

**Green Line Extension Project  
Design/Construction Working Group Meeting – Draft Meeting Minutes**

LOCATION OF MEETING: Tufts University, 51 Winthrop St., Medford, MA

DATE/TIME OF MEETING: October 3, 2013, 6:00 – 7:30 PM

**WORKING GROUP ATTENDEES:**

Doug Carr, College Avenue Station  
William Deignan, City of Cambridge  
Frederick Dello Russo, Medford City Council  
Courtney Koslow, Lowell Street Station  
Margaret Lackner, MBTA Co-Chair  
Hayes Morrison, City of Somerville  
Jim McGinnis, Union Square Station  
Alan Moore, Lowell Street Station  
Polly Pook, Washington Street Station  
Ellin Reisner, Community Co-Chair  
Barbara Rubel, Tufts University  
Sean Sullivan, Washington Street Station  
Marie Trottier, MBTA Department of System-Wide Accessibility

**MBTA:**

Andrew Brennan  
Jeff Sarin

**PROJECT TEAM ATTENDEES:**

Karen Arpino-Shaffer, HDR/Gilbane  
Roger Borggaard, HDR/Gilbane  
Jim Cahill, WSK  
Regan Checchio, RVA  
Caroline Downing, AECOM/HNTB  
Nancy Farrell, RVA  
Mike McBride, HDR/Gilbane  
Bill McGuinness, WSK  
Lydia Rivera, WSK  
Joe Sgroi, HDR/Gilbane  
Brian Williams, WSK  
Greg Yates, AECOM/HNTB

**PUBLIC:**

Elizabeth Bayle  
Melissa Bennett  
John Elliott  
Eric Humphries  
Mike Korczynski  
Laurie Krieger  
Tom Lincorn  
Paul Morrissey, GLAM  
Kate Moskos

Charlene Sanderson, MA Commission for the Blind  
Steve Taylor  
Heather Van Aelst

**HANDOUTS:**

- Agenda
- November/December Noise Wall Meetings – Proposed Outreach Strategy

**PURPOSE/SUBJECT:** Design Working Group Meeting

**SUMMARY:**

**Welcome/Introductions**

Ellin Reisner, Community Co-Chair, opened the meeting and invited the Working Group members to introduce themselves (see Attendance).

**Project, Schedule and FTA New Starts Update**

Andrew Brennan, MBTA, then discussed the recent and projected project milestones:

- Phase 1 Work Notice to Proceed (January 2013)
- Passage of *The Way Forward Plan* (Summer 2013)
- CM/CC Contract Awarded (July 2013)
- MassDOT awards \$393 million for GLX Construction of Phases 2/2A (September 2013)
- 60% Design (September 2013)
- Submit New Starts Update (September/October 2013)
- 60% Design Estimate (January 2014)
- Submit Full Funding Grant Agreement (FFGA) Application (February/March 2014)
- Begin 2/2A Early Work Construction (Summer 2014)
- FFGA (Spring 2015)
- Revenue Service for Phase 2/2A (Spring 2017)
- Revenue Service for Phase 3 and 4 (Spring 2019)

He discussed the New Starts process, noting that New Starts is the federal government's program for allocating discretionary transit funds. This process is managed by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA). New Starts establishes a series of metrics against which all projects across the country are compared.

Mr. Brennan reviewed the metrics, or ratings, FTA will use to grade the GLX project. The two main categories (each worth 50% of the total) are the Project Justification Rating (the transit, economic and land use benefits of the project) and the Financial Rating (financial health of the transit agency).

After discussing many of the transit, economic and land use benefits of the project, Mr. Brennan noted that the New Starts Project Development Process falls under MAP-21, the federal transportation authorization law passed in 2012. There are three phases: Project Development; Engineering; and Full Funding Grant Agreement. After each phase, FTA evaluates, rates and approves the project to move forward or not. Currently, the GLX project is in the Engineering phase.

The Project Justification Rating is comprised of six measures, rated on a 5-point scale (high, medium-high, medium, medium-low, and low). Mr. Brennan reviewed each measure and added the score for GLX for each:

- Mobility Improvements – Medium
- Environmental Benefits – Medium
- Congestion Relief – Medium
- Economic Development – High
- Cost Effectiveness – Medium
- Land Use – High<sup>1</sup>

These measures lead to an overall Project Justification Rating of medium-high.

The Financial Rating is comprised of three measures:

- Current Capital and Operating Conditions
- Commitment of Capital and Operating Funds
- Reasonableness of Cost Estimates and Funding Capacity

Mr. Brennan noted that this is a more subjective measure, but thinks the project has a chance to do well because of the recent passage of The Way Forward this summer, which provides more funding to the transportation system. He said that he is optimistic for a "medium" score on this measure from FTA.

The GLX project is looking for \$675 million in federal funding. Mr. Brennan then showed other competing projects in the Engineering phase, Project Development phase, and FFGA phase around the country.

The next steps for New Starts include:

- Submit New Starts Update: September/October 2013
- Submit Request for FFGA: March 2014
- Recommendations for FFGA: November 2014
- FFGA Issued: Spring 2015

### **Design Working Group/Construction Working Group Roles**

Nancy Farrell, RVA, then invited Working Group members to share their thoughts about the role of the group as it shifts from the design phase of the project to the construction phase.

Jim McGuinness said that while the community meetings in the neighborhoods have been informative and well-attended, he thought this group has been more detached. He said he is unsure of how to provide more information to the communities he represents, noting there are already many resources such as the Aldermen and 311.

Polly Pook said that since she represents a building (Brickbottom), she is able to provide updates back to her constituents more easily. She noted that it was hard to see the influence of the Working Group on the larger process.

Councilor Fred Dello Russo, Medford, agreed that the most fruitful events have been the local neighborhood meeting since they are able to focus on the individual issues of concern. He suggested holding quarterly neighborhood meetings to provide updates.

---

<sup>1</sup> Land use is comprised of five measures: employment served by system (high); parking costs (high); average population density (high); amount of affordable housing (low); and parking supply (high).

Sean Sullivan said it is sometimes difficult to ascertain when advice from Working Group members is appropriate and timely to the process. During the construction phase, he encouraged there to be more notice on how and when to provide feedback.

Alan Moore suggested that the MBTA do more outreach so the public knows who the representatives of the neighborhoods are. He noted that members are not even recognized at the local, community meetings.

Courtney Koslow said that she had anticipated being contacted about the station meetings as they were being planned. She said that the MBTA has also not asked or provided materials for members to do outreach in their communities.

Mr. McGinnis suggested holding office hours in the neighborhoods for a few hours each month. He said that holding these on a regular schedule, with the community representatives present, could reach more people who cannot always attend public meetings.

Margaret Lackner, MBTA Co-Chair, suggested having a storefront available with hours and an exhibit. Ms. Reisner added that many existing groups already have space and could share what they have.

Ms. Farrell encouraged members to submit other ideas and recommendations regarding Working Group roles to Regan Checchio, RVA. The feedback provided will be adapted into a draft document that will be circulated for comment.

Ms. Farrell also noted that some Working Group members have dropped out since the group was originally formed. She suggested that the Working Group members and municipal representatives recruit and recommend replacements. She noted that once the goals document is finalized, it can be distributed with an application for the group. Ms. Farrell also noted that an important part of the process will be the role of the Community Co-Chair. She invited Ms. Reisner to share her experiences.

Ms. Reisner said that she did not think she was as active as she should have been through the process. She suggested that if she were to attend more meetings with the MBTA and project team, she could better share information with the rest of the group.

Ms. Lackner also noted the stations will have an arts program. She thinks the Working Group will be able to play an important venue to developing this program.

### **CM/GC Introduction**

Karen Arpino-Shaffer, HDR/Gilbane, described the role of the Construction Manager/General Contractor (CM/GC) that was selected in the summer. She noted that there is a two-phase contracting process: pre-construction then construction (through multiple contracts). She recognized Jim Cahill as the manager of the pre-construction and Brian Williams as the construction manager.

Ms. Arpino-Shaffer said the CM/GC approach allows for more integration between the PM/GC (HDR/Gilbane), Design (AECOM/HNTB) and Construction teams. The CM/GC for GLX is a joint venture of JF White Contracting, Skanska USA Civil, and Kiewit Infrastructure. The joint venture is known as WSK.

Bill McGuinness, WSK, provided a brief background of the joint venture's previous projects in the fields of transit, bridges and viaducts, maintenance facilities and transit stations. He discussed the firms' national experience and local presence.

Currently, WSK is reviewing the 60% Design, looking at it from several points of view, including constructability, value engineering, scheduling and pricing. WSK is collaborating with the PM/GC and Design firms to do this work. They are all co-located at the project office at 100 Summer Street in Boston.

Mr. McGuinness then introduced Lydia Rivera, WSK, who will be the contractor's liaison to the MBTA and communities. Ms. Rivera noted that she is the former MBTA spokesperson, and that she is eager to enhance the communication practices on the project and work directly with the communities to build an effective outreach program.

### **Design Update**

Greg Yates, AECOM/HNTB, noted that the Advanced Preliminary Engineering (APE) was submitted to the MBTA on August 30, 2013. Value engineering on this submission, such as the type of materials used for construction, occurred in September. He noted that the design will progress based on six construction packages being issued.

Barbara Rubel, Tufts University, asked if there have been design changes since the June meetings. Mr. Yates said the stations are essentially the same. Changes mostly have to do with phasing and construction.

Doug Carr said that at some of the June meetings (specifically Ball Square and College Avenue), there were significant design issues left open. He asked what the format will be to resolve these issues which include pedestrian access, aesthetics and circulation. Mr. Yates said these would be resolved at the fall meetings and again at station meetings in Spring 2014.

Mr. Yates said the team plans to hold meetings in November/December to focus on corridor walls. At these meetings, the team will present wall sections, elevations and aesthetics to specific neighborhoods in the corridor.

### **Fall Meetings on Noise Walls**

Ms. Farrell noted that Working Group members had a handout outlining the proposed outreach strategy for these meetings, with a map breaking out the different geographic segments and proposed meeting locations:

- Brickbottom/Union Square (Holiday Inn, Somerville)
- Washington Street to Medford Street (Holiday Inn, Somerville)
- Medford Street to Lowell Street (Center for the Arts at the Armory)
- Lowell Street to Broadway (Center for the Arts at the Armory)
- Broadway to College Avenue (St. Clement School, Medford)
- Glass Factory Condominiums/Hampton Inn (briefing at the Glass Factory Condominiums)

Mr. Moore said the approach made sense to him. He confirmed the meetings will include discussions of noise and retaining walls.

Ms. Pook asked why Brickbottom is grouped with Union Square since the needs are so different. Ms. Farrell said that at the meetings, there would be breakout groups by neighborhood after an initial presentation. Ms. Arpino-Shaffer added that there are not that many walls proposed along the Union Square corridor, and it would not make sense to hold a separate meeting on that topic.

Ms. Farrell then asked the members to review the proposed notification strategies outlined in the handout. Ms. Reisner said that if flyers are provided to members for distribution, they will need to be provided in multiple languages. Ms. Farrell agreed.

#### DISCUSSION:

Ms. Reisner then opened the meeting up for questions from the Working Group.

Councilor Dello Russo asked if recent difficulties with MBTA financing could be an impediment to the New Starts process. Mr. Brennan said that he thinks the MBTA is in a good position with the recent passage of *The Way Forward*, which provides \$800 million/year in transportation revenue.

Mr. Moore asked if there was a way for the public to view the entire design submittal and cost estimates. Ms. Arpino-Shaffer suggested scheduling an appointment at the project office, and the team could provide the materials for review in a conference room. She said that she would check with the MBTA Project Manager, Mary Ainsley, on the issue of providing the cost estimates.

#### OPEN COMMENTS:

An attendee asked if the project team will be providing 3D versions of the renderings. Ms. Arpino-Shaffer said that the team has been working on the model and plans to have it at the fall meetings.

Melissa Bennett asked about the 60% design drawings. Mr. Yates explained that they were shown at the June station meetings and are available on the project website.

An attendee asked if there is still a giant pipe at College Avenue. Mr. Yates said there is.

Charlene Sanderson, MA Commission for the Blind, asked how the team incorporates accessibility into the project. Marie Trottier, MBTA Department of System-Wide Accessibility, noted that she will be reviewing and signing off on the project. She said the MBTA will also review with ACT as well as the plaintiffs from the BCIL lawsuit.