Sarah is a very
5 important person. She is taking your comments down.
6 Okay. Go ahead.

7 KERI PYKE: To respond -- Keri Pyke,
8 Howard Stein Hudson.

9 To respond to Tad's question about
10 improved access to the river, under multimodal, the
11 third one down marked south access, I think that's
12 what we were trying to get at. We just called it out
13 as north-south because that seems to be the most
14 difficult problem is how do you get across all of the
15 transportation infrastructure. So, if you want
16 something phrased slightly differently, that was what
17 we were trying to get at.

18 TAD READ: But that is different
19 because I think that's physical -- that's connections
20 directly to the waterfront. What I'm thinking about
21 is there have been schemes that show sort of an
22 Esplanade style encroachment into the river with some
23 constructed feature that would provide direct access
24 to the edge of the water that isn't there right now.

1 KERI PYKE: Okay.

2 TAD READ: I think that's sort of what
3 I'm trying to get to.

4 PALLAVI MANDE: Pallavi Mande from the
5 Watershed Association.

6 Just to build on Tad's point and
7 inspired by what you were saying Keri, I think for a
8 lot of us it's not just been about pathway connections
9 to the river. It's actually open space connections
10 that would actually provide functional landscapes.
11 So, if you read up on a lot of comments that we've
12 provided to the DEIR and since then, I don't think we
13 can categorize those so neatly under public realm,
14 resiliency, environment, because they all are kind of
15 related.

16 TAD READ: Connected, yeah.

17 PALLAVI MANDE: So, the point that I
18 think Tad's making, and hopefully I think will be
19 addressed when you count our criteria and the
20 measures, is you tweak one and the ripple effect goes
21 on the other. So, we just need to understand what
22 these options look like transformed, modified, and
23 then how do we actually use this criteria in a
24 meaningful way to get towards a restoration option

1 rather than just the impact analysis or just talking
2 about potential benefit.

3 So, noise was brought up. I didn't see
4 water quality. I know those are details, but those
5 are important pieces for us to evaluate.

6 ILYAS BHATTI: I think that was
7 probably the environment in terms of the water
8 quality. That was included in that somewhere, but we
9 should make a note of that anyway.

10 JESSICA ROBERTSON: If I could add onto
11 that last specific -- it was just specifically on the
12 same ones we were just talking about. Jessica
13 Robertson again.

14 So, on those two that we were just
15 talking about, the criteria under public realm for
16 increases/decreases, water sheet area available, that
17 one seems, again, much too limited. It's not about
18 sort of the exact square footage of the water sheet.
19 It's about whether it's actually usable, whether you
20 can get to it, whether you can see it. And so that
21 one should definitely be more about -- or we should
22 add another criteria about the access, the visibility,
23 the usability of the water sheet on the edge.

24 And then on the other related but

1 separate one under multimodal connectivity, the number
2 of north-south access points for bike/ped, wondering
3 if that is ones that are built or the possibility for
4 future ones that aren't necessarily designed as part
5 of this project, and if we could include both.

6 ILYAS BHATTI: Okay. Sure.

7 BILL DEIGNAN: So, under -- two things
8 under multimodal connectivity, the allows future two-
9 or three-track operation on the Grand Junction. I'd
10 also like to include allows future multiuse path

11 connections of the Grand Junction. We're, in
12 Cambridge now, starting to design a multiuse path --

13 ILYAS BHATTI: Right.

14 BILL DEIGNAN: -- that's intended to
15 eventually go over the bridge. So, the various
16 options have differing abilities to connect with
17 future multiuse path on the Grand Junction.

18 ILYAS BHATTI: Yeah.

19 BILL DEIGNAN: And, also, under public
20 realm, enhances the visual quality of the riverfront,
21 given the measure is visualization, it seems like
22 that's a tool; it's actually not a measure. And so I
23 think that needs to have more detail like what are you
24 actually looking for in terms of enhancement. Is that

1 green space, trees, you know, the impact -- the visual
2 impact of say the viaduct being lowered or reduced. I
3 mean there are a lot of other things that I think that
4 needs a lot more thought and detail on.

5 ILYAS BHATTI: Visual impacts.

6 STENOGRAPHER: Can you state your name
7 for the record?

8 BILL DEIGNAN: Bill Deignan, City of
9 Cambridge.

10 STENOGRAPHER: Thank you.

11 ILYAS BHATTI: Mike O'Dowd is here, and
12 I think he's taking the second. So, we will continue.
13 Thank you for volunteering, donating your time.

14 MICHAEL O'DOWD: There's more questions
15 that need to be answered, so --

16 ILYAS BHATTI: Thank you.

17 GUUS DRIESSEN: Guus Driessen, Town of
18 Brookline.

19 On the multimodal criteria, I don't
20 know, the alignments that you are reviewing, if it
21 affects the vertical alignment of the station. And
22 then, also, the potential for transit across from
23 north to south of the tracks, I don't know if that
24 plays a role and if that still remains in the

1 potential solution to get across the tracks for
2 transit, buses.

3 And the second point, talking about the
4 third one on the multimodal connectivity, the number
5 of north-south. But I'm wondering also the ease of --
6 and it talks about evaluation or the measures, the
7 number of connections and the travel time. Do you
8 intend to show let's say some design or is it just
9 going to be the number, what kind of connections?
10 Because I think it's going to be important how you get
11 across and where those access points are. So, in
12 other words, is there going to be some kind of
13 picture?

14 ILYAS BHATTI: Jack, do you have any
15 thoughts on that?

16 STENOGRAPHER: Could I have your name
17 again?

18 GUUS DRIESSEN: Guus Driessen, Town of
19 Brookline.

20 JACK WRIGHT: I didn't understand what
21 --

22 KERI PYKE: Well, I think what he's
23 asking is if we're going to actually -- I mean I think
24 we are going to evaluate where you could make those

1 connections because, you know, you've got to look not
2 just at horizontal, but vertical, and say, "Okay, this
3 is feasible and we think it would be approximately
4 here." I mean we're not going to do a ton of design
5 of that, but we're going to -- that's kind of I think
6 the level we're looking at.

7 GUUS DRIESSEN: Yeah, I noticed on the
8 measures it talks about numbers of connections and
9 travel time. So I'm just wondering if you have some
10 picture to get an idea for the reviewer or --

11 JACK WRIGHT: The schematics.

12 KERI PYKE: Yeah, there will be. We
13 don't have them right now, but, yes, there will be.

14 GALEN MOOK: And my question along that
15 exact same point is what destinations, travel time
16 between destinations, what counts as destination?

17 KERI PYKE: Yeah, we haven't really
18 defined that yet. We were trying to think about how
19 could we measure the benefit or impact of having or
20 not having them.

21 ILYAS BHATTI: There's a hand up
22 waving. Yeah?

23 KERI PYKE: Ilyas?

24 ILYAS BHATTI: Yeah?

1 KERI PYKE: I think Wendy had a related
2 -- comments.

3 ILYAS BHATTI: Wendy, you had a related
4 question?

5 WENDY LANDMAN: Yes, because another
6 piece, there's no accessibility for somebody in a
7 wheelchair now between the Mass. Ave. Bridge and River
8 Street.

9 ILYAS BHATTI: I see, yeah.

10 WENDY LANDMAN: So, in addition to
11 looking at more access points as providing general
12 transportation accessibility for people on foot and
13 bike, actually looking at the issue of access for
14 people with disabilities to the riverfront because
15 right now there's a huge gap.

16 ILYAS BHATTI: Right.

17 WENDY LANDMAN: And so it's sort of a
18 separate measure from, you know, can you shorten your
19 trip between Harvard Square and the LMA if there's
20 more access to and from the river connecting to Comm.
21 Ave., there's also this issue of providing equitable
22 access to the park.

23 ILYAS BHATTI: So, yeah?

24 DICK GARVER: I'm Dick Garver, Charles

1 River Alliance of Boaters.

2 On the criteria, increase/decrease
3 water sheet area available, the measure runs contrary
4 to our recommendation to the project manager here.
5 It's not a question of absolute increase or decrease
6 but the extent to which navigation is impaired. Every
7 design with impacts, it's not an absolute more or
8 less.

9 ILYAS BHATTI: Okay. Yeah?

10 JESSICA ROBERTSON: There's also other
11 people behind you, but I'm happy to go again.

12 ILYAS BHATTI: Okay. Yielded to Ken.

13 KEN MILLER: Ken Miller, Federal
14 Highway Administration. I just have a few. I'm going
15 to skip around, so bear with me.

16 Just looking at safety and operations,
17 the fifth one down says "requires design exception for
18 any shift." I don't know why you have that as a
19 criteria. We do design exceptions on pretty much
20 every project. So whether you do or you don't is
21 probably not even relevant.

22 The two above it, maintains or improves
23 shoulder width and lane width, those are not the only
24 attributes that contribute to safety or not. There

1 may be a distinction between an at-grade that has less
2 curvature and a viaduct that has horizontal and
3 vertical curvature. You have to do a safety analysis.
4 You can't rely solely on whether you have lane width
5 and shoulder width for doing a safety analysis.

6 Just a couple of other things. You
7 talk about the maintain -- minimizes risk associated
8 with building interstate highways. And there is no
9 prohibition about building highways in a floodplain.
10 The only requirement that we have is you cannot build
11 an interstate that will be inundated by a 50-year
12 flood, which is the current definition. It has
13 nothing to do with forecast. It's a federal law. We
14 don't believe that that requirement precludes any
15 alternative that's being considered. So, it's not
16 clear what these two -- and, by the way, you have two
17 of them. They're both -- they're sort of redundant.
18 You have one under resiliency and one under permitting
19 risk, which is the same, which is sort of the same.

20 And I'll just -- just on the permitting
21 risk, you have this long list. But when you -- you
22 know, whether you're talking about -- it's not always
23 a yes or no answer, whether you need a variance or
24 not. I mean I think we're talking about schedule risk

1 and all kinds of other things when you're talking
2 about variances and other permits. I mean some, if
3 you can absolutely not get it and it's a fatal flaw,
4 yes, that's one thing. But, for everything else, it's
5 a question of time. And a lot of these things happen
6 concurrently. So, by having these little separate,
7 you know, you have to -- you can't consider them all
8 separate things. A lot of these things happen
9 concurrently and that has to be a consideration too.

10 ILYAS BHATTI: Thank you.

11 Mr. Secretary?

12 FRED SALVUCCI: Fred Salvucci. Two
13 issues.

14 On the permitting risk, in the Draft
15 EIR there's a statement that the ABC plan had a flaw
16 and was not permittable. That's because DEP asserted
17 that there were alternative ways of achieving the
18 transportation facility that didn't touch the river.
19 That is almost certainly not true. If you recognize
20 the letter that the three environmental organizations
21 sent last night, you can't deal with that river edge
22 without getting into the river, I believe. So, that
23 fatal flaw is not a valid one, and I think that needs
24 to be looked at in the context of what really are you

1 going to do at the edge of the river, which is a touch
2 call because the basic information isn't there. I
3 don't know how you solve that.

4 And the second issue is I'm very
5 concerned with the discussion of cost. And I'm hoping
6 that you're talking about relative measures of cost
7 not dollar signs. I've got lots of scars on my back
8 because there is an inflation rate. This project is
9 five years delayed where it was supposed to be.
10 Anybody who understands inflation knows that means
11 it's going to cost more than it would have cost. And
12 that's a big part of the cost risk is the delay.

13 I think if you put numbers on these,
14 you're going to get headlines about, oh, new cost
15 estimate, project, bah, bah, bah. And that, in turn,
16 will lead to that pressure to say, "Oh, well, the hell
17 with the neighborhood. We're not going to do any
18 mitigation for the traffic impacts because we can't
19 afford it." And that's a self-inflicted wound. I
20 know you have to look at cost, but I would urge -- and
21 this is not easy to do. If you come up with a
22 different set of numbers than what you've been dealing
23 with, there's going to be a lot of controversy about
24 it. If you deal with relative terms like, okay, we've

1 been dealing with these terms, there's a base to your
2 assumption that these variations go up, down,
3 sideways, you might be able to convey the basic
4 information about relative cost without creating a
5 real conundrum because I think any numbers you put out
6 there, they will be different than the numbers that
7 have been out there and are going to create
8 controversy; and B) will be incorrect because there's
9 a long way to go on this project to get it bid. And
10 you don't know what the cost is until the project is
11 finished with all the change orders. So, I just would
12 urge caution.

13 ILYAS BHATTI: The basic principle of
14 estimating the cost --

15 FRED SALVUCCI: Yeah.

16 ILYAS BHATTI: Questions? Questions?
17 Comments? Okay. Oh, there's one.

18 GALEN MOOK: Go for it, Glen.

19 ILYAS BHATTI: Glen?

20 STENOGRAPHER: What's the name?

21 ILYAS BHATTI: Glen Berkowitz.

22 STENOGRAPHER: Thank you.

23 GLEN BERKOWITZ: Thank you, Galen.

24 On the second row of multimodal

1 connectivity, it says, "Allow separation of roads on
2 the Paul Dudley White Path," and then the measure is
3 level of comfort. I think the word "safety" really is
4 what comes into mind. When you look under the safety
5 column, all the way to the right --

6 ILYAS BHATTI: Yeah.

7 GLEN BERKOWITZ: -- it comes across, at
8 least to this reader, as being 100 percent auto- and
9 truck-focused with zero reference to human beings who
10 might walk or bike. And so you might want to, just a
11 suggestion, find a way to --

12 ILYAS BHATTI: To have that.

13 GLEN BERKOWITZ: -- bring the Paul
14 Dudley White safety issues more literal under the
15 safety and operations column.

16 ILYAS BHATTI: Sure. Okay.

17 GALEN MOOK: Can I take onto that?

18 ILYAS BHATTI: Yeah, okay.

19 GALEN MOOK: Just to echo, I 100
20 percent agree.

21 ILYAS BHATTI: Okay.

22 STENOGRAPHER: Name, please?

23 GALEN MOOK: My name is Galen Mook.
24 I'm a resident and with MassBike. And, to Wendy's

1 point, I just really want to echo this, it's not just
2 safety; it's accessibility. This, and we don't really
3 have much -- the one you pointed out, it's a glaring
4 missing point here is the accessibility.

5 ILYAS BHATTI: Thank you for the
6 comment.

7 Okay. Would you like to take it? The
8 lady may let you talk.

9 JESSICA ROBERTSON: I thought you were
10 turning it over to Mike.

11 So, Jessica Robertson again. I think
12 both Ken and others have brought up this question
13 already about the safety and operations. I think the
14 first one, you know, presence of safety elements per
15 lane mile sounds like it's pointing toward shoulders
16 But, as Ken pointed out, there should also be absence
17 of safety risks, such as vertical curvature and
18 horizontal curvature.

19 ILYAS BHATTI: Right. Right. Right.

20 JESSICA ROBERTSON: I think, also, in
21 all of these categories, I mean they're also very
22 redundant. There's, you know, like four different
23 things that are sort of the same thing. So, perhaps
24 we could collapse some of those. But we should also

1 take into consideration the same -- related to the
2 point about the train speed and there are restrictions
3 on either side of the throat area where you don't have
4 shoulders and any other, you know, lane width issues.
5 And so it's not a very valuable benefit to provide a
6 shoulder for 200 feet when you don't have a shoulder
7 on either side. So, I think we should just be
8 cognizant of that and how we phrase these and not --
9 you know, not having those shoulders shouldn't be
10 considered a deal breaker.

11 ILYAS BHATTI: Okay.

12 HARRY MATTISON: Thank you, Ilyas.

13 Harry Mattison. I'd like to add a couple of items.

14 One is that I think the overall tone,
15 and whether it's subconscious, or just random, or I
16 don't know where it's from, but when you think about
17 something like maintains or improves safety for I-90
18 versus permanent address impacts to parks, open space
19 it sounds totally different. Right? If it said,
20 "Maintains or improves parkland," I think we'd say,
21 "Great. That's what we should be trying to do,"
22 because the parkland is compromised, or substandard,
23 or whatever you'd like to call it.

24 ILYAS BHATTI: Yeah. Okay.

1 HARRY MATTISON: So, what was the --
2 what's driving the -- why in one case are we talking
3 about maintaining or improving, but in the other case
4 it's about minimizing impacts?

5 ILYAS BHATTI: Keri?

6 KERI PYKE: Jay, I don't know if you
7 want to jump in here. I'm a little out of my league.
8 But I think some of that is about what the
9 environmental regs say in terms of phrasing things in
10 terms of impact as opposed to benefit, which is why
11 some of the environmental things are written in that
12 frame as opposed to maintains or improves because they
13 -- especially it seems like the DEP wetlands are more
14 about impact and less about benefit. That's why they
15 phrased that way.

16 KEN MILLER: Yeah, generally criteria
17 really shouldn't imply -- it shouldn't imply a
18 direction. So it really should be things like the
19 effect on safety, the effect on parklands, the effect
20 on things. So, the criteria itself doesn't imply a
21 direction, either negative or positive. So, when you
22 construct criteria, you really should try to keep it
23 neutral.

24 STENOGRAPHER: Could I have your name

1 for the record?

2 KEN MILLER: Ken Miller.

3 ILYAS BHATTI: Ken Miller.

4 KEN MILLER: Sorry. Ken Miller,
5 Federal Highway Administration.

6 STENOGRAPHER: Thank you.

7 HARRY MATTISON: And then the last
8 thing I wanted to add was an additional criteria which
9 would be consistency with public comments.

10 ILYAS BHATTI: Yeah.

11 HARRY MATTISON: Hundreds of people
12 have written hundreds of letters commenting on this
13 project. And the extent to which these different
14 options are consistent with their comments I think is
15 important. But it seems to be --

16 JACK WRIGHT: But, again -- again, the
17 criteria doesn't lead to a score. I just want to
18 point that out. I hear you, but the Secretary is very
19 much aware of public comment on this. That's why
20 we're doing the whole review. But, you know, we'll
21 consider that and see, again --

22 HARRY MATTISON: The Secretary is aware
23 of a lot of this stuff. I don't think this is --
24 we're not piloting here elements that Stephanie

1 Pollock is not aware of that we're going to bring to
2 her consciousness. The point is that the comments
3 from probably 50 elected officials, from several
4 hundred residents, merit some inclusion in this
5 analysis.

6 JACK WRIGHT: In my mind, there's no
7 problem putting it in.

8 HARRY MATTISON: Thank you.

9 ILYAS BHATTI: Yeah. Yeah. Wendy, you
10 were --

11 WENDY LANDMAN: Sure. Thank you.

12 I just wanted to -- I did a little --
13 when looking at the criteria today, I did a little key
14 word search that's related to the letter that we sent
15 yesterday. And I just want to read out loud the words
16 that are in this letter about the environmental and
17 riverfront issues that aren't in the criteria as
18 written. I'm not -- I can hand you this later. But,
19 restoration or ecological restoration, that word isn't
20 mentioned; water quality; floodplain; bank
21 restoration; aquatic; riparian; erosion; Article 97;
22 Section 106, all of those things are not listed in the
23 criteria. And all of those things are utterly
24 relevant to the throat. And it's not that every one

1 of those words needs to be listed explicitly, but it
2 seems like an oversight in the way that that set of
3 things is being described under environment, that we
4 need a more holistic view such as what is called for
5 in the MEPA certificate, which says that the Final
6 Environmental Impact Report should be looking at
7 restoration of the riverbank, ecological restoration
8 of the riverbank.

9 So, I think, again, it's not word-for-
10 word that it has to be exactly the same, but somehow
11 that essence hasn't been captured.

12 ILYAS BHATTI: Is that -- I think under
13 permitting, environmental and permitting risk, we have
14 included some of the -- Jay?

15 JAY WICKERSHAM: Actually, I think the
16 very first environmental criteria could be revised,
17 yeah.

18 ILYAS BHATTI: Yeah. Right.

19 JAY WICKERSHAM: It probably should be
20 revised I think to expand upon exactly that point.

21 ILYAS BHATTI: Okay. So, good comment.
22 Jay Wickersham.

23 STENOGRAPHER: Thank you.

24 ILYAS BHATTI: Okay. Can I take

1 another question? Yeah?

2 TAD READ: Yeah, I'm not sure that the
3 notes capture the point that Jessica was making about
4 air rights. And I think we've heard many times that
5 one of the potential benefits of the at-grade throat
6 option is the potential that it creates for air rights
7 development over that section and the potential for
8 decking over for open space. So, I think in terms of
9 public realm, both have potential for air rights over
10 an at-grade throat and the potential for a deck, an
11 open space deck. Because it's been part of the
12 conversation, it should be included explicitly.

13 ILYAS BHATTI: Okay.

14 STENOGRAPHER: Your name?

15 TAD READ: I'm sorry. Tad Read, BPDA.

16 STENOGRAPHER: Thank you.

17 ILYAS BHATTI: Yes?

18 MARGARET VAN DEUSEN: Margaret Van
19 Deusen, Charles River Watershed.

20 I just want to go back to impact versus
21 benefit and how DEP might look at this. And I
22 understand their impact side, but they have a benefit
23 side to the agency as well. And, certainly, the
24 Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs

1 does, too. So, I think the benefit is squarely in
2 here and, as you look at the permitting aspects of
3 this, it would be shortsighted to just go to impact.

4 ILYAS BHATTI: Okay.

5 HARRY MATTISON: Ilyas, may I?

6 ILYAS BHATTI: I owe you one minute,
7 right?

8 HARRY MATTISON: Oh, yeah, yeah, yeah.

9 ILYAS BHATTI: You forgot. Why am I
10 remembering?

11 HARRY MATTISON: Yeah, sorry. Just we
12 mentioned --

13 ILYAS BHATTI: I'll give you one minute
14 and then --

15 TAD READ: I won't even need that. We
16 mentioned at the last task force meeting that the BPDA
17 in working with BTM will be launching a mobility study
18 for Allston Brighton this fall. The first kickoff
19 open house will be September 12th. And I'd like to
20 pass out some flyers. There are additional flyers
21 over on the table. And please, if you need additional
22 ones, check with me.

23 WENDY LANDMAN: And, please, because
24 just before that, which we didn't know, we had already

1 -- WalkBoston, the Charles River Watershed
2 Association, and the Charles River Conservancy are
3 doing a walk of the throat. We're going to meet at
4 the BU Beach and walk along the throat, in single file
5 so as not to block the bicyclists. We are going to
6 meet at 5:30 at the BU Beach area. So that's in the
7 letter that we're handing out. And we found out after
8 we had sent out a notice that that was happening. But
9 you'll be able to walk, run, or ride your bike from
10 the end of our walk to that meeting.

11 ILYAS BHATTI: Okay.

12 WENDY LANDMAN: So, thank you.

13 ILYAS BHATTI: Yeah?

14 GALEN MOOK: I just wanted to -- to
15 Margaret's point about impact versus benefit and to
16 really -- what Ken said just a minute ago about how
17 this is really the effect. And I thank you, Ken, for
18 actually bringing up that point because it's kind of
19 reframing how this whole conversation sits in my mind.
20 I would like the notes to reflect it's not really
21 impact versus benefit, but we're really looking at an
22 effect.

23 ILYAS BHATTI: Right. Right. Right.
24 Okay.

1 GALEN MOOK: So, for instance,
2 something with Tad's point about does -- how would air
3 rights be taken. If you said effect on air rights
4 development as opposed to allows for, or facilities,
5 or precludes, I think that really needs to be -- and,
6 yes, you could say that a viaduct precludes -- the
7 effect of a viaduct means you can't have air rights in
8 the analysis. But, really, I want to just get to
9 that.

10 ILYAS BHATTI: So, I think we are going
11 to wind down. And, you know, we got a tremendous
12 amount of feedback. Okay. It was wonderful hearing
13 from you, all aspects. Some of the things I have
14 lived through.

15 STACY THOMPSON: Hi. I actually have a
16 process-related question.

17 ILYAS BHATTI: Okay. All right. Let's
18 do that.

19 STACY THOMPSON: Stacy Thompson,
20 LivableStreets.

21 Given sort of some of -- one, it was
22 incredibly helpful to get the rundown of when the
23 meetings are going to be and to get this in advance.
24 And I think given some of the questions about process,

1 I'm wondering if, you know, I know you can't give us
2 everything before the next meeting, but I'm wondering
3 if you could maybe map out what we're supposed to be
4 achieving in each of the following meetings. And I
5 know that the People's Pike had a number of other
6 questions and considerations. And I'm curious about
7 when those are going to be brought up, and could we at
8 least get those in a couple of weeks? I think that
9 that would really help make these meetings run more
10 smoothly. And I know that there have been a lot of
11 requests about those things.

12 ILYAS BHATTI: I think a couple of the
13 dates that Jack announced, the 26th is definitely
14 that's -- oh, yeah, it's right there. And the 28th is
15 the date that we'll be submitting the report to the
16 Secretary. And, plus, you have this one week.
17 Unfortunately, the timeframe is so constrained that
18 we're just kind of moving fast.

19 STACY THOMPSON: Yeah, I think I'm
20 asking more about how we effectively use these
21 meetings. You know, like what are we planning on
22 doing in the next meeting? And what might we get in
23 advance so we can have a great conversation?

24 ILYAS BHATTI: One thing I can tell

1 you, the IRT, or the Independent Review Team, we're
2 going to take all this information -- I think tomorrow
3 we'll be, you know, rolling up our sleeves and working
4 the whole day, okay, what we heard from you, okay.
5 Some is over there. Some is over here. Okay? So, we
6 are going to get together and, you know, it was
7 tremendous and valuable feedback that we got. Okay?
8 So, we're going to take that and see what we can do
9 with this criteria that we developed with your
10 comments and your feedback.

11 FEMALE: Also, Stacy, I think you
12 should ask that question again in a minute because
13 both Ed, Donny, and Mike were all out of the room when
14 you asked that question. And I think it's largely
15 related to the -- not the 90-day review team, but the
16 rest of --

17 ILYAS BHATTI: Oh, yeah, yeah, yeah.
18 That's right. That's right. Good point. Yeah.

19 STACY THOMPSON: It was more just a
20 process question. You know, when we jumped -- it was
21 incredibly helpful to get this in advance. It helped
22 us to jump right into the conversation. And I know
23 that there are lots of topics that people brought up
24 that aren't related to the 90-day review. And so I'm

1 wondering if maybe in the next couple of weeks we
2 could get a map out of like these are the other issues
3 we're going to cover in the following meetings. This
4 is the plan.

5 DONNY DAILEY: Certainly. Send me a
6 request and I'll certainly run it by the folks --

7 HARRY MATTISON: I'm pretty sure Galen
8 made this request at the last meeting. And I
9 certainly -- I mean this isn't a new request. There's
10 a list of issues. Right? The rail yard flip that
11 Wendy and Joe mentioned, the Malvern Street busway,
12 the number of lanes on the streets in the new grid,
13 the Cambridge Street bypass, the interim West Station,
14 right?

15 MALE: The Franklin Street Footbridge.

16 HARRY MATTISON: Sure. We'd like to
17 know what's happening with all these things. We'd
18 like to know when we're going to be hearing about
19 things and --

20 DONNY DAILEY: Well, you were aware of
21 today's agenda. Harry, you got it, right?

22 MALE: Yesterday at 3:00 p.m.

23 JESSICA ROBERTSON: Well, I think,
24 Donny, the question is there's a lot of issues that we

1 -- a lot of design elements of the project that were
2 not included in the DEIR. And many of our comments
3 said, "Why aren't these things included in the DEIR?
4 When are we going to see them addressed?" And so
5 we've submitted a number of different requests and
6 letters over time saying when can we see all these
7 things that Harry just listed. And so we're just --
8 we still want to know, if we have two more meetings on
9 the books, are we going to cover all those things at
10 those meetings or not? Are there more meetings? When
11 are we going to cover all those things?

12 KATE FICHTER: Yeah, so the meetings we
13 scheduled so far are really just to work through the
14 Independent Review team process. We get that there's
15 lots of other issues related to the FEIR. We,
16 obviously, internally, are kind of trying to figure
17 out how to keep the two parallel tracks moving at the
18 same time. We had hoped to cover some street grid and
19 bike issues tonight. Obviously, it made more sense to
20 give over the whole meeting to the Independent Review
21 Team.

22 But, we hear you. And what we will do
23 is try as best we can to map out the next couple of
24 months worth of meetings. One thing that Mike and I

1 were talking about was we don't want to kind of like
2 overburden you guys. It doesn't make sense to maybe
3 to have like -- rather than trying to squish it all
4 into single meetings once a month, we go to two
5 meetings a month, one for FEIR, one for Independent
6 Review Team. Obviously, these guys are done in six
7 weeks or whatever it is. If people have a tolerance
8 for that, we can certainly do that until we get
9 through this process and then return solely to the
10 FEIR.

11 We're not hiding things from people.
12 We're trying to figure out as we go, too. But we hear
13 you. And we'll figure it out.

14 STENOGRAPHER: Can I get your name?

15 KATE FICHTER: Oh, sorry. I'm Kate
16 Fichter.

17 HARRY MATTISON: So, Kate, when should
18 we expect some sort of update then on that -- on those
19 issues?

20 KATE FICHTER: Let me look at it
21 tomorrow morning. I, obviously, have to talk to my
22 team, some of which is here today. They know, and I
23 don't. But we'll figure out how the work is going to
24 proceed.

1 HARRY MATTISON: Ilyas, can I just make
2 one suggestion that maybe you'll throw up?

3 ILYAS BHATTI: Sure.

4 HARRY MATTISON: You've gotten a ton of
5 feedback on the criteria already.

6 ILYAS BHATTI: Yes, we did. I did.

7 HARRY MATTISON: So, instead of us
8 spending hours and hours of our lives writing letters
9 that say what we already said to you tonight --

10 ILYAS BHATTI: Yeah.

11 HARRY MATTISON: -- would you be
12 willing to reissue an updated version of this in the
13 next few days, and then we'll send you written
14 comments on that updated version?

15 ILYAS BHATTI: Well, I don't know
16 whether I can make that promise in three days because
17 --

18 HARRY MATTISON: Well, you can take
19 four days, five days.

20 ILYAS BHATTI: Well, you are being very
21 generous now, okay, extending the schedule.

22 I don't know. We will definitely take
23 that into consideration as we work tomorrow. As I
24 said, tomorrow morning, we are, you know, going to be

1 working right from morning to see where we are.

2 HARRY MATTISON: Can you send us a

3 reply then by the end of the day tomorrow to let us

4 know?

5 ILYAS BHATTI: Well, it all depends on

6 the team, you know, what --

7 HARRY MATTISON: Well, we can wait and

8 send you our comments next Wednesday, or we can send

9 you much better comments if you go back, update this

10 over the next couple of days, Monday, Tuesday,

11 whenever you're done. And then you say, "Okay.

12 Here's the updated version. And we heard you. We

13 agree, we disagree," whatever. And then say, "Okay,

14 fine. By next Friday we'll send you comments on that

15 version 2."

16 MALE: Right. You could get to work on

17 it right away. You don't have to wait for comments.

18 MALE: That's a great idea.

19 JACK WRIGHT: So, we'll consider it.

20 ILYAS BHATTI: Definitely. We'll

21 consider it. Okay?

22 HARRY MATTISON: You'll let us know by

23 the end of the week?

24 KERI PYKE: By the end of the week,

1 yes.

2 JACK WRIGHT: By the time we get the

3 answers.

4 STENOGRAPHER: Your name again, sir?

5 HARRY MATTISON: Harry Mattison. Thank

6 you.

7 ILYAS BHATTI: Well, I think this

8 brings us to the conclusion of this meeting. And I

9 really appreciate your time, and your passion, okay,

10 and your knowledge. And we appreciate it. The

11 Federal Highway very much appreciates it.

12 Mr. Secretary, Wendy, if I go through

13 names I'll get in trouble because I'll leave somebody

14 out.

15 So, thank you very much. And we'll be

16 in touch. And think about you may want to send

17 something into us. Okay?

18 KERI PYKE: If you want to send

19 anything else, the email is on the screen. It was

20 also in the email Donny sent.

21 ILYAS BHATTI: Oh, yeah. That's right.

22 That's exactly right. Okay. Anyway, it's been a

23 great evening.

24 (Whereupon, the proceedings were concluded at 8:18 p.m.)

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, Judith A. Luciano, do hereby certify that the foregoing record is a true and accurate transcription of the proceedings in the above-captioned matter to the best of my skill and ability.

Judith A. Luciano

**** ALL NAMES NOT PROVIDED WERE SPELLED PHONETICALLY TO
THE BEST OF MY ABILITY**

Arlington Reporting Company
(339) 674-9100