MEMORANDUM

To:	Michael O'Dowd Project Manager	Date:	10/28/20
From:	Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis Howard Stein Hudson	HSH Project No.:	2013061.14
Subject:	Massachusetts Department of Transportation I-90 Allston Multimodal Project Task Force Meeting Meeting Notes of 10/15/2020		

Overview

On October 15th, the project team of the I-90 Allston Multimodal Project held a meeting with Task Force members of the project. Due to the Commonwealth's response to COVID-19, this meeting occurred virtually. Audience members were able to attend remotely and use the virtual platform to engage with the project team by asking questions and offering feedback in real time.

The Task Force is composed of local residents, business owners, transportation, and open space advocates, elected officials representing communities impacted by the project, as well as representatives of local and state agencies. The purpose of the group is, through the application of its members' in-depth knowledge, to assist and advise the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) in refining the preferred alternative selected by the Secretary of Transportation for documentation in a state Final Environmental Impact Report and in two federal documents: a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). Once the process associated with these environmental documents is completed, the project will be bid using a 25% design/build package that MassDOT will make available to interested general contractors.

The purpose of this meeting was to kick off the comment period for the selection of a preferred alternative for the throat area for inclusion in the DEIS. All three throat options under consideration, At-Grade Modified, Highway Viaduct Modified, and the Soldiers' Field Road Hybrid are compatible with the concept for the interchange and connecting roadways to the local street network, known as the 3L Realignment Alternative. As the existing viaduct continues to deteriorate and the permitting process for the project of this nature is per force lengthy, the need for a preferred alternative to be chosen this fall has become imperative. Identification of the preferred alternative for analysis in the DEIS is noted as Concurrence Point 3 (CP3) under the One Federal Decision environmental permitting process.

During the presentation, the project team went over updates of NEPA process, the three alternatives for the throat area, and how each alternative will impact the Charles River, roadway safety, and Grand Junction and Worcester Mainline rail operations. The project team also reviewed the cost of each alternative, noise impacts, impacts to park land, and historic resources.

A major element of contention during the meeting was the construction staging of each alternative. The project team presented that both the At-Grade and Highway Viaduct concepts could be constructed in 6-7 years, while the Soldiers' Field Road Hybrid would likely take 8-10 years. It was also presented that both the At-Grade and Soldiers' Field Road Hybrid options would require taking the Grand Junction Line out of service early during construction and leaving it disconnected until late in the process with attendant challenges to the maintenance program for the MBTA commuter rail leading to system-wide concerns about providing service at the desired levels. This prompted several Task Force members to demand access to the detailed construction staging diagrams and openly call the accuracy and truthfulness of MassDOT and its project team into consideration. In addition, some other attendees of the meeting requested that commuter rail impacts and other environmental impacts be further evaluated and quantified.

Agenda

Detailed Meeting Minutes[1]

Welcome & Opening Remarks

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Good evening, folks. My name is Nathaniel Curtis, I work for Howard Stein Hudson. We are under contract to MassDOT to provide public outreach for this project. Welcome to tonight's virtual meeting of the I-90 Allston Task Force. I think most folks are familiar with how this works now. We will have a Q&A period at the end of the presentation. For that Q&A section you can either type in your questions in the question panel, or you can raise your hand to ask them. We do encourage you to raise your hand so that folks can hear your questions, but if you do choose to type in your question, a member of the staff will read off your question and provide your name.

The machinery being used to broadcast this meeting automatically records us. We just wanted to let you know. It is not our goal to make anybody internet famous. The recording will be used in the

[1] Herein "C" stands for comment, "Q" for question and "A" for answer. For a list of attendees, please see Appendix 1. For a list of questions received via the typed question feature, please see Appendix 2.

furtherance of making an accurate record of the meeting minutes which will be posted to the project website. I would like to turn the meeting over to Donny Daily who will welcome our legislative friends.

C: Donny Dailey: Good evening, folks. I am Donny Dailey. I am the Government and Public Affairs Liaison for MassDOT's Highway Division. I would just like to welcome a few representatives from the State House. Those include Dennis Giambetti from the Office of Senate President Karen Spilka, State Representative Carolyn Dykema of Hopkinton, State Representative Hannah Kane of Shrewsbury and finally, State Representative Kay Kahn of Newton. Thank you, Nate.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: You are welcome Donny. I also understand that Owen you have some opening remarks as well. I think you may need to introduce yourself to folks in the audience, as I do not believe you have been to one of these before.

C: Owen Kane: I should introduce myself. Thank you very much, Nate. I am Owen Kane. I am the Deputy General Counsel for MassDOT and the MBTA. I wanted to do a couple things, introduce myself and reintroduce myself to many of you. Over the years, I have had the great pleasure of working with many of you on all sorts of projects. However, this is only my second Task Force meeting. What I would like to just make very clear in the beginning is that the purpose of this meeting, as is the purpose of the public engagement period for us, us being MassDOT, is to get feedback on what has been done thus far.

I just wanted to make sure that everyone understood that neither Mike nor any member of his team, will be answering deeply detailed questions tonight. They can certainly answer some clarifying questions, such that would help you write your comment, but the purpose of this meeting is for us to get input from you. The team will do the presentation. But the feedback period or the public engagement period is open until October 30th. We encourage you to provide any input that you have. I can see on the screen now is an email address for you to share any input you may have. Don't be surprised tonight if I jump in and say that we are not answering a particular question of yours at this point, because again, the idea of this is for us to get input from you. With that I will turn it back to Nate.

C: Donny Dailey: Nate if I may?

A: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Of course, Donny.

C: Donny Dailey: I have just learned that State Representative Kevin Honan of Allston-Brighton has also joined us. Welcome Representative Honan.

A: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Alright, so at this point, Ed, I think we will push into the agenda. Does that sound good?

C: Ed Ionata: Yes, thanks Nate. Hi, this is Ed Ionata from Tetra Tech. Hello to the Task Force members and newer people that are joining us. Tonight's agenda is a quick review of the status of the I-90 Multimodal Project and where we are in the NEPA process. We will also review the Modified At-Grade alternative and the entire range of alternatives.

In addition, we will take a dive into what choosing a preferred alternative means and how it will be accomplished. Then we will go over a summary of the analysis matrix that has been posted on the website. For the Task Force members that have been with us for many years, the presenters will be familiar people.

We will start with Sandy Hoover and then move on to Jim Keller then Mark Fobert and others. We are not going to interrupt the presentation to introduce who they are, they can certainly introduce themselves. They are also familiar to most of you. We will endeavor to get through the presentation as efficiently as possible to leave time for questions or comments. Sandy, it is all yours. Thank you.

Presentation

C: **Sandy Hoover:** Thank you and good evening everyone. So as Ed said, my name is Sandy Hoover, and I am a Project Scientist with Tetra Tech. I will be kicking off this presentation today with where we are in the NEPA process. Currently, the project is still in the Scoping Process under NEPA.

The purpose of the Scoping Report is to collaborate with the public to determine the scope of analysis and range of alternatives to be analyzed in the NEPA Environmental Impact Statement. As you all know, a scoping report for the project was published in November of last year. That report describes the proposed purpose and need alternatives under consideration, environmental analyses, and public coordination for the project. Public comments were received on that scoping report until December 12 of last year. Following the Scoping Report, a Scoping Summary Report was published. This Summary Report responded to those public comments received on the Scoping Report and identified what alternatives will be carried forward to the DEIS. Additional stakeholder engagement since publication of the Summary Report has led to further refinement of the Modified At-Grade Throat Area Option within the 3L realignment alternatives which we will discuss in more detail later in this presentation.

The NEPA DEIS will include a full evaluation of all reasonable alternatives identified during scoping, as well as detail a draft set of proposed mitigation measures to mitigate the project's environmental and traffic impacts. As we discussed at the August Task Force meeting, MassDOT and Federal Highway are pursuing the identification of a recommended preferred alternative in preparation for One Federal Decision Concurrence Point 3. Again, we will get into more detail regarding choosing a recommended preferred alternative later in this presentation.

The next steps in both federal and state environmental review processes: we just want to give you a sense of what documents we will see next and generally what you can expect to find in those documents. The next MEPA state environmental review document you will see is the Notice of Project Change (NPC). The NPC will update the project's Purpose and Need to align with the NEPA purpose in need. The NPC will also update the design of alternatives currently under consideration in the NEPA process. We have a lot of catching up to do with what's been described in the most recent NEPA documentation, so the NPC will do that as well, and it will also select a preferred alternative for the state environmental review process. The public will have an opportunity to provide comments on the NPC and the NPC will result in an updated Secretary Certificate to support preparation of a Final Environmental Impact Report.

Following the NPC, we expect to publish a NEPA Draft Environmental Impact Statement. I touched on this on the last slide, but the DEIS will provide an evaluation of the reasonable alternatives identified during scoping and will also detail draft mitigation measures. Following the NEPA DEIS the NEPA Final Environmental Impact Report will be published, followed by the NEPA Final Environmental Impact Statement Record of Decision (ROD)

document. All this of course, is working toward and in preparation for obtaining the appropriate state and federal permits for the alternative that will ultimately be selected.

We will now briefly describe the updated Modified At-Grade.

C: **Jim Keller:** Good evening, everyone. I'm Jim Keller with Tetra Tech, I am going to be presenting some of the refinements that have been made to the Modified At-Grade since the publishing of the Scoping Summary Report. MassDOT has been meeting with the City of Boston as well as A Better City (ABC) and have been working through some of these refinements. I will explain what they are.

The cross section that was presented in the Scoping Summary Report for the Modified At-Grade, had 4-foot shoulders for I-90, and ABC's cross section had 2-foot shoulders for I-90. ABC has widened the outside shoulder from 2 to 4 feet. We incorporated that into the cross section as well as increased the travel lane width from 10 feet to 11 feet for Soldiers' Field Road. MassDOT has essentially brought that into this latest refinement and is moving forward with that cross section. The rail cross section remained the same for both alternatives as well as the Paul Dudley White Path which was right on the river's edge in the Scoping Report, but in the modified version is on a pile supported boardwalk out in the river. In the modified version, a living shoreline gets created north of Soldiers Field Road between the Soldiers' Field Road and the boardwalk. Some of these dimensions outside of the cross section of the rail, I-90, Soldiers Field Road, etc. are slightly different than what has been proposed by the City of Boston and A Better City's concept, but this is what MassDOT is currently presenting as the Modified At-Grade.

Here we have a plan view of that layout, which incorporates the boardwalk. Essentially that is the major change, but based on the meetings and discussions between MassDOT, the City of Boston, and A Better City, there has been the ability to look at these different opportunities for a boardwalk. Also, based on applying some of the proposals from A Better City and the City of Boston, MassDOT was able to use the surveyed contours and take a look at some of the actual existing conditions and apply this boardwalk to the cross section. MassDOT also evaluated how the boardwalk may look. As far as its length, the boardwalk will be about 1,300 feet longitudinally, from east to west.

We can see that boardwalk to the north, represented by the white hatched area. On the right, there are some bullets that explain what the Modified At-Grade is. Most people here on the Task Force already have an idea of what the prior At-Grade and now the Modified At-Grade entail. In this option, I-90 is partially below grade since it needs to be able to pass below the Grand Junction overpass. The Grand Junction overpass would carry the rail line which is currently below the viaduct. That rail line goes up and over I-90 in the future for the Modified At-Grade alternative. That is really the only place where I-90 is below grade. Due to that, we will be discussing some of the information from the matrix for some of these impacts and areas that goes below grade, and then how the Soldiers' Field Road gets shifted under slightly shifted to the north to allow for the rail to come in with the Modified At-Grade. However, that is no change from what was done in the Scoping Summary Report as well as previous presentations.

C: **Mark Fobert:** Thank you, Jim. This is Mark Fobert from Tetra Tech. The Modified At-Grade option includes a wider version of the Paul Dudley White Path on the boardwalk along with a restored or living shoreline. While this version represents more intrusion into the river MassDOT believes on balance that the bike and pedestrian benefits along with the aesthetics and potential environmental benefits of the restored bank make it a more desirable version of the Modified At-Grade. The benefits

and impacts of the Modified At-Grade will be considered during the selection of the preferred alternative.

I am now going to briefly review the federal wetlands and waterways permanent environmental impacts. Both the federal water waters of the United States and the state flowed tidelands share the same limit of jurisdiction, which is elevation two, which is shown in blue on the section. We have a pile supported Paul Dudley White Path that would occupy approximately 29,000 square feet of the Charles River. The Path will also be supported by approximately 250 piles, which will result in a direct impact of 500 square feet of the Charles River. Fill associated with a bank restoration is approximately 20,000 square feet and finally the solid fill to support Soldiers Field Road is approximately 600 square feet. The impacts are shown as blue crosshatch on the graphic on the shoreline. The gray is upland, and the blue is the fill within the waters of the United States.

State wetland jurisdiction: starting at the river and moving landward includes land underwater which is shown in blue. The land underwater is the water sheet below elevation zero. We then have inland bank which is riverbank between elevations zero and 2 as shown in light blue and bordering land subject to flooding, which is the flood storage located between elevations 2 and 4 shown in yellow. Alterations to the river from fill are shown in the various crosshatch colors on the graphic. These color codes are like what you saw on the federal graphic. Alterations to land underwater includes 28,000 square feet of shading under the pile supported Paul Dudley White Path. There will also be 250 piles to support the walkway, which results in a direct alteration of 500 square feet of land underwater. There will be 1,400 square feet of land underwater that would be altered by the bank restoration. The bordering land subject to flooding the Paul Dudley White Path would occupy 620 cubic feet of floodplain. For the Soldiers Field Road Hybrid alternative that would amount to 100,000 cubic feet and the bank restoration 3,100 cubic feet.

All throat options allow for the riverbank restoration and enhancement at the end of the project. The Modified Highway Viaduct and Soldiers Field Road Hybrid allow for bank restoration enhancement with no additional fill in the river. The Modified At-Grade allows for bank restoration if fill is deemed permittable by the regulatory agencies. This is just an example of a rendering we have been using throughout the project of a possible restored bank would look like.

C: **Jim Keller:** Here we a have a little short discussion on the range of alternatives. We briefly went through the Modified At-Grade alternative and the refinements that have been made to that since the scoping summary report. We then review the matrix that was presented to the public on the project website last week. A portion of that matrix will be in this presentation. I will get into some of the greater details and some of those throat area alternatives. This is the 3L realignment alternative which just depicts the overall interchange with the realigned Highway, West station, and the Modified Flip that has been presented in the Scoping Summary Report. We also have the current layout of the street grid. Currently, there is traffic analysis being done for updated numbers and for updated analyses that will be considered and used to look at a range of factors. These factors include number of lanes, the viability to of shift elements around, if possible, and reduce turn pockets and roadway cross sectional width. Some of these factors are outside of the area that we are focused on at this time. Our focus now is the differentiators in the throat area as we move toward future environmental submissions.

For the NEPA and MEPA process, any refinements that happen outside of that can still, move forward with those submissions and as the project moves forward, but tonight, we are mainly focused on these current three throat area alternatives. Again, this is the Modified Highway Viaduct that was presented the scoping summary report. We have a description of what it is. There are no changes since the Scoping Summary Report. We are looking at extending the length of the widened Paul Dudley White Path. The path is not separated, in the far eastern end of the throat because it is

confined currently by the Grand Junction Rail bridge support, but we are looking to widen that path further to the west. Other than that, there are very few refinements to this alternative since the Scoping Summary Report. Here is the cross section that everyone is familiar with.

We can move on to the next slide and it's the same thing with the Soldiers' Field Road Hybrid, we have the same cross section that was presented and same plan view alignments. Nothing has been refined or revised since the August submission of the Scoping Summary Report. Again, this slide explains just what the elements are, where they are, and how Soldiers' Field Road is realigned and goes over I-90 eastbound. I-90 is extensively below grade, unlike the Modified At-Grade, places I-90 below grade for a shorter distance. This Soldiers' Field Road Hybrid placed I-90 below grade for a substantial distance within the limits of the throat area, impacting several major utilities to an extent much greater than any of the other alternatives. The Grand Junction Rail viaduct is similar between the At-Grade and Hybrid alternatives. Here is a cross section that has been through the Scoping Summary Report, so I'm not going to belabor it as Taskforce members and most elected officials are familiar with the Soldiers Field Road cross section.

Again, the no-build is always part of the discussion just for the fact that in the Scoping Summary it was described as the major preservation. The no-build includes replacement of the bridge deck, on the existing viaduct, and the deck joints, as well as bridge railings and general repairs to the structure. The no-build also includes the Cambridge Street Overpass Project that has been on hold for some time as we discussed the I-90 project. The Cambridge Street Overpass will be included in this project if there was a no-build alternative, as well as any of the other build alternatives. In addition, as part of the no build we have the Franklin Street preservation.

C: Mark Fobert: MassDOT has not identified a recommended preferred alternative, but it will need to do so soon to support a reasonable permitting timeline. Cooperating agencies are in the process of reviewing the matrix to determine if they have sufficient information to undertake federal actions and approvals on a preferred alternative. A recommended preferred alternative will be determined to aid the NEPA process, interagency coordination, and the One Federal decision process. All the alternatives will be fully analyzed in the DEIS and the designation of a preferred alternative would be modified throughout the NEPA process. The public will have additional opportunities to comment on the preferred alternative in the MEPA NPC and the NEPA DEIS.

One of the main reasons MassDOT is looking for an alternative this fall is the condition of the existing Viaduct. The Allston Viaduct is a critical piece of infrastructure that not only carries 150,000 vehicles a day, it is also a major evacuation route for the city. At the time of the Environmental Notification Form filing in 2014, MassDOT was spending more than $700,000 a year maintaining the Viaduct. 6 years later a preferred alternative has still not been chosen. The cost of maintaining that viaduct has now increased to $1 million a year. There is still at least two years of permitting and procurement along with 6 to 8 years construction required before the viaduct can be replaced. Based on this timeline, a preferred alternative must be selected this fall, or the current Viaduct will need to be fixed in its current location.

C: Jim Keller: Here are some of the current 2020 inspection photos of the current condition. These photos back up some of those bullet points that Mark just went over. In these pictures you can some of the deck and joint curb lines, corrosion that requires repair: from rebar being exposed, and cracks in the cross girders, with arresting holes drilled to stop them from spreading. These are just some of those major locations throughout the viaduct with advancing deterioration of the concrete and the steel requiring the increasing cost to maintain and repair. All these factors are driving our timetable and would be repaired as part of the no-build option.

C: **Mark Fobert:** There are several reasons the preferred alternative needs to be selected this fall. First, to meet the state environmental review timeframe. This timeframe requires filing of permits by MassDOT prior to the publication of the NEPA DEIS financial plan to determine if the MBTA needs to accelerate planning for the construction of the Southside maintenance facility. In addition, an alternative should be selected in the fall to support the development of environmental and traffic mitigation.

Here we have the criteria for evaluating the preferred alternative. It includes how well the preferred alternative meets the Purpose and Need. In addition, does the alternative result in excessive permanent environmental impact? Does the alternative have permanent temporary intrusion into the Charles River? Can the alternative be constructed and what are the impacts and duration for the highway traffic safety operations and maintenance? Will the alternative improve safety? Will travel time be affected? Will the level of service be worse? Will there be long vehicle queues interfering with the I-90 mainline? Do maintenance operations improve? Under rail operations: is local and regional multimodal access to future West Station supported? Does the alternative support the rail operation needs of the MBTA? Does the alternative require construction of the Southside maintenance facility in advance of mobilization in Allston? Under cost and schedule: does the alternative require an unreasonably high cost or complicated schedule? Have environmental performance commitments been considered in the decision?

Here is the summary of the analysis of the matrix. Hopefully, you have all seen it available on the website. The purpose of this section is to guide you through the summary analysis matrix for the throat area options. There will be a focus on those categories we have identified as differentiators. There were 8 major categories are identified in the matrix environmental, land use, economic development, construction cost, public input, mobility and access, safety, and operations and maintenance.

Environmental permitting: the project must be consistent with state and federal regulations to protect wetland resources. MassDOT's intention is to avoid and minimize impact to the Charles River wherever practicable. The Federal Clean Water Act, State Wetlands Act, and the Massachusetts Public Waterfront Act all include provisions for avoidance and minimization of wetlands and waterways impact. Similar considerations exist for parklands and historic properties under the Section 4F process to select an alternative that minimizes harm to the greatest extent practicable. The Soldiers' Field Road Hybrid and the Modified At-Grade result in more impact to wetlands and waterways resources, and therefore have a greater potential delay in the implementation of the project. This delay in implementation may result in delays in obtaining permits.

Here is a summary of the permanent wetland impacts to the Charles River. I went over the impacts of the Modified At-Grade earlier in the presentation. That leaves us with the Highway Viaduct and the Soldiers Field Alternative. All the alternatives impact approximately 1,000 square feet of Wetland in the Charles and that impact is associated with outfall construction.

The Modified At-Grade is expected to be less resilient due to a section of I-90 being depressed below the water table and narrower shoulders on I-90. The Modified Highway viaduct is expected to be the most resilient due to the elevated nature of I-90. The Soldiers' Field Road Hybrid is expected to be the least resilient with a major portion of I-90 located below grade.

C: **Stacey Donahoe:** Thanks Mark. This is Stacey Donahoe MassDOT's Senior Historic Resources Specialist. Under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, Federal Highway as the lead federal agency is required to take into account the effects of the project on properties that are listed

in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. A portion of the throat area is within the National Register, the Charles River Basin Historic District.

The section 106 process is still in early stages, and Federal Highway will be seeking the concurrence of the State Historic Preservation Office on the list of historic properties within the project area, but within the throat area MassDOT has preliminarily identified the Charles River, Soldiers' Field Road, parkland, and the Boston University and Grand Junction rail bridges as historic properties to be considered. While it won't be until the next phase of the section 106 process, the historic properties will all be evaluated. The State Historic Preservation Office, in response to the scoping report that was published last year, wrote a letter that noted the potential construction of a bypass road in the river and stressed the importance of carefully considering alternatives that would avoid adverse effects to historic properties; properties that include the National Register listed Charles River. Section 4F is another federal law that requires the consideration of historic properties, as well as park and recreation lands and other resources. In this project, the historic property, the park, and recreation lands are one in the same. For ease of understanding my discussion will focus on historic properties and in a few minutes, you will hear Nick Cohen discuss parkland.

For those of you familiar with the section 4F process, it is still too early to get into 4F specific uses and levels of evaluation, especially given the early stage that we are at in the section 106 process. Accordingly, our discussions are high level comparisons of the alternatives given the existing information rather than the regulatory reviews that will come later. Okay, so, let us look at the first cross section. The Charles River Basin historic district is indicated by the green line on the screen. The blue line indicates the area of the interstate that would be shifted into the historic district at this point. In the Modified At-Grade alternative, the highway viaduct structure would be removed, and I-90 would be brought down to grade. I-90 would occupy a portion of the existing Soldiers Field Road and the existing green space that lies between Soldiers Field Road and the existing rail. The total area of the interstate that would be shifted into the historic district is approximately 50,000 square feet. Soldiers Field Road would shift towards the river and new riverbank would be constructed on fill. In addition, the Paul Dudley White Path would shift onto a pile supported structure in the river. Additionally, the Grand Junction bridge over Soldiers Field Road would be replaced.

This cross section shows the proposed Modified Highway Viaduct Alternative. This alternative would largely maintain the existing conditions with a few exceptions. In this alternative, the new interstate viaduct would be slightly wider than the existing. That means that a few of this viaduct's piers would occupy approximately 500 square feet within the historic district. In addition, approximately 4,900 square feet of the viaduct would overhang the historic district. The alignment of the Grand Junction Railroad would shift slightly so that it occupies approximately 3,000 square feet of the historic district. Soldiers Field Road would shift away from the river onto that existing green space between Soldiers Field Road and the existing rail. That would allow for more green space to be created adjacent to the Paul Dudley White Path. No permanent or temporary structure is proposed in the Charles River, and the Grand Junction bridge over Soldiers Field Road would not be replaced.

Now we discuss the Soldiers Field Road hybrid alternative. Obviously, Soldiers Field Road would shift onto a viaduct that would be outside the bounds of the historic district. I-90 would be relocated slightly below grade and the interstate. In this configuration, I-90 would occupy approximately 66,250 square feet of the historic district. The Paul Dudley White Path would remain at the river's edge and a new wall or fence would be constructed to separate it from the interstate. During construction, Soldiers Field Road would be placed on a trestle in the river, and the Grand Junction bridge over Soldiers Field Road would be replaced.

This chart is just a summary of what I just discussed. The historic resources are listed on the left and the columns on the right, summarize all the different issues that we have looked at for each alternative. The bottom row summarizes the degree to which the interstate shifts into the bounds of the historic district for each alternative. With that, I will pass it on.

C: Jason Ross: Great, thank you very much. This is Jason Ross with VHB. I will be going go over the results of a preliminary noise analysis that we conducted for the throat area. Overall, the results are that we have show very similar sound levels among all the alternatives and when I say similar, I mean within a few decibels where a difference of three decibels is a perceptible change in sound level. In all the areas we are looking at differences of up to three decibels. One of the things that all the alternatives have done is that they have introduced elements to the designs that have improved noise conditions in some areas. For example, near the Soldiers' Field Road underpass, the noise levels have been reduced substantially along the Paul Dudley White Path due to being depressed and there being a greater separation between Soldiers' Field Road and Paul Dudley White Path. Similarly, through the throat area, all the alternatives have been able to increase the distance between the Paul Dudley White Path and the roadways which helps to reduce the noise. In Cambridgeport, which is relatively far from the throat area, we are seeing differences of about two to three decibels. However, these this is an area that is also heavily influenced from other sources of noise such as Memorial Drive, which is common to all alternatives.

The noise levels are slightly lower for the Soldiers' Field Road and Modified At-Grade options since I-90 is not elevated for these options and there is less efficient sound propagation. However, for all alternatives, the noise levels are in the mid-50s to low 60 decibels and are well below the noise abatement criteria that MassDOT and Federal Highway have established.

At Magazine Beach the differences are similar: only about a difference of 1 to 2 decibels and they are slightly higher for the Modified At-Grade alternative because some of the sources are closer to the river and the beach. Along Paul Dudley White Path and the throat area, noise levels are really similar among all the alternatives and this is based on a balance of both separating the Paul Dudley White Path from the roadway sources and changes to shielding that is provided by different design elements such as jersey barriers or the viaduct itself. Finally, in the Boston University area, the predominant source of noise there are the commuter train operations. The resulting sound levels are very similar among all the alternatives.

We are now going to look at some new renderings that were just done. This is the rendering of the Modified At-Grade, as you can see there is no viaduct. This configuration results in improved views with the Charles River from the south on Buick Street and Agganis Way and improved views of Boston University from the users of the Paul Dudley White Path. Here is the Modified Highway Viaduct and it remains on a viaduct. The new viaduct will include architectural improvements. Finally, here is the Soldiers Field Road hybrid. This configuration removes the I-90 Viaduct which results in a smaller Soldiers Field Road viaduct. This alternative would also include architectural treatment treatments like the Highway Viaduct option.

C: Nick Cohen: Hi, everyone. My name is Nick Cohen. I am an environmental planner with VHB. We are now moving on to a land use category. This is parkland, which is a subsection of land use in the matrix. As a reminder, parkland in this case is also in the historic district as Stacey described. Parkland includes accessible and inaccessible green space, Soldiers' Field Road and the Charles River itself, as all are under the care custody and control of the Department of Conservation and Recreation or DCR. Echoing what Stacy said a few minutes ago, we are not far enough in the section 106 or 4F processes yet where we can discuss things like section 106 adverse effects, or specific 4F terms like uses or the level of 4F evaluation. This is a high-level comparison of impacts and differences currently across the throat options. The first one of those comparisons is that first or

second row that you see their Parkland creation. The comparison we are making here is in terms of accessible Parkland. The Modified At-Grade results in 7.3 acres of publicly accessible parkland, which is a net increase of just under 4 acres from the existing. The Highway Viaduct results in 7.1 acres of publicly accessible parkland, which is a 4.5 net increase over existing. Soldiers Field Road hybrid results in 8.7 acres of accessible Parkland, which is a 6.1-acre increase.

Now, for the At-Grade is one important nuance to notice, 1.1 acres of that parkland is a trade between Parkland uses, because as I mentioned, the Charles River is considered a part of the Parkland. So that 1.1 acres is shifted from river park-use, if you want to call it that, to land based park-use or the Paul Dudley White Path park-use. That means we are not getting a new 1.1-acre park, it is just a trade between those park uses. The next row is impacts of I-90 and Grand Junction railroad and where they occupy parkland. These are the same numbers as Stacey showed a few minutes ago because as she mentioned, the Parkland and historic resources are one in the same in this case. I will not repeat the numbers but just to remind you where they come from. In the case of the Modified At-Grade and Soldiers Field Road hybrid, they are resulting from the incursion of the interstate into the parkland with depressed or the Modified At-Grade Alternative I-90. In the Highway Viaduct Alternative, those impacts result from the piers and the overhang of the I-90 viaduct into the parkland. In addition, the 3,000 square feet of Grand Junction rail realignment into the parkland under the Highway Viaduct Alternative.

Lastly, that last row is the Paul Dudley White Path. In all cases, the Paul Dudley White Path is widened. In the Modified At-Grade Alternative and the Soldiers' Field Road hybrid there are separated bike and pedestrian path with the Paul Dudley White Path the whole way. In the case of the Modified At-Grade, it is on a boardwalk. In the Highway Viaduct Alternative, there is a separated bike and pedestrian path for the majority, but not the entire length of the throat. So that, again, is the high-level comparison of the options with regards to parkland. With that, we can move on to the next resource category, thanks.

C: **Mark Fobert:** I will be discussing anticipated permits. For a detailed list of potential environmental approvals please see page six of the summary matrix. There is quite a complete list included in it. The ability to permit, level of complexity, and types of permits required for each alternative have not been established by the environmental permitting agencies at this time, even though we have not met with them. The Soldiers' Field Road hybrid and the Modified At-Grade resulted in significantly more impacts to wetlands and waterway resources and will have a greater potential to delay the implementation schedule of the project.

C: **Jim Keller:** We are now going to get into construction. We will start with some introductory slides to staging for the three alternatives, and then get into some of the information that was presented on the matrix. We have been able to take a conceptual look at the staging for the Modified At-Grade Alternative over the past couple of months with some of the changes that have been made to it. Currently, we are at 13 construction stages. This is something that we have been talking about as a team and trying to figure out the best way to number the stages. In addition, we are trying to determine what are stages or substages. For each alternative, we just want to note that we are currently looking at how we are going to number them. We are just not completely there yet as far as the number of stages.

When we say fewer alignment shifts in parentheses here in the matrix, we are saying these are generally more favorable as drivers do not need to re-familiarize themselves with temporary conditions such as lane shifts, closures etc. We just want to be clear as we go through this presentation, we understand that the matrix is generating questions. Feel free to have comments on anything you see on that as MassDOT stated earlier tonight. It is not intended to say that if you have more stages then you automatically have more alignment shifts. Sometimes you have stages

where you have I-90 or Soldiers' Field Road on consistent alignments for a few stages at a time. That is something that will be modified as we as we move forward. For the Modified At-Grade as well as the Soldiers' Field Road Hybrid due to the need to relocate all the elements there are more challenging alignments at times for these options. Where the I-90 profile must be lowered partially into a boat section, that will require some utility impacts just for a short distance, where we come out from under the Commonwealth Avenue bridge so that the Grand Junction could pass over top of I-90. That 60-inch storm drain that runs north-south and perpendicular to the throat will require relocation.

At this time, we continue to look at reducing the utility impacts in any way for any alternative that we can find. To get around impacts on the utilities we will continue to do that evaluation as we continue to work on and refine these alternatives. The Massachusetts Water Resource Authority (MWRA) sewer line runs longitudinally to the entire throat area as a 58x63" pipe that will have a partial impact again for that lowering of I-90 to get below the Commonwealth Avenue bridge to get low enough for the Grand Junction rail to pass over the new I-90 in the Modified At-Grade Alternative. The waterline for the MWRA is not impacted as part of the Modified At-Grade as it is with the Soldiers Field Road hybrid. The pump station that currently exists below the viaduct would require relocation. In addition, some of the private telecommunication as well as be utilities would be impacted as a result of using some of the Boston University property, currently the 7 feet that has been offered to the project, to get more width out of the cross section.

On to the Modified Highway Viaduct. Currently, we have been stating since the Draft Environmental Impact Report through the scoping summary that it needs 5 stages. Again, we have substages. We also want to reiterate that we will continue to look at the number of stages. The fewer alignment shifts are more favorable. There will be a temporary widening of that structure is going to be required to maintain traffic for throughout the duration so that viaduct can be reconstructed, but because of the nature of all the elements remaining generally where they are vertically and horizontally, there are no major impact no impacts to the major utilities. It retains that pump station, because again the profile of it remains the same.

With the Modified At-Grade, we have a challenge of geometric alignments. One of the big ones is keeping I-90 open on a temporary alignment, and moving it several times, while we demolish its original alignment. Other challenges include the construction of the extensive length of the below grade section on I-90 for this alternative to accommodate the Grand Junction viaduct that needs to pass over the I-90 eastbound barrel. The 60-inch water main is impacted. The 58x63" major MWRA sewer line, the 60-inch Boston Water and Sewer drain line is impacted as well. The power station needs relocation as well as an additional pump station to collect I 90 stormwaters, again the Boston University utilities and private telecommunications are impacted as well as some additional public telecommunications that are out there.

The Soldiers' Field Road hybrid has the most extensive impact on utilities and realignments during construction. I am going to briefly talk about impacts to the Charles River. Again, these are presented on the matrix. We are not going to go through every single word but let us start with the river users' navigation, encroachment, and resource area impacts. With the all At-Grade, the construction of the Paul Dudley White Path on a boardwalk will require some use of a barge for part of it to occupy some of the water sheet. There are no impacts for the for the Highway Viaduct in the river to reconstruct the part of the Paul Dudley White Path currently. That is what the staging is presenting as well as the Soldiers Field Road Hybrid, which will have a temporary trestle, which will have more extensive impacts to the river to accommodate Soldiers Field Road as well as the Paul Dudley White Path for an extensive period of time. This configuration can stay up to eight years on the trestle.

For navigation encroachment, there is a temporary encroachment of plus or minus 40 feet with the current layout for the Modified At-Grade alternative with a barge and construction work zone temporarily and for a period of time to construct the boardwalk, but the impacts would not be in the extensive range that the Soldiers Field Road hybrid alternative would be. The navigation impact there would be on the order of 110 feet out from the bank for the temporary trestle that alternative needs. For the Modified Highway Viaduct, there is limited contractor equipment impact for the Highway Viaduct alternative due to the outfall reconstruction. The resource area impacts are temporary in nature. Temporary and permanent impacts are expected to have a similar footprint for the Modified At-Grade because the boardwalk will get constructed in its final location. Then the users would be placed on that boardwalk at an early stage of construction and remain there throughout construction. There are limited impacts to the Charles for the associated outfalls in regard to the resource area impacts for the modified highway viaduct.

The Soldiers' Field Road Hybrid requires dredging in the Charles for the trestle. There would be impacts to the federal waters of the US chapter 91 waterway for the temporary Soldiers' Field Road trestle and impacts to state land underwater, inland bank, and bordering land subject to flooding for temporary 90 trestle. The ecological impacts: construction on the living shoreline requires placement of solid filling along the banks along the floodwaters at the Charles. This will result in the disturbing of river sediment. There will also be pile driving, which would be common to any work that requires the piles for the boardwalk, the Paul Dudley White path boardwalk or the trestle. Pile driving would disturb the river sediment, produce silt and be subject to fish time restrictions for construction. Currently, there are no temporary impacts to fisheries or disturbance of sediment or production of silt for the viaduct due to the remaining on land for the majority construction. The temporary impact to the fisheries during construction for the Soldiers Field Road hybrid for installation may disturb river sediment produce silt like the Modified At-Grade Alternative for the boardwalk or at a much greater extent. There may be an increase to the noise, again increased pile driving for the path construction for the hybrid for the trestle and then temporary construction noise would be minimal for the Highway Viaduct.

Here we are with the construction durations and impacts to the commuters. So when we look again at the previous slides where we talked about the number of stages, we just want to reiterate that even though there was a varying number of stages for the Modified At-Grade as well as the Modified Highway Viaduct, we have a similar duration of construction. Something to keep in mind, the Soldiers' Field Hybrid which we have been presenting for several months now it would require an 8 to 10-year range for construction. This duration is due to the impacts of the utilities as well as the trestle.

For I 90 for the Modified At-Grade for impacts to commuters there is a potential for greater opportunity to maintain four lanes for certain stages, due to the nature of demolition and some of the staging. We will also have a wider cross section to place it in its final location. That final condition is a four-lane cross section. Once that is complete four lanes would be available. A minimum three lanes would be maintained though for the Modified At-Grade as well as the other two throat alternatives, except for short durations when I-90 would need to be lowered in profile again as you come out from under the Commonwealth bridge to get below the Grand Junction viaduct overpass.

Due to the cross sectional width of the bays below the Commonwealth Avenue bridge, maintaining the 3 lane minimum would be difficult but for short periods to lower the grades, it may decrease and that would be similar for the Soldiers Field Road hybrid. For the Modified Highway Viaduct there is a limited opportunity currently to maintain the four lanes on I 90 during construction for certain stages. Again, a minimum of three lanes would be maintained in each direction throughout

construction. That could be maintained because we are not changing the profile out from under Commonwealth Avenue as previously stated.

For the Soldiers Field Road hybrid, again there is a limited opportunity to maintain the four lanes for I-90 during construction during certain stages. You would mostly have the minimum of three lanes in each direction, with short durations of further reduction to allow for that lowering of the profile to get below the future Grand Junction bridge over I-90. For Soldiers' Field road it is consistent; two lanes in each direction are maintained throughout the majority construction for all three, except for brief durations to switch over to the trestle. Obviously the Modified At-Grade does not have that problem. There will be two lanes maintained in each direction throughout construction for the Modified At-Grade in the Highway Viaduct.

For the Paul Dudley White Path, it is maintained on existing and temporary alignments for the Modified At-Grade Alternative. Again, the boardwalk would be constructed early and then the Path users would be shifted to the boardwalk for the duration of construction. The Paul Dudley White Path is maintained throughout construction on the existing and temporary alignments for the Modified Highway Viaduct. For the Soldiers Field Road Hybrid it will be maintained for most of the construction on the trestle. There will be intermittent closures to make the switch onto the trestle.

For the Worcester Mainline, we, along with MassDOT and the MBTA, are looking at shielding during construction to allow for 2 commuter rail tracks to be active longer than we previously presented. It is still a work in progress and staging will be a work in progress for some time even into procurement since this will be a design/build job but we are looking at different opportunities because of the strong desire from the public and users of the commuter rail to maintain 2 tracks at all times. We are looking at shielding, shifting of the tracks, and reductions to single track for certain periods, but we are not at the place where two commuter rail tracks are a guarantee, but we are looking to increase that the periods where two will be available. This will be a similar amount of single and double and double track for the commuter line for all three throat variations at this time.

The Grand Junction rail is going to be closed early for the Modified At-Grade Alternative as well as the Soldiers' Field Road Hybrid. The closure will allow for the demolition of the viaduct, construction of the Grand Junction rail viaduct over I-90 as well as over the Grand Junction over Soldiers' Field Road. All that work would take the Grand Junction rail out early, requiring a 100-mile detour for commuter rail equipment to get to the Boston Engine Terminal for heavy maintenance and construction necessitating construction of a Southside maintenance facility for the Soldiers' Field Road and the Modified At-Grade alternatives. Since the Grand Junction rail alignment remains largely as it does today, it can be maintained throughout the majority construction for the Modified Highway Viaduct with short, intermittent closures for track work and for some minor shifting of the alignment.

As far as safety, here is some of the information for the highway from the matrix. For the Modified At-Grade Alternative: there are 11-foot travel lanes for I-90. That is less width then the standard 12-foot lanes typically used to accommodate larger vehicles, but the 11-foot lanes for the Modified At-Grade and the Soldiers Field Road Hybrid are what is presented on MassDOT's cross sections for these alternatives and what will be moving forward into the DEIS. There are four foot outside and two foot inside shoulders on I-90. The Modified Highway Viaduct has standard 12-foot travel lanes, 4-foot shoulders inside and outside, which allows a little bit more room for the larger vehicles and minor shifting of traffic if necessary, which is helpful for maintenance. The 11-foot travel lane for I-90 for the Soldiers' Field Road Hybrid, again is like the Modified At-Grade Alternative cross section. The Modified At-Grade Alternative improves geometry of I-90 by providing a flatter and straighter highway as does the Soldiers' Field Road Hybrid. The Modified Highway Viaduct maintains similar curves and grades to what are present today on I-90.

The 11-foot travel lanes on Soldiers' Field Road have been widened from the 10-foot lanes previously presented for the Modified At-Grade. In addition, the Soldiers' Field Road alignment is in a similar location to what exists today for the Modified At-Grade and the Modified Highway Viaduct. While the Soldiers Field Road Hybrid changes the Soldiers' Field Road alignment as to introduce reverse curves as well as vertical and horizontal curves to be able to place the parkway on a viaduct that is placed above the eastbound lanes of I-90.

This is a brief slide on operations and maintenance for the highway. For the Modified At-Grade, the stormwater collection system and inlet design for I-90 will be more complicated and require more frequent inlets due to the narrower inside shoulder. There would also need to be manholes in the travel lanes because the narrower shoulders would accommodate the inlets, but not enough space for the catch basin. These manholes would need to be drained prior to any maintenance with attendant impacts on I-90 traffic. The Modified Highway Viaduct replaces the existing viaduct with a new viaduct that will require maintenance. For the Soldiers' Field Road Hybrid, there will be more complicated stormwater inlets and the design for I-90 will require drainage manholes in the travel way. There will be frequent maintenance on the relocated utilities for the Modified At-Grade as well as the Soldiers' Field Road Hybrid. The Modified Highway Viaduct would be a traditional bridge with scuppers and storm water inlets for I-90.

Mobility and access for bike and pedestrians: for the Modified At-Grade, the Paul Dudley White Path has been widened to 20 feet on the boardwalk. Outside the limits of the boardwalk, would be increased to 26 feet where possible for separated bicycle and pedestrian facilities. With the Modified Highway Viaduct, around 60% of the Paul Dudley White Path has the 26 feet with separation. As you approach the eastern section of the throat that narrows to a shared use path. We are looking to improve that, but even the shared use section is wider than what is present today. The Soldiers' Field Road Hybrid provides the greatest ability to separate bike and pedestrian facilities for the longest distance and entire throat length.

Based on the analysis in the Scoping Summary Report, an Agganis Way connection is possible for a future connection over I-90, but there are some challenges associated with that ramping to get up and over I-90 from the Agganis Way area because of the driveway to Nickerson Field that exists today. So, we are looking closer at opportunities for that north-south crossing in the future for all three alternatives. The Agganis way connection is possible for the Modified Viaduct, it places the users below the viaduct and above the rail. For the Soldiers' Field Road Hybrid and At-Grade, cyclists and pedestrians go over the rail and roadways. One of the particular challenges associated with the Soldiers' Field Road Hybrid is that while the Agganis Way connection is possible, it has to be much higher to get over the viaduct carrying the parkway. That means ramps and switch-backs coming up for Agganis Way, a higher crossing overall, and possible impacts to the driveway at Nickerson Field. We continue to look at alternatives on that.

This is brief slide on cost. This cost includes the complete interchange project with each throat area option. So, these are Interchange 3L Modified At-Grade, the Modified Highway Viaduct, and the Soldiers' Field Road hybrid with West Station, the layover yard, the realigned I-90 and ramp system. In addition, the street grids for each alternative. These costs are all encompassing. The cost of the Modified At-Grade and Soldiers Field Road do not include the cost of a Southside Maintenance Facility. The costs are $1.3 billion for the Modified At-Grade and Modified Highway Viaduct. $1.6 billion for The Soldiers Field Road hybrid. Life cycle costs are not currently available but are being prepared and will be available for the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. The cost of mitigation is not included in this analysis and is expected to be variable between the throat options. Selection of a preferred alternative is necessary to inform the financial plan for the I-90 project.

Discussion

C: Ed Ionata: Okay, thanks to everyone. This is Ed Ionata. Thanks for participating tonight. As you can see from this slide, public feedback is being received through October 30th, any time before the that date. Members of the public are encouraged to send feedback to I90 Allston@statemass.us. MassDOT will share this feedback with Federal Highway Administration and the cooperating agencies. Nate, we are ready to go to comments from the chat so you may take it from here please.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Yes. Before we do that, I want to offer the opportunity for any of the elected officials who are in the audience as we typically do, to speak first, if they wish. At this time, if you won an election to be sitting in this room, please go ahead and raise your hand. If not, we can go to audience questions and we can come back to you folks later. I do not want to put you on the spot.

We were joined during the presentation by Andrew Bettenelli of Senator Brownsberger's staff, so we appreciate that as well. All right, so I am going to go to Ari first because he had his hand up way back at the beginning. Then Jean, I am sure we have quite a few text questions. After I call on Ari Why don't we read off a couple of text questions and see if we cannot get through a few of those? Then we will go back to hands for a little while. I am going to switch Ari on for a moment. Jim, Ari's these questions probably coming at you it is about the width of the lanes on Soldiers Field Road.

Q: Ari Offsevit: I have a couple questions. The first one is that this project is showing 11-foot lanes on Soldiers' Field Road. I am going to read from the Department of Conservation and Recreation and put this in the notes in the chat here, so everyone knows where it is. It is the link to the Department of Conservation and Recreation standards for road width. I am going to read some pieces of it just so we all know we are all on the same page here. I am going to read "do not widen or add turning lanes." Here we are widening the lane. "Avoid widening lanes that encourage driving above the design speed with no gain and safety. In areas where travel lanes are wider than necessary, narrow them to as little as 10 feet to slow traffic and increase safety. Reclaim green space and restore the landscape." Then it goes into typical roadway width: "for pleasure vehicle only roads", which is like Soldiers Field Road, "or connecting Parkway or an internal Park Road, we are looking at 9 to 10-foot lane width. What I want to know and maybe there is someone here from the Department of Conservation and Recreation, who can help with it, why do we have 11-foot lanes? That is the first part of my question.

The second piece is that right now the Modified Viaduct Option is showing that 40% of the Paul Dudley White Path would not be widened. My question there is how does it meet the purpose in need of a project if the Purpose and Need is to improve it? If we only had to widen 60% of the highway lanes and we could go with two lanes on the mass pike instead of eight, it would be a lot easier to fit everything, but obviously we cannot do that. I do not think that would meet the purpose the need and I do not think widening only 60% of the Paul Dudley White Path meets it as well. So those are my questions, I really be interested to know why we are not following Department of Conservation and Recreation guidelines? And if there is someone here from Department of Conservation and Recreation, who can help or someone from the state, that would be great.

C: Owen Kane: Well, perhaps I should jump in before you, Jim. Ari thank you. I do not know if you were here in the beginning, I am Owen Kane, I am the Deputy General Counsel for MassDOT. The purpose of the public engagement period and this type Task Force meeting is to get advice from you and to hear your thoughts. The team just went through a quite extensive presentation and if you need some clarification of something within that, that is fine, but I think the presentation speaks for itself.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: I see that Representative Hannah Kane has her hand up. So, we are going to go back to elected officials for a moment. I will just remind folks, if you do raise your hand, after you speak, just pull it back down again so that we do not have a lot of hands left up in the air such that I cannot figure out what is going on. So representative Kane, your microphone is live.

C: Representative Hannah Kane: Thank you, Nate. Good evening, everyone and thank you for the presentation. I want to go back to the slide that talks about the impacts to commuters and specifically on the Grand Junction rail. I would suggest that in terms of the analysis that is here, we would be more specific about what the actual impacts to commuters are. The impact is not simply that the Grand Junction rail will have to be closed or will remain open. If it is closed, that means that there is a high degree of likelihood that there's going to be delays on the line on the Worcester-Framingham line as a result of the length of time it will take to get additional locomotives into that line if needed. I would personally like to see some additional level of analysis here. You know what happened when it needed to be closed for six months, a couple years ago, what the impacts were, I think you should be more specific here on what will happen if this needs to be closed for a lengthy period of time.

A: Owne Kane: Thank you, representative. Yes, we will certainly look at that. I think that makes sense.

Q: Representative Carolyn Dykema: This is Representative Dykema. I want to thank you for a great presentation, I have not been participating in these meetings and I want to thank my colleague, Representative Kane, who I know has been regularly attending. I represent four communities in MetroWest, who regularly commute on the Mass Pike and the commuter rail. I guess I just want to echo Representative Kane's concerns about the Grand Junction. We know that we have been following and working hard as a delegation to improve Commuter Rail service, which everyone knows has been spotty, to say the least in recent memory. When Grand Junction was closed for an extended period, not that long ago, the impacts on the commuter rail were immediate and significant. I would say looking at this matrix, there are two options here: I would welcome more detail in terms of the length of the closure, and the impact on the maintenance facility. I assume the maintenance facility would mitigate some of the concerns of the closure. Would it mitigate all the concerns? I would have a really hard time moving forward with any of these options that included the closure of Grand Junction, for any period of time.

The second comment I would make has to do with the depressed options for the Massachusetts Pike, which I know puts that, I guess, at least at grade if not below grade with the Charles River. If I am understanding that correctly. In terms of climate impacts, what does that mean for flooding? If we had flooding on the pike, that obviously is a big commuter disruption for us. Could you be clearer in terms of what the flood mitigation would be in those areas? And what is the likelihood of overlaying some of the likely storm projections? For example, how often is that area going to be seeing some significant water related climate impacts?

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Mark Fobert, perhaps you could give a little assistance with that? Owen if you want to say anything, that is fine, but Mark specializes in that in that area of the project.

A: Mark Fobert: Yes, the DEIR did include that flooding analysis with the overlays. The analysis was based on the Boston Harbor Flood Model. That Modified At-Grade modeling is different than the version today. The analysis in 2017 concluded that approximately 2,000 feet of I-90 is susceptible to flooding. We still must look at any mitigation that could be done. Mitigation being separating the Charles River floodwaters from the infrastructure, whether that be with a berm if there is space for that or a retaining wall or something like that. We plan to have that be part of the NPC and part of

the future filings is looking if the if the flood impact can be mitigated in the future. We can get you the DEIR if you want that section on it.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: I do not see that we have any more elected officials or their staff people with a hand up. Just a reminder for folks if there are some of you that have your hand up, we have not forgotten you, I am not asking for you to put your hand down, but if you could make sure to put your hand down after asking your question that would be great.

Q: Jean Charles: This first question comes from Christine Virallie. The question is, "how does the Charles River Watershed Association feel about the boardwalk going into the river? My first inclination is that I would like to see lanes removed from I-90 to make all grade and stay out of the river. It's 2020, we don't need 12 lanes of highway."

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: I do not think we would want to speak in favor of the Watershed Association. I know they are here tonight and I think Laura has her hand up so we can come to that later, but Owen since you are here, someone on behalf of the secretary, can you speak to something a lane count.

A: Owen Kane: Well, I think tonight's presentation and everything we have produced is self-explanatory. What we are looking for now is to hear from interested parties their thoughts. I think that everyone knows already what our position is. We have submitted materials to Federal Highway Federal Highway as in terms of giving them to the cooperating agencies and you know, I think until October 30 we would love to hear from everybody.

Q: Jean Charles: The next question is from Pallavi "how is the fill in the Charles River being justified in terms of lost flood storage capacity, especially when the 100-year flood level is so close to the grade?"

A: Mark Fobert: Flood storage would have to be found to mitigate for the fill within the floodway. You would have to do it in the same reach of the river at the same elevations and so, we must identify some space which has not been identified to create that flood storage.

Q: Jean Charles: The next question is from James, "it says 2 times 2 equals 24, but I thought I heard 11 feet wide lane." James, do you mind typing out that question again? Our next question is from Tad. It looks like they left the meeting. Their question is, "can you tell us when exactly the NPC will be released? And how long the public comment period will be?"

A: Mark Fobert: This fall or early winter, we are looking in that timeframe, there will be a minimum of a 30-day comment period. In the past, those have been extended to 45 days.

Q: Jean Charles: The next question is from Tad, "when will this presentation be available to the public to download?"

A: Nate Cabral-Curtis: There is another presentation to the public next week as well. So that may trip us up, but we will work to get this up quickly.[2]

C: Jean Charles: The next question is from Pallavi. I think it was regarding from her original question regarding flood storage.

Q: Nate Cabral-Curtis: The question is the project team just looking at the alternatives and run them through the evaluation criteria? Or are we looking to have people comment on the evaluation criteria?

[2] The Title VI compliant presentation was transmitted to MassDOT web administration for posting on October 19th.

A: Kane Owen: I think I can take that. We are in the midst of a process NEPA and One Federal decision. I would like to say we are in the middle of it, but we have gathered a lot of information. The team has done an analysis, it's been submitted to the Federal Highway, we are trying to get to a thing called Concurrence Point Three that I am sure many, if not all of you are familiar with. What we are doing is we have gathered the information, we have sent it to the Federal Highway, and we will send it to the cooperating agencies who are essentially the permitting agencies.

Then we hope to be able to continue to move forward. We are accepting comments until October 30. Tell us whatever you feel we need to know.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: All right, I am going to go to some of these hands here just because they have been up Jean, and then we will come back to the text. Let us go with Jeff Parenti from the Department of Conservation and Recreation. Jeff you are self-muted. While we wait for Jeff to figure out what is up with his microphone, I am going to come up to Task Force member Harry Mattison. Harry is talking by phone tonight, so the audio PIN is getting to him. While that is going, we will come up to Fred. Fred, your microphone is live.

Q: Fred Yalouris: I have a question about the 250 piles planned for the pile supported walkway. As someone who has been on the river, pretty much for the last 53 years, I can assure you that those piles will not only create havoc with the underside of the bottom of the river, but will present a significant danger to boating, especially crews and when I look at the cross section, it seems to me that you could put the drill on the slope with a far less total incursion into the river. So why is there not a graduated slope option that includes the Paul Dudley White Path? Very much like we have right now on the Memorial Drive side, between the Boston University boathouse and the MIT boathouse.

A: Nate Cabral-Curtis: That is a good comment, Fred, I think you should write that. As to the current Modified At-Grade, I believe that alternative is the one that folks negotiated said they would prefer to see forwarded along with the next set of environmental documents. Owen, do you want to speak to that at all?

A: Owen Kane: I think that is a good point. Again, submit that question to us.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Alright, so I am going to kick it back over to Jeff Parenti for a moment. Jeff, are you continuing to have difficulty with your microphone? You are currently self-muted. All right. Well, we will get back to you when we can, Jeff. I will keep trying. David, if you are there with us, you are good to go.

Q: David Loutzenheiser: Thank you, Nate. Two comments and question. One, you mentioned at the beginning of the presentation that 150,000 vehicles per day travel on the pike. And through this project, there has always been discussion about how many vehicles are traveling on the pike, but last I checked; it was people that are on the pike. People that are going to work. People that are going to offices, not cars. My question is that MassDOT look more at how we improve the capacity to move people through the corridor. That includes making those highway lanes more efficient, and therefore actually and potentially reducing the number of highway lanes. Whether those lanes be shifted into bus lanes or others.

Additionally, there were questions before about the impacts to the commuter rail. That is one question. The second sort of question or comment, it is more of a comment, is that I look at the width of the cross sections of the various alternatives. The viaduct is roughly 150 feet wide of roadway; 180 feet for the Soldiers Field Road hybrid and 220 plus feet for the Modified At-Grade alternative. I am really concerned as to why we are advocating for 220 feet of infrastructure space wide separating the river, making the river basically unusable except for transport between the river and the city? I think that is unprecedented. Thank you.

A: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Thank you, David. Good comments. I think the only point I would say is to write both of those things in. Alright, coming up here, let us try back to Harry one more time.

Q: Harry Mattison: There is a lot of good conclusions in the spreadsheet that you sent us. My question is if you can provide us with the documents behind those conclusions. I will ask you in a few areas. Given the comment period ends in two weeks, if you could within the next week, send us information about staging? Do you have a drawing showing the different stages for each of the four options?

A: Mike O'Dowd: I will defer that to Owen, Harry.

A: Kane Owen: Harry, as far as any of the background or documentation, we will certainly talk to Federal Highway ,but, we have, as I said before, provided information to them, they will provide them to the cooperating agencies. What specific information is or should be public at any point? I do not know we will have to talk to the different agencies about that. I cannot tell you that we will provide any background to the information that you just asked for.

Q: Harry Mattison: Who specifically do we need to talk to? Whose decision is it?

A: Owen Kane: If you have a concern, or a specific point, please make sure you send it to us that is it.

C: Harry Mattison: Owen, I do not know if I have a specific concern or question about construction staging, until I can see the drawings that describe the construction stages. Is there something that MassDOT is authorized to share those drawings with the Task Force?

C: Owen Kane: As I said the presentation that you were given tonight speaks for itself.

Q: Harry Mattison: No, there were no construction staging drawings showing the multiple stages during the presentation that you gave us tonight. Is there someone at MassDOT who is authorized to share those drawings with the Task Force?

A: Owen Kane: As I as I said, Harry, if you have specific concerns or specific comments, you can send them into me.

C: Harry Mattison: I am voicing a specific concern, which is we do not understand the staging that is being proposed, because we have never seen drawings of it. So, I am asking you a specific question, which is, is there anyone at MassDOT who is authorized to share those drawings with us? It is a yes or no question.

C: Owen Kane: It is not a yes or no question.

Q: Harry Mattison: Is anyone at MassDOT authorized to share this construction staging drawings with the Task Force?

C: Owen Kane: Harry, I am not sure how many times you want me to answer the question. If you have specific questions about something specific, just let me know what it is. And I am happy to investigate it for you, but right now, I do not have the document you are asking about.

Q: Harry Mattison: Michael O'Dowd, you have the documents I am asking about?

Q: Owen Kane: I am answering the question, right?

A: Harry Mattison: Well, you are not. I am asking the question to Mike. You said you do not have the document, Owen, and so I would like to know if Mike has the documents.

C: Owen Kane: I think Harry we are going to agree to disagree on this.

C: Harry Mattison: I have not stated an opinion. There is nothing to just agree with. All I have been doing is asking, can you share the drawings describing the construction stages that are mentioned in the spreadsheet that you sent? I think in one case, it says there is 11 stages. What this says is 5

stages. I know many members of the Task Force and the public would like to see the drawings to show what those specific stages are.

Q: Owen Kane: Okay, if there is someone on the team who wants to clarify the construction staging slide.

C: Harry Mattison: We want the drawings of each stage.

C: Owen Kane: As I said, Harry, if there is someone on the team that can clarify. The point of this is to, for us to get advice from you. We have provided you with something, tell us what you are thinking. That is what we want.

C: Harry Mattison: Okay. I think it is incomplete. I think that for us to be able to have a fair opportunity to provide you with feedback, you should provide the information that I am asking for.

Thank you.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Alright, so I am going to go back down to check with Jeff Parenti one more time then we can go back to Jean to read some more text. I do not know what is happening to Jeff's microphone, but go ahead, read some more text questions.

Q: Jean Charles: The next question is: "Can you elaborate on how the culvert replacement and other underground infrastructure replacement in the historic 4F and 106 areas are going to inform the mitigation in the three alternatives?"

A: Stacey Donahoe: Okay. This is outside the throat area, but as we talked about at the section 106 Consulting parties meeting the culvert, we still need to go through the identification of historic resources within the project area. I think it is very unlikely that the culvert would be considered a National Register eligible property. It is a concrete structure constructed in the early 20th century through the mid to late 20th century. In that sense, it is not eligible. If it is determined to not be eligible for listing in the National Register, then it would not require any kind of mitigation to replace it.

Q: Jean Charles: The next question is "What about noise impacts to the South, i.e. BU and Brookline?

A: Jason Ross: Yes. I addressed that in the in the presentation. Among the three throat area alternatives, the noise conditions are relatively similar. There is a lot of contribution of noise from the trains, which is very similar among all three alternatives.

C: Jean Charles: The next one from Anne Lusk. NEPA/DEIS were started in 1969. We now have climate change, increased pollution, heat island effect, in addition to the waterway and wetland vegetation analysis, can you also explore the benefits of mature trees through a root system, specific tree species, absorption of pollutants and the shade provided by other vegetation. This analysis could lead to explorations for an expanded NEPA/EIS to better address climate change pollution in the heat.

A: Nate Cabral-Curtis: That is a good comment. Anne, I think that is probably something that would be go into further in the next environmental document.

Q: Jean Charles: The next question is from David. "At some point, can you clarify which options proposed a sound barrier between the Paul Dudley White Path and in the highway, it appears that is the case for the Soldiers Field Road Alternative. Is it the same for the viaduct as well?

A: Jason Ross: We do not have that determined yet. I will say for reference, the DEIR, which did evaluate different alternatives, however, we determined that a noise barrier would not be feasible and reasonable, not meet the MassDOT criteria for acoustical effectiveness and cost effectiveness for

those alternatives, but we have not yet determined that for these alternatives that we are moving forward here.

Q: **Jean Charles:** Our next question is from Tad "are there safety standards that govern the design of alignment shifts? If so, can you explain why the well designed, engineered, and signed alignment shift would pose added safety risks?

A: **Jim Keller:** Based on the location of the interstate today, and the amount that it must vertically and horizontally shift in a temporary fashion, does not mean it cannot be done. There are reverse curves on the viaduct today that have been in place for 50-60 years. The vehicles and users have become familiar with them. So, in place of realigning the interstate several times throughout construction, the more times you realign it, for the Highway Viaduct, there are minimal realignments because the profile and the location of the viaduct is relatively the same as it is today, but when you take that viaduct down, go a bit below grade for the modified at-grade and then substantially below grade after the Soldiers' Field Hybrid, and relocating I-90 to prepare for the demolition of the viaduct as well as the construction of the new I-90 alignment, that forces you to place the traffic way off to the north at times, because of that shift, we are just getting into introducing horizontal reverse curves as well as vertical. It is just this is just a statement saying that speeds will be dropped for a construction period. The speeds will have to be controlled under all alternatives, not just the At-Grade and Hybrid, but the Modified Viaduct as well. We just want to maintain safety, but that does not mean it cannot be done. It is just going to require more temporary alignment shifts.

Q: **Jean Charles:** Next question is from Pallavi: "Ed, can you please tell us when you will share the flood projection modeling results from Woods Hole Group. Without that analysis, it is hard to understand how you evaluate the resilience of the three alternatives."

A: **Mark Fobert:** That should be included in the NPC. We used the Woods Hole models in the DEIR. It has not been updated since then I be, but we will overlay it again on each of the alternatives to determine resiliency.

C: **Nate Cabral-Curtis:** Go ahead and read the next question Jean, but I would say that given when this was asked, we probably spent a fair bit of time on vehicles at that point. We did talk about impacts to commuter rail, in some detail, both the Grand Junction line and Worcester Mainline. But go ahead and read the question Jean just in case there is anything else that folks want to say to it.

C: **Jean Charles:** "This presentation is almost solely focused on the road. Where is the analysis of how this around? What will commute times look like? Will there be more riders, more money and resources put into the commuter rail to make it a fully functioning regional rail system? Cars are not the future, and we should be encouraging people to use the Commuter Rail into the city instead of driving.

A: **Nate Cabral-Curtis:** I think we spent a fair bit of time on the commuter rail piece, but if there is anything more folks want to have discussed about commuter rail, I think, put it in your comments. Does that seem appropriate, Owen?

A: **Owen Kane:** Yes, absolutely.

Q: **Jean Charles:** This question is from James: "could we hear a more careful explanation of the numbers on noise, especially as it will supposedly, effect Cambridge? What is the difference? experientially between 62 and 63 decibels. Please elaborate on the anticipated noise matrix differential.

A: **Jason Ross:** Okay, thank you. This is Jason again. The difference between 62 and 63 decibels is that it would be largely indiscernible to human hearing. A three decibel change is something that is

at the very cusp of somebody being able to hear a difference in the noise. So that is what the difference between 62 and 63 is. The overall results in Cambridgeport where that noise levels were within about two to three decibels of each other, they were slightly lower for Soldiers Field Road Hybrid and the Modified At-Grade options. This was the case primarily due to I-90 not being elevated.

C: Owen Kane: Nate, could you pull up the slide? I think it is helpful to see that, as Jason explains it.

C: Jason Ross: At Cambridgeport, the noise levels are 54 decibels back in the neighborhood. That is inside Cambridgeport beyond Memorial Drive. The noise levels of 63 decibels are for the school right on Memorial Drive. That is the range of sound levels and you can see that they are not dramatically different among the alternatives. The Soldier Field Hybrid did get down as low 50 decibels where we did have a reduction of two to three decibels at some of these receptors, perhaps up to four decibels. This is very low-level differences in sound level. There are a lot of other sources there with Memorial Drive and other roadways.

Q: Jean Charles: Bill's question is: "please clarify the noise levels shown in the matrix. And if these are ranges or changes from before to after, or vice versa."

A: Jason Ross: These are the ranges in these areas of sound levels. Along the Paul Dudley White Path, ranges of sound levels from the low 60s to the to the mid 70 decibels, for example.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Alright, so the folks who have their hands up are folks who have already spoken. So, we will start with Ari and then we will go to Pallavi.

C: Ari Ofsevit: All I have to say is that I asked a question earlier, it was not answered beyond look at the presentation that was not really an answer. I guess that is what we are going to get here. It's great to have this kind of public meeting.

Q: Pallavi Mande: Hi, thanks for taking me off mute. So I just want to clarify, it seems to be that a lot of the analysis that has informed these conclusions has either been done, but not available to be shared, or will be included in the NPC or whatever the filings that will go after this. I specifically asked about the modeling study. Yes, I understand Mark that it was included the DEIR, but a lot has changed since, so I am not quite sure how you expect us to go back to the DEIR, somehow visualize for ourselves how the information is going to be overlaid on these three alternatives and then try and analyze the conclusions that you have already be drawn. I think it is a little unfair for you to expect people to do that kind of work and not have that be a part of the presentation.

I should follow up that comment with a question. A lot of the conclusions that this matrix is related to the rest of the project, not just the Throat Area. Especially when you see the connection between the riverbank restoration and the rest of the infrastructure that's going to be designed and engineered So, part of it is you are talking specifically about the throat area but not leading us to understand how it is going to be connected to other infrastructure moves that will have to be made to have that kind of resiliency conversation that we all need to have. A conversation that will help us visualize what kind of assumptions were made to inform the solutions that you are sharing with us now.

A: Owen Kane: I think you are right. We are looking at the full project. The throat is obviously a very important part of, but we are looking at the whole thing.

A: Mark Fobert: There is more detail in the matrix. There is quite an effort to run that model, and to get the input, but we do plan on doing it. We will be probably have it ready in the NPC timeline.

Q: Jean Charles: Next question: “why is the switchback required for the Modified At-Grade option? It appears there is no need to raise the profile so much.”

A: Jim Keller: The intent is not to switch back but because of the proximity of Agganis Way, Buick Street, the improvements to the sidewalk along Nickerson Field, the right of way line, the need for the Commuter Rail and Grand Junction rail-alignments needs to be shifted further south, and then the driveway to Nickerson Field with tennis courts in the back, the available land area, drives the placement of the ramp to get up to the crossing over the rail and I-90. That configuration is not sufficient to get a 5% or 4.5% grade, it requires one switch back at this time. If there was is more land area available, you would not need that.

There could be other options that would impact Boston University land. Maybe there would be an option, but we would have to discuss that with the university before that would be considered.

Q: Jacob DeBlecourt: My name is Jacob DeBlecourt and I am the Director of Public Policy for Boston city council Julia Mejia. I am also an Allston resident myself. One of the things that is so fantastic about our neighborhood is the diversity of languages that are spoken here, particularly with the small business community in our neighborhood. I am curious to know what plans you all have to make this presentation, and this community engagement process more equitable for people in language? Will this be offered in different translations and will those meetings in the future be offered with different interpretations? And then just who are you being more intentional about bringing to the table. In terms of small business owners, obviously the transportation, particularly public transportation, has a big impact on our business. I am curious to know just in general, from a process standpoint, how are we making them more equitable for people who do not speak English?

A: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Yes, Jacob. I actually can answer that one for you. Obviously, if you have some specific guidance you would like to give us write it in your comment. You know your neighborhood more than anybody. One of the things that we got guidance on early on in this was from the EPA, that wanted us to look at some of the limited language pockets in the area. We have reached out to Boston's Office of Neighborhood Services and corresponding offices in Cambridge and Brookline. Based on their guidance, one of the things that we do is make the project fact sheet available in English, Spanish, Russian, simplified Chinese, Amharic, and Haitian Creole. We have a public information meeting coming up next week. Our newspaper choices to advertise that meeting are in English and Spanish for the area. However, we have the meeting notice translated into all of the languages I mentioned just now, put that meeting notice out through those same offices I mentioned earlier. That just happened today, because some of those translations are pretty specialty, especially the Amharic, but that does go out. We are working on that. The EPA wants to make sure that we are doing our job in that regard and as the person here for Public Involvement I am concerned about it as well. But again, if you have specific guidance you want to leave us with go right ahead and write that comment. I am always happy do more. We have reached out out to the Allston small business community as well through Allston-Brighton CDC and Main Streets. And we will continue to do so.

Q: Jacob DeBlecourt: As a quick follow up when it comes to how you decide what languages are provided is that bottom up or top down? By which I mean are constituents asking for this or are you doing a survey of a neighborhood to determine these things? What guideline do you use?

A: Nate Cabral-Curtis: The languages that we got were based on, in the case of Allston-Brighton, consulting with the Mayor's Office of Neighborhood Services. And then for the adjoining communities working with the appropriate counterparts.

Q: Fred Salvucci: Let me reiterate the question and statements that Harry made. The matrix is not credible to most of us who have paid attention to this project without seeing any background information. Specifically, I know that the analysis done by ABC and the City on the All At-Grade

identified keeping the two tracks of the Grand Junction open during all peak periods throughout the construction period. That is different than what is stated in the matrix. There will also be three lanes moving in each direction of highway throughout the construction period. The matrix is also supposed to identify ways to reduce the closure of the single-track Grand Junction to approximately 3.5 years rather than 7 years. That is a work in progress and could be true if reduced. That is very different than what appears in the matrix, specifically, at least to speak for myself, was never satisfied that the old highway viaduct alternative was in fact, constructible. We never saw that analysis. This was back six years.

The Highway Viaduct alternative has all the difficulties of the alternative that was on the table last year. An alternative that was publicly rejected in November and now is back on the table. It is back on the table with the added constraints on keeping the Grand Junction open throughout the entire construction period. I have stated at this for a long time, I do not believe it is possible to simultaneously keep open two tracks in the Modified Highway Viaduct

I do not think you can simultaneously do justice to the two track Worcester service that is needed, do justice for the 6-lane turnpike service, and simultaneously handle the single-track Grand Junction. Which, by the way, is largely under the existing viaduct, which will be replaced with a different vertical support structure. Without the phasing diagrams to replace this it is not credible. Listening to this discussion tonight reminds me of the hearing of the Supreme Court Justice, there are no answers. This is bizarre. You have given us a matrix therefor you have an obligation to show us, where that information came from. I can ask a question, Mike, does the analysis exist that produces this matrix. If you do, why are you not making it public?

A: Nate Cabral-Curtis: I have a text message from Mike, that he is having issues connecting to audio. But Fred, he has informed me that this will continue to be evaluated. The analysis is under review. Owen, can you address Fred's questions?

C: Fred Salvucci: Even if the analysis has not been reviewed, it should be public. This is public information that has been produced with public money, it ought to be available to the public. Otherwise this is an insult.

A: Owen Kane: I have a lot of respect for Secretary Salvucci. I hope you know that. What we have presented is straightforward. As Mike said, there is further evaluation that will continue. There will be opportunity for the public to comment on this. I have heard Secretary Salvucci's words on this and other projects. He is very eloquent. I have heard his points, I do not know all of them, but we surely want to hear them and other comments from others.

C: Fred Salvucci: I know for certainty, that the impacts identified for the Modified At-Grade, are inaccurate. Specifically, ABC and the City of Boston solved the problem of keeping the two tracks available throughout the construction period. That is not what the matrix says. I am in awe, if the statement of the Modified Highway Viaduct is conceivable possible because it was not solved before you tried to get the Grand Junction open. It was only an issue that came on the table 3 months ago. It does not have 6 years of analysis behind it. I do not expect the same level of some of these other issues. But there has to be at least something available to justify the language you have put in this matrix. Otherwise, I know that the matrix is inaccurate for Modified At-Grade and I strongly suspect it is inaccurate for the Modified Highway Viaduct.

Especially when you are not showing the background analysis. I am repeating Harry's point; this is public information, and we have a right to get it. I will add that in writing.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Go ahead, Ari.

Q: Ari Ofsevit: I will echo Harry and Fred's sentiments: if this is a public meeting why are we not having our questions answered? That makes this whole meeting hardly a public meeting. Why are we even having it?

Q: Pallavi Mande: Is the public meeting you are hosting next week; will it be the same format as this one? I am assuming you will present what you will present, and then during the Q&A people will ask questions and not get their answers? If that is the format for the next public meeting, at least people should know that all they need to do is send in their comments and not bother to ask questions.

A: Nate Cabral-Curtis: I have not seen the presentation for next week, but we will make sure to clarify what how the meeting will be set up.

Q: Pallavi Mande: I want to interject that you can at least attempt to answer the questions that we asked. Maybe do it next meeting? At least people who came to this meeting can feel like that got something out of the meeting.

A: Owen Kane: I may have said it before, as to the release of the supporting documentation, we would have to talk to Federal Highway and the Cooperating Agencies to see if it is appropriate to release the documents. I cannot say, "yes, we will release them or no we will not." All I am saying is that we must talk to Federal Highway and the Cooperating Agencies first.

Q: Pallavi Mande: I do not think that is helpful to have a meeting with people reading off a slide. I recommend affirming the questions before entering a lengthy presentation. There has to be some change made before the next public meeting. Otherwise, I do not think it is a great use of people's time.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Thank you Pallavi. We are at 8:20. I will pass this on to Fred.

C: Fred Salvucci: A point of clarification on resiliency. The focus on this presentation is on changes in the harbor based on models from 2017. Allston is a bit distant from Boston harbor and there is a closer dam. But the bigger issue is the increased amount of rainfall in the river which is impacting transportation. That water goes somewhere. Where it goes now is down the highway viaduct is the low point under the Boston University Bridge. That means the grade of the highway viaduct exacerbates this waterflow issue. Meanwhile, the All At-Grade alignment, which is flatter than the highway viaduct with more frequent catch basins to get the water off the roadway without having it all flow downhill. That is the current and urgent problem drivers face today which will get worse over the next decade. That rainfall aspect needs more emphasis. When people see the year 2070, people think that is a long-time form now. The rainfall issue is happening now. That needs to be teased out more so that people can understand that better and address the rainfall as an imminent issue.

C: Nate Cabral-Curtis: Folks, the comment period goes all the way to October 30th. Owen, do you have any closing remarks?

C: Owen Kane: No. But thank you all. Please send out any comments you have.

Next Steps

There will be a public information meeting on October 20 to introduce similar materials to members of the public and explain the comment period to them. The comment period for the preferred alternative will last until October 30th.

Attendance

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Meredith	Avery	VHB
Paula	Alexander	Community Member
Jo-Ann	Barbour	Fiorentino Community Center
Joe	Beggan	I-90 Allston Task Force
Andrew	Bettinelli	City of Boston
Glen	Berkowitz	A Better City
Gregory	Boles	VHB
Eric	Bourassa	I-90 Allston Task Force
Liz	Breadon	Boston City Councilor
Nate	Cabral-Curtis	HSH
Chris	Calnan	Tetra Tech
Kevin	Cassey	Harvard University
Jean	Charles	HSH
Nick	Cohen	VHB
Farah	Cole	MassDOT
William	Conroy	I-90 Allston Task Force
Mary	Connaughton	Pioneer Institute
Jack	Corrigan	Community Member
Keith	Craig	Community Member
Deneen	Crosby	Harvard
Donny	Dailey	MassDOT
Jacob	DeBlecourt	Office of City Councilor Julia Mejia
Bill	Deignan	City of Cambridge
Rick	Dimino	ABC
Kate	Dineen	Community Member
Anthony	D'Isidoro	CSS
Stacey	Donahue	MassDOT
Thomas	Donald	VHB
Guus	Driessen	Task Force Member
Representative Carolyn	Dykema	Representative Dykema's Office
Krishan	Eskew	MassBike
Richard	Ferrante	Community Member

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Mark	Fobert	Tetra Tech
Robert	Frost	Harvard
Andrew	Giannino-Curtis	Community Member
Dennis	Giombetti	Representative Spilka's Office
Jacquelyn	Goddard	MassDOT
Mark	Handley	Office of Councilor Ciommo
Sandy	Hoover	Tetra Tech
Mike	Huber	Community Member
K	Herold	Community Member
Ed	Ionata	Tetra Tech
Laura	Jasinski	Charles River Conservation
Ritu	Kalra	Harvard University
Hannah	Kane	Representative Kane's Office
Owen	Kane	MassDOT
Correena	Keil	Community Member
Jim	Keller	Tetra Tech
Gregory	Kelly	Community Member
Representative Kay	Khan	Representative Khan's Office
Todd	Kirrane	Town of Brookline
Thomas	Lally	Community Member
Elizabeth	Leary	I-90 Allston Task Force
Jon	Lenicheck	MassDOT
Rich	Lenox	Community Member
Anna	Leslie	Community Member
Ethan	Long	Community Member
Oscar	Lopez	City of Boston
David	Loutzenheiser	I-90 Allston Task Force
Anne	Lusk	Community Member
Pallavi	Mande	I-90 Allston Task Force
Harry	Mattison	I-90 Allston Task Force
Tim	McCarthy	Community Member
Kinsale	McGrath	Community Member
David	Mohler	I-90 Allston Task Force
Galen	Mook	MassBike
Jen	Migliore	Office of Representative Moran
Scott	Mullen	Community Member

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Thomas	Nally	I-90 Allston Task Force
Conor	Newman	City of Boston
Mike	O'Dowd	MassDOT
Ari	Ofsevit	Task Force Member
Etty	Padmodipoetro	Bridge Scape LLC
Jeffrey	Parenti	DCR
Barbara	Parmenter	Community Member
Linda	Pehlke	Community Member
Travis	Pollack	MAPC
Dorothy	Raposa	Community Member
John (Tad)	Read	Task Force Member
George	Richards	Community Member
Clint	Richmond	Sierra Club
Jason	Ross	VHB
Staci	Rubin	Community Member
Tom	Ryan	Community Member
Lucy	Salwen	Community Member
Fred	Salvucci	Community Member
Lucy	Salwen	Community Member
Stefanie	Seskin	City of Boston
Stephen	Silveira	I-90 Allston Task Force Member
Robert	Sloane	WalkBoston
Mark	Shamon	Tetra Tech
Stephen	Silveira	I-90 Allston Task Force Member
Daniel	Sullivan	Community Member
Adam	Vaccaro	*Boston Globe*
Christine	Varriale	Community Member
Ellen	White	Community Member
James	Wilberforce	Community Member
Jack	Wofford	Community Member
Fred	Yalouris	I-90 Allston Task Force Member
Jesse	Youngblood	Community Member

Appendix

First Name	Last Name	Question Asked	Answer Given
Galen	Mook	Can this be recorded and shared for future viewing? I'm at a place with bad connections and will drop out of the webinar	This is being recorded, Galen, I'll check with Mike about sharing.
James	Wilberforce	At some point, could we please have a tally of participants?	We had 64 total registrations at kick-off time.
James	Wilberforce	Could speakers cover acronyms a bit more slowly please?	Yes. I will ask.
Ari	Ofsevit	Why were 11-foot lanes required for Soldiers Field Road, when DCR regulations stipulate lanes no wider than 10 feet for Historic Parkways?	You're first in queue, Ari for Q&A, I see your hand
Christine	Varriale	How does the Charles River Watershed Association feel about the boardwalk going into the river? My first inclination is that I would still like to see lanes removed from I-90 to make everything at all-grade and stay out of the river. It's 2020. We don't need 12 lanes of highway.	
James	Wilberforce	Can we see speakers?	

Pallavi	Mande	How is the fill in the Charles being justified in terms of loss of flood storage capacity especially when the 100-year flood level is so close to the grade?	
James	Wilberforce	!2 x 2 = 24, but I thought I heard 11 feet wide lanes?	
John (Tad)	Read	Can you tell us when exactly the NPC will be released and how long the public comment period will be?	
John (Tad)	Read	Also, when will this presentation be available to the public to download and view?	
Pallavi	Mande	Mark, where is the compensatory flood storage being accommodated? Why isn't the plan view of the current and projected flooding scenarios being shared?	
James	Wilberforce	Thx.	
John (Tad)	Read	Is MassDOT seeking public comment on the alternatives evaluation criteria themselves, apart from the conclusions of the analyses stemming from them?	
Pallavi	Mande	Stacy, can you elaborate on how the culvert replacement and other underground infrastructure replacement in the historic 4f and 106 areas going to inform the mitigation in the three alternatives?	
Linda	Pehlke	What about noise impacts on the South side, i.e. BU and Brookline?	
James	Wilberforce	Who are the two gentlemen at the table?	Chris Calnan and Ed Ionata, both from Tetra Tech.
Pallavi	Mande	Mark, while we are admiring the renderings, could you answer the questions that were posed?	
Anne	Lusk	NEPA/EIS were started in 1969 and we now have climate change, increased pollution, and heat island. In addition to the waterway and wetland vegetation	

		analysis, could you also explore the benefits of mature trees through their root system, specific tree species absorption of pollutants, and the shade provided by full crowns. This analysis could lead to explorations for an expanded NEPA/EIS to better address climate change, pollution, and heat island. Thank you. Anne Lusk, Ph.D>	
David	Loutzenheiser	At some point please clarify which options proposed a sound barrier between the PDW path and the adjacent highway? It appears that is the case for SFR. Viaduct as well? thanks.	
Harry	Mattison	What time will we be able to start asking questions?	
John (Tad)	Read	Are there safety standards that govern the design of alignment shifts? If so, could you explain why a well-designed, engineered, and signed alignment shift would pose added safety risks?	
Pallavi	Mande	Nate, when are the questions going to be responded to?	Getting into it now as you can see:)
James	Wilberforce	BET?	Boston Engine Terminal, this is where all MBTA commuter engines are repaired
Harry	Mattison	how many more slides are in this presentation?	
James	Wilberforce	Need a “Guide to Abbreviations.”	
Hannah	Kane	Nate I would like to speak - Rep. Kane	

Ari	Ofsevit	https://archives.lib.state.ma.us/handle/2452/335706	
Harry	Mattison	I have to leave in 10 minutes to pick up my daughter from soccer practice. Could I please ask my question before then?	
Pallavi	Mande	Ed, can you please tell us when you will share the flood projections modeling results from Woodshole group? Without that analysis it's hard to understand how you are comparing the "resilience" of the 3 alternatives?	
Ari	Ofsevit	@Owen the team should read state guidelines before they make these presentations	
Ari	Ofsevit	UNMUTE ME	
James	Wilberforce	Speak up please!	
James	Wilberforce	Closer to mics...	
James	Wilberforce	Why such a seemingly bizarre phobia about questions? Is this "our" government at work here? What's the harm?	
Harry	Mattison	Hi. Can I please ask a question?	
Christine	Varriale	This presentation is almost solely focused on the roads. Where is the analysis of how this will impact the commuter rail? What will commute times look like? Will there be more riders? We need more money and resources put into the commuter rail and to make it a fully functioning regional rail system. Cars are not the future, and we should be encouraging people to take the train into the city instead of driving by improving the service.	
Harry	Mattison	Hi. This is Harry. Please unmute me again to ask my question.	
James	Wilberforce	Does Jeff know how to "unmute" on phone?	

Christine	Varriale	Yes to having a bus lane on the pike!!!	
Harry	Mattison	Hi. This time I think my mic will actually work. Please give me one more try	
James	Wilberforce	No need to revisit my earlier question about lane width. Thanks.	
James	Wilberforce	Could we hear a more careful explanation of the numbers on noise, esp. as it will supposedly effect Cambridge? What is the difference - experientially, in particular - between 62 and 63 dBa, just as one example? Please elaborate on these anticipated matrix noised differentials.	
James	Wilberforce	Who can see Q & A? Task Force members?	The task force membership is listed on the I-90 Allston project website
James	Wilberforce	What law school??	
James	Wilberforce	Easier to comment when you know what you're commenting on, no?	
James	Wilberforce	Please ask Jeff to speak louder - closer to his mic!	
Anna	Leslie	Jean's audio goes in and out, it's quite hard to hear.	
James	Wilberforce	I mean Jean... Speak up, dude!	
James	Wilberforce	Jean... closer to mic, or mic closer to you, please...	
James	Wilberforce	Better volume... Thanks.	
James	Wilberforce	Kennedy brothers (on wall)?	

Bill	Deignan	Please clarify the noise levels shown in the matrix and if these are ranges, or changes from before to after, or vice versa.	
James	Wilberforce	Thanks for BET (thought it might be a TV network...)	
Christine	Varriale	thank you for not answering my question...	
James	Wilberforce	Thanks.	
Ari	Ofsevit	I would like an answer to my question if possible beyond "we had a presentation"	
Pallavi	Mande	Nate, I would like to be unmuted to ask a clarifying question since I don't think the response to my question was satisfactory	
James	Wilberforce	Hear, hear!	
Guus	Driessen	slide 51, why is a switchback required for the at -grade option? there appears no need to raise the profile so much! Guus Driessen	
James	Wilberforce	An Ethiopian dialect...	
James	Wilberforce	Was a “Fred” asking to speak?	
James	Wilberforce	Hahaha	
James	Wilberforce	This guy’s a real bullshit artist, I’m sorry to say...	
James	Wilberforce	Not “Fred,” Owen...	
James	Wilberforce	What would Bobby Kennedy do?	
James	Wilberforce	Any Globe reporters here?	Adam Vaccaro
Ari	Ofsevit	Agreed with Pallavi	
James	Wilberforce	Good. Thx.	

Bill	Deignan	Team - this was a very unsatisfactory meeting. It is very unclear how many of the finding in the matrix were determined. Many of them seemed judgmental in the language used and therefore the result are put in doubt. This is coupled with the fact that background information is not being made available which compounds people's doubt and questions. Thanks.	
James	Wilberforce	A mere 15 more days...	