



STV Incorporated

3 2 1 S u m m e r S t r e e t
B o s t o n , M a s s a c h u s e t t s 0 2 2 1 0
(617)482-7298 fax:(617)482-1837

Meeting Date: January 13, 2011

MassHighway Project Name: Fore River Bridge Replacement, Quincy-Weymouth
Bridge No. Q-01-001= W-32-001

MassHighway Contract No.: 50281

MassHighway District: 6

Designer: STV Incorporated

Minutes Prepared By: Nathaniel Cabral-Curtis – Howard/Stein-Hudson

Meeting Place: Fore River Club House, 16 Nevada Road, Quincy, MA

Persons in attendance: Meeting attendance lists have been removed to protect the privacy of audience members.

Purpose: The design team held a public information meeting at the Fore River Clubhouse in Quincy to explain the Environmental Assessment (EA) to the community and respond to questions and comments from the community on this important document. This meeting was intended to reach a combined audience of those that live in the communities on either side of the bridge, particularly North Weymouth, Weymouth and Quincy Ward 2. Advertisements were run in *The Quincy Patriot-Ledger*, *Hingham Journal*, *Weymouth News* and *Quincy Sun*. To accommodate the holidays, the meeting was advertised in both December and January.

Items Discussed:

Mike O'Dowd (MassDOT Accelerated Bridge Program) opened the meeting by thanking the audience for their attendance and reminding them to sign in to allow their attendance to be part of the public record. He then explained that the purpose of the meeting, one in a long line of similar public information meetings held since 2009, would be to provide audience members with information about the Environmental Assessment (EA). The release of the EA for public comment represents a significant milestone in the development of the Fore River Bridge Replacement Project. The EA provides community members with another opportunity--in conjunction with the public informational meetings held thus far--to make their comments, questions and concerns known to MassDOT and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). The EA was made available to the community on December 9, 2010 with all comments to MassDOT



STV Incorporated

3 2 1 S u m m e r S t r e e t
B o s t o n , M a s s a c h u s e t t s 0 2 2 1 0
(6 1 7) 4 8 2 - 7 2 9 8 f a x : (6 1 7) 4 8 2 - 1 8 3 7

and FHWA due by January 26, 2011. Comments sent to one agency will be shared promptly with the other and are taken seriously by both. Advertisements for the meeting were published before, during and after the holidays, December 10th, 11th, and 30th 2010, and January 6th, 2011 in the *Quincy Patriot-Ledger*, *Hingham Journal*, *Weymouth News* and *Quincy Sun*.¹

Mike then explained that the Fore River Bridge is being replaced through the Accelerated Bridge Program (ABP). The ABP is an eight year program, launched in 2008, to repair or replace structurally deficient bridges throughout the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. This program is supplying 20% of the \$260 million needed to replace the current temporary Fore River Bridge, with the remaining 80% coming from FHWA. Given the significance of the funding made available through the ABP, it is important that construction on the new bridge begin and end during the program's timeframe and before 2018 when the 15 year lifespan of the temporary ACROW-span will be up. The currently expected schedule is for MassDOT to issue an RFP by September of 2011 with construction beginning in early 2012. This means that a significant amount of work remains to be done over the next several months to achieve this timeline and the project team will keep coming back to the community to keep residents and other stakeholders updated.

At this point, Mike introduced the following members of the project team: Mark Ennis and Nikole Bulger (STV) and Joanne Haracz and Tom Herzog (AECOM). He then concluded his opening remarks by requesting that audience members hold their questions until after the presentation.

Highlights of the Presentation

Following Mike's introduction, Nikole Bulger, Mark Ennis (both of STV) and Joanne Haracz and Tom Herzog (both of AECOM) briefed the audience on the current status of the project with particular focus on the EA. Highlights of their presentation included the following:

- The meeting summarized herein has a different focus than previous public information sessions. While those meetings focused on providing audience members with grounding in the overall project, this one was focused specifically on helping community members understand the EA to be able to comment on it in an informed manner. Additional information about the EA and the document itself can be found on the project website.
- The scope of work for the 25% design team includes the following:

¹ The legal notice run in those publications is included as Appendix 1. The notice, minutes of this meeting and presentation will also be made available through the project website.



STV Incorporated

3 2 1 S u m m e r S t r e e t
B o s t o n , M a s s a c h u s e t t s 0 2 2 1 0
(6 1 7) 4 8 2 - 7 2 9 8 f a x : (6 1 7) 4 8 2 - 1 8 3 7

- Coordination with stakeholders and agencies – this includes the 12 public information sessions to date.
- Evaluation of structure options including the movable span and approach structures.
- Selection of a preferred alternative.
- Preparation of the EA document in compliance with NEPA (National Environmental Policy Act)
- Establish permitting requirements.
- Advance the design, construction staging and traffic management plans to 25% level and prepare the design/build procurement package.

- While the EA, prepared in compliance with NEPA, is one of the most significant environmental documents filed with regard to the project, the project team is also addressing the following permits and approvals:
 - The United States Coast Guard (USCG) Bridge Permit – already filed.
 - MassDEP Section 401 Water Quality Certificate
 - U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 Permit
 - Massachusetts Coastal Zone Management Consistency Determination.
 - U.S. EPA NPDES Permit for construction-related storm-water discharge – to be filed by the design/build contractor.
 - Compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act based on the Memorandum of Agreement signed prior to the demolition of the 1936 bridge through:
 - Archival documentation of the 1936 bridge.
 - State and local historic commission review of the proposed design.
 - Salvage of the 1936 bronze plaques for remounting on the new bridge.

- FHWA is the lead federal agency for this project and is charged with determining whether MassDOT and its design team have complied with NEPA. The USCG is the chief cooperating agency since it issues the bridge permit. The document prepared for FHWA in accordance with NEPA is the EA. The EA:
 - Addresses purpose and need.
 - Analyzes the alternatives including no-build, a bascule bridge and a vertical lift bridge.
 - Identifies impacts and environmental consequences, both short and long-term, and where appropriate proposes mitigations.

- Currently the EA² is open for public comment and will remain so through January 26, 2011. At that point, FHWA will review the received comments and make a

² This document is available from the public libraries in Braintree, Quincy, and Weymouth, through the project website at www.mass.gov/massdot/foreriverbridge and directly from MassDOT.



STV Incorporated

3 2 1 S u m m e r S t r e e t
B o s t o n , M a s s a c h u s e t t s 0 2 2 1 0
(6 1 7) 4 8 2 - 7 2 9 8 f a x : (6 1 7) 4 8 2 - 1 8 3 7

- determination as to whether MassDOT has complied with NEPA. Chapters of the EA include the following:
- 1 – Project Summary
 - 2 – Purpose and Need
 - 3 – Existing Environment
 - 4 – Alternatives Evaluation
 - 5 – Environmental Consequences
 - 6 – Secondary and Cumulative Impacts
 - 7 – Mitigation Measures
 - 8 – Permits and Regulatory Requirements
 - 9 – Public and Interagency Coordination
 - 10 – Summary and Conclusion.
- In terms of purpose and need, addressed in Chapter 2 of EA, the project team is attempting to provide a new, permanent bridge which best serves the needs of all of the structures users including motorists and mariners. To accomplish this, the new bridge must:
- Maximize vertical clearance in the closed position to minimize the number of bridge openings for the 32,000 motorists using the bridge each week day.
 - Maximize the horizontal clearance in the shipping channel to bring the width of the navigable waterway up to the standards recommended by the USCG and mariners: a minimum of 225 feet with a preference for 250. The horizontal clearance offered by the temporary bridge, which replicates that of the 1936 bridge – 175 feet – has been determined to be unacceptable by both the USCG and the Boston Harbor Pilots.
 - Do nothing which curtails current or future maritime activities in the Fore River Designated Port Area.
 - Be reliable to operate and economical to maintain.
 - Preserve essential fish habitat in the Fore River channel during and after construction.
 - Accommodate pedestrians and cyclists.
 - Be aesthetically pleasing and preserve public amenities on the Weymouth side of the river.
- The EA analyzes three possible options: no-build, a bascule bridge, and a vertical lift bridge.
- **No-build:** no action--beyond maintaining the current temporary bridge to the end of its 15-year life span--will be taken. At the end of that time, the temporary bridge would be demolished.
 - **Bascule:** a bridge of the same type as the 1936 bridge, but significantly larger would be built. In particular the piers would be much wider and heavier than those of the 1936 span. This bridge would be able to span the



STV Incorporated

3 2 1 S u m m e r S t r e e t
B o s t o n , M a s s a c h u s e t t s 0 2 2 1 0
(6 1 7) 4 8 2 - 7 2 9 8 f a x : (6 1 7) 4 8 2 - 1 8 3 7

minimum channel recommended USCG and the mariners it represents of 225 feet and would offer a 41.5 foot vertical clearance in the closed position. This would lead to 46 more projected openings of the bridge per year as compared to the current temporary structure. In addition, a bascule bridge of this size would likely present a long-term closure of the channel during construction as this type of bridge is most typically built in the closed position. Lastly, it would also have considerable maintenance and reliability challenges. It is worth noting that if a problem were to occur, a bascule bridge has to be repaired with the leaves in the open position, or closed to vehicle traffic.

- **Vertical lift:** a bridge similar to the current temporary bridge only in terms of the elevator motion of the deck would be built. This bridge would offer 250 feet of horizontal clearance and 58.5 feet of vertical clearance in the closed position leading to 112 fewer projected openings per year as compared to the current temporary bridge. This represents a difference of 150 fewer per year as compared to the proposed bascule bridge. As a vertical lift bridge spanning 250 is well within the capabilities of the type, maintenance and reliability issues would be reduced. Smaller foundation footprints would have a lessened impact on the bed of the Fore River and--as the vertical lift is a more efficient structure from an engineering standpoint--it would require less electricity to raise and lower it. As opposed to the bascule bridge, the vertical lift bridge offers significant opportunities for accelerated construction with components built off-site and floated into place. It is worth noting that if a problem were to occur, the vertical lift bridge would be repaired with the span in the closed position, or open to vehicle traffic.

- The EA addresses a wide range of factors all of which are addressed in the document, however, based on the themes of the public involvement process to date, those of greatest concern to the community around the Fore River are noise, traffic impacts for all modes, visual impacts and construction impacts.

- **Noise:**
 - One part of the EA process is disclosing potential noise impacts associated with the preferred alternative and the project team has conducted a noise assessment in accordance with FHWA guidelines.
 - While typically a bridge replacement falls under FHWA noise monitoring category three, the project team has chosen to proceed at the most stringent level – category one – which requires greater disclosure in the EA and in-neighborhood noise monitoring.
 - Monitoring was done using maximum peak hour volumes for free-flow conditions in accordance with how similar monitoring is done across the United States.



STV Incorporated

3 2 1 S u m m e r S t r e e t
B o s t o n , M a s s a c h u s e t t s 0 2 2 1 0
(617)482-7298 fax:(617)482-1837

- Baseline noise assessments were taken at five locations surrounding the bridge site. These include Quincy Ward 2, near Twin Rivers Technologies, Germantown, Along Rte 3A just east of Monatiquot Street, on Monatiquot Street, and on King Cove Beach Road.
- Under present conditions, the noise at all of these areas is generated by a combination of background and traffic noise, with the exception of the 3A site which is based entirely on traffic noise. This site along 3A is the only site among those monitored that is currently louder than the FHWA noise abatement criteria (NAC).
- Where permanent noise impacts are expected, the project team is directed to look at possible mitigation measures. These measures must achieve the two criteria of being feasible and reasonable. For example, at the Rte 3A site, a noise wall is not considered reasonable or feasible for several reasons including:
 - Openings for residential driveways would degrade the performance of the noise wall to the point where it could not achieve the required 5 dBA of noise reduction.
 - There is minimal room for such a wall and it could not be built without property takings and removal of the sidewalk.
- While developing noise criteria for construction is difficult, since only the selected contractor knows exactly what equipment will be used on the job site, however the project team has determined that it will use the most stringent noise monitoring criteria of 10 dBA above existing conditions. Existing conditions have been established for three periods of the day: daytime (7AM to 6PM), evening (6PM to 11PM) and night (11PM to 7AM).
- The MassDOT resident engineer will coordinate regarding noise with community-appointed liaisons throughout the project and the standard work day will be set at 7AM to 11PM. Local officials will be briefed in advance when exceptions are planned.
- **Traffic:**
 - As currently estimated, the project will begin with 30 months of off-line construction building the center span and approaches for the new bridge. Traffic will not be impacted during this time.
 - In the next four months, the bridge would operate with one lane in each direction resulting in a traffic impact.
 - In the next one month, three lanes would be available, followed by 5 months off-line demolition of the temporary bridge.
 - The winning design/build contractor will need to prepare a traffic management plan for MassDOT approval. It will include:
 - An employee parking plan.
 - Variable Message Signs (VMS) installed at key locations.



STV Incorporated

3 2 1 S u m m e r S t r e e t
B o s t o n , M a s s a c h u s e t t s 0 2 2 1 0
(6 1 7) 4 8 2 - 7 2 9 8 f a x : (6 1 7) 4 8 2 - 1 8 3 7

- A designated truck route for construction vehicles.
- Public updates on the traffic management plan throughout construction using a wide array of traditional and electronic media outlets.
- A contractor parking plan to protect residential areas.
- In the end, building a bridge with fewer openings represents the largest traffic mitigation this project can accomplish.

- **Visual impact:**
 - A visual assessment of the vertical lift bridge has been performed in compliance with FHWA guidelines and includes the visual context for residents and motorists. Based on this analysis, the vertical lift bridge is in keeping with other tall structures in the area, will be less visually cluttered than the existing temporary bridge, and the shadows of its towers will fall on the river.

- The presentation segment of the meeting concluded with a slide showing where members of the community can send their comments on the EA **through January 26, 2011.**
 - To FHWA: Mr. Richard Marquis
Attn: Damaris Santiago
Acting Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration
Massachusetts Division
55 Broadway, 10th Floor
Cambridge, MA 02142

 - To MassDOT: Mr. Frank Tramontozzi, P.E.
Chief Engineer
Attn: Michael Furlong
MassDOT Highway Division
Massachusetts Division
10 Park Plaza, Room 4160
Boston, MA 02116

Question & Answer Session

Mike began the Question and Answer session by reminding the audience that if they had not already done so, they should sign in and take a copy of the meeting packet. The meeting packet contained two comments sheets, one addressed to go to FHWA and the other to MassDOT. Mike then prefaced the opening of the Q&A session with some points from the process to date. These are as follows:



STV Incorporated

3 2 1 S u m m e r S t r e e t
B o s t o n , M a s s a c h u s e t t s 0 2 2 1 0
(6 1 7) 4 8 2 - 7 2 9 8 f a x : (6 1 7) 4 8 2 - 1 8 3 7

- The replacement bridge will fall directly in the footprint of the old bridge with the “jog to the south” associated with the temporary bridge eliminated.
- Throughout the process, many people have expressed concerns over the aesthetics of the proposed vertical lift bridge. The proposed bridge will look nothing like the current temporary structure which does not respond architecturally to its surroundings.
- The proposed vertical lift bridge would require 150 fewer openings per year as compared to the proposed bascule bridge.
- The opening and closing time associated with the proposed vertical lift bridge would be 13 minutes as opposed to the 26-30 needed by the temporary bridge. The new span would also have a solid, concrete deck providing a smooth and quiet ride.
- The vertical lift bridge offers greater opportunities for accelerated construction techniques, use of the channel to stage construction, and off-line construction avoiding impacts to maritime and road traffic.
- The contractor will be instructed to maintain ongoing coordination efforts through meetings and other forms of outreach with the surrounding communities and their appointed representatives. Coordination will address the upcoming work schedule, hours of operation, and times when the job will run outside its normal shift.

Q: Bob Conlon (BC): So you mentioned the bridge in Chelsea, what kind of bridge is that?

A: Mark Ennis (ME): The Chelsea Creak Bridge is a vertical lift bridge currently under construction.

Q: BC: And so what is the width of the channel there?

A: Mike O’Dowd (MOD): It is wider than the Fore River, about 300 feet.

Q: BC: You said the vertical lift bridge would have 112 fewer openings than the current temporary bridge, but 150 less than the bascule bridge, why the difference?

A: ME: The proposed bascule bridge would have less vertical clearance in the closed position than the current temporary bridge so it would need to open 47 more times per year. The proposed vertical lift bridge would be higher than the temporary bridge in the closed position and require 112 fewer openings. If you add 47 and 112 that gives you the delta of about 150.



STV Incorporated

3 2 1 S u m m e r S t r e e t
B o s t o n , M a s s a c h u s e t t s 0 2 2 1 0
(6 1 7) 4 8 2 - 7 2 9 8 f a x : (6 1 7) 4 8 2 - 1 8 3 7

- Q: BC: No matter which bridge you build, a tanker would need an opening, correct? And the tanker will always take some time to get through the bridge, correct?
- A: ME: There are three components to the time it takes for a ship to transit the bridge: the gates going down, the lifting of the bridge, the passage of the vessel, the lowering of the bridge, and the gates coming up. The first two and final two phases are the same length regardless of the vessel. We went through the current temporary bridge on a tanker and the critical part that's making it take so long now is the motion of the bridge.
- C: BC: When you say mariners, you always pluralize it, but I know better. I know its CITGO. The sailing club on the river doesn't care how wide the channel is, did CITGO ask you to build the bridge this big?
- A: MOD: We have been told about the channel width by the Boston Harbor Pilots and the United States Coast Guard. USCG represents the maritime community just like we represent the community of roadway users.
- C: BC: I'm sick and tired of coming to these meetings, because this is a foregone conclusion; you decided this a long time ago. I come and I tell you I don't want the vertical lift bridge and you keep pushing it. When did you [pointing to Mark Ennis] come to this decision? I'm a taxpayer, I have a right to know.
- A: MOD: MassDOT agreed with STV's recommendation of the vertical lift bridge in January 2010. We told you about it at the public information session held in Hingham on February 24, 2010.
- C: BC: Not you, him [pointing to Mark Ennis]. I want him to answer.
- A: ME: We finalized that process in January 2010 when we made the recommendation to MassDOT that was presented in February 2010, but that was the tail end of a process begun in 2009. It was not a decision we came to quickly.
- Q: BC: And how come we don't have renderings of the bascule bridge here, I'm just curious; it seems so prepackaged that you are coming down on the side of the vertical lift bridge. You just keep knocking the bascule bridge.
- A: ME: The bridge type study develops both bridges on the same 1 to 1 plan. For every plan for the bascule bridge, there is one for the vertical lift bridge. I want to say one more thing relative to CITGO. This is a Massachusetts Designated Port Area or DPA. That means we are required to build a bridge that does not curtail current or future maritime activity here. We simply cannot build a bridge that will not be accepted by USCG.



STV Incorporated

3 2 1 S u m m e r S t r e e t
B o s t o n , M a s s a c h u s e t t s 0 2 2 1 0
(6 1 7) 4 8 2 - 7 2 9 8 f a x : (6 1 7) 4 8 2 - 1 8 3 7

- Q: BC: To me, the environment also encompasses historicity. Weymouth was the 2nd settlement build in Massachusetts, in 1622, right after Plymouth. That terrible vertical lift bridge will negatively impact this historic community. This all comes down to money. We'll pay for it. It's our town and we'll go to court for it. There's always court action. I'm for a bascule bridge because 99% of my constituents said they wanted one.
- C: Victor Pap (VP): I just want to echo some of Bob's sentiments. I'm concerned about our area's historicity. I commend your attempts to improve the vertical lift bridge but now it just looks like Tron instead of 2001: a Space Odyssey. We need a historic bridge to support the area's economic development. This bridge will bring down property values. Everyone here wants fewer openings, but up until this presentation – and I've been to all of them – the difference in the number of the openings between the two types was much smaller. If it had always been 150 openings, we wouldn't even be having this discussion.
- A: ME: Victor, we first discussed the greater delta between the two bridges at our meeting on June 14, 2010 at the Abigail Adams School. We'll provide you with the minutes.
-
- C: Virginia Casey (VC): North Weymouth has had everything dumped in it from fuel tanks to pumping stations to fertilizer plants. We have it all. What ever happened to the idea of a tunnel? What about beautifying our waterfront? There are no homes or businesses along the route of the tunnel that couldn't be relocated. You can solve all your problems that way. A 2nd thing: the deck on the temporary bridge is really deteriorating; it's really dangerous for motorcyclists.
- A: MOD: The idea of a tunnel was considered in a 2002 study by Vollmer and what was then the Massachusetts Highway Department (MHD). The tunnel was quickly dismissed from further consideration for a variety of reasons including the cost to MHD and the community of relocating the businesses Councilor Pap just mentioned. In addition, there was an issue of access: with a tunnel, bicycles and pedestrians would no longer be able to go between Quincy and Weymouth. Contained in an appendix of the EA is the Vollmer study and I'd request that you review it to see how MHD got to its decision. In response to your second question, the deck of the temporary bridge is inspected regularly to ensure its safety. It neither looks nor sounds good, but it is safe. The new bridge will have a standard, concrete deck which will ride and sound much better.
-



STV Incorporated

3 2 1 S u m m e r S t r e e t
B o s t o n , M a s s a c h u s e t t s 0 2 2 1 0
(617)482-7298 fax:(617)482-1837

C: Jasmin Burke (JB): Sometimes it is nice to hang onto historic aspects, but sometimes a well-built modern item helps you to highlight historic elements. I approve of your blending of history and modernity by keeping the historic plaques from the old bridge. I'm also here representing the bicycle community. I understand this is being done by MassDOT through the ABP so I know it has to accommodate bicycles and pedestrians and be ADA-compliant with regard to sidewalks and curb-cuts. I appreciate the bicycle accommodating shoulders and the sidewalks. Considering the high speeds on the bridge, the grade cyclists will have to deal with going up the bridge and the difficulty motorists can have seeing a cyclist, I was wondering if you could look at something similar to what is being done on the Neponset Bridge. They are building an 8-10 foot sidewalk for all other access users so it keeps the bicycles and pedestrians separated from the cars on account of the high speeds. I want to make sure that you provide curb cuts which bring cyclists back into the street at either end of the bridge as we cannot ride on the sidewalks in the business districts in Weymouth or Quincy.

A: MOD: Thank you for your comments; we are definitely keeping bicycles and pedestrians in mind as we go forward.

Q: Brian Corlick (BC): I have a question and a comment. My question is about what happens to my comments. Everyone writes a written response and sends it to MassDOT and FHWA. I've read in the meeting minutes that the questions are responded to. How are they responded to and is there another comment period where I can respond to the response. I live on Church Street which is part of the alternate route around the bridge. That street isn't designed to handle a lot of cars and the HSH traffic report ignored that completely. In terms of aesthetics I feel like the vertical lift is being forced on us, but if you want to go for a modern bridge, make it really modern. The thing you're showing us tonight is all steel; it looks like the 1940's.

A: MOD: Let me touch on a few of those items. All written comments that we get or that go to FHWA are reviewed and then FHWA will direct us to respond to them; we have to draft a response that satisfies them. After that it is up to them as to whether they make the comments public. The environmental assessment does state that at certain periods of the project, roadway users will likely divert to other routes. We do not highlight or recommend a given route and if we do, it will only be after we've coordinated with the traffic officers for both communities.

Q: Jack Burke (JBk): This temporary bridge is a disgrace and it's falling apart since it was built. Hopefully whatever you build, will be built right, with union workers so it doesn't fall apart, do you understand what I mean?



STV Incorporated

3 2 1 S u m m e r S t r e e t
B o s t o n , M a s s a c h u s e t t s 0 2 2 1 0
(6 1 7) 4 8 2 - 7 2 9 8 f a x : (6 1 7) 4 8 2 - 1 8 3 7

A: MOD: I know just what you mean. This is why they only rated the bridge to last 15 years. It is only supposed to be a temporary structure.

Q: JBk: So then can you commit to building the bridge union so it won't fall apart?

A: MOD: I can't commit to a union contractor, but I can assure you that we will pay prevailing wages consistent with what a union worker would receive.

Q: Terry Spoy (TS): What is the life expectancy of each of the bridge types? Would either last longer than the other?

A: MOD: The conceptual designs which were in the type study and which are reflected in the EA shows that both bridges would last a minimum of 75 years. But we also look over that 75 years and try to see any issues that might come up. There's a very big bascule bridge in Ohio, the Charles Berry Bridge. Google it and you will see an enormous volume of articles. It was shut down for six months because they could not find replacement parts and residents were out demonstrating with signs. It was the result of non-standard, over-sized components and that is something we worry about with a new bascule bridge for the Fore River. The end result was a very frustrated population.

Q: Neil Conley (NC): I understand about prevailing wage, but the ABP is a big program and we need to build this bridge to provide jobs. When you say you will let all pre-qualified contractors bid, what does that mean?

A: MOD: A contractor would need to be pre-qualified in heavy construction and bridge construction.

Q: NC: I know that bridge construction is hard and disruptive, but I think a vertical lift bridge here could be beautiful. That Chelsea Street Bridge will be a great bridge when it's done. Can you tell me when you'd start work?

A: MOD: Subsequent to getting our permits in place, we'd like to be ready for letters of interest in September this year. 2 or 3 months after that we'd have a procurement document ready to issue to short-listed design/build teams. We'd like to be under construction in early 2012.

Q: NC: What are your plans for the temporary bridge?

A: MOD: We can't imagine the community getting any value from it. Typically the contractor would take possession of it and be responsible for demolition and disposal.



STV Incorporated

3 2 1 S u m m e r S t r e e t
B o s t o n , M a s s a c h u s e t t s 0 2 2 1 0
(617)482-7298 fax:(617)482-1837

Q: John Schneider (JS): I just started working in East Boston and that Chelsea Street Bridge is an awful eyesore. It's just enormous. Is that what we're getting in our backyard?

A: MOD: That is consistent in terms of bridge type and size. The span length is similar, the height of the towers is similar.

A: ME: I would just clarify that the height will be similar, but the span will be shorter. It's a 450 foot span at the Chelsea Bridge and we'd have a 325 foot span. The towers height will be commensurate, very similar to Chelsea Street

Q: MOD: What is the height of the towers we are proposing here, Mark?

A: ME: They are 280 feet above water level.

Q: Sandy Gildea (SG): I am concerned about the truck route for demolition and construction. I'd prefer to see that mandated rather than just designated. Our streets are not built to handle heavy trucks and if they are damaged, I will want to see them resurfaced nicely, not just patches in the potholes.

A: MOD: The truck route isn't finalized right now, Sandy, but right now we are looking at using the same truck route that was used by the MWRA and Middlesex. The truck route is something we are coordinating with the local traffic officers and will progress over the next year.

Q: SG: And you said the parts that would be installed in the bridge would be obsolete almost?

A: ME: Those would be the custom parts for the bascule bridge, it could take up to six months to fabricate them.

Q: SG: I think if you're building a bridge that's going to be there for 75 years, you could get something going so you wouldn't be waiting six months for parts. Those things sort of have to go hand in hand. You mention the height of the new bridge. Where are you measuring the height of the towers from? I want a visual of what that will look like.

A: ME: The existing bridge provides 175 feet of vertical clearance when open. I think above that there's roughly another 25 feet for machinery so that gives you a total height of 200 feet above the water line. We're proposing a structure that would be 80



STV Incorporated

3 2 1 S u m m e r S t r e e t
B o s t o n , M a s s a c h u s e t t s 0 2 2 1 0
(6 1 7) 4 8 2 - 7 2 9 8 f a x : (6 1 7) 4 8 2 - 1 8 3 7

feet higher than that. In short, it does need to be that high the type of equipment we will use that will hold up over time needs that much room.

Q: No name given (NNG): Do you plan to redesign the rotary?

A: MOD: The rotary represents the western endpoint of the work zone so it will remain intact as you see it today.

C: NNG: There is a problem with the rotary right now in that many large trucks cannot make it through easily. I think the truck drivers are worried about hitting cars that are in the rotary. This is because the shape of the rotary was changed and trees planted along the edge and that narrowed it down. I've heard trucks out there going up on the curb, breaking axles and tie rods. Who owns that rotary?

A: MOD: That rotary belongs to the City of Quincy, but we can have our traffic engineers take a look at it. I know some of the district [MassDOT District 6] engineers would like to improve the pavement and pavement markings as part of this project to make it safer.

Q: Gary Peters (GP): Good evening. I'm Gary Peters from the Fore River Bridge Neighborhood Association. Michael [to Mike O'Dowd], in 2009, what proposal did you send to the USCG?

A: MOD: Mr. Peters is referring to a letter we sent to USCG requesting that they consider a 200 foot shipping channel spanned by a new bascule bridge. Everyone should understand that it was not DOT or STV that said that wouldn't work. USCG said the bare minimum channel width they would accept would be 225 feet.

C: GP: In that same letter, USCG also told you to use extreme caution because they would not rule until you had filed with them. So, you seized on something they explicitly told you not to do and that put us into our current tight spot. The Fore River Bridge Neighborhood Association wants to see a 200 foot bascule bridge. This will give the maritime interests something and it will give us what we want. Today's *Quincy Patriot-Ledger* says we don't want the vertical lift bridge. We have never wanted it. Yet you have taken it upon yourself to go forward with something we don't want. What do we want? We want a 200 foot bascule bridge that will blend into the neighborhoods and take into account the neighborhoods. I am concerned because this process that you have run feels like the one that brought us the temporary bridge with slick, prepackaged presentations and there were terrible results from that. We want this process done right. I want to thank you for bringing your noise expert



STV Incorporated

3 2 1 S u m m e r S t r e e t
B o s t o n , M a s s a c h u s e t t s 0 2 2 1 0
(617)482-7298 fax:(617)482-1837

tonight and will direct my next question to him. When you came into our neighborhood, were your noise monitors manned?

A: Tom Herzog (TH): Some were manned and some were remote controlled.

Q: GP: FHWA requires that you report noise data in LEQ. DEP requires that you report it in L90. How do you reconcile those two things?

A: TH: We collected noise data in both LEQ and L90 formats.

Q: GP: For tonight's presentation the data isn't presented like that, let's talk about how it's presented in the environmental assessment.

A: TH: For the environmental assessment we did what was required of us by FHWA.

Q: GP: O.K. but you're using the DEP for enforcement.

A: TH: No, we're using FHWA which is a one hour LEQ which is an equivalent noise level.

C: GP: With all due respect you are referencing DEP. And that is my next question. How will you enforce the noise levels during construction?

A: TH: The DEP criteria we looked at were purely for construction. For operations we looked at one hour FHWA criteria. For construction, we looked at 10 decibels (db) over the L90. The L90 is a statistical number that references the background level without any interference, without pass-by traffic from the roadway that's the level you would hear. That's flat and the spikes come when the car goes by, so 10 db above that baseline level that's the limit for construction.

Q: GP: If you took an LEQ number and added 3 db to it, would it approximate an L90 number?

A: TH: The L90 is much more stringent than LEQ. LEQ is a lot higher because it includes all the noise. An L90 is just the level that's exceeded 90% of the time so it's the lowest grade in the class if you will. We reported the 24 hour variation of noise levels in the appendix of the EA.

Q: GP: All right, I can tell I'm losing most of the audience with this conversation, but let me ask you, as a practical matter, say something goes wrong on Monatiquot Street, how would it be enforced?



STV Incorporated

3 2 1 S u m m e r S t r e e t
B o s t o n , M a s s a c h u s e t t s 0 2 2 1 0
(6 1 7) 4 8 2 - 7 2 9 8 f a x : (6 1 7) 4 8 2 - 1 8 3 7

A: TH: Like anything else, if someone is bothered, you contact your community liaison and say that something is wrong. The contractor will be required before each phase of construction to submit a noise control plan showing exactly what equipment will be used and demonstrate how they will comply with the established noise levels.

Q: GP: Did you consult with the Department of Environmental Protection regarding the noise monitoring protocol?

A: TH: DEP criteria are not meant for construction. They are meant for stationary sources that run continuously.

Q: GP: We've recently sited two power plants, one in Weymouth and one in Braintree. They didn't use two separate numbers for construction and operation. I'd like to see one full 24-hour noise cycle. We know there will be problems when construction gets started. I'll be putting in the comment that I don't see your noise control plan as enforceable as written. This is our only opportunity to comment and so I have to say it is not right as you have it written now. One more thing, you mentioned the Vollmer Study, but we need to talk about the bridge type study. It's not in the EA, is it available?

A: MOD: It's not currently in its final format. What would you like from it?

Q: GP: Does it include the lifecycle costs for both bridge types?

A: MOD: That information is in the type study and we can make it available to you.

C: GP: I only raise it because I asked you for that a year ago and it isn't available yet. That's tough for me to swallow.

C: Steve McCloskey (SM): I want to dispute your finding of no visual impacts. You can see the Chelsea Street Bridge from South Boston, you can see it from downtown, and you can see it when you land at Logan. I am insulted that you said we are a neighborhood full of eyesores and so what's one more? CITGO isn't paying the bills, we the taxpayers are. They're too busy burning American flags and counting their money to worry about us. We don't want a 250 foot channel. The 175 foot channel got us through WWII. What do we have to do to get a bascule bridge at 200 feet? It's a commonly used design and it would allay the fears of the community and meet our technical challenges.

A: MOD: Please make sure you provide those comments to FHWA and MassDOT and we will make sure they get to USCG.



STV Incorporated

3 2 1 S u m m e r S t r e e t
B o s t o n , M a s s a c h u s e t t s 0 2 2 1 0
(6 1 7) 4 8 2 - 7 2 9 8 f a x : (6 1 7) 4 8 2 - 1 8 3 7

C: Mary Jordan (MJ): Going through the EA, you have a signal timing cost for both options. I live off Green Street and you say there will be an additional 560 cars coming down during peak hours and the truck route on top of that. Will the cars be going through Weymouth Landing while we're trying to revitalize that area? Have you looked at when the four months of diverted traffic would fall? There are a lot of uses in that area that could be impacted like schools, churches and daycare centers.

A: MOD: We are currently trying to get those four months to be during the summer when volumes tend to be a bit lower. The considerations being brought forward in the EA aren't final, but we are looking at them. We are still coordinating with the traffic engineers in Braintree, Weymouth and Quincy to see what the impacts will be and how they would tie into local planning and building efforts.

Q: MJ: Is that something you can put into the mitigation package?

A: MOD: I don't know whether it will turn up there, but I can assure that this is why we are working with the community to determine the best alternate route for trucks and diverted traffic.

C: Bethany Hawes (BH): I am concerned that your traffic assessment overlooks Evans Street. The turning movements are on Church Street and Green Street only. Those would only be used by people who live there. I feel these numbers are low because people would pass up Church or Green to take Evans.

A: MOD: Nikole, can you speak to that?

A: Nikole Bulger (NB): I will direct the traffic engineer to look into that.

Q: BH: I have one more comment. Why can't you tell the mariners that they get a bridge with the same functional capacity as the 1936 bridge, the same way the drivers are?

A: MOD: That's a comment you can submit to USCG. We requested a 200 foot channel from them in 2009 and they denied it.

C: BH: I'm a navy veteran and I don't remember the Coast Guard having this kind of authority. I think it's silly how you make them out to be gods.

A: MOD: I can tell you that USCG does have the right to regulate what we do in a designated port area which this is.



STV Incorporated

3 2 1 S u m m e r S t r e e t
B o s t o n , M a s s a c h u s e t t s 0 2 2 1 0
(617)482-7298 fax:(617)482-1837

- C: Michael Lang (ML): I have a couple of comments. Much of your justification for the vertical lift bridge rests on the fact that sloops can get through in the closed position, but in June 2009 you said that you could give us a bascule bridge with a closed position vertical clearance of 57 feet.
- A: ME: If we said that, then we misspoke. The existing bridge provides 55 feet of vertical clearance and the proposed bascule could only achieve 47 feet. One thing that has changed is that that we have revised the numbers of openings for the two proposed bridge types. We did that by digging through the bridge tender's logs for the 1936 bridge and the temporary bridge and that's how we arrived at the revised figures. Those were introduced to the community at our public information meeting on June 14, 2010.
- C: ML: Let me apologize, I set you up. The actual statement says its 57 feet at the center line. You moved the measurement. The bascule bridge is curved up towards the middle so the measurement at the fender and center line is different. You say that the grade of the two bridge types will be the same so much of your data is bad. The sloops are only there during the summer season. Most sloops go out on the weekend so the impact to commuter traffic is minimal.
- A: ME: You are correct that most sloops go out in the summer and that they cannot force a bridge opening during the commuter peaks. However, those off-peak openings have a substantial impact on local residential traffic.
- C: ML: You also brought up that if a ship went through at the right time it could hit one of the bascule leaves. In one of your earlier statements to the mariners you said that you could get the bridge to open to 80 degrees. Well I measured your figure with a protractor and your diagram shows it at 70 degrees. If you went to somewhere around 72 degrees it would be parallel or maybe even further back than the fenders so that argument is also flawed.
- A: ME: Some clarification: when the bascule bridge is open, the structure extends out to the water line – it took us some time to figure that out – but when you lay the bow of a panamax vessel over that, there is an overhang on the fender system. That gives you the possibility of an allision between the bow of the shift and the base of the leaf. The proposed bascule bridge would have a massive, deep structure around the trunnion. There's no way to really escape that.
- C: ML: I just love you example. I had to read it three times. You know a ship rides higher in the water when its empty and you play that up on the bascule bridge. You never mention it with the vertical lift.



STV Incorporated

3 2 1 S u m m e r S t r e e t
B o s t o n , M a s s a c h u s e t t s 0 2 2 1 0
(6 1 7) 4 8 2 - 7 2 9 8 f a x : (6 1 7) 4 8 2 - 1 8 3 7

A: ME: With the vertical lift bridge you escape the whole difficulty we're alluding to here because the plinth on which the movable span rests can be much further back from the shipping channel.

Q: ML: Can I get that study?

A: MOD: I will look through that report and make it available through the website.

C: ML: Another thing: I read through all the information on the Charles Berry Bridge and the bridge didn't break down, the DOT took it down for maintenance and the contractor screwed up ordering the components. It wasn't a bad bridge to begin with it was the moron who didn't fix it right.

A: ME: But you did see the length of the closure.

A: ML: But that wasn't the fault of the bridge, it was the fault of the stupid contractor. If someone comes to your house to do a job, you would expect them to order the tools and parts first right? Well this guy didn't.

A: ME: The issue is that if something happened you would have problems getting components. I want everyone to understand that we have no intrinsic preference for a vertical lift bridge. We started out comparing them equally after our initial request for a 200 foot channel was denied. Given the width we're dealing with the vertical lift bridge gives us a better value.

C: Ed Hancock (EH): Talking about the old Fore River Bridge: it was 42 feet at mean high water. That was written right on the bridge. You talk about the panamax tanker and the widest spot is the bridge wings. I came down the river over a hundred times in my career on all kinds of boats and I want to advocate for the 250 foot bridge. You need that space in case a tugboat fails. The 1936 bridge got hit all the time and the temporary bridge has been hit too. You need the space. There are six outfits in the shipyard that take delivery of fuel by tanker and not just CITGO.

A: MOD: Thank you for that, sir.

Q: Gordon Jackson (GJ): The 1936 bridge was wide enough to fit LNG tankers through. Why is CITGO having this problem now?

A: MOD: I want to point you back to what Mr. Hancock just said. Getting a boat through there at 175 feet isn't impossible, but it's difficult and dangerous. We talked to the mariners and they said "yes, LNG tankers used to go through the old bridge,



STV Incorporated

3 2 1 S u m m e r S t r e e t
B o s t o n , M a s s a c h u s e t t s 0 2 2 1 0
(617)482-7298 fax:(617)482-1837

but they scraped the fenders and the bottom of the river.” As I mentioned, MassDOT requested a 200 foot channel from the USCG and the pilots and USCG rejected it. USCG regulates that waterway and they said 225 feet was the bare minimum required to avoid allisions with the proposed bridge and expedite water traffic. We are trying to build a safer bridge for the future. I would listen to Mr. Hancock who speaks for experience and says we need the 250 feet.

Q: Gordon Jackson (GJ): Regarding construction times, can they be pushed back a bit later in the morning to avoid disturbing the neighborhood?

A: MOD: 7AM will be our normal start time, Monday through Friday. Sometimes we will work beyond 7AM to 4PM or on weekends, but we would make sure to coordinate it appropriately with the community.

C: Jack Perruzi (JP): You know that with a tunnel you wouldn't have any of these problems.

A: MOD: The conversation about the tunnel has been pretty fully explored. I'd urge you to visit the project website and look at the Vollmer report. It lays out the reasons why the tunnel, and fixed bridge, we're dismissed.

C: BC: Did I hear Mr. Peters right that he requested a report from you and you wouldn't give it to him?

A: MOD: Our legal counsel has prepared the documents Mr. Peters wants. He has been told that if he pays the \$50 fee associated with the processing the documents, then he will have them.

C: BC: That embarrasses me as an elected representative. Mr. Peters is a taxpayer. He has already paid for the documents with his taxes. Just give them to him.

C: GP: I want to take this moment to speak about the USCG. There is no mandate from USCG. You missed a huge opportunity by not looking at a 200 foot bascule bridge in your type study and a 300 foot bridge as well. If you'd given us both of those options to look at instead of the truncated options you have we'd all realize that 225 feet is a strain. From the taxpayer's standpoint, you missed the opportunity. If USCG can convince us, we'll embrace it, but we've been cut out of this process. You give us two unappealing options and then try to hang it on them. But – they'll rule one way or another and then we'll advocate for a 200 foot bascule bridge.



STV Incorporated

3 2 1 S u m m e r S t r e e t
B o s t o n , M a s s a c h u s e t t s 0 2 2 1 0
(6 1 7) 4 8 2 - 7 2 9 8 f a x : (6 1 7) 4 8 2 - 1 8 3 7

- C: Tom Schneider (TS): I would assume that you already know there is a railroad under the bridge and I hope you will make maximum use of it to keep traffic off the road. Second, I assume that CITGO is the biggest user of the waterway and will remain so into the future. What about extending CITGO's pier to the other side of the bridge? Then you could have a small bridge that meets everyone's needs.
- A: MOD: I don't know about relocating CITGO's pier. I do know that there have been discussions stretching back a decade about building an off-shore pipeline to avoid a movable bridge but that's been rejected flatly many times.
- C: EH: There's already too much stuff buried out there to put in anything more.



STV Incorporated

3 2 1 Summer Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02210
(617)482-7298 fax:(617)482-1837

Appendix 1: Official Notice

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION-HIGHWAY DIVISION

NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING

Quincy-Weymouth: Proposed Fore River Bridge Replacement Project File No. 604382

A Public Meeting will be held by MassDOT-Highway Division to receive public comments on the Environmental Assessment for the proposed Fore River Bridge Replacement Project. The project is located in Quincy and Weymouth, Massachusetts.

WHERE: Fore River Club House
16 Nevada Road
Quincy, MA 02169

WHEN: Thursday, January 13, 2011 @ 6:30 PM

PURPOSE: The purpose of this meeting is to present the Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Fore River Bridge Replacement Project, Quincy-Weymouth made available for public review on December 13, 2010. The EA was prepared to evaluate a range of alternatives and impacts for the permanent replacement of the 1936 Fore River Bridge, which was demolished in 2004 and temporarily replaced with the existing movable lift bridge. The EA was made available to the community through a range of outlets, including the project website (www.mass.gov/massdot/foreriverbridge) and local public libraries. Comments on the EA are due by January 26, 2011 and should be sent to:

Richard Marquis, Acting Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration
Massachusetts Division
55 Broadway, 10th Floor
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02142
Attn: Damaris Santiago

Frank A. Tramontozzi, P.E., Chief Engineer
MassDOT Highway Division
10 Park Plaza, Room 4260
Boston, Massachusetts 02116
Attn: Michael Furlong

Comments will also be accepted verbally and in writing during the public meeting on January 13, 2011. Following a brief presentation, MassDOT staff will lead a discussion to gather comments and answer questions.

PROPOSAL: The replacement of the Fore River Bridge, which carries Route 3A over the Fore River between Quincy and Weymouth, is being conducted under the Commonwealth's Accelerated Bridge Program (ABP). This is one of the largest projects being undertaken by MassDOT under the ABP and when completed, will create a permanent, movable bridge to replace the current temporary span.

The purpose of the proposed action is to replace the existing temporary bridge carrying Route 3A over the Fore River between Quincy and Weymouth with a permanent movable bridge that would be on the same alignment and have the same vehicular capacity as the 1936 bridge, while maximizing the vertical channel clearance to reduce opening frequency and duration, and widening the horizontal channel clearance to meet marine navigational needs. The alternatives considered in the EA include the No Build, a bascule bridge and a vertical lift bridge. The EA identifies a Preferred Alternative of a Vertical Lift Bridge with a 250-foot horizontal channel clearance and a vertical clearance of 58.5 feet above mean high water as the only alternative that meets the project's purpose and need. The proposed Fore River Bridge structure will have two travel lanes, a bicycle accommodating shoulder, and a sidewalk in each direction. The EA identifies impacts of the preferred alternative and proposes mitigation.

Print copies of the EA and Appendices are available at the Weymouth, Quincy, and Braintree Public Libraries. Compact disks and/or print copies may be obtained by contacting Michael Furlong at the Massachusetts Department of Transportation, 10 Park Plaza, Room 4260, Boston, MA 02116. Mike can also be reached at 617-973-8067 or Michael.Furlong@state.ma.us.

The community has declared that this facility is accessible to all in compliance with the ADA / Title II. However, persons in need of ADA / Title II accommodations should contact Angela Rudikoff by phone at (617) 973-7005 or email to angela.rudikoff@state.ma.us. Requests must be made at least 10 days prior to the date of the public meeting.

LUISA PAIEWONSKY
HIGHWAY DIVISION ADMINISTRATOR

FRANK A. TRAMONTOZZI, P.E.
CHIEF ENGINEER

Boston, Massachusetts



STV Incorporated

3 2 1 S u m m e r S t r e e t
B o s t o n , M a s s a c h u s e t t s 0 2 2 1 0
(617)482-7298 fax:(617)482-1837

File STV No. 20

End of Meeting

Note to the Reader: the materials made available through this section of the website have been developed by the project team to support the public involvement process. As the materials cover over a year's worth of meetings, the reader should assume that all materials reflect the project team's best understanding of the project at the time prepared. Later materials offer the reader a deeper and clearer look at the project and should be assumed to supersede earlier materials.

These minutes are a close representation of what transpired at the meeting summarized herein, but should not be considered a verbatim transcript. Contact information provided by meeting attendees has been removed to protect their privacy.
