



DESIGN PUBLIC HEARING

February 24, 2010 at 7:00 pm

AT

Hingham Town Hall 210 Central Street Auditorium Hingham, MA  
02043

FOR THE PROPOSED

Bridge Replacement of the Fore River Bridge Route 3A over  
Fore River Project 604382 Between the City of Quincy and  
Town of Weymouth

COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS

MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION HIGHWAY  
DIVISION

LUISA PAIEWONSKY  
HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATOR

FRANK A. TRAMONTOZZI,  
P.E. CHIEF ENGINEER

**ATM,INC.CourtReportingServices**  
**339.674.9100**

## **PRESENTERS**

Michael O'Dowd, Project Manager, MassDOT

Michael Sheehan, MassDOT Right of Way

Mark Ennis, STV

Mark Pelletier, STV

Nikole Bulger, STV

## **SPEAKERINDEX**

<b>Name</b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
MICHAEL O'DOWD	5, 7, 10, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 52, 53, 55, 56, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 69, 70, 71, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86
UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER	5, 6, 17, 45, 46, 53, 54, 59, 67, 68, 69, 73, 74, 75, 76, 78, 79, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85

**ATM,INC.CourtReportingServices**  
**339.674.9100**

## **SPEAKERINDEX**

<b>Name</b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
REPRESENTATIVE BRADLEY	5, 6
MICHAEL SHEEHAN	8
MARK PELLETIER	12, 45, 46, 48, 49, 50, 57, 67, 68, 69, 81, 82, 83
NIKOLE BULGER	17, 56, 62, 68, 69, 82
MARK ENNIS	23, 46, 48, 57, 58, 59, 67, 68, 74, 80, 81, 86
VICTOR PAP	42, 45
ALAN RIDDELL	43, 44
BILL REARDON	46, 63
LOU GAINER	47
NORRAINE WEYLOMAS	48, 49
MICHAEL LANG	49, 50, 51
PAUL GOODMAN	56
SANDRA PETERS	56, 57, 58
ALICE FULTON	58, 59
FRANK SINGLETON	59, 61
CHRISTINE GALVIN	61, 62
BARRY HASS	62, 63, 72, 86

## **SPEAKERINDEX**

<b>Name</b>	<b><u>Page</u></b>
SANDY GILDEA	64, 65
JOHN CURRAN	65, 66
STEVE MCCLUSKY	67
JIM HAYES	69, 70
RICK COLLINS	70
GARY PETERS	71, 81
PEGGY KELLEY	73
GEORGE GRAHAM	74
CHRISTINE GALVIN	76
REBECCA HOFFMAN	77, 79
JOANN HARQCZ	79, 80
JIM WATSON	80
SEAN GALLAGHER	82
MIKE BOYNTON	84

**EXHIBITS**

<u>Description</u>	<u>Page</u>
Sign in Sheet	89-90
Design	91-100

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24

P R O C E E D I N G S

MICHAEL O'DOWD: Let me get started. For any of you that have not signed in, I would ask that you please make your attendance known by signing off on the attendance sheet at the rear of the room when you leave this evening.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We can't hear you.

MO: I can fix that. I ask that anyone who hasn't signed in yet, before you leave tonight sign in on the sheet at the back of the room. Stephanie is back there and she has the attendance sheet and she likes to make note of all those in attendance tonight.

Good evening ladies and gentleman. My name is Michael O'Dowd, I am the Project Manager for Mass Department of Transportation and the Project Manager for the Fore River Bridge Replacement Project, Quincy, Weymouth over the Fore River Channel. I was asked to conduct this meeting tonight by Chief Engineer Frank Tramontozzi who is doing so on behalf of a request made by Senator Hedlund. Before I get started this evening I would like to acknowledge a couple of individuals. Representative Bradley who would you like to say a few words?

REPRESENTATIVE BRADLEY: I am right over here.

1 Can everybody hear me if I just yell? Is that okay? First  
2 off those of us in the house and the Senate wanted to have  
3 this meeting. This will be the first of a couple of  
4 meetings.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We can't hear you.

6 REP. B: If I yell any louder let me grab  
7 the microphone. I spoke to Representative Murphy and  
8 Mariano from Weymouth and those of you that are here from  
9 Weymouth there will be a followup meetings set up by them  
10 in the next several months. They were not able to be here  
11 tonight. Ed's staff is here from Representatives  
12 Cantwell's Office, Jamie Ryan from Representative Murphy's  
13 Office, Chris Walker is here from Mayor Koch's Office.

14 Senator Hedlund could not be here tonight, he  
15 has his radio show that he is hosting an event for Army  
16 Sergeant Benjamin Sherman who was killed in action in  
17 Afghanistan, he was from Plymouth. So it was originally  
18 scheduled for the phantom snow storm night, so he had  
19 rescheduled it for this. Mike is here as well. Jeff is  
20 here as well. I will be here for some of the meeting.  
21 There are several events I have to go to. Jeff will be  
22 here for the entire time.

23 For those of you who are not on our email  
24 notification - Victor Pap is here from Weymouth, sorry

1 about that, Victor. He is a Weymouth Town Councilor. We  
2 have an email notification that myself, Representative  
3 Murphy, Mariano and Hedlund and Representative Cantwell who  
4 couldn't be here tonight send out, so please signup for  
5 that. Jeff will be here to sign you up. It notifies you  
6 when the bridge is going up. We get the information and we  
7 forward it out. We have a couple thousand people who get  
8 that notification.

9           I want to thank you folks for being here  
10 tonight for giving us an overview of the project. This is  
11 a significant project everybody obviously knows it spans  
12 Weymouth and Quincy but it affects many people in my  
13 district, so I appreciate you coming out here tonight.  
14 Hopefully, you will have some questions and if do, please  
15 feel free to call your representative or your senator's  
16 office. Thank you very much for coming out tonight.

17           MO: Thank you Representative. I would like to  
18 start by introducing the members of the panel that will be  
19 joining me tonight. To my far left is the Right of Way  
20 representative from our local District Office, Mr. Mike  
21 Sheehan. To my immediate left is Mark Ennis from STV,  
22 Project Manager. To my right is Mark Pelletier, the Vice  
23 President of STV. To his immediate right is Nicole Bulger  
24 who is the Lead Civil Engineer of the project and to her



1 far right is Tammy Hillery who is our transcriptionist from  
2 Arlington Typing and Mailing. She will be making a  
3 verbatim transcript of tonight's hearing.

4 I will start by having Michael read a copy of  
5 the Public Notice.

6 MICHAEL SHEEHAN: The Commonwealth of  
7 Massachusetts, Massachusetts Department of Transportation  
8 Highway Division. Notice of Public Information Meeting.  
9 Quincy Weymouth: Proposed Fore River Bridge Replacement  
10 Project File No. 604382. A Public Information Meeting will  
11 be held by MassDOT Highway Division to discuss the proposed  
12 Fore River Bridge Replacement Project in Quincy and  
13 Weymouth, MA.

14 Where; Hingham Town Hall Auditorium, 210  
15 Central Street, Hingham, MA. When; Wednesday, February 24,  
16 2010 at 7:30 PM. Purpose; The purpose of this meeting is  
17 to provide the public with the opportunity to become fully  
18 acquainted with the proposed bridge replacement  
19 alternatives of Bridge No. Q01001W32001 Route 3A over  
20 the Fore River. Following the presentation, MassDOT staff  
21 will lead a discussion and answer questions and gather  
22 public comment on the alternatives. All views and comments  
23 made at this hearing will be reviewed and considered to the  
24 maximum extent possible.

1                   Proposal; The Project involves the replacement  
2 of the Fore River Bridge Route 3A over Fore River. The  
3 proposed Fore River Bridge structure will have two travel  
4 lanes, a bicycle accommodating shoulder, and sidewalks in  
5 each direction. When completed, the project will replace  
6 the existing temporary ACROW moveable lift bridge completed  
7 and placed into service in 2005.

8                   A secure right of way is necessary for this  
9 project. Acquisitions in fee and permanent or temporary  
10 easements may be required. The Commonwealth of  
11 Massachusetts is responsible for acquiring all needed  
12 rights in private or public lands. MassDOT's policy  
13 concerning land acquisitions will be discussed at this  
14 meeting.

15                   Written views received by MassDOT subsequent to  
16 the date of this notice and up to five days prior to the  
17 date of the meeting shall be displayed for public  
18 inspections and copying at the time and date listed above.  
19 Plans will be on display onehalf hour before the meeting  
20 begins, with an engineer in attendance to answer questions  
21 regarding this project. A project handout will be made  
22 available on the MassDOT website listed below.

23                   The community has declared that this facility  
24 is accessible to all in compliance with the ADA/Title II.

1 However, persons in need of the ADA/Title II accommodations  
2 should contact Angela Rudikoff by phone at 6179737005 or  
3 email [angela.rudikoff@state.ma.us](mailto:angela.rudikoff@state.ma.us). Requests must be made  
4 at least 10 days prior to the date of the public meeting.

5 In case of inclement weather, meeting  
6 cancellation announcements will be posted on the internet  
7 at <http://www.massdot.state.ma.us/Highway/>

8 Luisa Paiewonsky, Massachusetts Highway  
9 Division Administrator. Frank A. Tramontozzi, P.E., Chief  
10 Engineer, Boston, Massachusetts.

11 MO: Thank you, Michael. The handout that was  
12 presented to everyone in the room explains the purpose of  
13 the hearing and gives us an opportunity to make a formal  
14 presentation of the proposed project and at the same time  
15 allows us to record your input regarding this project.

16 Construction funding for this project is  
17 currently being provided for under the Accelerated Bridge  
18 Program. The Accelerated Bridge Program was initiated in  
19 2008 as the result of the signing of the bill and the  
20 legislature of the law of Governor Deval Patrick.

21 The purpose of the Accelerated Bridge Program  
22 was to provide funding in the amount of \$3 Billion to be  
23 used across the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for the  
24 purposes of repairing, replacing or rehabilitating existing

1 structurally deficient bridges. There are about two  
2 hundred bridges that have been identified to be completed  
3 under this program. It is an eight year program starting  
4 in 2008 and will expire in 2016. So this has come upon us  
5 at MassDOT to make sure that all those projects that have  
6 been identified including this one that we are here to  
7 present this evening be completed in construction by 2016.

8                   In addition to the accelerated bond funds that  
9 are being provided for the Federal Highway Administrations  
10 is also providing construction funding for this. The  
11 estimated cost of this project is \$255 million. That cost  
12 does not include any right of way acquisitions. The design  
13 is expected to be completed in the spring of 2011. We are  
14 preparing this project to be delivered for construction by  
15 the design build delivery.

16                   The design build is an opportunity that allows  
17 the Commonwealth to complete the preliminary design and the  
18 regulatory permitting including the environmental  
19 assessments and the Coast Guard permitting to have that  
20 complete prior to actually starting construction. The  
21 design build entity is a contracting lead team who hires  
22 their own bridge designers at which point they will take  
23 the preliminary design that has been brought to 25% by STV  
24 and they will complete the final design.

1           It allows the contractor to actually start  
2 construction while many of the final design points are  
3 still being finalized. So, plans that are not presented to  
4 you tonight are similar in nature to many of you that  
5 attended previous public meetings in Quincy or Weymouth. A  
6 lot of the information will look very similar to you.  
7 This is an opportunity for those especially commuters who  
8 have not seen this presentation tonight to be brought up to  
9 speed as to where we have started, when this project  
10 started, a number of the details that we then take into  
11 account and then the alternatives that are being  
12 investigated.

13                       So, I will first ask that Mark Ennis or Mark  
14 Pelletier will be opening or at least opening the  
15 presentation tonight being conducted, I would ask that if  
16 there are any questions that you please hold off until the  
17 presentation is completed at which point in time we will be  
18 more than happy to answer any and all questions to the best  
19 of our ability. Thank you.

20                       MARK PELLETIER: Thank you, Mike. My name is  
21 Mark Pelletier with STV and I am here to present The Fore  
22 River Bridge Replacement Project. A little bit about the  
23 Accelerated Bridge Program, Mike gave you a briefing. This  
24 project is included in the program and it is an Accelerated

1 Bridge Program is a \$3 million commitment over eight years  
2 and it is to accelerate the construction or rehabilitation  
3 of a lot of the deficient bridges here in Massachusetts.

4 Part of the techniques associated with the  
5 Accelerated Bridge Program, as Mike mentioned, one of  
6 those techniques is the innovated construction contracting  
7 and that is what we are doing with this project at this  
8 time. We are preparing a design build procurement package  
9 that will be put out to bid sometime in the Spring of 2011.

10 A little bit about STV, we are a firm of about  
11 sixteen hundred people. We have thirty offices around the  
12 country. We have been in Boston for the last thirty years.  
13 I have been there for over twentyseven years and we have  
14 worked on some of the most complicated and challenging  
15 projects in Massachusetts. We are very familiar with this  
16 area and the project location.

17 Our team is made up of not only STV but a group  
18 of specialty consultants. A lot of them are here today.  
19 We have Joann Haracz who is here from AECOM who is handling  
20 the environmental structural support work for the  
21 approaches. TRC for the environmental work, Howard/Stein  
22 Hudson, Tom Stokes and Dave Matton are here tonight to  
23 answer any questions relative to traffic. We have Nate  
24 CabralCurtis for Public Communications and Nate is

1 available for any comments that you may have and that sort  
2 of wraps up the team that is here today.

3                   A little bit about the scope and what we are  
4 able to do. Mike mentioned that we have been having these  
5 public information meetings. This is our seventh public  
6 information meeting. We are here to present the scope of  
7 work that we are undertaking. We are here to listen to  
8 whatever concerns that you have. We are here to give you  
9 an update of where we are. This isn't a formal 25% public  
10 hearing that will happen later on in the process. We have  
11 a lot of these public informational meeting, so we can  
12 present to you what we have done to date and listen to what  
13 your feedback is. So, please if you have comments we are  
14 happy to hear them.

15                   Our job at STV is to coordinate with the  
16 stakeholders and the agencies involved in this project.  
17 Again, that is why we are here. Part of the work that we  
18 are doing is to evaluate structure options at this  
19 location. So, we are looking at the moveable span. Our  
20 scope includes looking at a lift option and a bascule  
21 option. We will present those in greater details as part  
22 of our presentation. We have a lot schemes that we have  
23 developed. We are looking for your input on them.

24                   We are also evaluating different types of

1 approach structures based on the span of regulation for the  
2 moveable span that we come up with. So, once we have done  
3 that we will prepare a preferred alternative and we've  
4 actually submitted a type study to MassHighway which  
5 recommends an option and MassHighway is evaluating that at  
6 this time and they haven't made the decision. So, we have  
7 a little ways to go. Part of this process is meetings like  
8 this.

9                   So, once we have a scheme that MassHighway is  
10 satisfied with we'll go ahead with the NEPA filing. We  
11 will talk about that process that we are going to go  
12 through and once we make the NEPA filing it will establish  
13 our permitting constraints and then we will begin advancing  
14 to 25% design based on the permitting constraints, based on  
15 the informational meetings that we have had to date, based  
16 on your input and will prepare design plans, construction  
17 staging plans to minimize impacts to traffic, and to  
18 minimize the impacts to mariners. We will prepare them in  
19 a way that it will be combined with the design build  
20 procurement package to put out to the design builder.

21                   The schedule we started in October of 2008.  
22 The basic design which was basically gathering information  
23 that was relative to the existing site conditions, doing  
24 traffic studies, preparing the function of the design and



1 preparing the bridge type study which evaluates multiple  
2 schemes and then submitting them to MassHighway for  
3 MassHighway to review. So that is the stage where we are  
4 at right now. We are having MassHighway review our type  
5 study. In the Spring of 2010, we are almost there, we will  
6 begin the 25% design. We will be working on the federal  
7 and state permits, as well the highway plans, the bridge  
8 sketch plans and then submit that to the MassHighway  
9 review.

10                   So, in the Fall of 2010 we will have defined  
11 what the project will be. We will prepare a design  
12 procurement package that will be discussed and negotiated  
13 over a six month period and in the Spring of 2011, as Mike  
14 indicated, we will put out a design bid procurement  
15 package.

16                   Part of the things that we consider as part of  
17 our design to come up with a bridge configuration we looked  
18 for community input, again that is why we are here today.  
19 There are environmental concerns which Nikole will talk  
20 about. Channel clearance issues certainly the mariners are  
21 concerned about of wide the channel is, not only  
22 horizontally but vertically. We want to come up with a  
23 design which will minimize the bridge openings. Mark Ennis  
24 will present that as part of his presentation.

1                   So, we are looking to minimize that for the  
2 mariners.

3                   UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We can't hear you.

4                   MP: We are looking to minimize the effects to  
5 the mariners and also to the traffic, people who use the  
6 roadway. We are also concerned with bicycles, pedestrians  
7 and marine traffic. We are going to look at the  
8 construction staging issues to minimize the traffic issues  
9 during construction. We are going to look at aesthetics  
10 and we also have renderings that we have developed with our  
11 engineers and our architects working together. And  
12 certainly we are going to look at capital maintenance and  
13 life cycle costs.

14                   At this time Nikole Bulger is going to talk  
15 about the site issues, the permitting issues and the  
16 traffic issues.

17                   NIKOLE BULGER: Can everyone here me okay? As  
18 we would expect a project of this scale would coordinate  
19 with many federal and state agencies and permitting  
20 documents. The primary permitting documents for this  
21 project is under the National Environmental Policy Act,  
22 NEPA. The Federal Highway Administration is the lead  
23 agency for that filing and the Coast Guard serves the forth  
24 agency because the Fore River is a waterway.

1                   We will be preparing an environmental  
2 assessment as part of that NEPA process. For those of you  
3 who are familiar with the Massachusetts Environmental  
4 Policy Act, MEPA; this document will be similar to an  
5 environmental impact report. That environmental assessment  
6 document will assess the existing conditions; outline the  
7 alternatives that have been analyzed during the design  
8 phase, identify the preferred alternative and any potential  
9 impacts that it might have and propose any mitigation  
10 methods that may be necessary. It will also outline our  
11 community outreach process that began last October that you  
12 will hear this evening and will continue as part of the  
13 design phase.

14                   We will complete that document for the Federal  
15 Highway Administration review and for their use in  
16 soliciting additional public comment. Ultimately, the  
17 Federal Highway Administration will issue a finding of the  
18 impacts and the project will be able to move forward.

19                   Getting into the environmental assessment more  
20 specifically it addresses all these impacts that you see  
21 here. I am not going to go into each one individually but  
22 what you see here is the intent of the document is to  
23 address any potential impacts that might be from the  
24 project on the community or the surrounding environment.

1           In the finding permitting process for this  
2 project it is important to mention that the Fore River  
3 Bridge Replacement project is considered a footprint bridge  
4 project. It is more familiar know as the transportation  
5 Bond Bill. Footprint Bridge Projects are exempt from  
6 filings under the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act,  
7 MEPA, from Chapter 91 licensing with the Massachusetts  
8 Department of Environmental Protection and also from the  
9 Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act.

10           However, we are filing many other permit  
11 applications. We will be filing for a US Coast Guard  
12 Bridge permit. We will be filing with the Massachusetts  
13 Department of Environmental Protection for our 401 Water  
14 Quality Certificate with the Army Corp of Engineers for our  
15 404 permit with the Massachusetts Coastal Zone Management  
16 for consistency determination with the EPA for a NPDES  
17 Permit. And as some of you may already know we have  
18 already gone through negotiations on the Section 106  
19 National Historic Preservation Act to establish an  
20 agreement. That had to be done before the demolition of  
21 the 1936 bridge.

22           This line is intended to just give you more of  
23 an overview of the project area and you will see it refers  
24 to several of the facilities in the area. The Fore River

1 generation station is here, the bridge here, you have the  
2 Twin Rivers facility here and the shipyard in this area.  
3 So, just to orient you with some of the things that we will  
4 be talking about in the presentation.

5 More specifically the Fore River Bridge context  
6 is a very industrial area but we also recognize that there  
7 are residents who have the Fore River Bridge in their view  
8 point from their home.

9 Here you see pictures of the Fore River  
10 Station, Germantown residents across the river, and the USS  
11 Salem. Looking here at the site plan in the upper right  
12 you see the MWRA facility land. To the lower left is the  
13 Fore River Station. Many of you are probably familiar with  
14 the public amenities that were constructed as part of the  
15 power plant rebuilding project a few years back. MassDOT  
16 has entered into a signed restoration obligation with the  
17 power plant owners, so that any impacts to the public  
18 amenities will be fully restored after completion of the  
19 replacement bridge project will be the demolish of the  
20 temporary bridge.

21 When we began looking at the profile of the  
22 roadway on this project we had four major concerns. The  
23 first was the design speed which is 40 mph; the second is  
24 that we need to maintain sites that are in accordance with

1 the American Disabilities Act, ADA which means that we have  
2 5% maximum slopes. We also needed to insure that our  
3 impacts to the Quincy rotary and to the homes immediately  
4 adjacent to the right of way on the Weymouth approach were  
5 not impacted. And we needed as best we could to maximize  
6 the elevation of the roadway across the center of  
7 navigation channel and what this does is it raises the  
8 height of the structure and allows more of the sailboats of  
9 using the channel to pass without having to request a  
10 bridge opening which means less impact to traffic.

11                   So, those were our four constraints that we  
12 were dealing with as we analyze these profile alternatives.  
13 You can see that the red line at the top actually has  
14 impacts to the homes in Weymouth which you can see on the  
15 right side of the profile and the roadway in Quincy which  
16 is on the far left. We determined that these impacts  
17 really weren't acceptable, so we ended up settling on the  
18 middle profile shown here in blue, on the next slide. You  
19 can actually see what this profile looks like in comparison  
20 to the 1936 bridge.

21                   We were actually able to raise the roadway  
22 profile approximately fifteen feet while still meeting all  
23 of our other criteria. This is the roadway cross section  
24 and we are currently proposing. We have four 12 foot

1 travel lanes for vehicles. A 5 foot bicycle lane in each  
2 direction and a 6 ½ foot sidewalk in each direction and  
3 crash protective barriers.

4 Traffic management is something that we know is  
5 a major issue for all commuters and anyone who lives near  
6 the bridge. Obviously things that occur during the  
7 temporary bridge construction and issues that you might  
8 have had are a great interest to us. We are trying to work  
9 with those pitfalls this time around. So, again as Mark  
10 mentioned during the question and answer session any  
11 comments that you have or suggestions that you might have  
12 this would be a great time to tell us so we can incorporate  
13 them in our design.

14 We will work very closely with traffic  
15 management plans that we develop during construction and  
16 trying to update the public for our design process and  
17 MassDOT throughout the construction phase. We also look at  
18 the traffic management that is going to occur from the  
19 structure and as I mentioned we have raised the roadway  
20 profile as much as we can so that we can try to minimize  
21 the number of bridge openings that are required.

22 What you see here is a simplified view of  
23 construction sequencing. One of the major things about  
24 this project is that most of the construction of the bridge

1 replacement will occur without any impact to the traveling  
2 public. What you see on the figure, in the number one, is  
3 the red area is where the new bridge and the approaches  
4 will be constructed. You can see that that really has no  
5 impact on the existing bridge approaches and the temporary  
6 bridge traffic.

7                   In view two you see the proposed bridge fully  
8 observant and connected to the approaches and we are going  
9 through the demolition is the temporary bridge. What you  
10 don't see between these two views is that there will be a  
11 traffic management exercise tentatively significant that  
12 will be required in order to rebuild the approach section.  
13 That is something that we studying as part of our type  
14 study. We present several alternatives and we will be  
15 analyzing those alternatives to determine the best course  
16 of action and once we have that we will show that to you.

17                   Figure three shows the completed bridge with  
18 the temporary bridge. I will now turn it over to Mark  
19 Ennis who will assess the bridge type study.

20                   MARK ENNIS: Good evening everybody. Can you  
21 all hear me? I hope so. Now the phase that we are at now  
22 is we are coming to the conclusion of the bridge type study  
23 phase of the project. A bridge type study involves the  
24 study of several different structure types to determine the



1 most appropriate type to be constructed at a particular  
2 site. In this case we are looking at two aspects.  
3 Certainly the approach span but more importantly the most  
4 appropriate moveable span to be constructed across the  
5 navigation channel.

6           Part of our evaluation is to consider the  
7 constraints and the issues that are generated by the  
8 particular site in question and in this case the Fore River  
9 site between Quincy and Weymouth. Relative to the  
10 approaches we expect three to four spans of approach  
11 structure in each direction approaching the bridge from  
12 each side of it. You see two sections of the bridge here  
13 that we are evaluating and they might appear quite similar  
14 in appearance. The structure on the left is supported by  
15 steel Ibeams which in turn supports a concrete deck that  
16 provides the roadway surface. On the right hand side it is  
17 a similar structure but we use precast Ibeams structures  
18 made of concrete to provide support. Then the pier  
19 structures are again formed of reinforced concrete which in  
20 turn is supported by deep sharp foundation.

21           The presentation that we are giving here today  
22 primarily relates to the removable span and more  
23 particularly we are evaluating two structure types for this  
24 moveable span. They are the bascule type bridge structure

1 as you see in the top left hand photograph. That is one of  
2 the many bascule structure that are found in Chicago and  
3 then also a vertical lift type structure which is shown in  
4 the lower photograph. That is an example of a vertical  
5 lift in Sacramento, California. The bascule type structure  
6 is relatively common in this area. There are several  
7 examples. The old Fore River Bridge, the 1936 structure  
8 that was demolished some ten years ago was also a bascule  
9 type structure. Bascules typically work well up to a  
10 certain span of length. In our particular area site we can  
11 achieve a 225 foot channel opening with a bascule. A  
12 vertical lift can channel much larger than that. One of  
13 the bridges currently just beginning construction in the  
14 Boston area is the Chelsea Street Bridge and that bridge is  
15 a total span of over 450 feet. So, you can see that the  
16 vertical lift can have longer spans that bascule bridge  
17 can.

18           Some examples are shown here of different  
19 bascule types from traditional on the left hand side to  
20 more modern on the right. The top right corner Woodrow  
21 Wilson Bridge was recently constructed just outside of  
22 Washington, DC. So for the vertical lifts we have some,  
23 you see the Sacramento Bridge in the top left corner. The  
24 top righthand and lower left are examples of steel type

1 vertical structures where the superstructures are supported  
2 by steel and the towers are formed of steel. In the bottom  
3 righthand side is a more exotic vertical lift structure  
4 from Bordeaux in France where they have individual concrete  
5 towers supporting the vertical lift span as it moves up and  
6 down.

7                   So the criteria that we are evaluating as we  
8 make our study and certainly the roadway study is a  
9 significant issue in our study. The Route 3A which is the  
10 road that is carried across the Fore River by the bridge  
11 provides a bike lane for the central residents to and from  
12 Boston. There are some 32 thousand vehicles a day that  
13 pass across this section of Route 3A and that number is  
14 only expected to grow as the years go on.

15                   So we are very aware of the disruption caused  
16 by openings to the people using Route 3A. The detour  
17 routes are not easy around this particular site and they  
18 involve going through areas that already have heavy  
19 congestion, so they do not make a good alternative to  
20 crossing this bridge site.

21                   So relative to roadway traffic our intent is to  
22 reduce the number of openings and also to reduce the  
23 duration of those openings. Another very important group  
24 is the mariners who use the channel on a daily basis. Just

1 as we have had several public meetings, as Mark has  
2 described, we have also had some with the mariners to  
3 discuss the project. And their needs and what the mariners  
4 point out to us is that certainly it is a busy channel  
5 there is a range of 600 boats per year but there is - the  
6 largest of the vesicles that use the channel are the  
7 tankers that feed the Citgo tank farm but there is also the  
8 expectation with the construction that a larger class of  
9 tanker will be coming into production. So it is important  
10 to provide a large delegation of opening is very important  
11 to the mariners.

12                   In addition to that as noted on the screen here  
13 the area around Fore River is designated a fort area.  
14 Massachusetts Office of Coastal Zone Management we are  
15 tasks with ensuring and in no way hinder the development of  
16 that designated port area by the type of bridge that we put  
17 in place. So the barriers in short are looking for the  
18 largest possible opening that can be feasibly achieved at  
19 the site.

20                   The anticipated traffic is for a 300 foot  
21 navigation channel at which one aspect of that not only is  
22 it very expensive but it would eliminate any opportunity to  
23 use a bascule type structure. In discussions back and  
24 forth we believe that they may well accept a 250 foot

1 channel opening sufficient to their needs. They may  
2 consider a 225 foot opening which puts a bascule type  
3 structure in play. The goal in terms of the navigation is  
4 to provide a better navigation access to the Fore River.

5                   Going back to the bascule type structure this  
6 is a diagram to briefly explain how a bascule type bridge  
7 works. It rotates around the horizontal access and over  
8 here this diagram as a trunnion. It is a counterlever in  
9 type that is a different sort of support for a bridge  
10 system. Counter Lever suspends the other trunnion to  
11 support the roadway trunnion. When it rotates the counter  
12 weight on the back side helps to balance the weight on the  
13 deck. And as we said as bascule structures get larger and  
14 larger one of the problems that we encounter is as it opens  
15 up there is a very large area of surface area that is  
16 exposed to winds and other forces, primarily wind. So, in  
17 large winds there are significantly low (Inaudible Phrase)  
18 in the motor system that drives the movement of the bridge  
19 and that low cannot be offset by the counter lever. So  
20 the larger the surface area here the more difficult and  
21 problematic the operation of the bascule type structure  
22 becomes.

23                   As we said we can get up to 225 feet with this  
24 structure but at 225 feet when we layout the bridge we find

1 that the trunnion to trunnion distance is some 315 feet  
2 which would make this the largest bascule structure in the  
3 United States. So, it is somewhat of a groundbreaking  
4 structure for bascule type construction.

5                   This is a simplified layout showing vertical  
6 lift type structure. The vertical lift involves support on  
7 both sides of the bridge being provided by wire ropes that  
8 wrap around a sheave or basically a pulley and on the other  
9 side of the pulley there is a counterweight which pulls the  
10 bridge up on both sides. Particularly, for larger spans  
11 this is a much more stable way to raise and lower a bridge.  
12 The cost of the vertical lift obviously is associated with  
13 the towers but for the longer spans it provides the best  
14 and most stable way to raise and lower a bridge structure.

15                   The other advantage that a vertical lift bridge  
16 has is that as you see as we have laid it out here is most  
17 of the support structure for the roadway is provided by  
18 this structure that is mostly located above the roadway  
19 elevation. What that means in turn is the distance from  
20 the roadway down to the underside of the structure is  
21 minimized and the consequence with that is the distance  
22 from the structure in the closed position to the water is  
23 maximized and hence the largest number of vessels can use  
24 the channel without requiring an opening. The vertical

1 lift is a much deeper system because the roadway support is  
2 provided by a steel support structure below the bridge deck  
3 which is much deeper. A consequence at a closed position  
4 we have much less room on the other side of the bridge to  
5 the water and therefore there are more openings required  
6 for intermediate sized vessels.

7                   Now we understand that vertical lifts are not  
8 common in this area and we anticipate that most people's  
9 experience with vertical lifts relate to the existing  
10 temporary bridge that is currently at the site. There is  
11 one other vertical bridge down on the Cape Cod Canal. You  
12 might see it in the distance as you pass the Cape Cod on  
13 the side of the Sagamore Bridge and it carries a railroad  
14 bridge. Like I said, there is this large vertical lift  
15 under construction at this moment at Chelsea Street in  
16 Boston. They are not certainly a common type in this part  
17 of the country. So we wanted to emphasize that the  
18 permanent vertical lift structure that we proposed would be  
19 quite different in nature to the temporary structure that  
20 people have to contend with at the moment.

21                   The most notable fact is that the design life  
22 of the temporary bridge, it is a temporary bridge and it is  
23 build only to last for fifteen years. The people who build  
24 that bridge built it to last no more than fifteen years.

1 Consequently, the features and the methods of operation are  
2 very much light weight and simple and let's say economic.  
3 It is not a bridge built for long lasting and maintenance  
4 free service. The bridge we would propose building would  
5 have the design life of at least 75 years.

6           The basis for the mechanical design of the  
7 temporary bridge is basically the guidelines of crane  
8 construction standards. We will be using AASHTO which is  
9 the federal road and bridge studies for construction for a  
10 much higher level of design and quality of workmanship.

11           One problem with the vertical lift because the  
12 temporary bridge does not meet AASHTO they have difficulty  
13 with the current bridge operating at high winds. The  
14 bridge that we design which will meet the AASHTO standards  
15 the high winds will not present a problem for operation.

16           The wire rope lubrication, we have certainly  
17 been aware and talking with MassDOT maintenance people that  
18 they constantly have to go out and oil and grease the  
19 cables of the existing temporary bridge which is the reason  
20 why often during the day they have to have one side of the  
21 bridge closed because they have a maintenance crew  
22 virtually full time employed greasing these cables on the  
23 temporary bridge. That will not be the case.

24           The navigation channel width 175 feet has



1 proved not to be a good workable number for the mariners.  
2 The 175 that is provided by this bridge and the old bridge  
3 has lead to significant problems for the larger vessels  
4 passing through. There have been several collisions with  
5 the fender system that has caused repairs to be needed and  
6 it has caused problems for the use of the navigational  
7 channel. Ease of navigation needless to say with the wider  
8 and the navigation channel the passage of boats becomes  
9 easier.

10                   It should be noted and you see in the reviews  
11 to come that one of the challenges of the site is that this  
12 bridge is located in the bend of a river. So you have a  
13 large oil tanker that is perhaps a thousand foot long and  
14 you have to make a sweeping turn. He has to feed himself  
15 through the eye of an needle with the 175' dimension. That  
16 leads to prolongs opening times so that he can position  
17 himself, set himself up and then thread the needle through  
18 this opening. So it provides a constraint for the vessel.

19                   The deck system is a very large bridge and you  
20 can certainly hear the rapping on the bridge if you stand  
21 in any near distance to the site. We would propose using a  
22 concrete deck system so the bridge will be no louder than  
23 any other bridge.

24                   Also, we will achieve significant improvements

1 in the opening times. We can't guarantee this reduction  
2 but it is certainly what we estimate on a conservative  
3 basis. The existing bridge takes seven minutes to rise and  
4 six minutes to drop for a total moving time. The bridge  
5 that we are proposing will take two and a half minutes in  
6 each direction. So that will be a total of eight minutes  
7 of savings time. There may well be some additional savings  
8 given the ease of navigation. There is an opportunity for  
9 the vessels to move through the channel with greater ease  
10 with the wider opening.

11                   We have some renderings of how the two bridge  
12 types may look and this aerial shot shows the existing  
13 structure as it currently exists today with the temporary  
14 bridge and this is the sweep in the river that we were  
15 talking about that the boats have to contend or the tankers  
16 have to contend with as they sweep into the Fore River  
17 basin.

18                   Again, this is another aerial shot from another  
19 perspective. That is the power plant in the distance and  
20 Weymouth. This view shows the proposed bascule layout that  
21 we developed at this time. Again, in the open position.  
22 Different from the old bridge because of the size of this  
23 bascule the counterweight when the bridge opens drops down  
24 to below water level. So, where the old bascule had an

1 open area at the back where the counterweight slowed  
2 through fresh air we have to provide protection for that  
3 counterweight and hence these massively large pier  
4 structures that will house the counterweight as it swings  
5 through its rotation.

6                   Looking at the power plant and the bascule will  
7 appear. Again, the same bridge and the open bridge. We  
8 have developed this view to show the original bridge in the  
9 lighter gray color, that is the 1936 construction in the  
10 background. How that compares to the new bascule structure  
11 that would now be required to meet all the constraints of  
12 the site. We note that it is at a higher elevation as  
13 Nikole pointed out to achieve the best possible clearance  
14 for the boats below in the closed position but we also have  
15 a very large barrier that acts certainly as a visual  
16 barrier but it also has other implications for a large pier  
17 structure.

18                   What it does is it creates more of a scour  
19 issue than certainly the original bridge or for that matter  
20 a vertical lift bridge. It increases the speed or the  
21 velocity of the water particularly near the piers. So we  
22 have a more of a challenge to design for the potential of  
23 the seabed that will be cleaned out by the fast moving  
24 water around the foundations of the pier structures.

1                   Also, the faster moving water will present a  
2 little bit more of a challenge for the mariners as they  
3 attempt to navigate through this channel which is already  
4 tricky not only for the bend in the river but also because  
5 of the tide action that flows in and out of the Fore River  
6 base.

7                   The original bridge provided a channel  
8 clearance of 175 feet and the channel clearance provided we  
9 don't actually show our fender system but when you account  
10 for the fender system we provide a channel clearance of 225  
11 feet with the bascule. So it is 50 feet greater than the  
12 temporary or for that matter the original.

13                   What is shown here is the renderings generated  
14 by a vertical lift structure and again you get the wider  
15 channel clearance of 250 feet. In this particular  
16 rendering we are showing concrete tower systems which has  
17 certainly advantages but also some challenges, again the  
18 same thing with the bridge in the open position. Again,  
19 with the view towards the Weymouth area and we show the  
20 bridge in the closed position and again in the open  
21 position. We superimposed the proposed elevation of the  
22 views that you just saw for the vertical lift bridge in the  
23 darker line and we show the existing temporary bridge in  
24 the back.

1                   You will note that the towers that we proposed  
2 are some, I believe, some eighty to eightyfive feet higher  
3 than the existing structure that is out there at present.  
4 We do eliminate the cross number that you have present and  
5 we believe we can make the bridge look more esthetically  
6 pleasing than the erector set type structure that is out  
7 there at present.

8                   The tower systems that were developed for the  
9 rendering that you just saw like I said assumes a concrete  
10 tower system and this shows the elevation of the tower,  
11 this is about 35 to 40 foot wide across in this direction.  
12 And then this is the view of the cross section looking at  
13 the tower system. This has the operators of the bridge  
14 located immediately above the tresses. Now needless to say  
15 at this point when we are not even at the 10% level of  
16 design this is all very schematic.

17                   So we not only showed a concrete type system  
18 but to also develop a rendering of how a steel structure  
19 may appear. This is what we show here. A single advantage  
20 with a steel tower system is it is much lighter than the  
21 massiveness that is associated with a concrete type. By  
22 way of example the foundation system associated with a  
23 steel tower system is much smaller. Foundations in this  
24 location will be expensive. We will have to put deep

1 drilling 150 feet below the water elevation. So those  
2 foundations will have a significant impact on the cuff of  
3 the structure and by using the steel towers from certain  
4 elevation up it will allow it will allow us to have - it  
5 will give us some economic advantages.

6                   Again, we show a simpler rendering of a purely  
7 steel type structure from below the deck system up to the  
8 top of the tower system the same structure with the  
9 moveable span in the raised position. Just to summarize  
10 what we have found on our investigation in this time. The  
11 1936 that is now demolished provided a vertical clearance  
12 at the fender line of 33 feet and that was when the bridge  
13 was in the closed position.

14                   So, another words, if a vessel was to come  
15 along that was 30 feet or higher a nothrough would have  
16 been required to let that vessel to pass through. The  
17 navigational channel is 175 feet and the year of last  
18 records that we have in 2002 there were some 646 openings  
19 of that bridge.

20                   The temporary bridge that is out there actually  
21 provides significantly better vertical clearance than the  
22 1936 construction, it gives you 55 feet. Again, 170 foot  
23 in channel clearance and the number of openings in 2007 was  
24 587 openings. For the two bridges that we are looking at

1 the proposed bascule the channel clearance at the, excuse  
2 me, the vertical clearance at the fender line when the  
3 bridge is in the closed position is less than the temporary  
4 bridge. It is down to 43 feet and you do get the 225 foot  
5 channel which is the absolute minimum width that the  
6 mariners will consider.

7           The number of openings and the internal  
8 information to get this number is approximately 612  
9 openings for such a condition. For the vertical lift  
10 bridge we get significantly improved vertical clearance  
11 when the bridge is in the closed position. We get 58.5  
12 feet which accommodates not quite all but almost all of the  
13 pleasure vessels the yachts and so forth that use the two  
14 or three marinas on the inboard side. We get the wider  
15 channel opening which goes some ways in satisfying the  
16 mariners. We anticipate the number of openings based on  
17 the 2007 numbers we would be down to 560.

18           So to convert that into what it means for the  
19 roadway users we expect the proposed bascule would require  
20 an average of 25 additional openings and the vertical lift  
21 would require 47 less openings. So there is a delta  
22 between the two bridge types. Those openings would be  
23 primarily be concentrated in the summer months when the  
24 yachts and the pleasure crafts, so through those summer

1 months we would expect a swing, a delta of three openings  
2 per week between the two bridge types.

3                   Having evaluated this information we have come  
4 to the position that we are recommending to MassDOT  
5 Highways' Division that the vertical lift is the most  
6 appropriate structure at this site. We have a list of the  
7 criteria that we have evaluated. The cost of the two  
8 bridges is so close at the ten percent level we would say  
9 they are essentially the same.

10                   The schedule for the construction of each  
11 bridge is essentially the same. However, there is a  
12 significant advantage of the vertical lift when it comes to  
13 the construction of the two bridge types. The vertical  
14 lift affords keeping the navigation channel opened at all  
15 times. The vertical lift span can be built off site and  
16 flown into place once complete and put directly into place.  
17 That option is not available with the bascule, so there  
18 would be significant issues with the mariners in the  
19 construction of the bascule obstruction.

20                   Ease of entrance because this bascule is beyond  
21 the normal range of bascule type structures we will be  
22 forced to use much larger machinery, bigger motors and more  
23 expensive materials that will be used for the bascule type  
24 structure. The basis for that equipment will be expensive



1 and also the physical ability to inspect and maintain the  
2 equipment is a challenge. The pits we show are so large  
3 and are very cramped because of this massive machine so the  
4 ability of the workmen to get in and maintain that quickly  
5 would be a significant challenge for us if we have such a  
6 structure.

7                   The life size of the two structures have pros  
8 and cons for both but we have come to the conclusion that  
9 they essentially balance. The number of bridge openings  
10 are certainly reduced because of the vertical clearance in  
11 the closed position of the vertical lift. The bridge  
12 opening time is going to be - the difference isn't large  
13 but it will be a shade better than we anticipated for the  
14 vertical lift by virtual larger wider navigation channel  
15 will allow the vessels to move through the opening.

16                   The permitting is in favor of the vertical lift  
17 primarily because you have a far easier process in going to  
18 the Coast Guard approval process. You basically represent  
19 the mariners with the vertical lift structure and the  
20 appearance.

21                   We invite everyone to come down to the boards  
22 and look at what we have shown. When we have shown the  
23 boards in the past we have found that there is a strong  
24 preference either way.

1           MOD: Thank you, Mark. We appreciate that  
2 presentation. Once again, I would like to remind you that  
3 the plans that we are presenting here tonight are  
4 approximately ten percent and the purpose was to evaluate  
5 both alternatives equally. As Mark has mentioned STV has  
6 presented to Mass Department of Transportation a  
7 preliminary type study report in which they did make their  
8 recommendation. MassDOT however has not fully completed  
9 the review of their report nor have we made a  
10 recommendation as to which one we will pursue through the  
11 environmental process and into final design.

12           So, the purpose of this meeting, as I mentioned  
13 earlier was to solicit your input and as the plans are not  
14 complete we may not be able to answer all of your questions  
15 at this time. We will ask that anyone who does wish to  
16 stand and ask question tonight would you please state your  
17 name so that Tammy, our transcriptionist, will have an  
18 opportunity to record your name into our public meeting  
19 transcripts.

20           Also, attached with the handouts that you  
21 received as you walked in this evening is a mail in sheet  
22 if you would like to write in your comment, and I please  
23 ask that you do so. Write your comments; send them in to  
24 the Chief Engineer's Office, so that those comments can

1 also be added to the public transcript.

2                   Finally, I would like to ask if there are any  
3 local officials, elected officials that would like to  
4 stand, please state your name. I would like to give them  
5 the opportunity to please ask our panel or myself any  
6 questions and after that the floor is open to the public.  
7 Please, once again I ask that when you stand to please  
8 state your name. Thank you very much.

9                   VICTOR PAP: Thank you very much. Council  
10 Victor Pap from Weymouth and first I have a quick question.  
11 I just wanted to know if the Coast Guard had come back with  
12 the specifications on the mandatory channel width or  
13 minimum requirements on the channel width? I know that we  
14 were waiting to hear from the Coast Guard and I didn't know  
15 if they had gotten any initial feedback.

16                   MOD: The Coast Guard has not given us an  
17 official nor will they. They will wait until sometimes  
18 when we make a recommendation as to which one we find to be  
19 the most preferable bridge type to go forward with. At  
20 which point they will then go out for a notice of intent to  
21 the mariner community. We have spoken with them many  
22 times. They realize that we are at the stage of evaluating  
23 both the alternatives and we are here being able to make a  
24 selection of the bridge types and move forward but not

1 until such time as our bridge engineers and our structural  
2 engineers have had an opportunity to take a look at what is  
3 being proposed. Thank you, Mr. Pap.

4 ALAN RIDDELL: Hello, my name is Alan Riddell  
5 of Norwell. I would like to know, who is the person in the  
6 agency that makes the decision that the bridge can go up at  
7 7:30 in the morning?

8 MOD: I understand that was a recent occurrence  
9 and maybe not uncommon occurrence as well. My  
10 understanding is that the individuals who are responsible  
11 for scheduling, if there is a schedule to open, they report  
12 that back to the Mass Department of Transportation. That  
13 information is then placed on the variable message boards  
14 as well as being sent to the SmarTraveler forms and  
15 SmarTraveler reports whereby it can be notified via the  
16 radio communications and also the variable message boards.

17 AR: My question is who makes the decision that  
18 it can go up in the first place?

19 MOD: The Coast Guard requires that anybody, if  
20 you yourself were in a vessel and you made a request that  
21 the bridge be opened we have to open that bridge. So  
22 anybody that is coming through that channel has an  
23 opportunity to request to the bridge tender that that  
24 bridge be opened. If it is a question of the height of the

1 boat verses the height of the clearance in the closed  
2 position that the bridge is.

3 AR: So you are saying that it is the master of  
4 the vessel that makes that determination that he wants to  
5 leave at 7:30 in the morning?

6 MOD: No, I cannot answer at which point in  
7 time or who it is. If something like that has occurred, I  
8 can't explain exactly why that has occurred.

9 AR: My question is who decides that at 7:30 in  
10 the morning that the bridge is going to go up? Is it the  
11 master of the vessel, is it the Coast Guard?

12 MOD: The bridge tender may have some  
13 discretion as to what time it does get opened. Now it may  
14 not necessarily be immediately upon request by the mariner  
15 and that once again is the bridge tender. He may have to  
16 call in to his supervisor and let them know that a request  
17 has been placed in for an opening but the bridge tender  
18 will have to use his discretion as to whether or not the  
19 traffic impacts that are associated with that could be a  
20 problem.

21 Now, I myself are not a bridge tender but  
22 certainly I can get back to you with who it is and it  
23 sounds like it has to do with the particular occurrence  
24 that recently happened.

1 M: It happens all the time.

2 MOD: Yes, Victor.

3 VP: I just want to address that. The vessels  
4 have a legal right of way from the guidelines to pass. Who  
5 actually pulls the switch, I believe are the Boston Harbor  
6 Pilots. We are currently working with them to get a  
7 systematic update with an uptothe minute notification on  
8 changes. Essentially our hands are tied because they have  
9 the legal right of way.

10 MOD: In the rear of the room sir, yes.

11 M: Your proposal sounds good but I have a  
12 question. Weymouth, Quincy both sides, how is that going  
13 to change, the businesses of Weymouth?

14 MOD: The limits of the work, is that what you  
15 are asking on the Quincy and Weymouth sides?

16 M: Yeah.

17 MP: We were very careful. Actually Nikole  
18 presented it. When we were evaluating the different  
19 profiles issues we made sure that we were not impacting the  
20 rotary to the west or the homes to the east of the bridge.  
21 So, we made sure that there were no permanent impacts to  
22 the existing facilities that are there.

23 M: I have a quick question. I assume the  
24 contract is already solidified.

1 MP: The contract for construction?

2 M: Yeah.

3 MP: No.

4 MOD: That is the purpose of why we are here  
5 tonight. A contract has not been advertised nor has it  
6 been let to any contracting firm. The firm that you see  
7 listed on the board here behind me is STV. STV is the  
8 design consultant who is under contract with the Mass  
9 Department of Transportation to develop these preliminary  
10 plans.

11 BILL REARDON: Hello, Bill Reardon. You  
12 emphasized that the issue was to try and minimize both the  
13 number of openings, the length of the openings. I am  
14 finding myself with a little less information on the length  
15 of openings on the bascule option and the vertical lift  
16 option. I think you are implying that they are roughly the  
17 same which under the new bascule bridge is about 13  
18 minutes; I think that was in the presentation. Are you  
19 saying it would be roughly the same 13 minutes? But there  
20 is some benefit because the channel will be wider and it  
21 will allow quicker passage?

22 MP: That is correct.

23 ME: There are two parts to that. Like you say  
24 it is the additional width of the channel and there is also

1 the issue that the water maybe flowing - will be flowing at  
2 a slightly higher speed because of the narrower opening  
3 because of the large massive structures associated with the  
4 pier structures. So, that would be - the water flows  
5 slower - it would be less of a navigation challenge with  
6 the vertical lift. It would not be a dramatically large  
7 difference.

8           LOU GAINER: Lou Gainer, Hull. I use the  
9 roadway as a commuter and I use the waterway as a boater.  
10 My concern is making the bridge wider for bigger ships to  
11 come in giving a potential for a bigger oil spill or who  
12 knows it may be an LNG terminal that goes to that place.  
13 They are saying they are making that wider channel is an  
14 opportunity for the a thousand foot ship, I don't know what  
15 it would be for them to come into that channel, I don't  
16 think a thousand foot ship could do it. I think you should  
17 check the draft and make it wider may be impractical if the  
18 ships can't physically fit in the channel.

19           MOD: In regards to the wider channel and  
20 whether or not there have been requests made. Certainly we  
21 met with the coast guard and a number of their constituents  
22 and their groups they have requested, certainly as has been  
23 discussed tonight, wider openings in excess of 225 feet  
24 that could be accommodated by the bascule bridge. With



1 regards to the size of the vessels that may be coming in as  
2 Mark had mentioned earlier, I believe Mark can confirm this  
3 is approximately 135 feet, is it.

4 ME: Yes.

5 MOD: As far as the size of the future vessels  
6 Citgo has mentioned to us that they have larger vessels  
7 whether or not the depth of the drafts on that vessel  
8 compared to what the, I believe it is 35 foot is what it is  
9 in the Fore River Channel right now, it would be  
10 complicated. It would require that the Army Core actually  
11 drew additional dredge activities within the channel to be  
12 able to accommodate a vessel larger than 135 foot.

13 NORRAINE WEYLOMAS: Hello, I'm Lorraine  
14 Weylomas from Weymouth. I have a question about the  
15 percentage of commercial crafts going under the bridge  
16 verses private recreational vehicles? What number, is it  
17 about 600 openings in the year, so what percent of those  
18 were due to the tankers?

19 MP: We would have to get. We have the  
20 calculation but we don't have it memorized. We will have  
21 to get back to you on that.

22 NW: Well my follow up question to that is, I  
23 guess I was thinking about well are the oil tanker  
24 companies going to contribute to the cost of this?

1 MP: No.

2 MOD: The short answer is no.

3 NW: How come?

4 MOD: The more important answer is the fact  
5 that is owned and operated by the Highway Department and  
6 needs to be maintained. The bridge currently - we need to  
7 replace the existing structure that is out there right now.

8 NW: But we could if we didn't have tankers  
9 going through and the sailboats.

10 MOD: As mentioned earlier this is a designated  
11 port area as defined by the Coastal Zone Management. To do  
12 something like that we would need to decommission  
13 essentially as a DPA and that won't be happening any time  
14 soon.

15 NW: I don't mean - my concern is if the oil  
16 company needs an envelope why don't they build a pipeline  
17 and then limit the size of the mast on the mariners?

18 MOD: Those are good comments and I appreciate  
19 you being here tonight. Yes sir, yes.

20 MICHAEL LANG: Hello, my name is Michael Lang  
21 and I'm from Braintree. I have two questions. First of  
22 all, I didn't notice anyone here from Braintree. Since  
23 Weymouth Landing is the only alternative for traffic in the  
24 area, I wanted to know how much it will involve the Town of

1 Weymouth in your discussions. The second thing is I worked  
2 twentythree years on the Greenbush Project and Greenbush  
3 was built on the design build method and my own  
4 interpretation of design build is cheaper is better for the  
5 contractor. When it is in mitigation the towns can ask for  
6 it, especially with the fact of permitting. Can you  
7 further go into the design build method and what it is  
8 about?

9                                   MOD: Well, by coincidence it is good that STV  
10 is the design of record for that project.

11                                   ML: I worked with you guys.

12                                   MOD: So then Mark will answer some of your  
13 questions relative to the Greenbush Line and how the design  
14 build in that project went.

15                                   MP: I'm not sure what specifically you are  
16 talking about relative to cheaper is better because I don't  
17 believe that is the case on Greenbush. Certainly, I was  
18 the Design Manager in Greenbush. The project was designed,  
19 permitted, constructed in a very short period of time.  
20 2002 to 2007 to operation date. I think it took the  
21 Commonwealth over 25 years to bring it up to the 25% design  
22 level. I think bringing it from a 25% design level to  
23 completion and revenue operation in a very short period of  
24 time was beneficial, not only to the Commonwealth in terms

1 of funding, it saved money in terms of its quick delivery  
2 and also provided a benefit to the South Shore community.

3 I am a South Shore resident as well, I live in  
4 Norwell. Certainly we were benefited by the Greenbush  
5 line, so I think that the design was done, the construction  
6 was done in accordance with FRA standards. There was no  
7 other criteria that could be followed and those standards  
8 were met. In terms of this particular project it will be  
9 done in terms of ASHTO standards which is the American  
10 Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials.  
11 So, those standards will have to be followed. There is no  
12 way around it. We will prepare procurement documents which  
13 will specify the type of bridge structure to be constructed  
14 and we will through MassHighway make sure that the design  
15 builder follows those standards.

16 I think - I'm sure Mike has heard me say it  
17 many times. I wife works in Quincy so she rides over the  
18 Fore River Bridge every day, so if she is not happy I hear  
19 about it. So we are looking to put a quality structure  
20 there that will last for a long period of time.

21 ML: What I was saying was there is obviously  
22 there is some mitigation involved when you are building  
23 structures like this. The only mitigation is based on the  
24 permitting process. Obviously you can't get the permit if

1 we can leverage enough questions to keep you from getting  
2 it which gives us our mitigation. That is what I am  
3 saying. Basically, this is a structure and what you need  
4 to do is make it look nice for the people that happen to  
5 live here. The people of Norwell are not affected by this.  
6 What I am asking you to do is tell these people what level  
7 of mitigation that they have in this process.

8           MOD: Mitigation is measured in many ways. I  
9 am working on many projects for the Commonwealth right now  
10 and this topic is coming up very frequently. Now with  
11 regards to mitigation and how are MassDOT going to provide  
12 mitigation to impacted communities, towns, individuals,  
13 neighborhoods, business, communities. The Accelerated  
14 Bridge Program does not define dollar amounts of mitigation  
15 that is available for any project in a community that is  
16 being addressed under the Accelerated Bridge Program. What  
17 we do however, is provide the public with an opportunity to  
18 sit down and discuss with us - layout on the table exactly  
19 what their concerns are. Tell us exactly what they think  
20 should change in the bridge. Once we define what the  
21 bridge is, how are we going to work with the communities so  
22 that the construction phase is less detrimental, less  
23 inconvenience not only to the commuters but also to the  
24 public, adjacent businesses, the abutters. Mitigation is

1 one of those terms that can be interpreted in many  
2 different ways. Certainly if we know the concerns of the  
3 community which is why we are here and as Mark mentioned I  
4 believe this is the seventh time that we have gone before  
5 the people to present this project. It does have an impact  
6 on the design. It does have an impact on how MassDOT is  
7 able to make its decisions. So, I ask you to write those  
8 out on the comment sheet. What exactly are your concerns,  
9 so that we can help to mitigate what the impact may be  
10 during construction.

11 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: INAUDIBLE PHRASE

12 MOD: Braintree will have to be involved as far  
13 as traffic impacts that may be required. The traffic  
14 management, typically any project that MassDOT undergoes we  
15 try to maintain all the traffic within the corridor where  
16 it currently exists. So we try to minimize how much the  
17 traffic we are directly going to contribute to all the  
18 neighborhoods. We try to minimize that as much as  
19 possible. Certainly people are going to divert. People  
20 will find alternate routes. We can only try to accommodate  
21 the existing commuters to the best of our ability.

22 If for some reason we determine that there is  
23 going to be a need to detour traffic or divert traffic to  
24 another location certainly we need to work with all the

1 local communities. One of the things we actually take into  
2 account is the emergency services. What are the emergency  
3 services, how are emergency services going to be impacted  
4 as a result of a specific phase of construction or a  
5 specific lane closure or detour that the department can  
6 actually include on a traffic management drawing whether  
7 the contract may request. Those are things that go into  
8 the decision making that we have to do. Certainly we will  
9 include all of those communities that will be impacted by  
10 that. Certainly we will need to reach out to all the  
11 affected communities including Braintree, Quincy, to  
12 another expense beyond Quincy into Neponset, Dorchester  
13 there is going to be an area of impact that we need to take  
14 into account during construction of this. We are looking  
15 at it now during the design.

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: You mentioned the depth  
17 of the channel but I'm concerned with the depth of the  
18 channel before you get to the Fore River Bridge how much  
19 impact that will have, if that has been looked at, how wide  
20 the channel is and the depth of it? That is my first  
21 comment.

22 The second being the traffic condition, I would  
23 hope that when passing the bridge that you are proposing -  
24 we all know that in addition you have two bike paths being

1 added to it and traffic going about 45 miles per hour,  
2 anyway, so my comment would be that right now it is a  
3 disaster getting from Quincy point down to the Hingham  
4 Shipyard. None of those lights are coordinated at all.  
5 You really need a significant traffic mitigation plan that  
6 goes at least that whole area including the coordination of  
7 all of those lights. When all those areas come on line, I  
8 don't think that anyone will coordinate all those lights  
9 together. You can sometimes zip through there and other  
10 times it takes 45 minutes. So that would be great.

11                   MOD: Let me respond to those two items that  
12 you mentioned. One was the federal navigational channel,  
13 my understanding is it is 300 feet, I believe, in the width  
14 and the Army Corps dredged in 2007, I believe it was. They  
15 completed the dredge activity to 35 feet but that was just  
16 east of the bridge structure that is there now. So it will  
17 be upon us to do some dredge activity but the Army Corps  
18 has coordinated with us right now as to what would be  
19 involved with them to come in and complete their activity  
20 that they stopped just shy of the bridge previously.

21                   With regards to the coordination of traffic  
22 signals, things like that we would need to coordinate with  
23 the local officials. We can't as the state agency make the  
24 signals coordinate with one another. That would need to be



1 done in compliance and coordination and cooperation with  
2 the City of Quincy and the Town of Braintree, Weymouth. So  
3 those are things that we will discuss with them once we  
4 define what our bridge type is going to be. The traffic  
5 managements and how that traffic management may impact  
6 those communities.

7                   PAUL GOODMAN: Hello my name is Paul Goodman.  
8 I own the first house over the bridge on the Weymouth side  
9 and my main concern is impacts to my property.

10                   NB: We actually used your house as one of  
11 constraints. We noted how close your front steps are to  
12 the right of way line and we have done everything we can to  
13 set the roadway profile to accommodate your home.

14                   PG: What about my property?

15                   NB: There is no taking of your property we  
16 will work with you on the temporary construction easement  
17 but we will not be any takings of your property.

18                   PG: I would like to say that I prefer the  
19 bascule bridge but if it has to be the vertical lift  
20 bridge, I'd prefer the concrete towers.

21                   MOD: Yes ma'me, in the back.

22                   SANDRA PETERS: Sandra Peters from North  
23 Weymouth. I hear the rattle of the bridge from my home.  
24 Getting back to your bridge slide, I was wondering if there

1 is a construction impact on the neighborhood in terms of  
2 the noise. Which type of bridge would require more noise,  
3 drilling, and night time noise?

4                   ME: Well, to speak to that point the  
5 superstructures would not - the work associated with  
6 installing the superstructures will not anticipate a  
7 significant difference noise wise. There would be more  
8 work in the river for the foundations in the bascule  
9 structure. The bascule is actually a heavier structure  
10 than the vertical lift, so we would need to install a  
11 larger diameter drill shaft. I don't expect that to be a  
12 very noisy work.

13                   SP: Will there be a lot of drilling involved  
14 and blasting?

15                   ME: We do not anticipate blasting.

16                   SP: I think there should be a mind sight on  
17 the esthetics of the vertical lift bridge and we do hear a  
18 lot of noise at night.

19                   MP: We will certainly try to limit noise at  
20 night. What we have done to date and what we will do in  
21 the specification that we will prepare. We have done a  
22 base line noise assessment of the project area including a  
23 lot of the sensitive receptors which is the neighborhoods  
24 and the adjacent area. So we know what the noise levels

1 are today. This specification will require that those noise  
2 levels not be exceeded by five decibels during  
3 construction. So, that will be put in the specifications  
4 and then what we will require the contractor to do is make  
5 modifications to his operations and his equipment to keep  
6 the noise within those acceptable limits.

7           So, when we prepare the design procurement  
8 package we will prepare specifications that will limit  
9 their ability to increase the level of noise in the project  
10 area.

11                   SP: Thank you very much.

12                   ALICE FULTON: Hi Alice Fulton from Weymouth.  
13 Concerning the vertical lift bridge and the picture showing  
14 it without the ties like the current temporary bridge has  
15 is there any impact on strength or durability without the  
16 cross bars and also with the concrete towers compared to  
17 the steel towers, I am just thinking of Big Dig concrete  
18 compared to the steel. How would that - if it wasn't mixed  
19 properly or something like that durability whether it was  
20 mixed properly or not, I guess is my concern.

21                   ME: We do not anticipate an issue with the  
22 durability with the concrete. We have been involved with  
23 construction projects with our company for over a hundred  
24 years we have many concrete structures that have held up

1 very well over time. There are many people who prefer  
2 concrete for that reason because they believe it is a more  
3 durable material.

4 AF: Than steel?

5                   ME: Yes. If it is properly constructed  
6 concrete should not present durability issue. In terms of  
7 the cross member as we say the temporary bridge was erector  
8 set type construction. We will be using much more massive  
9 and higher quality materials in our tower structure so that  
10 they are self supporting and would not need to be braced  
11 across the top. That brace reflects the flimsiness of the  
12 structure constructed and we will be building a much more  
13 massive and high quality structure.

14                   M: I suggest that the sidewalk be lighter.

15                   MOD: Either of the alternatives that have  
16 presented to us by STV both indicated a concrete surface.

17 M: Thank you.

18                   FRANK SINGLETON: Frank Singleton, North  
19 Weymouth Fore River Watershed Association. We are  
20 involved as an intervener with the power plant, so I am  
21 familiar with how that stack got built. I really like your  
22 idea of floating in steel structures because what I am  
23 concerned about is the staging and the amount of work it  
24 is going to take to actually build this even though it is

1 short term pain for a couple years it is still going to be  
2 very painful for our neighborhood. I live right adjacent  
3 on Bluff Road. So, my question I guess is the former coal  
4 pile site, I don't believe it is under your control but it  
5 will be part of the staging because there is sort of a no  
6 man's land between the pump station and the proposed  
7 restoration of the bridge but could be very useful, I  
8 assume, for that purpose. Formally you used the shipyard  
9 which is no longer available. Bring in the stage and  
10 workers by bus to avoid parking in the local neighborhood  
11 and the impact of having large swings of construction  
12 workers on two shifts.

13                   So, I realize it is way early perhaps for this  
14 but is there possibilities to actually take advantage of  
15 that open space, the former coal pile, if you will in  
16 between the pump station and there to actually provide a  
17 buffer staging area. I think emphasizing floating in steel  
18 structures and putting them up compared to building massive  
19 concrete in place actually has a lot of advantages from the  
20 point of view of construction, noise and staging.

21                   MOD: One of the keys to the Accelerated Bridge  
22 Program when it was first initiated was that we need to use  
23 more innovative and efficient methods of construction. One  
24 of the things to use in this particular instance we have

1 the benefit of the Fore River Channel and the ability to be  
2 able to barge equipment and prefabricate precast numbers;  
3 use the advantage of having the channel. So that is  
4 something we are going to stress to the contractor that  
5 they need to do.

6 Another thing is with regards to the staging  
7 areas if there are staging areas that we can't come to an  
8 agreement with the current owners certainly we can make  
9 that available to the contractors. Typically we do not  
10 direct the contractor that he has to obtain his own staging  
11 areas.

12 FS: Preplanning would be really helpful.

13 MOD: Thank you. Let's go over to this side.  
14 Way over there, yes.

15 CHRISTINE GALVIN: First of all, thank  
16 whichever one of you explained the closed lane of the  
17 bridge everyday because it is only a temporary bridge and  
18 it is falling apart. The temporary bridge was built for  
19 how many years?

20 MOD: It was built to withstand 15 years of  
21 service.

22 CG: So will the new bridge be up in plenty of  
23 time before the 15 years?

24 MOD: What I am saying is if we don't have this

1 bridge completed by 2016 we will have lost the funding  
2 opportunity to replace the temporary bridge that is there  
3 now. So, we want to keep moving so the project can be  
4 completed and construction is done by 2016.

5 CG: On the width of the channel, the picture  
6 that I am looking at here, are you actually going to have  
7 to take land to make it that way?

8 MOD: No we will not. This is a federal  
9 navigational channel that extends through that area of 300  
10 feet. There will be areas on the construction that we will  
11 have to dredge down to the depth that is equivalent to the  
12 center channel now of 35 feet. What is it at the bridge  
13 site now?

14 NB: It is 35 feet.

15 MOD: It is 35 feet now, okay. There will be  
16 minor dredging.

17 BARRY HASS: Hi Barry Hass. What percentage of  
18 the current bridge openings are schedules and whose  
19 responsibility might it be to heighten the predictability  
20 and public awareness?

21 MOD: That question came up earlier tonight and  
22 Mike had mentioned to me that the federal law gives the  
23 mariners the right to call an opening on a moveable span  
24 bridge when they feel it is necessary. As Mike points out

1 they have priority.

2                   BH: My first question is what percentage of  
3 the openings are scheduled?

4                   MOD: I don't have an answer and I don't know  
5 if Mark has it. We can get back to you on that.

6                   BR: Bill Reardon again. Environmental and  
7 traffic reps back and forth with our environmental  
8 consultant at MassDOT, one of the things that will happen  
9 here will be pressure of other transportation systems on  
10 the South Shore. We are certainly hoping that they will  
11 have those services particularly the size of the parking  
12 lot at certain areas is carefully coordinated. There have  
13 been construction pressures on other parking lots which are  
14 not always full but if there are construction delays or  
15 down phase that lot will be very very full and we will need  
16 more ferries.

17                   So I would like to have some clarification that  
18 there will be careful coordination on this project and  
19 MassDOT and the MBTA both train and ferry service to  
20 overcome the difficulty.

21                   MOD: Fortunately with all the integration and  
22 the transition of all the transportation agencies into one  
23 organization the coordination effort and the communication  
24 effort should be made somewhat easier. I believe that was



1 also on the existing bridge, the original rights would be  
2 removed and the installation of the temporary that is in  
3 place now there has additional federal reserve's provided  
4 then and I will anticipate that we will coordinate an  
5 effort with the MBTA to provide their service once again  
6 during the construction of this project.

7                   SANDY GILDEA: Sandy Gildea, Weymouth. I have  
8 a question on demolition and construction truck traffic.  
9 Would there be anything like a designated truck route or a  
10 mandated truck route? I understand that 3A is a state  
11 highway but the side streets are going to be where people  
12 may use as an alternative route are not. Therefore  
13 Weymouth will have to absorb the cost of the wear and tear  
14 on the streets and sidewalks and even vegetation. So, I  
15 just want to know if that will be part of the plan?

16                   MOD: Those are some good comments. It is  
17 something that we can meet a local level to define what  
18 those streets are that we can't afford to have construction  
19 traffic going down. We can identify those on the drawings  
20 also within the contract documents that would prohibit the  
21 contractor from accessing those neighborhoods if there is  
22 no reason or work that would lead to bring him down to  
23 those areas.

24                   SG: At what phase would you have the

1 neighborhood, town visits to get that squared away?

2                   MOD: We have to bring that to the attention of  
3 the design build team. The design build team are the ones  
4 - we developed preliminary traffic plans for the  
5 construction phase and sequence of operations. When a  
6 design build team is selected on best selection, best  
7 value. We have to then discuss with them they need to  
8 define for us what their construction schedule is going to  
9 be, what the potential impacts that they see, how they  
10 intend to attack the construction of a project. We will  
11 work with them and then we need to coordinate the contract  
12 from the design team with the local officials and how it  
13 will be impacted in their neighborhood.

14                   SG: So it will be addressed?

15                   MOD: Yes. Over the left there.

16                   JOHN CURRAN: Is there any thoughts on the  
17 tunnel?

18                   MOD: The tunnel is ruled out. It is not on  
19 the table for discussion any longer. That report, I  
20 believe it was mentioned earlier tonight, there was back in  
21 2005, I believe, excuse me 2002, conducted a study  
22 investigating the alternatives that existed for this area  
23 whether it could be a fixed bridge, moveable or a tunnel.  
24 At that point in time what came out of it the best solution

1 for this area for this particular site was a moveable  
2 bridge. That is why we are here nor investigating and  
3 evaluating the two moveable bridge types. So a tunnel and  
4 a fixed bridge are no longer part of the discussion.

5 JC: Are we going to be compensated for the  
6 aggravation of dealing with this project?

7 MOD: I think that falls into the category of  
8 mitigation. Mitigation that we can offer is to provide as  
9 minimal impacts to the abutters and to the local  
10 neighborhoods and the abutters and business owners. As far  
11 as offering any monetary compensation, no.

12 JC: Are you going to finish the bridge on time  
13 and are you going to have enough funds to do it?

14 MOD: One of the conditions that we place in a  
15 design build procurement package is that the contractor as  
16 basis for him submitting his bid, he also needs to submit  
17 the time frame of which he anticipates completing the  
18 project. So that is actually taken into account and weight  
19 as to the selection process. When the selection process is  
20 undergoing the contractor submits the time frame that he  
21 can actually get the work done and that weights heavily on  
22 his ability to win the bid. So, the contractor defines  
23 when he can complete it and we hold him to that. We have  
24 the ability to assess the damages and there can be damage

1 to assess against the contractor for failure to complete on  
2 time.

3                                 STEVE MCCLUSKEY: Hi Steve McCluskey, North  
4 Weymouth. I just want to echo one time that aesthetically,  
5 I think that for people who live near the bridge would say  
6 that the bascule is the preferred option. The profile is  
7 obtrusive but with that being said if we had to go vertical  
8 lift you mentioned a few measurements earlier and I think  
9 that you said you proposed the design of the tower would be  
10 eighty feet higher, what would the total height be on that.  
11 I feel like eighty feet that is about eight stories and it  
12 is already ten stories tall. What would the actual height  
13 from the water level?

14                                 MOD: If you measuring from ground level, I  
15 believe it is 2 -

16                                 NB: From the water it is 280. It is about the  
17 same height as the tower.

18                                 MOD: I know the area fairly well myself.

19                                 M: Is it as big as Goliath?

20                                 MOD: Goliath was -

21                                 MP: It is the same height as the smokestack.

22                                 ME: As a method of them comparison, I am sure  
23 everyone is aware of the Fore River Power Station that  
24 there on the Weymouth side and with the large diameter of

1 concrete and smokestack. It depends on which option we  
2 are looking at but for the concrete system we are  
3 anticipating about 35 feet in one direction and 16 feet in  
4 the other direction for each of the four structures.

5 M: But steel would be shorter?

6 ME: Steel would be similar in height.

7 M: Then we have the erector set type.

8 ME: You wouldn't get, I wonder if we could  
9 back up.

10 M: Is the power point available on the website  
11 at all?

12 NB: No.

13 MP: We can make it available.

14 ME: The steel towers. So there will be some  
15 significant differences between the existing structure and  
16 the proposed structure should it be a steel tower system.  
17 What we show here is an elevation structure. Now the  
18 towers that are out there are much more flimsy and it has  
19 the cross member across the top. We do not have that cross  
20 member. The other option that we have with this system is  
21 we can put a skin on the other tower frame to make it more  
22 solid in appearance and that will be something that we  
23 would work out with our architect should we pursue this  
24 option.

1                   MOD: The website, someone was asking if the  
2 presentation of the past and this one here, the PowerPoint  
3 presentations, if they are available. MassDOT just  
4 recently launched the website for this particular project  
5 at which point we will be making. I believe in the handout  
6 that you received tonight that there is a web address for  
7 that site.

8                   NB: We ran out of handouts.

9                   MOD: That's not good is it? Do you know the  
10 address?

11                  F: I just want to thank you because we did get  
12 word through the phone calls.

13                  MOD: Typically as far as notification goes  
14 MassDOT will make notice in its own website but also make  
15 notice in local newspapers. Recently it has come to our  
16 attention that specifically in this project here but also  
17 in many other projects I am involved with is that fewer and  
18 fewer people are reading newspapers now. So we are looking  
19 to start using other ways of communicating to the people  
20 whether it be through websites, whether it be through  
21 Twitter, Facebook, Blogs, we are working on different  
22 methods to communicate publically on these locations, times  
23 through various town halls.

24                  JIM HAYES: Jim Hayes. First of all the

1 current, when these tankers come in they come at high tide  
2 so it is already filled with water, so there is not much of  
3 a current. (INAUDIBLE PHRASE)

4 MP: We are more concerned with the pleasure  
5 crafts that frequent the Fore River going against the  
6 current. Certainly the sail boats and the smaller power  
7 boats. The tankers will have an issue but not as much.

8 JH: Yeah.

9 MOD: Sorry folks, I was trying to find out why  
10 we ran out of handouts to go around. We made 75 available  
11 but obviously there is a lot more than 75.

12 RICK COLLINS: This is not the last public  
13 meeting that is being held, however it is very important  
14 that as the process is going that you get in your questions  
15 and comments into us in some form. You can contact your  
16 local elected official's office or contact MassDOT. It is  
17 very important that you do get us the feedback now.

18 In regards to the aesthetics I think we will be  
19 discussing it with ourselves for the next couple of weeks  
20 and we definitely hear what you are saying about the  
21 aesthetics and we are going to be making our process known  
22 to MassDOT as they go forward with this process.

23 The third part is that if there is any  
24 information that you would like a copy of, please contact

1 us so we can get a copy to you. We don't want you to go  
2 without the information that you need so if you have  
3 questions you can contact your local officials office  
4 someone will get the information off to you.

5 MOD: Thank you very much. Once again, any of  
6 the information that was presented here tonight including  
7 the PowerPoint presentation, the fact sheet, brochure, it  
8 will be available for downloading from the website.

9 GARY PETERS: Will a temporary bridge  
10 demolition be part of this project?

11 MOD: Yes.

12 BH: After switch over, after cut over to the  
13 new bridge what criteria will have to be met for demolition  
14 starts of the temporary bridge?

15 MOD: The criteria being the public will then  
16 have full use of the new bridge before we can remove the  
17 existing.

18 BH: So it is measured by some MTBF (sounds  
19 like) or some liability?

20 MOD: I'm sorry.

21 BH: Another words will there be some  
22 reliability in regards to up time, operational time before  
23 the old bridge is demolished?

24 MOD: The new bridge will go through a period



1 of openings and closures before such time as the old one is  
2 taken out of service. That is typically written into all  
3 new construction documents and construction contract  
4 documents that DOT puts out.

5                   BH: Does that measure the cycles or are the  
6 cycles -

7                   MOD: Cycles and both. It is measured in  
8 cycles and time, yes.

9                   M: In regard to the bridge openings it is  
10 interesting that you have a state agency requesting this  
11 job and then state funds being appropriated for it and yet  
12 the private oil company is not helping but they have a say  
13 on when the bridge opens. That doesn't seem right.  
14 Congressman Studs worked with the Coast Guard to get the  
15 oil companies to adjust their time schedules so that usage  
16 times are minimized. It would be interesting if they could  
17 do a study and change the policy of when they open the  
18 bridge and at what times.

19                   One other comment has there been an analysis of  
20 the impacts of the loss productivity time on the amount of  
21 pollution or the amount of gas that is wasted during the  
22 bridge openings?

23                   MOD: The short answer is it is part of the  
24 preliminary type study that has been submitted to us. STV

1 has conducted a lifecycle cost analysis on these. To a  
2 lesser expense we take into account whether the gas cost  
3 may be for instance in that but certainly within the  
4 environmental document that is created by our design. We  
5 need to take into account carbon emissions, gas, not only  
6 for the users of the vehicles on the facility but also for  
7 any of the equipment that is used on the construction and  
8 also the perimeter has to be pertained with the bridge  
9 itself.

10 PEG KELLEY: Peg Kelley, Weymouth. I heard you  
11 talking about the larger ships coming through and I was  
12 wondering has anybody looked further down near the yacht  
13 club all the way up to the bridge if there was an issue  
14 with the sea walls?

15 MOD: That has not been considered as part of  
16 the evaluation for this scope of work for this project.

17 M: The situation is the opening of the bridge.  
18 35 feet of water and potential with the tide it is 45 feet.  
19 You can't come in the channel there is a ten thousand ton  
20 limit on the barges coming aboard. You have 6:30 to 9:00  
21 and 4:30 to 6:30 at night they can't come through otherwise  
22 or anybody else. The tankers can go anytime they want.

23 MOD: Thank you for that comment.

24 GEORGE GRAHAM: George Graham, Weymouth. I

1 pulled a study that was done about 30 years ago. It states  
2 here that the vertical lift bridge was the favor over the  
3 bascule. It seems like this might have been decided a long  
4 time ago. The slide that you had up there (INAUDIBLE  
5 PHRASE)

6                   MOD: I don't believe that STV's recommendation  
7 to MassDOT was prejudged based on the recourse that they  
8 had made and investigated previously. As far as if MassDOT  
9 themselves had made a final determination that is not the  
10 case. We are still evaluating the type study. We are  
11 still looking to see what the merits are between both of  
12 them, the bascule and the vertical lift.

13                   F: Is cost a factor?

14                   MOD: Cost is a factor in all decisions that we  
15 make.

16                   ME: We have been hired by the state, by  
17 MassDOT to study this and the document that we are  
18 producing for MassDOT to review is the bridge type study  
19 that was referred to in the presentation. In that document  
20 we are recommending to MassDOT that we believe given all  
21 the criteria of evaluation that the vertical lift is the  
22 best solution given the full range of criteria to be  
23 considered. MassDOT does not have to accept our  
24 recommendation. They are evaluating -

1 M: Why not?

2 MOD: Because

3 M: I don't understand that.

4 MOD: It's not predetermined by a designer how  
5 MassHighway is going to make a decision. We evaluate all  
6 the information that is given to us, we comment on it, we  
7 ask for them to look at what it is that they submitted,  
8 review our comments, and address those comments. Often  
9 times we do take the recommendation but there are other  
10 times when we do not. So we have our own inhouse staff of  
11 reviewers who are to provide input on the decision making  
12 process.

13 As we were talking before there has been many  
14 questions asked relative to this project but typically in  
15 all projects. What type of criteria does MassDOT use? I  
16 have a whole page of things and I will just run through  
17 them quickly.

18 Users and consumers, everybody tax payer in the  
19 Commonwealth of Massachusetts is a client, a consumer of  
20 the product that MassDOT brings to it. So we need to be  
21 considerate of everybody. Whether it be the motorist,  
22 whether a navigational or mariner, a bicyclist, a walker,  
23 it doesn't matter. We have to take it into account. We've  
24 been left with the responsibility of best determining of

1 how this bridge is going to serve all the needs of all  
2 those users. Businesses, emergency service personnel,  
3 right of way, construction complications, environmental  
4 impacts, schedule, cost aesthetics, opening and closing  
5 times, maintenance issues, traffic management, utility  
6 impacts, collisions on the existing and proposed fender  
7 systems, these are just a short list of all of the things  
8 that we need to consider before we make a determination.  
9 It is not simple but it is certainly something that we do a  
10 complete thorough process in evaluating before we make the  
11 final determination.

12 F: Thank you for the clarification.

13 MOD: The way that determination is made  
14 MassHighway will be able to come to the MassDOT, we were  
15 once MassHighway, MassDOT will be able to come forward back  
16 into the public again and be able to defend the decision  
17 that will lead us to what bridge type we select over the  
18 other.

19 CHRISTINE GALVIN: Did I hear you say that you  
20 will evaluate other ways for people to get to work?

21 MOD: That is part of the traffic management  
22 plan that we need to take into consideration.

23 CG: I'm just going to throw it out there. The  
24 only alternate route is through Weymouth Landing. It would

1 be wonderful if temporarily anybody who it would impact  
2 could get a reduced price on passes and that would get some  
3 people off the road. Most people drive their cars into  
4 Boston. Some people might do that so it doesn't impact  
5 them as much.

6                   MOD: I'm glad you mentioned that. That was  
7 something that the group that I work with at the  
8 Accelerated Bridge Program, we have discussed that in the  
9 past and more recently on other projects and locally within  
10 the Metropolitan Boston area we are discussing with the  
11 MBTA and other providers of transportation as to how we can  
12 make commuting in and out of Boston more convenient for  
13 those who are directly impacted by construction.

14                   Once again, one of the things that needs to be  
15 considered in the evaluation the environmental assessments  
16 it is one of the criteria the federal highway looks at is  
17 the user cost associated with delays due to construction  
18 projects. So that is something that our design team is  
19 going to have to evaluate is what is the potential for  
20 delays for motorist and what is the cost of that delay to  
21 that motorist. That actually is part of the decision  
22 criteria that we had to use moving forward.

23                   REBECCA HOFFMAN: If the vertical lift bridge  
24 is approved how long will that be, the construction?

1                   MOD: We are anticipating that construction  
2 will be about four years for either bridge type. That will  
3 be the entire job including the demolition and removal of  
4 the existing.

5                   F: (Inaudible phrase)

6                   MOD: For this particular location as eluded to  
7 earlier we have done the baseline noise evaluation. They  
8 have recently gone out and conducted and I believe they  
9 have gotten all the information back. We use that  
10 evaluation on what the effects would be with running second  
11 and third shifts. We try to weigh what the cost benefit  
12 is. Certainly working second and third shifts we may be  
13 able to increase the time frame but not at the risk of  
14 inconveniencing all the people who live adjacent to it.

15                   So, there are certain noise evaluation criteria  
16 that MassDOT follow those standards that are established by  
17 Federal Highway Administration and it gives a range of  
18 opportunity that improves five decibels is what we are  
19 using on other projects in the Metropolitan Boston area.  
20 Anything beyond five decibels over the existing background  
21 noise levels is when the contractor needs to provide  
22 mitigation. Essentially enclosures, he has to maintain  
23 those levels. So it is something that we will be  
24 evaluating.

1 F: Our home directly abuts the bridge and I am  
2 very very concerned about the noise, construction hours and  
3 so on. We went through a living hell with the MWRA  
4 construction and the Power Plant construction. We couldn't  
5 sleep at night and we went to countless meetings. The  
6 people doing the construction don't have to live in the  
7 area. There has to be some type of criteria to help us  
8 protect the quality of life. You have to.

9 RH: And what does it mean when you say five  
10 decibels of noise?

11 MOD: I have gone through the class and maybe  
12 Joann can help me as to how we proceed with five decibels  
13 is.

14 JOANN HARACZ: What we will do is do a noise  
15 assessment; we will take the type of machinery and the type  
16 of operation at first. I will tell you though that the  
17 noise analysis you will get night time noise. You will get  
18 a ten decibel penalty added to it just because the  
19 background is quiet. So we understand that the background  
20 is quiet. Noise is measured on an impact assessment of  
21 what you have and what the potential is. So, if you  
22 already have noise and add more noise you don't perceive it  
23 as such. In a quiet environment it is more obvious.

24 M: So if there is a siren at night, how many



1   decibels is it?

2                           JH: I don't know but I can get that for you.

3                           JIM WATSON: During the last study, the  
4   increase in the bridge's height resulted in fewer openings,  
5   so how can we get the fewest possible openings?

6                           ME: Can you go to that slide. I think we may  
7   have shown this slide earlier. The temporary bridge that  
8   is in place at present provides a 55 feet vertical  
9   clearance when the bridge deck is in the closed position.  
10  For the bascule structure that we have studied that would  
11  provide the necessary 225 channel width that vertical  
12  clearance would reduce down to 43 feet. So that is a  
13  reduction from the 55 to the 43 foot value would represent  
14  a 12 foot reduction and clearance in the closed position.

15                           However the vertical lift bridge would be a  
16  little higher than the temporary bridge is now. So it  
17  would provide 58.5 feet of vertical clearance. The next  
18  slide shows the consequences of that. With the bascule  
19  bridge you would have an additional 25 openings per year  
20  based on the data that we have been able to collect.

21                           On the other hand the vertical lift bridge  
22  would reduce the number of openings by 27. So, the delta  
23  affect. The difference between the bascule and vertical  
24  lift is approximately 52 openings per year. We have raised

1 the profile as much as we possibly can.

2 MP: The clearance is about ten feet higher  
3 than the former bridge.

4 ME: The 1936 bridge vertical clearance when  
5 the bridge is in the closed position is 33.

6 GP: Noise is our biggest thing. How do you  
7 plan to enforce it? They are out there and doing  
8 construction, how do you plan on enforcing that? In  
9 another words, at night what will happen?

10 MOD: Our director of construction at the time  
11 with the design build some of what you have experienced  
12 before, we have a resident engineer. They can issue a stop  
13 work order immediately. We have that authority to issue a  
14 stop work order if they are not compliant with the contract  
15 documents. That is DOT.

16 F: (Inaudible phrase)

17 MOD: The information in the contract documents  
18 - before any construction will start we will have - we will  
19 come out to the public once again. Have the public meet  
20 the team that is responsible for designing and constructing  
21 the project and also the construction staff that is  
22 responsible for supervising them.

23 F: You talked about environmental impacts.  
24 There is another industrial park across the river, what

1 impact would that have?

2 NB: I just want to clarify, are you asking  
3 about the potential of contamination of property?

4 F: Yes.

5 NB: Yes, certainly. Looking at hazardous  
6 materials is part of the environmental process and so far  
7 the design. We have done and had to identify if the soil  
8 is contaminated or not and then any requirements to make  
9 sure the soil meets the specifications for the contract.  
10 Borings have been done already.

11 MP: We are still evaluating.

12 NB: I don't have the exact information in  
13 front of me but that would be certainly be on the  
14 environmental document.

15 MOD: Thank you. Any other questions?

16 SEAN GALLAGHER: We are going to spend millions  
17 of dollars on this bridge, is it possible to have better  
18 signage for the bridge on both sides so we can see the  
19 schedule for openings? It would be great to even have  
20 these alerts on Twitter or directly sent to our iPhones.

21 MOD: Thank you for those comments.

22 F: What is the difference in how long it will  
23 take for construction between the two bridge types?

24 MOD: The time frame of construction will be

1 similar. The methods of construction will probably be  
2 different and the ability to be able to use the channel,  
3 the navigational channel for purposes of heavy lifts. The  
4 overall contract time will be very similar between the two  
5 options.

6 F: (Inaudible phrase)

7 MP: I think perhaps what Mark stated was the  
8 piers adjacent to the navigation channel require much more  
9 construction in terms of the width of the structure. There  
10 are a hundred foot piers at each of the bascule spans. One  
11 of the things that in fact we had to consider is in  
12 constructing the bascule span they have to be constructed  
13 in the horizontal position. So they basically cut down on  
14 the usage of the navigation channel during construction.

15 That is occurring down in Fall River right now  
16 for the construction of the bascule in Fall River and it is  
17 an issue for the mariners who use that channel. In terms of  
18 construction of the approaches they are pretty similar in  
19 both options. Mike indicated as well the funding runs out  
20 in 2016, so the construction has to be completed in that  
21 time.

22 MOD: We also reserve the right to penalize the  
23 contractor for not meeting the time frame in which he was  
24 selected on. During all phases of construction we intend

1 for all users to be accommodated, pedestrians, bicyclist,  
2 motorist, so not only during construction but also final  
3 design.

4                   MIKE BOYNTON: When the project starts does  
5 that mean the funding is guaranteed until the bridge is  
6 done? You said in 2016 the funding stops, what happens if  
7 the contractor that you hired goes out of business or  
8 something happens. Who would pick up the tab for this?

9                   MOD: I can't anticipate what is going to  
10 happen if a contract runs beyond 2016, all I know is part  
11 of this program we have been directed to make sure that if  
12 for some reason we anticipate work is going to be beyond  
13 2016 we need to seriously reconsider whether or not we  
14 advertise it in the first place.

15                   So we have to have a level of insurance not  
16 only our design team has to provide us with the level of  
17 insurance we also have independent review, schedulers,  
18 estimators, to anticipate whether or not what it is the  
19 designer has presented to us is actually factual, realistic  
20 and whether it is reasonable to anticipate that it is  
21 conventional construction that the contractor be completed  
22 within the time frame that we are looking at which is 2016.

23                   M: Will the bascule bridge be noisy as the old  
24 bridge?

1                   MOD: Mark was just saying the open bridge, as  
2 the gentleman mentioned before. Either the two bridge  
3 types that we looked at right now are of the concrete wear  
4 surface, so it will be a little bit quieter than what you  
5 had before with the original bascule.

6                   F: Will the bascule bridge be lower in  
7 clearance when it is closed (inaudible phrase)

8                   MOD: It has to do with the structure type and  
9 the depth of the superstructure and the depth of the deck  
10 that would be considered. It's all being driven by the  
11 height of the profile of the roadway is right now and then  
12 relative to that depending on the bridge type that is  
13 selected is the depth of the superstructure. the steel, the  
14 concrete that supports all the traffic. That is how the  
15 vertical clearance is in a closed position of being  
16 evaluated.

17                   It is based on maintaining a similar profile  
18 not to exceed a certain gradient approach at the top of the  
19 bridge and then relative to that dropping down what the  
20 depth of the structure would need to be to support the low  
21 beam on that bridge for unrestricted truck loading, motor  
22 vehicles, etc.

23                   I am going to call this as the last question.  
24 I have just got word that people are asking us to leave the

1 hall tonight.

2           BH: The vertical lift aside, is there any  
3 advantage to having two different spans for reliability or  
4 maintenance?

5           ME: That is an interesting question. We  
6 actually started off the project with that thought in mind.  
7 We would have two separate vertical lift spans such as the  
8 temporary bridge does now. We have come away from  
9 recommending that type of approach because it is  
10 significantly more expensive, you have to have two sets of  
11 machinery, two sets of electrical equipment and it is a  
12 much more complicated and expensive structure.

13           Also, the tower system becomes more involved  
14 and more intrusive on the site lines on the bridge because  
15 you have a significant support in the center of the bridge.  
16 It would also cause the two directions to swing away from  
17 each other to allow a center tower to be put in place. So  
18 it there would be some significant roadway impacts as well.

19           MOD: I would like to thank you all very much  
20 and thank you for the use of your hall tonight.

21

22           (Whereupon, the proceedings were concluded on  
23 February 24, 2010 at 9:40 p.m.)

24

CERTIFICATE

I, Tammy A. Hillery, do hereby certify that the foregoing record is a true and accurate transcription of the proceedings in the above captioned matter to the best of my skill and ability.

Tammy A. Hillery

\*\*All names not provided were spelled phonetically to the best of my ability