



November 17, 2014

To: Mike O'Dowd
Allston I-90 Interchange Improvement Project
Project Manager

From: Nathaniel Curtis
Howard/Stein-Hudson
Public Involvement Specialist

RE: **MassDOT Highway Division
Allston I-90 Interchange Improvement Project
10th Taskforce Meeting
Meeting Notes of November 5, 2014**

Overview

On November 5, 2014 the Allston Interchange Improvement Project taskforce held its tenth meeting. The taskforce is composed of local residents, business owners, transportation and green space advocates as well as representatives of local, State and Federal governments. The purpose of the taskforce is, through the application of members' in-depth local knowledge, to assist and advise MassDOT in developing an implementable design for the reconstruction of the I-90 Allston Interchange, the Allston viaduct and Cambridge Street in the vicinity of the interchange. The chance to reconfigure the interchange has emerged through the opportunities presented by the implementation of All Electric Tolling (AET) and the structural deficiency of the I-90 Allston viaduct. MassDOT sees the project not only as an opportunity to improve safety and connections for all modes of travel in the area around the interchange, particularly along Cambridge Street which has been noted by local resident as dangerous and acting as a barrier between Allston and the Charles River. Another major goal of the Allston Interchange project is to build the new West Station, a new station to serve the Allston community, in the old Beacon Park Yard while providing the commuter rail conditions necessary for the expansion of South Station and the eventual the inauguration of Diesel Multiple Unit (DMU) service along the Grand Junction line from Allston to Cambridge and Somerville.

The meeting summarized herein primarily addressed the filing and contents of the Environmental Notification Form (ENF) with Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA). The ENF was filed on October 31st and will have an extended comment period ending on December 15th. A site walk and public hearing will be held on November 20th as part of the MEPA process under the Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs (EEOEA). The central theme of the meeting was one of concern regarding the project's future, not only in light of the inauguration of a new gubernatorial administration, but also in terms of whether a taskforce will continue to operate in the design phase, and how elements near and dear to the community, but not required for the filing of the ENF, will be addressed by the design period.

Generally speaking, MassDOT sees the I-90 Allston Interchange project as a unified effort and that the project makes far better sense as a multimodal package as opposed to the "no-build" option outlined in the ENF which would address only the structurally deficient viaduct. As has been noted herein and elsewhere, MassDOT sees the "no-build" option was *for comparison purposes only*. The agency remains committed to addressing design details, for example the exact location of the new bicycle and pedestrian bridge to the Paul Dudley White path, in the project's next phase. With regard to continuation of a taskforce, MassDOT is committed to maintaining some taskforce like structure in the design period. Whether it will be called a taskforce, working group, advisory committee, or something else will be decided after ENF comments have been received and processed. Additionally, the composition of such a group remains to be seen, however it

is most likely that it will be a reduced version of the currently existing body without substantial injections of new members if at all.

Detailed Meeting Minutes¹

Opening Remarks

- C: Ed Ionata (EI): Good evening everyone. I would like to start tonight off by saying there has been a tremendous impact and influence by the taskforce on this project. Tonight we will be reviewing the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) filing. There are CD copies of the MEPA Environmental Notification Form (ENF) available and it will be posted on the MassDOT project website shortly². Let's begin the agenda; I believe we are all caught up with meeting minutes and materials.
- A: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis (NCC): We are just about up to date with the posting of minutes. The September public information meeting minutes are now posted. The October 1st and October 15th meeting minutes have also been posted. We are pretty well all fixed up.
- C: EI: I forgot to introduce myself; I am Ed Ionata from TetraTech. I notice a few faces here tonight that I don't think I've seen here before so we will be sure to introduce ourselves as we come up to present. We'll go into the ENF distribution in more detail later but the short story is that it was filed with MEPA on October 31st and it was posted in the environmental monitor today. I'm going to pass it off to Mike O'Dowd, project manager to tell you about some meetings that have taken place outside of the taskforce sessions.
- C: Mike O'Dowd (MOD): Good evening everybody, thank you all for coming out. I wanted to give you all a sense of what we have been up to for the past two weeks. I have received comments addressing the difficulty of accessing the project website through the MassDOT site. Is anyone still having that issue? No, all right, that's good. One of the things that you asked of us was to have a sit down conversation with the Boston Society of Architects (BSA) and Tim Love. We have done that and we had a great meeting. We were presented an abbreviated session of the initial BSA charrette by Tim Love and I am happy to relay to you that there were a lot of common themes that the BSA team and our team are bringing to the project. There were something's that the BSA was not aware of and about which we needed to let them know. They had a lot of good ideas with regard to the placement of Stadium Way and other proposed roads. One element that the BSA looked at in detail and that we didn't get to discuss was storm water control. As we move forward we will work with them to cover this topic.

In addition to meeting with the BSA we've been meeting with Commissioner Gillooly at the Boston Transportation Department (BTD), Kairos Shen at the Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA) and the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) in coordination with West Station. Access to and from West Station continues to be a discussion along with a north to south connection over the Rail Yard. One thing I want to reiterate and something that we are creating is a pedestrian and bicycle connection from the Commonwealth Avenue side of the Rail Yard to Cambridge Street. Throughout the process of the taskforce we have been working to maintain the list of shared-goals and objectives that we created early on in the taskforce process. We want to positively address congestion in Allston and we will continue to work that into the project for the future. We've also been meeting with the Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS) and Scott Peterson who came to an earlier taskforce session and has continued to develop the base model for the project area. CTPS is now in the process of finalizing that and their also assisting us by modeling future conditions for 2035.

¹ 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.

² This file can be downloaded at

<http://www.massdot.state.ma.us/highway/HighlightedProjects/AllstonI90InterchangeImprovementProject/Documents.aspx>.

As it stands, our traffic analysis is preliminary but it will become finalized as we move forward with actual numbers relative to the region. There was a great discussion at the last taskforce session as to whether Babcock Street and Malvern Street are the best access points to West Station. We have been in touch with Boston University (BU) and we are planning to have a site walk with them on the Commonwealth Avenue side. The exact details of the access points have not been nailed down and we have left it that way in the ENF. The ENF probably doesn't get into the level of detail you want to see and we know that. I don't want you to think we have a final design developed; we're trying to present to you the impacts of each alternative.

I also met with the Allston-Brighton Transportation Management Association (TMA) and we will be coordinating with them to best work through the construction impacts in the future. The Allston-Brighton TMA has been onboard since early on and we will continue to work with them as we move forwards. If there are any questions on the ENF please call us or email us. It's out for a 20 day comment period and November 25th is the last day of the comment period. I believe the Secretary's comment scope is sometime in December.³

C: El: Thanks Mike. Joe is now going to run you through what is in the ENF. I think this will be more of a review for most of you. All the items we said would be in there are in there.

Discussion of the Environmental Notification Form

C: Joe Freeman (JF): Good evening. I'm Joe Freeman. We filed the ENF with MEPA last Friday; Happy Halloween. The public notice for the environmental review is a legal requirement. It has been published in multiple papers. It's a notice that says the ENF has been filed and it's in the comment review period. It runs 20 days from now until November 25th and we're waiting to finalize the details with the MEPA analyst. We don't have the exact details but we do know that we will be convening at the Brighton High School on November 20th. It is a standard review and the intent is to identify the issues that should be in the ENF report. The document that is issued will have the scope of the project. MEPA has deadlines and they meet their deadlines. The project exceeds the mandatory Environmental Impact Report (EIR) threshold. The EIR is required by regulations. There are seven attachments for which MEPA calls. Attachment 8 is a table and a figure that covers hazardous materials. Attachment 9 is the biggest attachment and it's a description of all alternatives including our preliminary screening. Attachment 10 is a summary of public involvement that we've done to date. The ENF outlines what we have been doing over the past few months and how we got to where we are now. We have settled on 3 options; 3J-1, 3J-2 and 3J-3. We have not identified a preferred alternative but we have identified a preferred concept. The shared-use path is included and we are including the realignment of Soldiers Field Road (SFR) to accommodate the pedestrian and bicycle bridge.

These are the alternatives we are showing in the ENF. West Station is included however there is not a lot of information or advancement in designs. The ENF contents for West Station will include two tracks with 4 platforms, a bus loop on the viaduct, bicycle and pedestrian access north and south, a bicycle and pedestrian connection from Babcock Street with access to the Paul Dudley White Path, design development to consider feasibility of a two-way bus loop, and an accommodation for potential Diesel Multiple Units (DMU) service to North Station along the Grand Junction Line. We have covered the layover yard and we will continue to develop that configuration of that space. There is a need for layover capacity and it includes operational support, train-car wash, quarters for crew members and a noise barrier along the south side of the railroad tracks. We will be doing an assessment and looking at it through the draft EIR. This is the figure we have shown in the ENF. We also covered the configuration and look of Cambridge Street and potential future designs of it. In terms of bicycle and pedestrian accommodations we will be looking at segments south of Cambridge Street, connections to West Station, a shared-use path connection from Cambridge Street and Lincoln Street to the Charles River and Paul

³ Since this meeting took place, the comment period was extended to the close of business on December 15th, 2014.

Dudley White Path, a new bicycle and pedestrian bridge over Soldiers Field Road, and the replacement of the Lincoln Street pedestrian bridge over I-90.

This is all in the ENF and we've talked about the design alternatives for Cambridge Street. It is a MEPA and NEPA requirement to have a no-build alternative in the ENF so we have included that as well. We don't see the no-build alternative as a good choice or something we'd want to do, but we must have one and this is how it would look. The toll plazas will be removed and All Electronic Tolling (AET) will be installed. We will be narrowing the toll plaza to 4 lanes using Jersey barriers. I should also note that under the no-build scenario West Station, a second track along the Grand Junction Line, the shared-use path, and the multimodal enhancements would not happen. There would also be no highway noise mitigation and the commuter rail layover area would not be constructed.

As I mentioned earlier we have also included a strong outline of the public outreach efforts including all the meetings we've held and acknowledgement of the taskforce input in the development of the conceptual alternatives. It is obvious that we would not be where we are today without the input from the taskforce. The timeline going forward will mostly cover environmental filings and the preliminary design. We'll be starting work on the EA and combining it with the Draft Environmental Impact Report (DEIR). This document will include everything in the Secretary's and MEPA scope. It will also include detailed responses to all public comments received. The document won't be released to the public for review until the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) feels like we've answered the questions adequately. Once the DEIR and EA are issued for comment we are going to be in the third quarter of next year. Under NEPA we expect FHWA to issue a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI). If that happens we will be complete with the MEPA process and the Secretary will issue a certificate. Filing the comments received is important for us. One favor that I would like to ask from you is to send us a copy of your comments to Jim Cerbone.

Q: Name Not Given (NNG): How many pages is the ENF?

A: JF: It's approximately 125 pages.

C: Glen Berkowitz (GB): The PDF says it's 175.

A: JF: It is 125 pages of text and about 50 pages of images.

Q: El: Nate, do you have an estimate on when the ENF will be accessible and able to be posted to the website?

A: NCC: I expect early next week.

C: El: Joe touched on the concept of an expanded ENF. There is a lot of additional and supplemental information in the ENF. We wanted to maintain the normal MEPA process and we see the importance of having a DEIR. It is in no means an attempt to shorten or lessen the detail of the MEPA process. We want to let people know how we got to the point we are at not.

C: NNG: I would like to have a discussion on highway noise. This is the main impact on the neighborhood and we should have a discussion about it.

A: JF: We intend to have a discussion on noise mitigation and we will be looking at that in part with the DEIR.

A: El: It's also a State and Federal requirement. You get the benefit of 2 different noise requirements; both rail and vehicular. There will be a lot of noise analysis. Before Chris comes up, we heard a question about priorities in the design phase and if our process will be impacted in the MEPA scope. We need to find a scope and a good sketch of how we will go forward.

Elements to be addressed during the Design Phase

C: Chris Calnan (CC): Good evening everybody. As Ed mentioned we have a list of elements that we plan to address in the next phase of the project. The list you see in front of you is the exact list that will be incorporated into the ENF filing. We've talked about the shared-use path and the pedestrian bridge over SFR. Each element is listed in the ENF and we will be investing each further as we move into the EIR. We have decided on the 3J series and each concept really depends on the one or two-way parallel streets. West Station came a little late to the game so we will need to play a bit of catch up there.

The viaduct configuration needs a lot of work. We also need to further evaluate the approach roadways in terms of noise and air quality. Storm water treatment will be an important element as we move forward with the construction staging. Up until now we've used CTPS data. Once we get their finished model we'll be able to plug in our alternatives and see how everything works. Mike mentioned switching East Drive and Stadium Way. The viaduct needs further refinement and the configuration needs to be worked out. The staging of the viaduct is extremely important and presents a host of challenges. We are looking at a two track Grand Junction Line crossing and not precluding it in the future. We have some catch up work to do with the rail yard and West Station. We will be doing an operational analysis for West Station. We will also be looking at the connections from the south side of the Rail Yard over to the north for pedestrians and cyclist. These are the types of items we will be focusing on over the next 9 to 12 months.

Q: Matthew Danish (MD): I recently read the EIR for the South Station Expansion project and there is mention of the Beacon Park Rail Yard. It is described as an ex-industrial rail yard and there is no mention of the Allston I-90 Interchange Project. I think there needs to be better coordination between the two projects. How can the South Station Expansion file their EEIR and not mention this project?

A: JF: The team for the South Station Expansion Project has been working extremely hard. The Beacon Rail Yard and West Station have been added to the scope of this project very recently. Any further analysis of the rail yard layover area will be included in our project's EIR.

Discussion of Design Period Public Involvement

C: NCC: I'm going to briefly discuss the future plans for the public involvement effort in the design phase. We will have the quarterly public information meetings as Mike mentioned earlier. We've spent a lot of time in Allston which is nice, but we feel it's appropriate to do at least one meeting in MetroWest, maybe Framingham, for users of the Turnpike. We agree that community briefings and presentations amongst small groups will be beneficial. We are happy to make staff available to go out in the neighborhood and give briefings. We will continue to document all meetings and keep the project files available online. The website will continue to be updated and as always, any documents that are presented will make their way to the project website.

C: Jessica Robertson (JR): There was a strong intention voiced by us at the last taskforce meeting to figure out if we will continue having taskforce sessions. You told us you would talk with MassDOT officials regarding our interest in continuing the taskforce and it sounds that you may have not had that conversation.

A: MOD: MassDOT is supportive of what we have discussed and what has come from the taskforce up to this point. We know there is a need to hold additional quarterly public meetings and we will be asking to sit down with many of you to continue our conversation. We will be communicating with you as we do our noise analysis and other reports. When it comes time we will walk you through the traffic analysis and the design of West Station including the layover area, connections to the Station and construction staging. Urban planning and landscaping is going to be important. We are bringing an urban planner on board for the design phase. At a minimum, we will sit down with you at least 6 times.

Q: JR: Why wasn't that in your presentation?

A: MOD: It wasn't in the presentation probably because I didn't give it to the team to put in there.

Q: GB: To follow up on Jessica's question, this is a big document. We may be missing something when we skim through it. I don't see any language that says you are committing to future taskforce meetings. The question on the table is, how does one get the commitment in the ENF? Do you agree that you don't say it?

A: El: Absolutely, we do not say it.

C: GB: Could you help us understand why?

A: El: The formal makeup of a taskforce is still a little uncertain. The secretary of environmental affairs may respond and say that it should continue. We will have a new governor and new appointed officials in the near future. It's difficult to commit to a titled membership until we get some reaction from MEPA and the upper levels at MassDOT.

C: Bruce Houghton (BH): I always feel like I have an answer from you, but I don't think I do.

A: El: The bottom line is that the people in this room don't get to make the decision.

C: JR: This is the same discussion we had at the last meeting. You said you were going to take the conversation back to your people and give us an answer.

A: MOD: Whether we have a taskforce, advisory committee, or a stakeholder group, we can't continue to have a 52 member taskforce group. My suggestion is to try to reduce it and carry forward a smaller group. If individuals want to participate you can. We will be discussing it further at MassDOT, but right now we don't have a decision made. We'll be sitting down with the Secretary and the Chief Engineer. Whatever the case may be, it is our intent to account for all viewpoints.

Q: BH: Will the future meetings be open to the public?

A: MOD: Yes. The public is never restricted from attending taskforce meetings. It was brought to our attention that the taskforce meetings were not being advertised early on, and we have made sure that they are now.

C: BH: It may be helpful if you tell us that you will be suggesting that this committee will be reconstituted when you have that conversation. I agree, I'm not sure if a 52 person taskforce group is the best way to move forward but I'm also not sure if the size of the committee matters. If I understand what you are talking about it sounds like you are in favor of reconstituting a smaller group. This group feels like we've spent a lot of time here and there are still items left on the wall. The important issues to this community are still up in the air. If you're really going to reconstitute a group and want people here to feel more comfortable I think you need to clarify that and not use the cautious wording you have been using. I also think holding meeting further west than Allston may not be a great idea. People that commute through Allston to work don't want a small highway, I'm sure they would rather see a 20 lane highway. This community wants to know how you're going to integrate their concerns and report back those concerns.

A: MOD: I don't think you'll see any new individuals. What we need to look at is the same thing we started out looking at when we turned down this road. I was hopeful that a lot of the information that has been discussed here would be communicated to each of your represented groups. I have received a lot of questions and comments from the general public that made it seem to me that some members of the taskforce were not disseminating information to their represented constituency. That's neither here nor there, but where I do think we all agree is that we can't keep up with a 2 week meeting schedule. We are looking at something more like an 8 week schedule along with quarterly public information

meetings. There won't be new faces in the taskforce group, it will be the same faces but probably not all the same faces. As I said, it is open to the public and you are all welcome to attend. That's where we're going to want to focus the attention moving forward. Hopefully I'm not being invasive with my comments.

- C: GM: To throw it out there, we are disappointed that you took our feedback and didn't add it into the ENF. No hands went up about not continuing the taskforce force. We asked you very clearly to put this in the ENF. I'm disheartened about this up in the air-ness. We wanted to end today with something concrete and we're not getting that. When you were going through the list of what will be included in the future phase I counted 17 design elements that we wanted to see that aren't in the ENF. You're telling us that you're going to be designing it and you're going to be holding meetings but we want to be part of that collaboration.
- A: MOD: I understand.
- Q: GM: I have a question for Senator Brownsberger and Councilor Ciommo. I'm wondering what Mayor Walsh would want us to do? Should we advocate and ask our elected officials to help us? What do you think Secretary Davey or soon-to-be Governor Baker would want?
- C: Anthony D'Isidoro (AD): Yesterday was not a very good day for public transportation in Massachusetts. The changes that are taking place in Washington and Question 1 going down are not helping. Transportation funding is a serious issue that needs to be addressed. We have a new governor that does not support raising taxes. My big concern is here is the no-build option. We have limited funds and those funds will be used to fix the viaduct. In terms of the process, what is the status for the funding for this project? Has it been secured, is there a possibility that the new administration could come in and change what the taskforce has been working to do?
- A: Senator William Brownsberger (WB): The administration has huge discretion with regard to what projects they fund and the shape in which they fund them. I think it is very important to engage with the next administration and advocate for this project; it's something that we're going to have to do together.
- Q: AD: Are you saying that the red flag is up and the community needs to organize itself and push this project onto the new administration?
- A: WB: I wouldn't want to imply that I have any feeling that they will. I think this project has huge benefits for the community, local institutions, and transportation. I think in general it has to be done. I think we have a lot of momentum, but we shouldn't take anything for granted.
- C: MOD: To follow up on what the Senator said, there is 160 million dollars that has been allocated to the viaduct and the replacement of the viaduct. The funds have not been, to my knowledge allocated for the Beacon Park Yard and West Station. In addition to that the improvements on Cambridge Street and the bicycle and pedestrian accommodations throughout the project area would not be in either. We have to move forward and we have to show you what the no-build scenario would be, it's standard in any ENF document.
- Q: AD: Is that part of the equation? The fact that you don't know what will happen at MassDOT over the next several weeks?
- A: MOD: I can't say for certainty what could transpire over the next several weeks or several months.
- C: WB: I think you can expect the next administration to take a review of the priorities the outgoing administration has set. Nothing is set in stone until it goes out to bid and we are still 3 years away from that.

- Q: AD: In terms of the viaduct, do you feel that the structure is on solid ground in terms of funding because of the safety issue?
- A: MOD: I think we can certainly say there is a need to ensure safety on the viaduct.
- Q: AD: Are you saying that we should really start lobbying for the additional things we've been talking about during these taskforce sessions?
- A: MOD: I wouldn't discourage it.
- Q: GM: I'd like to rephrase what I was trying to say before. We're now at the end of the taskforce process, what do you think the Mayor would want the taskforce to be like in the next phase in terms of community involvement?
- A: Councilor Mark Ciommo (MC): The fact that Jim is a major part of the Mayor's operation and sits on the taskforce really shows how important this project is to Mayor Walsh and to the City of Boston.
- A: Commissioner Jim Gillooly (JG): Mayor Walsh is very committed to robust involvement. From a practical point of view there are going to be additional parties that are interested in this moving forward and there are going to be folks in this room that move away. To say that this is the group that is going to work all the way through is impractical. We're going to raise the flag if there isn't sufficient public involvement but we don't think we will have to do that.
- C: Alana Olsen (AO): You just said some things that I wish I could say as a community member; you're going to have meetings with MassDOT in coordination with the City.
- A: JG: We don't have the capacity in Government to meet with every project in the way that we have been on this project. This taskforce has convinced me of a lot of things I wasn't considering before entering this room. There is a life cycle to this project and I would say that I've got a relationship with MassDOT that I find very trustworthy. The Highway has to run through this area and there are a lot of economic issues that have to be balanced. I want to reassure you that Mayor Walsh is behind a robust community engagement process. I want to ask you all to have more trust in MassDOT and a little compassion for Mike's team.
- C: Marc Kadish (MK): The Commonwealth Avenue Project is happening. Certain stops on the Green Line are going to be eliminated. I think it makes a lot of sense to consider which stops are eliminated in relation to the proposed access points from Commonwealth Avenue to West Station.
- A: El: I've worked on a lot of monster projects that have gone through changes in the administration. The good thing here is that we have a MEPA filing and we have a relatively defined concept that will have a MEPA scope. This is a great target to move forward with on a project like this one.
- C: AD: When this project was put together the talk I heard was that it was going to be put on the fast track. The intention was to try to get as much done as quickly as possible. I hope this project is far enough down the road at this point so we don't lose the work we've accomplished so far. We need to make sure this project doesn't get reduced down to the replacement of the viaduct.
- A: MOD: I have drafted appropriate language considering a change in the administration relative to the scope of work we have been doing over the last 6 months.
- C: JR: The reason all of us keep going back to the same point is because all of the things we find most important are pieces that are not in the MEPA document. Those things are not set in stone and we are going to need help from our elected officials to reassure us they will be in the project scope. The items we care about are already the most easily rolled back aspects to any project. This is where we need your help carrying our priorities forward.

- C: WB: I think that's what we want to do: it is a positive advocacy mission. We want to move it across the ultimate goal line and work to make sure the funds are there to support the scope of this project.
- C: GB: I want to try to integrate some things that were said in the past 35 minutes. Will the taskforce continue to meet? I don't think any of us want to meet every 2 weeks for the next 6 months but I also don't see something that's broken. There are 30 dedicated taskforce members here in a taskforce of over 50. You have taskforce members here because they care and because they live here. I don't see why anyone wouldn't want this to continue. The list you have on page 7 of the ENF has 19 items that still need to be worked through. You have admitted you haven't given us design details; who better to help you than the very people who brought them to your attention. Why would you not commit to continuing this group?
- A: MOD: You just repeated what I said earlier, it would be a more reduced body.
- C: GB: No one thinks we should continue at this rate but I don't think anyone amongst us feels that we shouldn't continue this.
- A: MOD: I've said that the time period at which we meet is more likely to be closer to an 8 week timeframe.
- Q: GB: That's cool Mike, but many of us were hoping that you were going to talk to your people at 10 Park Plaza and incorporate language in the ENF regarding the continuation of a taskforce. Does MassDOT agree to continue the taskforce at a greatly reduced schedule?
- A: MOD: Yes, that is why I mentioned it here tonight. We see a need and we are committed to continue the coordination meetings.
- C: GB: I'm going to check with my language interpreter, Bruce?
- C: BH: Are those people in this room? If you look at your attendance record will the people who have been committed to this taskforce continue? I guess the worry is that there will be people who are not committed that will continue as the taskforce representatives.
- A: MOD: I would expect the people who have shown strong attendance and commitment will continue.
- C: BH: I think I have an answer, let's move on.
- Q: Tom Nally (TN): There are several ways we can get active. As we prepare our comments to MEPA should we consider a citizens advisory committee? That might reinforce the need for MEPA.
- Q: GM: Is the I-90 overpass on Cambridge Street under consideration to be reconstructed?
- A: MOD: There are two alternatives to the Cambridge Street overpass in the ENF. One would replace it entirely and one would preserve it.
- Q: GM: Does it all depend on the pillars?
- A: MOD: Not only that, but it also considers the proposed access points. It demands 2 lanes on the overpass. We don't want the piers to become a pinch point.
- Q: GM: Do you have a price estimate?
- A: MOD: Not at this time, no.

- Q: HM: Mike, regarding the 17 unknown items, is there a work plan as to how they get resolved over the next months?
- A: MOD: There are a lot of things we need to look once we start doing the environmental impact analysis to ensure that we are moving forward with an alternative that has the least environmental impact. We'll be presenting to you the alternatives we have further advanced when we meet on that for the future coordination meetings. I can't give you a list of order for each of the 17 elements.
- C: HM: You must have some idea. Maybe the Franklin Street footbridge won't get figured out until August and the access to West Station will get worked out in April?
- A: MOD: We are developing a schedule and a timeframe for each of the critical elements and when they will be developed.
- C: HM: If you would share it with us when we are done I guess that would satisfy us.
- A: MOD: I anticipate that we will go out to the public in January. I hope there will be several dozen comments on the ENF. When we meet we will be in a better position to talk about the scheduling of the critical elements.
- Q: HM: Is that we us or is that we as in the public?
- A: MOD: That is we as in the public.
- C: HM: Okay, so your message is, chill out for 2 months and you'll develop a plan. Then we come back and try to better discuss this?
- A: MOD: That is exactly what I'm saying.
- C: El: With that, I'll call it a night. Thank you everybody.

Next Steps

The project's MEPA scoping session will take place at **6PM on Thursday November 20th at the Brighton High School**. The Brighton High School is located at 25 Warren Street in Brighton. A site walk with MEPA personnel is scheduled for 3PM at the Lincoln Street entrance to the Beacon Park Rail Yard.

Appendix 1: Meeting Attendees

First Name	Last Name	Affiliation
Jo-Ann	Bakbour	Charlesview, Inc.
Joseph	Beggan	Taskforce Member
Glen	Berkowitz	Taskforce Member
Marini	Christine	Boston Police Department
Mark	Ciommo	Taskforce Member
Jim	Curley	Taskforce Member
Anthony	D'Isidoro	Taskforce Member
Matthew	Danish	Taskforce Member
Bill	Deignan	Taskforce Member
Stacey	Donahoe	MassDOT
John	Fallon	MassDOT
James	Gillooly	Taskforce Member
David	Grissino	Boston Redevelopment Authority
Barbara	Jacobson	Taskforce Member
Marc	Kadish	Taskforce Member
Erin	Kinadam	MassDOT
John	Laadt	Taskforce Member
Elizabeth	Leary	Taskforce Member
Joseph	Levenduskey	Watertown Transit Taskforce
Aleksandar	Loncarevic	TetraTech
David	Loutzenheiser	Taskforce Member
Wayne	MacKenzie	Taskforce Member
Mary	Maguire	Taskforce Member
Frank	Mahady	FXM Associates
Christina	Marin	Community Resident
Harry	Mattison	Taskforce Member
Ian	McKinnon	TetraTech
Galen	Mook	Taskforce Member
Tom	Nally	Taskforce Member
Paul	Nelson	Taskforce Member
Alana	Olsen	Taskforce Member
Jessica	Robertson	Taskforce Member
Ben	Rouvalis	Community Resident
Steve	Silveira	Taskforce Member
Bob	Sloan	Walk Boston
Christine	Spont	Community Resident
Dianne	Tsitsos	FXM Associates

Appendix 2: Meeting Flipcharts⁴

Chart 1:

EEA #15278 Comment Deadline 11/25

Q: How Many papers in ENF?

A: Approximately 125 of text, approximately 170 with figures.

A: Lots of supplement info in the ENF. Likely to get lots of comments. ENF filed such to maintain normal MEPA process and not short change.

C: Want to catch noise walls along highway early, especially with northwest wind.

A: Will be part of analysis. Doing hybrid rail and roadway analysis.

A: Also a requirement of MEPA and FHWA

Chart 2:

Q: DEIR for South Station expansion mentions Beacon Park as layover. But Allston I-90 not mentioned. Railroad parcel not as isolated as thin document says. Want coordination.

A: Working hard over last 6 months. The Allston piece is recent addition. All future analysis of railroad facilities will be part of I-90 reports. Will be drawn in.

Q: Very strong sentiment regarding taskforce numbers, any progress.

A: DOT management supportive of ongoing taskforce. We foresee in between quantity public meetings looking to sit down with taskforce on issues such as noise. Talk about the science there with noise engineer. Walk you through traffic. Talk more on railroad issue and connections:

- Local street design.
- Construction staging.
- Urban planning and landscaping.

Chart 3:

A: Minimum of six addition taskforce meetings beyond what is on slide.

Q: Big document, we may miss things. See no language where we commit to more taskforce sessions in ENF. How can it get into ENF? Do you agree you don't say it (yes)?

A: At time of writing formal makeup and name of future taskforce a bit fluid. Section of EEOEA may confirm this, may not, we'll see. Hard to commit to exact title and composition.

C: Feel like there is an answer here.

A: Still needs some more progress at DOT.

⁴ To increase accessibility to this document for the visually impaired, transcriptions of the meeting flipcharts have been presented rather than photographs of the charts produced at the meeting. Images of these charts have been made and may be had upon request.

A: See importance of an advisory committee whether it's called taskforce or stakeholder committee or something else. This group may be too large for design. Not fully prepared. Will keep discussing it with Secretary and Chief Engineer.

Chart 4:

Q: These are public sessions.

A: Yes. Will continue to be posted.

C: Not sure whether size of committee is huge issue if you will reconstitute us in some form it would be nice to say it, it would also be nice if for approval you feed in this can be a timetable, where meets would be appropriate relative to approvals. Our important issues are still up in there. Some clarity and not careful wording. This community wants to know how its concerns will be dropped into this.

A: Won't see new individuals. Want consistent representation on taskforce. So members asked you all to participate and push data to represented groups. If we get smaller groups, need to get information pushed out. Not new faces, maybe half. Not my decision but will be based in part on ENF comments.

Chart 5:

C: Disappointed about taskforce feedback. Asked you clearly to codify process in ENF. Disheartened to see up in the airiness. Wanted in promise. Counted 17 design elements left to be discussed. Your approach is too defensive. Want to be in on the design. Questions for local elected, forged this with your advocacy. What do you think Walsh or DePaola would want?

C: Tough day yesterday for public transportation, yes on Question 1. Transportation finding a real issue with no new taxes. My concern is that we will wind up with no build option under Baker. My question is what is status for funding? Open to debate and could Baker undo our input?

A: (Will Brownsberger): Legislature earmark funds but administration funds within broad categories.

Q: So community needs to advocate because Baker will hurt us.

A: Lots of momentum, but don't take things for granted.

Chart 6:

A: MOD: \$160 million allocated towards viaduct due to safety issue. Funds not allocated for West Station and Cambridge Street. We have to show you no-build it's proforma. No-build not practical here. Write in comments supporting this.

Q: So are you unclear on next few months?

A: Next administration will review priorities, we hope they respect.

Q: But you are sure on viaduct.

A: Can demonstrate the need.

Q: And on community should lobby for this?

A: Wouldn't say no to it.

Q: What do you (elected) feel is right next.

A: Mayor sees this as important. BRA and BTM in the room. Mayor heavily invested in community preferences.

A: Mayor is committed. Respect MassDOT's position. C/AT always had to hedge. To say this is the group is impractical. We'll raise the flag if we see insufficient public process. Don't have capacity to stay with you each step of the way.

Chart 7:

A: Continued: Project well teed up. Phases are not always the same. MOD and crew very trustworthy. There will be charrette moments, but City's agenda points are adopted. About the community process of balancing. Walsh behind robust involvement. Have compassion and trust with MOD. Will be reading PNF, will be gaps of time where you don't see us. Still must be robust.

C: Commonwealth Avenue beautification and stop consolidation. Make sense to not eliminate green line stops. Align to West Station.

A: MBTA very clean plan. Platforms now at center of block, just right or left turns. Just reducing trolley headways.

C: Our Elected Officials need to push beyond just replacing the viaduct.

A: Worked on lots of big projects. Defined concept and project with MEPA scope is good. Schedule and yes it worked out well. Your MEPA unit knows this job.

Chart 8:

C: My concern is making sure the project doesn't reduce down.

A: DOT must put together transition documents on this. Relative to overall benefit of the project. This is ID'ed in expanded form.

C: Reasons we all keep coming back to this is all community benefits are on the TBD list, that's where we need your help. Those are the "add-ons" to cut. We need your help there.

A: That's our dual role. Want the project moving forward. In terms of taskforce, DOT team has good faith. Please support them on this.

C: Based on last 33 minutes on taskforce continued, don't think any of us want to meet every two weeks, what's against meeting every 2 months? This isn't broken; generally it works from City to community to consultant and community leaders. Your list on page 7 is the things we care most about. Who better to help you work through that than us? Seems like a waste of time. What are we debating? We can have new members.

Chart 9:

A: You said 30 actively engaged members, you said reduced. The interval is more in the 8 week time frame.

C: We want to see the sentence on a continued taskforce. Does DOT agree to that?

A: I agree to it. I am committed to continuing to have your input over and above public meetings.

Q: If you looked at the attendance record, they're committed; will these people get to stay in?

A: I would expect so.

C: Suggest that as we prepare MEPA comments, we emphasize the need for a taskforce to keep meeting. That's an option.

C: Bottom line for me is Pratt Street noise wall.

Q: Is I-90 overpass on Cambridge Street (for cars) under consideration for full replacement?

A: 2 alternatives. One for full replacement, one with retaining structure. It's about Cambridge Street access and pinch points of piers.

Q: Cost?

A: Unsure.

Chart 10:

Q: Is there a work plan on these pieces?

A: Different levels of completeness. In future sessions with you, will present those elements we are advancing. Maybe traffic ahead of noise. Traffic from CTPS in next few weeks. Can't say which piece first but all of them.

C: But you must have some idea.

A: Developing critical path schedule. CC still working it. I will share that with you early in the New Year after we review comments from MEPA.

Appendix 3: Comments Received

Good Afternoon All,

I hope this note finds everyone well and having a good day. I look forward to seeing everyone this evening at 6PM at the Fiorentino Center.

While we intend to distribute copies of the ENF to our taskforce membership in either hard copy or CD, depending on the preferences you have indicated to me over the past week or so, for anyone looking for a quick downloadable copy, we have made the following link available:
<https://dl.dropboxusercontent.com/u/65597439/I-90AllstonENFcomplete-FINAL.pdf>.

Regards & Good Wishes,
-Nate

Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis

Transportation Planner, Public Involvement Specialist, Associate

Howard/Stein-Hudson Associates, Inc.

11 Beacon Street, Suite 1010

Boston, MA 02108

direct: 617.348.3336 **main:** 617-482-7080

www.hshassoc.com

- Transportation Planning
- Traffic Engineering
- Civil Engineering
- Public Involvement/Strategic Planning

Please Note Our New Address

Good Evening Harry,

I welcome Elizabeth Leary as I do with all participants to speak actively about the project or to clarify any responses to questions that you or other Task Force members may have if she so wishes. With regard to your inquiry relative to the financial contributions that Boston University may or may not be making to the cost of construction for West Station, I can report that there are ongoing discussions being held with our Secretary and the B.U. Administration. If you have any further questions, I will be happy to address them tomorrow night.

Thanks
Mike O'D

From: Harry Mattison [mailto:h[REDACTED]]
Sent: Tuesday, November 04, 2014 4:08 PM
To: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis
Cc: erleary@bu.edu; Ed Ionata; O'Dowd, Michael (DOT)
Subject: Re: BU response re West Station at Nov 5 meeting

Hi Nate,

In the agenda you just sent for tomorrow's meeting, is this the section during which BU will answer the questions from our last meeting regarding financial contribution to the construction of West Station?

"Update on Meetings with Government Entities and Stakeholders"

Thanks
Harry

On Tue, Oct 28, 2014 at 2:03 PM, Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis <ncabral-curtis@hshassoc.com> wrote:

Good Afternoon Harry,

I hope this note finds you well and having a good day. I'm in receipt of your note and will make inquiries on the topic.

Regards & Good Wishes,

-Nate

From: Harry Mattison [mailto:h[REDACTED]]
Sent: Tuesday, October 28, 2014 10:37 AM
To: erleary@bu.edu; Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis
Subject: BU response re West Station at Nov 5 meeting

Hi Nate,

Could you include time on the agenda of the Nov 5 meeting for Elizabeth Leary to answer the questions from our last meeting regarding BU's financial contribution to the construction of West Station?

Thanks
Harry

Hi Nate,

Could you include time on the agenda of the Nov 5 meeting for Elizabeth Leary to answer the questions from our last meeting regarding BU's financial contribution to the construction of West Station?

Thanks
Harry