



OVERVIEW OF CONTENTS

As a result of its extensive outreach activities, the MPO received a substantial number of written and spoken comments on Paths to a Sustainable Region. They are summarized in this appendix. The formal comments on the draft document that were received during the 30-day public review and comment period are each summarized in Table A-2; a response from the MPO accompanies each of these comments. The contents of this appendix are:

- Table A-1, Comments Received During the Development of the Draft Long-Range Transportation Plan, June 1, 2010–August 14, 2011
- Table A-2, Comments Received During the Official Public Comment Period, August 15–September 13, 2011

THE BOSTON REGION MPO'S OUTREACH ACTIVITIES

In developing Paths to a Sustainable Region, the MPO conducted a variety of outreach activities, beginning in the spring of 2010, inviting the involvement of participants that included the Regional Transportation Advisory Council; area residents; municipal, state, and federal officials; businesses; transportation interest groups; environmental groups; transportation providers; persons with disabilities; low-income and minority communities; the elderly; and persons with limited English proficiency. Methods for eliciting public input included:

- The Regional Transportation Advisory Council, the main avenue for public involvement in the work of the MPO. It is the MPO's official advisory group. Composed of transportation advocacy groups and other interest groups, municipal officials, and state agencies, it is charged with creating a forum for ongoing and robust discussion of pertinent regional transportation topics and for generating

diverse views to be considered by the MPO. MPO staff often discussed Paths to a Sustainable Region with the Advisory Council and its Plan Committee during the course of this LRTP's development. The Advisory Council submitted several letters and reports to the MPO expressing its views and providing guidance to the MPO.

- Open houses that informed the public about the transportation planning process and about studies and projects underway and offered a forum for discussion and an exchange of ideas. Open houses were held periodically from the adoption of the last LRTP in 2009 through the summer of 2011 and focused on LRTP topics such as policies, modeling, transportation equity, transportation projects, and land use planning.
- Public workshops on the LRTP held in July 2010, February 2011, and August 2011 to hear the views of members of the public and to provide information on the LRTP. The February 2011 workshops were held to generate feedback on the draft transportation needs assessment, and the July 2011 workshops were held to discuss the draft LRTP and seek more comments. The workshops were held in locations throughout the region: Bedford, Boston (three workshops), Burlington, Natick, Needham, Norwood, and Saugus.
- A transportation equity forum held in February 2011 at the Boston Public Library for professionals working in organizations serving environmental justice neighborhoods and for members of the public, at which the transportation needs of low-income and minority persons living in these neighborhoods were discussed.
- “Invite Us Over” sessions, where MPO staff visited, when requested, organizations with an interest in transportation planning, to present information about and discuss ideas for the LRTP.
- MAPC subregion meetings, where MPO staff met periodically with MAPC subregional groups to keep these local officials informed of the LRTP process and its progress, to gather feedback on the visions and policies and on the transportation needs assessment, and to receive information on projects under consideration for inclusion in the LRTP.
- Environmental consultations with staff from the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection, the Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs, and the Massachusetts Department of Transportation. At these meetings, MPO staff provided updates on the development of the LRTP and gave the environmental agencies an opportunity to provide feedback on the work.

Ongoing, multipurpose outreach tools and activities of the MPO also contributed to public involvement in Paths to a Sustainable Region. The MPO uses several methods for keeping the public informed of its work and creating opportunities for the public to provide feedback and engage in the transportation planning process:

- Email distribution lists (MPOinfo and MPOmedia), used to distribute timely information and news to stakeholders, the general public, and the media. MPOinfo is a one-way email distribution list that includes more than 1,700 contacts, including municipal officials, planners, transportation equity contacts, special interest groups, members of the general public, legislators, environmental agencies and interest groups, and providers of transportation, including freight transport. Press releases are also distributed to more than 200 media outlets, including local Spanish-language publications (which receive Spanish-language text).
- TRANSreport, the MPO’s monthly newsletter. TRANSreport is an important means of providing information on various aspects of the entire MPO planning process, including announcements of public participation opportunities and outreach activities. Special inserts on important LRTP topics were included to provide detailed information and encourage public comment. TRANSreport is sent to approximately 3,000 recipients, including over 100 state legislators and their staffs, numerous local officials, and members of the general public in each municipality in the region.
- A website, www.bostonmpo.org, with pages devoted to the LRTP and each of the other certification documents. Basic information on Paths to a Sustainable Region has been posted at www.bostonmpo.org/2035plan since the planning process for the document was launched. Draft documents were also posted there as they became available. These Web pages were promoted through the website’s home page, by email messages to MPOinfo, and on postcards that were distributed at public meetings.

A new Web feature developed for Paths to a Sustainable Region allowed visitors to the site to easily submit feedback. Under the link to each draft document, a “Provide Feedback” button was posted. By clicking on this button, a visitor could provide feedback on any draft material at any time. This feedback is included in Table A-1.

- Social media outlets, including Twitter. The MPO launched a Twitter account (@BostonRegionMPO) in March 2010. Social media sites are among the most visited websites on the Internet and allow the MPO to reach a broad audience and attract people to the MPO’s website to learn more about the MPO’s work. Announcements about Paths to a Sustainable Region, such as notifications of the availability of draft documents and of public meetings, were transmitted through Twitter. The MPO also uses YouTube to explain transportation planning issues.

TABLE A-1

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|-----------------|----------------------|--|---------|
| Unidentified | Hopedale resident | Supports extending commuter rail to Hopedale. The community is growing, but isolated. | 8/5/11 |
| Fernando Colina | Medford resident | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. Having reliable and affordable transportation will improve the quality of life for residents along the extension route. | 8/4/11 |
| Jeff Reese | Medford resident | Upset about the delay of the Green Line Extension to 2018 or later. The extension is a mandatory project that was supposed to be completed by 2014. Obtaining federal funding is not a requirement for the project to proceed. The project is not complex as it will be built within an existing right-of-way. Suggests the funds being used to add a lane to Route 128 could go towards the Green Line Extension. Questions why highway expansions are prioritized over transit expansions. The Green Line Extension will reduce air pollution in Medford and Somerville coming from I-93. The two communities bear a large burden from this facility, which benefits residents of many other communities. Any interim offset projects should have environmental, transportation, and economic development improvements. | 8/4/11 |
| Janet Campbell | Somerville resident | Supports construction of the Community Path from Lowell Street to Lechmere. It should be built at the same time as the Green Line Extension. | 7/24/11 |
| Scott Mullen | Arlington resident | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. Supports light rail in general. | 7/25/11 |
| Stephen Winslow | Bike to the Sea Inc. | The MPO should fund the Northern Strand Community Path rather than the Route 1 widening. The Northern Strand can serve the same purpose, will cost less, will have less environmental impact, and will produce greater health benefits. It has the potential to attract more users than the Minuteman because of the adjoining population densities. | 7/15/11 |
| Pat Brown | Sudbury resident | Commends the MPO on the draft "Livability and the Environment" chapter. It is unclear how the MPO determines if a path is for recreation or transportation. This is important because a path for transportation may reduce emissions, while a recreational path may not. Trail counts should be conducted in summer and winter in order to understand if the trail is being used for transportation purposes. Both capital and operation expenses should be tracked in the LRTP to allow better comparison of projects. The discussion for Figure 5-16 should explain what constitutes transit and the appropriate level of service relative to population density. Recent breakdowns on the MBTA system highlight the need for more maintenance expenditures. A discussion of the trade-off between maintenance and expansion should be included. Table 5-2 does not define community type, pedestrian coverage, or bicycle coverage, nor does it indicate the source of data or when it was collected. Bicycle plans developed by MAPC and MassDOT are fiscally unconstrained. The MPO should communicate through its public outreach the fiscal constraints imposed by the federal process. | 7/18/11 |
| Unidentified | Boston resident | Bus rapid transit (BRT) is a subpar transportation option. The MPO should build light rail and heavy rail systems rather than BRT. Supports extending the Orange Line through Boston to Route 128. | 7/19/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|---------|
| Michael J. Lang | East Braintree Civic Association | MassDOT is proposing a new Fore River Bridge 28 stories high with a 250-foot channel clearance. This is too large for the shipping needs and would negatively affect the community. A bascule bridge would be cheaper, built faster, and more accommodating to commuters and boaters. It would be cheaper to maintain and better to look at. The "Type Study" conducted by MassDOT should be available. The funding for the project should be withheld until the public can review this study. | 7/9/11 |
| Lydia Rogers | Wildlife Passages Task Force, Concord | Suggests the Plan include a dictionary of acronyms. Recommends the Plan include a discussion of strategies to mitigate wildlife impacts. Wildlife underpasses save animals, preserve movement corridors, and improves safety for drivers. | 7/7/11 |
| Fred Moore | | Dissatisfied that the Blue Line to Lynn has not been built. | 7/6/11 |
| Anne Lee | | Supports construction funding for the Assabet River Rail Trail (Acton-Maynard-Stow section). | 7/4/11 |
| U.S. Rep. Niki Tsongas | US Congress | Supports the Assabet River Rail Trail and Bruce Freeman Rail Trail in the LRTP. Keeping these trails in the LRTP will ensure that necessary funding will be allocated for these trails. The federal government has pledged more than \$1.5 million in HPP earmarks, launching a partnership with the state and local communities to build the trails. It is important that the projects be brought to completion. Both trails have tremendous community and regional support. Both trails terminate at commuter parking lots and will be used by many communities as part of a multimodal transportation model. Both trails advance economic development goals by providing connections to the town centers of Hudson, Maynard, and Marlborough. | 6/30/11 |
| Jim Gallagher | Somerville resident | The Plan, as a "public" document, should be useful and accessible to that public. That means a document that is relatively short, which can be read in a few hours at most (50 to 100 pages with a lot of graphics). And it should be largely written in non-technical, jargon-free language. And as for the mix of specific projects to include, I think that few projects should be listed beyond 2025. Instead there should be a commitment to fix already identified and prioritized needs, whether or not a specific "project" is already under design. To cite one example, there is currently no "project" under development to make improvements to the 128 Central area (I-90 to I-93), in spite of its current problems and the hopes/plans for additional economic growth which will require more people to get to the corridor than currently do. Rather than ignoring this critical need (effectively saying that nothing will be done in this corridor before 2035), the Plan should contain a commitment for improvements as they are identified, perhaps even including some very general allocation of a minimum amount of funds that may be needed. And a commitment that in the time before the next Plan is developed there will be additional study to identify those fixes, with some slightly more specific costs that can then be included in the next Plan. | 6/29/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|-------------------|--------------------------|--|---------|
| Jonah Petri | Somerville resident | Concerned about the draft set of projects in the LRTP. Directing 85% of money toward highway expansion and reinforcement is counter to the stated goals of the LRTP. The LRTP should be addressing environmental justice, increasing use of low-carbon transportation modes, and most importantly, preserving a livable climate for our children. More paths are needed instead of massive highway investment. | 6/27/11 |
| Mike Gowing | Acton Board of Selectmen | The Town of Acton thanks the MPO for keeping the Assabet River Rail Trail and Bruce Freeman Rail Trail projects in the draft LRTP and asks that they remain in the final LRTP. Keeping the ARRT in the FFYs 2016-20 time band and the BFRT in the FFYs 2021-25 time band reflects Acton's priorities with respect to these projects. The Town of Acton is committed to the completion of both trails and counts on the continued support of the MPO. | 6/16/11 |
| Ed Beauchemin | | Supports construction funding for the Assabet River Rail Trail (Acton-Maynard-Stow section). The Rail Trail will provide access between the Acton MBTA station and many businesses in the area. It will provide a safe path for commuters, walkers, joggers, bicyclists, and other users to use instead of the busy streets. Encourages the MPO to start the construction of this project as soon as possible. | 6/21/11 |
| Carolyn Stock | | Supports construction funding for the Assabet River Rail Trail (Acton-Maynard-Stow section). | 6/21/11 |
| David Mark | Assabet River Rail Trail | Supports construction funding for the Assabet River Rail Trail (Acton-Maynard-Stow section). This part of ARRT will provide for safe, off-road commuting among the towns and the railroad station in Acton. Currently, non-car commuting is along Route 27, a busy road with narrow shoulders and in parts no sidewalks. Has been volunteering on ARRT projects since 2000. | 6/21/11 |
| Stephen Wagner | Maynard resident | Supports construction funding for the Assabet River Rail Trail (Acton-Maynard-Stow section). Uses the very short section in Maynard that has been cleared; the mulch between the rails is a great walking surface. If the trail were complete to South Acton, would use it regularly to walk to the commuter trains daily. | 6/21/11 |
| Debra Mercurio | | Supports construction funding for the Assabet River Rail Trail (Acton-Maynard-Stow section). | 6/21/11 |
| Sara Hartman | Maynard resident | Supports construction funding for the Assabet River Rail Trail (Acton-Maynard-Stow section). The available public recreation space, especially in Maynard, is very limited and there are many Maynard residents who are eagerly supporting and waiting for a rail trail that will open up new possibilities in this area. The roads are not very safe for biking and the traffic has gotten increasingly heavy in the last 10 years. | 6/21/11 |
| Johanna MacAloney | | Supports construction funding for the Assabet River Rail Trail (Acton-Maynard-Stow section). This project has been ongoing for more than 15 years and needs to be completed. The Acton and Maynard sections are likely to be the most heavily used portions of the trail. Delays in trail construction are only leading to higher overall costs. This is an important project for our communities and for the health of the environment. | 6/21/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|-------------------|--|--|---------|
| Charlie Flammer | | Supports construction funding for the Assabet River Rail Trail (Acton-Maynard-Stow section). As in other areas that have developed bike paths, it will transform the towns by injecting a vitality into the area as people make use of it to improve their health and interact with others. | 6/20/11 |
| Richard J. Fallon | Assabet River Rail Trail | Supports construction funding for the Assabet River Rail Trail (Acton-Maynard-Stow section). The part completed so far is excellent and well used. | 6/20/11 |
| Lucille Spera | | Supports funding for the Assabet River Rail Trail completion. Wants to ride for miles from Marlboro through Hudson and Stow and on to Maynard, Sudbury, and Concord. Wants to connect it all for us and for our kids. | 6/20/11 |
| Neal Silverman | | Supports funding the Assabet River Rail Trail as quickly as possible. | 6/20/11 |
| April Lowe | | Supports construction funding for the Assabet River Rail Trail (Acton-Maynard-Stow section). The rail trail currently is a wonderful place for her and her family to walk and ride bikes. Supports funding for the continuation and lengthening of the trail and to make it more of a draw for bikers from around the state. | 6/20/11 |
| Chris Spear | Assabet River Rail Trail (AART) | Supports construction funding for the Assabet River Rail Trail (Acton-Maynard-Stow section). States that a teenage son was able to use the dirt road to bike around their town of Stow and into Maynard without having to ride his bike on the busy Route 62 and Route 117. It would save the writer at least a mile when biking to Maynard, Sudbury, and beyond. The writer is a bicycling merit badge counselor, and could plan more rides, and safer rides, if the ARRT was completed between Marlborough and Acton. | 6/20/11 |
| Priscilla Ryder | City of Marlborough Conservation Officer | Supports construction funding for the Assabet River Rail Trail (Acton-Maynard-Stow section). The trail is an asset in Marlborough and Hudson; recommends extending the trail to its full length of 12 miles from Marlborough to the South Acton train station. This is a great nonmotorized transportation corridor and an asset to our region. Recommends keeping this funding in the plan. | 6/20/11 |
| Rebecca Arsenault | AECOM and Hudson resident | As an avid user of the rail trail systems and local resident, strongly supports the FFYs 2011-2035 Long Range Transportation Plan, Paths to a Sustainable Region. Requests that the MPO consider the continuous development of these projects to enhance our future as a sustainable region. | 6/20/11 |
| John E. McNamara | Maynard resident, ARRT member | Supports construction funding for the Assabet River Rail Trail (Acton-Maynard-Stow section). It would provide construction jobs and stimulate the economies of Stow, Maynard, and Acton, and it would get sedentary senior citizens out on their bikes for healthy exercise. | 6/19/11 |
| Sarah Johnson | Hudson resident | Supports construction funding for the Assabet River Rail Trail (Acton-Maynard-Stow section). The trail has added enormous value to the Hudson and Marlborough area, which would greatly benefit by the expansion. The trail adds value to their homes and livelihood. Reports often running on the trail alone and then walking with her kids later in the day. Loves to watch others enjoying the trail as well, especially during nice weather. The trail promotes exercise as well as adding value to the community as a whole. | |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|-------------------|--------------------------------|--|---------|
| Richard Gelpke | Hudson resident | Supports the Assabet River Rail Trail project. Is a long-time user, who, before retiring, worked closely with AART. The rail trail is a tremendous asset to the towns. Reports that he walks and bikes it a lot in the summer (is away in the winter) and sees a lot of people, especially younger ones, now on the trail. It is a great way for families to be together - "there is precious little of it happening now." It is also a great place to exercise, see the countryside, and just plain enjoy the out-of-doors. Requests that the MPO keep this a very high priority in its planning and funding process. | 6/19/11 |
| Jezanna Gruber | | Supports funding for the Assabet River Rail Trail through Acton, Maynard and Stow. Would use this trail frequently, along with the rest of her family. Would like to be able to bike safely to Maynard instead of driving. | 6/19/11 |
| Kathie Larsen | | Supports construction funding for the Assabet River Rail Trail (Acton-Maynard-Stow section). This is valuable both for recreational purposes and commuting. With limited parking in South Acton for non-Acton residents, this path allows people to ride bikes to commute into Boston. It is both environmentally wise and good for exercising. | 6/19/11 |
| Mary Hunter Utt | Assabet River Rail Trail | Supports the Assabet River Rail Trail. It is an important linkage for five communities, offering opportunities for recreation and commuting. | 6/19/11 |
| Duncan Power | Assabet River Rail Trail | Supports completing the Assabet River Rail Trail (Acton-Maynard-Stow section) as soon as possible. The short, direct connection between commuter rail, the Maynard business center, and Stow residences would benefit the economy. | 6/19/11 |
| Michael B. Duclos | Assabet River Rail Trail | Supports construction funding for the Assabet River Rail Trail (Acton-Maynard-Stow section). Stow is perhaps the most isolated, beautiful and utilitarian section since it avoids travel on high-traffic roads (Route 117/62 or Hudson Rd.) and passes between the Assabet River and National Wildlife Refuge, connecting major housing developments to downtown Maynard and the South Acton Rail Station. States that it is difficult to imagine a higher-leverage use of public dollars, in return for reduced automobile traffic, higher quality of life and fitness, and quiet access to a beautiful corner of Stow. Stow Town Meeting has enthusiastically and nearly unanimously voted financial support for this project for the obvious value it presents. | 6/19/11 |
| Richard Denio | Unidentified | Supports the Assabet River Rail Trail. Trails provide more than just a place for healthy exercise; they also encourage a sense of community among the users and economic benefit to the towns they pass through. They must be of sufficient length, at least 12 miles, to attract a good number of cyclists and pedestrians. All successful trails are of a good length. | 6/18/11 |
| Tom Kelleher | Assabet River Rail Trail, Inc. | Supports keeping construction funding for the Assabet River Rail Trail project (Acton-Maynard-Stow) in the FFYs 2016-2020 time slot of the LRTP, if not sooner. | 6/18/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|---|---|--|---------|
| Tom Yardley | Medical Academic and Scientific Community Organization Inc. (MASCO) | Commends the MPO for developing the Needs Assessment of the LRTP and comments on needs of the Central Area of the MPO region and the Longwood Medical Area (LMA). Supports including the Urban Ring as an Illustrative Project in the LRTP and notes that the Needs Assessment identifies the need for additional circumferential transit services in the Central Area. Requests that the Needs Assessment note that the LMA is not directly served by commuter rail, further contributing to the need for improved circumferential transit, and that Yawkey Station does not have full rush-hour service, requiring riders destined for the LMA to travel into Boston and then outbound again. MASCO is pleased about the upgrades to Yawkey Station. The Needs Assessment should note that further schedule changes are needed to ensure that additional trains can be scheduled to stop when the station is rebuilt. | 6/14/11 |
| Michelle Ciccolo | Minuteman Advisory Group on Interlocal Coordination (MAGIC) | MAGIC's priority projects for the LRTP are: the Assabet River Rail Trail (Acton-Maynard-Stow, and Hudson-Stow segments); Bruce Freeman Rail Trail, Phases 2A, 2B, 2C, and 2D; and Concord Rotary. Requests that the Assabet River Rail Trail, Phase 2, be programmed in the earliest available time band of the LRTP so that earmarked funds can be accessed for the remainder of the design for the two-mile Track Road section of Stow. Also requests that all phases of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail be programmed and that Phase 2B be coordinated with the Concord Rotary project. Also supports siting a multimodal transportation facility near Weston and Waltham along the Route 128 corridor and programming funding for it in the LRTP as soon as feasible. (The letter also included comments on the TIP and UPWP. MAGIC's TIP priorities are: Crosby's Corner; Middlesex Turnpike, Phase 3; and Minuteman Bikeway Extension.) | 6/14/11 |
| Rep. Carl Sciortino; Rep. Denise Provost; Sen. Patricia Jehlen; Sen. Kenneth Donnelly | State Representatives and State Senators | Support the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 6/15/11 |
| Rep. James Dwyer; Rep. Jay Kaufman; Sen. Kenneth Donnelly; Sen. Patricia Jehlen | State Representatives and State Senators | Wrote (in regard to TIP programming) to express their support for the New Boston Street Bridge and Montvale Avenue projects in Woburn. The projects would enhance public safety, quality of life, and economic development in Woburn and surrounding areas. | 6/14/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|--------------------|---------------------|---|---------|
| Jim Nigrelli | Sudbury resident | States that the two rail-trail projects listed in the draft LRTP are estimated to cost nearly \$54 million, and that, according to the plan, the \$54 million does not include Phase 2B of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail, which is part of the Concord Rotary/Route 2 project. At over \$4.5 million dollars a mile, the costs of these recreational trails will provide little benefit in meeting the transportation needs of the MetroWest area compared to other transportation projects. Provides an example: the recent expansion of CSX's rail facility in Worcester would create improved freight service for businesses and improved service for commuters along the Worcester/Framingham Line to Boston's South Station. At a cost of \$100 million, the CSX expansion would have far greater impact on congestion mitigation and air quality improvement than \$54 million spent on 11 miles of bike paths in the suburbs of Boston. With limited funds, the MPO should prioritize "true" transportation projects over those that are recreational and nonessential. | 6/13/11 |
| Daniel A. DePompei | Sudbury resident | Compliments the MPO on maintaining a realistic long-range schedule/plan for the Assabet River and the Bruce Freeman Rail Trails. The Assabet is at a stage of maturity and acceptance that deserves inclusion in the long-range transportation plan. The Bruce Freeman does not enjoy this maturity. The Bruce Freeman does not belong on the current long-range plan for the following reasons: 1) The towns along the currently proposed route for the Bruce Freeman are not united in a concept for the trail; 2) the Bruce Freeman creates significant, unresolved environmental, wildlife, and small-business conflicts along the proposed trail route; 3) there are no quantified transportation benefits applicable to the trail; and 4) future phases of the proposed trail (south Sudbury and Framingham) would require additional real property purchases from CSX, the current owner. Who should purchase this property and how the purchase would be funded are problems requiring resolution prior to any additional planning for the Bruce Freeman. | 6/12/11 |
| Martin Ferguson | Arlington resident | Supports Option 1 of the proposed LRTP Investment Strategies with the Green Line Extension to Route 16. This would be very convenient for East Arlington residents living near the Medford line for traveling to the hospital area in Boston. | 6/9/11 |
| Robert Gentile | Framingham resident | States that the Framingham 126/135 Grade Separation project is a waste of money if it is seen only as a highway modernization project. This project should be designed to benefit passenger and freight rail as well. This would involve grade separation of rails crossing Route 135 and Route 126. Otherwise, it would only speed up traffic going through downtown Framingham without making the downtown area a more desirable destination. A number of downtown merchants agree with this assessment. | 6/8/11 |
| John Akers | Stow resident | Supports programming the Assabet River Rail Trail in the LRTP. Considerable local funds have been spent on right-of-way acquisition. Acton, Maynard, Hudson, Marlborough, and Stow are working together in a process that will promote and improve pedestrian and bicycle use, and increase fitness. | 6/14/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|----------------|---|--|---------|
| Pat Brown | Sudbury resident | Concerned that the inclusion of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail (Acton, Concord) in the 2021-2025 period of the LRTP does not state explicitly that the two segments are disjoint. The failure to include the Route 2 crossing would leave trail users from Acton with no safe passage to Concord; users from Concord could not safely arrive at Acton, for the same reason. The Route 2 crossing (606223) of the trail must be included in the cost estimate and in the project description, or the trail would not provide safe access to public transportation at the West Concord commuter rail station for users from Acton and points north. Preliminary estimates for the Route 2 crossing, which has not reached 25% design, are currently \$6 million (see project 606223 in the MassDOT PROJIS database). Requests that these costs be included in the estimates for the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. Alternatively, the Plan should indicate that the proposed segments are disjoint and describe the provision for the safety of trail users until they can be connected. | 6/10/11 |
| Sarah Hamilton | Medical Academic and Scientific Community Organization Inc. (MASCO) | The Longwood Medical Area is the largest employment center outside of downtown Boston but has limited transit access. MASCO is grateful to the state for its support of transit improvements in the area. To support job growth in the LMA area, continued collaboration would be needed to plan for LMA's infrastructure needs. MASCO supports modeling incremental components of the Urban Ring Locally Preferred Alternative and selecting some low-cost components for the LRTP. Suggestions for modeling are: Ruggles Station Platform Improvements; Melnea Cass Boulevard center median busway; Montfort Street Corridor improvements; Albany Street bus lanes in Boston; short-term cross-town bus service improvements to the LMA from Sullivan Station to JFK/UMass Station; and an alternative LMA tunnel for long-range bus rapid transit (BRT) service. The MPO's Needs Assessment reinforces these suggestions. MASCO requests that the MPO include the Urban Ring as an Illustrative Project in the LRTP. By taking incremental steps to evaluate elements of Central Area transit improvements, such as components of the Urban Ring, the state would be in a better position to achieve greenhouse gas reduction goals in the future. | 6/8/11 |
| Carole Wolfe | Sudbury Citizens for Responsible Land Stewardship | Expresses concern about the Assabet River Rail Trail and Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. The number of people who would use the trails for transportation verses recreation has not been determined. There is no verifiable measurement to prove that congestion mitigation or air quality improvement would result from these multi-million-dollar investments. It is unrealistic to believe the BFRT would have any quantifiable impact on relieving congestion at the Concord rotary or that unpaved, unlighted suburban trails would significantly improve the region's transportation. The timeframes for the trails should be extended so that more accurate measures to calculate commuter use could be developed to better assess cost-benefit. In addition to the construction cost, there will be costs for maintaining the trails, and communities don't always have the financial resources for maintenance. Building the trails would also have a cost to wildlife and wildlife habitat. A Sudbury wildlife study has determined that trail construction would have irreparable consequences for wildlife, especially through riparian zones that provide the greatest amount of wildlife diversity. Acton and Concord should also conduct wildlife studies to understand the impacts that the trails would have on wildlife. | 6/13/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|---|------------------------------------|---|--------|
| Resa Blatman and Stefan Cooke | Somerville residents | Supports full funding for construction of the Community Path from Lowell Street (Somerville) to Lechmere/NorthPoint (Cambridge) in the LRTP. It would make sense to build the Path along with the Green Line Extension since both projects share infrastructure, rights-of-way, and simultaneous heavy construction. | 6/7/11 |
| Richard C. Walker III | Federal Reserve Bank of Boston | The Federal Reserve Bank supports the Silver Line, Phase III, and T Under D projects. These projects could make a real difference in the continued success of the emerging South Boston Waterfront, in the revitalization of Dudley Square, and in better meeting the job and transportation needs of Boston and Greater Boston residents. | 6/6/11 |
| Alex and Ami Feldman | Somerville residents | Supports full funding for construction of the Community Path from Lowell Street (Somerville) to Lechmere/NorthPoint (Cambridge) in the LRTP. It would make sense to build the Path along with the Green Line Extension since both projects share infrastructure, rights-of-way, and simultaneous heavy construction. This would link a network of paths, help reduce car usage, encourage people to exercise, and build community. | 6/5/11 |
| Winfred Kathy Martin and David L. Johnson | Somerville residents | Supports full funding for construction of the Community Path from Lowell Street (Somerville) to Lechmere/Northpoint (Cambridge) in the LRTP. It makes sense to build the Path along with the Green Line Extension since both projects share infrastructure, rights-of-way, and simultaneous heavy construction. | 6/3/11 |
| Shoshana Gourdin | Somerville resident | Supports full funding for construction of the Community Path from Lowell Street (Somerville) to Lechmere/NorthPoint (Cambridge) in the LRTP in the same time frame as the Green Line Extension. | 6/3/11 |
| David B. Clarke | Unidentified | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail, Phase 2, in the FFYs 2016-20 time band of the LRTP. It is important to him as a cyclist who would use the trail for local transportation instead of using a car. | 6/3/11 |
| Tara Urspruch | Unidentified | Supports Option 1 of the proposed LRTP Investment Strategies with the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 6/2/11 |
| John Kyper | Sierra Club, Massachusetts Chapter | The Sierra Club supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16 and is dismayed that the MPO is considering dropping the final link of the extension, thereby permanently terminating the Green Line at College Avenue. A terminus at Route 16 would be better suited to serving motorists driving from suburban communities than the College Avenue station, which would be accessed primarily by foot or bus. The extension to Route 16 is critical for the entire metropolitan region. If it is to become a success in enhancing the urban fabric by providing alternatives to the private automobile, it must be well designed and well built from the start. | 6/2/11 |
| Rick Kaufman | Unidentified | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 6/2/11 |
| Linda Given | Somerville resident | Supports full funding for construction of the Community Path from Lowell Street (Somerville) to Lechmere/NorthPoint (Cambridge) in the LRTP. It would make sense to build the Path along with the Green Line Extension since both projects share infrastructure, rights-of-way, and simultaneous heavy construction. The path would improve the quality of life, encourage exercise and recreation, and provide access to Boston. | 6/2/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|-----------------------|---------------------|---|--------|
| Marc Gabriel | Somerville resident | Supports full funding for construction of the Community Path from Lowell Street (Somerville) to Lechmere/NorthPoint (Cambridge) in the LRTP. It makes sense to build the Path along with the Green Line Extension since both projects share infrastructure, rights-of-way, and simultaneous heavy construction. | 6/2/11 |
| Keith Fallon | | Supports Option 1 of the proposed LRTP Investment Strategies with the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 6/2/11 |
| Robert Cowherd | | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP, and references the bicycle safety aspect of the project. Proper infrastructure engineering is important for determining whether or not we travel by car or bicycle. People will reject the bicycle as a viable transportation alternative if there is not a safe, interconnected system for bicyclists. | 6/2/11 |
| Susanna Barry | Somerville resident | Supports full funding for construction of the Community Path from Lowell Street (Somerville) to Lechmere/NorthPoint (Cambridge) in the LRTP. It makes sense to build the Path along with the Green Line Extension since both projects share infrastructure, rights-of-way, and simultaneous heavy construction. | 6/2/11 |
| Mayor Michael McGlynn | Medford Mayor | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. The mayor has requested over the years that the state define its proposed extension of the Green Line, analyze possible impacts, and identify transit development opportunities, while creating a plan to protect and preserve residential neighborhoods. It is premature to eliminate funding for the study while the MAPC Land Use Study is not complete. Supports preservation of residential neighborhoods in the Hillside while identifying opportunities for the expansion of the commercial tax base and creation of jobs. The Walking Court housing development could benefit from a public-private partnership to improve living conditions for seniors and from providing a mix of uses. The redevelopment of the Whole Food's property should be evaluated to explore mixed-use transit-oriented opportunities. | 6/1/11 |
| Jared Ingersoll | Medford resident | Supports Option 1 of the proposed LRTP Investment Strategies with the Green Line Extension to Route 16. The proximity of this station to several environmental justice communities in Medford and Somerville makes the location at Route 16 and Boston Avenue essential for providing quality transportation to this neighborhood. The terminus at College Avenue does not fulfill the Commonwealth's requirement to serve the neighborhood of Medford Hillside. Extending the line all the way to Mystic Valley Parkway would provide the best environmental benefits and would insure that Massachusetts meets the requirements of the Clean Air Act. Not meeting this would put millions of dollars in federal highway money in jeopardy. | 6/1/11 |
| Loren Barcus | Somerville resident | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. To not do this is short sighted and not in the best interest of Medford, Somerville, or the Boston region. | 6/1/11 |
| Enrique Tamayo | Unidentified | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. Encouraging more bicycling needs to happen to address issues of obesity, energy, etc. Neighborhood connections to the MBTA stations would generate more users and economic development, which would benefit the surrounding communities of Cambridge and Somerville and set a positive civic example. | 6/1/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|-------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--------|
| Nicole Stewart | Charlestown resident | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. | 6/1/11 |
| Ivey St. John | Charlestown resident | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. Charlestown was promised a redesigned Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square once the Big Dig was done, and the current plan meets that promise and would end Charlestown's role as a regional commuter route. | 6/1/11 |
| Matt Porter | Unidentified | Supports the Rutherford Avenue project. | 6/1/11 |
| Sean Nyhan | Charlestown resident | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. Supports changing Rutherford Avenue from the current highway to a neighborhood boulevard, and adding green space and a bike path. | 6/1/11 |
| Kate Namous | Unidentified | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. The project would improve neighborhood connections to the MBTA and give Charlestown better links to Cambridge, Somerville, and Everett. | 6/1/11 |
| Andre Leroux | Massachusetts Smarth Growth Alliance | Supports full funding for construction of the Community Path from Lowell Street (Somerville) to Lechmere/NorthPoint (Cambridge) in the LRTP. It makes sense to build the Path along with the Green Line Extension since both projects share infrastructure, rights-of-way, and simultaneous heavy construction. This is a rare opportunity to transform connections across the region and turn a largely recreational trail system into a more functional one, safe and viable for commuters. Also supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 6/1/11 |
| Paul Morgan | Somerville resident | Supports full funding for construction of the Community Path from Lowell Street (Somerville) to Lechmere/NorthPoint (Cambridge) in the LRTP. It makes sense to build the Path along with the Green Line Extension since both projects share infrastructure, rights-of-way, and simultaneous heavy construction. The path will increase ridership on the Green Line. Many who would otherwise drive would use the path to commute to Boston. Air quality issues in the community and region are serious and without a change in thinking and leadership they are not going to get better. | 6/1/11 |
| Janet C. Miller | Charlestown resident | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. The area is a blight on the neighborhood and hazardous, especially for bicyclists and pedestrians. | 6/1/11 |
| William Messenger | Belmont resident | Supports full funding for construction of the Community Path from Lowell Street (Somerville) to Lechmere/NorthPoint (Cambridge) in the LRTP. It makes sense to build the Path along with the Green Line Extension since both projects share infrastructure, rights-of-way, and simultaneous heavy construction. The streets in this corridor are not safe for bicyclists. All people in the Greater Boston area would benefit from reduced auto traffic, lower health care costs, and improved air quality if the route were attractive, safe, and direct for bicycles. | 6/1/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|----------------------------|---------------------------|---|--------|
| Darlene and Brian Matthews | Somerville residents | Supports full funding for construction of the Community Path from Lowell Street (Somerville) to Lechmere/NorthPoint (Cambridge) in the LRTP. It makes sense to build the Path along with the Green Line Extension since both projects share infrastructure, rights-of-way, and simultaneous heavy construction. The path will benefit tourists and the local community by reducing pollution and traffic, as well as by encouraging physical activity, safe nonmotorized vehicle travel, and a lifestyle that supports local businesses by putting the consumers near the markets. | 6/1/11 |
| Sandra and Kevin Kelley | Charlestown residents | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. It would improve neighborhood connections to the MBTA stations and improve the surrounding communities of Cambridge and Somerville. | 6/1/11 |
| Frank Hall | Everett resident | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. Would like to see more bike-friendly roadways. | 6/1/11 |
| Diana E. Gilchrist | Somerville resident | Supports full funding for construction of the Community Path from Lowell Street (Somerville) to Lechmere/NorthPoint (Cambridge) in the LRTP. It makes sense to build the Path along with the Green Line Extension since both projects share infrastructure, rights-of-way, and simultaneous heavy construction. The path would allow her to bike, walk, or take the T to work, and it would improve quality of life and increase property values. | 6/1/11 |
| Marji Gere | Somerville resident | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. Supports connecting the new bicycle lanes on Washington Street in Somerville to the planned bicycle lanes in Charlestown. | 6/1/11 |
| Sarah Freeman | Arborway Coalition | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. The Arborway Coalition supports improving neighborhood connections to MBTA stations throughout the region, and it promotes safety for all users: pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, and residents. | 6/1/11 |
| Rep. Carolyn C. Dykema | State Representative | Supports the Route 126/135 Grade Separation project in Framingham in the LRTP. It is important for five MetroWest Communities. Reliance on rail service is expected to increase given the significant economic activity in the region and the impending purchase of the rail line from CSX. The ability to meet this increased need will be constrained without a plan for addressing the longstanding concerns at the 126/135 intersection. Public safety at the intersection is also a concern. There is a high accident rate there that will only grow as rail service is increased. | 6/1/11 |
| Kristine Daniel | Unidentified | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. | 6/1/11 |
| Regina Capozzi | Sotheby's Realty | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. They are important for the safety and well being of residents (the rotary is dangerous), would provide neighborhood access to MBTA stations, and would improve the surrounding communities of Cambridge and Somerville. | 6/1/11 |
| Maureen Barillaro | Somerville Climate Action | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. They are important for neighborhood connections to the MBTA stations and improving the surrounding communities of Cambridge and Somerville. The future of transportation depends on low-energy, high-volume transport in urban environments. | 6/1/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|------------------|--|---|---------|
| Emile Baker | Charlestown resident | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. Would like more trees and better landscaping to decrease the noise on Rutherford Avenue. | 6/1/11 |
| Rebecca Albrecht | | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. | 6/1/11 |
| Roland Bartl | Town of Acton | Requests programming of construction funding for the Assabet River Rail Trail in the LRTP, which would allow access to a federal HPP earmark. Alternatively, the MPO should find another way or formula with the FHWA that would allow the ARRT communities to access the HPP earmark. | 5/31/11 |
| Jennifer Truong | Charlestown resident | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. The redesign of this area is vital for improving pedestrian and cyclist safety, improving access to public transportation and green space, and coping with traffic volumes and speeds. | 6/1/11 |
| Aaron Spransy | Brighton resident | Supports full funding for construction of the Community Path from Lowell Street (Somerville) to Lechmere/NorthPoint (Cambridge) in the LRTP. It makes sense to build the Path along with the Green Line Extension since both projects share infrastructure, rights-of-way, and simultaneous heavy construction. | 6/1/11 |
| Brad Simas | Unidentified | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. | 6/1/11 |
| Joanne Samuelson | Unidentified | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. Also supports the Green Line Extension to Union Square and neighborhood connections to MBTA stations. | 6/1/11 |
| Mark Rosenshein | Chairman, Charlestown Neighborhood Council Development Committee | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. The Charlestown Neighborhood Council endorses the design concept. The community supports the improvements for pedestrian access, traffic flow management, reintegration of the MBTA stations with the community, a regional bike path, and increased community connectivity. | 6/1/11 |
| Joe Rapoza | Unidentified | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. | 6/1/11 |
| Daniel Pugatch | Somerville resident | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. The Sullivan Square rotary is dangerous. Suggests a footbridge for providing safer access for bicyclist and pedestrians around that location. | 6/1/11 |
| Tanya Paglia | Somerville resident | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. | 6/1/11 |
| Lorna Murphy | Unidentified | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. They would improve the appeal of Charlestown, Somerville, and Cambridge. With improvements being made near Middlesex Avenue, it is critical that Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square be able to handle the increase in traffic and keep up with the look and feel of the area. | 6/1/11 |
| Tim Maimone | Charlestown resident | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. | 6/1/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|---------------------|--------------------------------|---|--------|
| Bob Kindel | Somerville resident | Supports full funding for construction of the Community Path from Lowell Street (Somerville) to Lechmere/NorthPoint (Cambridge) in the LRTP. It makes sense to build the Path along with the Green Line Extension since both projects share infrastructure, rights-of-way, and simultaneous heavy construction. The Path would provide a safe way for students to get to school, tie together neighborhoods, provide commuting options, mitigate congestion, and increase MBTA ridership. | 6/1/11 |
| Cynthia Gillham | Charlestown resident | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. | 6/1/11 |
| Peter G. Furth | Unidentified | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. This dangerous site can be transformed into a transit-oriented development, a safer arterial, and linear path with bike paths. | 6/1/11 |
| Chandler Blake | Charlestown resident | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. Supports continued bike improvements in Boston. | 6/1/11 |
| Bathsheba Grossman | Somerville resident | Supports full funding for construction of the Community Path from Lowell Street (Somerville) to Lechmere/NorthPoint (Cambridge) in the LRTP. It makes sense to build the Path along with the Green Line Extension since both projects share infrastructure, rights-of-way, and simultaneous heavy construction. | 6/1/11 |
| Steven Ozer | Charlestown resident | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. These projects are for making the gateway to Boston more attractive and accessible. They would improve alternative transportation options. | 6/1/11 |
| Christopher Collier | Charlestown resident | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. These projects would enhance community and business development in Charlestown, Cambridge, and Somerville, improve access to the MBTA Orange Line, encourage multimodal transportation, and improve regional equity by benefitting the residents of the Mishawum Park housing development. | 6/1/11 |
| Robert teDuits | Unidentified | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. | 6/1/11 |
| Carl Jahn | Charlestown resident | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. | 6/1/11 |
| Nathan Blanchet | Charlestown resident | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. Reconstruction is needed for safety, traffic flow efficiency, and neighborhood-friendly economic development. | 6/1/11 |
| Tai Dinnan | Somerville resident | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. | 6/1/11 |
| Wendy Landman | Executive Director, WalkBoston | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. Would provide greatly improved multi modal transportation options to residents and employees of nearby Boston, Somerville, and Cambridge neighborhoods. | 6/1/11 |
| George Ulrich | Unidentified | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. On behalf of the Boston Cyclists Union and Rozzie Bikes, supports the neighborhood connections to the MBTA stations and improvements to surrounding communities. | 6/1/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|----------------------|----------------------|--|--------|
| Holger Zwickau | Charlestown resident | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. | 6/1/11 |
| Jurgen Weiss | Somerville resident | Supports full funding for construction of the Community Path from Lowell Street (Somerville) to Lechmere/NorthPoint (Cambridge) in the LRTP. It makes sense to build the Path along with the Green Line Extension since both projects share infrastructure, rights-of-way, and simultaneous heavy construction. Creating a cycling infrastructure would have a tremendous positive impact on the energy footprint of the region. | 6/1/11 |
| Kristin Valdmanis | Charlestown resident | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. | 6/1/11 |
| Noel Twigg | Unidentified | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. Rutherford Avenue is an important link for the surrounding neighborhoods and much used by bikers, pedestrians, and those accessing MBTA stations. | 6/1/11 |
| Brian Thomas | Unidentified | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. | 6/1/11 |
| Annette Tecce | Charlestown resident | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. These roadways are hazardous for pedestrians, bicyclists, and cars. | 6/1/11 |
| Daniel Shugrue | Unidentified | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. | 6/1/11 |
| Gerald Robbins | Charlestown resident | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. It is critical to providing bicycle and pedestrian access to Sullivan Square Station and other parts of Boston, Somerville, and Cambridge. They will improve traffic flow, especially when the Assembly Square redevelopment has been completed. | 6/1/11 |
| Anthony Reidy | Charlestown resident | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. These projects would complete the transformation of Charlestown and prepare the way to link it to Assembly Square in a seamless beautification of the neighborhoods. It would make a proper entry to Boston for people coming off I-93 or Route 99. | 6/1/11 |
| Louise Ambler Osborn | Charlestown resident | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. The Sullivan Square rotary is dangerous for drivers, bicyclists, and pedestrians. | 6/1/11 |
| Sarah Newlin | Charlestown resident | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. These are vital to the continued improvement of the residential neighborhoods of Charlestown, Cambridge, and Somerville, and would improve safety. | 6/1/11 |
| Cory Mian | Somerville resident | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. This corridor is a major connector for the region. It has suffered from under-investment and is in need of state resources. The surrounding area is ripe for development. | 6/1/11 |
| Nicholas Mian | Somerville resident | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. This area of Boston has untapped development potential. | 6/1/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|-----------------------|--|--|--------|
| Kateri McGuinness | Charlestown resident | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. It will improve connections to MBTA stations and enhance quality of life in surrounding communities. | 6/1/11 |
| Anthony A. McGuinness | Unidentified | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. They would improve connections to the MBTA at Sullivan Square and Community College making the MBTA more accessible. | 6/1/11 |
| Linda Lintz | Unidentified | Supports full funding for construction of the Community Path from Lowell Street (Somerville) to Lechmere/NorthPoint (Cambridge) in the LRTP. It makes sense to build the Path along with the Green Line Extension since both projects share infrastructure, rights-of-way, and simultaneous heavy construction. | 6/1/11 |
| Liz and Chuck Levin | Charlestown residents | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. The improvements would provide good vehicular, transit, bicycle, and walking access to Charlestown, and more open space. MBTA stations are currently difficult to access. | 6/1/11 |
| Nate Leskovic | Unidentified | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. | 6/1/11 |
| William Lamb | Chair, Design Review Committee, Charlestown Preservation Society | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. The projects would improve traffic flow, pedestrian safety, access to MBTA stations, and the regional bicycle network. | 6/1/11 |
| Cindy Kimball | Unidentified | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. | 6/1/11 |
| Kate Kennen | Co-Chair, Friends of Sullivan Square | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. These improvements would provide alternate modes of transportation, increased access to the MBTA, and new green space. They would benefit Somerville, Cambridge, and Everett. | 6/1/11 |
| Doug and Leigh Hurd | Charlestown residents | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. Ideally they would include neighborhood connections to MBTA stations and improvements to the surrounding areas of Cambridge and Somerville. | 6/1/11 |
| Burton Holmes | Somerville resident | Supports full funding for construction of the Community Path from Lowell Street (Somerville) to Lechmere/NorthPoint (Cambridge) in the LRTP. It makes sense to build the Path along with the Green Line Extension since both projects share infrastructure, rights-of-way, and simultaneous heavy construction. | 6/1/11 |
| Justin Hildebrandt | Somerville resident | Supports full funding for construction of the Community Path from Lowell Street (Somerville) to Lechmere/NorthPoint (Cambridge) in the LRTP. It makes sense to build the Path along with the Green Line Extension since both projects share infrastructure, rights-of-way, and simultaneous heavy construction. | 6/1/11 |
| Alex Gershaw | Malden resident | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. It is an important corridor for travel to and from Boston, Charlestown, Somerville and Everett. The state should soon renovate the Alford Street Bridge on Route 99 in Everett and resurface Route 99 and Beacham Street in Everett. The Rutherford/Sullivan improvements would dovetail with these projects. | 6/1/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------|---|---------|
| Karen and Justin Ferguson | Charlestown residents | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. Current traffic patterns in the area are untenable, and it is dangerous to cross the rotary on foot. | 6/1/11 |
| Jeanine Jenks Farley | Somerville resident | Supports full funding for construction of the Community Path from Lowell Street (Somerville) to Lechmere/NorthPoint (Cambridge) in the LRTP in the same time frame as the Green Line Extension. It makes sense to build the Path along with the Green Line Extension since both projects share infrastructure, rights-of-way, and simultaneous heavy construction. | 6/1/11 |
| Glen Fant and Anne-Marie Wayne | Medford residents | Supports full funding for construction of the Community Path from Lowell Street (Somerville) to Lechmere/NorthPoint (Cambridge) in the LRTP in the same time frame as the Green Line Extension. It makes sense to build the Path along with the Green Line Extension since both projects share infrastructure, rights-of-way, and simultaneous heavy construction. The Path would add to the commercial benefits of the Green Line Extension by funneling foot and bicycle traffic from as far away as Lexington. | 6/1/11 |
| Debbie Collier | Charlestown resident | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. They would improve traffic and enhance community and business development in Charlestown, Cambridge, and Somerville, and would improve access to MBTA Orange Line stations. | 6/1/11 |
| Amy Branger | Charlestown resident | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. Charlestown has had to bear the brunt of Central Artery construction impacts and it's time to reclaim Rutherford for the community. | 6/1/11 |
| Blythe Robertson and Mary Perkins | Charlestown residents | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. | 6/1/11 |
| Jean Bourguignon | Charlestown resident | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. | 6/1/11 |
| Ted Bach | Somerville resident | Supports full funding for construction of the Community Path from Lowell Street (Somerville) to Lechmere/NorthPoint (Cambridge) in the LRTP. It makes sense to build the Path along with the Green Line Extension since both projects share infrastructure, rights-of-way, and simultaneous heavy construction. Having strong mixed-mode transit would help reduce dependence on cars and increase MBTA ridership. | 6/1/11 |
| Nancy Arents | Charlestown resident | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. The area is unsafe for pedestrians and is an eyesore. | 6/1/11 |
| Neil and Ivy Ahluwalia | Unidentified | Supports the Rutherford Avenue and Sullivan Square projects in the LRTP. | 6/1/11 |
| Patrice Kastenholz | West Medford resident | Supports Green Line Extension to Route 16 and would prefer that it go farther, to West Medford center. | 5/31/11 |
| Elizabeth Bolton | Medford resident | Supports full funding for the Green Line Extension to Route 16. It is inexcusable to leave the neighborhood beyond Tufts without subway access. Subway access is critical due to roadway congestion, air pollution, and rising fuel costs. It would make the neighborhood more vibrant. | 5/31/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|------------------|------------------------------------|--|---------|
| Justin Ashton | Citizen and resident of Somerville | Supports Option 1 of the proposed LRTP Investment Strategies with the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/31/11 |
| Laura Solano | Medford Resident | Supports Option 1 of the proposed LRTP Investment Strategies with the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/31/11 |
| Judith Siegel | East Arlington Resident | Supports Option 1 of the proposed LRTP Investment Strategies with the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/31/11 |
| Conor McKenzie | Unidentified | Supports Option 1 of the proposed LRTP Investment Strategies with the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/31/11 |
| Alex Bilsky | Arlington resident | Supports Option 1 of the proposed LRTP Investment Strategies with the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/30/11 |
| R. P. Marlin | East Arlington resident | Supports Option 1 of the proposed LRTP Investment Strategies and the Green Line Extension to Route 16. Looks forward to biking to a new Green Line station to reduce car use and reduce traffic along Route 16. The Mass. Ave. area is becoming more bicycle-and pedestrian-friendly, seeing more businesses attracted to the area, and residential areas revitalized. | 5/29/11 |
| John Reinhardt | Unidentified | Supports Green Line to Route 16. | 5/29/11 |
| David von Schack | Unidentified | Supports Option 1 of the proposed LRTP Investment Strategies with the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/28/11 |
| Jeanie Tietjen | Arlington resident | Supports Option 1 of the proposed LRTP Investment Strategies with the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/27/11 |
| Chris Nitchie | Unidentified | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. The Mystic River area has existing pathways that make this a natural corridor for pedestrian and bicycle traffic. It makes sense to connect the Green Line to this corridor. | 5/27/11 |
| Carolyn Montello | Unidentified | Supports Option 1 of the proposed LRTP Investment Strategies with the Green Line Extension to Route 16. The project is a legal commitment of the Commonwealth and the hallmark of GreenDOT. It should be the centerpiece of the LRTP. This is a chance to revitalize Medford and provide sustainable transportation. | 5/27/11 |
| John McKenna | Arlington resident | Supports the Green Line Extension to Arlington. | 5/27/11 |
| Julie Marcal | Arlington resident | Supports Option 1 of the proposed LRTP Investment Strategies and the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/27/11 |
| Robert Lemp | Arlington resident | Supports Option 1 of the proposed LRTP Investment Strategies and the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/27/11 |
| Meryl Becker | East Arlington Resident | Supports Option 1 of the proposed LRTP Investment Strategies and the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/27/11 |
| Ted A. Adams | Medford Resident | Supports extending the Green Line to Route 16. | 5/27/11 |
| Julia Malik | Arlington resident | Supports Option 1 of the proposed LRTP Investment Strategies with the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/27/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|---|---------|
| S. Riley Hart | Arlington resident | Supports Green Line to Route 16. | 5/27/11 |
| Christine Gorwood | Unidentified | Supports Option 1 of the proposed LRTP Investment Strategies with the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/27/11 |
| Sarah Endo | Unidentified | Supports Option 1 of the proposed LRTP Investment Strategies with the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/27/11 |
| Kaitlyn Wong | Somerville resident | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/26/11 |
| Lynne Weiss | Medford Hillside resident | Supports Option 1 of the proposed LRTP Investment Strategies with the Green Line Extension to Route 16. The extension is vital for reaching the customer base who would benefit from the extension and cut down on traffic pollution. It would also allow more people to reduce their driving by providing access to shopping and businesses located at and near Route 16. | 5/26/11 |
| Alison Walcott | Medford resident | Supports Option 1 of the proposed LRTP Investment Strategies with the Green Line Extension to Route 16. The project is a legal commitment of the Commonwealth and the hallmark of GreenDOT. It should be the centerpiece of the LRTP. | 5/26/11 |
| Greg Venne | West Medford resident | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. It would help reduce the growing congestion of Routes 93, 16, and 60, the McGrath and O'Brien highways, and all secondary roads in Medford, Somerville, and Cambridge. | 5/26/11 |
| Lawrence Sodano | Medford resident | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. A station at Route 16 would connect transit to a larger population than a terminus at College Avenue, and it would draw riders from West Medford, West Somerville, and Arlington. It would relieve traffic congestion on Alewife Brook Parkway. A terminus at College Avenue would result in more traffic congestion on Boston Avenue. | 5/26/11 |
| Franklin J. Schlerman | Medford resident | Supports Option 1 of the proposed LRTP Investment Strategies with the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/26/11 |
| Michael Sandler | Arlington resident | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/26/11 |
| Nancy Salzer | East Arlington resident | Supports Option 1 of the proposed LRTP Investment Strategies and the Green Line Extension. | 5/26/11 |
| Vaughan Rees | Medford resident | Supports Option 1 of the proposed LRTP Investment Strategies with the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/26/11 |
| John Murphy | Medford resident | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. If resources were available, the line should go to Route 128. | 5/26/11 |
| Jim Moodie | Medford resident | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. It would provide access to more riders and prevent potential traffic gridlock if the line were to terminate at College/Boston Avenues. A long-term vision is required. Keep Boston a leader in mass transit. | 5/26/11 |
| Peter Micheli | Medford resident | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. It would reach thousands more commuters in West Medford and Arlington. It would be short-sighted not to extend the line. | 5/26/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|----------------------|-----------------------|---|---------|
| Nancy Lincoln | Medford resident | Supports Option 1 of the proposed LRTP Investment Strategies and the Green Line Extension to Route 16. The Extension is essential. | 5/26/11 |
| Thomas W. Lincoln | Medford resident | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. It is a legal commitment of the Commonwealth and it is an investment in a sustainable future. | 5/26/11 |
| Michael Lambert | Medford resident | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. The project would make downtown Boston and Somerville accessible to Medford residents by transit and take cars off the road. | 5/26/11 |
| Unidentified | Unidentified | Supports the Green Line Extension to Boston Avenue in Medford. | 5/26/11 |
| Daniel J. Jacob | Medford resident | Supports Option 1 of the proposed LRTP Investment Strategies and Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/26/11 |
| John Hoppe | Arlington resident | Supports Option 1 of the proposed LRTP Investment Strategies and Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/26/11 |
| Lois Grossman | Medford resident | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. It should be the centerpiece of the LRTP. Supports efforts toward sustainable living and movement toward mass transit. | 5/26/11 |
| Martin Fraser | Medford resident | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. Benefits would include reduced traffic, improved public safety, improved quality of life, and improved parking. | 5/26/11 |
| Rev. Dorothy Emerson | West Medford resident | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/26/11 |
| Erik Egbertson | Medford resident | Supports Option 1 of the Investment Strategies, with the Green Line Extension to Route 16. With rising gas prices, connecting neighborhoods to a subway line will be fundamental to ensuring that these communities thrive. The state should focus on modes of transportation that are the most efficient. Light rail is a good investment. Challenges the MPO to also consider future projects to connect MBTA lines radially. | 5/26/11 |
| Eileen de Rosas | Arlington resident | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. Better service to downtown Boston is needed. | 5/26/11 |
| D. Carnevale | Unidentified | Opposes funding the Green Line Extension. Prefers that monies be used to update and repair existing infrastructure. Questions how the extension would be maintained when the MBTA has over \$8 billion of debt. | 5/26/11 |
| Christine Bennett | Medford resident | Opposes spending on the Green Line Extension project as Medford has subway and bus routes already. Prefers that monies be used to repair potholes in all major roadways, improve existing bus and train service, update trains and buses to make them more eco-friendly, and improve accessibility to persons with disabilities throughout the MBTA system. | 5/26/11 |
| Sarah Beardslee | Unidentified | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/26/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|-------------------|--|---|---------|
| Elisabeth Bayle | Medford Hillside resident | Opposes the removal of the Green Line Extension to Route 16 from the L RTP. It should be put back into Phase 1 of the Green Line Extension project to make it more economical to build, less disruptive than a two-phase project, and closer to the state's obligation to provide improved air quality, environmental justice, and opportunities for transit-oriented development. The project to Route 16 fulfills the state's legal obligation to bring rail transit to Medford Hillside. | 5/26/11 |
| Carol Band | Arlington resident | Prefers Option 1. Supports the Green Line Extension to East Arlington. | 5/26/11 |
| Debra Agliano | Medford resident | Supports Investment Strategy 1, with the Green Line Extension to Route 16. Expanding public transportation is important due to increasing gas prices, overcrowding on roads, and harm to the environment. | 5/26/11 |
| Jonathan Koopmann | Arlington Resident | Supports the Green Line to Route 16. | 5/26/11 |
| Naomi Slagowski | Unidentified | Supports Option 1 of the proposed L RTP Investment Strategies with the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/26/11 |
| Judy Kaplan | Unidentified | Opposes Option 1 of the proposed L RTP Investment Strategies and opposes the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/26/11 |
| Megan Allen | Resident of Medford | Supports Option 1 of the proposed L RTP Investment Strategies with the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/26/11 |
| Michael Adamian | Medford Hillside resident | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/26/11 |
| Bruce Kulik | Resident of Medford | Supports Option 1 of the proposed L RTP Investment Strategies with the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/26/11 |
| James McGinnis | Unidentified | Supports Option 1 of the proposed L RTP Investment Strategies with the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/26/11 |
| Zachary Atwell | Resident of Medford | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/26/11 |
| Andrew Griswold | Resident of Medford | Supports Option 1 of the proposed L RTP Investment Strategies with the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/26/11 |
| Maxim Weinstein | Unidentified | Supports Option 1 of the proposed L RTP Investment Strategies with the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/26/11 |
| Phil Goff | Co-chair, East Arlington Livable Streets Coalition | Supports Green Line to Route 16. | 5/26/11 |
| Lindsay Leete | Resident | Supports Green Line to Route 16. | 5/26/11 |
| Jan Nicholson | Resident (S. Medford) | Supports Green Line to Route 16. | 5/26/11 |
| Alex Epstein | Somerville Bicycle Advisory Committee | Supports Option 1 of the proposed L RTP Investment Strategies with the Green Line Extension to Route 16. Would like to see the Somerville Community Path included as well. | 5/26/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|---------------------|--|--|---------|
| Mary Kaye | Medford, MA | Supports Option 1 of the proposed LRTP Investment Strategies with the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/26/11 |
| Scott Englander | Unidentified | Supports Option 1 of the proposed LRTP Investment Strategies with the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/26/11 |
| Lauren H. Grymek | Executive Director, South Boston Seaport Transportation Management Association | Requests that the MPO model the Silver Line, Phase III, and T Under D projects for inclusion in the LRTP. Both projects are critical to the continued success of the emerging South Boston Waterfront neighborhood. T Under D would reduce travel times and improve safety for Silver Line riders traveling to and from Logan Airport, and in the future, Chelsea. It would also improve vehicular traffic on D Street and adjacent roadways by eliminating a signalized intersection. It addresses the need for maintenance, modernization, and efficiency; livability and economic benefit; mobility; and issues relating to the environment and climate change. Silver Line, Phase III, would address a need identified in the MPO's Needs Assessment (the "three-seat ride" between locations in Boston, Brookline, and Newton to the South Boston Waterfront and Logan Airport). It could also address congestion in the Central Subway and reduce the need for a transfer at Park Street. It would address transportation equity issues by providing a one-seat ride between Roxbury and Logan Airport and would create new job opportunities on the Waterfront. | 5/25/11 |
| Susie Nacco | Medford resident | Supports Option 1 of the proposed LRTP Investment Strategies with the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/25/11 |
| Jim Morse | Unidentified | Opposes funding for the Green Line Extension to Route 16. Funds should be used to support larger financial issues such as the repair of bridges and highways, and the backlog of maintenance at the MBTA. There needs to be a moratorium on all MBTA expansion. Comment references the current state deficit and findings of the Transportation Finance Report. | 5/25/11 |
| Kristin Mattera | Medford resident | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/25/11 |
| Unidentified | Unidentified | Supports Option 1 of the proposed LRTP Investment Strategies and the Green Line Extension to Route 16. The Extension is a legal commitment of the Commonwealth and is the hallmark of the state's GreenDOT initiative. | 5/25/11 |
| James Feldman | Unidentified | Supports Investment Strategy 1 with the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/25/11 |
| Stacy Colella | Unidentified | Supports full funding for the Green Line Extension to Route 16. It is vital for the economy and the environment. | 5/25/11 |
| Chris Donelan | Unidentified | Supports Option 1 of the proposed LRTP Investment Strategies with the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/25/11 |
| Ethan Contini-Field | Somerville Resident | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/25/11 |
| Paul Lehrman | Tufts University | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/25/11 |
| Ann Gallagher | MGNA | Supports Option 1 of the proposed LRTP Investment Strategies with the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/25/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|-------------------------------|----------------------|--|---------|
| David Phillips | Medford resident | Supports Option 1 of the proposed LRTP Investment Strategies with the Green Line Extension to Route 16. The extension would provide critical access to schools, jobs, sporting, and other opportunities for a new generation of young people. It would serve environmental justice areas. It is a legal commitment of the Commonwealth. It has strong community support. | 5/24/11 |
| Rep. James Arciero | State Representative | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail, Phase 2. This project has sustained community support. It would reduce traffic congestion by enhancing commuter access to the West Concord commuter rail station and to the commuter bus from the Colonial Liquor Plaza in Acton. It would benefit area shops and businesses. Bicycle and pedestrian projects provide alternatives to auto travel and investing in those infrastructure needs would encourage non-auto commuting. This would yield economic, environmental, and public health benefits. | 5/17/11 |
| Kenneth Krause | Medford resident | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. The Route 16 terminus strengthens the projects in all criteria. The station design no longer requires the need to acquire two large office buildings. An extension of the Minuteman Bikeway will end two blocks west of the proposed station. The Department of Conservation and Recreation plans to extend the Bikeway to Wellington Station. Medford has already built part of the path. New developments in the area, including an expanded office building and housing for seniors and young people with disabilities, are located near the future station. MAPC is in the middle of a yearlong community visioning process for the area. The project is consistent with the state's GreenDOT policy directive. | 5/25/11 |
| Felix and Gwendolyn Blackburn | Medford residents | Opposes the Green Line Extension to Route 16. Other areas need transportation improvements more, such as the Dorchester and Mattapan neighborhoods of Boston. Maintenance of the existing system should be the top priority. | 5/24/11 |
| Unidentified | Unidentified | Opposes the Green Line Extension. Prefers that funds be spent on maintenance of road, bridges, and transit. | 5/24/11 |
| Richard Grant | Unidentified | Opposes the Green Line Extension because the MBTA does not have funds for the project and federal funds are not guaranteed. Tufts University is a benefactor of the project and should help pay for it. | 5/24/11 |
| Paul Morrissey | Aero Cycle owner | The MBTA should not extend the Green Line. The system needs to be repaired before it's expanded. Medford is already well served by transit. Not everyone would benefit from the increased property values that the extension would bring. | 5/24/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|---------------------|---|--|---------|
| Thomas Nally | A Better City | Supports implementation of several elements of the Urban Ring because they will relieve infrastructure constraints, fill gaps in service, accommodate increased transit demand, enhance transportation equity, and support realization of the MetroFuture land use vision. The Urban Ring should not be viewed as a mega-project, but a project that can be implemented incrementally as funding becomes available. Potential early actions include: Albany St. bus lanes (\$1 million), Mountfort St. bus lanes (\$14 million), Ruggles Station improvements (\$33 million), Melnea Cass Blvd. reconstruction with median busway (\$27 million), Albany St. bus lanes in Boston (\$2 million), and Mass Ave. and possible Columbia Point bus lanes (\$ 2 million). Other possible early action items include: interim surface improvements in the Fenway/ Longwood area, bus lanes on 3rd and 1st Streets in Cambridge, and the East Boston Bypass Road, with a potential Silver Line extension to Chelsea. A Better City also supports the T Under D project, Silver Line, Phase III, and the Red Line-Blue Line Connector. Asks the MPO to include a selection of the early actions for the Urban Ring in the Plan and to model them. | 5/23/11 |
| Marco Rivero | Unidentified | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/23/11 |
| Ken Krause | Medford Green Line Neighborhood Alliance | Extending the Green Line to Route 16 strengthens its evaluation in the regional mobility, ridership, environmental benefits, cost effectiveness, economic development, and environmental justice evaluation criteria. Keep the Green Line to Route 16 in the Plan. | 5/23/11 |
| Chris Ramsey | Medford resident | Supports Investment Strategy 1 because it includes the Green Line Extension to Roue 16. | 5/20/11 |
| Rachael Stark | Walking in Arlington | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. The Red Line extension to Alewife made Arlington a more desirable community, and the Green Line Extension would have the same effect. | 5/19/11 |
| Juliet Moir | Arlington resident | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/19/11 |
| Edward Starr | Arlington Transportation Advisory Committee | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16 because it could reduce the automobile use of residents in the area. | 5/19/11 |
| Chris Loreti | Arlington Town Meeting member | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/19/11 |
| Martin Klingensmith | Massachusetts resident | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/19/11 |
| Scott Smith | Arlington resident | Supports the Somerville Community Path because it would connect the Minuteman Bikeway and Charles River Path network, and because it would support the Green Line Extension. | 5/19/11 |
| Thouis Jones | Arlington resident | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/19/11 |
| Gwen Blackburn | Green Line Advisory Group for Medford | Does not support the Green Line Extension to Route 16. There is enough transportation between Medford and Boston. The project is a waste of funds. | 5/19/11 |
| Maria Daniels | Unidentified | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/19/01 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|----------------------|--|--|---------|
| Andrew Bengtson | Arlington resident | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/19/11 |
| Mark Kaepplein | Arlington resident | Route 16 should be expanded before the Green Line is extended. The Extension would bring more traffic. Funds should be invested in maintenance to the highway and transit system before expanding the transit system. | 5/19/11 |
| Michael Sandman | Brookline Transportation Board | Supports the inclusion of the Commonwealth Ave., Phase 2A, project in the Plan. Supports the inclusion of fencing along the MBTA reservation as an important safety improvement. | 5/19/11 |
| Rep. Michael Capuano | United States Congress | States that it is essential to set a project priority list and move forward with it. The Somerville Community Path should be added to the Universe of Projects. The Green Line Extension to Route 16 should be included in the second and third proposed investment strategies. Urges the MPO to include both projects in the Plan. | 5/18/11 |
| Roberta Cameron | Unidentified | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. It is an ideal terminus that would expand transit options for many underserved neighborhoods. Transit, and bicycle and pedestrian transportation, are key to the future when cars are no longer affordable or preferred. The MPO should invest in infrastructure that would give people more options. | 5/18/11 |
| Alia Atlas | Unidentified | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/18/11 |
| John Kohl | Unidentified | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. It would fulfill the legal obligation to extend the Green Line to Medford Hillside, and should be the centerpiece of the Plan. | 5/18/11 |
| John Roland Elliott | Medford Hillside resident | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16 for its air quality and environmental justice benefits. It would also comply with the legal requirement to extend the Green Line to Medford Hillside. Supports Investment Strategy 1. | 5/18/11 |
| David Rajczewski | Medford Green Line Neighborhood Alliance | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. It is consistent with the state's GreenDOT policy and should be a centerpiece of the Plan. | 5/18/11 |
| Michael Bernstein | Medford Hillside business owner and resident | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. There is widespread community support for the project. It would support the environmental and transit needs of Medford Hillside, West Medford, West Somerville, and East Arlington. | 5/18/11 |
| Carter Wall | Medford Hillside resident | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/18/11 |
| Peter Ungaro | Unidentified | Supports Investment Strategy 1 because it includes the Green Line Extension to Route 16. The project could reduce auto use by residents in the area. | 5/18/11 |
| Susan Fendell | Somerville resident | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/18/11 |
| Sophia Sayigh | Arlington resident | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/18/11 |
| Alex Formanek | Unidentified | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/18/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|---|---------------------------------------|---|---------|
| Nadia Sladkey | Arlington resident | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/18/11 |
| Tom Scott | Arlington resident | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/18/11 |
| John Roland Elliott | Medford resident | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. It would improve air quality and access for the community. It would serve a marginalized, underserved population. | 5/18/11 |
| DiDi Vaz | Medford resident | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. The project would support economic development in the Medford Hillside neighborhood. The Route 16 terminus rates better in every evaluation criterion than the College Avenue terminus. It should be a centerpiece of the Plan. | 5/18/11 |
| Stephen Paul Linder | Medford resident | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. Will improve connections from Medford to Cambridge. | 5/18/11 |
| Unidentified | Unidentified | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. | 5/18/11 |
| Jeanne Griffith | Concord resident | Supports Phase 2 of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. It would improve non motorized access to many destinations. Design funds have been committed to the Trail. It should be in the FFYs 2016-2020 time band. It would be a vital connection in a nascent, but growing, web of active transportation facilities. | 5/18/11 |
| Carolyn Rosen, Chair | Green Line Advisory Group for Medford | Does not support the Route 16 terminus for the Green Line Extension. The T has a large backlog of deferred maintenance that must be addressed before expansion. There are already many bus routes in the area of the proposed station. The area is already a vibrant, walkable community. The Route 16 terminus would disrupt a historic African American community in West Medford. | 5/19/11 |
| Dr. William Wood | Unidentified | Does not support the Route 16 terminus for the Green Line Extension. It would affect many lives, disrupt a vibrant historic African American community, and increase traffic in the area, requiring a parking lot. Supports the Green Line Extension to College Avenue. The transit-oriented development planned for the area around Route 16 would not serve the needs of the existing community. | 5/19/11 |
| Rep. Sciortino, Sen. Jehlen, Rep. Garballey | Massachusetts General Court | Urges the MPO to support the Green Line Extension to Route 16. The Patrick Administration supports the Route 16 terminus, and it is the preferred alternative identified in the Draft Environmental Impact Report. It is receiving very positive support from the community during the current MAPC public engagement. Expanding public transportation supports regional and statewide economic growth. The extension of the Green Line to College Avenue fails to meet the Commonwealth's obligation to extend the Green Line to the Medford Hillside neighborhood. It would be more cost-effective and less disruptive to the community to combine Phases 1 and 2 of the project. Funding for the entire project should be in the FFYs 2011-2015 time band of the Plan. | 5/18/11 |
| Unidentified | Unidentified | Supports Investment Strategy 1 because it includes the Green Line Extension to Route 16. It would serve thousands of commuters, and fulfill the commitment to serve Medford Hillside. | 5/18/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|------------------------------|---|--|---------|
| Michael Lambert and Tom Bent | City of Somerville | Request that the Somerville Community Path, Phase 2 (Lowell Street Station to Inner Belt District), be included in the Plan. This would pave the way for the City to seek external funds for the project. Design work has begun as part of the Green Line Extension project. The estimated cost is \$17 million, plus contingency, and the City expects it to decrease. It would connect trails in the western suburbs to Boston, and must be built along with the Green Line. Timing is important because of the Green Line project; the Path should be programmed for the FFYs 2013-2015 time period. The project would improve transportation options, unlock economic opportunity, and bring cleaner air and recreational space to an environmental justice community. | 5/18/11 |
| Melissa B. Bennett | Medford resident | Supports Investment Strategy 1 because it includes the Green Line Extension to Route 16. Extending the Green Line to Route 16, rather than College Avenue, would improve its performance in every evaluation criterion. | 5/18/11 |
| Erik Jacobs | Medford resident | Supports Investment Strategy 1 because it includes the Green Line Extension to Route 16. Extending the Green Line to Route 16, rather than College Avenue, would improve its performance in every evaluation criteria. | 5/18/11 |
| Andrew Callen | Acton resident | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. The Trail would provide a commuting alternative to driving. | 5/18/11 |
| Crispin Olson | Arlington resident | Supports the Green Line Extension to Route 16. It would serve the only environmental justice community in Arlington. It would serve many more people than would be served ending the project at College Avenue. | 5/18/11 |
| Kamal Dasu | Acton resident | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. The project would provide access to commuter rail and bus, and would provide congestion relief. | 5/18/11 |
| Christopher Burgess | Unidentified | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. It would provide access to shopping in downtown Chelmsford and green commuting opportunities to IBM. | 5/18/11 |
| Nancy Powers | Friends of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail for its transportation and recreational benefits. | 5/18/11 |
| Doug Carr | Medford resident | Supports the proposed Investment Strategy 1 because it's the only one that includes extending the Green Line to Route 16. Extending the project to Route 16 has mobility, ridership, environmental, cost-effectiveness, and environmental justice benefits. | 5/18/11 |
| Mary Ellen Chaney | Unidentified | Supports including Phase 2 of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail in the FFYs 2016-2020 time band of the Plan. It would benefit many people, and the environment. | 5/18/11 |
| Ed Kross | Framingham resident | Supports including Phase 2 of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail in the FFYs 2016-2020 time band of the Plan. The Trail would offer commuting alternatives. The Mass Central Rail Trail is also an important component in creating a path network. | 5/18/11 |
| Donna Laquidara-Carr | Medford resident | Supports the proposed Investment Strategy 1 because it includes the Green Line Extension to Route 16. It would serve a larger market, and would reduce traffic in the Hillside neighborhood. It would have environmental and social justice benefits. | 5/18/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---------|
| David G. Fox | Boxborough resident | Supports including Phase 2 of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail in the FFYs 2016-2020 time band of the Plan. It would give people another commuting option, save oil, help to improve air quality, and reduce wear and tear on roads. It also has health benefits. | 5/18/11 |
| Suzanne Knight | Concord resident | Supports Phase 2 of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. The Trail would provide safe access to several destinations. It would also be an ideal way to get to work. | 5/18/11 |
| Lynn Weissman and Alan Moore | Friends of the Community Path | Requests that a \$25 million budget line item be included in the proposed investment strategies to build the Community Path with the Green Line Extension. It would be more expensive, and logistically impractical, to design and build the Community Path after the Green Line Extension. Prefers, but does not endorse, Investment Strategy 3 presented at the May 5 MPO meeting. None of the three strategies is consistent with GreenDOT, and none account for the need to program the Path with the Green Line Extension. The Path would connect the Minuteman and Charles River Path networks, reduce congestion, improve air quality and safety, and have benefits for the environmental justice neighborhoods of East Somerville. | 5/18/11 |
| Anne Gardulski | Boxborough resident | Supports including Phase 2 of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail in the FFYs 2016-2020 time band of the Plan. It would provide a safe recreational bike, running and walking path that would help alleviate the choke point at Concord Rotary. It would reduce congestion, provide nonmotorized access to other modes and destinations, and build a strong sense of community. Supports Plan Strategy 3. | 5/18/11 |
| Sherry Bauman | Unidentified | Supports the Community Path connector. The project would create a safe connection between the Minuteman Bikeway and the Charles River Path network. It would have commuting, environmental, and health benefits. | 5/18/11 |
| Tom Michelman | Acton resident | Supports including Phase 2 of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail in the FFYs 2016-2020 time band of the Plan. The Trail has a contract in place for design and has overwhelming local support. The Sudbury portion of the project has not made enough progress, but has strong public support. The design will be completed for all relevant portions before 2016 if it's included in the Plan. The MPO does not put weight on several factors that support the Trail, including the support for these facilities from the public, the need for alternative transportation in order to reduce dependency on imported oil, and the growth in bicycling that would result from the completion of a network, bike sharing, and allowing bikes on the T during peak hours. Urges the MPO to adopt Strategy 3 outlined in their May 5 meeting. The Plan can't be considered sustainable if it does not increase funding for bicycles and pedestrians. | 5/18/11 |
| Cathy Ricketson | Westford resident | Supports including Phase 2 of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail in the FFYs 2016-2020 time band of the Plan. | 5/17/11 |
| Cynthia McLain | Chelmsford resident | Supports including the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail in the FFYs 2016-2020 time band of the Plan. The extended trail would give people better access to many destinations, and other transportation facilities such as commuter rail and the Minuteman Bikeway. It would support sustainable transportation and give young people a safe place to learn to ride a bike. Failure to include the Trail in the Plan could result in the loss of federal design funds. | 5/17/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|--------------------------|--|--|---------|
| Alan Frankel | Framingham resident | Supports including Phase 2 of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail because it would help alleviate congestion and improve commuter access to commuter rail and bus. Phase 1 has been successful and delaying the project could result in the loss of federal funds and support from the governor. | 5/17/11 |
| Stanislav R. Mudrets | Framingham resident | Supports Phase 2 of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. Riding a bike is much cheaper than driving a car. It would help reduce congestion and pollution. | 5/17/11 |
| Chad Gibson, Co-Chair | East Arlington Livable Streets Coalition | The proposed Investment Strategies 2 and 3 do not promote sustainability. Supports Strategy 1 because it includes the Green Line Extension to Route 16. Encourages the MPO to lead the country in a progressive transportation policy that will reduce our dependency on automobiles. | 5/17/11 |
| Mayor Curtatone | City of Somerville | Requests that the Green Line Extension from College Avenue to Route 16 be included in the FFYs 2016-2020 time band of the Plan. The project would improve quality of life, decrease air pollution, and accelerate economic development. The Route 16 station presents an excellent opportunity for transit-oriented development. | 5/17/11 |
| Dick Williamson | Sudbury resident | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. State and federal funds have been secured for design. Any project designed with federal funds must be in the first 10 years of the Plan. Expects construction of Phases 2A and 2C to be programmed before 2021. The Trail will provide nonmotorized access to many destinations and other modes of transportation. Construction closer to 2013 is highly desirable. | 5/17/11 |
| W. Barber | Concord resident | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. It would have recreational benefits, and would give people nonmotorized access to parks, fields, and commercial centers. | 5/17/11 |
| Alan Mertz | Acton resident | Supports including Phase 2 of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail in the FFYs 2016-2020 time band of the Plan. It would provide nonmotorized access to commuter rail and reduce congestion. The project is ready to access design funds, and must be in the first 10 years of the Plan in order to do so. | 5/17/11 |
| Paul Cohen, Town Manager | Chelmsford | Supports including Phase 2 of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail in the FFYs 2016-2020 time band of the Plan. It would provide alternative transportation access to many destinations, and provide open space and recreational opportunities. | 5/17/11 |
| Blossom Hoag | Hingham resident | The Linden Ponds retirement community is not served by public transportation. The surrounding area is growing. Supports a bus route on Whiting Street in Hingham to serve the elderly and employees in the area, and to connect modes of transportation. | 5/17/11 |
| Steve Buchanan | Sudbury resident | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail because biking on roads is dangerous and the Trail would give people commuting options other than driving. | 5/17/11 |
| Margaret Kohin | Acton resident | Supports Phase 2 of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail because it would serve a dual purpose for transportation and recreation. It would reduce automobile traffic, global warming, and gridlock. | 5/17/11 |
| Bob Zuffante | Concord resident | Supports including Phase 2 of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail in the earliest possible time band of the Plan because of the problems of obesity, scarce resources, and pollution. | 5/17/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|------------------|--|---|---------|
| P. McWilliams | Westford resident | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail because it would provide a safe place for people to exercise and commute. | 5/17/11 |
| Dave and Emily | Unidentified | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail because it would provide a healthy transportation choice. | 5/17/11 |
| Lowell Gilbert | Acton resident | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail and bicycle facilities in general. Gasoline availability will inevitably drop, making them necessary, and the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail would connect commercial areas and provide a safe crossing of Route 2. | 5/17/11 |
| Jack Currier | Bruce Freeman Rail Trail; Nashua, NH, resident | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail because it would allow for more commuting by bicycle. | 5/17/11 |
| Gary Webster | Bruce Freeman Rail Trail | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail because it's a good use of scarce funds. | 5/17/11 |
| Joshua Mazgelis | Westford resident | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail because it would give people nonmotorized access to destinations they currently drive to, including a commuter rail station. | 5/17/11 |
| Daniel Singer | Friends of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail | Supports Phase 2 of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail because it would improve the quality of life in the surrounding areas by providing recreation, exercise, and non-automotive access to businesses and offices, which would relieve congestion and reduce pollution. | 5/17/11 |
| Jane Calvin | Lowell Parks and Conservation Trust Inc. | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. Is working to ensure that the Concord River Greenway connects with the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail in Chelmsford. | 5/17/11 |
| Steve Buchanan | Sudbury resident | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail for its commuting and safety benefits. | 5/17/11 |
| Mark Childs | Unidentified | Supports Phase 2 of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail for its health, recreational, and congestion-reducing benefits. | 5/16/11 |
| Maria Kuffner | Unidentified | Supports Phase 2 of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. | 5/16/11 |
| Lynne Ziter | Sudbury Resident | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail for the health and quality-of-life benefits it would provide. | 5/16/11 |
| Carol Domblewski | Friends of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail; resident of Acton | Supports including the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail in the FFYs 2016 - 2020 time band of the Plan because it would give people access to destinations without needing a car, and would provide health and quality-of-life benefits. | 5/16/11 |
| Lisa Mandel | Unidentified | Supports including the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail in the FFYs 2016-2020 time band of the Plan for the environmental, health, and economic benefits. | 5/16/11 |
| Denise Howard | Friends of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail | Supports including the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail in the FFYs 2016-2020 time band of the Plan because of its health benefits. Voters prefer paths to highways. | 5/16/11 |
| Josef Kerimo | Concord resident | Supports Phase 2 of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail because it would provide connections to transit options and reduce congestion. | 5/16/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|----------------------|---|---|---------|
| Paulita Alinskas | Friends of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail because of the safety, health, and congestion-reduction benefits it would provide. | 5/16/11 |
| Leonard Simon | Unidentified | Supports including the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail in the FFYs 2016-2020 time band of the Plan because of the safety and air quality benefits it would provide. | 5/16/11 |
| Ann Grace | Unidentified | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail because it would improve air quality and health, and would provide access to the West Concord MBTA station. | 5/16/11 |
| Kim Colson | Westford resident | Supports Phase 2 of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail because it would allow people to reach destinations by bike rather than car, and it would be a recreational resource. | 5/16/11 |
| Kathryn Angell | Concord resident | Supports including Phase 2 of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail in the FFYs 2016-2020 time slot of the LRTP because it would decrease congestion by providing alternatives to driving and connect to other bike investments in the region, and because of the time and effort dedicated to planning for the Trail by the proponents. | 5/16/11 |
| Howard Quin | Unidentified | Supports including the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail in the FFYs 2016-2020 time band of the Plan. | 5/16/11 |
| Daphne G. Freeman | Chelmsford resident | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail because it would provide an alternative to driving and connect to other transportation modes and bike investments in the region. | 5/16/11 |
| Kathryn Achen Garcia | Unidentified | Supports including Phase 2 of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail in the FFYs 2016-2020 time slot of the Plan. | 5/16/11 |
| Stuart Johnstone | Concord resident | Supports including Phase 2 of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail in the FFYs 2016-2020 time band of the Plan because of the time and effort of the project proponents to advance the project to its current status, and the need for nonmotorized transportation options. | 5/16/11 |
| Nancy Savage | Acton resident | Supports including Phase 2 of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail in the FFYs 2016-2020 time band of the Plan because it would give people a nonmotorized option for commuting in a congested area. | 5/16/11 |
| Jim Terry | Concord resident | Supports including Phase 2 of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail in the FFYs 2016-2020 time band of the Plan because of the health benefits of the Trail, and because it would give people nonmotorized access to many destinations in an area that is congested. | 5/16/11 |
| Lisa Underkoffler | Acton resident | Supports Phase 2 of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail because of the health benefits of the Trail, and because it would give people nonmotorized access to many destinations. It would also give people, including those confined to a wheelchair, access to fresh air and exercise. | 5/16/11 |
| Rick Fallon | Acton resident | Supports Phase 2 of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. | 5/16/11 |
| Kathleen Klofft | Unidentified | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail because it would reduce congestion along local roadways. | 5/16/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|-----------------------------------|--|---|---------|
| Bruce R. Freeman | Bedford, NH, resident and son of former Rep. Bruce Freeman | Supports including Phase 2 of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail in the FFYs 2016-2020 time slot of the LRTP because it would decrease congestion by providing alternatives to driving, and connect to other bike investments in the region, and because of the time and effort dedicated to planning for the Trail by the proponents. The Trail would help people save on the cost of gasoline, promote health, and help to create a network that would allow bicycling to blossom. Voters prefer paths to highways. | 5/16/11 |
| Richard E. Kenyon | Westford resident | Supports including Phase 2 of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail in the FFYs 2016-2020 time slot of the LRTP because it would decrease congestion by providing alternatives to driving, and connect to other bike investments in the region, and because of the time and effort dedicated to planning for the Trail by the proponents. The Trail would help people save on the cost of gasoline, promote health, and help to create a network that will allow bicycling to blossom. Voters prefer paths to highways. | 5/16/11 |
| Elizabeth Adams | Unidentified | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail because it would improve health and air quality, and relieve congestion. | 5/15/11 |
| Frona Vicksell | Friends of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail | Supports rail trails because they are safer and faster than roads for bicyclists and pedestrians. | 5/15/11 |
| Michelle Lee | User of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail | Supports Phase 2 of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail because it would provide connections to other modes of transportation and new bicycle investments, such as the Boston bike sharing program. | 5/15/11 |
| Barbara Pike | Bruce Freeman Rail Trail | Supports including Phase 2 of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail in the FFYs 2016-2020 time slot of the LRTP because it would provide an alternative to driving and connect many destinations. | 5/15/11 |
| Sue Felshin | Concord resident | Supports Phase 2 of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail because it would give people alternatives to driving and reduce congestion. | 5/15/11 |
| Eunice Garay | Sudbury resident | Supports including the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail in the FFYs 2016-2020 time band of the Plan because of the quality-of-life and environmental benefits. It would allow people to replace auto trips with biking or walking trips. | 5/15/11 |
| Rafael Mares | Conservation Law Foundation | Urges the MPO to keep the Green Line Extension to Route 16 in the Plan, and for the MPO to ensure that the Plan complies with the requirements of the GreenDOT initiative of MassDOT. There is community consensus that Route 16 is the best terminus for the Green Line Extension. The Commonwealth has incorporated GreenDOT into its Global Warming Solutions Act Climate Plan. Accordingly, in its consideration of projects to include in the Plan, the MPO is required to plan for reducing greenhouse gas emissions over time. The LRTP must incorporate elements that balance highway system expansion with projects that support smart growth and promote public transportation, walking, and bicycling. Extending the Green Line to Route 16, and extending the Somerville Community Path, are the types of projects that will enable the state to meet its greenhouse gas emissions reduction mandate. | 5/12/11 |
| Wendy Landman, Executive Director | WalkBoston | Supports the Somerville Community Path because it would connect the Minuteman Bikeway and Charles River Path network, and because it would support the Green Line Extension. | 5/5/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|---|-----------------------------|---|---------|
| Renata von Tscharnner, President | Charles River Conservancy | Urges the MPO to include the Community Path connector as a top priority bicycle and pedestrian project in the Universe of Projects for the next Plan. The extended Path would connect the Minuteman Bikeway and the Charles River Path network, and stations of the Green Line Extension. The developers of NorthPoint in Cambridge are building the path through their property. The Path must be built with the Green Line Extension. | 5/2/11 |
| Carole Wolfe | Sudbury resident | Does not support the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail because it is for recreation, rather than transportation; most people will drive to it; it costs about \$3 million per mile; it would run through environmentally sensitive areas; and the path will not be convenient for accessing destinations such as schools. Funds are scarce and would be better spent on projects that move large numbers of people, such as public transportation. | 5/2/11 |
| Catharine M. Hornby, Chair | Cambridge Bicycle Committee | Supports including the Somerville Community Path project in the Plan because it would connect the Minuteman Bikeway to downtown Boston, and because it would support the Green Line Extension. | 5/2/11 |
| Patrick McMahon, Vice President | Simpson Housing, LLLP | Supports the Causeway Street Reconstruction Project. Simpson Housing is building 287 apartments and 17,000 square feet of retail space at Bulfinch Triangle. The Causeway Street project would improve the safety and livability of the area. Urges the MPO to support the project. | 5/2/11 |
| Urban Ring, Phase 2, Citizens' Advisory Committee | Urban Ring, Phase 2 | <p>The Urban Ring project contains several elements that would be worthwhile as stand-alone projects. The Urban Ring is the surest way to direct development to dense, already developed areas. The CAC welcomes the MPO policy that economic impacts are a criterion for evaluating projects. The project would also address policies calling for a higher transit mode share, and actions to address climate change and transportation equity.</p> <p>Among the early actions the MPO can take to address issues identified through the Needs Assessment are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Ruggles Station platform improvements * Bus lanes on 1st Street in Cambridge, and 3rd and Main Street near Kendall Square, and Main and Albany streets to Cambridgeport * Extension of Silver Line service into Chelsea along the new bypass road, and a dedicated busway from Everett to the Orange Line via Wellington with a new bridge over the Malden River, or via mixed traffic on Route 99 with access to Sullivan Square Station through bus lanes * Melnea Cass Blvd. reconstruction with a center median busway * Mountfort St. corridor with bus lanes on the Carlton St. bridge, and between Park Dr. and Beacon St. * Albany St. bus lanes in Boston * Massachusetts Ave. and Columbia Point bus lanes <p>These projects and components of projects address the Plan's priorities and should be modeled to document their benefits.</p> | 3/21/11 |
| Arlene Wyman Petri | Unidentified | Supports the Community Path because it would support health and the environment, reduce congestion, and improve the quality of life. | 5/9/11 |
| William H. Petri | Wayland resident | Supports the Community Path because of its safety, mobility, and environmental benefits. It would connect the Minuteman Bikeway and the Charles River Path network. Would like the MPO to fund the Cedar-to-Lowell section in the FFY 2012 Transportation Improvement Program. The Community Path should be built with the Green Line Extension. | 5/4/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|-------------------|---------------------|--|--------|
| Keja Valens | Somerville resident | Supports including the Community Path connector in the Plan because of the project's environmental benefits. The Path would also promote access for all people to the Green Line Extension. | 5/3/11 |
| Ryan Robbins | Somerville resident | Supports including the Community Path connector in the Plan because it would close gaps in the region's bike network. The Path should be build along with the Green Line Extension. | 5/3/11 |
| Kathleen Knisely | Somerville resident | Supports the Community Path connector. The project would create a safe connection between the Minuteman Bikeway and the Charles River Path network. It will have commuting, recreational, social, and health benefits. | 5/2/11 |
| Laura McMurry | Cambridge resident | Supports including the Community Path connector in the Plan because it would close gaps in the region's bike network. The Path should be build along with the Green Line Extension. | 5/2/11 |
| John Wilde | Somerville resident | Supports including the Community Path connector in the Plan because of the project's environmental benefits. The Path would also promote access for all people to the Green Line Extension. It should be built with the Green Line Extension. | 5/2/11 |
| Linda Lintz | Medford resident | Supports including the Community Path connector in the Plan because it would close gaps in the region's bike network and provide access for all users to the Green Line Extension. The Path should be build along with the Green Line Extension. | 5/2/11 |
| Jonathan O'Connor | Boston resident | Supports building the Community Path connector with the Green Line Extension because it would be cost-effective to build them together, and they would both reduce congestion. The Path has environmental, health, financial, and safety benefits. It would provide a place for children to safely learn to ride a bike. It would promote health, local business, and improved quality of life, and would close a gap in the path network. | 5/2/11 |
| Camille Petri | Unidentified | Supports the Community Path connector because of its community safety, environmental, health, and mobility benefits. It must be built with the Green Line Extension. | 5/2/11 |
| Ulandt Kim | Somerville resident | Supports the Community Path connector because it would provide a safe place to bike and walk. It should be a higher priority than the Green Line Extension. | 5/2/11 |
| Alex Feldman | Somerville resident | Supports the Community Path connector because it would reduce congestion, increase T ridership, promote exercise, and support the Bike Share program. It will also connect the Minuteman Bikeway to the Charles River Path network. It should be designed and built with the Green Line Extension. | 5/2/11 |
| Gabrielle Weiler | Boston resident | Supports the Community Path connector because it would close gaps in the region's bike network. It should be designed and built with the Green Line Extension. | 5/2/11 |
| Jeff Reese | Medford resident | Supports including the Community Path connector in the Plan because it would close gaps in the region's bike network. The Path would also promote access to the Green Line Extension. It should be built with the Green Line Extension. | 5/2/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|--|--|--|--------|
| Joel Snider | Cambridge resident | Supports the Community Path connector because it would close gaps in the region's bike network and provide access into Boston and Cambridge for major events such as the 4th of July. It should be designed and built with the Green Line Extension. | 5/2/11 |
| Dan Hamalainen | Waltham resident | Supports the Community Path connector because it would close gaps in the region's bike network. It should be designed and built with the Green Line Extension. | 5/2/11 |
| Anna Anctil | Watertown resident | Supports the Community Path connector because it would close gaps in the region's bike network, and give people a safe place to bike. It should be designed and built with the Green Line Extension. | 5/2/11 |
| Sen. Tolman; Rep. Brownsberger; Belmont Selectmen Jones, Paolillo, and Firenze | Elected officials representing Belmont | Support the Belmont Trapelo Road Corridor Project. Belmont has spent about \$2.7 million on the project. Pleased that the project was identified as a regional need. Ask that the project be included in the Plan, and ultimately placed in the FFY 2015 element of the TIP. It is expected that the right-of-way will be secured by the spring of 2012. | 5/2/11 |
| David H. Douglas | Somerville resident | Supports including the Community Path connector in the Plan because it would close gaps in the region's bike network. The Path would also promote access for all people to the Green Line Extension. It should be built with the Green Line Extension. | 5/1/11 |
| Jay Wessland | Somerville resident | Supports including the Community Path connector in the Plan because it would close gaps in the region's bike network. The Path would also promote access for all people to the Green Line Extension. It should be built with the Green Line Extension. | 5/1/11 |
| Michelle Liebetreu | Somerville resident | Supports including the Community Path connector in the Plan because it would close gaps in the region's bike network. The Path would also promote access for all people to the Green Line Extension. It should be built with the Green Line Extension. | 5/1/11 |
| Resa Blatman and Stefan Cooke | Somerville residents | Supports including the Community Path connector in the Plan because it would close gaps in the region's bike network. The Path would also promote access for all people to the Green Line Extension. It should be built with the Green Line Extension. | 5/1/11 |
| Fred Berman and Lori Segall | Somerville residents | Supports including the Community Path connector in the Plan because it would close gaps in the region's bike network. The Path would also promote access for all people to the Green Line Extension. It should be built with the Green Line Extension. | 5/1/11 |
| Pauline Lim | Somerville resident | Supports including the Community Path connector in the Plan because it would close gaps in the region's bike network. The Path would also promote access for all people to the Green Line Extension. It should be built with the Green Line Extension. | 5/1/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|---------|
| Jess Hicks | Somerville resident | Supports including the Community Path connector in the Plan because it would lose gaps in the region's bike network. The Path would also promote access for all people to the Green Line Extension. It should be built with the Green Line Extension. | 4/30/11 |
| Matthew Belmonte | Unidentified | Supports including the Community Path connector in the Plan because it would close gaps in the region's bike network and improve safety. It should be built with the Green Line Extension. | 4/29/11 |
| Arnold Reinhold | Cambridge resident | Supports including the Community Path connector in the Plan because it is cost-effective and would close gaps in the region's bike network. It should be built with the Green Line Extension. | 4/29/11 |
| Lynn Weissman and Alan Moore | Friends of the Community Path | Supports the Community Path Connector, which would connect the Minuteman Bikeway to the Charles River Path network. The Path needs to be built with the Green Line Extension. The Path is consistent with the Plan's visions and policies, and would address identified needs. The density of Somerville, and the critical connection made by the path, mean that no other multi-use trail proposed in the region would generate the usage of the Community Path. The Path would bring riders to the Green Line extension, would fill a missing link, provide a safe and emissions-free path to downtown Boston, provide recreational and open space in environmental justice communities, and create safe routes to schools. The Path has been identified as a priority in many other planning documents, and has already received funding from the MPO for other sections. It is part of other proposed trails. The Path is consistent with new federal and state policy directives encouraging livability and healthy transportation. | 4/27/11 |
| Lynn Weissman and Alan Moore | Friends of the Community Path | In an addendum to their 4/27/11 letter, stated the following points: Please include the Community Path in the list of Projects and Programs by Investment Category released on April 5. There is tremendous regional support for the project. In March, 138 letters in support of the project were sent to the MPO. Many of the letters mentioned the safety benefits of the project. | 5/3/11 |
| Alice Grossman | Somerville resident | Supports including the Community Path connector in the Plan because it would close gaps in the region's bike network. The Path would also promote access for all people to the Green Line Extension. It should be built with the Green Line Extension. | 4/27/11 |
| Robert O'Brien, Executive Director | Downtown North Association | Supports the Causeway Street Crossroads Initiative and the larger Boston Crossroads Initiative. Causeway Street supports very high pedestrian volumes to and from regional centers of employment, recreation, and transportation. The project is consistent with the visions and policies of the Plan. The project would address a regional need. The project would restore the connection between the West and North Ends, long severed by the elevated highway and transit facilities. The project would make Causeway Street a vibrant multimodal urban boulevard that supports livability, mobility, safety, and aesthetics. Asks the MPO to support the project. | 4/20/11 |
| Susan Brooks | Unidentified | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail because it provides nonmotorized access to several destinations. | 4/15/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|--|---|---|---------|
| Terri North | Kenmore Residents Group | Supports the Commonwealth Ave Phase 2A improvement project. | 4/13/11 |
| Melissa Hoffer | Conservation Law Foundation | The State's Clean Energy and Climate Plan for 2020 requires the LRTP to address MassDOT's three sustainability goals and plan for reducing greenhouse gas emissions over time. It will require that MPOs and MassDOT balance highway system expansion with projects that support other modes and smart growth. The LRTP is also required to evaluate greenhouse gas emissions and ensure that the emissions are reduced over time. The emissions must fit into an overall statewide greenhouse gas reduction target. Would like to know how greenhouse gas emissions will be quantified and whether or not each project will be evaluated individually. Would like to know who will be responsible for quantifying the emissions. Would like to know how the methods of different agencies for quantifying emissions will be made consistent. Would like to know which methods will be used, which model will be used to estimate the vehicle-miles traveled, and whether or not induced demand will be considered. | 4/12/11 |
| Pam Beale, President | Kenmore Association | Supports the Commonwealth Ave, Phase 2A, improvement project. Phase 1 enhanced the streetscape and improved safety for all street users. | 4/10/11 |
| Elizabeth Walsh | Boston resident | Supports the Commonwealth Ave., Phase 2A, improvement project. | 4/8/11 |
| Suzanne Kennedy, Town Administrator | Town of Medway | Medway has hired a design firm for the reconstruction of Route 109. This demonstrates the town's strong commitment to taking appropriate project management actions. | 4/7/11 |
| Yvette Lancaster, President | Audobon Neighborhood Citizens Group | Supports the Commonwealth Ave, Phase 2A, improvement project. It would enhance the streetscape and improve safety for all street users. | 4/7/11 |
| Alan Weinberger | Bay State Road Neighborhood Association | Supports the Commonwealth Ave, Phase 2A, improvement project. Phase 1 enhanced the streetscape for all users. | 4/1/11 |
| Bob Church | Kenmore Towers | Supports the Commonwealth Ave, Phase 2A, improvement project. | 4/1/11 |
| Gary Nicksa, Vice President for Operations | Boston University | Supports the Commonwealth Ave, Phase 2A, improvement project. It would enhance the streetscape and improve safety for all street users. | 3/28/11 |
| Unidentified | Sudbury resident | Not in favor of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. Funds should be spent on maintaining the MBTA system rather than recreational trails. | 3/2/11 |
| Thomas Hedden, Ph.D. | (self-employed) | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail to Framingham. The completed section is full of riders, skaters, joggers, and others. Roads can be dangerous places for children to ride bikes. The Trail would promote healthy exercise and safety. | 2/28/11 |
| Chris Barrett | Unidentified | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. \$1 million is available for design of the next phase. The Trail should be built soon so the design funds don't go to waste. | 2/28/11 |
| William Latimer | Clinton Greenway Conservation Trust | Supports the Mass Central and Bruce Freeman Rail Trails. They have health, environmental, social justice, and community connectivity benefits. | 2/28/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|------------------------|--|---|---------|
| Richard J. Fallon | Acton resident | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. | 2/28/11 |
| Bob Krankewicz | Bruce Freeman Rail Trail member | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. It would help with the “greening” of Massachusetts and improve citizens’ health through increased exercise and cleaner air. It could lead to a healthier citizenry, which in turn lessens the cost of health care incurred by the public and the state government. | 2/28/11 |
| John Barry | Bolton resident | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. | 2/28/11 |
| Robert Comer | Friend of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail, Concord resident | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. Substantial investments have been made by the state, municipalities, and volunteers. The Trail would enhance bicycle and pedestrian connections to the Fitchburg Line and West Concord. Bicycle storage facilities along the Fitchburg Line should also be expanded. Being able to bike to the train and store a bike safely and reliably would encourage sustainable commuting and travel. | 2/28/11 |
| Danielle Woodman Kehoe | Unidentified | Supports expansion of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. Trails support the health of citizens by providing a beautiful, safe space for activities such as walking, running, and bike riding. | 2/28/11 |
| Nancy Peacock | Unidentified | Supports investments that encourage bicycling. | 2/27/11 |
| Robert Mandel | Unidentified | States that this is a time to close the state budget deficit by eliminating any unnecessary spending. Believes that bike-oriented facilities expenses are not essential. | 2/27/11 |
| Gerard Boyle | Resident | Supports shared-use trails. | 2/27/11 |
| Timothy Fohl | Unidentified | Supports shared-use trails. | 2/27/11 |
| Bill Stewart | Acton resident | Supports the expansion of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. Many bikers, runners, and walkers use the trail. | 2/27/11 |
| Jim Salem | Unaffiliated | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. It would reduce automobile traffic and improve bicycle connections to the Fitchburg Line. | 2/27/11 |
| Robert D. Hall | Friends of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail | Impressed by the thoroughness with which the MPO is working on the Long-Range Transportation Plan. Asks planners not to view trails for bike and pedestrian travel as simply recreational facilities whose realization can be delayed until the economy can afford them. They have mobility, safety, environmental, and public health benefits. Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. | 2/27/11 |
| Ellen Quackenbush | Concord resident | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. It would offer recreational and transportation benefits for everyone. | 2/27/11 |
| Frederick M. Rust | Boy Scout Troop 63, Sudbury | There are few transportation alternatives for teenagers or other non-drivers in the MetroWest area. Bicycling can be a safe, enjoyable, and human-power alternative to autos, but only if there are dedicated bicycling routes. The Bruce Freeman Rail Trail would help connect schools, town centers, and athletic fields. The transportation needs of younger citizens should be an important consideration to the Needs Assessment, and dedicated bicycle facilities are an appropriate way to meet these needs. | 2/27/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|--------------------|---|---|---------|
| Bob Schneider | Bruce Freeman Rail Trail rider | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. It would improve health and air quality. A lot has been spent on roads. More investment should be made in trails. | 2/27/11 |
| Franny Osman | Acton Transportation Advisory Committee | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. Encourages the MPO to consider radial and circumferential routes between the big highways. Between-town transit is lacking. Promoting local and between-town transit projects would support the economy. | 2/27/11 |
| James Fitzpatrick | Sudbury resident | Supports rail trails. They offer health, community development, environmental, and air quality benefits. They should be driven by coordinated state and regional planning, rather than relying on individual communities to develop them. A very vocal minority of people have delayed implementation of a rail trail crossing through Sudbury. | 2/27/11 |
| Mary Hunter Utt | Friends of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail | Any form of transportation that helps wean us from cars, pollution, and oil dependence should be a priority. Bicycle trails are important for recreation, connection, and fitness. The Bruce Freeman Rail Trail should be a priority. | 2/27/11 |
| Thomas W Bailey | Concord resident | Supports inclusion of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail in the Long-Range Transportation Plan. | 2/27/11 |
| Wendy Wolfberg | Unidentified | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. It provides a critical service in supporting community diversity, and it provides a neutral area to support positive and friendly interaction. It also provides a safe place for recreational activity. It is safe for mothers with small children, for young kids on their own, and for older citizens. | 2/27/11 |
| Brett Peruzzi | Framingham resident | “Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. The trail would provide a vital corridor for walking, biking, and other forms of personal transportation to many key points of interest and commerce, and to educational and cultural facilities. | 2/27/11 |
| R Bradley Potts | Westford resident | Supports rail trails. Rail corridors are a wasted commodity and could be vitalized and utilized with support from the state. They can support commuting and recreational transportation. | 2/27/11 |
| Sharon Mastenbrook | Maynard resident | Traffic in the areas to be served by the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail is at gridlock. More transportation options to Boston and Lowell are necessary. The Trail will provide many personal, community, and environmental benefits. | 2/27/11 |
| Susan Brooks | Unidentified | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. Gas prices are high. Public policy should help people travel more easily and safely without cars. | 2/27/11 |
| Barbara Pike | Unidentified | The Bruce Freeman Rail Trail would provide off-road nonmotorized access to commuter rail stations, schools, shopping centers, and recreation facilities. It should be included for construction funding. | 2/27/11 |
| Pat Wallace | Unidentified | Supports extending the hours of service for the MBTA system. Young adults are heading for other places in part because of a lack of late night transit service. | 2/27/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|-------------------------------|--|--|---------|
| Judith Artley | Resident of Framingham, Sudbury Valley Trustees, New England Wild Flower Society | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. The Trail would provide safe, accessible transportation by foot and bicycle to work, the library, shopping, and other destinations. Minimizing the use of gas-powered vehicles improves air quality and eliminates noise. | 2/27/11 |
| James Weaver | Unidentified | Rail trails are mainly recreational. Basic transportation infrastructure should have a much higher priority. | 2/27/11 |
| Pat Brown | Citizen | The metrobostoncommondata.org information on walkways is, to my direct knowledge, out-of-date for Sudbury. The need to expand walkway coverage may be perceived as more urgent in communities that delay updating their sidewalk inventory, since they appear to have fewer walkways than they actually have. | 2/25/11 |
| Donna DeAngelis and Eric Holm | Concord residents | "More funds should be invested in support and maintenance of commuter rail equipment. The system has frequent delays due to disabled trains. Recreational investments, such as the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail, are important. But investing in the maintenance of our basic public transportation infrastructure is even more important. Many people support rail trails, but the majority of us would prefer that we address these basic needs first." | 2/25/11 |
| Ernest Stern | Unidentified | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. It would provide a safe route to West Concord and provide a place for exercise. | 2/25/11 |
| Beth Logan | Unidentified | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail and extending the Lowell Line into New Hampshire with a stop in Chelmsford. Alternative transportation will help cut greenhouse gas emissions. Trails give people safe routes on which to walk or bike, and are less costly to repair than roads. For expansion projects, transit and nonmotorized modes should be prioritized over highways. | 2/24/11 |
| Pat Brown | Citizen | "Asks if the draft LRTP incorporates data and analysis, and addresses the recommendations, of the 2007 Massachusetts Transportation Finance Committee reports. The Needs Assessment includes a No-Build scenario, but it does not explicitly outline the results of a No-Maintain scenario. The MPO should focus on maintenance of existing facilities. The Needs Assessment should include a realistic look at how mobility in the region would be reduced if we were to choose not to invest in maintenance." | 2/22/11 |
| Lydia Rogers | Unidentified | Expressed concerns about the impacts of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail on wildlife. It is an expensive project at a time when communities like Concord are turning off street lights to save money. There are also major safety issues that have not been solved at the railroad crossing in the downtown area of West Concord. This is a recreational trail that would not decrease automobile traffic or improve air quality. | 2/21/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|---------------|---------------------------|---|---------|
| Steve Olanoff | Town of Westwood | The Needs Assessment of the LRTP does not cover the needs of economic development adequately. Large economic development areas and large projects are listed, but many locally designated economic development areas are not mentioned. While many transportation needs are outlined, there is no connection drawn between the economic development areas and projects and the transportation needs to support this economic development. | 2/17/11 |
| Larry Koff | Larry Koff and Associates | “The Needs Assessment should put the costs into a broader context so that citizens and policy makers can better assess the financial deficiencies and choices before the Commonwealth. Currently, resources are dispersed so that everyone gets some funding, but there is no clear path to the future. MetroFuture requires that the funding be allocated to advance the vision identified in the plan. Important coalitions are formed, new funding sources identified, and a clearer set of land use, economic development, environmental and equity goals achieved. I think the Regionwide Needs Assessment should reflect these choices. The State Rail Plan offers ways to promote economic growth, but it should have discussed the relocation of Beacon Park Yards.” | 2/17/11 |
| Jim Gallagher | Somerville resident | States that the level of detail in the Needs Assessment is too great. Many of the problems identified should be reframed to state a need, and accompanied by graphics. For bottlenecks, one of the three methods referred to is based on V/C ratios [Volume-to-Capacity], a very crude and often misleading measure. Focusing on V/C ratio would encourage roadway capacity expansion and exclude many options that increase throughput (for example, signal improvements and Intelligent Transportation Systems). For crash locations, a need to fix the five worst non-interstate intersections should also be identified. In the Bicycle and Pedestrian section, the need statement can identify ways to judge the necessity of new proposed facilities. For example, on all federal-aid-eligible facilities where bicyclists and pedestrians are allowed, there needs to be a sidewalk on both sides and safe crossings every 1,000 feet, and bicycle lanes on all roadways with posted speed limits of 35mph or higher. For Transportation Equity, environmental justice solutions need to be identified. For the land use section, the investment transportation infrastructure needs to be done in a way that is consistent with the regional land use plan. Urges the MPO to use this to identify and prioritize regional needs, and then use those needs to prioritize future projects, programs, and ideas. | 2/16/11 |
| Peter Smith | Arlington resident | Supports extension of the Red Line to Arlington Center. It would be well used and reduce congestion on local roads. | 2/14/11 |
| Sam Milton | Arlington resident | Recommends that the MPO should consider extending the Red Line to Arlington and Lexington. | 2/11/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|-------------------------|--|--|--------|
| James Marsh | City of Lynn, Development Director | "The City of Lynn is plagued by poor traffic flow and access. The City of Lynn's commercial base and resulting economics are limited to smaller, local roads that pass through residential neighborhoods with many intersections. The City needs a carefully constructed transportation plan to address the possibilities of a casino on Route 1A and the waterfront development that would be the largest in the Northeast Corridor. It is imperative to the City's long-term viability to create solutions revolving around Route 1A, Route 107, and the Blue Line, as they provide access to our downtown, industrial zones, and waterfront. Also needed is access into Lynn at Goodwin Circle/ Route 129 and pedestrian access to the developing waterfront." | 2/9/11 |
| Gail Costelas | Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection | Recommends that the MPO reach out to commuters by using bus advertising and/or announcements on MBTA platforms. Also, the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) collects comments from area companies on how the transportation system should be improved. These comments are required as part of the Ride Share regulation. DEP could share these comments with MPO staff. | 2/9/11 |
| Linda Olson Pehlke | Brookline Town Meeting Member, Climate Action Committee | "Surface Green Line service improvements should include using signal priority to give trains priority right-of-way at some signalized intersections in Brookline. Service and capacity of the C Line must be improved to handle current and future demand. Circumferential bus and transit routes need improvement. The bunching problem and slow travel speeds could benefit from stop consolidation and signal priority for buses. Comfort and protection from the elements must be improved for bus riders. Bicycle and pedestrian crossings at Riverway and Route 9/Brookline Ave. must be improved. Pedestrian access to the Reservoir T stop must be improved. Circumferential transit, bicycle, and pedestrian travel must be a priority focus." | 2/6/11 |
| Martin Klingensmith | Unidentified | Supports extending the Red Line to Bedford. | 2/5/11 |
| Unidentified | Arlington resident | Supports extending the Red Line. The present terminus at Alewife creates parking problems in East Arlington. | 2/5/11 |
| Chris Moore | Unidentified | Supports the extension of the Red Line to Arlington and eventually Lexington. | 2/5/11 |
| Peter Hechenbleikner | Town Manager, Reading | "Concerned that data about commuter rail parking usage in Reading is inaccurate. Suggests the MPO count the total number of parking spaces used by commuters, not just the off-street spaces. In Table 3-3 [of the Needs Assessment] Reading should not be listed as an ICICLE member, but we have a very active Climate Protection Committee. Figure 3-7 could be clearer as to which community is represented by which dot. On page 53 in the recommendations, one deficiency that is not adequately highlighted is that which talks about deficiencies on I-95 from Burlington to Wakefield. It should mention including the lane drop east and west (or north and south) bound beginning at the intersection of I-93 and I-95. The Needs Assessment should consider bus shelters. Some of the bus lines (137) would benefit from smaller (and alternate-fuel) vehicles, based on their ridership." | 2/2/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|-----------------------|---|---|---------|
| Marc Johnson | Selectman, Hamilton | States that the Northeast Corridor draft plan completely misses our real transportation needs. Citizens need to get to concentrations of shopping and medical areas. We can always benefit from improved commuter connections to downtown Boston, but that is not our highest transportation priority. We need scheduled local public transit, even if on an abbreviated schedule. We have no public transportation other than commuter rail on the Newburyport branch. Hamilton, Ipswich, and Wenham have better-scheduled bus/RIDE/minibus connections to other transit areas, such as north Beverly or Beverly/Salem/Peabody/Danvers for elderly and young citizens. | 2/2/11 |
| Jim Gallagher | Somerville resident | States that the design of the Plan seems to be based on a paper document which is posted online. I think it should be an e-document that can be printed as needed. That means there should be internal links to other sections referred to and other documents: the MBTA's Program for Mass Transportation and MAPC's MetroFuture. It is too long and too full of jargon to be useful to anyone but the most initiated and committed members of the public. | 2/2/11 |
| Jim Gallagher | Somerville resident | Please list the summary chapter as under development. Boston Proper is referred to separately in the Needs Assessment. Does that mean Boston Proper is not part of the Central Area? Is the distinction important? | 2/2/11 |
| Jim Gallagher | Somerville resident | "There is no way to attach a document here. For a review of a long document, which will likely take place over a number of days/openings/saves, it would be much easier to prepare one coherent document and submit it once." | 2/2/11 |
| Jim Gallagher | Somerville resident | "A direct link from the Needs Assessment announcement on the front page to the Needs Assessment write-ups would be helpful. And once the reader gets to the correct place, if the reader cares about one corridor or a few communities, an easier way to figure out where to look would be appreciated. Asks why there are different colors for communities in the same corridor. (Knows the inside-the-MPO versus the modeled-area distinction, but why would most people?) The MPO should be striving to make this as easy as possible so people will not get frustrated and can focus on substantive comments." | 2/2/11 |
| Stephanie Mercandetti | Town of Walpole | On Table 6-3 on Page 6-20 of the draft Needs Assessment, please note that Walpole has approved 43D Priority Development Sites and does not have an approved 40R District. I think the Maturing Suburb box should also be checked. | 2/2/11 |
| Dick Williamson | Bruce Freeman, Assabet River, and Mass Central Rail Trails | States that the section on the West corridor appears to be a summary of what exists today. Major additions to the Bruce Freeman, Assabet River, and Mass Central Rail Trails are in various stages of planning and design. These shared-use paths would be a major addition to the intermodal transportation mix and would cost much less than many of the mega-projects that are being considered suggest that, perhaps a measure such as return-per-dollar should be used to value these low-costs projects. | 2/1/11 |
| Chris Anzuoni | Massachusetts Bus Association | Asks if the passenger transportation services provided within and beyond the MAPC communities by the network of intercity bus carriers will be recognized in the development of this plan? There does not yet appear to be an acknowledgement of these options on the Radial Corridors map, the Circumferential Corridors map or the Ideas for Visions and Policies chart. | 1/27/11 |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-1 (CONT.)

**SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE DEVELOPMENT OF *PATHS TO A SUSTAINABLE REGION*:
JUNE 1, 2010 - AUGUST 14, 2011**

| NAME | AFFILIATION | FEEDBACK | DATE |
|--------------------|--|--|---------|
| Linda Olson Pehlke | Town of Brookline Climate Action Committee | <p>"States that there are many important and positive visions and policies. However, there do not seem to be any guidelines on setting priorities. Perhaps the MPO could include a goal of assigning a certain percentage of funds to alternative transportation. Some really good research about the costs, amount of land, impacts on travel, impact on the ability to retain dense commercial centers, etc., with our current excessive parking requirements would be really helpful."</p> | 5/18/10 |
| Meg Robertson | Massachusetts Commission for the Blind | <p>Should emphasize improving pedestrian access to subway stations and improving the lighting.</p> | 5/17/10 |
| Pat Brown | Sudbury resident | <p>"Recommends that the Plan include a glossary that defines terms and acronyms. It would help the public understand the document. A new vision should be added to require that future maintenance and operating costs be included in the plans for any system expansion and the revenue source for these expenditures be identified.</p> <p>Also, a new vision should be added to require a cost-benefit analysis of investments. For the livability vision, energy use is managed efficiently and alternative energy sources are used should be amended to read "energy use is managed efficiently and alternative energy sources are used where appropriate and cost-effective".</p> <p>For the mobility vision, a new statement should be added to include balancing and addressing the needs of all stakeholders - transit riders, drivers, cyclists, pedestrians, and taxpayers.</p> <p>For the safety and security vision, the viability of all transportation infrastructure should be protected from natural and man-made threats. Emergency response and evacuation routes should receive priority, but all infrastructure should be protected as much as possible."</p> | 6/1/10 |
| Pat Brown | Sudbury resident | <p>"States that there is only a single reference to freight in this draft, found under the mobility vision section. The smooth flow of food, fuel, medicine, and other commodities through the greater Boston metropolitan region is critical to the future viability and economic success of the region and to the health and well-being of its residents. A specific policy or addition to the current policies should ensure that maintenance of the freight infrastructure is a focus of this plan, specifically requesting that projects describe whether the proposed project maintains or expands freight transport facilities.</p> <p>The safety and security policies should include a policy to educate cyclists, pedestrians, and motorists in using the roads safely, responsibly and effectively."</p> | 6/1/10 |

TABLE A-2

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|----------------------------------|-------------|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| Green Line Extension Comment Key | Multiple | GLX 1 Comment: The delay of the Green Line Extension is unacceptable. The Green Line Extension is a legal commitment under the State Implementation Plan and the Transportation Conformity regulations for the LRTP and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The MPO should reject the delay. | X | | | | <p>GLX Response: The extension of the Green Line to Medford Hillside (College Avenue)/ Union Square is part of the Air Pollution Control Regulations of the Commonwealth's Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), codified in 310 CMR 7.36, Transit System Improvements. Because the Green Line to Medford Hillside (College Avenue)/ Union Square Extension project is a legal commitment, the Boston Region MPO has included it in its Long-Range Transportation Plan and Air Quality Conformity Determination (LRTP). The MPO must include in its LRTP any new project costing over \$10 million that uses federal transportation funds, any project that adds capacity to the transportation system, and any project that is included as a Transportation Control Measure (a strategy to reduce emissions of air pollutants) in the State Implementation Plan (SIP).</p> <p>The Green Line to Medford Hillside (College Avenue)/Union Square Extension project is being studied and designed by the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) and the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) and funded using Commonwealth or New Starts funds. The MPO felt that it was important to further extend the Green Line from Medford Hillside (College Avenue) to Route 16/Mystic Valley Parkway as a second phase of the extension project and "flexed" \$185 million of federal funding dedicated to highway projects to do so. Flexing of this type is at the discretion of the MPO. The segment of the Green Line Extension project from Medford Hillside (College Avenue) to Route 16/Mystic Valley Parkway is not part of the SIP commitment.</p> <p>310 CMR 7.36 (4) states that SIP projects may be delayed beyond their established deadlines. For delayed projects, MassDOT must implement interim emission offset measures during the period of delay. These measures, which must be in place by December 31, 2014 (the legal deadline for the construction of the Green Line Extension), must provide an air quality benefit that is equal to that anticipated from the construction of the Green Line Extension. MassDOT submitted its annual SIP Status Report to the DEP on July 27, 2011. The document is available at www.mass.gov/massdot/sip. In that report, MassDOT announced there would be a substantial delay past 2014. MassDOT is currently working with the Central Transportation Planning Staff (the staff to the MPO) to project the air quality benefit that would have resulted from the Green Line Extension during the period of anticipated delay. (continued on next page)</p> |

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|----------------------------------|-------------|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| Green Line Extension Comment Key | Multiple | GLX 1 Comment (cont.): The delay of the Green Line Extension is unacceptable. The Green Line Extension is a legal commitment under the State Implementation Plan and the Transportation Conformity regulations for the LRTP and the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). The MPO should reject the delay. | X | | | | Once that analysis is complete, MassDOT and the MBTA will develop a portfolio of interim measures that meet the calculated air quality threshold. Once a set of measures is approved by the DEP, the MPO will amend the LRTP to list them and identify their sources of funding. Since the Green Line Extension to Medford Hillside (College Avenue)/Union Square has a deadline of 2014, there is time to identify the measures, submit them for public review and DEP approval, and amend them into the LRTP. Until that time, the MPO will continue to carry the Green Line Extension project in the LRTP in the 2012-2015 time band; once the interim project(s) providing equal or greater air quality benefits to the region are added, it will be appropriate for the extension project's time band to be changed. |
| Green Line Extension Comment Key | Multiple | GLX 2 Comment: Full funding of the Green Line Extension project and any interim replacements must be identified in the Boston Region MPO's FFYs 2012-15 TIP and the LRTP. | | X | | | The Green Line Extension to Medford Hillside (College Avenue)/Union Square project is being funded by the Commonwealth, with funding that is not at the discretion of the MPO. Nevertheless, the MPO felt that it was important to further extend the Green Line from Medford Hillside (College Avenue) to Route 16/Mystic Valley Parkway, and "flexed" \$185 million of highway funding to do so (the flexing of funds is at the discretion of the MPO). The segment of the project from Medford Hillside (College Avenue) to Route 16 section is not part of the SIP commitment. (continued on next page) |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|----------------------------------|-------------|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| Green Line Extension Comment Key | Multiple | GLX 2 Comment (cont.): Full funding of the Green Line Extension project and any interim replacements must be identified in the Boston Region MPO's FFYs 2012-15 TIP and the LRTP. | | X | | | For the Green Line Extension to Medford Hillside (College Avenue)/Union Square portion of the project, MassDOT is pursuing federal funding – through the competitive New Starts program managed by the Federal Transit Administration – to support the design and construction. In January of 2010, MassDOT and the FTA initiated formal collaboration on the development of a complete New Starts application for the Green Line Extension project. The final New Starts application materials are in progress and need to be finalized for FTA review. In addition to the use of any federal funding, MassDOT and the MBTA will use Commonwealth funds to support the design and construction of the Green Line Extension project. These funds will be raised with the backing of authorizations made to support the SIP projects in Transportation Bond Bills of the past several years. At present, MassDOT has \$800 million (less funds already spent on planning, design, and construction) in active Transportation Bond Bill authorizations for the SIP projects. As needed, MassDOT will seek additional Transportation Bond Bill authorization to cover the costs of the Green Line Extension project. This information is presented in Chapter 7 (The Financial Plan) of the LRTP. The funding that is projected for the first four years of the project is included in the FFYs 2012-2015 Transportation Improvement Program. |
| Green Line Extension Comment Key | Multiple | GLX 3 Comment: The Green Line to Route 16 must be funded because it is a State Implementation Plan legal commitment. | | | X | | The legal commitment is to construct the Green Line to Medford Hillside (College Avenue) with a spur to Union Square. The MPO felt that it was important to further extend the Green Line from Medford Hillside (College Avenue) to Route 16/Mystic Valley Parkway as a second phase of the Green Line Extension project, and “flexed” \$185 million of funding dedicated to highway projects to do so. Flexing of this type is at the discretion of the MPO. The segment of the Green Line Extension project from Medford Hillside (College Avenue) to Route 16/Mystic Valley Parkway is not part of the SIP commitment. |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|----------------------------------|---------------------|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| Green Line Extension Comment Key | Multiple | GLX 4: Delaying the Green Line Extension project also delays the Community Path. Full funding of the Community Path should be programmed in the MPO's FFYs 2012-15 TIP. | | | | X | <p>The design and the cost of design for the proposed extension of the Community Path are included as part of the Green Line Extension to Medford Hillside (College Avenue)/Union Square project; however, this is not part of the State Implementation Plan improvement. As part of Paths to a Sustainable Region, the MPO was required to update project costs and revise the financial assumptions in the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). While the MPO worked to use its available funding in a way that produces the optimal benefit, many projects that would help to maintain the existing system or allow for future expansion or enhancement could not be included in the fiscally constrained LRTP.</p> <p>The MPO intends to continue working with state and federal partners to identify additional transportation funding in order to be prepared for the future. This project will remain in the Universe of Projects list and will be considered during the development of the next LRTP.</p> |
| Jennifer Dorsen | Somerville resident | | X | | | X | |
| Michael Monroe | Somerville resident | | X | | | | |
| Matthias David Siebler | Somerville resident | | X | | | X | |
| Sylvia Romm, MD | Somerville resident | | X | | | X | |
| Jennifer Lawrence | Somerville resident | | X | X | | | |
| Jonathan Buck | Unidentified | | X | X | | | |
| Dorie Clark | Somerville resident | | X | X | | | |
| Emily Arkin | Somerville resident | | X | | | | |
| Dianne Haas | Somerville resident | | X | | | | |
| Don MacKenzie | Unidentified | | X | | | | |
| David J Marcus, PhD | Somerville resident | | X | | | | |
| Kate Ledogar | Somerville resident | | X | | | | |
| Larry Rosenberg | Unidentified | | X | | | | |
| Jill Clarke | Somerville resident | | X | | | X | |
| Marcus Rozbitsky | Unidentified | | X | | | | |
| Satori Bailey | MA resident | | X | | | | |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
| Victoria Thompson | Somerville resident | | X | | | | |
| Gloria Korsman | Cambridge resident | | X | | | X | |
| Steven Morr-Wineman | Cambridge resident | | X | | | | |
| Cynthia Snow | Unidentified | | X | | | | |
| Joanna Herlihy | Cambridge resident | | X | | | | |
| Doroth Fennell | Tufts University student | | X | | | | |
| Henry Lieberman | Cambridge resident | | X | | | | |
| Anne Tate | Somerville resident | | X | X | | | |
| Glen Fant & Anne-Marie Wayne | Medford residents | | X | | | X | |
| Steve Mulder | Somerville resident | | X | | | | |
| Nina Garfinkle | Livable Streets Alliance, President | | X | | | X | |
| Susan Moynihan | Somerville resident | | X | | | X | |
| Ellen Shea | Somerville resident | | X | X | | X | |
| Tanya Paglia | Somerville resident | | X | | | | |
| Daniel Brockman | Somerville resident | | X | | | | |
| Maureen Barillaro | "Somerville Climate Action | | X | | | | |
| David Dahlbacka | Somerville resident | | X | | | | |
| Andy Pyman | Somerville resident | | X | | | | |
| Janine Fay | Somerville resident | | X | | | | |
| Sara Rostampour | Somerville resident | | X | X | | | |
| Ethan Contini-Field | Somerville resident | | X | | | X | |
| Todd Kaplan | Somerville resident | | X | | | | |
| Alice Grossman | Unidentified | | X | X | | | |
| John Wilde | Somerville resident | | X | | | X | |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|---------------------|---|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
| Alp Sipahigil | Cambridge resident | | X | | | X | |
| Zehra Cemile Marsan | Medford resident | | X | | | X | |
| Naomi Slagowski | Somerville resident | | X | | | | |
| Barbara Broussard | East Cambridge Planning Team, President | | X | | | | |
| Bob Nesson | Boston resident | | X | | | X | |
| Alex Epstein | Somerville resident | | X | | | | |
| Jamie Glass | Cambridge resident | | X | | | | |
| Tai Dinnan | Somerville resident | | X | | | X | |
| Lois Grossman | Medford resident | | X | | X | | |
| Dennis Dunn | Weymouth resident | | X | | X | | |
| Lynn Laur | Somerville resident | | X | | | | |
| Susan Wilkinson | Somerville resident | | X | | | X | |
| Rachel Stark | Unidentified | | X | | | | |
| Jeffrey Swan | Medford resident | | X | | | X | |
| Luke McDermott | Medford resident | | X | | X | | |
| William Messenger | Belmont resident | | | X | | X | |
| Rachelle | Unidentified | | X | | X | | |
| David Scott | Somerville resident | | X | | | | |
| Mark Chase | Somerville resident | | X | | | | |
| Pauline Lim | Unidentified | | X | X | | X | |
| Eric Becker | Somerville resident | | X | | | | |
| Marla Rhodes | Somerville resident | | X | | | | |
| Michael De Lisi | Somerville resident | | X | X | | | |
| Melissa Lowitz | Somerville resident | | X | | | | |
| Leonard Tower Jr. | Somerville resident | | X | | | X | |
| Dan Hamalainen | Waltham resident | | X | | | X | |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|---------------------|---|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
| Linda Goulet | Somerville resident | | X | X | | | |
| Erin Hemenway | Somerville resident | | X | X | | | |
| Phoebe Hackett | Somerville resident | | X | | | | |
| Carice Reddien | Cambridge resident | | X | | | | |
| John Roland Elliott | Medford resident | | X | X | X | | |
| Chris Mancini | Somerville resident, Exec. Dir. Groundworks | | X | X | X | | |
| Aileen Bellwood | Somerville resident | | X | X | X | | |
| Natasha Burger | Somerville resident | | X | X | | X | |
| Heather Van Aelst | Brickbottom Community Trust | | X | X | | X | |
| James Moodie | Medford resident | | | X | | | |
| Alan Moore | Somerville resident | | X | X | | X | |
| Richard Nilsson | Nilsson Associates | | X | | | | |
| Michael Chiu | Somerville resident | | X | | | | |
| Joanna Hale | Somerville resident | | X | | | | |
| Thomas Eagan | Somerville resident | | X | X | | | |
| James McGinnis | Somerville resident | | X | X | X | | |
| Andrew Hinterman | Somerville resident | | X | | | X | |
| Jared Worful | Somerville resident | | X | X | X | | |
| Adelaide Smith | Somerville resident | | X | X | | X | |
| Karen Molloy | Somerville resident | | X | X | | X | |
| Vanessa Vega | Medford resident | | X | X | X | | |
| Emma Oster | Somerville resident | | X | X | X | | |
| Julia Petipas | Somerville resident | | X | | | | |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|------------------------|---|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
| Lisa Brukilacchio | Somerville resident | | X | X | X | | |
| Elizabeth Kazakoff | Somerville resident | | X | X | | X | |
| Michael Prange | Somerville resident | | X | X | | | |
| Beatrice Denise Taylor | Somerville resident | | X | X | | X | |
| Nancy Bernhard | Somerville resident | | X | X | | X | |
| Rich and Alison Lee | Unidentified | | X | X | X | | |
| Elisabeth Bayle | Medford resident | | X | X | X | | |
| Marguerite Avery | Somerville resident | | X | X | | | |
| John Wilde | Somerville resident | | X | X | | X | |
| Wendy Blom | Somerville resident | | X | X | | X | |
| Rachel Burckardt | Cambridge resident | | X | | | | |
| Douglas Rhodes | Medford resident | | X | X | | X | |
| Lynn Weissman | Somerville resident | | X | X | | X | |
| Enid Kumin | Somerville resident | | X | X | | X | |
| James Bride | Somerville resident | | X | X | | | |
| Ellin Reisner | Somerville Transportation Equity Partnership, President | | X | X | | | |
| Joel Bennett | Somerville resident | | X | X | | X | |
| Andrea Yakovakis | Unidentified | | X | X | X | X | |
| Scott C Campbell | Dedham resident | | X | X | | X | |
| Jeanine Jenks Farley | Somerville resident | | X | X | | X | |
| Derek Prior | Somerville resident | | X | | | | |
| Resa Blatman | Unidentified | | X | X | | X | |
| Gerald R. Herb Wilmoth | Somerville resident | | X | | | | |
| Paul Morgan | Somerville resident | | X | X | | X | |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
| Catherine Thompson | Somerville resident | | X | X | | X | |
| Alex Krogh-Grabbe | Somerville resident | | X | X | | X | |
| Courtney Petri | Somerville resident | | X | X | | X | |
| Michelle Liebetreu | Somerville resident | | X | X | | X | |
| Leigh Lozano | Somerville resident | | X | X | | X | |
| Abe Cohen Dvornik | Somerville resident | | X | X | | X | |
| Tim Sackton | Cambridge resident | | X | | | | |
| Amanda King | Somerville resident | | X | X | | X | |
| Christine Casalini | Somerville resident | | X | X | | X | |
| Jonah Petri | Somerville resident | | X | | | | |
| Brett LaFlamme | Somerville resident | | X | | | | |
| Sarah Shugars | Somerville resident | | X | | | | |
| Esme Blackburn | Somerville resident | | X | X | | | |
| Fred Berman | Unidentified | | X | X | | X | |
| Jane Sauer | Somerville resident | | X | | | | |
| Bathsheba Grossman | Somerville resident | | X | X | | X | |
| Sara Zucker | Somerville resident | | X | | | | |
| James McGinnis | Somerville resident | | X | | X | | |
| John Hostage | Watertown resident | | X | X | | | |
| Kristine Lessard | Somerville resident | | X | | | | |
| Taryn LaFlamme | Unidentified | | X | | | | |
| Bill Marx | Somerville resident | | X | | | | |
| Carice Pingenot | Unidentified | | X | | | | |
| Ted Bach | Somerville resident | | X | | | | |
| Jeff Reese | Medford resident | | X | X | | X | |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|-----------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
| Erica Schwarz | Somerville resident | | X | | | X | |
| Rachel Fichtenbaum | Cambridge resident | | X | | | | |
| Arun Sannuti | Somerville resident | | X | X | | X | |
| Chun Ye | Somerville resident | | X | X | | X | |
| Miranda Banks | Somerville resident | | X | X | | X | |
| Rachel Gordon | Medford resident | | X | | | X | |
| Katjana Ballantyne | Somerville resident | | X | X | | | |
| Sarah Lim | Somerville resident | | X | | | | |
| John Roland Elliott | Medford Hillside resident | | X | X | X | | |
| Seth Minkoff | Unidentified | | X | X | | | |
| Alan Moore | Somerville resident | | X | X | | X | |
| Ethan Haslett | Medford resident | | X | X | X | | |
| Erika Tarlin | Somerville resident | | X | | | | |
| William Harnois | Somerville resident | | X | | | | |
| Greg Kindel | Somerville resident | | X | X | | | |
| Arun Sannuti | Somerville resident | | X | X | | | |
| Kimberly Gosselin | Somerville resident | | X | X | | | |
| Ethan Gilsdorf | Somerville resident | | X | | | | |
| Jeff Levine | Somerville resident | | X | X | | | |
| Margaret Welgel | Medford resident | | X | | X | | |
| Margaret Collins | Unidentified | | X | | X | | |
| Marilyn and John MacDougall | Cambridge residents | | X | | | | |
| Arnold Reinhold | Cambridge resident | | X | | | | |
| Karin Galil, MD | Unidentified | | X | | | | |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|------------------|------------------|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| Mary Anne Adduci | Medford resident | Does not express support for the Green Line Extension project. Expresses opposition to fully or partially fund the project with State Bonds and believes that spending should instead be dedicated to urgent needs. Expresses concern that the project cannot guarantee future economic development. States that the community of Medford has a different character and landscape than Somerville, and its residents are less dependent on public transportation. Suggests that the extension to Route 16 be reconsidered after completion to College Avenue. | | | | | In the context of the visions and policies set forth in the LRTP by the MPO, it was determined that transit projects are important. In addition, the extension of the Green Line to Medford Hillside (College Avenue)/ Union Square is part of the Air Pollution Control Regulations of the Commonwealth's Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), codified in 310 CMR 7.36, Transit System Improvements. Because the Green Line to Medford Hillside (College Avenue)/ Union Square Extension project is a legal commitment, the Boston Region MPO has included it in its Long-Range Transportation Plan and Air Quality Conformity Determination (LRTP). The MPO must include in its LRTP any new project costing over \$10 million that uses federal transportation funds, any project that adds capacity to the transportation system, and any project that is included as a Transportation Control Measure (a strategy to reduce emissions of air pollutants) in the State Implementation Plan (SIP). The MPO chose to allocate all of the MBTA's future transit and capital funding to system infrastructure maintenance, accessibility improvements, and system enhancements, to ensure that the existing system can continue to function into the future and continue to serve its existing ridership. The Commonwealth made the commitment to fund the State Implementation Plan transit expansion projects. The MPO felt that it was important to further extend the Green Line from Medford Hillside (College Avenue) to Route 16/Mystic Valley Parkway as a second phase of the extension project and "flexed" \$185 million of federal funding dedicated to highway projects to do so. |
| Kenneth Krause | Medford resident | GLX comments 1, 2, and 3. Also, supports reconstruction of the Revere Beach Parkway over the Malden River and reconstruction of the Cradock Bridge over the Mystic River. They will benefit all modes and the waterways beneath the spans. | X | X | X | | The reconstruction of the Revere Beach Parkway over the Malden River and reconstruction of the Cradock Bridge over the Mystic River will remain part of our Universe of Projects in both the Long-Range Transportation Plan and Transportation Improvement Program. |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|------------------------|---|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| Mayor Joseph Curtatone | City of Somerville | Stressed the importance of the Green Line Extension for economic development. The project will unlock more than 300 acres of underutilized land in Somerville and Cambridge for transit-oriented development. The project will create 18,000 construction jobs and 26,000 permanent jobs. It will expand commerce opportunities in every municipality served by the MBTA rapid-transit system. It will reduce daily vehicle-miles traveled in the region by 25,000. States it is vital for the MPO and MassDOT to work together to establish a concrete timeline for the project. | | | | | <p>The Green Line Extension to Medford Hillside (College Avenue)/Union Square project is being funded by the Commonwealth, with funding that is not at the discretion of the MPO. However, the MPO felt that it was important to further extend the Green Line from Medford Hillside (College Avenue) to Route 16/Mystic Valley Parkway, and “flexed” \$185 million of highway funding to do so (the flexing of funds is at the discretion of the MPO).</p> <p>MassDOT announced there would be a substantial delay of the first phase of the Extension past 2014. MassDOT is currently working with the Central Transportation Planning Staff (the staff to the MPO) to project the air quality benefit that would have resulted from the Green Line Extension during the period of anticipated delay. The MPO will continue to work with the Commonwealth to update the Long-Range Transportation Plan and Transportation Improvement Program with new information on the interim measures and timelines as that information becomes available.</p> |
| Rafael Mares | Conservation Law Foundation Massachusetts | The CLF states that because of insufficient funding of the Green Line Extension Project in the appropriate time period, and since MassDOT has not yet petitioned the DEP to delay the project, the LRTP and the TIP are not in compliance with Transportation Conformity regulations. Until a petition of delay is submitted and approved by DEP, transportation conformity must be conducted with respect to existing transportation control measures (TCMs) and their existing deadlines in the current SIP. MassDOT has not yet received permission to eliminate the Red Line - Blue Line Connector and to delay additional parking spaces beyond the existing deadline. MassDOT also delays additional funding of the Fairmount Line Improvement Project until after the SIP deadline. Therefore, the TIP and LRTP cannot be adopted as proposed. The TIP and LRTP should also include greenhouse gas accounting for individual transportation projects. In the future, this information should be provided to the MPO and the public prior to selection of transportation projects for the TIP and LRTP. | X | X | | | <p>The design of the Red Line/Blue Line Connector is part of the Air Pollution Control Regulations of the Commonwealth’s Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), codified in 310 CMR 7.36, Transit System Improvements. Because the design of the Red Line/Blue Line Connector is a legal commitment, the Boston Region MPO has included it in its Long-Range Transportation Plan and Air Quality Conformity Determination (LRTP). The MPO must include any new project costing over \$10 million that uses federal transportation funds, any project that adds capacity to the transportation system, and/or any project that is included as a Transportation Control Measure (a strategy to reduce emissions of air pollutants) as part of the State Implementation Plan (SIP) in its LRTP. MassDOT has petitioned the DEP to nullify the commitment to perform final design of the Red Line/Blue Line Connector, due to the unaffordability of the eventual construction of the project. MassDOT is initiating a process to amend the SIP to permanently and completely remove the obligation to perform final design of the Red Line/Blue Line Connector. The MPO is awaiting the results of MassDOT’s proposal and potentially will revise its LRTP once that request has gone through the DEP’s process. MassDOT has also submitted a petition to delay for the Fairmount Line project. Once approved the MPO will amend the LRTP to include these interim measures. (continued on next page)</p> |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|---|--|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| Rafael Mares (continued) | Conservation Law Foundation Massachusetts | | | | | | Working closely with MassDOT, the MPO will continue to report on its actions to comply with the GWSA and to help meet the greenhouse gas reduction targets. As part of this activity, the MPO will provide further public information on the topic and will advocate for steps needed to accomplish the MPO's and state's goals for greenhouse gas reductions. The MPO will continue to analyze projects for the reductions they bring about, conducting these analyses either at the regional level (using its regional model) or at the project level when it is preparing its TIP or conducting project-level studies (using its regional model or other methods). |
| John G Sieber | Medford resident | Supports extending the Green Line to Route 16. | | | | | Thank you for your support. The Green Line Extension to Route 16 project is included in the list of recommended projects in Paths to a Sustainable Region in the 2016-2020 time band. |
| Gladys Maged | Somerville resident | Feels that her neighborhood has become increasingly unhealthy because of air pollution. Believes that the Green Line project will decrease car traffic and help with congestion issues faced by many Somerville and Boston workers. | | | | | The MPO is committed to the Green Line Extension to Route 16 project and has included it in the list of recommended projects in Paths to a Sustainable Region in the 2016-2020 time band. |
| Renata von Tscharnar | Charles River Conservancy, President and Founder | The Community Path will provide convenient access to the new Green Line stations and will better connect the Minuteman Path and Charles River Path Networks. | X | X | | X | |
| Lynn Weissman and Alan Moore (with 320 attached notes of support from individuals listed below) | Friends of the Community Path, Co-Presidents | Full funding and realistic funding sources for the Green Line Extension and the Community Path should be shown in the LRTP. The LRTP fails to meet the fiscal constraint and the environmental (timely completion) requirements. MassDOT has failed to meet promised deadlines. Urge the Extension to be put back on schedule. Also urge enforcement of the legal and environmental obligations to the full extent. The Community Path should be constructed simultaneously with the Green Line Extension. They share infrastructure, right-of-way, heavy construction activities. The Green Line Extension and Path are sustainable transportation and will help more people get around without cars, reduce emissions and help economic development, connect neighborhoods to Green Line stations, increase Green Line ridership at low cost, make the project multi-modal, create a regional path network of almost 50 miles in 11 municipalities. (continued on next page) | X | X | X | X | |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|--|--|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
| Lynn Weissman and Alan Moore (continued) | Friends of the Community Path, Co-Presidents | State-funding the Green Line will alleviate delays. The Green Line and other TCMs must be given priority for completion (It has never been a state priority). This delay violated the legal requirements to give the project highest priority in all transportation planning documents. Money should be reallocated to the Green Line from optional projects. The state is legally obligated to extend the Green Line to Medford Hillside; College Avenue is not Medford Hillside. Failure to fund the extension to this point violates the existing agreement. Delaying the Green Line Extension without mitigation of pollution will negatively affect the health of Somerville and regional residents. Somerville has high exposure to traffic and diesel rail pollution. Green Line is greatly needed in environmental justice and economic justice neighborhoods in Somerville and Cambridge. There may be higher rates of mortality, lung cancer, heart attack, childhood asthma because of this exposure. The Green Line project brings access to 85% of Somerville residents and to residents of neighboring municipalities. It fully embodies the principles of GreenDOT and will help Massachusetts reach its GHG reduction goals. The delay could jeopardize the state's federal funding, increase the cost, deny a key transit link, result in loss of sales and income tax revenues, and cause the communities to miss benefits. The Governor and Lt. Governor should honor their commitment to build the Green Line Extension in their term. MassDOT has not demonstrated a funding plan and construction schedule to meet the SIP requirement using only state funding. There is a lack of transparency and seriousness in meeting the legal SIP requirements. Land acquisition is not acceptable as a primary factor for the delay. Track could be laid while acquisitions for the stations are made. The maintenance facility could be completed after the Green Line is built. The phasing suggested should only be allowed if the state is legally bound to complete the full project to Route 16 by 2018. The Fast 14 project is an example of what the state can accomplish with commitment. | X | X | X | X | |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|---|--|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
| Justine Cohen, The Campe Family, Nora O'Brien, Hannah Jenkins, Elizabeth Auroden, John Wilde, Charles Denison IV, Matt Carty, Bower, Dr. Rachel Freudenburg, Kristine O'Brien, Jesse De la Rose, Patrick King, Jennifer Kapuscik, Joan Kreie, Justin Launderville, Kristine Dunn, John Lewis, Joanna Launderville, James Castignoli, Michael Quan, Catherine Anne Tweedie, Nathan Dale, F.J. Zandbergen, John Covert, Curtis Townsend, Kate Kelleher, Nancy Gittelson | Lexington, Somerville, Boston, Brookline, Cambridge, Medford, Falmouth, Winchester residents | <p>These people submitted supporting notes to the Friends of the Community Path letter. They all asked that the Community Path be in the final LRTP Investment Strategy. Asks that the LRTP include funding for the community Path with the Green Line Extension from Lowell Street to Lechmere between 2013-2015, as this is the most cost-effective and practical way to complete the project. Many have handwritten individual comments and several comments are in the form of drawings expressing enthusiasm. The individual handwritten notes convey messages about the following benefits and attributes of the Community Path:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It promote exercise, health, family activity, and fun; reduce obesity • Would be a cost effective way to provide access to the stations • Would create community and social space • Would support healthy transportation (including commuting) • Would result in a larger linked network of paths • Would link neighborhoods and municipalities in the region • Would be an asset for the region • Would improve air quality and quality of life • Would reduce roadway congestion and support economic activity • Would be a commitment to health and sustainability • Would increase safety and promote bicycling and walking • Would provide better access to community resources • Would improve mobility and save fuel • Would be an important transportation option for commuting and other types of trips • Would create a direct route (to destinations including Boston) for persons with disabilities; persons using wheelchairs or scooters • Would reduce neighborhood transportation impacts and support responsible growth • Would improve motorists level of comfort <p>Some individual notes urged completion of the Community Path in conjunction with construction of the Green Line.</p> | X | X | X | X | |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|---|---|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
| Megan Sebasky, Susan Hamilton, Sarah Perlmutter, Charles Bend, Julia Malik, Marcello Murray, Gerald Hershkowitz, Rebecca Schor, John Sommerstein, Ethan Contini- Field, Lauren Mayhen, Cian Rath- Cullimore, Daniel Toner, Jeanie Mills, Judith Klausner, Stephen Pomeroy, Adam Rocha, Josh Wairi, Michael Heyman, Mark Pasmussen, Roger May, M. Halevi, Timothy Butler, Rev. Ellen Frith, Ashley Coleman- Fitch, Kim Neher, Alex Bombard- Fitch, Richard Dougherty | Cambridge, Somerville, Arlington, Medford, Boston, Fairhaven, E. Wenatchee, WA; Lexington residents | Continuation of the list of names in support of the Friends of the Community Path comment letter. | X | X | X | X | |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|--|--|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
| George Smith, Marjorie Crockett, Elizabeth Brighan, Rebecca Abbott, Patricia Cordeiro, Mark Fellenz, Christian Rodriguez, Miranda Banks, Louis Epstein, Nix Goldowsky-Dill, Maggie Kaiser, Daniel Reis, Ranga Natasujan, Dion Mraz, Christine Mraz, Susan Bloom, Cassandra Baxter, Meridith Greene, Eben Cross, Rahela Zdunic, Stephan LoVerme, Erin Genett, Becky Ernes, Paula Pomianowski, John Collins, Tim Curtin, Ariyeh Weissman Bennett, Kate Penrose, Kate Sheehan | Cambridge, Winchester, Wayland, Medford, Somerville, Arlington, Boston, Belmont, West Boylston residents | Continuation of the list of names in support of the Friends of the Community Path comment letter. | X | X | X | X | |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|---|---|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
| Rachel Fichtenbaum, David Anderson, Elizabeth Hardy, Brian Cagney, Mark Jewell, John Jackson, Meghan Misset, Seth Heidkamp, Juni Chandalia, Sam Christy, Jeff Greenwald, Janie Katz-Christy, Kelly Richburg, Chris Richburg, Rob Canuso, Zackary Weissman Bennett, Dan Brun, John Sadoff, Andrea Broggi, Joseph Keane, Kristian Varnik, Alex and Ami Feldman, Ana Olgi, N. Kumar, Ian Boardman, Adelaide Smith, Mitch Stoltz, Kate Daniel, Elizabeth Fine | Somerville, Medford, Brookline, Cambridge, Westwood residents | Continuation of the list of names in support of the Friends of the Community Path comment letter. | X | X | X | X | |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|---|---|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
| Chad Laurent, Jardaena Laurent, Sasha Krushnic, Janet Wood-Spagnoli, Amy Mendoza, Mary Anna Gram, Patricia Hawkins, Enxhi Popa, Jean Monroe, Daniel G., Juan Jose C., Heather MacLean, Heidi Burke, C. Garrett Laws, Karen Edlund, David Bank, Stewart Jester, Peter Lee, Margaret W., Gianna Ericson, Dr. Keith Ericson, Michelle Vincow, James Hanley, Martin Jaspar, Michael Corso, Ember Cook, Naomi Stein, Kara S., Sarah Winaweer-Wetzel, Michael Schechter | Somerville, Medford, Belmont, Maynard, Cambridge, Boston, Waltham residents | Continuation of the list of names in support of the Friends of the Community Path comment letter. | X | X | X | X | |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|--|---|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
| Danielle Ulanet, Christopher Eschenbach, E. Wiest, Debra Lytle, Ilana Galil, Michael Edge, Kristen Irvin, Gregory Saia, Rachel Borgatti, Jennifer Gifford, Lee Stoiser, Anthony Smith-Grieco, Ulysses Lateiner, Allison Stochlic, Sally Chapman, Matthew Farrellee, Christopher Bova, Rebekah McAslin, Christina Epstein, Pallas Snider, John Bunzick, Carol Parker, Chris Hearse, Amanda Breneman, Matthew Banos, G. Schnitzler, Micah Sachs, Edward Gordon, Sarah Phillips | Somerville, Arlington, Medford, Cambridge, Boston residents | Continuation of the list of names in support of the Friends of the Community Path comment letter. | X | X | X | X | |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|--|---|---|----------|----------|----------|----------|--------------|
| James Scott Arnold, Holly Hatch, Geoff Sheinfeld, J. Rosenstock, Vita Waters, Gillian Carter, Ellin Reisner, Andrea Yakovakis, Zehra Cemile Marsan, Catherine Cabrera, Justin Haber, John Fuller, Joe Sherman, Alana Parkes, Louisa Bradberry, Beverly Hsu, Molly Swanson, Ben Gleason, Jane Gillooly, Cathy Thomason, Jack Cushman, Ryan Evans, J. Davey Duke, Kimmy Chan, Jesse Mott, C. Leonardi, Sharon Zimmerman, Alaine Thaler, Holly Parker, Ron Brunelle, Louisa Stephens | Somerville, Cambridge, Boston, Malden, Medford, Nashua, NH residents | Continuation of the list of names in support of the Friends of the Community Path comment letter. | X | X | X | X | |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|---|--|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
| Dan von Lossnitzes, Meg Rose, Charles Rose, Andy Joseph, Lucilia Valerio, Rain Robertson, Zoe Robertson, Megan Curtis, Mark Niedergang, Karen Molloy, Christopher Vaughan, Ted Bach, Kathryn Johnson, Victoria Thompson, Todd Easton, Brian Murphy, Lisa Oray, Joanne Pascar, Melanie Magnan, Kate Doiron, Laura Ma, Ryan Ma, Silvia Rimolo, D. Charbonneau, John Chamberlain, Jennifer Argiras, John Taylor, Cate LaRoche, P. Argires, Stephanie Bielagus, Ritu S., Chris Yang, Alexis Gates | Somerville, Cambridge, Newton, Belmont residents | Continuation of the list of names in support of the Friends of the Community Path comment letter. | X | X | X | X | |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|---|--|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
| Yvonne Yamanaka, James Zou, Niels LaWhite, Kyle Barrett, Matthias David Siebler, Meghan Bailey, Tiffany Knight, Evan Reynolds, Rui Zhong, Christine DiBusno, Catherine Boyson, Lisa G., Arah Schuur, Cynthia Y., Eric Krupka, Iyah Romm, Carmel Kozlov, Sylvia Thompson, Thomas Hobson, Leslie Caiola, Ellen Stoolmacher, Joanna Sebik, Kathleen Eldridge, Michelle Becker, Monica Luke, Diego Garcia, Carolyn Grantham, Maureen Strode, Harold Boll, Lakshmi Jayaraman, Zoe R., P. Gupte | Cambridge, Arlington, Somerville, Worcester, Lowell, Quincy, Medford residents | Continuation of the list of names in support of the Friends of the Community Path comment letter. | X | X | X | X | |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|---|--|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--------------|
| Amelia Ehrens, Elizabeth Bergman, Pauline Katz, Kara Morris, Kathryn Kinder, Charles Snow, Edward Below, Laura Roberts, Megan Murphy, Stuart Mendelson, Jennifer H., Glenn Patrick, Joel McKellar, Joshua Elvander, Elaine Strunk, James Barr, Galen Murton, Brian Brady, Graham Twibell, Daniel Snyder, Karen Gardner, Gabriella Cafalano, Michael Conte, Max Poulsson, Rebecca Moses, Barr Polsky, Jennifer Gutbezahl, Cindy Vojnovic, Zorangeli Ramos, Randall Winchester, Alissa Weiss, Eric Weiss, Carson Campe, Ana Barrett | Somerville, Cambridge, Boston, Hopkinton, NH residents | Continuation of the list of names in support of the Friends of the Community Path comment letter. | X | X | X | X | |
| Howard Muise and Jeffrey Maxtutis | Town of Arlington Transportation Advisory Committee | Concerned about the delay to the Green Line Extension. Arlington strongly supports extending the Green Line to Route 16 in Phase I. The Route 16 terminus will reduce vehicle miles traveled and have air quality, environmental, economic, and social benefits. Building the Community Path connector along with the Extension will provide Arlington residents a nonmotorized way of travel to Boston. The delay will result in additional costs. | X | X | | X | |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|-----------------------|----------------------------------|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| Elsie Woodward, Chair | Concord Board of Selectmen | Supports the Crosby's Corner Project as it will address long-standing safety concerns for Route 2 travelers. Also supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail Project which will improve traffic flow in Concord, promote alternatives to automobile transportation, and will support West Concord businesses. | | | | | Thank you for your support. The Crosby's Corner project is included in the list of recommended projects in Paths to a Sustainable Region in the 2012-2015 time band and the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail is included in the 2021-2025 time band. |
| Richard A. Dimino | A Better City, President and CEO | Commends the Needs Assessment. The Current Approach Investment Strategy selected by the MPO is not the most effective strategy for achieving the MPO's goals or addressing the issues identified in the Needs Assessment. The LRTP misses an opportunity to respond to the Needs Assessment in the near-term, and to consider a big-picture, long-term view that goes beyond the current highly-constrained funding environment. Strategy Three, New Mix of Projects and Programs, would have been more effective at addressing the needs. Identifies several policies that should receive emphasis in project selection. Identifies critical needs in the Central Area, including transit reliability; capacity constraints at Ruggles Station, the Green Line Central Subway, and the Orange Line at peak hours; gaps in the transit system that limit circumferential travel in several communities; poor connectivity between points served by the Green Line and the South Boston waterfront and Logan Airport; expansion to meet future transit demand; and the transit needs of environmental justice communities. Supports including Illustrative Projects. Among those suggested are the Urban Ring early action items, Silver Line Phase III, T under D, and design of the Red Line-Blue Line connection. These projects address many issues identified in environmental justice areas. Cautions against assuming all funds available for transit will need to be spent on state of good repair projects during the time horizon of the LRTP. Urges the MPO to spend some of the 42% of the MPO's discretionary funds that are unassigned in the LRTP on low-cost projects that directly address the MPO's goals and the identified needs, including the early action items for the Urban Ring. | | | | | <p>The MPO included the development of a regional Needs Assessment as part of Paths to a Sustainable Region. The Needs Assessment revealed a tremendous number of maintenance, safety, and capacity issues that needed to vie for scarce transportation funds available to address them. In discussing the projects to be funded in the LRTP, the MPO sought to fund projects across transportation modes in order to support a transportation system that expands travel options. The particular mix of projects that have been selected allow the MPO to continue prior commitments and to achieve a modal split among roadway, strategic transit, and bicycle and pedestrian projects. The MPO left 41 percent of its discretionary funds unassigned and available to fund lower-cost projects that do not have to be specifically listed in the LRTP. It is with this funding that lower-cost projects can be programmed in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and constructed in the future. The MPO will continue to apply its visions and policies (including livability, mobility, environment, and climate change) that promote sustainable, green transportation as it selects projects that will use the unassigned funds.</p> <p>The MPO also acknowledges the need for increased transit in the future; however, it also recognizes the significant backlog of maintenance and state-of-good-repair work for the existing transit system. The MPO chose to allocate all of the MBTA's future transit and capital funding to system infrastructure maintenance, accessibility improvements, and system enhancements, to ensure that the existing system can continue to function into the future and continue to serve its existing ridership. (continued on next page)</p> |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|----------------------------------|--|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| Richard A. Dimino (continued) | A Better City, President and CEO | A far greater proportion of the programmed funds should go towards transit expansion. Model results showing greater growth in transit trips than auto trips support the need to invest more funds in transit. The MPO needs to plan for additional resources that will be available in the future. | | | | | <p>The Commonwealth made the commitment to fund the State Implementation Plan transit expansion projects. The MPO felt that it was important to further extend the Green Line from Medford Hillside (College Avenue) to Route 16/Mystic Valley Parkway as a second phase of the Green Line Extension project, and “flexed” \$185 million of federal funding dedicated to highway projects to do so.</p> <p>The MPO chose not to include an Illustrative Projects chapter in this LRTP, listing projects that it would fund if new funding were to become available, because of the significant backlog of maintenance and state-of-good-repair work to be done on the highway and transit systems. The LRTP must be updated at least every four years. As new financial information becomes available, the MPO will update its list of recommended projects in future LRTPs.</p> |
| Robert W. Healy | City of Cambridge, City Manager | <p>Commends the Needs Assessment. States that there is a disconnect between the Needs Assessment and the where the MPO is directing resources through the LRTP.</p> <p>Disagrees with the MPO’s strategy of honoring previous commitments regardless of whether or not they address the most pressing needs.</p> <p>Projected demand for transit service resulting from MetroFuture requires investments to expand transit capacity. Red Line maintenance and bus crowding in Cambridge are not addressed by the projects in the LRTP. Urges the MPO to support the Green Line Extension. Supports continued planning for the Urban Ring, Phase II. Concerned that the LRTP does not go far enough to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.</p> | | | | | <p>The MPO included the development of a regional Needs Assessment as part of Paths to a Sustainable Region. The Needs Assessment revealed a tremendous number of maintenance, safety, and capacity issues that needed to vie for scarce transportation funds available to address them. In discussing the projects to be funded in the LRTP, the MPO sought to fund projects across transportation modes in order to support a transportation system that expands travel options. The particular mix of projects that have been selected allow the MPO to continue prior commitments and to achieve a modal split among roadway, strategic transit, and bicycle and pedestrian projects. The MPO left 41 percent of its discretionary funds unassigned and available to fund lower-cost projects that do not have to be specifically listed in the LRTP. It is with this funding that lower-cost projects can be programmed in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and constructed in the future. The MPO will continue to apply its visions and policies (including livability, mobility, environment, and climate change) that promote sustainable, green transportation as it selects projects that will use the unassigned funds.</p> <p>In discussing the projects to be funded in the LRTP, the MPO sought to fund projects across transportation modes in order to support a transportation system that expands travel options. The particular mix of projects that have been selected allow the MPO to advance a modal split among roadway, strategic transit, and bicycle and pedestrian projects. (continued on next page)</p> |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| Robert W. Healy (continued) | City of Cambridge, City Manager | | | | | | <p>The MPO chose to allocate all of the MBTA's future transit and capital funding to system infrastructure maintenance, accessibility improvements, and system enhancements because of the significant backlog of maintenance and state-of-good-repair work for the existing transit system. The purpose is to ensure that the system can function into the future and continue to serve existing ridership. The Commonwealth made the commitment to fund the State Implementation Plan transit expansion projects. In addition, the MPO felt that it was important to further extend the Green Line from Medford Hillside to Route 16/Mystic Valley Parkway as a second phase of the Green Line Extension project, and "flexed" \$185 million of funding dedicated to highway projects to do so.</p> <p>The 41 percent of its unassigned discretionary funds can also be used to fund the lower-cost projects that help to reduce CO2 emissions the future. The MPO will continue to apply its visions and policies (including livability, mobility, environment, and climate change) that promote sustainable, green transportation as it selects projects that will use the unassigned funds. The MPO contributes to reductions in greenhouse gas emissions through the TIP by funding projects and programs that reduce the need to drive and ease roadway congestion. It funds projects that support the use of alternative fuel sources. Many of its programs (funded through its Unified Planning Work Program) that promote livability in the region also help in reducing greenhouse gas emissions. These include livability workshops held in MPO communities, support for local pedestrian and bicycle planning to improve conditions for these modes in the region, and the community technical assistance program. A full list of the MPO's activities can be found in Chapter 5 of the LRTP.</p> <p>Working closely with MassDOT, the MPO will continue to report on its actions to comply with the GWSA and to help meet the greenhouse gas reduction targets. As part of this activity, the MPO will provide further public information on the topic and will advocate for steps needed to accomplish the MPO's and state's goals for greenhouse gas reductions. The MPO will continue to analyze projects for the reductions they bring about, conducting these analyses either at the regional level (using its regional model) or at the project level when it is preparing its TIP or conducting project-level studies (using its regional model or other methods).</p> |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|------------------|---|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| Paul F. Matthews | 495/MetroWest Partnership, Executive Director | <p>Growth in the 495/MetroWest region has led to several transportation challenges including traffic congestion, increased vehicle miles traveled, highway capacity constraints, gaps in public transit, and aging infrastructure. Disappointed by the inability to fund the I-495/I-290/Route 85 interchange project in Hudson and Marlborough. Urges the MPO to reevaluate the potential benefits of this project. It's the top interchange priority for the Partnership and the region's second worst transportation problem. Presents data supporting its inclusion in the LRTP and a favorable evaluation under the Environment and Climate Change, and Livability and Economic Benefit evaluation criteria. Appreciates the inclusion in the LRTP of the Assabet River Rail Trail, the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail, and the Route 135/126 Grade Separation. Emphasizes the importance of the 135/126 Grade Separation. It is a highly congested area and a top crash location. It will encourage redevelopment and revitalization of Framingham's downtown. Expansion of service on the Worcester/Framingham commuter rail line will make the problems worse. The Boston Region MPO should share in the funding of the I-495/Route 9 and I-495/I-90 interchange projects. Urges the Boston Region MPO to approach MassDOT and the Central Mass MPO to work on new and creative mechanisms for funding cross-jurisdictional projects. This is especially important because of current land use planning work for the MetroWest region. The movement of people and goods pays no attention to MPO boundaries. Commends the Needs Assessment, but asks why the I-495/I-290/Route 85, I-495/I-90, and I-495/Route 9 interchanges were not identified as bottlenecks. Also, the MetroWest/495 TMA is not listed in the existing conditions section. Alarmed that several projects in the MetroWest region were not identified as addressing a regional transportation need, although they appeared in the Universe of Projects.</p> | | | | | <p>As part of developing Paths to a Sustainable Region, the MPO was required to update project costs and revise the financial assumptions in the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). While the MPO worked to apportion its available funding in a way that produces the optimal benefit, many projects that would help to maintain the existing system or allow for future expansion or enhancement of the system could not be included in the fiscally constrained LRTP. In discussing the projects to be funded in the LRTP, the MPO sought to fund projects across transportation modes in order to support a transportation system that expands travel options. The particular mix of projects that have been selected allow the MPO to continue prior commitments and to achieve a modal split among roadway, strategic transit, and bicycle and pedestrian projects. The MPO did identify the I-495/I-290/Route 85 project as meeting a regional need, but due to financial constraints did not include it in the Recommended Plan. The MPO intends to continue working with state and federal partners to identify additional transportation funding in order to be prepared for the future. The project will remain in the Universe of Projects list and will be considered during the development of the next LRTP. The Assabet River Rail Trail is included in the 2016-2020 time band, Bruce Freeman Rail Trail is included in the 2021-2025 time band, and the Route 135/Route 126 Grade Separation is included in the 2026-2030 time band. The Metropolitan Area Planning Council, which is a member agency of the Boston Region MPO, is coordinating with the Central Massachusetts Regional Planning Council on issues along the I-495 corridor. The Boston Region MPO recently approved a work scope to support MassDOT in conducting a study to evaluate these I-495 interchanges. The Boston Region MPO will provide technical assistance and attend stakeholder meetings. The Central Massachusetts MPO has committed to funding the construction of these projects once the study and design are completed. The interchanges along I-495 were not identified as bottlenecks in the Needs Assessment because they did not meet the criteria under the speed index or volume to capacity methods over the three hour time periods used in the peak periods. The MetroWest/495 TMA was added to the existing conditions in the Needs Assessment. The Universe of Projects list includes all projects that have been identified to the MPO whether they meet a regional need or not, including projects that are identified through study or through the public comment process.</p> |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|-----------------------|---|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| Pamela Harting-Barrat | Town of Acton, Vice Chair, Board of Selectmen | Strongly support the Assabet River Rail Trail (AART) and Bruce Freeman Rail Trail (BFRT) projects. Urges the MPO to keep the AART in the 2016-20 time band of the LRTP and the BFRT in the 2021-25 time band. Design contracts for both trails are in place. | | | | | Thank you for your support. The Assabet River Rail Trail is included in the 2016-2020 time band and the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail is included in the 2021-2025 time band. |
| Peter John Marquez | Community Corridor Planning Group | Urges the Green Line Extension to be constructed without delay. States that a delay in the Green Line Extension threatens to disengage people from public participation and increase a collective sense of skepticism in a way that severely undermines public planning. The Green Line Extension corridor suffers from congestion and air pollution. The project will reduce vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions, improve access to jobs, spur economic development, and support small businesses. The delay will be costly. | X | | | | |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|---------------|---------------------|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| Jim Gallagher | Somerville resident | The LRTP seems to support sustainable transportation, but the projects selected represent the status quo. Less than 1% of funding is allocated to paths. Modeling shows negligible increases in transit, walking, and biking mode shares. Urges the MPO to reject the LRTP until it can be amended to allocate resources in a way more consistent with the stated priorities. Urges the MPO to renew its commitment to build the Green Line Extension by the end of 2014. There is no difference between the No-Build scenario and the Recommended Plan. The draft LRTP includes less funding for sustainable projects than the previous one. The MPO should commit to making all communities walkable and bikeable, which would cost less than the \$200 to \$500 million devoted to one large project. Supports building the Community Path Extension concurrently with the Green Line Extension. The LRTP should commit to developing a process to expedite walking and biking projects. The draft LRTP is not consistent with the region's land use plan, MetroFuture. States there are no projects in the LRTP not already under construction that will benefit environmental justice communities. Maintaining the existing system also has the unintended consequence of maintaining the harmful health and environmental impacts of the existing system. The full document is too long and the executive summary is too short. The LRTP should have less jargon. | X | | | X | The MPO included the development of a regional Needs Assessment as part of Paths to a Sustainable Region. The Needs Assessment revealed a tremendous number of maintenance, safety, and capacity issues that needed to vie for scarce transportation funds available to address them. In discussing the projects to be funded in the LRTP, the MPO sought to fund projects across transportation modes in order to support a transportation system that expands travel options. The particular mix of projects that have been selected allow the MPO to continue prior commitments and to achieve a modal split among roadway, strategic transit, and bicycle and pedestrian projects. The MPO left 41 percent of its discretionary funds unassigned and available to fund lower-cost projects that do not have to be specifically listed in the LRTP. It is with this funding that lower-cost projects can be programmed in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and constructed in the future. The MPO will continue to apply its visions and policies (including livability, mobility, environment, and climate change) that promote sustainable, green transportation as it selects projects that will use the unassigned funds. Many of its programs (funded through its Unified Planning Work Program) promote livability in the region and include bicycle and pedestrian projects. These include livability workshops held in MPO communities, support for local pedestrian and bicycle planning to improve conditions for these modes in the region, and the community technical assistance program. The MPO continues to work with environmental justice communities through its Transportation Equity Program. The LRTP includes the Green Line Extension project in Somerville and Medford and the Route 126/Route 135 Grade Separation project in Framingham that will benefit the environmental justice communities. The MPO also helps to administer the Coordinated Public Transit Human Services Transportation Program which provides funding to improve the mobility of the elderly, individuals with disabilities, and low-income individuals. |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|-------------|---|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| Tom Yardley | Medical Academic and Scientific Community Organization Inc. | <p>Recognizes the need to address maintenance issues, but the LRTP misses the opportunity to prioritize projects that would address gaps in service and could be advanced in better financial times. The Needs Assessment identifies transit needs, but the “Current Approach” Investment Strategy selected by the MPO fails to fully address them. Funding should be more balance between transit and highway. The modeling for the LRTP predicts a 30% increase in transit demand between now and 2035. Several transportation gaps affecting the Longwood Medical Area (LMA) are identified in the LRTP. The LMA will be adding 2.7 million square feet. It is adding 1,200 jobs per year. It is the second largest employment center outside of downtown Boston. The LMA depends on the transit system. When the LRTP is next updated, it must include long-term recommendations for the expansion of transit services. Supports including a list of Illustrative Projects in the LRTP in order to be prepared for better financial conditions in the future. The Urban Ring should be included as an Illustrative Project. Smaller or incremental components of the Urban Ring should be modeled and included in future amendments or updates to the LRTP.</p> | | | | | <p>The MPO included the development of a regional Needs Assessment as part of Paths to a Sustainable Region. The Needs Assessment revealed a tremendous number of maintenance, safety, and capacity issues that needed to vie for scarce transportation funds available to address them. In discussing the projects to be funded in the LRTP, the MPO sought to fund projects across transportation modes in order to support a transportation system that expands travel options. The particular mix of projects that have been selected allow the MPO to continue prior commitments and to achieve a modal split among roadway, strategic transit, and bicycle and pedestrian projects. The MPO left 41 percent of its discretionary funds unassigned and available to fund lower-cost projects that do not have to be specifically listed in the LRTP. It is with this funding that lower-cost projects can be programmed in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and constructed in the future. The MPO will continue to apply its visions and policies (including livability, mobility, environment, and climate change) that promote sustainable, green transportation as it selects projects that will use the unassigned funds.</p> <p>The MPO acknowledges the need for increased transit in the future; however, it also recognizes the significant backlog of maintenance and state-of-good-repair work for the existing transit system. The MPO chose to allocate all of the MBTA’s future transit and capital funding to system infrastructure maintenance, accessibility improvements, and system enhancements, to ensure that the existing system can continue to function into the future and continue to serve its existing ridership. The Commonwealth made the commitment to fund the State Implementation Plan transit expansion projects. The MPO felt that it was important to further extend the Green Line from Medford Hillside (College Avenue) to Route 16/Mystic Valley Parkway as a second phase of the Green Line Extension project, and “flexed” \$185 million of federal funding dedicated to highway projects to do so.</p> <p>The MPO recognizes that there are many mobility and capacity issues now and projected for the future. The MPO chose not to include an Illustrative Projects chapter in this LRTP, listing projects that it would fund if new funding were to become available, because there is a significant backlog of maintenance and state-of-good-repair work to be done on the highway and transit systems. The LRTP must be updated at least every four years. As new financial information becomes available, the MPO will update its list of recommended projects in future LRTPs.</p> |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|-----------------------|--|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| Mayor Michael McGlynn | City of Medford | States the Green Line Extension has air quality, transportation, and economic development benefits, and that air quality benefits should be of overriding concern. Concerned that the project has been underfunded and delayed as a result. Concerned that the project is not construction ready to compete for additional economic stimulus funds. Asks the MPO to revise the LRTP and TIP to allocate necessary funds to plan and design the project so it is shovel ready and to build the project in accordance with legal commitments. | X | X | | | |
| Tony Fields | North Suburban Planning Council, Chair | States that it appears contradictory that the MPO did not add any regionally-significant projects to the LRTP, but reserved 42 percent of the discretionary funds for less regionally-significant projects funded through the TIP. There is uncertainty in the early years of the LRTP as to which projects will move forward. The "Current Approach" Investment Strategy was modified at a meeting without sufficient deliberation and consideration of the impacts. The public process should be transparent. Transparency helps communities plan their investment in transportation projects for which they are seeking MPO funding. The Council supports the following projects: I-93/I-95 Interchange in Woburn; New Boston Street Bridge in Woburn; Montvale Avenue in Woburn; West Street in Reading; Tri-Community Bikeway in Woburn, Stoneham, and Winchester; Route 3 and 38 intersections in Woburn and Winchester. Asks that the projects in the North Suburban subregion not be pushed into later time bands. | | | | | <p>The MPO included the development of a regional Needs Assessment as part of Paths to a Sustainable Region. The Needs Assessment revealed a tremendous number of maintenance, safety, and capacity issues that needed to vie for scarce transportation funds available to address them. In discussing the projects to be funded in the LRTP, the MPO sought to fund projects across transportation modes in order to support a transportation system that expands travel options. The particular mix of projects that have been selected allow the MPO to continue prior commitments and to achieve a modal split among roadway, strategic transit, and bicycle and pedestrian projects. The MPO left 41 percent of its discretionary funds unassigned and available to fund lower-cost projects that do not have to be specifically listed in the LRTP. It is with this funding that lower-cost projects can be programmed in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and constructed in the future. The MPO will continue to apply its visions and policies (including livability, mobility, environment, and climate change) that promote sustainable, green transportation as it selects projects that will use the unassigned funds.</p> <p>The MPO has considered your time band request and has decided to keep its currently planned schedule for implementing these projects. The I-93/I-95 Interchange project in Woburn is in the 2026-2030 time band and the New Boston Street Bridge and Montvale Avenue projects are in the 2021-2025 time band in the LRTP.</p> |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|---------------------|--|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| Pasquale Ciamarella | Old Colony Planning Council, Executive Director | States that transportation improvements to the Route 3 south corridor are a regional priority. Supports expanding the highway to six lanes from Hingham to Route 44 in Plymouth. Asks the Boston Region MPO to consider identifying the importance of improvements to the Route 3 corridor in its LRTP. | | | | | <p>As part of developing Paths to a Sustainable Region, the MPO was required to update project costs and revise the financial assumptions in the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). While the MPO worked to apportion its available funding in a way that produces the optimal benefit, many projects that would help to maintain the existing system or allow for future expansion or enhancement of the system could not be included in the fiscally constrained LRTP. In discussing the projects to be funded in the LRTP, the MPO sought to fund projects across transportation modes in order to support a transportation system that expands travel options. The particular mix of projects that have been selected allow the MPO to continue prior commitments and to achieve a modal split among roadway, strategic transit, and bicycle and pedestrian projects.</p> <p>The MPO did identify the Route 3 South project as meeting a regional need, but due to financial constraints did not include it in the Recommended Plan. The MPO intends to continue working with state and federal partners to identify additional transportation funding in order to be prepared for the future. The project will remain in the Universe of Projects list and will be considered during the development of the next LRTP.</p> |
| John Kyper | Sierra Club, Massachusetts Chapter, Transportation Chair | Supports alternatives to private automobile use and broadening public transportation coverage to environmental justice areas. Concerned about the Green Line Extension delay. States that the needs of the inner city population are slighted in the rush to lure suburban commuters back to transit. States that repeated delays are intolerable and urges commencement of construction. Appalled by the MassDOT proposal to abandon the design of the Red Line-Blue Line Connector. This is a missing link in the transit system that would benefit users of the entire transit system. The Commonwealth has neglected expansion to the downtown core of the transit system. The MPO did not identify mitigation for the Green Line Extension delay. Regrets the delay of the Fairmount Line Improvement Project, but encouraged that construction is proceeding on elements other than the controversial Blue Hill Avenue station. | X | | | | <p>In discussing the projects to be funded in the LRTP, the MPO sought to fund projects across transportation modes in order to support a transportation system that expands travel options. The particular mix of projects that have been selected allow the MPO to continue prior commitments and to advance a modal split among roadway, strategic transit, and bicycle and pedestrian projects. The MPO acknowledges the need for increased transit in the future; however, it also recognizes the significant backlog of maintenance and state-of-good-repair work for the existing transit system. The MPO chose to allocate all of the MBTA's future transit and capital funding to system infrastructure maintenance, accessibility improvements, and system enhancements, to ensure that the existing system can continue to function into the future and continue to serve its existing ridership. The Commonwealth made the commitment to fund the State Implementation Plan transit expansion projects. The MPO felt that it was important to further extend the Green Line from Medford Hillside (College Avenue) to Route 16/Mystic Valley Parkway as a second phase of the Green Line Extension project, and "flexed" \$185 million of federal funding dedicated to highway projects to do so. (continued on next page)</p> |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|---|--|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| John Kyper (continued) | Sierra Club, Massachusetts Chapter, Transportation Chair | | X | | | | The design of the Red Line/Blue Line Connector is part of the Air Pollution Control Regulations of the Commonwealth's Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), codified in 310 CMR 7.36, Transit System Improvements. Because the design of the Red Line/Blue Line Connector is a legal commitment, the Boston Region MPO has included it in its Long-Range Transportation Plan and Air Quality Conformity Determination (LRTP). The MPO must include any new project costing over \$10 million that uses federal transportation funds, any project that adds capacity to the transportation system, and/or any project that is included as a Transportation Control Measure (a strategy to reduce emissions of air pollutants) as part of the State Implementation Plan (SIP) in its LRTP. MassDOT has petitioned the DEP to nullify the commitment to perform final design of the Red Line/Blue Line Connector, due to the unaffordability of the eventual construction of the project. MassDOT is initiating a process to amend the SIP to permanently and completely remove the obligation to perform final design of the Red Line/Blue Line Connector. The MPO is awaiting the results of MassDOT's proposal and potentially will revise its LRTP once that request has gone through the DEP's process. |
| Stephen V. Mackey | Somerville Chamber of Commerce, President and CEO | The Green Line Extension will bring economic development. The project will support development in Somerville's Green Line Extension development zone, which includes the Innerbelt, Brickbottom, Union Square, and Boynton Yards. The zone is ideally situated for transit-oriented development that would help the city be fiscally sustainable. The Green Line Extension will lead to these benefits and create short-term and long-term jobs. | X | | | | |
| Sen. Patricia Jehlen, Sen. Sal N. DiDomenico, Rep. Denise Provost, Rep. Timothy Toomey, Rep. Carl Sciortino, Rep. Sean Garballey | General Court of Massachusetts | State that the Green Line Extension is an extremely high priority for environmental, economic, and legal reasons. The delay will increase the cost of the project. Asks the MPO to reject the 2018-20 time frame for completion. The delay violates the requirement to prioritize projects that are necessary to comply with the Clean Air Act. Construction on the Green Line Extension should begin while land taking issues are resolved. A phased construction approach should be utilized. Mitigation projects for the delay should benefit the Green Line Extension corridor, such as the Route 16 terminus and the Community Path. | X | | | X | |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|--|---------------------------|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| Mimi Graney and Livingston Parsons III | Union Square Main Streets | Urges timely completion of the Green Line Extension. Concerned about the project's delay. The MPO should not accept the draft LRTP because it does not satisfy Transportation Conformity regulations. The Department of Environmental Protection has not granted approval to delay the Green Line Extension. The schedule shown in the LRTP does not conform to the State Implementation Plan. Deferring the Route 128 Add-a-Lane project would open up funding for the Green Line Extension. Additionally bonding authority is needed for the project as the state's 2008 Transportation Bond Bill does not authorize enough funding, even if New Starts funds are awarded to the project. Mitigation projects for the delay will be expensive. The postponement of the economic benefits of the project will also be costly to the Commonwealth. The lack of progress and delay is unacceptable. | X | X | | | |
| Mayor Jeannette McCarthy | City of Waltham | Requests that the MPO include in the LRTP a new interchange and system of frontage roads, including Green Street, between Routes 20, 117, and 128. States that this project would reduce congestion, improve air quality and circulation, remove traffic from the Stow Street neighborhood, provide access to a potential transit station, and encourage economic development. An early action could be to widen and improve Green Street to serve as a regional connector between Routes 20 and 117. | | | | | <p>As part of developing Paths to a Sustainable Region, the MPO was required to update project costs and revise the financial assumptions in the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). While the MPO worked to apportion its available funding in a way that produces the optimal benefit, many projects that would help to maintain the existing system or allow for future expansion or enhancement of the system could not be included in the fiscally constrained LRTP. In discussing the projects to be funded in the LRTP, the MPO sought to fund projects across transportation modes in order to support a transportation system that expands travel options. The particular mix of projects that have been selected allow the MPO to continue prior commitments and to achieve a modal split among roadway, strategic transit, and bicycle and pedestrian projects.</p> <p>The MPO intends to continue working with state and federal partners to identify additional transportation funding in order to be prepared for the future. The new interchange and system of frontage roads project will remain in the Universe of Projects list and will be considered during the development of the next LRTP.</p> |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| Mayor Scott Galvin | City of Woburn | The New Boston Street Bridge and Montvale Avenue projects were shifted into the next decade. Urges the MPO to reconsider this decision. The policy decision to leave 42 percent of discretionary funds unassigned in the LRTP has negatively affected these two projects. Woburn has invested funds in design of the projects and it's unacceptable to push them further into the future. This decision was made without sufficient deliberation and consideration of the impacts. The public process should be more transparent. The first years of the LRTP are less clear because projects were pushed into later years. Requests that the MPO move the two projects back into this decade. | | | | | The MPO has considered your request and has decided to keep its currently planned schedule for implementing these projects. The New Boston Street Bridge and Montvale Avenue projects are in the 2021-2025 time band in the LRTP. In discussing the projects to be funded in the LRTP, the MPO sought to fund projects across transportation modes in order to support a transportation system that expands travel options. The particular mix of projects that have been selected allow the MPO to continue its prior commitments and advance a modal split among roadway, strategic transit, and bicycle and pedestrian projects. The MPO chose to leave the higher proportion of 41 percent of its discretionary funds unassigned and available to fund lower-cost projects that do not have to be specifically listed in the LRTP because of the significant backlog of maintenance and state-of-good-repair work to be done on both the highway and transit systems. These projects will be chosen as part of the Transportation Improvement Program process. |
| Michelle Ciccolo | Town of Hudson | Thanks the Boston Region MPO for keeping the Assabet River Rail Trail in the draft LRTP. Urges the MPO to keep the project in the final LRTP in the earliest possible time band. States that the Trail is a valuable transportation route connecting many activity centers. Large investments have been made in local, state, and federal funds to design the trail and build other portions. 5.5 miles in Hudson and Marlborough have been built. The Town supports completion of the full 12-mile Trail. | | | | | Thank you for your support. The Assabet River Rail Trail is included in the 2016-2020 time band in the LRTP. |
| Ted Alexiades, Town Administrator | Town of Hingham | Asks the MPO to include the Derby Street Corridor Improvement Project and proposed improvements to Route 3A and the Hingham Rotary in the next version of the LRTP. The Derby Street project is the Town's top priority. It will support commercial and industrial development along Derby Street. The Town is moving forward with design for the project. The corridor has safety and capacity issues. The Route 3A and Hingham Rotary project will address hazards and support regional economic development. | | | | | As part of developing Paths to a Sustainable Region, the MPO was required to update project costs and revise the financial assumptions in the Long-Range Transportation Plan (LRTP). While the MPO worked to apportion its available funding in a way that produces the optimal benefit, many projects that would help to maintain the existing system or allow for future expansion or enhancement of the system could not be included in the fiscally constrained LRTP. In discussing the projects to be funded in the LRTP, the MPO sought to fund projects across transportation modes in order to support a transportation system that expands travel options. The particular mix of projects that have been selected allow the MPO to continue prior commitments and to achieve a modal split among roadway, strategic transit, and bicycle and pedestrian projects. |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|---|--|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| Ted Alexiades, Town Administrator (continued) | Town of Hingham | | | | | | The MPO intends to continue working with state and federal partners to identify additional transportation funding in order to be prepared for the future. The Derby Street Corridor Improvement project will remain in the Universe of Projects list and will be considered during the development of the next LRTP. |
| Laura Wiener and Schuyler Larrabee | Regional Transportation Advisory Council, Chair; and the Advisory Council's Plan Committee Chair | Commends the MPO for the Needs Assessment. Offers several policy recommendations to help the MPO make choices about difficult tradeoffs: maintenance should be the highest priority; for expansion favor rail, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian projects over highway projects; use statistical data and quantifiable performance measures to select projects; and the MPO should include a list of Illustrative Projects in the LRTP. Inclusion of Illustrative Projects allows the MPO to express a compelling vision of the future. Supports including the following as Illustrative Projects: the Urban Ring, the Blue Line Extension to Lynn, the North-South Rail Link, and electrification of the commuter rail system. Offered several other suggestions by mode. For transit, supports flexing highway funds to transit, urges the state to reverse the delay of the Green Line Extension, close transit gaps, and support high-speed rail. For freight, suggests the MPO include a chapter dedicated to the topic in the LRTP, describe the freight benefits and drawbacks of each project, and urges the MPO to support the Conley Terminal Bypass Road, Track 61 rehabilitation, improvements to the Framingham subdivision line of CSX, and the addition of a modern truck stop on I-495. For highways, the Advisory Council supports better management and operations and a regional HOV system. For bicycle and pedestrian planning, the Advisory Council supports a complete streets design policy where the MPO will only fund projects that serve all street users. The Advisory Council also urges the MPO to develop criteria for the evaluation of shared-use paths so that projects that will receive the most use, and do the most to remove automobiles from streets, will be prioritized. | | | | | In discussing the projects to be funded in the LRTP, the MPO sought to fund projects across transportation modes in order to support a transportation system that expands travel options. The particular mix of projects that have been selected allow the MPO to continue prior commitments and to advance a modal split among roadway, strategic transit, and bicycle and pedestrian projects. The MPO acknowledges the need for increased transit in the future; however, it also recognizes the significant backlog of maintenance and state-of-good-repair work for the existing transit system. The MPO chose to allocate all of the MBTA's future transit and capital funding to system infrastructure maintenance, accessibility improvements, and system enhancements, to ensure that the existing system can continue to function into the future and continue to serve its existing ridership. The Commonwealth made the commitment to fund the State Implementation Plan transit expansion projects. The MPO felt that it was important to further extend the Green Line from Medford Hillside (College Avenue) to Route 16/Mystic Valley Parkway as a second phase of the Green Line Extension project, and "flexed" \$185 million of federal funding dedicated to highway projects to do so. (continued on next page) |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|--|--|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| Laura Wiener and Schuyler Larrabee (continued) | Regional Transportation Advisory Council, Chair; and the Advisory Council's Plan Committee Chair | | | | | | <p>The MPO recognizes that there are a tremendous number of maintenance and capacity issues vying for scarce transportation funds. It also recognizes that there are many mobility and capacity issues now and projected for the future. The MPO chose not to include an Illustrative Projects chapter in this LRTP, listing projects that it would fund if new funding were to become available, because there is a significant backlog of maintenance and "state-of-good-repair work to be done on the highway and transit systems. The LRTP must be updated at least every four years. As new financial information becomes available, the MPO will update its list of recommended projects in future LRTPs. This LRTP does not include separate chapters on each mode but is designed to address the different vision topic areas and discusses each mode, including freight in each of the chapters. The Conley Terminal Bypass Road is included in the LRTP and the Track 61 rehabilitation, improvements to the Framingham line, additional truck stops, and a regional HOV system will remain part of the LRTP's Universe of projects and programs.</p> <p>The MPO has committed to develop performance measures as part of the next phase in the LRTP process. Examples of performance measures that will be examined are included at the end of Chapter 4 (Transportation System Operations and Management), Chapter 5 (Livability and Environment), and Chapter 6 (Transportation Equity).</p> |
| Jim Nigrelli | Sudbury Citizens for Responsible Land Stewardship | States that the construction of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail in Acton and Concord, with a bridge over Route 2 included, will cost about \$4.5 million per mile. Questions spending funds on non-essential amenities that will be used primarily for recreation. The LRTP should allocate funds to projects that improve air quality and reduce congestion. On-road bicycle facilities, which cost must less, should be considered in all road projects. | | | | | <p>In the context of the visions and policies set forth in the LRTP by the MPO, it was determined that bicycle and pedestrian projects are important. Several of the vision topics address this. Specifically, bicycle and pedestrian facilities are addressed under the livability (promote healthy transportation), mobility (improve access to transit; expand bicycle and pedestrian networks), environment (support nonmotorized modes; support greenhouse gas emission reductions), and climate change (increase transit/bicycle/pedestrian options) visions and policies.</p> <p>In discussing the projects to be funded in the LRTP, the MPO sought to fund projects across transportation modes in order to support a transportation system that expands travel options. The particular mix of projects that have been selected allow the MPO to continue prior commitments and to achieve a modal split among roadway, strategic transit, and bicycle and pedestrian projects. On-road bicycle facilities continue to be considered as part of the Transportation Improvement Program process.</p> |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|-------------------|--------------|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| Cathy Ann Buckley | Unidentified | <p>Concerned about climate change. Table 5-2 in the LRTP shows carbon dioxide emissions increasing if the projects in the LRTP are built, compared to a scenario in which they are not built. A business-as-usual approach will not work for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The use of single-occupant vehicles must be dramatically reduced. Urges the MPO to take a stand and fight against climate change. Requests the LRTP include simple tables in the finance chapter that describe how much total money comes to the state from the federal government, how much is collected at the state level, and where it is spent. The tables should also show how much is at the MPO's discretion. Historic information should also be included.</p> | | | | | <p>In discussing the projects to be funded in the LRTP, the MPO sought to fund projects across transportation modes in order to support a transportation system that expands travel options. The particular mix of projects that have been selected allow the MPO to advance a modal split among roadway, strategic transit, and bicycle and pedestrian projects. The MPO chose to allocate all of the MBTA's future transit and capital funding to system infrastructure maintenance, accessibility improvements, and system enhancements because of the significant backlog of maintenance and state-of-good-repair work for the existing transit system. The purpose is to ensure that the system can function into the future and continue to serve existing ridership. The Commonwealth made the commitment to fund the State Implementation Plan transit expansion projects. In addition, the MPO felt that it was important to further extend the Green Line from Medford Hillside to Route 16/ Mystic Valley Parkway as a second phase of the Green Line Extension project, and "flexed" \$185 million of funding dedicated to highway projects to do so.</p> <p>The MPO left 41 percent of its discretionary funds unassigned and available to fund lower-cost projects that do not have to be specifically listed in the LRTP. It is with this funding that lower-cost projects that can help to reduce CO2 emissions can be programmed in the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and constructed in the future. The MPO will continue to apply its visions and policies (including livability, mobility, environment, and climate change) that promote sustainable, green transportation as it selects projects that will use the unassigned funds. The MPO contributes to reductions in greenhouse gas emissions through the TIP by funding projects and programs that reduce the need to drive and ease roadway congestion. It funds projects that support the use of alternative fuel sources. Many of its programs (funded through its Unified Planning Work Program) that promote livability in the region also help in reducing greenhouse gas emissions. These include livability workshops held in MPO communities, support for local pedestrian and bicycle planning to improve conditions for these modes in the region, and the community technical assistance program. A full list of the MPO's activities can be found in Chapter 5 of the LRTP. (continued on next page)</p> |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|----------------------------------|--------------|---------------------|----------|----------|----------|----------|--|
| Cathy Ann Buckley (continued) | Unidentified | | | | | | <p>Working closely with MassDOT, the MPO will continue to report on its actions to comply with the GWSA and to help meet the greenhouse gas reduction targets. As part of this activity, the MPO will provide further public information on the topic and will advocate for steps needed to accomplish the MPO's and state's goals for greenhouse gas reductions. The MPO will continue to analyze projects for the reductions they bring about, conducting these analyses either at the regional level (using its regional model) or at the project level when it is preparing its TIP or conducting project-level studies (using its regional model or other methods).</p> <p>The MPO is limited to funding the components of the regional transportation system over which the MPO has programming and geographic jurisdiction. The LRTP includes only funding of federal transportation money for the Statewide Road and Bridge Program, the Central Artery/Tunnel project, the Accelerated Bridge Program, and the public transportation system. The only state funding included in the LRTP is the Commonwealth's portion of the funding of projects that cost over \$10 million and its funding of State Implementation Plan projects. Chapter 7 of the LRTP shows the federal funds that are available to the MPO to program at its discretion. The MPO is looking into the use of Chapter 90 funds as part of its Pavement Management Study that is currently underway. Historic information on transportation spending can be found in other statewide documents, including the Statewide Capital Investment Plan.</p> |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|---------------|--|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| Tom Michelman | Friends of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail, President | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail in the LRTP for the 2021-25 time band. Phase I in Chelmsford and Westford has been very successful. Phase 2, which will bring the Trail through Westford, Carlisle, Acton, Concord, and Sudbury will improve access to commuter rail and bus services, decrease congestion and offer alternatives to driving, provide safe access to schools, and increase economic vitality. It is important to include the Trail in the 2021-25 time band because it must be planned for construction in the next 10 years in order to access federal design funds, a kick-off meeting for final design of Phases 2A and 2C was held on September 14, and the Trail will reduce the cost of travel for users; it will contribute to a network of paths; large increases in bicycle and pedestrian use should be expected because of a better network, higher gas prices, more congestion, and investments such as the Boston Bike Share; it will encourage exercise; and voters love community paths. | | | | | The Bruce Freeman Rail Trail project is included in the list of recommended projects in Paths to a Sustainable Region in the 2021-2025 time band. |
| Tom Bailey | Concord resident | Supports Phase II of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail in the 2021-25 time slot of the LRTP. | | | | | The Bruce Freeman Rail Trail project is included in the list of recommended projects in Paths to a Sustainable Region in the 2021-2025 time band. |
| Matt Straayer | Acton resident | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. The Trail offers a safe place for commuters and families to ride. | | | | | The Bruce Freeman Rail Trail project is included in the list of recommended projects in Paths to a Sustainable Region in the 2021-2025 time band. |
| Judith Sprott | Concord resident | Opposed to the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. States that the Trail comes from nowhere and goes nowhere. It may lead to further damage to White Pond and other environmentally sensitive areas. Supports improving the existing street network for cyclists. There are dangerous street and rail crossings on the Trail. The Trail has not been accepted by Sudbury. | | | | | <p>"In the context of the visions and policies set forth in the LRTP by the MPO, it was determined that bicycle and pedestrian projects are important. Several of the vision topics address this. Specifically, bicycle and pedestrian facilities are addressed under the livability (promote healthy transportation), mobility (improve access to transit; expand bicycle and pedestrian networks), environment (support nonmotorized modes; support greenhouse gas emission reductions), and climate change (increase transit/bicycle/pedestrian options) visions and policies.</p> <p>In discussing the projects to be funded in the LRTP, the MPO sought to fund projects across transportation modes in order to support a transportation system that expands travel options. The particular mix of projects that have been selected allow the MPO to continue prior commitments and to achieve a modal split among roadway, strategic transit, and bicycle and pedestrian projects.</p> |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|---------------|------------------|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| Sally Elliott | Unidentified | Opposed to the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. It is cost prohibitive and funds are not available for maintenance. States that funds would be better spent to upgrade existing roads so bike riders can use them to commute. | | | | | <p>In the context of the visions and policies set forth in the LRTP by the MPO, it was determined that bicycle and pedestrian projects are important. Several of the vision topics address this. Specifically, bicycle and pedestrian facilities are addressed under the livability (promote healthy transportation), mobility (improve access to transit; expand bicycle and pedestrian networks), environment (support nonmotorized modes; support greenhouse gas emission reductions), and climate change (increase transit/bicycle/ pedestrian options) visions and policies.</p> <p>In discussing the projects to be funded in the LRTP, the MPO sought to fund projects across transportation modes in order to support a transportation system that expands travel options. The particular mix of projects that have been selected allow the MPO to continue prior commitments and to achieve a modal split among roadway, strategic transit, and bicycle and pedestrian projects.</p> |
| Dan Latham | Concord resident | Opposed to including the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail and the Assabet River Rail Trail in the LRTP. Does not think the proposed trails will reduce congestion. They are mostly for recreation. Asks the MPO to prioritize projects that have a transportation purpose. | | | | | <p>In the context of the visions and policies set forth in the LRTP by the MPO, it was determined that bicycle and pedestrian projects are important. Several of the vision topics address this. Specifically, bicycle and pedestrian facilities are addressed under the livability (promote healthy transportation), mobility (improve access to transit; expand bicycle and pedestrian networks), environment (support nonmotorized modes; support greenhouse gas emission reductions), and climate change (increase transit/bicycle/ pedestrian options) visions and policies.</p> <p>In discussing the projects to be funded in the LRTP, the MPO sought to fund projects across transportation modes in order to support a transportation system that expands travel options. The particular mix of projects that have been selected allow the MPO to continue prior commitments and to achieve a modal split among roadway, strategic transit, and bicycle and pedestrian projects."</p> |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|--------------|--------------|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| Kevin Smith | Unidentified | Questions why two bicycle trails are included in Table 8-3, which lists the major infrastructure and expansion highway projects included in the LRTP. Would rather see these funds spent on other bicycle access projects. | | | | | <p>In the context of the visions and policies set forth in the LRTP by the MPO, it was determined that bicycle and pedestrian projects are important. Several of the vision topics address this. Specifically, bicycle and pedestrian facilities are addressed under the livability (promote healthy transportation), mobility (improve access to transit; expand bicycle and pedestrian networks), environment (support nonmotorized modes; support greenhouse gas emission reductions), and climate change (increase transit/bicycle/ pedestrian options) visions and policies.</p> <p>In discussing the projects to be funded in the LRTP, the MPO sought to fund projects across transportation modes in order to support a transportation system that expands travel options. The particular mix of projects that have been selected allow the MPO to continue prior commitments and to achieve a modal split among roadway, strategic transit, and bicycle and pedestrian projects.</p> |
| Carole Wolfe | Unidentified | Questions air quality benefits and congestion mitigation resulting from suburban bike trails. The Acton and Concord sections of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail travel mostly through woods and wetlands. Questions how many people will use the Trail to access a transit station or other activity centers. States that there appears to be a lack of quantitative analyses demonstrating that trails are cost-effective as either transportation or recreation projects. | | | | | <p>In the context of the visions and policies set forth in the LRTP by the MPO, it was determined that bicycle and pedestrian projects are important. Several of the vision topics address this. Specifically, bicycle and pedestrian facilities are addressed under the livability (promote healthy transportation), mobility (improve access to transit; expand bicycle and pedestrian networks), environment (support nonmotorized modes; support greenhouse gas emission reductions), and climate change (increase transit/bicycle/ pedestrian options) visions and policies.</p> <p>In discussing the projects to be funded in the LRTP, the MPO sought to fund projects across transportation modes in order to support a transportation system that expands travel options. The particular mix of projects that have been selected allow the MPO to continue prior commitments and to achieve a modal split among roadway, strategic transit, and bicycle and pedestrian projects.</p> |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|-----------------|------------------|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| Donna DeAngelis | Concord resident | Opposed to including the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail in the LRTP. The MPO should prioritize projects that will get more people to use public transportation. The Trail will be primarily a recreational pathway. | | | | | <p>In the context of the visions and policies set forth in the LRTP by the MPO, it was determined that bicycle and pedestrian projects are important. Several of the vision topics address this. Specifically, bicycle and pedestrian facilities are addressed under the livability (promote healthy transportation), mobility (improve access to transit; expand bicycle and pedestrian networks), environment (support nonmotorized modes; support greenhouse gas emission reductions), and climate change (increase transit/bicycle/ pedestrian options) visions and policies.</p> <p>In discussing the projects to be funded in the LRTP, the MPO sought to fund projects across transportation modes in order to support a transportation system that expands travel options. The particular mix of projects that have been selected allow the MPO to continue prior commitments and to achieve a modal split among roadway, strategic transit, and bicycle and pedestrian projects.</p> |
| Marianne Maurer | Unidentified | Opposed to the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. The overgrown right of way is home to wildlife that will be disturbed if the Trail is built. Construction will remove many trees, which is bad for the environment. | | | | | <p>In the context of the visions and policies set forth in the LRTP by the MPO, it was determined that bicycle and pedestrian projects are important. Several of the vision topics address this. Specifically, bicycle and pedestrian facilities are addressed under the livability (promote healthy transportation), mobility (improve access to transit; expand bicycle and pedestrian networks), environment (support nonmotorized modes; support greenhouse gas emission reductions), and climate change (increase transit/bicycle/ pedestrian options) visions and policies.</p> <p>In discussing the projects to be funded in the LRTP, the MPO sought to fund projects across transportation modes in order to support a transportation system that expands travel options. The particular mix of projects that have been selected allow the MPO to continue prior commitments and to achieve a modal split among roadway, strategic transit, and bicycle and pedestrian projects. This project will go through the environmental and design phases to ensure the environment is not harmed.</p> |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|------------------|------------------|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| Daniel De Pompei | Sudbury resident | Supports bicycle transportation, but does not support the design or construction of shared-use paths that do not reduce automotive traffic. Does not support paths that go through environmentally-sensitive areas. Does not support the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail because it will not mitigate traffic congestion and will affect environmentally-sensitive areas. | | | | | <p>In the context of the visions and policies set forth in the LRTP by the MPO, it was determined that bicycle and pedestrian projects are important. Several of the vision topics address this. Specifically, bicycle and pedestrian facilities are addressed under the livability (promote healthy transportation), mobility (improve access to transit; expand bicycle and pedestrian networks), environment (support nonmotorized modes; support greenhouse gas emission reductions), and climate change (increase transit/bicycle/ pedestrian options) visions and policies.</p> <p>In discussing the projects to be funded in the LRTP, the MPO sought to fund projects across transportation modes in order to support a transportation system that expands travel options. The particular mix of projects that have been selected allow the MPO to continue prior commitments and to achieve a modal split among roadway, strategic transit, and bicycle and pedestrian projects. On-road bicycle facilities continue to be considered as part of the Transportation Improvement Program process.</p> |
| Tammy Quirk | Sudbury resident | Opposed to construction of the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail and Assabet River Rail Trail. The Trails are not cost effective. They will not be well maintained. The Trails will be used largely for recreation. | | | | | <p>In the context of the visions and policies set forth in the LRTP by the MPO, it was determined that bicycle and pedestrian projects are important. Several of the vision topics address this. Specifically, bicycle and pedestrian facilities are addressed under the livability (promote healthy transportation), mobility (improve access to transit; expand bicycle and pedestrian networks), environment (support nonmotorized modes; support greenhouse gas emission reductions), and climate change (increase transit/bicycle/ pedestrian options) visions and policies.</p> <p>In discussing the projects to be funded in the LRTP, the MPO sought to fund projects across transportation modes in order to support a transportation system that expands travel options. The particular mix of projects that have been selected allow the MPO to continue prior commitments and to achieve a modal split among roadway, strategic transit, and bicycle and pedestrian projects.</p> |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|---------------|------------------|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| Candace Young | Concord resident | Opposed to the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. States that the Trail should be funded locally. The state should focus on making roads safe and accessible to all people. | | | | | <p>In the context of the visions and policies set forth in the L RTP by the MPO, it was determined that bicycle and pedestrian projects are important. Several of the vision topics address this. Specifically, bicycle and pedestrian facilities are addressed under the livability (promote healthy transportation), mobility (improve access to transit; expand bicycle and pedestrian networks), environment (support nonmotorized modes; support greenhouse gas emission reductions), and climate change (increase transit/bicycle/ pedestrian options) visions and policies.</p> <p>In discussing the projects to be funded in the L RTP, the MPO sought to fund projects across transportation modes in order to support a transportation system that expands travel options. The particular mix of projects that have been selected allow the MPO to continue prior commitments and to achieve a modal split among roadway, strategic transit, and bicycle and pedestrian projects.</p> |
| Lydia Rogers | Unidentified | Opposed to the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. Funds would be better spent on making it safer and easier to bike in congested areas and along streets. | | | | | <p>In the context of the visions and policies set forth in the L RTP by the MPO, it was determined that bicycle and pedestrian projects are important. Several of the vision topics address this. Specifically, bicycle and pedestrian facilities are addressed under the livability (promote healthy transportation), mobility (improve access to transit; expand bicycle and pedestrian networks), environment (support nonmotorized modes; support greenhouse gas emission reductions), and climate change (increase transit/bicycle/ pedestrian options) visions and policies.</p> <p>In discussing the projects to be funded in the L RTP, the MPO sought to fund projects across transportation modes in order to support a transportation system that expands travel options. The particular mix of projects that have been selected allow the MPO to continue prior commitments and to achieve a modal split among roadway, strategic transit, and bicycle and pedestrian projects.</p> |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|----------------|-------------------|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| The Dimauro's | Sudbury residents | Opposed to the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. It would pass through environmentally-sensitive areas. | | | | | <p>In the context of the visions and policies set forth in the LRTP by the MPO, it was determined that bicycle and pedestrian projects are important. Several of the vision topics address this. Specifically, bicycle and pedestrian facilities are addressed under the livability (promote healthy transportation), mobility (improve access to transit; expand bicycle and pedestrian networks), environment (support nonmotorized modes; support greenhouse gas emission reductions), and climate change (increase transit/bicycle/ pedestrian options) visions and policies.</p> <p>In discussing the projects to be funded in the LRTP, the MPO sought to fund projects across transportation modes in order to support a transportation system that expands travel options. The particular mix of projects that have been selected allow the MPO to continue prior commitments and to achieve a modal split among roadway, strategic transit, and bicycle and pedestrian projects. This project will go through the environmental and design phases to ensure the environment is not harmed.</p> |
| Gail Bucher | Concord resident | Opposed to the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. It is costly and will not reduce congestion or emissions. It is mainly recreational. Funds should be spent making it easier and safer to bike in congested areas and along streets. | | | | | <p>In the context of the visions and policies set forth in the LRTP by the MPO, it was determined that bicycle and pedestrian projects are important. Several of the vision topics address this. Specifically, bicycle and pedestrian facilities are addressed under the livability (promote healthy transportation), mobility (improve access to transit; expand bicycle and pedestrian networks), environment (support nonmotorized modes; support greenhouse gas emission reductions), and climate change (increase transit/bicycle/ pedestrian options) visions and policies.</p> <p>In discussing the projects to be funded in the LRTP, the MPO sought to fund projects across transportation modes in order to support a transportation system that expands travel options. The particular mix of projects that have been selected allow the MPO to continue prior commitments and to achieve a modal split among roadway, strategic transit, and bicycle and pedestrian projects.</p> |
| Emily and Dave | Unidentified | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. They support public health. | | | | | The Bruce Freeman Rail Trail project is included in the list of recommended projects in Paths to a Sustainable Region in the 2021-2025 time band. |
| Anne Anderson | Acton resident | Supports the Bruce Freeman Rail Trail. There is high demand for bicycle transportation, as Hubway has demonstrated. The Trail will make bicycling safer. It will connect activity centers. It will support fitness. | | | | | The Bruce Freeman Rail Trail project is included in the list of recommended projects in Paths to a Sustainable Region in the 2021-2025 time band. |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|--------------------|--------------|--|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| Frederick Salvucci | Unidentified | States that it is important for the Department of Environmental Protection to hold MassDOT to a high standard of mitigation for the delay to the State Implementation Plan commitments. It would be appropriate for MassDOT to purchase or lease diesel multiple units (DMUs) and initiate 10-minute service frequency on the Fairmount Line as a result of the slippage of the Fairmount Line improvements. To mitigate the delay of the Revere parking facility, the MassDOT should conduct a planning analysis of how to effectively use the newly increased capacity on the Blue Line. In the long-range, a connection between the Red and Blue lines and the extension of the Blue Line to Lynn should be considered. MassDOT should conduct a value engineering review of the current state of design for the Red Line-Blue Line Connector, prepare design-build documents, and include the project's construction in the design-build package for the Green Line Extension. Regarding the Green Line Extension, the first obligation of MassDOT should be to mitigate the delay. An early action item MassDOT should move forward with is the bridge connecting Inner Belt Road to North Point Boulevard, which could facilitate circumferential bus service. Air quality impacts should be measured by estimating vehicle hours of travel rather than vehicle miles traveled. This allows better consideration of congestion impacts. The emissions estimated in 1990 for 2010 should be compared to what actually transpired. Additional mitigation may be necessary. Suggests a Big Dig assessment on Massport to help pay for the SIP commitments as they were a major beneficiary of the Big Dig. Flexing of highway funds and creative finance should also be considered. The region has been stuck in a rut of planning and priority revision with little implementation. Planning is needed to develop the next generation of transit investment. | X | | | | <p>This comment has been forwarded to MassDOT to consider the comments that have been specifically addressed to MassDOT.</p> <p>The MPO acknowledges the need for increased transit in the future; however, it also recognizes the significant backlog of maintenance and state-of-good-repair work for the existing transit system. The MPO chose to allocate all of the MBTA's future transit and capital funding to system infrastructure maintenance, accessibility improvements, and system enhancements, to ensure that the existing system can continue to function into the future and continue to serve its existing ridership. The Commonwealth made the commitment to fund the State Implementation Plan transit expansion projects. The MPO felt that it was important to further extend the Green Line from Medford Hillside (College Avenue) to Route 16/Mystic Valley Parkway as a second phase of the Green Line Extension project, and "flexed" \$185 million of federal funding dedicated to highway projects to do so.</p> |

(CONT.)

TABLE A-2 (CONT.)

SUMMARY OF WRITTEN COMMENTS RECEIVED DURING THE OFFICIAL PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: AUGUST 15 - SEPTEMBER 13, 2011

| NAME | AFFILIATION | SUMMARY OF COMMENTS | GLX 1 | GLX 2 | GLX 3 | GLX 4 | MPO RESPONSE |
|----------------|--|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|---|
| Stephen Kaiser | Association of Cambridge Neighborhoods | Suggested several means for raising additional revenue for transportation. Among them were a tax on fiber-optic cables installed in railroad rights of way, a gas tax explicitly for paying off debt associated with the Big Dig project, the sale of 13 acres of state-owned land at NorthPoint, possible energy savings, and avoidance of a taking of the Walker Building in the Inner Belt Industrial Park. These could raise \$550 to \$850 million over the next 10 years. | | | | | Thank you for your suggestions for raising additional revenue. These will be considered in the future in the development of future Long-Range Transportation Plans and Transportation Improvement Programs. |
| Lynn Weissman | Friends of the Community Path, Co-President | Asked the MPO to support future funding for the Community Path as it will connect nearly 50 miles of existing paths. States that the LRTP and the TIP are non-conforming to the federal Transportation Conformity regulations. Urged federal and state entities to fully enforce the legal and environmental obligations of the Green Line Extension. Disappointed that delaying the Green Line Extension will also delay the Community Path connector and the potential to compete for TIGER grant funds. | X | | | X | |
| Wig Zamore | Somerville Transportation Equity Partnership | The certification documents are non-conforming to Transportation Conformity regulations. They also do not show interim replacement projects. The highways and diesel rail that run through Somerville represent more VMT per square mile than in any of the other 350 Massachusetts municipalities. The environmental and health impacts remain an extraordinary burden on the densest population and second densest immigrant population in the state. Shared findings of several studies on the impacts of air pollution on human health. | X | | | | |