



*The Commonwealth of Massachusetts*  
*Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs*  
*100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900*  
*Boston, MA 02114*

Charles D. Baker  
GOVERNOR

Karyn E. Polito  
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Matthew A. Beaton  
SECRETARY

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

September 21, 2018

CERTIFICATE OF THE SECRETARY OF ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS  
ON THE  
NOTICE OF PROJECT CHANGE

PROJECT NAME : Long Island Bridge Superstructure Replacement Project  
PROJECT MUNICIPALITY : Boston and Quincy  
PROJECT WATERSHED : Boston Harbor  
EOEA NUMBER : 15308  
PROJECT PROPONENT : City of Boston Public Works Department  
DATE NOTICED IN MONITOR : August 8, 2018

Pursuant to the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA; M.G.L. c. 30, ss. 61-62I) and Section 11.10(6) of the MEPA regulations (301 CMR 11.00), I have reviewed the Notice of Project Change (NPC), and hereby determine that this project **does not require** the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

Project Change

The NPC describes the proposed design and construction methodology for replacement of the Long Island Bridge superstructure. Existing piers will be reused, with the exception of Pier 1 which will be used for temporary support and then abandoned or removed. Bridge spans will be floated in and installed onto piers by barge at high tide. The replacement will include demolition and reconstruction work to the top portion of the piers (above Mean High Water (MHW)), and repointing of the granite facing (above Mean Low Water (MLW)).

The proposed superstructure replacement includes a hybrid design that includes a “Delta Frame Girder” (Delta Frame) design<sup>1</sup> that maintains the original bridge footprint and dimensions including roadway width and elevation. The bridge will include two 12-foot travel lanes and a six-foot sidewalk.

---

<sup>1</sup> While the Delta Frame design will be used for the structural elements to support the bridge superstructure, the navigation span will remain a through truss structure.

The design includes improved stormwater management and architectural lighting, and will improve resiliency to sea level rise and storm damage. Superstructure supports (members) extending from the pier caps will be designed to resist wave action to protect the structure during peak storm events and provide a higher bridge under-clearance for all spans (except the navigation span) to reduce its exposure to salt water. Coatings on steel elements will reduce long-term maintenance costs.

The project is proposed by the City of Boston (City) to replace access to essential public health services on Long Island. Facilities on Long Island have provided services to vulnerable populations in the Boston region. Access to these services was eliminated when the bridge was closed due to public safety concerns. The City proposes to construct the bridge on an expedited basis to support re-opening of the public health facilities on Long Island.

### Original Project

The Original Project consisted of the demolition of the Long Island Bridge superstructure and the relocation of utilities that were located on it subsequent to the closure of the bridge to vehicular and pedestrian traffic in October 2014. The Long Island Bridge spanned Boston Harbor between Moon Island in Quincy and Long Island in Boston. The bridge provided the only vehicular access to Long Island and carried the sole water, electric, and telecommunications services for Long Island and Spectacle Island. An Emergency Authorization was granted on December 31, 2014 for the bridge demolition and utility removal project, pursuant to 301 CMR 11.13 of the MEPA regulations. The Emergency Authorization was followed by issuance of a Certificate on the Initial Environmental Notification Form (ENF) on February 6, 2015.

The authorization was limited to actions necessary to demolish the bridge superstructure and maintain the substructure in a safe and sound condition and to provide temporary power to Spectacle and Long Island. It did not extend to permanent relocation of the utilities, the eventual replacement of the bridge or new development on Long Island.

Consistent with the emergency provisions, the City filed an Amended ENF to provide information on the final demolition methodology, identify the impacts associated with the demolition of the bridge and utilities, and describe measures taken to avoid, minimize, and mitigate environmental impacts associated with the emergency action. It also described the utility relocation project, and identified associated federal and State approvals and permits, potential impacts, and measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate these impacts.

The Original Project included removal of all elements of the superstructure, including bridge deck, bridge rail, structural elements, trusses, bearings, joints, and utilities. The piers, abutments and other sub-structural elements were not demolished so that they could be used to support replacement of the superstructure while minimizing impacts to wetland resource areas. The Original Project also included the relocation of utilities within a permanent utility corridor in Boston Harbor.

The Amended ENF proposed the permanent installation of utilities by dredging a trench along the entire conduit alignment between Moon and Long Islands. The project included installation of most of the length of the submarine utilities using conventional dredging and trenching methodology, however horizontal direction drilling (HDD) was used for a distance of approximately 100 feet commencing at

Moon Island. The use of HDD reduced the trenching footprint as compared to the description provided in the Initial ENF. The project included installation of a 16-inch high-density polyethylene (HDPE) water line with concrete ballast units, an armored submarine power cable, and an armored data fiber submarine cable in a single trench. It reused material that was excavated from the trench as backfill. The April 30, 2015 Certificate on the Amended ENF determined that the potential impacts associated with the Original Project (Bridge Demolition and Utility Relocation) did not warrant the preparation of an EIR. Removal of the Long Island Bridge superstructure was completed in 2015.

The review of the Amended ENF did not include the replacement of the Long Island Bridge. The City indicated its intention to replace the bridge superstructure on the retained bridge piers and abutments; however, at that time, efforts were focused on the immediate safety concern and permanent reconnection of utilities to Long Island and Spectacle Island. The City was required to address the replacement of the bridge superstructure through a subsequent NPC when sufficient information was available to provide a constructive review of the project.

### Segmentation

Comments from the City of Quincy on the NPC assert that the bridge replacement is being segmented from future expansion of the public health facilities on Long Island. The MEPA regulations include provisions at 301 CMR 11.01(2)(c) to ensure that a project is not phased or segmented to evade, defer or curtail MEPA review. In determining whether a project is subject to MEPA jurisdiction or meets or exceeds any review thresholds, and during MEPA review, the entirety of the project is considered, including any likely future expansion, and not separate phases or segments thereof.

From the outset of MEPA review, the City has indicated its intention to reconstruct the bridge and restore use of public health facilities on the island. The April 30, 2015 Certificate on the Amended ENF directed the City to submit an NPC to describe the bridge superstructure replacement and its associated impacts. The bridge is proposed to replace its prior function and is not designed to expand capacity compared to the original structure.

The City has indicated that it intends to restore prior public health uses located in existing buildings. The City has also indicated that it has initiated planning for a long term recovery center. This planning is in its early stages and includes research and data collection and public meetings to identify needs and potential programming. The City intends to hire an outside consultant to support development of a plan. If the City does develop a plan within the next five years that proposes to increase uses and infrastructure on Long Island that would result in increased environmental impacts, the City must consult with the MEPA Office regarding the need for additional MEPA review in the form of a NPC or an ENF.

### Environmental Impacts and Mitigation

Potential environmental impacts associated with the demolition activities and utility relocation work included temporary alteration of 350 linear feet (lf) of Coastal Bank; 326,883 square feet (sf) of Land Under Ocean (LUO) (demolition: 13,523 sf and utility relocation: 313,360 sf); 16,747 sf of Coastal Beach (demolition: 1,692 sf and utility relocation: 15,055 sf); 16,747 sf of Land Containing Shellfish (LCS) (demolition: 15,055 sf and utility relocation: 1,692 sf); and 17,900 sf of Land Subject to Coastal

## Storm Flowage (LSCSF).

The NPC indicates that the project has been designed to limit work within wetland resource areas to the extent practical. Potential impacts to wetland resources areas and buffer zone associated with the superstructure replacement project are noted in the following table.

Coastal Resource Area	Quincy		Boston		Total	
	Temporary	Permanent	Temporary	Permanent	Temporary	Permanent
Coastal Bank (lf)	512	0	340	0	852	0
Coastal Beach (sf)	80	0	120	0	200	0
LSCSF (sf)	592	0	118	0	710	0
LUO (sf)	0	0	40	0	40	0
Buffer Zone to Coastal Bank	4,889	126	8,700	537	13,589	663

Measures to avoid, minimize and mitigate environmental impacts associated with the superstructure replacement project include: reusing existing piers and abutments; improvements to the stormwater management system; avoidance of impacts to intertidal areas and other aquatic resources during construction by using cranes that will be operated from upland areas, barges, or erected bridge elements; prohibiting the grounding of equipment on the seafloor by floating the bridge in or launching the structure; minimizing traffic by assembling steel members onshore and using barges to float them to the site for placement on pier supports; and implementation of construction period best management practices (BMPs).

#### Jurisdiction and Permitting

The Original Project underwent MEPA review and required an ENF pursuant to 301 CMR 11.03(3)(b)(1)(a), 301 CMR 11.03(3)(b)(1)(f), 301 CMR 11.03(3)(b)(3) and 301 CMR (11.03(3)(b)(5) because it required State Agency Actions and included alteration of Coastal Bank and one-half or more acres of other wetlands (LUO), dredging of 10,000 or more cubic yards (cy) of material, and a new or existing unlicensed non-water dependent use of waterways or tidelands.

The Original Project required State, federal and local emergency authorization, permits and approvals. The demolition project required a Chapter 91 (c. 91) Permit, Section 401 Water Quality Certification (401 WQC), Approval of Lead Compliance Plan and Approval of Non-Traditional Asbestos Abatement Work Practices from the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP). It required a Bridge Demolition Permit and Bridge Permit from the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) and a Category 1 General Permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE). The project also required an Order of Conditions (OOC) from the Boston and Quincy Conservation Commissions.

The utility relocation project required a c. 91 License and 401 WQC from MassDEP and Federal Consistency Review from the Massachusetts Office of Coastal Zone Management (CZM). It also required an Individual 404 Permit from the ACOE and OOCs from the Boston and Quincy Conservation Commissions.

The Superstructure Replacement project exceeds an ENF review threshold pursuant to 301 CMR 11.03(3)(b)(1)(a) for alteration of Coastal Bank. It will require a c. 91 License and Superseding Order of Conditions (SOC)<sup>2</sup> from MassDEP and Federal Consistency Review from CZM.

It also requires a Bridge Permit Amendment from USCG and a Preconstruction Notification General Permit from the ACOE. It will require an OOC from the Quincy Conservation Commission (and, on appeal only, an SOC from MassDEP).

The original project received Financial Assistance from the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT). Therefore, MEPA jurisdiction for this project is broad and extends to all aspects of the project that are likely, directly or indirectly, to cause Damage to the Environment as defined in the MEPA regulations.

### Review of NPC

The NPC provides a description of the project, associated impacts, project plans, and analysis of alternatives. It identifies measures to avoid, minimize and mitigate environmental impacts. The NPC was subjected to an extended comment period.

I received over 900 comment letters, most of which were form letters expressing support for replacement of the Long Island Bridge superstructure to provide access to public health facilities. I also received comments which express concerns regarding increased traffic impacts to Quincy and specifically, the Squantum neighborhood. Comments from State Agencies do not request additional MEPA review.

### *Alternatives Analysis*

The project is proposed to provide safe, reliable, and effective access to the public health facilities on Long Island. The NPC includes an alternatives analysis which compares environmental impacts associated with the No Build, Ferry Service as Sole Access, Design Alternatives and the Preferred Alternative (described herein). Design Alternatives include replacement of the superstructure in-kind (using original design/materials) and construction of a superstructure with a conventional multi-modal bridge deck width; and the Preferred Alternative. The NPC evaluates the consistency of the alternatives with the project's purpose and need, operational reliability (e.g. provide 24 hour-access every day that accommodates transport vans and emergency vehicles), impacts to environmental resources, construction schedule, and addressing sea level rise.

The No Build Alternative would not restore roadway access to Long Island and its public health facilities. The City wants to continue to provide the long-term and successful use of the island for those in need of health and addiction treatment services and highlights the importance of these services to address the opioid crisis. Based on guidance from USCG, the No Build Alternative would require the removal of the piers from Boston Harbor to eliminate their presence as a navigational hazard. The dredging and in-water work associated with removal of the piers would impact the seafloor and shellfish habitat. This alternative was dismissed because it would not meet the project purpose and need, it would

---

<sup>2</sup> The OOC from the Boston Conservation Commission, which was issued on June 6, 2018, was appealed.

be costly and would increase environmental impacts compared to the Preferred Alternative.

The Ferry Service as Sole Access Alternative would provide access to the island through ferry service. The City asserts that this alternative would not meet operational needs and would not provide reliable access to the public health facilities. The NPC indicates that it would increase environmental impacts and have high operating and maintenance costs compared to the Preferred Alternative.

An existing dock facility at Long Island, limited to access by pedestrians, has supported ferry service to access the island; however, the City indicates that it cannot accommodate the transfer of large equipment or vehicles, such as ambulances to transport patients in need of critical medical attention, and it is located some distance away from the public health facilities. Dedicated dock facilities on both Long Island and on the mainland would be required to address urgent care issues, with around the clock staffing, and sized to accommodate larger vehicles. Further operational challenges include reliability and safety of marine vessel transport during inclement weather. Construction of docking facilities to support emergency vehicles, utility connections and parking facilities on both shorelines would require dredging. In addition, similar to the No Build Alternative, removal of existing bridge piers would still be required in accordance with USCG guidance and impact the seafloor and shellfish habitat. This alternative would include costs associated with pier removal; procuring and maintaining ferry vessel(s); and siting, designing, permitting, constructing, operating and maintaining two docking facilities.

The City considered an alternative to replace the superstructure with the same type of span (riveted deck trusses for all spans). While the deck width would meet the project purpose and need, the City maintains that the construction cost is significantly higher for truss bridges than for girder bridges, the construction schedule is significantly longer than for a girder structure, and the bridge design would not include resiliency measures to address sea level rise.

The City considered constructing a typical multi-modal bridge consistent with current design guidelines that would be substantially wider and require new bridge piers and abutments to support the wider and heavier structure. This alternative would result in increased environmental impacts associated with fill and/or dredge for construction of new piers and removal of existing piers, and clearing and grading approach areas to accommodate the wider bridge which may require retaining wall construction in resource areas. The wider bridge would increase shading impacts on the marine environment and intertidal zone and likely require more in-water temporary support work for its construction. The larger bridge would include a significantly longer construction schedule.

The design and construction methodology for the Preferred Alternative was developed to avoid, minimize and mitigate environmental impacts and community impacts associated with construction. Project specifications and the construction contract will include strict constraints that will require the contractor to use a site such as the one available in Boston's Seaport District (Dry Dock 4) for construction laydown and assembly of bridge spans. Barges will be required to transport assembled bridge components to the site and float them into place onto reused piers. The construction approach will allow work to proceed in a shorter timeframe while minimizing construction vehicle traffic on city streets, particularly in Quincy, and avoid impacts to intertidal zones and the seafloor within Boston Harbor. Reuse of existing abutments will reduce construction cost and eliminate the need for construction of new abutments and associated impacts to wetland resource areas. Post-construction traffic volumes are anticipated to be similar to those prior to the bridge demolition in 2015. The NPC

indicates that the Preferred Alternative was selected because it meets the project purpose and need while minimizing environmental impacts.

### *Rare Species*

Portions of the project site are mapped as *Priority* and *Estimated Habitat*, as indicated in the Massachusetts Natural Heritage Atlas (14<sup>th</sup> Edition) for state-listed species. These species and their habitats are regulated pursuant to the implementing regulations of the Massachusetts Endangered Species Act (MESA) (MGL c131A) and its implementing regulations (321 CMR 10.00). Comments from NHESP indicate that it issued a determination letter to the City on June 1, 2018 in response to two separate Notices of Intent (NOIs). This letter stated that the project will not result in a prohibited Take of state-listed rare species pursuant to MESA and it will not adversely affect the actual Resource Area Habitat of state-protected rare wildlife species pursuant to the Wetlands Protection Act (WPA). The City should continue to consult with NHESP as the project design and construction approach is developed to avoid and minimize impacts to habitat, and mitigate any potential unavoidable impacts during construction and management of the project.

### *Wetlands, Waterways, and Tidelands*

The project site includes Moon Island and Long Island, and is located within Boston Harbor. The project will impact Coastal Bank and its buffer zone, Coastal Beach, LUO, and LSCSF. The construction methodology avoids permanent alteration of the seafloor, intertidal areas, or any other areas subject to regulatory jurisdiction. The Boston Conservation Commission issued an OOC on June 6, 2018 which was appealed to MassDEP. Therefore, the Quincy Conservation Commission and MassDEP will review the superstructure replacement project to determine its consistency with the WPA, the Wetlands Regulations (310 CMR 10.00), and associated performance standards, including the Stormwater Management Standards (SMS). MassDEP will also review the project to determine its consistency with the c. 91 regulations (310 CMR 9.00) and associated performance standards. Comments from MassDEP do not request further MEPA review.

In Quincy, the project will permanently and temporarily alter 126 sf and 4,889 sf of buffer zone to Coastal Bank, respectively, to allow construction of a slightly modified roadway approach to the bridge on Moon Island that will provide roadway geometry that is compliant with current design standards. It will also temporarily impact 592 sf of LSCSF, of which 512 sf is within Coastal Bank and 80 sf is within Coastal Beach.

In Boston, the project will temporarily alter 40 sf of LUO and 120 sf of Coastal Beach associated with installation of pipe piles that will support construction staging from which the bridge approach span will be placed between the Long Island Abutment and the nearest bridge pier. It will also temporarily alter 340 lf of Coastal Bank and 118 sf of LSCSF. On Long Island, the project will temporarily alter 8,700 sf and permanently alter 537 sf within the buffer zone to Coastal Bank near the existing abutment to allow improved roadway geometry that meets current design standards.

The design assumes that the existing bridge piers can be used for the new superstructure and that additional work underwater will not be necessary. No dredging, fill or use of cofferdams is proposed. Repointing is planned to be conducted from the water. MassDEP comments note that during demolition

of the Long Island Bridge, two of the piers were damaged and required repair. The project may require submission of a new NOI under the WPA if it proposes repairs to the piers that would require work in LUO. In addition, the project may require a Section 401 Water Quality Certification if the threshold for work in LUO is exceeded.

Impacts to marine fisheries resources and habitats from work on the existing piers will be limited to noise impacts. Temporary impacts to the seafloor will result from the use of spuds to hold barges in place and turbidity resulting from pipe pile installation for the temporary supports. Comments from the Massachusetts Division of Marine Fisheries (DMF) do not identify concerns regarding impacts to marine fisheries resources.

### *Stormwater*

The superstructure replacement will include drainage improvements to meet the current “redevelopment” stormwater design standards of the Wetlands Regulations (310 CMR 10.00). Stormwater will be directed from the roadway surface via a closed drainage system to Long Island and Moon Island. BMPs include proprietary water quality structures behind the abutments on both shorelines to treat runoff and a subsurface infiltration system on Long Island to provide recharge. The City will be required to provide information to demonstrate that the project qualifies as a redevelopment project during permitting and will be consistent with the SMS to the maximum extent practicable, pursuant to 310 CMR 10.05(6)(k)(7) and 310 CMR 10.05(6)(o)(2).

### *Climate Change*

The replacement design includes consideration of the effects of climate change, including sea level rise and the incorporation of resiliency measures. The majority of the bridge steel will be raised above the water. The original bridge pier caps, designed in 1949, were generally set at an elevation of 11.5 feet.<sup>3</sup> The modified caps will be set at an elevation 13.5 feet to improve resiliency. The NPC identifies MHW at the site at 4.33 feet and the record high tide elevation which occurred during the Blizzard of 1978 at 9.59 feet. The roadway surface elevations will range from approximately 49.5 feet at the abutments to 58.9 feet over the navigable opening. MassDEP comments indicate its support for design considerations that reflect anticipated sea level rise and climate change resiliency as they affect bridge operations, navigation and maintenance. I encourage the City to consider comments from Boston Harbor Now regarding opportunities for increasing resiliency of the structure.

### *Construction Impacts*

The project must comply with MassDEP Solid Waste and Air Pollution Control regulations, pursuant to M.G.L. c.40, s.54 during construction and demolition. All construction and demolition activities should be undertaken in compliance with the conditions of all State and local permits. Construction methodology includes the use of barges and land-based cranes to limit impacts to wetland resource areas, including the intertidal zone and the seafloor. The City should consult with MassDEP regarding any changes to proposed construction methodology that would require additional permitting and/or mitigation due to increases in impacts to wetland resource areas.

---

<sup>3</sup> Datum references the North American Vertical Datum of 1988 (NAVD88).



The selected contractor will be required to use barges or other vessels that will not ground on the seafloor. The contractor may use a crane from a roadway near the bridge abutments, on barges, or on erected bridge elements at either terminus of the bridge, to install approach spans over the near-shore areas. A minimal number of temporary piles will be used to support this construction methodology.

### *Historical and Archaeological Resources*

Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC) comments indicate that Long Island is listed in the State and National Registers of Historic Places as part of the Boston Harbor Island Archaeological District. Because portions of the project area associated with the bridge approaches on Long Island have been deemed archaeologically sensitive, MHC requests that the Proponent conduct an intensive (locational) archaeological survey for those areas. The purpose of the survey is to locate and identify any significant archaeological resources that may be affected by the project to inform avoidance, minimization and mitigation of adverse effects. The project may require review by MHC in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (36 CFR 800) and M.G.L. Chapter 9, Section 26-27C (950 CMR 71.00).

In its comment letter, the Massachusetts Board of Underwater Archaeological Resources (BUAR) indicates that an archaeological assessment and an archaeological remote sensing survey was previously conducted of submerged portions of the project area that may be archaeologically sensitive. Survey results found no archaeological or historical resources. Therefore, BUAR indicates that the project is unlikely to affect submerged cultural resources. If heretofore unknown submerged cultural resources are encountered during the course of the project, BUAR expects that the City will take steps to limit adverse effects and notify the BUAR in accordance with its Policy Guidance for the Discovery of Unanticipated Archaeological Resources.

### Conclusion

The NPC has sufficiently defined the nature and general elements of the project change for the purposes of MEPA review and demonstrated that the project's environmental impacts will be avoided, minimized and/or mitigated to the extent practicable. The NPC addresses the criteria for Insignificance which provides guidance in determining whether a change in a project might significantly increase environmental consequences (301 CMR 11.10) and informs a determination regarding whether additional MEPA review is warranted in the form of an EIR. The reconstruction of the superstructure will not expand the project or change the project site. It will require new Agency Action and it will result in relatively minor increases in environmental impacts compared to the Original Project; however, the City is reconstructing the bridge within the footprint of the previous bridge and the NPC includes sufficient information regarding the change, potential impacts and associated mitigation.

Based on a review of the NPC and after consultation with State Agencies, I hereby determine that no further MEPA review is required. Outstanding issues will be addressed during State, local and federal permitting.

September 21, 2018

Date



Matthew A. Beaton

Comments received:

08/09/2018 Massachusetts Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program (NHESP)  
 08/16/2018 Massachusetts Board of Underwater Archaeological Resources (BUAR)  
 08/22/2018 Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC)  
 08/23/2018 Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) –  
 Northeast Regional Office (NERO)  
 08/28/2018 Massachusetts Division of Marine Fisheries (DMF)  
 08/27/2018 State Senator Michael F. Rush  
 08/27/2018 State Senator John F. Keenan  
 08/28/2018 State Representative Angelo Michael Scaccia  
 08/28/2018 State Senator William N. Brownsberger  
 09/11/2018 State Representative Bruce J. Ayers  
 09/19/2018 State Representative Adrian C. Madaro  
 08/16/2018 Boston City Councilor Timothy P. McCarthy  
 08/23/2018 Boston City Councilor Lydia Edwards  
 08/24/2018 Boston City Councilor Annissa Essaibi-George  
 08/24/2018 Boston City Councilor Matt O'Malley  
 08/27/2018 Boston City Councilors Frank Baker, Annissa Essaibi-George, Tim McCarthy, Mark  
 Clommo, Kim Janey, Michael Flaherty, Andrea Campbell, Ed Flynn, and Josh Zakim  
 08/27/2018 Boston Fire Department Commissioner Joseph E. Finn  
 08/28/2018 Boston City Councilor Kim Janey  
 08/28/2018 Boston City Councilor Ed Flynn  
 09/05/2018 City of Boston Health and Human Services Chief Marty Martinez  
 09/05/2018 City of Boston Chief of Policy Joyce Linehan  
 09/07/2018 City of Boston Environment Department Chief Christopher Cook  
 09/08/2018 Boston Public Health Commission/Board of Health Chairman Francis J. Doyle  
 09/10/2018 City of Boston Mayor Martin J. Walsh  
 09/10/2018 Quincy City Councilor William P. Harris  
 09/11/2018 Mayor Thomas P. Koch and the City of Quincy  
 08/20/2018 Kate Webby – Acadia Healthcare, Northeast Region  
 08/21/2018 Bob Minnocci  
 08/21/2018 Heidi Brewster  
 08/22/2018 Brian Gokey  
 08/22/2018 Brian Halley  
 08/22/2018 Rachael Albarran  
 08/22/2018 T. Hart  
 08/22/2018 Jen S. Thomas  
 08/22/2018 Aaron Perrino

08/22/2018 Marilyn Wright  
08/22/2018 David Berarducci  
08/22/2018 Desmond Murphy  
08/22/2018 Andrew Brand  
08/22/2018 Joanne Peterson – Learn to Cope  
08/22/2018 Vijay Thomas  
08/22/2018 Jesse Wong  
08/22/2018 Scott Mabel  
08/23/2018 George Stergios  
08/23/2018 Jeremy Holman  
08/23/2018 Lubo Karadashkov  
08/23/2018 Frederick W. Newton – Hope House Inc.  
08/23/2018 Michael Boudah  
08/23/2018 Liz Nyman  
08/23/2018 Jennifer Adleman-Howe  
08/23/2018 Julie Burns – RIZE Massachusetts  
08/24/2018 Bill Sprague – Bay Cove Human Services  
08/24/2018 Marcus Matic  
08/24/2018 Susan L. Sullivan – Newmarket Business Association  
08/24/2018 Priya Shah  
08/24/2018 Russell Harris  
08/24/2018 Alissa Anderson  
08/29/2018 Barbara Waterhouse – Circle of Hope, Inc.  
09/06/2018 Jack Connors, Jr. – Camp Harbor View  
09/07/2018 Tim Horn – Fenway Civic Association  
09/07/2018 Mary Michael Leahy – The Boston Advisory Council on Ending Homelessness  
09/07/2018 Lyndia Downie – Pine Street Inn  
09/08/2018 Robert H. Haas – Upham’s Corner Westside Neighborhood Association and Upham’s  
Corner Main Street  
09/09/2018 David W. Manzo  
09/10/2018 John Rosenthal – Friends of Boston’s Homeless  
09/10/2018 Doug Meyer – Downtown Boston Business Improvement District  
09/10/2018 Old South Church in Boston  
09/10/2018 Bill Lim  
09/10/2018 C.A. McCawley – The New England Center and Home for Veterans  
09/10/2018 Deni Sindel  
09/10/2018 Christen Schatzel  
09/10/2018 Richard D. Golden  
09/10/2018 Brian Franklin  
09/10/2018 Frank McLaughlin  
09/10/2018 Marie Layden  
09/10/2018 Jonathan Galvin  
09/10/2018 Jenelle O’Neil  
09/10/2018 Maureen O’Neil  
09/10/2018 Kevin Layden  
09/10/2018 Sheila & Dan Smith

09/10/2018 Mary Curtin  
09/11/2018 James Stamos  
09/11/2018 Bonnie Marcel  
09/11/2018 Boston Harbor Now  
09/11/2018 Karen LaFrazia – St. Francis House  
09/11/2018 Karen Antman – Boston University  
09/11/2018 Barry Bock – Boston Health Care for the Homeless Program  
09/11/2018 Elizabeth Bertolozzi – The Fenway Garden Society  
08/27/2018 Joao Evora submitted 102 signatures (additional two signatures submitted 08/28/2018)  
Form letters beginning “The debate regarding....”  
09/05/2018 Leticia St. Pemy  
09/07/2018 Mary Marshall  
09/10/2018 833 form letters submitted to the MEPA Office from City of Boston  
09/11/2018 Jeff Maynard  
09/11/2018 Rosa Herrero  
09/11/2018 Patricia Cahill  
09/14/2018 seven signatures  
09/14/2018 Kahlen A. Curz  
Form letters beginning “I am writing to you as a member of the Back Bay Association...”  
09/06/2018 George Terpilowski – Fairmont Copley Plaza  
09/07/2018 Chris Talanian – C. Talanian Realty  
09/10/2018 Meg Mainzer-Cohen – Back Bay Association  
09/10/2018 Bernard Chiu – Upland Capital Corporation  
09/10/2018 Cindy Brown – Boston Duck Tours  
09/11/2018 Leo Fonseca – Lyons Group  
09/12/2018 Christopher Scott – The Capital Grille  
09/13/2018 Bill Taylor – Four Seasons Hotel Boston  
09/21/2018 Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe

MAB/PPP/ppp