
To: Michael O'Dowd
Project Manager

Date: February 22, 2016

From: Nick Gross
Howard Stein Hudson

HSH Project No.: 2013061.14

Subject: MassDOT Highway Division
Allston I-90 Interchange Improvement Project
Taskforce Workshop – Part 1
Meeting Notes of February 11, 2016

Overview

On February 11, 2016 members of the Allston I-90 Interchange Improvement Project team and MassDOT staff associated with the job held a workshop for task force members at the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) headquarters located at 10 Park Plaza, Boston. The workshop session was held at the request of the task force with the goal in identifying the best features from each alternative; MassDOT 3K, A Better City (ABC), and Amateur Planner, in an effort to improve all three alternatives by incorporating the identified best features throughout. Meeting invitations were sent out to the entire task force on January 28, 2016 asking that recipients RSVP if planning to attend. In total, 21 task force members were present at the session as well as a handful of interested community members.

The meeting summarized herein was thematically driven by the questions submitted in advance of the session by ABC¹. As such, unlike the other task force meetings, a self-generating theme did not emerge; however, a few key points received a lot of discussion. One major topic of discussion was whether the various options under discussion had been pushed as close to the Boston University (BU) property line as they could be. The project team explained that this has been done for all three concepts. Whether or not shoulders are needed and whether MassDOT should install them on its proposed replacement viaduct was another topic of continued interested relating to the MassDOT 3K Alternative.

Substantial time was spent defining and discussing Section 4F as well as Section 106 and their importance of protecting and enhancing the parkland along the Paul Dudley White Path. This led into the discussion about whether or not the ABC Alternative could effectively come out of the Charles River to avoid the Section 106 impact. Representatives of ABC admitted that they were challenged by this and agreed that removing lanes from Soldiers Field Road (SFR) or the Turnpike was not realistic. While the Charles River Watershed Association expressed concern at the potential removal of the riprap and its conversion to a seawall in an effort to get the ABC Alternative out of the Charles River due to the loss of fish habitat, it

¹ These questions can be found as a PDF on the project website.

was suggested that removing the Paul Dudley White Path from its existing location and elevating it was an option by a task force member.

Rail operations in the context of selecting the best alternative that accommodates anticipated future operations was also discussed. It was explained by the project team's rail operations consultant, Mark Shamon of VHB that the MassDOT and ABC Alternatives perform roughly the same accommodations for future rail operations while the Amateur Planner Alternative (AMP) hamstring future rail operations through overly tight switches and trains accessing the yard needing to cross the mainline. Likewise, one of the most advantageous aspects of the AMP concepts, the ability for future cross-platform connections between long distance commuter rail trains and transit-style DMU's, can be accomplished equally well by the MassDOT alternative. The session wrapped up with a discussion of the Houghton Chemical Line and how its removal could benefit the various alternatives, chiefly by reducing elevated roadway sections. It was agreed that the removal of the Houghton Chemical Line would achieve this however it has been made clear by the owner of the facility that it is the companies intent to remain in their existing location due to the convenient access to the rail facilities. Further, even if Houghton Chemical were actively seeking to leave the site, CSX retains ownership of the spur and their right to it is regulated at the federal level. Unlike property, MassDOT is not empowered to acquire active rail lines by eminent domain.

Detailed Meeting Minutes²

- C: Ed Ionata (EI): Welcome everyone. The original intent of this session was to attempt to combine the best features each alternative to reduce the overall number of alternatives. There was a lot of correspondence and discussion leading up to this session and we now understand that is not a shared goal. The best way to summarize what we all want to accomplish today is to improve all three alternatives and figure out if there is a way to move the best features from each alternative to another in order to come up with the best alternative. We have a recommendation to start the conversation from Tom Nally and A Better City (ABC) who have produced a list of great questions. Everyone here has heard all of the positions of all of the participants and today we want to focus on the specifics of the design elements for each alternative. If a question can be answered with yes, no, I don't know, or a number, let's start with that.
- C: Tom Nally (TN): Since we have the outline in front of us, I would suggest that we go down the list, one-by-one, to address each question. That way we can stay focused.
- C: EI: I agree and if a related question comes up we can certainly go down that path. I'll do my best to encourage people to summarize their answers. Mike, would you like to add anything before we begin?

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

C: Mike O'Dowd (MOD): I would like to welcome and thank you all for being here. We have received a lot of comments over the previous months requesting to set this working session up. It's been complicated trying to find a time for this session with the ongoing Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA) sessions and the Holidays. The intent today is to identify the strongest components of each alternative and integrate those features into all of the alternatives. I think we are all in agreement that we want to select the best alternative for the job and strive to do it as quickly as possible. The Secretary of Transportation desire remains to see this project in construction by 2018. She is making every effort along with our Administrator and Chief Engineer to identify the funding mechanisms by which construction in 2018 can happen. Those are the orders that have been given to me and those are the orders I've given to the design team. If you have questions relative to the design process, that's great, we'll do our best to answer those. Now let's get to work.

C: EI: Question 1³ is about the widths of the travel lanes and shoulders in the throat area. The answers to these questions are a series of numbers. After, I would then like to hear some thoughts on why the details of these numbers are so important.

C: Rich Lenox (RL): Hi everyone, for those who don't know me my name is Rich Lenox. The existing viaduct within the throat has a cross section of 48.0' curb-to-curb. The average lane widths in the westbound direction are 11.4' and in the eastbound direction the average is 11.5'. The average median shoulder on the westbound side is 1.4' and on the eastbound side the average is 1.2'. The average outside shoulder in the westbound direction is 1.0' and in the eastbound direction the average is 0.8'. It is important to note that the current viaduct has safety walks which results in a slight shelf above the curb before you get to the face of the barrier. That creates an extra offset to the face. The face of rail from outer rail to outer rail in both directions is 52.0'. In all of the other three alternatives, safety walks are not incorporated. We also included the widths of Soldiers Field Road (SFR) within the throat. The existing dimension from outer curb to outer curb is 52.0'. At present, the average widths of the lanes are approximately 10.8', both shoulders average 1.2', and there is a 4' median in the center.

Q: Wendy Landman (WL): Are you using decimals?

A: RL: Yes.

Q: HM: Could you email all of this to us later?

³ Question 1: relative to highway travel lanes and shoulders in the so-called Throat Area ONLY:

- a. Existing Condition: What is the width of travel lanes and shoulders for the Existing Condition?
- b. Alternative 1 (MassDOT 3K): What is the width of the proposed travel lanes and shoulders. Please specifically describe the width of both the inside and outside shoulders as well as their function.
- c. Alternative 2 (ABC Alternative): What is the width of travel lanes and shoulders?
- d. Alternative 3 (Amateur Planner Alternative): What is the width of travel lanes and shoulders?

A: RL: Yes.

C: HM: Thanks.

C: RL: Are there any other questions relative to the existing widths? Let's move on to Question 1B which addresses the MassDOT 3K Alternative. The proposed lane widths are 12.0'. The proposed median shoulders are 6.0'. In the westbound direction we are showing a 12.0' outside shoulder and in the eastbound direction we are showing a 9.0' outside shoulder. For SFR we are holding the existing 52.0' cross section and striping the lanes at 11.0' with 1.0' shoulders and a 4.0' median. Are there any questions relative to those numbers? Anytime you have a barrier, the two feet next to the barrier are not considered useable space of the shoulder. For example, if there was a 6.0' shoulder, we would call that a 4.0' shoulder with a 2.0' off-set. The shoulder widths I gave are the physical dimensions. The functioning shoulder would be 2.0' less than the dimensions I provided.

Q: Ari Ofsevit (AO): Does that include the median?

A: RL: No, the median on the viaduct is roughly 3.5'.

Q: Margaret Van Deusen (MVD): On SFR, are you giving the exact width of the median?

A: RL: The width of the median on SFR for the MassDOT 3K Alternative is 4.0'.

Q: Jack Wofford (JW): What is the total width of the throat section?

A: RL: The total outer dimension is 135.9'.

Q: AO: What is the current outer dimension?

A: RL: The current is 108.0'.

Q: HM: Did the 11.4' and the existing conditions conform to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) standards at the time of construction?

A: MOD: I believe the Turnpike in this section was originally built to maintain three travel lanes in each direction.

Q: HM: So it was built conforming to standards for a six lane viaduct and then MassDOT decided to add a travel lane in each direction?

A: MOD: Yes.

C: RL: Alright, let's move onto the ABC Alternative. In both directions on I-90 we are showing 12.0' lanes. We are showing both left and right shoulders at 1.25'. On SFR the lanes widths are 10.0' in both directions. The left and right shoulders are 1.0' and we are showing 3.0' wide median. On the Amateur Planner Alternative the I-90 dimensions are the same as the ABC Alternative with 12.0' travel lanes and 1.25' shoulder widths. On SFR, the only difference in comparison to the ABC Alternative is that we are showing a 2.0' median.

Q: JW: Could you give us the total width on both of those alternatives?

A: RL: The total width is approximately 105'.

A: Chris Calnan (CC): It ends up being slightly less than the existing width.

A: RL: When we looked further into it, the Amateur Planner Alternative becomes slightly wider to accommodate the support structures for the Grand Junction viaduct in the median of SFR.

C: EI: In summary, those are the cross sections from HNTB who added their engineering expertise in an effort to minimize the cross section. My follow up question is are we at a point with the MassDOT 3K Alternative that has the minimal cross section that is acceptable to MassDOT?

A: CC: The MassDOT 3K Alternative cross section is actually less than the standard as currently proposed. MassDOT is compromising some of the widths to accommodate the proposed alignment. This will have to go through a formal design exception process with MassDOT and FHWA. Right now we believe that the MassDOT 3K Alternative will be the most acceptable alternative moving through this process based on FHWA with the added shoulders and 12.0' lanes.

Q: EI: In summary, MassDOT and the engineering team have come down as narrow as possible which they believe is as reasonable, feasible, and as acceptable as possible?

A: CC: Yes while at the same time meeting the goals and objectives we set out with when the project started.

Q: HM: The proposed new viaduct is about 27.0' wider than the existing viaduct. Could you explain what side the widening is occurring on?

A: RL: The majority of the widening is to the north. We are picking up approximately 5' on the Boston University (BU) southern side.

Q: HM: Does that 5' include columns or is it the edge of viaduct?

A: RL: It's the edge of the viaduct. The columns stay in the same location.

Q: HM: Does the 5' bring you fully to the BU property line?

A: RL: Yes.

Q: David Loutzenheiser (DL): You mentioned that the ABC Alternative has minimal shoulder widths but you're saying the minimum width for the MassDOT 3K Alternative will have 12.0' shoulders? Why does the viaduct have wider shoulders?

A: Jim Keller (JK): We're saying the acceptable minimum. The MassDOT 3K Alternative is based off of the ASHTO design standards. The other alternatives are not.

C: DL: I think that's where there could be some flexibility.

Q: WL: Have any of these alternatives been shown to FHWA?

A: MOD: FHWA is part of the task force.

Q: WL: Let me ask that in a different way. Has FHWA made any comments on the alternatives?

A: MOD: Not to my knowledge. My understanding is that they would like to see a formal design exception. We have a general understanding of what their desirable numbers are. If we are proposing something other than that, they are going to want to see justification from us to determine why we think something less than standard is acceptable.

C: EI: One of the things I'm concerned about is that we are at the level of detail that would normally be discussed in an advanced design stage. The items that typically go to a Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) or National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review are much more schematic. Even if we could knock off 10' from the MassDOT 3K Alternative we're still cantilevered over SFR and we'll still have historic impacts.

C: Glen Berkowitz (GB): I'm not sure why your question is about 10'. I think your question should be about 20'.

C: EI: Okay, let's say 20'.

C: GB: There are probably six to ten people in this room who spent the large amount of their adult careers working on the Central Artery Tunnel Project. Either that project was negligent or illegal in not providing 12' breakdown lanes or in an urban area they were not required. On this project, whether a plan has them in the throat or not, I don't see anyone saying that they are going to be downstream of the throat. I don't see anyone saying that we are going to have shoulders in the Prudential Tunnel. Is MassDOT saying that the only reason to have a viaduct in the throat is to gain

the 20 something feet of extra width needed to provide breakdown lanes? If so, those would be the most expensive breakdown lanes in the history of the interstate highway system.

C: EI: I think that's a valid question and we'll get back to that.

Q: John Shields (JS): Hi, I'm John Shields with the Charles River Alliance (CRA) and we're concerned about parkland. Can you explain how SFR aligns in comparison to the present alignment with the MassDOT 3K Alternative?

A: RL: One of the objectives was to pull SFR further to the south away from the Charles River. In the initial part near the throat we are somewhat restricted due to the Grand Junction Line. From that point on we are angling the alignment away from the Charles River towards the north where the Double Tree Hotel is located.

Q: JS: If you were to shift the radius of the Grand Junction, could you push SFR even further?

A: RL: In theory, yes.

A: Greg Boles (GB): By doing that you would have to rebuild the Grand Junction Bridge over the Charles River. That bridge holds the angle that is defining the curve radius.

C: JS: That's a good idea.

C: Fred Salvucci (FS): I want to suggest another factor that should be on the table with the discussion of standards. There's a Federal Law called Section 4F and the Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) is protected by Section 4F. The words in the statute are something like, you cannot proceed unless there is no feasible or prudent alternative and if there is no alternative that is feasible or prudent you must take all options to mitigate the impacts. Today at St. Paul and Buick Street you've got eight lanes that are normally functioning and a single track of the Grand Junction Line which is supposed to become two tracks. We've got substandard lane widths and two rail tracks pushed up against a Section 4F resource. On the other side of the right-of-way (ROW) you've got land owned by BU.

I would like to suggest that there are two ways in thinking about BU's land. The BU property line in some areas is protecting a pretty useless slope that goes up to Buick Street. Buick Street is really the functional line. It may be useful to think about those two lines separately; the property line and the functional line. Near Agganis Way there is some land between the property line and the functional line. Towards Buick Street there is a right angle that turns toward Commonwealth Avenue and the functional line is much closer to the property line. There's about 5-6' of useless land which could become functional.

The BU Institutional Master Plan (IMP) calls for someday being able to build over the air rights of the Turnpike. BU owns the land on both sides of the Turnpike which they would need in order to activate that. There would still be a need for foundation space in the middle of the highway for air rights development or it will become functionally unusable. One should look at what that dimension is that supports Commonwealth Avenue over the Turnpike today in order to replicate it. If the English words, “feasible” and “prudent” are to mean anything, then it ought to be that you don’t need to add breakdown lanes. You’ve lived without them for 50 years. It seems to me that it would be feasible and prudent to stick with the cross section that exists today. All three approaches have adverse impacts to the DCR land that are governed by Section 4F. The Section 4F analysis should be on the table prior to the feet and inches discussion.

The rough justice analysis at the St. Paul and Buick Street property line is that there are eight substandard highway ramps and the rail is tucked under the viaduct. The Grand Junction is an outlier and the second track is going to be 13’ more of an outlier. If you slim down the MassDOT plan you’d still have a 13-14’ issue to deal with on the BU side. On the ABC Alternative, the Grand Junction structure is physically over the highway and the same is true for Ari’s Alternative. Moving down towards Agganis Way; if you insist on the breakdown lanes you’ll end up with 10 substandard lanes. It will then pretty much be the same as the Ari’s Alternative and maybe with two tracks less than the ABC Alternative. From a Section 4F perspective, the MassDOT plan has more of a Section 4F impact at St. Paul Street. It may be a little bit better than the ABC Alternative but about the same as Ari’s Alternative at Agganis Way.

Once you factor in the need for rail on the MassDOT 3K Alternative in order to get back to grade without messing up the vertical alignment, you’ll probably need to move closer to the Charles River than you previously thought. The MassDOT plan is going to start looking a lot like Ari’s Plan once you realize this. I apologize from distracting from the feet and inches conversation but the Section 4F considerations are more important and need to be on the table especially at the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR) analysis. The difference between substandard lanes and a standard lane is a far third importance to the Federal Law that projects DCR land.

C: Steve Silveira (SS): From our vantage point in terms of functionality, it’s like the saying, “beauty is in the eye of the beholder.” I want to reiterate BU’s willingness to grant MassDOT and their team the privilege to come out to our property to do a survey and figure out what’s what. I think this discussion would benefit greatly from facts and feet rather than assumptions on numbers.

Q: HM: Has that not happened yet?

A: MOD: This is not the first time Steve and BU have made this offer. We’ve sat down and discussed this with them before and to the extent we see possible in trying to utilize the constructability issues associated with the embankment we have used it. That 5-6’ does not appear to hold a benefit to us. Jim Keller is looking at how much it actually helps us. There are points that we could take 4-5’ but we

don't know if that will necessarily help because the line is inconsistent as it runs parallel to the structure.

C: EI: To summarize, you don't think you need more space because there are other obstructions in the way. Does that sound right?

A: MOD: Agreed. We have taken into account where the current foundation lines are.

Q: HM: What are the other obstructions in the way?

A: JK: Mostly buildings and property. One of the potential issues is the eastbound on-ramp. When we're talking about the throat section near Agganis Way, we're coming in with a two-lane ramp. This is our major pinch point. We've already pushed the viaduct further south from its current location.

C: EI: Stacey, could you give a quick overview on how MassDOT's sees the Section 4F impacts associated with the MassDOT 3K Alternative? Stacey is a Senior Historic Resources Specialist in the Environmental Division at MassDOT.

A: Stacey Donahoe (SD): The process begins with Section 106. At that point there is a determination of what kind of affect the alternative will have on the abutting properties. In this case, it is the Charles River Basin which is in a historic district. Under the MassDOT 3K Alternative we see that there is a potential impact by moving SFR south in order to create additional parkland to the north. We could argue that this would not have an adverse effect on a historic resource because of the net gain. MassDOT would make that determination. It would then be reviewed by FHWA and then the Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC). If everyone agrees that the impact is not an adverse effect, then it would not be a factor under Section 4F.

C: EI: Thank you Stacey.

Q: JS: Does the green you showed include the existing parkland plus the addition of new parkland?

A: JK: Yes.

Q: JS: Do you take into consideration the vertical impact as well as the horizontal impact, such as noise or the distance of the structure to the water's edge?

A: SD: Yes, all of those factors are impacts under Section 4F. There can be indirect impacts as well as direct impacts.

Q: JS: Would the impact of noise be a direct impact because you're moving the road closer to the Charles River?

A: MOD: I think the question ends up being; will the noise become an irritant to the users of the parkland compared to the existing condition?

C: AO: I have a couple points, the first is relating to parkland. You're going from having the Turnpike approximately 50-60' away from the parkland to about 20'. Given the height of the structure we're probably looking at shadows for much of the winter and partly year round. I hope that is part of your consideration. If it's in the shadows it will be harder to keep snow off of as well as keep clear through the winter for commuters. The second part is that there is a large strip of DCR parkland that would be transferred. I'm curious what the net loss of parkland from that strip would be. The last point is, if you move the MassDOT 3K Alternative further to the east, I noticed that you have to shift the Worcester Line by about 250'.

A: JK: We're taking that into account.

C: AO: It looks like the overbuild would start around the end of the fill area.

A: JK: The shoulder will transition.

Q: AO: So there wouldn't be a 10' shoulder on that part of the curve?

A: JK: Maybe not that far down. One of the things HNTB had to do with the ABC and your alternative was to physically shift the nose to the west. It resulted in decreasing the length of the deceleration to maintain the tangent.

C: AO: So east of that point you wouldn't have the breakdown lanes?

A: JK: It would be significantly less.

Q: AO: If we don't need breakdown lanes where the highway is steeper and curvier, why do we need them where it's straight?

A: JK: It's because we are tying into the existing condition at that point.

C: JW: Hi, I'm Jack Wofford. At one point in time, every Section 4F in the country had to cross my desk before going to the Secretary. I want to emphasize what Fred said about the importance of Section 4F and the protection of parklands. We all know how unusual a Supreme Court unanimous decision would be. No one lives in a park and nobody works in a park but in 1971, Congress issued a special protection to parkland. It is important to note that a parkland impact has to be taken into account as you create each alternative. It is not something to be hashed on later. The analysis really needs to take into account the impacts Fred mentioned with respect to BU or the issue of breakdown lanes.

C: EI: Thank you Jack.

Q: WL: What is the design speed in this section of the Turnpike compared to the areas further east and further west?

A: JK: The design speed is 60 mph.

A: CC: I should note that the design speed does not influence the width of the proposed shoulders. The 60 mph design speed relates to the curves and sight lines.

Q: WL: What is the design speed to the east in the Prudential Tunnel?

A: MOD: I believe it's posted at 45 mph but the design speed is something like 55 mph. We do that intentionally.

C: FS: The southbound direction of the Central Artery was originally supposed to be 35 mph along the curved wall. FHWA pushed to rip the whole thing out to achieve a 45 mph design speed. It was a huge added cost and it ended up being posted for 35 mph. It was way below the interstate highway standard. The law changed in 1991. It should not be a given that this is a 60 mph design speed zone.

Q: JS: What is the proposed design speed for SFR?

A: EI: We are holding the same design speed for SFR.

A: MOD: I believe it's posted at 40 mph but it could handle more. Most people drive at 50-55 mph. We design for a certain speed but we have to consider the reality of the operational speed.

C: JS: Further west SFR is 35 mph and further east SFR is 35 mph.

A: MOD: As you travel west it is still 40 mph. Karl Haglund is agreeing with me so I believe that is correct.

Q: GB: My question was a Section 4F question for Stacey. For over a year now, it seems as though MassDOT has been asked by other people, can we do something different. That different thing would cost less and have less impact to the environment as well as the community. One of the impacts of this discussion is Section 4F. Stacey mentioned Section 4F and then she mentioned Section 106. If Jim said before that the north edge of the elevated I-90 viaduct is going to be 22' close to the Charles River, does that have a Section 4F impact yes or no?

A: EI: Yes.

Q: GB: What did Stacey say about that Section 4F impact?

A: MOD: There has been no formal decision made whether that would be a Section 4F impact. We've discussed it with the operator of the parkland and how we would deal with that intrusion. 20' horizontally to the Charles River and 20' vertically over may or may not constitute a Section 4 impact. It depends on if the park area could be replicated closer to the water's edge.

Q: GB: My question isn't what you're conclusion is. My question is, it seems as though MassDOT and the project team are assuming there is no Section 4F impact raised as part of MassDOT's 3K Alternative. It's as if the space between the existing I-90 and the existing SFR eastbound is not parkland. Is MassDOT assuming that space is not parkland and therefore there is no Section 4F impact?

A: SD: There would be Section 4F impact however by adding parkland closer to the Charles River it would be an overall net benefit to Section 4F source.

C: KH: My understanding is that the finding of impacts is done separately from mitigation. First you have to define the impacts. The boundary is not the curb line. In this case, the boundary starts at the fence and ends in the middle of the Charles River with respect to the City of Boston.

Q: WL: Would boating be one of the uses that you would consider for impacts? If the highway is 22' closer to the Charles River it will impact the people who are walking along the Esplanade and people who are boating.

A: KH: In the Central Artery Project, shadow, noise, light, and view were considered.

C: FS: The judgment of impact ought to happen by disclosing the impacts and allowing the public to comment on what they believe are the impacts. I would assume DCR would like access to the document before public access. All three alternatives have impacts; the question is how severe each alternatives impact is.

A: EI: That's why my first answer was yes.

C: GB: The nuance is that Stacey said something about a programmatic exception.

A: SD: It's not an exception.

Q: GB: What does that mean and does it mean that a Section 4F analysis is not necessary?

A: EI: No, a Section 4F analysis is necessary.

A: SD: It's still Section 4F; it's just a different process.

C: EI: All of the alternatives have to disclose Section 4F impacts and propose mitigation in the environmental documentation. Then we would expect all of you and MHC to provide input.

Q: Galen Mook (GM): Do you know what the shadow impacts are? Have you done a shadow study or analysis? Is it hard to do?

A: EI: No it's not hard to do. It hasn't been done yet.

C: Jessica Robertson (JR): I would ask that when we pick a cross section to analyze the shadows, we pick the cross section where the highway is closest to the parkland in order to see the maximum impact.

C: HM: We should probably do a 3D model as well.

A: EI: I don't know how to run the model but the output of the model ends up being 2D.

C: GM: I would argue we do five cross sections.

C: EI: Relative to Question 5⁴, the big issue for MassDOT is reducing the number of impacts to the Charles River and eliminating the involvement of the Army Corps of Engineers (ACE) and the Clean Water Act. Does the MassDOT team have any ideas how to get the ABC Alternative out of the Charles River?

C: TN: We're looking for ideas.

C: CC: We're looking for ideas as well. If you think about all of the widths, the ABC Alternative gets down as narrow as possible in attempting to maintain the existing widths. When you look at the physical north-south area it is very limited. Short of trying to move the section further into BU's land or removing features, we're stumped. One of the challenges that HNTB identified was that some of the barrier widths don't accommodate some of needed the features such as signs. Trying to make it even narrower is a real challenge. HNTB engineered this concept in order to see how narrow it could be, unfortunately it sill projects into the Charles River.

Q: JS: Are you saying the alternative projects into the Charles River with the promenade?

A: CC: Yes, the ABC Alternative ends up beyond the edge of the river's edge.

Q: JS: How far into the Charles River does it go?

⁴ How can the ABC Alternative be modified to eliminate or reduce changes or impacts to the Charles River, and to improve the relationship of the options to the edge of the river?

A: JK: Approximately 16’.

C: CC: This has the reduced lane widths and shoulders as well.

Q: JS: So it maintains the existing width on I-90 and on SFR?

A: CC: Yes.

Q: JS: Around the country there have been a lot of ways people have come up with creative ideas to address similar problems along a rivers edge. I wouldn’t let the fear of the ACE stop you from heading in that direction.

A: EI: MassDOT has done some thought on that. Much like the Section 4F issue, one of the elements of the Clean Water Act and ACE Program is to build the least environmental damaging and practical alternative.

C: Meredith Avery (MA): For any type of situation like this we start with avoidance, whether that is Section 4F or Section 106. We look at whether or not the alternative meets the purpose and need, while avoiding the impact to the resource. When you have three alternatives and two of them don’t go into the Charles River, it is very difficult to convince the ACE to select that alternative.

C: JS: The impacts of the ABC Alternative may be less in terms of noise and shadow.

A: MA: You’re right and we’re going to look at that, but before you mitigate an impact you have to see if you can avoid it.

C: AO: We are actually widening the lane widths from 11.4’ to 12.0’. If we kept it at 11.4’ we could pull the cross section back by 5’. With regard to design speed on SFR, maybe we should look at building a road that is more similar to Memorial Drive to slow traffic with four lanes and no median. That would be another way to save space.

A: CC: In the tangent section you could have a design speed of 20 mph or 60 mph; it’s still a straight tangent. It really comes down to the widths on SFR.

C: AO: Right, SFR is 52’ wide now with four lanes. Memorial Drive on the other side of the Charles River is still four lanes wide and only 38’. I don’t know what the DCR’s long term plan is but maybe SFR can eventually serve the true purpose of a parkway.

C: CC: There is a big difference in safety with a median versus no median.

C: AO: Memorial Drive is much slower roadway and it doesn't have a median.

A: MOD: Let's keep in mind that Memorial Drive functions completely differently. There are significantly more intersecting streets, driveways, and access points. That alone slows traffic down. SFR and Storrow Drive don't have that.

Q: AO: Do we need a median on SFR?

A: MOD: That's a decision that would be made by DCR. I know DCR is always looking to improve safety along SFR in this segment. Last year they replaced the guard rail to reflect that effort.

C: KH: One of the issues here is that SFR carries about three times as much traffic as Memorial Drive. Where do the 60,000 cars go if we slow down SFR? SFR carried more traffic than the Turnpike until the late 90's.

Q: AO: Is the DCR mission to move as many people through a roadway as possible?

A: KH: It's not a matter of what we would like to do; it's a matter of what is feasible. If we try to take 60,000 cars off SFR they have to go somewhere else.

C: AO: We're not asking about that. We're talking about slowing down SFR and making it narrower. This started because we are looking at ways to narrow the overall cross section. Is the DCR mission to move as many cars through this area as quickly as possible?

A: KH: The DCR mission is to maintain and improve the state wide and regional park systems.

C: HM: We started this discussion by asking, is this the narrowest section possible for the ABC Alternative?

C: GB: The question is not what you just said; the question is the way it was specifically worded. The question is, how can we? We know impacts to the Charles River are unacceptable so there for it is worded, how can we?

Q: HM: There are several voices on the task force that are saying, this not the most narrow cross section possible. The existing cross section of the Turnpike has 11.4' lanes not 12.0' lanes. The need of a median barrier may not be necessary. On a separate point, is MassDOT collecting data on I-90 westbound during the current construction?

A: MOD: Yes, I believe we are. I'll double check. I don't know what the most recent counts are.

Q: HM: Is there an operational analysis that would be possible to share with the task force?

A: MOD: Sure, I'll look into see what is available.

C: HM: The antidotal observation as well as an article in the *Boston Globe* about a year ago had data and concluded that three lanes on the Turnpike outbound is roughly equivalent to four lanes.

C: MOD: I don't think that was the conclusion.

C: HM: That was the conclusion of the *Boston Globe* article.

A: MOD: There were many people who forwarded Nate and myself emails thinking that the construction was our doing as part of this project and not being particularly complimentary towards us. Nate sent me one which contained quite a few four letter words.

Q: HM: I'm just talking about outbound. Inbound and outbound operate very differently. We all agree that three lanes inbound would back traffic up to New Balance. Three lanes outbound with the removal of the toll plaza would make the current condition operate even better than it has over the past year. Do the jersey barriers and construction staging help slow the traffic down?

A: MOD: As a construction condition, traffic is slowed because of the signs and distractions.

Q: HM: If you can look at the existing data from the past year, plus the three lane outbound Turnpike, add in the factor of the removing the toll plaza, and make the temporary flashing signs permanent, I think that would help inform whether three versus four lanes is possible.

A: MOD: The CTPS modeling effort has taken into account whether there is likely to be more throughput associated with the benefits of the removal of the toll plaza. Taking all of this into account, the model does not conclude that the Turnpike can handle the same amount of traffic with three lanes as it can handle with four.

C: AO: The *Boston Globe* article said the change was negligible with regards to time. It was only a different of seconds.

C: MOD: What was the date of that article?

C: AO: October 2, 2014

C: Wayne McKenzie (WM): I want to make it clear that not everyone on the task force agrees about shrinking lanes and the removal of median on SFR. I don't want to drive with a Red Sox game letting out without median. I want the ambulances to be able to get to Mass General as quickly as they can.

Q: EI: So you're in favor of the median?

C: Wayne: Yes. I'm also in favor of keeping the lanes the same size. Not all of us are against the size of the lanes.

C: EI: It's a tough act as engineers to make the highway less safe than what it is today.

C: HM: Please don't characterize it that way; that's really unfair. No one is trying to make it less safe.

C: CC: When you eliminate shoulders, it is less safe.

C: HM: We're not eliminating shoulders; they don't even exist.

C: CC: The MassDOT 3K Alternative incorporates shoulder; that is safer.

C: MOD: It would be great to have SFR behave more like an historic parkway. At the beginning of this, it was proposed to sink SFR. There are major MWRA pipes and a lot of infrastructure under below SFR which makes this extremely difficult. The at-grade option, which we have been told would be good for place-making would require some kind of separating wall through this section for sound. I don't think 10 lanes of traffic parallel to the Charles River could have no physical separation between SFR and the Turnpike. There are a lot of elements that aren't considered with that cross section relating to required widths. Light foundations are one example. When constructing the feasibility study, HNTB was directed to do everything possible to minimize the cross section while considering the acceptable tolerance from MassDOT. They've taken some liberties in developing these cross sections to accommodate the desires from the task force. We are open to ideas to help reduce the overall impacts.

Q: FS: This needs a 3D model. Having breakdown lanes traveling eastbound that abruptly end is not a good thing. There's an optimum speed on the Central Artery but when you try to go faster it becomes less safe. The reverse curve that exists today is unsafe and dangerous. We need to consider the vertical dimensions. A 3D model may show that something less than the standard would be a benefit. Section 4F uses the term feasible. The ACE uses the terms feasible and practical. I believe that includes constructability because of the impacts during construction. We need a constructability analysis. It needs to be on the table. My last point relates to the impacts of the Charles River. I'm not suggesting we fill the Charles River, I'm suggesting that we cantilever over it. In fairness to MassDOT, I understand you're worried because of the legal issues associated with that. It may also cause delays in the project schedule relating to the permitting process with the ACE. My question is, do you have to build a vertical wall or can you build a cantilevered structure instead?

A: MOD: No one wants to go to court if they don't have to. From a permitting perspective it appears that this would add up to a 12-18 month delay. We're looking to find what the least environmental damaging alternative is. Our goal is to avoid, minimize, and mitigate the impacts. We're acknowledging the inaccessible parkland adjacent to SFR.

- C: FS: We're trying to create the best three alternatives we can. If Galen's idea of building a wall gets you more parkland than it should be incorporated on the MassDOT 3K Alternative and the other two alternatives as well.
- C: MA: In terms of jurisdiction, anything beyond the river bank is water of the ACE. We can certainly make that case that we're minimizing the impacts but we are still in ACE jurisdiction as well as altering a natural resource. As far as a schedule and permitting, we're going to have to consult with the ACE no matter what. If we had all three alternatives that didn't enter into the Charles River then we could build whichever one was preferred. It's going to be hard to select an alternative that encroaches into the Charles River where other alternatives do not.
- Q: EI: From a regulatory standpoint, is it possible to convert the riprap to a vertical wall at the water's edge?
- A: MA: If you are going to stay at the edge of the water by dredging, a riprap, or by putting in a wall you're not altering anything beyond the edge of the water.
- C: MVD: The riprap is actually a fish and wild life habitat. If you build a granite wall you've destroyed that habitat.
- C: GM: I want to get back to the question on how we can reduce the impacts of the ABC Alternative. We mentioned the idea of decking over SFR with a multiuse path. If we were to do a cost analysis in converting this portion of SFR with a multiuse path overhead, the river's edge and parkland will likely benefit. A multiuse path viaduct will be a lot cheaper than a transit or highway viaduct.
- C: JS: You're still destroying parkland. You're creating a multiuse path but you're destroying parkland.
- Q: GM: How do you mean?
- A: KH: It may be that the benefits are greater than the impacts but there is still an impact.
- C: GM: Everything is going to have an impact; that's what we determined.
- C: KH: If you don't touch the edge of SFR, you have no impact. As soon as you cross that line, you have an impact.
- C: MOD: This goes back to day one and Joe Orfant was very clear. As soon as you cross the edge of SFR closest to the river, that impact exists.
- C: JW: The rules and regulations give a lot of weight to DCR and its own plan. There are groups that can litigate to protect the Charles River and at least one of them is at the table. The Section 4F analysis for MassDOT 3K Alternative is at risk of litigation. With respect to design speed, breakdown lanes, the BU property line, Harvard University property line, and Houghton Chemical, it is paramount that those things are accounted for in terms of protecting parkland.

- C: DL: We're looking at 12 travel lanes of traffic. That's 120' or more. Those assumptions are based on the status quo which has a ratio of people to car. This is focused in moving traffic, not people. If we're really going to change how we're moving people we need an analysis that looks at moving people through this area in less space. We need to look at ways to reduce the number of lanes and make them operate more efficiently. I don't see how 12 lanes is acceptable from an urban design standpoint.
- A: MOD: This is all the more reason to rely on the unbiased results that come back from CTPS. We fully expect that there will be a higher demand placed on transit in this area over the next 20 years. That's why our mode share results reflect a significant expansion of transit. We are looking to optimize that ability over the next 15-75 years. We entered into this project knowing that it is a full, multimodal project. MassDOT Highway division is always being criticized as being vehicle centric but the fact is that we are trying to increase operational efficiencies for the future.
- C: DL: If you provide 12 lanes without restrictions, people are going to use 12 lanes.
- C: CC: That may be the right context for a lot of projects but this is an interstate interchange and we are considering regional mobility. We don't want to artificially constrain the corridor through Boston. We've got eight lanes to the west and to the east of this project. If we remove lanes through this area where is the volume going to go?
- C: MOD: As soon as you take a lane out, people don't stop driving, they find another way to go. It could be right through the neighborhood. We want to keep regional traffic out of the neighborhoods.
- C: DL: That's assuming regional traffic stays constant. There's been no traffic one-way on the Longfellow Bridge during construction. We have plenty of years to perfect this change. If we bring SFR down to one lane in each direction, it could be for high occupancy vehicles during peak hours and it can be more efficient.
- C: Paola Ferrer (PF): The facilities should make it more attractive to use other modes. If you had an at-grade option, it's more welcoming and easier. Being under the shadow of an elevated viaduct in the winter will not be pleasant.
- C: MOD: We brought that up to DCR because we wanted to know visually what the impact would be. In the concept phase we're seeing that we're projecting out over the eastbound lane of SFR by approximately 12'.
- C: PF: When we think about multimodal facilities, we're often thinking about the people who currently use that facility. We're not thinking about the people who could be swayed to take public transit or ride a bike if provided with the proper facilities. We have an opportunity to make something that's transformational. When we look around at other cities in the country they're all bring urban viaducts down.

- A: MOD: We completely agree with you, that's why we are looking to increase the width of the Paul Dudley White Path. The area to be expanded could be as wide as 25'; that's a huge improvement. It is certainly going to be more welcoming for anyone walking or cycling.
- C: PF: We keep hearing language that this is an improvement over current conditions but I feel that in many ways, we were short changed with the current conditions. We've had two other people come up with ideas that for some reason MassDOT was not willing to explore. I'm still a little bitter from the first conversations that proposed a suburban alternative. To me that was symbolic of how some of the conversations have gone. Eventually, there won't be any space if we think of the car as king.
- C: JR: I want to go discuss which alternative does a better job of moving future transit demand. One of the three options for throat makes significant improvements. Ari's plan which comes down between the Worcester tracks is hugely important for future transit demand. None of the stuff we've seen has a transit connection across the project. I know you've been working on it but we still haven't seen it. That's a crucial piece of the project. The success of that may be very different based on the road structure and heights.
- C: MOD: We have a lot of transit experts in the room. I'd like to talk more about the transit connection associated with Ari's plan.
- A: MS: The ABC and MassDOT 3K Alternatives are not much different than the Amateur Planner Alternative. We see Amateur Planner Alternative as least beneficial. Using the mainline track from South Station disturbs operations into the yard. Separate from the Grand Junction track, it reduces capacity. There was some talk about cross platform benefits. We don't see a lot of that, but we can talk more about that to see what the benefits could be. If you're coming from Grand Junction, you have to cross up, over, and down.
- C: AO: If you're coming from Grand Junction and you want to get to the red line, you're going to get off at Kendall Square. What you're looking at is connectivity from the west to Kendall Square. A lot of people who are congesting the roadways are heading to Kendall Square and they're not taking transit because they would have to take a train all the way into South Station.
- C: JR: When we spoke a few months ago about the street widths associated with the new street grid, the reason that the streets were so large was driven by the demand of people and increased jobs in Kendall Square. If we can get those people on transit it solves a lot of those issues.
- C: AO: We're also looking at the ease in which people make those transfers. If people have to come off a train, travel up and over the platform, they end up being penalized by 3-4 minutes. They're not going to make that trip if that's the case.
- C: MS: You can make the cross platform move on Track 1 and Track 2.

- C: AO: But can you get to Kendall from there? In my plan you could take the train into West Station, get off and use DMU service to get to Kendall Square. If we don't have a cross platform transfer, we're going to force all those people to go up cross and come down.
- C: JR: From a service perspective, you could get off the commuter rail and get on a DMU to go over Grand Junction.
- C: MS: We want to maintain as much capacity as we can in the future; not only on the Worcester Line but also out to Springfield and New York. That's why we're trying to use Track 1 and Track 3 to get people over to Grand Junction. In terms of coming in, we have two trains coming in on Track 1 and Track 2.
- Q: JR: Can you explain the tracks?
- A: MS: Track 2 is the existing service track. Track 1 is going to be built parallel to it. Theoretically it would be for outbound service but it could be inbound as well. The way it works in railroads is that everything to the south is 2, 4, 6, 8 and to the north is 1, 3, 5, 7. We're using the line between 1 and 2 as the divider.
- Q: JR: How would you get from a Commuter Rail train from Framingham to Kendall Square with DMU service?
- A: MS: In the future, that transfer could happen almost anywhere along the line. All these other stations will be able to do that.
- C: AO: There are only two tracks. That's going to dramatically affect throughput on trains in the other direction. West Station is where we have four tracks. It's where it makes sense and it's connected to BU and Harvard Square. This is where we want the most transfers. It makes the most sense to do it at West Station.
- A: TN: The coordination of schedules is going to be extremely important in addition to the transfers from one platform to another. Coordinating schedules so two trains are in West Station at the same time will save along of time for people looking to transfer.
- C: MS: We're looking at 4 minute headways in each direction. There's quite a bit of capacity so there wouldn't necessarily be a lot of waiting time. That's way down the road.
- C: AO: With 4 minute head way on each track, would we want to introduce that kind of crossover?
- C: MS: It would all have to be scheduled.
- Q: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis (NCC): Mark, what you're saying is that the connection that Jessica wants is made and you can do it under the MassDOT 3K Alternative and the ABC Alternative. Is that correct?
- A: MS: Yes.

C: FS: Making the connection is not the question. It's the ability to make it easily. The ABC Alternative could equally adopt a cross platform feature to drop it either way. The viaduct scheme doesn't allow that flexibility. It's also a capacity question. In the layup yard, every train out of South Station will cross in the at-grade plans; that's a capacity killer. There would be two platforms in a four track station. You're killing it by relying on signals. It can work when the number of trains is low. Jessica's point is true; I think it will be hard to get commuter rail service across Cambridge. DMU service would be a more acceptable notion. I've been around rail for some time; we should factor in trains leaving South Station. We need on a DMU service on the Grand Junction. I think the cross platform on the AMP plan is better.

A: MS: It hurts capacity.

Q: AO: What's the design speed for the trains through the various interlocking's?

A: GB: 15 mph.

Q: AO: Is that the maximum speed given the geometry?

A: GB: Yes.

Q: JR: As we're looking for ways to make the ABC Alternative more viable, can we make this more viable?

A: GB: With the current layout, that's the best possible.

Q: AO: So you could run a train through the station and reverse into yard if necessary?

A: MS: That's another difficulty with the AMP design. The yard was brought down and as a result the elevations are difficult.

C: Jim Gillooly (JG): I'd like to make an observation and a suggestion. A lot of people keep talking about capacity in transit and bicycles but when we talk about reasonable capacity on roadways, I don't get the same sentiment. If we start to downsize the throughput of the Mass Pike or SFR and we haven't yet reach a point in the state where there is money for transit it's not going to work. I want to be realistic about the future of robust transit. We have to be fair with balanced approaches and recognize the need for capacity on major interstate systems.

C: TN: We have given ourselves a real challenge to replicate current widths. It becomes more difficult, if we keep the same number of lanes. To the extent possible, we want to maintain current capacity.

C: JR: We're all in agreement; the reason we're having traffic problems in the Seaport is because we haven't been building for transit, bicycles, and pedestrians. That's why in this context we want to build additional capacity for other modes.

- C: HM: I feel like the conversation is getting narrow. The spirit of the ABC Alternative brought a lot of benefits that need to be weighed. Can I get from the BU Bridge to New Balance in 3 minutes? You can't get from St. Paul Street to Babcock Street. This seems like a high life cycle cost over 75 years. We need to have a more balanced approach.
- C: TN: We started off with the goal to reduce cost, both the initial cost and long term cost. That way we could save money and invest in other accommodations throughout the project.⁵
- C: HM: The other side benefit is that the development potential of the project area is dramatically increased when we don't have tall hills and highways to go over with steep slopes.
- Q: GB: Can we go back to the way Question 5 is worded. In the course of discussing this, someone said that there would be a 16' impact. Is that literally over the water from the current shore of the riprap or is that including the 12' that is the riprap?
- A: EI: Each box is 2' and there are eight boxes. It's 16'.
- Q: GB: I think the answer to my question is that the plan is showing 9' over the river. Am I right or wrong? If you drew a vertical line from the edge of the riprap, how many feet over the water is that plan showing?
- A: EI: 18'.
- Q: GM: Where is this cross section?
- Q: AO: The MassDOT 3K Alternative shifts 5' towards BU. Does the ABC Alternative or mine shift the same?
- A: EI: Yes, it was a guiding principal.
- C: AO: There's been discussion of putting the multiuse path over SFR. This would provide great access to Agganis Way and BU.
- C: EI: This would be required if everything else was at-grade correct?
- A: AO: Yes, this is with ABC Alternative.
- C: GM: You'd still need a couple of feet at the narrowest section. Having a park on top of a freeway isn't necessarily a park but having a freeway on top of a park isn't necessarily a park either. I suggest we look at what it would mean to put the multiuse path over SFR. What would the expense be compared to a train or highway viaduct?

⁵ It is worth noting that if the project saves \$100 million for example, that money will not remain as part of this project available for amenities or improvements beyond what the job needs to function. It would instead be allocated to another project where funding is needed.

- C: EI: From a park standpoint, there are still shadowing impacts.
- C: GM: Unless you consider that drivers on SFR are park users. There would be more usable park which would have net benefits.
- Q: CC: We need to think about the safety considerations with that idea. What about emergency responders?
- Q: GM: If there was permeability it would be more accessible to Commonwealth Avenue. If there was an incident today on the Esplanade, how do you respond to it?
- A: MOD: If there's an incident on the Esplanade, SFR is right next to it.
- Q: GM: How does it work where SFR dips under Arlington Street?
- A: MOD: It's like a bridge, it drops below.
- Q: GB: The question is not about whether this is desirable or not, but whether MassDOT has asked this question. Under the MassDOT 3K Alternative, the red viaduct stays a viaduct east of the throat for the main reason of keeping access to Houghton Chemical. Under the Ari's plan, it also provides a viaduct to get access to Houghton Chemical. Has MassDOT asked Bruce Houghton to give up access and if so, what is the price?
- A: MOD: The simple answer is no. We have asked Bruce about the importance of maintaining rail pre, post, and during construction. It's always been his idea to keep his clients and he needs rail access to do that. There has been no discussion of cost because we haven't gotten past that first question.
- C: JR: It's a crucial phrasing of the question. An interruption could be damaging but maybe he could relocate to a new place. If he moved, it might cost less for the project. In the absence of any other options and as a tax payer, I would like to see that we explore that.
- C: MOD: I was hoping Bruce would make it today. Bruce has always told us he plans to conduct business beyond 2020. He has always told us he could not meet his demand without rail service because of the bulk volume he is able to transport with rail versus trucks.
- C: JR: I understand that and if I were Bruce I would hold a hard line on the necessity to keep that rail. What I'm saying is that it's not incumbent upon him. It's incumbent on us to find a better solution.
- C: MOD: Glen hit on a good point; is there a benefit? Let's assume we don't need to provide access to Bruce. Is there still a need for all of the other rail infrastructure to be elevated? The fact is yes and Greg and Mark have said that. We still need to maintain certain vertical clearances into the yard.
- C: JR: There are a million other impacts of the rail spur including land use impacts and at-grade crossings for the other spurs coming off SFR. You answered my question about the conversations that

have been held so far. What I'm asking is that we do some strategic thinking about what the other alternatives might be.

C: GB: Mike didn't label it but what he said refers to the MassDOT 3K Alternative, not the ABC Alternative. Under the ABC Alternative, all the fill could potentially go away. HNTB already said the ABC Alternative is the cheapest.

C: CC: But you lose yard access.

C: GB: You would never lose yard access if you provided it in an alternative way.

C: AO: You can provide access off of the Turnpike.

C: FS: To go back to Jim Gillooly's point of traffic on local streets. The bus I take every morning gets stuck in traffic, and it's going to get worse in the foreseeable future. The impact during construction will be most difficult. A constructability analysis is essential to get on the table. I would love to see more rail service but it won't be there in time. The Amateur Planner Alternative has big advantages such as less Section 4F impacts. The big ABC Alternative benefit is that it has the best constructability.

C: CC: I would respect that you reserve your judgment before you've seen our construction staging plans. We have an integrated solution with transit and the highway.

C: FS: That's good news to hear but it needs to be done in detail so people can judge it. The spirit of this is trying to make the plans as good as they can be. It needs to be on the table and it isn't now.

Q: HM: Could we talk about Question 8?⁶

C: JK: The options we've looked at include keeping the western end of the interstate higher for access to the existing tunnel to the yard. Another option is an access off-ramp system. We've looked at options to do that and they disturb the yard layout.

Q: JR: What about an access point off of the mainline that would go under the elevated ramps? It could be similar to the access off the BU Bridge today.

A: MS: The bottom line is that it takes capacity from the yard.

C: JR: No, it would be under the elevated portion.

C: GB: If the Governor asked you to save \$50 million by finding an alternative that provides access to their yard, I would bet you could find a way.

⁶ Are there other ways to reduce the difficulty and cost to relocation of the existing pump station and electrical substation? And how does this vary among the three alternatives?

- C: MOD: It's a great thought Jessica but the fact is the majority of maintenance crews wouldn't use that roadway. They would access the yard via Houghton Chemical or the Double Tree Hotel. We typically don't want our service crews coming on and off the Turnpike.
- Q: JR: I'm not trying to say I've thought of a brilliant solution but can we have a brainstorming approach to this where we work on all the options?
- C: HM: We're trying to find ways to put these two at-grade options in the best light. The gymnastics required to accommodate this access road and the Houghton Chemical spur are one of the biggest problems for these scenarios. To leave both of these in the plans is to leave them in a deeply flawed condition. Can you negotiate with Bruce?
- A: MOD: We're looking at ways to find other access points to the MBTA yard and Houghton Chemical. Unless there is agreement by Bruce or CSX, we have to keep it in.
- C: HM: We don't need to keep it in during the planning phase.
- C: MOD: I have asked Houghton Chemical if they would be open to losing their service. The last time I spoke with him, the answer was no. In fairness to Bruce, he is amenable to listening to what is the overall best solution for the project. We can go along with a planning exercise to see if there are other options but at this time, all the options reflect trying to maintain that access.
- C: HM: It's not a question of what Bruce and CSX are saying now. It's a question of whether we can draw this out without those two things in order to figure out how much money we could save.
- C: FS: We've focused on two at-grade alternatives but we're trying to make all three alternatives better. Better access to the yard makes all three alternatives better. The viaduct scheme is longer than it needs to be because of the access road which adversely affects the profiles. There's also a lot of cost associated with a driveway for MBTA workers. There may only be 100 employees. We're asking you to look at this for at-grade and viaduct.
- C: HM: I think we're in complete agreement.
- C: EI: MassDOT is a proponent and the author of the document. We think HNTB did a great job engineering the alternatives. We probably need to have another session as we didn't get through all of the questions. There's still the question of the pump station and that opens a new discussion that is too long for today.
- C: MOD: Sounds good, we can do the same time in two weeks. Nate and Nick will get back to you.
- C: EI: I have asked team members what their biggest concerns are particularly with the Amateur Alternative and somewhat with the ABC Alternative. It's a complicated issue but the need for pumping relating to groundwater is a major element that we didn't get to. It's a long discussion for both of the

at-grade alternatives because they actually below grade. There may be a significant cost associated with the water cycle pumping.

C: NCC: Mike will give me a date and we'll be in touch.

C: MOD: Thank you all for coming out.

Next Steps

At the conclusion of the meeting summarized herein, there were a number of questions outlined by ABC that were unable to be answered due to time. For this reason, MassDOT has scheduled a second workshop style task force session on February 24, 2016 at the Fiorentino Community Center located at 123 Antwerp Street, Allston in order to answer the remaining questions.

The next traditional task force meeting will be held at 6:00 PM on Thursday, March 10, 2016 at the Fiorentino Community Center. All task force sessions are open to the public.

Appendix 1: Meeting Attendees

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Greg	Boles	VHB
Gerald	Autler	Task Force Member
Joseph	Beggan	Task Force Member
Jorge	Briones	Task Force Member
Jim	Cerbone	MassDOT
Nick	Gross	HSH
John	Cusack	Carpenters L.U. #40
Donny	Dailey	MassDOT
Bill	Deignan	Task Force Member
Stacey	Donahoe	MassDOT
Paola	Ferrer	Task Force Member
Kate	Fichter	MassDOT
Joshua	Grzegorzewski	FHWA
Karl	Haglund	Task Force Member
Wendy	Landman	Task Force Member
Elizabeth	Leary	Task Force Member
Oscar	Lopez	Task Force Member
David	Loutzenheiser	Task Force Member
Wayne	Mackenzie	Task Force Member
Amy	Mahler	Task Force Member
Clancy	Main	Task Force Member
Harry	Mattison	Task Force Member
Galen	Mook	Task Force Member
Tom	Nally	Task Force Member
Paul	Nelson	Task Force Member
Ari	Ofsevit	Task Force Member
Jessica	Robertson	Task Force Member
John	Shield	Charles River Allianace
Mark	Shamon	VHB
Steve	Silveira	Task Force Member
Margaret	Van Deusen	Task Force Member
Josh	Weiland	BRA

Jack	Wofford	Community Member
Meredith	Avery	VHB
Don	Kinsvatter	Kleinfelder
Etty	Padmodipoetro	Urban Ideas Lab