The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Environmental Affairs
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900
Boston, MA 02114-2524

MITT ROMNEY
GOVERNOR
KERRY HEALEY
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR
STEPHEN R. PRITCHARD
SECRETARY

Tel. (617) 626-1000
Fax. (617) 626-1181
http://www.mass.gov/envir

June 23, 2006

CERTIFICATE OF THE SECRETARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS
ON THE
ENVIRONMENTAL NOTIFICATION FORM

PROJECT NAME	: Storrow Drive Tunnel Reconstruction Project
PROJECT MUNICIPALITY	: Boston
PROJECT WATERSHED	: Charles River
EOEA NUMBER	: 13777
PROJECT PROPONENT	: Department of Conservation and Recreation
DATE NOTICED IN MONITOR	: April 26, 2006

Pursuant to the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (G. L. c. 30, ss. 61-62H) and Section 11.06 of the MEPA regulations (301 CMR 11.00), I hereby determine that this project **requires** the preparation of a mandatory Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

The purpose of this project is to address the deteriorating condition of the Storrow Drive tunnel. The primary goal of the project is to address this public safety concern. At the same time, the project offers important opportunities to enhance the Esplanade and restore vital connections between it and the City. The alternatives being considered could reduce traffic generation and associated air quality emissions. In addition, impacts to groundwater and to the Charles River introduced with the original construction of Storrow Drive can be addressed. The Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) has committed to explore a wide range of alternatives – from reconstruction of the existing tunnel to its elimination and replacement with a surface roadway – to ensure public safety while analyzing each alternative's ability to meet these other project goals. DCR has committed to conducting this alternatives analysis in a transparent, public process that encourages input and debate about the appropriate role of the parkway within the context of the park system. I applaud DCR for the effective outreach it has conducted to date to apprise the public of the problem and to solicit public input on the potential alternatives prior to and during MEPA review. The overall tenor of the comments received has been positive, engaged and supportive of the goals and criteria DCR has identified for the alternatives analysis.

Storrow Drive is a parkway owned by DCR that extends from Otter Road (Arlington Street) to the Boston University Bridge. It was constructed in 1950-1951. It consists of a median divided highway with two to three lanes in each direction for most of its length. Along the Esplanade, inbound traffic is diverted underground through a tunnel while outbound traffic is carried on the surface over the roof of the tunnel. Speed limits are set at 30 and 40 miles per hour (mph); however, actual speeds are much higher. Storrow Drive carries approximately 103,000 vehicles per day. Access for pedestrians, bicyclists and the disabled are provided by paths on bridges or footbridges. The project area extends from Clarendon Street to Otter Street and is located entirely within filled tidelands. Storrow Drive is located within and adjacent to the Charles River Basin Historic District, the Back Bay Historic District and the Beacon Hill Historic District, all three of which are listed in the State and National Registers of Historic Places. Also, it is located within the City of Boston Groundwater Overlay District.

DCR has indicated that the reconstruction and/or repairs to the tunnel are necessary to address: 1) deterioration of the concrete and steel in the walls and roof of the tunnel; 2) leaks in the roof, walls and base slabs; and 3) original design deficiencies that limit emergency traffic on the tunnel roof. Designs to address this problem will also assess the feasibility of restoring vital connections between the Esplanade and the City that were removed with the construction of Storrow Drive. In addition, the project will include an upgraded stormwater management system to collect and treat stormwater prior to its recharge and/or discharge. Groundwater flows will be addressed either through elimination of the tunnel or construction of a pumping system to maintain groundwater equilibrium. The Arthur Fiedler Footbridge will either be improved or replaced by at-grade crossings. The project may also include replacement of the Clarendon Street footbridge.

DCR is managing the design and review process for the project. The Massachusetts Highway Department (MHD) will be responsible for construction. Construction is scheduled to begin in 2008. Depending on the alternative selected, construction will last from two to four years and, based on preliminary estimates, cost from $35 to $135 million dollars.

Permits and Jurisdiction

The project is subject to MEPA review and preparation of a mandatory EIR pursuant to Section 11.03 (3)(a)(5) of the MEPA regulations because it requires a state permit and consists of a new, non-water dependent use or expansion of an existing non-water dependent structure greater than one or more acres of tidelands. The project requires a Chapter 91 license from the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP). It may require Air Quality Certification by DEP for tunnel ventilation and review by the Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC). Also, it requires an Order of Conditions from the Boston Conservation Commission (and a Superseding Order of Conditions from DEP in the event that the local Order is appealed). Because the proponent is a state agency and the project will be funded with state transportation bonds, MEPA jurisdiction extends to all aspects of the project that may cause significant Damage to the Environment. These include open space, cultural resources, tidelands, traffic, transportation, air quality, wetlands, water quality, drainage, groundwater, solid and hazardous waste and construction period impacts.

SCOPE

The EIR should follow the general guidance for outline and content contained in section 11.07 of the MEPA regulations, as modified by this Certificate.

Project Description

The EIR should include a thorough description of the project and all project elements and construction phases. The project description should include historical information on the development of the Esplanade and Storrow Drive to provide context for this project review. The EIR should address, in detail, the structural deterioration of the tunnel and provide an assessment of the urgency of its reconstruction or replacement.

The EIR should include an existing conditions plan illustrating resources, infrastructure and abutting land uses for the entire project area and a proposed conditions plan (or plans) illustrating proposed elevations, structures, access roads, stormwater management systems, and sewage connections. It should include information on roadway design, grading, landscaping and lighting. Separate plans should be provided that illustrate access improvements along and across the parkway for pedestrians, bicyclists and the disabled. Also, the EIR should include plans for the construction period that clearly delineate construction limits, construction staging areas and circulation.

Project Permitting and Consistency

The EIR should briefly describe each state permit required for the project and should demonstrate that the project meets applicable performance standards. Funding for the project and any design criteria associated with it should be identified. In accordance with section 11.01 (3)(a) of the MEPA regulations, the EIR should discuss the consistency of the project with any applicable local or regional land use plans. The EIR should address the requirements of Executive Order 385 (Planning for Growth). The EIR should address the project's consistency with the Master Plan for the Charles River Basin and the Draft Historic Parkways Preservation Treatment Guidelines and identify how it supports established principles and goals for the parkway and parklands.

Alternatives Analysis

The ENF provides a set of criteria by which each alternative is being reviewed. These include construction period and long-term goals for the Esplanade, for traffic and for abutting neighborhoods. Fourteen preliminary designs were included in the ENF and analyzed for consistency with these criteria. Based on this preliminary analysis and input from public meetings, DCR analyzed the following four designs that are representative of each of four broad categories of alternatives and will be analyzed in more detail within the EIR:

1. Reconstruction of the tunnel in its current configuration
   (Alternative A3)
   Preliminary Cost Estimate: $54 – 62 million Duration: 2 years

2. At-grade parkway with traffic signals to reduce traffic speed and volume (Alternative B4)
   Preliminary Cost Estimate: $ 35 – 42 million Duration: 1½ years

3. Rebuild eastbound tunnel and add westbound tunnel without Arlington Street Exit (Alternative C2)
   Preliminary Cost Estimate: $ 115 – 135 million Duration: 4 years

4. New tunnels (without vent building) with at-grade local traffic (Alternative D2)
   Preliminary Cost Estimate: $ 95 – 135 million Duration: 4 years

DCR has approached this project as a public safety imperative and as an opportunity to assess how the roadway functions within the park system and the regional transportation system. The project could be designed to transform a portion of Storrow Drive to a more genuine version of a parkway with the primary purpose of providing access to and along the park system for multiple users. It could be designed to serve a stronger role as a major regional roadway providing vehicular connections to the Massachusetts Turnpike (MTA), Longwood Medical Area (LMA) and Interstate-93 (I-93). It could restore an area of the Esplanade that was lost with Storrow Drive's construction or emphasize improvements and access to existing parkland. Traffic, and the noise associated with it, could be routed entirely underneath the Esplanade or be routed entirely along the surface to remove any influence the tunnel may have on groundwater conditions.

DCR has not identified a Preferred Alternative and, based on review of the comment letters, civic organizations and the public are reserving judgment until additional information on design, potential improvements and impacts are provided. The comment letters do provide strong support of the criteria for analysis outlined by DCR. Interesting variations on alternatives have been presented during this review and will continue to emerge from the planning process. Alternatives will be further developed through an iterative process informed by the analysis of traffic and other environmental impacts and public participation in the process. The EIR should present further analysis of the four alternatives identified in the ENF (with conditions noted below) and identify a Preferred Alternative. Comment letters provide very limited support for Alternative C2 because of the vent building that would be associated with its construction; however, this alternative represents an opportunity to significantly restore parkland to the Esplanade and provide a more natural connection to the neighborhoods of Back Bay and Beacon Hill. DCR has indicated that this alternative could be modified to eliminate the need for the vent building. The EIR should include a variation on this alternative that eliminates the vent building while demonstrating that compliance with safety and air quality standards can be achieved. Variations on Alternative B4 should include consideration of roundabouts as well as traffic signals. The footprint of this alternative should not be expanded beyond that presented in the ENF (two lanes in each direction, three lanes at intersections with the inclusion of turning lanes) to minimize the permanent loss of parkland.

Construction and maintenance costs should be identified for each alternative. Each alternative should be fully analyzed for its ability to meet other project goals including: parkland enhancement, non-vehicular access improvements, improvements to air quality and water quality and improvements to groundwater. For each alternative, the EIR should quantify the amount of land altered, the amount of earth work involved in meeting final grades and the amount of impervious surfaces created. The EIR should investigate all feasible methods of avoiding, reducing, or minimizing impacts to land. Construction period and long-term impacts should be identified for each.

Review of alternatives for this area of Storrow Drive is not fully informed by previous planning but, as noted above, this project provides an opportunity to explore long-term goals. The Charles River Basin Master Plan addresses improvements to parkland along the length of Storrow Drive (and beyond) and identifies the need for better connections across and along the roadway but it does not directly address its role in the regional roadway system or the park system. Planning for the Central Artery/Tunnel Project (CA/T) (EOEA #4325) identified issues related to Storrow Drive's design and function but did not address them directly. DCR should use this project as a catalyst for long-term planning for Storrow Drive. The EIR should specifically address the relationship between Storrow Drive, Memorial Drive and the Massachusetts Turnpike (Interstate-90). This analysis is necessary to assess the feasibility and advisability of several of the alternatives. Future efforts, beyond the scope of this review, should address broader alternatives and non-vehicular access improvements for the remainder of Storrow Drive to the Boston University Bridge and beyond. Such an effort would provide a more effective forum for addressing some alternatives raised during this review, including the relocation of Storrow Drive to a tunnel running lengthwise under the Charles River. Any long-term planning conducted for Storrow Drive to date should be presented in the EIR and the EIR should address related comments.

Open Space and Cultural Resources

Storrow Drive, while functioning more as a regional roadway than a parkway, is a part of the Metropolitan Park System (MPS) and abuts the Esplanade. Its introduction in 1951 eliminated important connections between neighborhoods and the Esplanade and forever changed the experience of the Charles River in this area. Additional parkland and substitute pedestrian connections were created as mitigation for its construction. These pedestrian connections are substandard and do not meet goals for universal access that should be achieved in our parks. The Charles River and the Esplanade are treasured regional resources, as much for their beauty as for their history, that must be protected and restored. Despite poor connections, thousands of people – tourists, students, residents, boaters, runners, bikers - use and enjoy the Esplanade everyday.

As noted previously, the parkway is located within and adjacent to the Charles River Basin Historic District, the Back Bay Historic District and the Beacon Hill Historic District, all three of which are listed in the State and National Registers of Historic Places. MHC has indicated that several of the alternatives would have an adverse effect on historic resources. Consultation with MHC and Boston Landmarks Commission will be an important aspect of this planning process and should be initiated early in the process and prior to filing of the EIR.

DCR has presented mitigation as an inherent part of this project as it should be. It is necessary to address the impacts of the roadway on the park, its users and the Charles River and to address the incongruence of its guardrails and jersey barriers running through the formal and historic Back Bay, Beacon Hill and Esplanade. DCR has indicated that it will not use the Esplanade for temporary traffic diversion. Mitigation should be designed to protect open space and historic resources during construction and in the long term and to address problems introduced by the roadway's construction.

The EIR should clearly identify open space and historic resources on a reasonably scaled map and identify ownership and relevant protections (i.e. inclusion in National Register, Article 97, etc). The EIR should clearly identify any impacts to these resources and to park users and identify alternatives that may avoid or minimize impacts and propose mitigation measures. DCR should consider comments provided on protection and improvement of parkland and historic resources and identify what improvements will be incorporated in the project. Access to and along the Esplanade should be a major focus, including replacement/reconstruction of the Arthur Fiedler Footbridge and the Clarendon Street footbridge and enhancements to the Dr. Paul Dudley White bike path. The EIR should present conceptual plans for any footbridges including details on grading, materials, pavement markings and lighting. The EIR should identify how each alternative meets the goals of universal access design.

The design of the road should be consistent with the purpose, character and context of a parkway. Conceptual roadway designs should be presented that demonstrate consistency with the Draft Historic Parkways Preservation Treatment Guidelines. Information on design speed, paving, guardrails, lighting, signage and other details should be provided. The design should be considered as a prototype for use on other areas of Storrow Drive where access improvements are needed (i.e. Boston University, Western Avenue).

Waterways

Storrow Drive was constructed on filled tidelands of the Charles River. The ENF indicates that, depending on the alternative selected, the project will include approximately 5 to 7 acres of work within filled tidelands subject to Chapter 91 jurisdiction. The project will be reviewed as a non-water dependent infrastructure facility and should be designed for consistency with the applicable Waterways Regulations (310 CMR 9.55).

The EIR should identify the extent of work within filled tidelands for each alternative and discuss the consistency of each alternative with the objectives of the Chapter 91 program to protect and promote public access to the water. DCR should consult with DEP regarding project design and mitigation prior to the filing of the EIR.

Traffic and Transportation

Storrow Drive carries approximately 103,000 vehicle trips on an average weekday. The project offers an opportunity to reduce traffic congestion and the potential to reduce traffic

generation in the long-term. Construction of any of the alternatives will require shutting down or diverting traffic from parts of the roadway including entrances and exits. DCR has begun preliminary traffic analysis, including development of an origin and destination study by the Central Transportation Planning Staff (CTPS), to analyze Storrow Drive's role in the regional transportation system.

The EIR should include a traffic study prepared in conformance with the EOEA/EOTC Guidelines for EIR/EIS Traffic Impact Assessments. DCR should consider use of traffic simulation models for improved analysis of traffic flows and the effectiveness of mitigation strategies. The traffic study should include analysis of existing conditions and projections of construction-period and long-term conditions for vehicles, pedestrians and bicycles. It should compare impacts for the various alternatives and identify appropriate mitigation measures. The proponent should provide a clear commitment to implement and fund mitigation measures and should describe the timing of their implementation based on the phases of the project. The EIR should present capacity analyses and a summary of the average and 95th percentile vehicle queues for each intersection within the study area. Any proposed traffic signal must include a traffic signal warrant analysis according to the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control devices (MUTCD). The traffic study should also include weave, merge, diverge, ramp and road segment analyses where applicable. The traffic study should be broad in scope and include intersections along the following roadways in Boston and Cambridge:

- Cambridge Street
- Embankment Road
- Gilmore Bridge/Charlestown Aveune
- O'Brien Highway
- Land Boulevard
- Main Street
- Memorial Drive
- Charles Street
- Back Street
- Arlington Street
- Berkeley Street
- Clarendon Street
- Beacon Street
- Commonwealth Avenue
- Massachusetts Avenue
- Soldiers Field Road
- Western Avenue

Any intersection that will experience an increase attributable to the project of 10% or more over existing traffic volumes and that currently operates at level of service (LOS) D or worse should be included. The EIR should present a merge and diverge analysis for each on- and off-ramp to Storrow Drive. DCR should examine traffic data and projections from other recent projects to assess the consistency of traffic counts and traffic patterns. DCR should

continue consultations with the City of Boston, the City of Cambridge and the Massachusetts Turnpike Authority regarding development of the traffic analysis.

The EIR should include conceptual plans for the proposed roadway designs that are of sufficient detail (e.g. 80 scale) to verify the feasibility of constructing such improvements. The conceptual plans should clearly show proposed lane widths and offsets, layout lines and jurisdictions, and the land uses (including access drives) adjacent to areas where improvements are proposed. Details should be provided for intersections including sight lines, location of crosswalks, lighting, traffic signal timing and signage.

The EIR should address construction period conditions and impacts including: location of construction staging areas; frequency, times and routes of truck movements; potential detours and road closings; maintenance of access for emergency vehicles; maintenance of pedestrian and bicycle access; and identification of parking and access routes for facilities located within the parkland.

DCR has indicated that construction may begin in 2008 but will be scheduled to minimize conflicts with other projects in the immediate vicinity, including the Longfellow Bridge and Memorial Drive Improvements Phase II. The EIR should identify and develop a timeline for other roadway or transit projects slated to be completed within a similar timeframe that could support diverted traffic or that could contribute additional traffic to Storrow Drive (e.g. Longfellow Bridge, Boston University Bridge, Craigie Dam/Bridge). In addition, the EIR should evaluate impacts of removing certain connections (e.g. Arlington Street, Berkley Street) during construction and the advisability of instituting these changes on a long-term basis.

The EIR should examine the relationship between projects and opportunities for improving regional traffic patterns based on the findings of the origin/destination analysis. For instance, some commentors have noted that completion of the CA/T Project (including the MTA Extension) and construction of the MTA Sling-Shot/U-Turn Ramp could provide alternative access to vehicles currently using Storrow Drive to access I-93 and the Longwood Medical Area.

DCR should work with MHD and the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) to develop a traffic mitigation plan. Consideration should be given to ways of increasing service and/or service frequency, commuter station parking, transit subsidies or fare reductions and contributions to improved signalization technology. In addition, DCR should consider funding a pilot program to provide targeted support to area households to assess transportation needs and choose alternatives that can minimize car trips while meeting those needs. Implementation of this type of program in other areas has demonstrated real and sustained reductions in vehicle trips.

Air Quality

The Boston metropolitan area is in moderate non-attainment for ozone, whose precursors are nitrogen oxides (NO_x) and volatile organic compounds (VOCs). The contribution of mobile source emissions, primarily from automobile, truck and bus traffic, to ground-level ozone and regional air quality is significant. Air quality impacts are a critical component of any alternative and should be incorporated into DCR's criteria for analysis of projects. Tunnel alternatives that

require ventilation systems must be developed consistent with DEP air quality regulations (310 CMR 7.38, Certification of Tunnel System Ventilations in Metropolitan Boston).

Air quality impacts of the alternatives presented by DCR may vary significantly. The construction of an additional tunnel and separation of regional and local traffic could result in air quality impacts by increasing average vehicular speed in the project area. Conversely, the surface roadway alternative could significantly reduce air quality impacts in the long-term by reducing traffic generation, although such an approach, if not well planned and conducted in concert with transit mitigation and other alternatives to driving could actually increase localized air quality impacts. To adequately assess local and regional air quality impacts of various alternatives and determine whether they can meet regulatory standards, DCR should conduct micro- and mesoscale air quality analysis. Emissions of NO_x, VOCs, carbon monoxide (CO), greenhouse gases, particulate matter (PM) and air toxics should be evaluated. DCR should consult with DEP regarding the geographic scope and other study protocols to ensure their consistency with DEP guidelines.

Wetlands, Water Quality and Drainage

The project provides an excellent opportunity to minimize impacts of Storrow Drive on water quality within the Charles River. DCR should design a stormwater management system that will be consistent with shared water quality goals for the Charles River. DCR has indicated that the project will include a stormwater management system with oil/gas separators and sediment traps. Treated stormwater will be discharged into a series of groundwater infiltration chambers for recharge.

The EIR should include plans that clearly delineate all applicable resource area boundaries including riverfront areas, buffer zones, 100-year flood elevations and waterways. BVW that have been delineated in the field should be surveyed, mapped and located on the plans. The EIR should identify all water and sewer infrastructure on existing conditions plans. The EIR should quantify the project's estimated impact on each resource area and existing infrastructure. It should describe the nature of all likely impacts that cannot be avoided and identify whether impacts are temporary or permanent in nature.

The EIR should include a section on stormwater that demonstrates that source controls, pollution prevention measures, erosion and sediment controls and the drainage system will comply with the DEP Stormwater Management Policy and standards for water quality and quantity both during construction and post-development. The EIR should include an operations and management plan to ensure the long-term effectiveness of the stormwater management system. Hydraulic capacity and performance of existing water and wastewater infrastructure proposed for use as part of this project should be assessed. The locations of any detention basins, distances from wetland resource areas, and expected quality of the effluent from the basins should be identified. The EIR should also analyze indirect impacts to parklands and wetland resource areas from receipt of drainage and stormwater runoff from the site.

Emphasis should be placed on reducing the volume of stormwater and the discharge of sediments and nutrients to the Charles River. Narrow roadway width should be maintained to minimize permanent impacts to parkland and to minimize impervious surfaces. Low Impact

Development (LID) techniques, such as landscaped medians and use of pervious pavement should be considered.

The EIR should address construction period impacts and propose mitigation measures to protect parkland and prevent erosion and sedimentation. Dewatering techniques should be described in detail.

Groundwater

DCR and a number of commentors, including the Boston Groundwater Trust, have highlighted the opportunity this project provides to address groundwater issues that affect Back Bay. The project is located within the Back Bay Groundwater Overlay District and each alternative offers opportunities to improve groundwater conditions. The At-Grade Parkway alternative would eliminate obstructions to groundwater and restore conditions to a more natural state of flow. All options will reduce permanent negative impacts to groundwater. DCR has indicated that any new or existing tunnel construction will include a groundwater recharge system that will treat and inject groundwater into a series of infiltration chambers for recharge within the affected neighborhoods.

The EIR should provide details on management of groundwater during construction and within project designs. The EIR should provide sufficient detail on proposed recharge systems (i.e. location above seasonal high groundwater, protocol for determining recharge locations and strategies for managing overflows) to enable reviewers to assess the effectiveness of proposed systems and/or project designs. DCR should continue to maintain its groundwater monitoring wells during and after construction and share data with the Boston Groundwater Trust to support the groundwater monitoring well network in the City.

Construction Period Impacts

Close coordination with affected neighborhoods and park user groups will be critical during construction, particularly for traffic management and night construction. The EIR should detail how parkland, landscape and trees will be protected during construction. The EIR should include a discussion of construction phasing, evaluate potential impacts associated with construction activities and propose feasible measures to avoid or eliminate these impacts. The proponent should implement measures to alleviate dust, noise, and odor nuisance conditions, which may occur during the construction activities. DCR should consider adoption of construction mitigation protocols for noise and dust developed for the CA/T project. The EIR should identify how the project will comply with DEP's Solid Waste and Air Quality Control regulations. The EIR should identify how solid waste and/or hazardous waste encountered or produced during construction will be assessed, removed, collected and disposed.

This project will take place in a densely developed urban area and adjacent to a heavily used park. Temporary air quality impacts from diesel construction impact should be minimized. DCR is a participant in DEP's Diesel Retrofit Program to minimize impacts from diesel construction equipment by requiring retrofits of heavy-duty construction equipment and/or using Low Sulfur Diesel (LSD) fuel. The EIR should identify DCR's commitment to this program and provide the contract specifications that will be used for this project.

Mitigation

The EIR should include a separate chapter on mitigation measures associated with each alternative. It should include a Draft Section 61 Finding for all state permits that includes a clear commitment to mitigation, an estimate of the individual costs of the proposed mitigation, and the identification of the parties responsible for implementing the mitigation. A schedule for the implementation of mitigation, based on the construction phases of the project, should also be included.

The EIR should identify improvements to adjacent parkland as mitigation for the project. It should indicate whether mitigation will include restoration of parkland elements identified in the Charles River Master Plan.

Response to Comments

The EIR should contain a copy of this Certificate and a copy of each comment received. The EIR should respond to the comments received, to the extent that the comments are within MEPA subject matter jurisdiction. The EIR should present additional narrative and/or technical analysis as necessary to respond to the concerns raised.

Circulation

The EIR should be circulated in compliance with Section 11.16 of the MEPA regulations and copies should be sent to any state agencies from which the proponent will seek permits or approvals, to the list of "comments received" below, and to Boston and Cambridge officials. The proponent should circulate a hard copy to state and city agencies. To save paper and other resources, the proponent may circulate the EIR in CD-ROM format, although the proponent should make available a reasonable number of hard copies, to accommodate those without convenient access to a computer, to be distributed upon request on a first come, first served basis. Also, a copy of the EIR should be made available for review at Boston and Cambridge public libraries.

June 23, 2006
Date

Stephen R. Pritchard

Comments Received:

6/13/06	Department of Environmental Protection/Northeast Regional Office (DEP NERO)
6/8/06	Massachusetts Historical Commission
6/12/06	Massachusetts Water Resources Authority (MWRA)
6/9/06	Boston Water and Sewer Commission (BWSC)
6/13/06	City of Cambridge
5/23/06	City of Cambridge/Office of the City Clerk
6/9/06	Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC)

6/12/06	August, William for Cambridgeport Neighborhood Association, Inc. and the Riverside Neighborhood Association
6/13/06	Back Bay Association
6/12/06	Beacon Hill Civic Association
6/7/06	Boston Groundwater Trust
5/9/06	Boston Landmarks Commission
6/13/06	Boston Preservation Alliance
6/12/06	Boston University
6/13/06	Charles River Conservancy
6/13/06	Charles River Watershed Association
6/9/06	Community Boating Inc.
6/13/06	Conservation Law Foundation
6/13/06	Downtown North Association
5/23/06	Massachusetts Bicycle Coalition
6/13/06	Massachusetts General Hospital
6/12/06	Medical, Academic, Scientific Community Organization, Inc.
6/13/06	Neighborhood Association of the Back Bay
6/12/06	Sherin and Lodgen, LLP for 128 Beacon Street Condominium Trust
6/13/06	The Esplanade Association
6/12/06	The Mount Auburn Neighborhood Association
6/13/06	WalkBoston
6/12/06	West End Civic Association
6/13/06	Connaire, Chris and Chris Weller
6/12/06	Cox, Linda M.
6/6/06	Detweiler, Michael R.
6/6/06	Frieze, Kenneth S.
6/12/06	Kaiser, Stephen H.
6/12/06	Nolan, Herb
6/12/06	Anthony Pangaro
4/27/06	Spiller, David
6/13/06	Thomson, Peter
6/13/06	Wellons, Marion
6/12/06	Wolkoff, Dennis

SRP/CDB/cdb