Cape Cod Bridges Program

Bourne, Massachusetts

Appendix 6.2
Responses to Environmental Impact Statement Scoping Comments

SUBMITTED TO:
Federal Highway Administration
Massachusetts Division
220 Binney Street, 9th Floor
Cambridge, MA 02142

PROPONENT:
The Massachusetts Department of Transportation
Highway Division
10 Park Plaza
Boston, MA 02116

Submitted October 2025

massDOT
Massachusetts Department of Transportation

Table of Contents

Tables

Acronyms and Abbreviations

Acronym/Abbreviation	Definition
AAB	Architectural Access Board
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
APE	Area of Potential Effects
AQ	air quality
ASL	American Sign Language
BMP	best management practices
BRA	Bourne Recreation Authority
CARB	California Air Resources Board
CBO	Community Based Organization
CCBP	Cape Cod Bridge Program
COA	Class of Action
CZM	Coastal Zone Management
DEIS	Draft Environmental Impact Statement
DFG	MA Department of Fish and Game
DMF	MA Division of Marine Fisheries'
DOT	Department of Transportation
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
EV	Electric Vehicle
FAQ	Frequently Asked Question
FEIS	Final Environmental Impact Statement
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FNP	Federal Navigation Project
ICE	Intersection Control Evaluation

Acronym/Abbreviation	Definition
ISWM	Integrated Solid Waste Management
MassDOT	Massachusetts Department of Transportation
Mega Grant	National Infrastructure Project Assistance program
MPDG	Multimodal Discretionary Grant
MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization
MRER	Major Rehabilitation Evaluation Report
MUTCD	Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NOI	Notice of intent
NRLM	nonroad, locomotive, and marine
O&M	Operations and Maintenance
PPP	Public-Private Partnership
RFP	Request for Proposals
ROW	right-of-way
RSL	Relative sea level
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Officer
SL	sea level
SUP	shared-use path
ULSD	ultra-low sulfur diesel
US	United States
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USEPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
USCGUS	U.S. Coast Guard
USDOT	U.S. Department of Transportation

1 Introduction

This Responses to Environmental Impact Statement Scoping Comments Appendix has been prepared in support of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the Cape Cod Bridges Program (the Program), in accordance with the following federal statutes, regulations, and guidance:

- National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, 42 United States Code (USC) 4321 et seq.
- Efficient Environmental Reviews for Project Decisionmaking and One Federal Decision, 23 USC 139.
- Federal Highway Administration's (FHWA) regulations implementing NEPA, Environmental Impact and Related Procedures [23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 771], and corresponding guidance, Technical Advisory (T 6640.8A): Guidance for Preparing and Processing Environmental and Section 4(f) Documents (October 30, 1987).

2 Response to Environmental Impact Statement Scoping Comments

FHWA and MassDOT conducted the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) scoping period from February 29, 2024, through May 31, 2024, and received comments through June 7, 2024. To obtain agency comment on the scope of the DEIS, FHWA and MassDOT disseminated Program information to Cooperating Agencies, participated in a virtual meeting, and conducted follow-up meetings and additional coordination to review materials and solicit feedback. Following the March 29, 2024, Cooperating Agencies meeting discussion and further coordination, FHWA received scoping comment letters from two Cooperating Agencies:

- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), dated April 16, 2024.
- Massachusetts Department of Fish and Game (DFG), dated March 20, 2024

MassDOT also received a scoping comment letter from the Town of Bourne, dated May 30, 2024.

FHWA and MassDOT provided opportunities for public review and comment on the NOI through the following:

- A virtual public information meeting on April 25, 2024
- An Open House on May 13, 2024
- A comment period from February 29, 2024 (the publication of the NOI in the Federal Register) through May 31, 2024.

In total, 89 members of the public provided comments on the NOI through June 7, 2024, via the virtual public information meeting, Open House, Program website, and/or email correspondence to the FHWA and MassDOT. **Appendix 1, Attachment 3,** provides the **EIS Scoping Process Memorandum and Materials**.

Table 2-1 identifies the agencies, organizations, and individuals that provided comments on the NOI and the corresponding table(s) that reiterates the individual comments and provides a thematic response. Table 2-2. through Table 2-20 provide responses to these comments, which are separated according to common themes or the topic of the comment.

Table 2-1. Comments Received on the Notice of Intent

Agency	Commenter	Type	Table(s) Where Comments are Addressed
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)	Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	Letter	Table 2-2, Table 2-4 includes comments and responses related to adaptation issues and infrastructure resiliency. Table 2-4, Table 2-5, Table 2-6 includes comments and responses related to projects with the potential for indirect effects. Table 2-6, Table 2-11, Table 2-13 includes comments and responses related to the Program public involvement process. Table 2-14, Table 2-15, Table 2-19, Table 2-20
Massachusetts Department of Fish and Game (DFG)	Douglas H. Cameron, Director/Chief Engineer	Letter	Table 2-9 includes comments and responses related to proposed mitigation measures. Table 2-14, Table 2-20
Town of Bourne	Mary Jane Mastrangelo, Bourne Select Board Chair	Letter	Table 2-14, Table 2-16
Public	Abrams, Susan	Public Meeting	Table 2-3
Public	Akeley, Art	Public Meeting	Table 2-12 includes comments and responses related to existing and Program-generated noise.
Public	Alden, Pam	Public Meeting	Table 2-8 includes comments and responses related to the proposed infrastructure operations and maintenance.
Public	Alfano, Kathy Fox	Public Meeting	Table 2-5

Agency	Commenter	Type	Table(s) Where Comments are Addressed
Public	Amado, Amelia	Public Meeting	Table 2-15
Public	Barns, Jenette	Public Meeting	Table 2-7 includes comments and responses related to Program funding.
Public	Booth Jr., Joseph	Online Comment Form	Table 2-11
Public	Buckley, Stephen	Public Meeting	Table 2-11, Table 2-13 includes comments and responses related to the Program public involvement process.
Public	Cacho, Abel Gil	Public Meeting	Table 2-7 includes comments and responses related to Program funding.
Public	Campanini, Patricia	Online Comment Form	Table 2-13 includes comments and responses related to the Program public involvement process.
Public	Caulfield, M.	Online Comment Form	Table 2-5
Public	Donoghue, Jim	Online Comment Form	Table 2-13 includes comments and responses related to the Program public involvement process.
Public	Emerson, Donald	Public Meeting	Table 2-5
Public	Fizek, Robert	Public Meeting	Table 2-6 includes comments and responses related to projects with the potential for indirect effects.
Public	Goddard, Phil	Public Meeting	Table 2-3, Table 2-7 includes comments and responses related to Program funding.
Public	Hallgren, John	Online Comment Form	Table 2-3
Public	Heisler, Kenneth	Online Comment Form	Table 2-13 includes comments and responses related to the Program public involvement process.

Agency	Commenter	Type	Table(s) Where Comments are Addressed
Public	Herrmann, Conrad	Public Meeting, Online Comment Form	Table 2-3
Public	Hutton, Jeremy	Online Comment Form	Table 2-11
Public	Johnson, Richard	Online Comment Form	Table 2-10 includes comments and responses relative to proposed multi-modal accommodations.
Public	Kay, Steve	Public Meeting	Table 2-16
Public	Ketch, Kristofer	Online Comment Form	Table 2-16
Public	Kleindinst, Judy	Public Meeting	Table 2-16
Public	Kromer, Barry	Online Comment Form	Table 2-11
Public	Lambdin, Barb	Public Meeting	Table 2-16
Public	Lewko, Karen	Online Comment Form	Table 2-16
Public	Lyons, Jeanmarie	Online Comment Form	Table 2-15
Public	Marsh, Jane	Online Comment Form	Table 2-13 includes comments and responses related to the Program public involvement process.
Public	McLaughlin, Valerie	Online Comment Form	Table 2-5
Public	Notick, Samantha	Online Comment Form	Table 2-7 includes comments and responses related to Program funding.
Public	Palma, Joseph	Online Comment Form	Table 2-5
Public	Pavan, Michael	Online Comment Form	Table 2-10 includes comments and responses relative to proposed multi-modal accommodations. Table 2-10, Table 2-13 includes comments and responses related to the Program public involvement process.
Public	Pepe, Monica	Public Meeting	Table 2-19

Agency	Commenter	Type	Table(s) Where Comments are Addressed
Public	Philips, Melissa	Public Meeting	Table 2-3
Public	Pierce, Leslie	Public Meeting	Table 2-10 includes comments and responses relative to proposed multi-modal accommodations.
Public	Rainey-Slavick, Cole	Online Comment Form	Table 2-11
Public	Roy, Lucas	Public Meeting	Table 2-10 includes comments and responses relative to proposed multi-modal accommodations.
Public	Ryan, Sandra	Online Comment Form	Table 2-16
Public	Sparkes, Michael	Public Meeting	Table 2-16
Public	Sullivan, Kevin	Public Meeting	Table 2-3
Public	Tonello, Rachel	Public Meeting	Table 2-5
Public	Troyer, Doug	Public Meeting	Table 2-16
Public	Turner, Michael	Public Meeting	Table 2-3
Public	Vaughan, John	Online Comment Form	Table 2-16
Public	Wilson, Rob	Public Meeting	Table 2-3, Table 2-16
Public	York, John	Public Meeting, Email, Online Comment Form	Table 2-3, Table 2-10 includes comments and responses relative to proposed multi-modal accommodations. Table 2-10, Table 2-11, Table 2-13, Table 2-16, Table 2-17 includes comments and responses related to different scenarios of pedestrian and bicycle use and proposed accommodations.
Public	Young, David	Public Meeting	Table 2-16

Please note that Table 2-1 excludes 39 comments that were submitted without personal identifying information (such as comments provided by “Anonymous”).

2.1 Air Quality

Table 2-2. Air Quality Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comment	Response
USEPA: Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	EPA recommends the NEPA document discuss the direct, indirect, and cumulative air quality impacts from project construction, maintenance, and operations with respect to criteria air pollutants and air toxics, including diesel particulate matter emissions. Disclose current representative background air pollutant concentrations in the areas of the project and compare these concentrations to the state and federal ambient air quality standards.	The DEIS includes a comprehensive evaluation of air quality impacts from construction, maintenance, and operations, with a focus on criteria air pollutants and diesel particulate matter emissions. Current background air quality data is analyzed and compared against both state and federal ambient air quality standards. The DEIS provides detailed modeling results and discusses mitigation strategies to minimize air quality impacts. Please refer to **Section 4.13, Air Quality,** of the DEIS for the full assessment.

Commenter	Comment	Response
USEPA: Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	Disclose any other air quality regulations and requirements related to the project. For air pollutant emissions expected during construction, discuss the potential exposure of these pollutants to nearby sensitive populations, such as residences including communities with environmental justice concerns, park/recreational users, schools, daycares, senior centers/assisted living facilities, hospitals, and other healthcare facilities. EPA recommends including a discussion of measures to be taken to minimize air quality impacts on the local environment and to decrease exposure of construction related emissions to neighboring sensitive populations.	The DEIS identifies applicable air quality regulations, including state and federal requirements, and assesses the project's emissions against these standards. Sensitive populations, including those in schools, healthcare facilities, and recreational areas, are specifically addressed. The analysis evaluates potential exposure and outlines measures to mitigate construction-related air quality impacts, such as implementing dust control measures, using cleaner diesel technologies, and scheduling construction to reduce impacts on sensitive populations. In accordance with Executive Order 14173 and the U.S. Department of Justice February 5, 2025, memorandum, "Rescinding 'Environmental Justice" Memoranda," Environmental Justice is not a criterion for consideration for NEPA review. Detailed mitigation strategies and their anticipated effectiveness are described in **Section 4.13, Air Quality,** and **Section 4.09, Wetlands and Floodplains,** of the DEIS.

Commenter	Comment	Response
USEPA: Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	We offer the following measures for consideration to help reduce project impacts: 1. Ultra-Low Sulphur Diesel (ULSD) fuel should be used for all diesel engines throughout the construction site. Since 2014 EPA's diesel standards have required that all nonroad, locomotive, and marine (NRLM) diesel fuel be ULSD, and all NRLM engines and equipment must (rather than should) use this fuel (with some exceptions for older locomotive and marine engines). In addition, ULSD requirements applied to all on road diesel vehicles after 2010. 2. We note that all non-road construction equipment, including marine vessels, with a power rating of 50 hp or greater should meet Tier 4-Final emissions standards. We encourage the development of construction specifications that require the use of Tier 4 nonroad equipment, if available. 3. We note that Mass. General Laws, Chapter 90 Sec. 16A, sets maximum idling times for an owner or operator of a motor vehicle under certain conditions, with exemptions. Consistent with that regulation we recommend that to the extent practicable, idling of on road and nonroad vehicles and equipment should be minimized during project construction.	Thank you for the comment. MassDOT is committed to minimizing environmental impacts during construction. MassDOT Contract Specifications will require the contractor to enforce anti-idling measures consistent with Massachusetts General Law Chapter 90 Section 16A and to certify that all diesel-powered non-road construction equipment and vehicles rated 50 horsepower or greater will have engines that meet either the EPA particulate matter emission standards or emission control technology verified by the EPA or the California Air Resources Board (CARB); or emission control technology certified by manufacturers to meet or exceed emission reductions verified by EPA or CARB. Emission control devices, such as diesel oxidation catalysts or diesel particulate filters, will be installed on the exhaust system side of the diesel combustion engine equipment. Please refer to **Section 4.13, Air Quality,** of the DEIS for additional details regarding air quality.
USEPA: Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	We recommend that the EIS address how fugitive dust and vehicle fueling will be handled for the project.	Please refer to **Section 4.13, Air Quality,** of the DEIS for details regarding measures to control fugitive dust and address vehicle fueling during construction.

2.2 Bridge Design

Table 2-3 includes comments and responses related to bridge design and bridge aesthetics.

Table 2-3. Bridge Design and Bridge Aesthetics Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comment	Response
Abrams, Susan	Where will the new bridges be relative to the existing bridges?	The replacement bridges would be constructed adjacent to the existing bridges, slightly offset to allow for construction while minimizing disruption to current traffic flow. At the Bourne crossing, the new bridges would be just to the east of the existing bridge, and at the Sagamore crossing, the new bridges would be just to the west of the existing bridge. Please refer to **Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives,** of the DEIS for more details.
Goddard, Phil	The bridge design you showed is beautiful. You had a strange gap between the two bridges, and as a result you have barrier fences (4), if you look to the left, you will look through the flicker of three fences. Why can't the deltas be squeezed closer together, connect the two once they are put up, and eliminate the fences in the middle?	The gap between the replacement bridges is intentional to allow for inspection access and facilitate maintenance on both structures. The bridges are designed as two separate tied-arch spans for safety, constructability, and inspection purposes. The barriers and fencing are included to enhance safety for users, particularly for the shared-use path, and to prevent unauthorized access between the spans. The final designs and materials for these features are still being refined based on feedback and engineering considerations. Additional information is available in **Section 4.2, Transportation, Traffic, and Safety,** and **Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives,** of the DEIS.
Hallgren, John	The team said that the cables are consistent with the existing, but I disagree because they are diagonal.	The design incorporates diagonal cables for structural efficiency while maintaining visual elements of the arch type structure that reflect the character of the region. Efforts have been made to balance modern engineering standards with aesthetic considerations to ensure the new bridges reflect the iconic style of the current structures. More information can be found in **Section 4.15, Visual Resources,** of the DEIS.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Hallgren, John	Knowing that these bridges are designed more modern, I'm hearing that we are trying to make it similar. Looking at the side view, I do not understand why we could not have a double semicircle trust to have it more like the style we have now.	The double semicircle truss design was considered; however, current structural design standards require more modernized designs. These designs accommodate wider lanes, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and improved structural resiliency, redundancy and longevity, which are better suited to current and future needs. For more details, please refer to **Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives,** and **Section 4.15, Visual Resources,** of the DEIS.
Hallgren, John	Addendum to my written comment form from yesterday's meeting at Bourne Comm Ctr: To John Smith and others: The new hanging/mounted over roadway memorial plaque similar to existing ones with bridge name and dates of construction might possibly be made from composite or similar materials to reduce weight, but still have the look of current ones with raised lettering, doesn't need to be steel or metal like the existing ones. It's an important part of the unique look of these bridges and needs to be duplicated in new ones.	Thank you for your comment and suggestion. As the Program proceeds into more detailed structural and aesthetic design of the bridges in future phases, consideration will be given both to appropriate repurposing of existing bridge plaques, and location and materials of any new plaques. This topic will be discussed at future public meetings. Please note that the Section 106 review process, which evaluates historic elements and their preservation, will guide how the plaques and other historic artifacts are handled. **Section 4.16, Cultural Resources,** of the DEIS provides details about the Section 106 process and the proposed stipulations for the Programmatic Agreement among FHWA, the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), MassDOT, and consulting parties.
Hallgren, John	The old plaques can and should be mounted somewhere that they might be seen from vehicle on sides.	Thank you for your comment about the historic plaques. The Program plans to preserve and repurpose historic elements of the existing bridges. The Section 106 review process, which evaluates historic elements and their preservation, will guide how the plaques and other historic artifacts are handled. **Section 4.16, Cultural Resources,** of the DEIS provides details about the Section 106 process and the proposed stipulations for the Programmatic Agreement among FHWA, the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), MassDOT, and consulting parties.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Herrmann, Conrad	My great grandfather, Charles Spofford (a civil engineering professor at MIT) designed both bridges through his company Fay, Spofford, & Thorndike. There are plaques on both bridges acknowledging their contribution to the original building of these bridges. I'm wondering if there is a way that we can have those plaques saved for our family?	The Section 106 review process, which evaluates historic elements and their preservation, will guide how the plaques and other historic artifacts are handled. **Section 4.16, Cultural Resources,** of the DEIS provides details about the Section 106 process and the proposed stipulations for the Programmatic Agreement among FHWA, the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), MassDOT, and consulting parties.
Herrmann, Conrad	Hello, I am a descendant of Charles Spofford who was a civil engineering professor at MIT and wrote the textbook, Theory of Structures. His design firm - Fay, Spofford & Thorndike - was the firm that designed the Sagamore and Bourne bridges over the Cape Cod Canal. There are plaques on the bridge that I'm wondering if we could have as the bridges get torn down to be rebuilt. Thank you for your consideration on this matter. - Conrad B. Herrmann	
Nick	My question is about the McArthur side of the bridge – how far up McArthur Blvd will the touchdown of the new Bourne bridge fall?	The replacement Bourne Bridge will connect to McArthur Boulevard just south of the existing Bourne Rotary. The new alignment will reduce steep grades and improve traffic flow. The specific touchdown location is east of the current roadway, closer to Cape Cod Bay, to ensure minimal disruption during construction. Additional information is available in **Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives,** of the DEIS and will be refined in subsequent project phases.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Philips, Melissa	Have structural engineers determined at what wind speed would travel be restricted due to safety issues?	Yes, structural engineers have analyzed the impact of wind on the replacement bridges. The design accounts for high wind speeds, ensuring safety for pedestrians, vehicles, and cyclists. Wind tunnel testing and climatological analysis are being incorporated to refine these parameters. Restrictions, if needed, will depend on real-time conditions and will prioritize public safety. Please refer to **Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives,** and the supplemental **Appendix 3.1, Attachment 1, Cape Cod Bridges Program Alternatives Analysis Report,** for further details.
Sullivan, Kevin	Does the arch have tension tie or is there a more robust solution after what almost happened in Arkansas?	The replacement bridges are planned as twin tied-arch bridges, chosen for their robust structural design and ability to meet modern safety standards. Unlike welded steel tension ties, the replacement bridges would feature bolted components and a robust framing system under the deck to enhance durability and resilience. MassDOT is designing a redundant structure, meaning it can be possible to lose one member and still be able to support the bridge. For more details, please refer to **Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives,** of the DEIS.
Turner, Michael	Will teams be able to select the most efficient structure/bridge type using the Design Build?	The Design-Build procurement process allows teams to propose efficient construction methods while adhering to the specified tied-arch design for the replacement bridges. MassDOT will provide clear requirements in the Design-Build Request for Proposals (RFP), and contractors can propose cost-effective solutions within these parameters. This process ensures innovation while maintaining safety, durability, and design standards.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Wilson, Rob	Is 135 feet of vertical clearance what was approved by USACE? I thought it was raised due to climate change.	The 135-foot vertical clearance was maintained to ensure consistency with the existing navigational clearance and to accommodate fluctuations in relative sea level over the lifespan of the new bridges. The design includes three feet of additional freeboard to account for projected fluctuations in relative sea level. Final approval of this clearance is subject to the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and US Coast Guard permitting processes. For more details, refer to **Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives,** of the DEIS.
York, John	A slide showed the profile of the 2 bridges overlaid. The slide is not correct, it shows the two bridges at the same elevation and grade. It would be helpful for an overlay of the two brides at the heights they will exist so we can see the impact of the shallower grade and the length and height of the approaches as they pass through the interchange.	The replacement bridges would have improved grades to reduce steep inclines, facilitating smoother traffic flow and safer conditions for all users. Updated visuals and accurate profiles showing the height and grade impacts will be provided during future public information sessions and made available on the Program website. These adjustments are part of the ongoing design refinements aimed at meeting modern engineering standards and community needs. Further details can be found in **Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives,** of the DEIS.
Anonymous	Please design bridge structures like what already exists.	The replacement bridges are designed to reflect the iconic character of the existing structures while incorporating modern engineering standards and safety features. While the tied-arch design offers a visual connection to the current bridges, it also supports enhanced functionality, such as wider lanes and dedicated pedestrian and bicycle paths. This design balances preserving regional character with addressing current and future transportation needs. For more details, refer to **Section 4.15, Visual Resources,** of the DEIS

Commenter	Comment	Response
Anonymous	Our existing bridges are unique to the USA. They are Gothic looking which match our Gothic train station and people come from all over and comment how different and beautiful they are. I would like a similar design to the Gothic look for the supporting pillars. Do not remove the rotary. Traffic flows nicely without traffic lights.	The replacement bridges incorporate modern tied-arch designs that reflect the aesthetic character of the existing structures. The pier design is ongoing, and details will be shared at future public meetings. Additional enhancements, such as aesthetic lighting and structural finishes, will ensure the new bridges remain visually striking and regionally distinctive. Please refer to **Section 4.15, Visual Resources,** of the DEIS for additional details.
Anonymous	As discussed with John Smith: must have a memorial or similar plaque to existing over roadway with bridge name, and dates.	As the Program proceeds into more detailed structural and aesthetic design of the bridges in future phases, consideration will be given both to appropriate repurposing of existing bridge plaques, and location and materials of any new plaques. Bridge aesthetics is an important area of public interest that will be considered and publicly discussed as the design advances.
Anonymous	Can't wait! Looking forward to them being iconic structures, lighting, etc.	Bridge aesthetics and lighting are key considerations as the design develops. Please refer to the DEIS **Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives, Section 4.15, Visual Resources**, and **Section 4.16, Cultural Resources,** for further details.

2.3 Adaptation and Resiliency

Table 2-4 includes comments and responses related to adaptation issues and infrastructure resiliency.

Table 2-4. Adaptation and Resiliency Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comment	Response
USEPA: Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	EPA recommends the NEPA document apply the interim guidance [published by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) in January 2023] as appropriate, to ensure robust consideration of potential climate impacts, mitigation, and adaptation issues.	Executive Order 14154, "Unleashing American Energy," which was issued by President Trump in January 2025, directed the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) to rescind its NEPA implementing regulations, including consideration of cumulative effects in environmental reviews. Please refer to **Section 4.21, Adaptation and Resiliency,** of the DEIS for detailed information regarding extreme weather adaptation and resiliency, and which assesses the impacts of extreme weather.

2.4 Construction

Table 2-5 includes comments and responses related to construction sequencing, construction period impacts, and construction duration.

Table 2-5. Construction Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comment	Response
USEPA: Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	Describe potential construction period impacts, including the potential for traffic congestion and rerouting, and all associated air emissions and noise from changes to traffic and from construction activity. The analysis should describe and compare the impacts associated with different alternatives for construction phasing and staging.	The DEIS provides an analysis of potential construction impacts, including anticipated traffic rerouting, qualitative assessment of changes in air emissions and noise, and the mitigation strategies to minimize these effects. The Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) will include a quantitative assessment of construction impacts. **Appendix 3.2, Construction Approach Technical Report,** describes conceptual phasing approaches for the four Program quadrants. **Section 4.2, Transportation, Traffic, and Safety, Section 4.13, Air Quality,** and **Section 4.14, Noise and Vibration,** of the DEIS provide summaries of effects, with their accompanying technical reports providing details.

Commenter	Comment	Response
USEPA: Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	Provide a detailed discussion of any construction period impacts to the waters and natural resources of the Cape Cod Canal at both bridge locations as well as associated recreational uses of land and water resources. The discussion should include impacts associated with demolition and removal of the existing bridge.	The DEIS evaluates the potential effects of bridge demolition and removal on water resources, natural habitats, and recreational land use. Mitigation measures are identified to minimize and/or mitigate for adverse effects. These measures include compliance with state and federal environmental regulations. **Section 4.09, Wetlands and Floodplains, Section 4.10, Water Quality and Stormwater, Section 4.11, Threatened, Endangered, and Protected Species and Habitats,** and **Section 4.17, Public Parks, Recreational Facilities, and Open Space,** of the DEIS provide summaries of effects and mitigation measures. Accompanying technical reports for wetlands, water quality and stormwater, and threatened and endangered species provide additional details.
Alfano, Kathy Fox	The Bourne Bridge is in the worse shape of the two bridges. Could MassDOT consider building the Bourne bridge first and directing all trucks to go over the Sagamore Bridge until the Bourne Bridge is constructed?	The two existing bridges are in similar condition. Traffic studies indicated that it was preferrable to construct the Sagamore Bridge first. The project timeline and construction phasing are designed to minimize disruptions and maintain safe operations for all vehicles during the construction period. Additional details on the scheduling are available in **Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives,** of the DEIS.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Caulfield, M.	I know there's a lot still in the planning stage, but when would you expect construction to start, esp for the sagamore bridge?	MassDOT is advancing the design and permitting phases as efficiently as possible while adhering to federal and state requirements. Completing both bridges is a priority for the Cape Cod Bridges Program, and the team is committed to minimizing construction timelines while ensuring safety and quality. Construction activities for replacement Sagamore and Bourne Bridges is expected to occur over eight to ten years, respectively. Construction of replacement Sagamore Bridge will begin first, anticipated in fall 2027, followed by replacement Bourne Bridge once funding is secured. Potential schedule updates will be disclosed in the FEIS. For further details, refer to **Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives,** of the DEIS.
Emerson, Donald	Will existing capacity be maintained throughout the duration of the project? [He appreciates that the CCBP wants to maintain existing connections, noting that existing capacity is vital to maintain.]	Yes, one of the primary goals of the Cape Cod Bridges Program is to maintain existing traffic capacity throughout construction. Please also note that all existing roadway connections will be maintained throughout the duration of construction and two lanes of traffic over the canal will be maintained in each direction throughout the duration of construction. This approach ensures that the impacts to local and regional travel are minimized. Construction phasing and traffic management plans will be shared in detail as the project progresses. More information is available in **Section 4.2, Transportation, Traffic, and Safety,** of the DEIS.

Commenter	Comment	Response
McLaughlin, Valerie	Good afternoon, For business purposes, I'd like to find out when there will be bridge work done on the Bourne or Sagamore that will slow traffic down (Route 25 and Route 3) as I will need to adjust my hours of operation. Thank you, Valerie Gagne Lane Oral & Maxillofacial Surgery [PHONE NUMBER REDACTED].	To minimize the impacts of construction, MassDOT will ensure an active and responsive public outreach program during construction to coordinate construction activities and schedules, and will work with local communities to address concerns.
Palma, Joseph	Is mass dot hiring for the bridge project?	Information about career opportunities with MassDOT can be found on the MassDOT Careers page. We encourage you to check this page regularly for updates on open positions.
Tonello, Rachel	I understand that there will be year-round construction. Once construction starts, does MassDOT anticipate a 24/7 construction work schedule?	MassDOT anticipates that some night work will be necessary to minimize disruptions to traffic during peak hours. However, whether a 24/7 work schedule will be implemented is still under development and will depend on project needs and environmental considerations. Please also note that all existing roadway connections will be maintained throughout the duration of construction and two lanes of traffic over the canal will be maintained in each direction throughout the duration of construction. To minimize the impacts of construction, MassDOT will ensure an active and responsive public outreach program during construction to coordinate construction activities and schedules, and will work with local communities to address concerns.
Anonymous	System needs to move faster. Both bridges need to be completed.	MassDOT is advancing the design and permitting phases as efficiently as possible while adhering to federal and state requirements. Completing both bridges is a priority for the Cape Cod Bridges Program, and the team is committed to minimizing construction timelines while ensuring safety and quality.
Anonymous	Please get the replacement bridges built as soon as possible. The bridges are the life blood of the region the point of access for goods services people any significant disruption in one or both of the bridges would be an absolute disaster for the cape and islands.	

Commenter	Comment	Response
Anonymous	2054 For Bourne Bridge.	Construction activities for replacement Sagamore and Bourne Bridges is expected to occur over eight to ten years, respectively. Construction of replacement Sagamore Bridge will begin first, anticipated in fall 2027, followed by replacement Bourne Bridge once funding is secured. Potential schedule updates will be disclosed in the FEIS. For further details, refer to **Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives,** of the DEIS.
Anonymous	Outstanding design! Just would like to see bridge replacements get going. Present to bridges were completed in almost 2 years. I think we have been talking about replacement for almost 10 years. But thanks for your information. Good job!	
Anonymous	Concerns about access roads during construction.	

2.5 Indirect and Other Effects

Table 2-6 includes comments and responses related to projects with the potential for indirect effects.

Table 2-6. Indirect Impacts Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comment	Response
USEPA: Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	We recommend that the EIS identify and analyze impacts from current and reasonably foreseeable projects area (including utility relocation work described above) and activity near the FHWA/MassDOT project including whether the bridge and roadway improvements will change development rates or patterns in the region. We recommend that the analysis clearly identify how resources in the human, natural and built environment may be cumulatively impacted, the timeframe for the impacts and the geographic extent of impacts catalyzed by the proposed project. For all resources considered it would also be helpful if the analysis links the potential for cumulative impacts to the long-term health of the resource under consideration. If any adverse cumulative impacts are identified, the EIS should attempt to identify which parties will be responsible for avoiding, minimizing, and mitigating those impacts.	Executive Order 14154, "Unleashing American Energy," which was issued by President Trump in January 2025, directed the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) to rescind its NEPA implementing regulations, including consideration of cumulative effects in environmental reviews. The DEIS evaluates impacts from current and foreseeable projects, including utility relocation activities and adjacent development. The analysis identifies potential changes to development rates and patterns, as well as impacts to human, natural, and built environments. The DEIS also outlines mitigation measures to minimize adverse indirect effects. This detailed evaluation is included in **Section 4.22, Indirect Effects,** of the DEIS.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Buckley, Stephen	My concern was dismissed by the Army Corps, that wider bridges will encourage people to travel down to the Cape and will induce more traffic. It will be a regional impact and the EIS should address the significant impact on the human environment outside of the canal area.	As described in **Section 4.2.4.6, Induced Travel Demand,** of the DEIS, the Build Alternative would not result in induced demand as the improvements focus on geometric upgrades and separating local and regional traffic near the replacement bridges, with no significant changes in travel mode, route, trip length, or number of trips anticipated. Additionally, the Build Alternative is unlikely to cause secondary growth effects because of housing growth limitations and existing roadway capacity and traffic operation challenges. Existing traffic bottlenecks and minimal travel time improvements further reduce the likelihood of significantly enhancing access or increasing development opportunities. The DEIS addresses potential induced travel demand in **Section 4.22, Indirect Effects.**
Fizek, Robert	More lanes of traffic and higher design speeds mean greater volumes of traffic going into roadways on Cape. Where is the accounting and study of these impacts?	The DEIS addresses potential induced travel demand in **Section 4.22, Indirect Effects.** Since the bridges are the only vehicular crossings of the Cape Cod Canal, no new travel routes will emerge. Improved traffic operations, along with enhanced bicycle, pedestrian, and bus facilities, may encourage shifts to public transit or alternative modes for shorter trips, but these impacts are expected to be minimal as vehicular traffic will remain the primary mode of travel. While some seasonal travel demand may shift back to peak hours due to improved conditions, particularly during summer Saturdays, the overall number of daily trips is not anticipated to increase. Additionally, please note that no new through travel lanes will be provided on the bridges.

2.6 Funding

Table 2-7 includes comments and responses related to Program funding.

Table 2-7. Funding Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comment	Response
Barns, Jenette	Given the bridge collapse and commitment to rebuild in Baltimore with federal funding, is there any concern that the Baltimore Bridge could delay future funding of this bridge?	MassDOT has not received any indication from USDOT that funding commitments for other projects, such as the Baltimore Bridge, will impact funding for the Cape Cod Bridges Program. Both projects are considered priorities within their respective regions, and funding is allocated based on individual project merit and needs.
Cacho, Abel Gil	Is Public-Private Partnership (PPP) being considered due to the funding not being 100% secured for both bridges?	A Public-Private Partnership is not being considered for the Cape Cod Bridges Program. The funding strategy includes state bonds, federal grants, and other traditional public funding mechanisms. MassDOT and the USACE are coordinating closely to ensure funding is secured for the replacement of both bridges.
Goddard, Phil	Is the 700 million the state will bond focused on approaches and other work that the state was responsible for all along or will this be used for the bridge itself? The bridge needs to be fully funded by the federal government.	The $700 million state bond will support multiple aspects of the project, including design, utility relocations, and right-of-way acquisitions. While the bond contributes to the overall project, federal funding will cover a significant portion of the bridge construction itself. The allocation of these funds is being coordinated to ensure all components of the project are fully supported.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Notick, Samantha	Hi, My name is Samantha and I'm the Collections and Exhibits manage for the Cape Cod Maritime Museum in Hyannis. We have an exhibit going up in June of this year about the original dredging of the Cape Cod Canal, and the various bridges that have been built over it. The end of our exhibit will have (hopefully) the most recent info on the new bridge construction. I'm trying to understand how the funding for the new construction will break down, but I'm having some difficulty. I understand the sources are the Mass state budget, the federal budget, and a federal grant applied for by MassDOT and the US Army Corp of Engineers. Any clarification on this breakdown will be much appreciated	The Cape Cod Bridges Program is funded through a combination of federal and state resources, including USACE resources. Federal funding is expected to cover the majority of construction costs, secured through programs such as the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law. These funds support the replacement of the Bourne and Sagamore Bridges, which are critical components of the National Highway System. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts has committed $700 million through state bonds to fund design, utility relocations, right-of-way acquisitions, and other preparatory work. This funding ensures that necessary groundwork is completed to keep the project on schedule. The USACE, which owns and operates the existing bridges, is also a key funding partner. Their contributions will align with their responsibility for ensuring the safe and efficient operation of canal crossings.

2.7 Maintenance

Table 2-8 includes comments and responses related to the proposed infrastructure operations and maintenance.

Table 2-8. Maintenance Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comment	Response
Alden, Pam	Will maintenance of this bridge design be cheaper, shorter, and less frequent than the existing bridge type?	Yes, the new tied-arch bridge design is expected to require less frequent and shorter duration maintenance compared to the existing bridges. This is due to the use of modern materials and construction techniques, which enhance durability and reduce the need for extensive repairs. These improvements will result in lower long-term maintenance costs. For further details, refer to **Chapter 3, Proposed Actions and Alternatives,** of the DEIS.
Anonymous	Hope the state does not take over maintenance of the new bridges. State does not have a good track record for maintenance.	Thank you for your comment. The new Cape Cod bridges would be owned and maintained by MassDOT. The agency is committed to ensuring the long-term safety and reliability of these critical structures through its Asset Management Program, which prioritizes proactive maintenance and investment in infrastructure. MassDOT's bridge maintenance efforts are guided by a systematic approach that includes regular inspections, data-driven decision-making, and strategic investment to address both current and future needs. For the Cape Cod Bridges, designs are being developed with durability and ease of maintenance in mind, reducing the need for major repairs over their lifespan. The maintenance strategies and practices outlined in MassDOT's Asset Management Program will be applied to ensure the bridges meet the needs of Cape Cod residents and visitors for decades to come.
Anonymous	DOT to maintain these bridges really? Tolls?	Thank you for your comment. The new Cape Cod bridges would be owned and maintained by MassDOT. The agency is committed to ensuring the long-term safety and reliability of these critical structures through its Asset Management Program, which prioritizes proactive maintenance and investment in infrastructure. Please also note that tolls are currently not included in the Cape Cod Bridges Program.

2.8 Mitigation

Table 2-9 includes comments and responses related to proposed mitigation measures.

Table 2-9. Mitigation Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comment	Response
Massachusetts Department of Fish and Game (MA DFG): Douglas H. Cameron Director/Chief Engineer	The above policies could be met by incorporating handicapped accessible recreational public fishing pier structures extending seaward from the service road to the new bridge piers proposed to be located within the intertidal zone. An alternative would be to repurpose a portion of the existing bridge piers to support new fishing structures. This would eliminate the need to demolish and dispose of the in-water portion of the existing bridge piers. In either case, the inclusion of public recreational fishing piers as part of the bridge program would improve fishing access overall, it would greatly improve safe access for the young and for those with physical disabilities that cannot safely navigate the steep banks and slippery rocks along the canal's shoreline.	The Cape Cod Bridges Program is committed to enhancing recreational opportunities and accessibility. Please note that MassDOT considered the potential reuse of the existing bridge piers. However, to eliminate navigational conflict, the USACE has directed the removal of the existing bridge piers. At each new bridge crossing, MassDOT is proposing to create a walkway/fishing platform at the top of the delta pier footing, at the same elevation as and accessible from the Canal Service Road. **Section 4.15, Visual Resources,** provides a conceptual plan of a pier walkway/fishing platform.
Massachusetts Department of Fish and Game (MA DFG): Douglas H. Cameron Director/Chief Engineer	In addition, the Division of Marine Fisheries has a program that develops underwater reefs to provide fish habitat, which also promotes and improves recreational fishing opportunities. Suitable demolition materials generated from the removal of the existing bridge foundation should be considered for reuse of DMF's underwater reef program.	The Program appreciates your recommendation regarding the reuse of demolition materials for the Division of Marine Fisheries' (DMF) underwater reef program. MassDOT will consider recycling and reuse of concrete and other materials where possible. Updates on coordination with DMF and material reuse and recycling will be provided in the FEIS.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Anonymous	Leave the old bridge piers as ocean/fishing piers.	MassDOT considered the potential reuse of the existing bridge piers. However, to eliminate navigational conflict, the USACE has directed the removal of the existing bridge piers. At each new bridge crossing, MassDOT is proposing to create a walkway/fishing platform at the top of the delta pier footing, at the same elevation as and accessible from the Canal Service Road. **Section 4.15, Visual Resources**, provides a conceptual plan of a pier walkway/fishing platform. **Section 4.15, Visual Resources**, of the DEIS provides a conceptual plan of a pier walkway/fishing platform.
Anonymous	Please consider preserving one of the existing spans as a public park.	USACE owns the existing bridges. The USACE has indicated that keeping the bridges in service for future use would require an extensive rehabilitation as well as ongoing maintenance responsibilities and therefore the USACE supports the demolition of the existing bridges.

2.9 Multimodal Accommodations

Table 2-10 includes comments and responses relative to proposed multi-modal accommodations.

Table 2-10. Multimodal Accommodations Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comment	Response
Pavan, Michael	SAGAMORE NORTH: "Sagamore North" road connections plan seemed OK, except - Scenic Highway to Canal St Pedestrian/Bicycle path loops back and forth making it very long, an alternate Scenic Highway/Meetinghouse Ln pedestrian/bicycle path should be added in place of the removed Sagamore Bridge to Meetinghouse Ln exit ramp.	The Program recognizes the importance of direct and efficient pedestrian and bicycle pathways to encourage non-vehicular travel. Alternate path designs, including potential adjustments to reduce length and improve connectivity, are being evaluated in coordination with community feedback and engineering constraints. Additional information is available in **Section 4.3, Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities,** of the DEIS.
Pavan, Michael	It seems Pedestrian and Bicycle facilities were afterthoughts and not always well planned.	The Cape Cod Bridges Program prioritizes safe and efficient pedestrian and bicycle access as integral components of the bridge and approach road designs. Efforts are being made to ensure these facilities meet the needs of the community while aligning with broader mobility and accessibility goals. Details are available in **Section 4.3, Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities,** of the DEIS.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Pierce, Leslie	In your Bourne design, the intersection of the street to access my neighborhood, Nightingale Pond Rd, will become the intersection of the northbound ramp to Route 25. There are a lot of children and an elementary schools in my neighborhood. Children and adults cross that intersection to access the Canal walkway. It is the main access for residents. I am afraid when this intersection becomes part of the bridge/ highway system it will be hazardous and inaccessible to pedestrians, inaccessible for residents to enter and exit the Nightingale Pond neighborhood due to speed, congestion, increase noise, and air pollution	The Cape Cod Bridges Program recognizes the importance of addressing community concerns related to accessibility, safety, and traffic impacts. The recommended alternative (BN-14.4b) includes a Directional Interchange Option designed to enhance safety and traffic flow in this area. Key features include a new flyover ramp allowing vehicles from Scenic Highway to Route 25 to bypass Belmont Circle, reducing congestion and the need for additional traffic signals. A direct connect ramp from Route 25 eastbound to Scenic Highway provides efficient access for eastbound travel. To further address traffic and safety concerns, the design includes modifications to the southbound off-ramp to create an option lane, improving geometry and driver decision sight distances. MassDOT is also evaluating intersection control at Scenic Highway/Nightingale Road/Andy Oliva Drive through the Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) process to determine the best approach to facilitate safe pedestrian crossings and manage vehicular flow. The design prioritizes multimodal accommodations, including reducing Scenic Highway from four to three lanes to provide space for a 12-foot-wide shared-use path (SUP) on the south side of Scenic Highway, connecting to Belmont Circle, and a six-foot-wide sidewalk on the north side. These improvements, along with a grade-separated crossing for pedestrians and bicyclists at the flyover ramp, aim to enhance neighborhood connectivity and safety. Further details about traffic flow, pedestrian accommodations, and mitigation strategies can be found in **Section 4.2, Transportation, Traffic, and Safety**, of the DEIS.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Roy, Lucas	What does pedestrian/bike access from the canal look like?	The Build Alternative includes extensive shared-use paths (SUPs) to enhance multimodal connectivity. As shown by the yellow lines in the project graphics within **Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives,** of the DEIS, these SUPs will connect the replacement bridges to local roadways and the Cape Cod Canal Service Roads, ensuring safe and direct access for pedestrians and bicyclists. The design also incorporates connections to surrounding neighborhoods and key destinations, supporting seamless travel across and around the canal area. Further details can be found in **Section 4.3, Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities**, of the DEIS.
York, John	MacArthur Blvd – Route 28 – is a multi-user roadway with vehicles entering from both sides and numerous businesses. With new design speed and as I see on the plan, there will be seamless transition and opportunity for fast speeds. What are the speed calming measures that will be implemented and bike/ped accommodations with high-speed drivers accessing Bourne South?	The target speed for the Bourne crossing approach along Route 28 is 55 mph. The functional classification is Principal Arterial-Partial Access Highway. Speed calming along a Principal Arterial is challenging and the design team is currently evaluating options to introduce speed calming measures while maintaining safety to the traveling public. The program will not be introducing bicycle and pedestrian accommodations along Route 28 as there are regulatory posted signs (MA-R9-15) prohibiting pedestrians and bicycles. E-20-001 – Controlling Criteria and Design Justification exempts improvements to multimodal accommodations where pedestrians and bicyclists are not legally allowed.

Commenter	Comment	Response
York, John	I just noticed that Brian Cordeiro stated this meeting will be considered part of the scoping process. In that case I would like the program team to address the specific performance criteria that will be used to evaluate system performance for pedestrians and ADA community roadway users. Specifically, will pedestrian travel time from origin to destination be evaluated for all relevant pedestrian trips? Will impact of travel time on pedestrian usage/demand be evaluated?	While specific pedestrian travel times were not evaluated of the DEIS, the program adheres to FHWA Technical Advisory T 6640.8. This guidance ensures that anticipated use, potential impacts, and measures to avoid or reduce adverse effects on pedestrian facilities are considered. Relevant design policies and guidelines, such as the MassDOT Healthy Transportation Policy Directive (P-13-0001) and Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA)/Architectural Access Board (AAB) regulations per the Public Right-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines design standards, will guide the development of safe and accessible infrastructure.
York, John	Will the impact of travel distance on mobility device users, whose trip distance is limited by battery life, be considered as a performance parameter of pedestrian/mobility user facilities?	While this specific consideration is not addressed in the DEIS, future evaluations will consider the needs of mobility device users, guided by FHWA and MassDOT policies. These policies emphasize accessibility, safety, and equity for all facility users, including those with mobility limitations. The design will meet ADA/AAB regulations for accessibility including other power-driven mobility devices. Restrictions of device use will be evaluated per the ADA assessment criteria outlined to ensure safe and healthy facilities for all users. Your feedback is appreciated and will inform ongoing design refinements.

Commenter	Comment	Response
York, John	It seems likely that this project will require approval of Design Exceptions to allow it to proceed in its currently proposed form. Based upon the conceptual alternatives presented so far, the Design Exceptions would be primarily for failure to meet standards for pedestrian, bicycle and transit facilities, with few or no design exceptions required for motor vehicle lane geometry, on and off ramp lengths, or other motor-vehicle driven standards. MassDOT scoping procedures specify that anticipated Design Exceptions should be identified during the scoping process. The program team to date has not identified any anticipated Design Exceptions for this program, although the plans they have presented would clearly Based on the August 11, 2023, letter and MassDOT's Healthy Transportation Policy, one would expect the interchange alternatives advanced so far to include at least one shared-use path along each reconstructed or new roadway and pedestrian facilities of some sort on each side of each new or modified roadway. Less consistent application of MassDOT standards in one or more alternatives might be understandable as long as there were at least one alternative for each interchange depicting an interchange that meets the assurance made to Secretary Buttigieg as well as the standards specified by MassDOT's Healthy Transportation Policy.	FHWA has established certain controlling criteria under 23 CFR 625, which must be adhered to when designing a roadway project. MassDOT adopted this policy and applies the requirements of 23 CFR 625 to all projects regardless of funding source. In addition, MassDOT established controlling criteria for bicycle and pedestrian facilities, transit provisions and the length of off- and on-ramps, which must also be adhered to on all applicable projects. Engineering Directive E-20-001 provides additional guidance regarding the Design Justification Process, supplementing information provided in Chapter 2 of the Project Development and Design Guide. A Design Justification Workbook is submitted with the 25% design plans per MassDOT procedures. The Program is committed to safe and efficient bicycle access and will make multimodal improvements including a Shared Use Path at each crossing. Per MassDOT Design Justification Workbook guidance under bicycle facilities, a shared use path located on one side of the road meets the minimum controlling criteria of providing a facility that provides bi-directional travel.

Commenter	Comment	Response
York, John (continued from previous page)	No matter what the level of compliance among multiple preliminary alternatives, any final preferred build alternative developed by a Program receiving MPDG grant funds should meet assurances made to the Department providing those funds. Such a consistently compliant build alternative, if built would come closer than any of the currently considered alternatives to meeting stated program goals, and should be included among the multiple conceptual alternative currently being considered. However, none of the interchange alternatives currently proposed for this project make good on the assurance provided to Secretary Buttigieg and none comply consistently with Directive P-13-0001. Each of the build alternatives would require one or more Design Exceptions to advance to construction. The consultants who prepared these plans, and the project team who selected these alternatives for advancement are well aware that these alternatives do not meet Massachusetts Healthy Transportation standards and therefor will require Design Exceptions. MassDOT Engineering Directive E-21-002 Pre-25% Design Scoping Procedures requires identification of anticipated Design Exceptions early in the conceptual design process. However, presentations of the proposed alternatives to date have not indicated the Design Exceptions that would be required to advance these alternatives.	

Commenter	Comment	Response
York, John (continued from previous page)	Item 3.6 of Directive E-21-002 states that in preparing for the scoping meeting the Program manager should "Obtain input for cross-section(s) to accommodate all users, project limits and project scope;" and "identify utility constraints, preliminary environmental permitting requirements, and design exceptions." MassDOT Engineering Directive E-21-002, Pre-25% Design Scoping Procedure: https://www.mass.gov/doc/pre-25-design-scoping-procedure-e-21-002/download Promise to provide shared use paths throughout A letter from the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) addressed to US Secretary of Transportation Pete Buttigieg, dated August 16, 2023, signed by Massachusetts Secretary of Transportation Gina Fiandaca and Scott Acone for US Army Corps of Engineers District Engineer Colonel Justin R. Pabis, describing MassDOT Project 608020, Cape Cod Canal Area Transportation Improvement Program, also known as the Cape Cod Bridges Program, states: "Existing geometric deficiencies also influence poor traffic operations, congestion, and high crash rates, particularly during the peak summer season. Gaps and unsafe conditions exist in pedestrian and bicycle access across the Bridges and between the Cape Cod Canal service roads and local roadways in the area." and	

Commenter	Comment	Response
York, John (continued from previous page)	"The project will be built fully offset from the existing bridges so that traffic may be maintained on the existing bridge while the new bridge is being constructed. As a result, the project will also include the reconstruction of portions of the existing roadways on either side of the proposed canal crossing. The Project will include shared use paths throughout." This letter accompanied an application submitted to the US Department of Transportation (USDOT) by MassDOT and the FHWA for Federal funding under the Mega grant program, and was displayed on a slide presented at a Cape Cod Bridges Program Stakeholder Advisory Group meeting held September 26, 2023. Cape Cod Bridges Program Stakeholder Advisory Group Meeting, September 26, 2023, Presentation Slides are available via a link on the "Program Documents" page of the Cape Cod Bridges Program website. Stakeholder Advisory Group September 26, 2023, presentation slides: (Letter to Pete Buttigieg, August 16, 2023, is shown on slide 5) https://www.mass.gov/doc/cape-cod-bridges-program-advisory-group-presentation-92623/download The August 16, 2023, letter was sent just a few days before the Program Team submitted a grant application to the US Department of Transportation in response to a Multi-modal Discretionary Grant (MPDG) opportunity. As such, it would have been received in Washington as supporting information relating to the Cape Bridges August 23, 2023, MPDG grant request.	

Commenter	Comment	Response
York, John (continued from previous page)	The assurance, "with shared-paths throughout," made to Secretary Buttigieg would imply that all build alternatives will have shared-use paths alongside every multi-user roadway to be constructed or reconstructed as a part of this program. That would be an obvious outcome for a Massachusetts project. MassDOT Policy Directive P-0013-0001, The Healthy Transportation Policy, requires pedestrian facilities (side walk or shared-use path) on each side of each multi-user roadway and a shared-use path or paths serving every multi-user roadway constructed or reconstructed in any project.	
	The only public respondent during the public comment period for the June 2023 ENF was Robert Dwyer, president of the Pocasset Village Association, a Community Based Organization (CBO) located within Census Block Group 1, tract 139, one of Bourne's three recognized EJ populations. Mr. Dwyer's two pages of comments describe traffic problems on MacArthur Boulevard as significant to PVA members and other Pocasset residents, and requests that the Bridges Program include improvements for MacArthur Boulevard, specifically extending Frontage Road, a proposed road shown on Bourne South interchange plans, farther south along MacArthur Boulevard.	The Cape Cod Bridges Program is committed to addressing these concerns through the proposed Build Alternative, as detailed in **Section 4.2, Transportation, Traffic, and Safety,** of the DEIS. This plan replaces the Bourne Rotary with a grade-separated diamond interchange (Option BS-2), designed to improve traffic flow while enhancing safety and accessibility for all users. Specific to MacArthur Boulevard, the Build Alternative would include measures to mitigate traffic congestion and ensure safe access for pedestrians and cyclists. Shared-use paths (SUP) would provide dedicated connections between key areas, including Trowbridge Road, the Cape Cod Canal Service Road, and the Bourne Recreation Area. These improvements would offer safe routes for non-motorized users

Commenter	Comment	Response
York, John (continued from previous page)	Talking about people walking along MacArthur Boulevard is unpleasant. MassDOT has failed to mention, describe or consider pedestrians on MacArthur Boulevard in any document or plan related to the Cape Cod Bridges Program, or in any document related to MassDOT's recent curb, roadway and signage improvements at the Bourne Rotary (MassDOT Project 610542), just as Project 610542 ignored pedestrians crossing Trowbridge Road. Mass DOT's failure to provide a Trowbridge Road cross-walk in previous projects at the Bourne Rotary have already incapacitated one person. MassDOT granted itself the Project 610542 Design Exception two months after receiving Mr. Dwyer's MacArthur Boulevard comments, and three weeks after the incident which disabled the pedestrian Park and Ride commuter. MassDOT has since included a Trowbridge Road cross-walk in MassDOT Project 613604, a district wide program to improve safety and pedestrian access at selected transit facilities, but has not taken any steps to improve pedestrian safety on MacArthur Boulevard. MassDOT's primary justification for a Design Exception allowing Project 610542 to proceed without providing pedestrian or bicycle facilities was that Project 610542 is an interim project that will be replaced by the Bourne South interchange planned for the Cape Cod Canal Bridges Program. To validate that justification, MassDOT should include required pedestrian and bicycle facilities along MacArthur Boulevard in the scope of the Bridges Program, and if necessary should extend the Project 613678 area further south, just as MassDOT extended project 613604 to include crosswalk improvements at Trowbridge Road.	traveling along and across MacArthur Boulevard. MassDOT is also evaluating intersection controls at Trowbridge Road through the Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) process to determine the best approach to facilitate safe pedestrian crossings and manage vehicular flow. MassDOT is also addressing broader concerns about accessibility and equity. The Build Alternative prioritizes multimodal connectivity. By focusing on pedestrian and cyclist infrastructure in these critical areas, the project aims to enhance safety and mobility without compromising the needs of the surrounding community. In accordance with Executive Order 14173 and the U.S. Department of Justice February 5, 2025, memorandum, "Rescinding 'Environmental Justice" Memoranda," Environmental Justice is not a criterion for consideration for NEPA review.

Commenter	Comment	Response
York, John (continued from previous page)	Failure to provide accommodations for pedestrian and cyclists along MacArthur Boulevard would require a Design Exception similar to the design exception MassDOT granted itself for Project 610542. Granting such a Design Exception for the Bridges Program, a Design Exception which would have no remaining justification, would further disadvantage an Environmental Justice population already disadvantaged by MassDOT's previous decisions. The scope of the EIS for the Bridges Program and the EIS itself should directly address Mr. Dwyer's comments, and the use cases provided above in the present comments.	
	The scope of the Bridges Program and the Bridges Program itself should be scrutinized closely to be certain that this Program equitably addresses transportation and Environmental Justice issues not addressed by previous MassDOT projects in the Program area and equitably distributes the benefits of this 4.5 billion dollar project. Thank you for your attention to the needs and desires of all roadway users.	As described in **Section 4.3, Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities,** of the DEIS, the Build Alternative would expand and close gaps in the bicycle and ADA-accessible sidewalk networks, consistent with the goals of the Cape Cod Regional Transportation Plan. These infrastructure improvements would make walking and biking more convenient, comfortable, and safer options for short trips than driving, which are consistent with the goals of the MassDOT Statewide Pedestrian and Bicycle Transportation Plans. As outlined in the Program's Public Involvement Plan, the Program team has and will continue to prioritize equitable transportation issues. In accordance with Executive Order 14173 and the U.S. Department of Justice February 5, 2025, memorandum, "Rescinding 'Environmental Justice" Memoranda," Environmental Justice is not a criterion for consideration for NEPA review.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Anonymous	Need safe cross walk on South side of Sagamore Bridge to get from upper Adam St. to lower Adam St. Many people use Adam to get to the P.O & Canal.	The current Sagamore South Crossing: Westbound On-Ramp under Route 6 Option (SS-3.1A) of the DEIS includes sidewalks along Cranberry Highway where it intersects Adams Street. Proposed improvements along Adams Street are not currently included within the Program Scope.
Anonymous	Bicycle and pedestrian access both bridges.	The replacement bridges are designed with dedicated shared-use paths to accommodate pedestrians and cyclists, providing safer and more accessible travel options across the canal. These improvements are part of MassDOT's commitment to enhancing multimodal transportation in the region. Further details can be found in **Section 4.3, Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities,** of the DEIS.
Anonymous	Commuter lot on the Bourne bridge is badly needed.	While the Cape Cod Bridges Program focuses on replacing the Bourne and Sagamore Bridges and related roadway improvements, the development of commuter lots is not currently within the Program's defined scope. However, MassDOT recognizes the importance of multimodal transportation solutions and may consider opportunities for collaboration with local and regional planning initiatives to address parking and access needs. Further details can be found in **Section 4.2, Transportation, Traffic, and Safety,** of the DEIS.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Anonymous	A crossing light is needed for a person wanting to cross over cranberry highway from Adam Street. Many people walk to the post office on Sandwich Road or on their way to walk the canal.	MassDOT recognizes the importance of improving multimodal access and pedestrian safety in this area. Proposed improvements under the Build Alternative include shared-use paths (SUPs) and sidewalks along Cranberry Highway, Meetinghouse Lane, and nearby areas. These facilities are designed to enhance connectivity and improve safety for pedestrians traveling to local destinations, such as the post office or the canal. Additionally, the Program is conducting an Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) process to determine appropriate measures, including the potential for new traffic control devices or pedestrian crossings at key intersections. Your input will be considered as these design decisions progress. For further details, please refer to **Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives,** of the DEIS.

2.10 NEPA Process

Table 2-11 includes comments and responses related to the Program Purpose and Need, alternatives development, Program scope, EIS Scoping process, and EIS development.

Table 2-11. NEPA Process Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comments	Response
Purpose and Need		
USEPA: Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	EPA concurs with the purpose and need for the project and the overall focus on connectivity and mobility identified and studied to date.	USEPA's Concurrence with the Program Purpose and Need was noted as Cooperating Agencies Concurrence Point #1.
Booth Jr., Joseph	Cape wash a shore going on 10th year here. I think it may be a feasible study, given the fact that so many out of state tourists frequent the Cape, to the potential incorporation of a non year round residents pay by plate toll. Surely, daily commuter passes are absolutely a must have for the trucking industry/ economic job sakes. I have notice Rhode islands Implementation of such tolled bridges beyond the Massachusetts Braga Bridge. Dually noted, the money need be for funding and maintenance of said bridges. Just my 2cents. Pretty great idea honestly. People come here and absolutely trash the beaches with litter and beer cans . This has increased noticeably over the last 5 years. Particularly noticed it JUST after the first holiday weekend in the summer months. They want to throw riots and have gatherings in excess on the Cape like its one big beach party? Charge a cover fee at the door because they are only increasing in numbers as is the negligent and disrespectful behaviors from then incessant flow of out of towners who feel they own everything within their path while on their vacation. Enough is enough. We have already turned our two most decent cheeks . Its time to bend over and let em all Kiss the other two natural cheeks we were blessed with. Mussel the tourists because they are , disrespectfully a problem, yet love coming here to rage and trash the place. We have had boating deaths , adolescent teens ripped from the water for performing sexual intercourse in public, and yes, nearly constant trash to clean up well into the winters on our beaches. And all the while, little compton, rhode island residents are quoted in the paper why dont they just go to their state beaches instead its time to levy the over entitled and much too enthusiastic beach hounds.	We appreciate your insights and concerns regarding tourism, beach usage, and economic contributions in the Cape Cod region. While this program focuses on improving mobility and safety through the replacement of the Bourne and Sagamore Bridges, it does not include tolling or funding mechanisms related to beach or tourism management.

Commenter	Comments	Response
Booth Jr., Joseph	It is time to make them pay for the latent disrespect shown upon Cape Cod beaches. Enough is enough. If we cant have our beaches in the summer, at least leave them cleaner?(in more ways than one, needles, beer cans, typical holiday deserter beach chairs and coolers. Its the same cycle every year. Why not cash in? Im sure it would amount to far more than 2 cents	Comment noted
Johnson, Richard	Please add a significant commuter parking lot with EV charging stations and a commuter bus station to your plans for the Bourne Bridge: it is badly needed and must be integrated with the approach road proposals.	The inclusion of EV charging stations, and a commuter bus station are not currently part of the defined scope for the Cape Cod Bridges Program. For more information on the scope and focus of this program, please refer to **Chapter 2, Program Purpose and Need**, of the DEIS.

Commenter	Comments	Response
Rainey-Slavic, Cole	You could also rebuild the transit bridge so that it no longer has to raise for ship traffic and can support higher frequencies. These projects, unlike what you are actually doing would align with state climate goals and would actually reduce traffic by providing people with viable alternatives. You would probably still have money left over too. It is absolutely unacceptable to continue to widen highways while claiming to be reducing emissions.	This Program does not include work on the Cape Cod Canal Railroad Bridge. For more information on the scope and focus of this program, please refer to **Chapter 2, Program Purpose and Need,** of the DEIS. The Program does not include the addition of any through travel lanes nor does it add capacity to the approaching highways nor local roadways. The Program does include the addition of multimodal accommodations including a shared-use path at each crossing, as well as connections between the Cape Cod Canal service roads and the Bridges, helping increase accessibility for all users, and improving the level of cohesiveness between communities. For further information, refer to **Section 4.3, Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities,** of the DEIS.
Rainey-Slavick, Cole	With the money you are spending on this highway project you could instead upgrade the tracks on the Cape to enable service to Hyannis that doesn't only run on weekends in the summer and isn't abysmally slow once it reaches the cape.	While the current Cape Cod Bridges Program does not include plans for new rail infrastructure, we appreciate your input. For more information on the scope and focus of this program, please refer to **Chapter 2, Program Purpose and Need,** of the DEIS.
Anonymous	I like the idea of having a real line going down MacArthur Boulevard towards joint base Cape Cod.	

Commenter	Comments	Response
Alternatives		
USEPA: Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	The bridge and roadway approach alternatives are well conceived and establish a solid basis for the NEPA analysis of the project. At this point we cannot comment on a preferred alternative as information related to the performance of each alternative and the associated environmental impacts is yet to be developed. We support consideration of the alternatives presented during the March 29, 2024 interagency meeting in the EIS in combination with a discussion of other alternatives considered and dismissed from detailed analysis (along with the rationale for dismissal).	The DEIS includes a detailed analysis of the Preferred Alternative as well as the other alternatives considered during the planning process and explains the rationale for dismissing those not carried forward. These evaluations and further details are included in **Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives,** of the DEIS.
Buckley, Stephen	In all my years of NEPA experience, I have never heard of any federal agency being prohibited from doing an Environmental Impact Statement for an action that significantly affects the human environment. Please let me know where the specific federal regulations that are preventing the Army Corps from doing an EIS.	USC Title 33, Chapter II, Part 230 specifies USACE procedures for implementing NEPA, including those specific to Environmental Impact Statements. USACE is not prohibited from conducting an Environmental Impact Statement.

Commenter	Comments	Response
Hutton, Jeremy	Wouldn't it make more sense and save on costs of the project to run one bridge spanning 10 lanes across? Down the center so you can go along the power lines and utilize mostly state property and redirect traffic out to 25 and 28 and rt 6 and 3 without major impact to the local town traffic patterns?	MassDOT evaluated a Single New Bridge Alternative to replace both existing bridges with a centrally located mid-canal bridge. However, this alternative was determined to be unreasonable due to significant impacts to accessibility, residential and commercial areas, environmental resources, and the extensive redesign of transportation networks on both sides of the canal. Additionally, relying on a single crossing would pose risks to emergency evacuation and access if the bridge were unavailable for any reason. Based on these factors, including high costs and public safety concerns, MassDOT determined that the Single New Bridge Alternative does not meet the Program Purpose and Need and was not carried forward for further evaluation. For more details, please refer to **Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives,** of the DEIS.

Commenter	Comments	Response
Kromer, Barry	For the past 2 years, you have been given data showing that either building tunnels or more especially filling in the Cape Cod Canal, yet you are proceeding with this painfully long forced project to build 2 new bridges. You are wasting $4.5 BILLION. The canal can be filled in with 2 safe wide land roadways for $40 MILLION. After the disaster at Baltimore today, you should be ashamed of yourselves for not immediately stopping this farce and get off the bridge building scam. Whose brother in law owns a bridge building business??	In April 2020, the USACE completed an MRER for the Bourne and Sagamore Bridges. USACE evaluated the possibility of filling the Cape Cod Canal in the MRER, as well as building tunnels in addition to or as a replacement to the highway bridges. Both alternatives were dismissed. The MRER concluded that there is sufficient justification for pursuing a program of bridge replacement for both the Bourne and Sagamore Bridges. Additionally, both of the MRER's alternatives would have substantial environmental, economic, and navigational implications, which would conflict with the project's Purpose and Need. A summary of MassDOT's review of the MRER's alternatives is detailed in **Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives,** of the DEIS.

Commenter	Comments	Response
Rainey-Slavick, Cole	Hello, I tried to leave a comment on the Cape Cod Bridges Program site but the feed back form doesn't work. This project is terrible. It is not only doubling down on poor decisions of the past but actively making them worse. Widening highways does not relive congestion it only encourages more people to drive, worsening both congestion and pollution.	MassDOT is unaware of any issues regarding the online comment form. The bridges are currently nearly 90 years old, functionally obsolete, in deteriorating condition, and nearing the end of their usable lifespan. In April 2020, the USACE completed a Major Rehabilitation Evaluation Report (MRER) for the Bourne and Sagamore Bridges. The USACE prepares an MRER whenever infrastructure maintenance costs are expected to exceed $20 million and take more than two years of construction to complete. The purpose of the MRER was to determine whether major rehabilitation or replacement of either or both Bridges would provide the most reliable, fiscally responsible solution. The MRER concluded that there is sufficient justification for pursuing a program of bridge replacement for

Commenter	Comments	Response
Rainey-Slavick, Cole (continued from previous page)		both the Bourne and Sagamore Bridges. This Program does not include the addition of any through travel lanes nor does it add capacity to the approaching highways nor local roadways. The Program does include the addition of multimodal accommodations including a shared-use path at each crossing, as well as connections between the Cape Cod Canal service roads and the Bridges, helping increase accessibility for all users, and improving the level of cohesiveness between communities.

Commenter	Comments	Response
York, John	This case of a vehicle running out of gas is something that might occur on any highway or bridge. The inappropriate actions of both drivers as well as the state police trooper raise serious questions: What was the state trooper, or whoever called off the tow truck, thinking when they allowed and encouraged the pick-up truck driver to refuel the truck in a travel lane on the bridge roadway? This may be an outlier use case. However, it did occur, and is a reminder that roadway design should include fail-safe redundancy sufficient to handle moments of poor judgement. In this case of running out of fuel on the bridge, the 10 foot right side shoulder of the proposed bridge span roadway would have provided a safer location for the disabled truck while waiting for a tow truck, and the proposed separate spans for north and southbound traffic would have prevented the impaired northbound driver from entering the south travel lanes or shoulder. This is an example of how well the proposed build option provides for the needs of users at the top of the priority order.	The proposed bridge design includes a 10-foot-wide right shoulder, which is designed to provide a safe location for vehicles experiencing breakdowns, such as running out of fuel. This shoulder ensures that disabled vehicles do not obstruct travel lanes or pose a risk to other drivers. The design also includes wider travel lanes, auxiliary lanes, and left and right shoulders on both the northbound and southbound spans. These features not only improve traffic flow but also reduce delays and enhance response times for emergency services, such as police, fire, and medical personnel, by allowing vehicles to pull over and clear the way. The wider lanes and auxiliary lanes also reduce delays during future bridge inspections and maintenance activities conducted by MassDOT, ensuring efficient operations. These design features align with the program's priority of enhancing safety and accommodating a wide range of use cases, including unforeseen emergencies.

Commenter	Comments	Response
Anonymous	Have you considered filling the canal?	In April 2020, the USACE completed an MRER for the Bourne and Sagamore Bridges. USACE evaluated the possibility of filling the Cape Cod Canal in the MRER, however, this alternative was dismissed as it would require Congressional Legislation. The MRER concluded that there is sufficient justification for pursuing a program of bridge replacement for both the Bourne and Sagamore Bridges. Additionally, filling the canal would have substantial environmental, economic, and navigational implications, which would conflict with the project's Purpose and Need. A summary of MassDOT's review is detailed in **Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives,** of the DEIS.

Commenter	Comments	Response
EIS Scope Development		
USEPA: Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	We recommend that the EIS consider noise, traffic, and mobility as potential impact-producing factors that could adversely affect populations near the project area. The analysis should distinguish between construction period impacts and those associated with the operation of the roadways and bridges upon their completion.	The DEIS includes a comprehensive analysis of noise, traffic, and mobility impacts during both the construction and operational phases. For further details, please refer to **Section 4.2, Transportation, Traffic, and Safety, Section 4.3, Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities, Section 4.13, Air Quality,** and **Section 4.14, Noise and Vibration,** of the DEIS for applicable information.
EIS Scoping Process		
Buckley, Stephen	Regarding the scoping process ending on May 31. A concern I have is why the Federal Highway Administration thinks that the USACE MRER/EA made a mistake in its environmental assessment saying that there would not be significant impact from wider bridges. Is there a letter available? I would like to find out more about what they think was missed as far as conclusions made. The Class of Action (COA) letter from FHWA is not available on the Program website.	The NEPA Class of Action letter is included in **Appendix 1, National Environmental Policy Act and Program Preliminary Actions, Attachment 1** of the DEIS**.**
Buckley, Stephen	I am forwarding an email (below) from John York that provides more than sufficient information that the legally required "scoping" process described in the NOI was inadequately publicized. As such, the vast majority of people who will be significantly affected by the proposed project do not know that they should be raising their concerns to you by May 31, 2024 (today). If you ignore this shortcoming, it will result in project delays due to your dismissiveness regarding public engagement concerns.	Please note that these comments are addressed in the responses to John York.

Commenter	Comments	Response
York, John	Identification of Anticipated Required Permits and Authorizations: A letter from the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Massachusetts Division to Carrie Lavallee, MassDOT Chief Engineer, dated August 11, 2023, states: "Please note the following information is required to be included in the NOI to publicly disclose FHWA's intent to provide an EIS: "1) The purpose and need for the proposed action; "2) A preliminary description of the proposed action and the alternatives the environmental impact statement will consider; "3) A brief summary of expected impacts; "4) Anticipated permit and other authorizations; "5) A schedule for the decision making process; "6) A description of the public scoping process including any scoping meeting(s);" An image of the first page of this letter was included in a presentation slide during a Cape Cod Bridges Program update presented at a Cape Cod Municipal Planning Organization (Cape Cod MPO) meeting on September 18, 2023. NOI Item (d), Anticipated Permits and Authorization, on the second page of the NOI provides a list of Federal and State and local authorizations required for this program, but does not indicate that Federal or State Design Exception approvals will be required. Anticipated authorizations specified in requirement (4) of FHWA's August 11, 2023, letter, should include anticipated Design Exceptions requiring specific authorization and should be explicitly identified in the NOI. That would also be in keeping with MassDOT Engineering Directive E-21-002 Pre-25% Design Scoping Procedures which requires identification of anticipated Design Exceptions early in the conceptual design process.	In coordination with FHWA, MassDOT was directed to use an early and open process to determine the scope of issues for analysis in the Program's EIS. This included publishing a notice of intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS in the Federal Register. The EIS Scoping Process Memorandum is included as an attachment to **Appendix 1, National Environmental Policy Act and Program Preliminary Actions, Attachment 3.** The DEIS provides an updated list of permits required for the Program in **Chapter 7, Authorizations, Permits and Approvals,** of the DEIS.

Commenter	Comments	Response
York, John	Below is an email from Marlene McCollem, Town Administrator of the Town of Bourne which is the host community for the Bridges Program, dated May 30, 2024, indicating that to her knowledge neither she nor any Town staff that report to her have received notice of a scoping meeting for the Cape Cod Bridges Program nor of any extension of the public comment period for the Bridges Program EIS NOI. . . . . From: Marlene McCollem Date: May 30, 2024 at 11:00:48 AM EDT To: jyork@cataumet-arts.org Subject: RE: Scoping meeting for FHWA Notice of Intent (NOI) Hi John: Please see my responses, highlighted, below. Thank you, Marlene [Question] Have you or any Town of Bourne staff who report to you received notice that the April 25, 2024, Virtual Public Information Meeting and/or the May 13, 2024, Cape Bridges Open House would or will serve as scoping meetings for the Cape Cod Bridges Program and/or for the EIS or the EIS NOI for this Program? Have you or any Town staff who report to you been notified of any other scoping meeting for the Cape Cod Canal Bridges Program and/or for the EIS or the EIS NOI for this Program?	In coordination with FHWA, MassDOT was directed to use an early and open process to determine the scope of issues for analysis in the Program's EIS including, but not limited to, the following: Inviting the participation of potentially affected Federal, State, Tribal, local agencies and governments, and likely affected or interested persons (including those who might not be in accord with the action); Conducting a scoping meeting or meetings, publishing scoping information, or using other means to communicate with those persons or agencies who may be interested or affected, which the agency may integrate with any other early planning meeting; and Publishing a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS in the Federal Register. The FHWA and MassDOT provided opportunities for public review of the NOI through a virtual public meeting, an open house, and an extended comment period through May 31, 2024. Please refer to **Appendix 1, National**

Commenter	Comments	Response
		Environmental Policy Act and Program Preliminary Actions, Attachment 3, of the DEIS, which includes public outreach information.
York, John	[Response] No. To the best of my knowledge, neither the TA office, or any of the other town departments, received such notice. [Question] Have you or any Town of Bourne staff who report to you received any notice or notices announcing a public comment period for the above referenced NOI, other than the notice provided in the NOI itself? [Response] No. To the best of my knowledge, we have not received separate notice of the public comment period. [Question] Have you or any Town of Bourne staff who report to you received any notice or notices announcing a modification or modifications to the public comment period for the NOI specified in the NOI? [Response] No. To the of my knowledge, we have not received any notice of amendments . . . . Full text of email from Marlene McCollem, Town of Bourne Town Administrator, May 30, 2024 From: Marlene McCollem Date: May 30, 2024 at 11:00:48 AM EDT To: jyork@cataumet-arts.org Subject: RE: Scoping meeting for FHWA Notice of Intent (NOI)	As presented in **Section 6.3.3.4, Rounds of Public Outreach**, of the DEIS, MassDOT conducted a virtual public meeting on April 25, 2024. In total, 367 members of the public attended the meeting. In addition to providing an update on the Program's funding status, MassDOT provided a NEPA update and reviewed the NOI documents. MassDOT addressed 42 comments from 30 individuals during the meeting. MassDOT conducted an open house at the Bourne Veteran's Memorial Community Center on May 13, 2024, which was attended by 283 members of the public. In addition to providing comment boxes, MassDOT conducted an

Commenter	Comments	Response
York, John	Hi John: Please see my responses, highlighted, below. Thank you, Marlene From: jyork@cataumet-arts.org Sent: Tuesday, May 28, 2024 4:16 PM To: Marlene McCollem Subject: Scoping meeting for FHWA Notice of Intent (NOI) Marlene, On Friday, May 3, 2024, I sent you an email with questions concerning a supposed public Scoping meeting for the Cape Cod Canal Bridges program. It is now three and one half weeks later. I ask the question also to cover any receipt of such notice which may have come to your attention after May 6, 9:30 AM, the date and time of your response. In the Notice of Intent (NOI) to file an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Cape Cod Canal Bridges Program, submitted by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), published in the Federal Register on February 29, 2024, Docket FHWA-2024-0014, in the third paragraph under the heading "(f) Scoping and Review", on p. 14926 in the print version of the Federal Register, the FHWA states:	interactive survey with open house attendees regarding usage of the bridges, needs, priorities, and goals. Please refer **Appendix 1, National Environmental Policy Act and Program Preliminary Actions, Attachment 3,** which includes public outreach information. On February 11, 2025, FHWA determined that the scoping process has sufficiently met the requirements for public involvement and an extension of the scoping period is not necessary.

Commenter	Comments	Response
York, John	"The FHWA will hold at least one public Scoping meeting upon publication of this NOI as part of the Scoping process for the EIS. Advanced notice of the date, time and location of the public Scoping meeting will be provided to the public through the Program website, public notices and press releases." FHWA Notice of Intent (NOI) to file an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), Docket FHWA-2024-0014, published in Federal Register, February 29, 2024: online version: https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2024/02/29/2024-04160/notice-of-intent-to-prepare-an-environmental-impact-statement-for-the-cape-cod-bridges-program-in print version (digital facsimile image of printed Federal Register, 2/29/2024, pp. 14923-14926): https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/FR-2024-02-29/pdf/2024-04160.pdf Supplemental Notice of Intent, (Date?) (online version only): https://downloads.regulations.gov/FHWA-2024-0014-0002/attachment_1.pdf	

Commenter	Comments	Response
York, John	The language of my question does not specific the source of the notice, so would cover any notice of a Cape Cod Canal Bridges scoping meeting issued by any entity. I provide the above information from the NOI to alert you to include in your response any such notice received any such notice provided by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) or the FHWA Massachusetts Division in addition to any such notice provided by Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT), the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) or any other source including a relay of such notice from other stakeholders or any other source. The questions I am asking at the present time are: Have you or any Town of Bourne staff who report to you received notice that the April 25, 2024, Virtual Public Information Meeting and/or the May 13, 2024, Cape Bridges Open House would or will serve as scoping meetings for the Cape Cod Bridges Program and/or for the EIS or the EIS NOI for this Program? Have you or any Town staff who report to you been notified of any other scoping meeting for the Cape Cod Canal Bridges Program and/or for the EIS or the EIS NOI for this Program? No. To the best of my knowledge, neither the TA office, or any of the other town departments, received such notice.	
York, John	Also, I am adding two additional questions: Have you or any Town of Bourne staff who report to you received any notice or notices announcing a public comment period for the above referenced NOI, other than the notice provided in the NOI itself? No. To the best of my knowledge, we have not received separate notice of the public comment period. Have you or any Town of Bourne staff who report to you received any notice or notices announcing a modification or modifications to the public comment period for the NOI specified in the NOI? No. To the best of my knowledge, we have not received any notice of amendments. Thank you for any information you can provide. John York. . . .	

Commenter	Comments	Response
York, John	Scoping and Public Review: NOI Item (f), Scoping and Public Review, as published in the Federal Register, complies with requirement (6) of the FHWA August 11, 2023, letter. The third paragraph of item (f) states: "The FHWA will hold at least one public Scoping meeting upon publication of this NOI as part of the Scoping process for the EIS. Advanced notice of the date, time and location of the public Scoping meeting will be provided to the public through the Program website, public notices and press releases." It is not clear if the Program is currently complying with the scoping and review process described in item (f).	Please refer to **Appendix 1, National Environmental Policy Act and Program Preliminary Actions, Attachment 3,** of the DEIS, which includes public outreach information. On February 11, 2025, FHWA determined that the scoping process has sufficiently met the requirements for public involvement, and an extension of the scoping period is not necessary.
York, John	I follow the Cape Cod Bridges Program closely, I subscribe to the Program's email notice list and I read local newspapers. I have not received or read any notice of a scoping meeting for the Cape Bridges Program EIS or EIS NOI. I do not know whether such a meeting has been held or whether such a meeting will be held at some future date. I am in contact with other members of the public who follow the Cape Cod Bridges Program closely, but am not aware of any members of the public who have received any notice of a scoping meeting for the Cape Bridges Program EIS or EIS NOI.	
York, John	During a Cape Cod Bridges Program Virtual Public Information meeting on April 25, 2024, Program Manager Bryan Cordeiro, in a chat response to a chat question of when a promised project scoping meeting would occur, stated that the April 25, 2024 virtual meeting and an upcoming May 13, 2024, Cape Bridges Open House would serve as scoping meetings. This statement was made in the sidebar "chat" only, and was not verbally stated directly to meeting attendees, nor presented in any of the meeting presentation slides.	Please refer to **Appendix 1, National Environmental Policy Act and Program Preliminary Actions, Attachment 3,** of the DEIS, which includes public outreach information. On February 11, 2025, FHWA determined that the scoping process has sufficiently met the requirements for public involvement and an extension of the scoping period is not necessary.
York, John	Public Meeting Notices for the April 25 meeting and May 13 Open House were posted in advance of the meetings on the MassDOT "Events Calendar" webpage, and may now be found via links on the MassDOT "Past Events" webpage. Neither the Meeting Notice for the April 25 Virtual PIM nor the Meeting Notice for the May 13 Open House contain the words "scoping" or "scoping meeting".	

Commenter	Comments	Response
Buckley, Stephen	I am forwarding an email (below) from John York that provides more than sufficient information that the legally required "scoping" process described in the NOI was inadequately publicized. As such, the vast majority of people who will be significantly affected by the proposed project do not know that they should be raising their concerns to you by May 31, 2024 (today). If you ignore this shortcoming, it will result in project delays due to your dismissiveness regarding public engagement concerns.	Please note that these comments are addressed in the responses to John York (repeated here).

2.11 Noise

Table 2-12 includes comments and responses related to existing and Program-generated noise.

Table 2-12. Noise Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comment	Response
Akeley, Art	Can noise abatement features be built into the design for the residents on both sides of the approaches and on both sides of the canal in such a way we can review and comment on those noise abatement features?	As required by FHWA and MassDOT's highway traffic noise assessment policy, noise barriers were considered for noise-sensitive receivers that were predicted to be impacted by project related traffic noise under the 2050 Build Alternative. Refer to **Section 4.14.7, Noise and Vibration, Mitigation,** of the DEIS and **Section 7.1, Operational Traffic Noise Barrier Evaluation Results, of Appendix 4.14, Noise and Vibration Technical Report,** for additional information.
Anonymous	I live on a cul-de-sac and the noise level needs to be mediated in some fashion because it does affect the quality of life for our cul-de-sac. I'd like to be contacted when the final plans are done. This will ease all nerves. We are a stressed neighborhood.	As required by FHWA and MassDOT's highway traffic noise assessment policy, noise barriers were considered for noise-sensitive receivers that were predicted to be impacted by project related traffic noise under the 2050 Build Alternative. Refer to **Section 4.14.7, Noise and Vibration, Mitigation,** of the DEIS and **Section 7.1, Operational Traffic Noise Barrier Evaluation Results, of Appendix 4.14, Noise and Vibration Technical Report,** for additional information. To minimize the impacts of construction noise, MassDOT will ensure an active and responsive public outreach program during construction to coordinate construction activities and schedules, and work with local communities to address concerns. We encourage you to continue to engage with the Program and monitor the Program website for future updates.

2.12 Public Involvement

Table 2-13 includes comments and responses related to the Program public involvement process.

Table 2-13. Public Engagement Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comment	Response
USEPA: Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	Provide early and frequent outreach and engagement opportunities to collect and incorporate community feedback throughout the NEPA process and to maintain maximum transparency. Community based workshops are an effective way to facilitate discussion and issue resolution during the NEPA process.	MassDOT has actively involved the community through multiple rounds of public engagement, beginning as early as 2021. Notably, public engagement efforts have included numerous public meetings, open houses, advisory group meetings, and targeted stakeholder sessions. These opportunities have facilitated two-way communication and transparency during the development of design alternatives and environmental reviews. Specific examples include the three public open house events held at the Bourne Veterans Memorial Community Center, where members of the public were able to meet Program Team members, receive information and details, and directly provide input. The Program website and the online comment tool also provide ongoing access to project updates and opportunities to submit feedback. Refer to **Chapter 6, Agency Coordination and Public Involvement,** of the DEIS for further details.
USEPA: Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	FHWA and MADOT should continue ongoing coordination with the Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head (Aquinnah) and Wampanoag Tribe of Mashpee to ensure there are no disproportionate impacts for Tribes.	MassDOT and FHWA have engaged the Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head (Aquinnah) and the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe to ensure cultural and environmental considerations are prioritized. As Section 106 consulting parties, the Tribal Historic Preservation Officers of both tribes will have opportunities to review documents prepared by MassDOT and to share their views regarding the identification and assessment of historic and archaeological resources within the Areas of Potential Effect. Refer to **Section 4.16, Cultural Resources,** of the DEIS for further details.

Commenter	Comment	Response
USEPA: Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	Public meetings should be accessible to all and scheduled at times that accommodate the greatest number of participants. Where possible, both in person and meeting virtual formats should be provided to increase accessibility.	MassDOT has ensured accessibility by scheduling meetings at varied times, offering virtual options, and providing materials in accessible formats. For example, the Open House events have included both afternoon and evening sessions, and public meetings have been recorded and posted online for those unable to attend. Accommodations including language Spanish and Portuguese translation service, and Communication Access Realtime Translation services have been made available, as well as other accommodations upon request.
USEPA: Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	We note that the 65+ age group comprises roughly 1/3 of the population in the impacted area and encourage FHWA and MADOT to continue providing accessibility considerations for this group when planning meetings.	MassDOT recognizes that a significant portion of the affected population is aged 65 and older. Outreach efforts have included sharing information with local senior centers and libraries and hosting meetings in easily accessible venues such as the Bourne Veterans Community Center. Accommodations have been made available including Communication Access Realtime Translation services are available for virtual public meetings, as well as other accommodations upon request. Additionally, meeting notifications and materials are distributed through numerous methods, including being posted online in an accessible format, through email, media advisories, and paid advertisements, to ensure broad distribution. Refer to **Chapter 6, Agency Coordination and Public Involvement,** of the DEIS for further details.

Commenter	Comment	Response
USEPA: Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	Consistent with our public engagement recommendations above, we strongly recommend that an outreach strategy be developed to inform the public about construction period impacts and the range of impacts associated with each phase of construction. Outreach efforts should focus on identifying questions and concerns about the project/construction period and working to explain how identified impacts will be minimized and addressed. Impacts that should be considered include (but are not limited to) traffic delays at each bridge and the surrounding roadway network, emissions from construction equipment (both working and idling); and longer travel timers through the area by onroad vehicles slowed by highway construction.	To minimize the impacts of construction noise, MassDOT will ensure an active and responsive public outreach program during construction to coordinate construction activities and schedules, and work with local communities to address concerns. Through its outreach efforts including in-person open houses, virtual public meetings, and online comment form, the Program has received comments and questions from stakeholders regarding construction related impacts and is considering this feedback and input as the Program advances. Refer to **Chapter 6, Agency Coordination and Public Involvement,** of the DEIS for further details.
USEPA: Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	Ensure that translation/interpretation services are provided to address language barriers for any linguistically isolated populations. We support past efforts to translate project materials into Spanish, Portuguese, and ASL to ensure meaningful public engagement.	MassDOT has prioritized language access by providing live Spanish, Portuguese, and ASL interpretation at all public meetings and open houses, and translating Program materials including flyers, notices, and FAQs. Requests for additional languages are also accepted in advance of any meeting or event. Refer to **Chapter 6, Agency Coordination and Public Involvement,** of the DEIS for further details.

Commenter	Comment	Response
USEPA: Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	Address technology barriers that may prohibit participation from communities affected by the project, such as access to Internet in the case of virtual meeting formats.	MassDOT strives to ensure equitable access to public involvement and has employed numerous outreach tools and methods to accommodate individuals with limited computer access. For example, individuals have had the ability to join virtual public meetings via phone, and open houses are held in-person. Meeting recordings have been made available for on-demand viewing, and comments have been accepted via mail or phone. Materials including meeting notices are published in area newspapers and distributed broadly to organizations throughout the region. Refer to **Chapter 6, Agency Coordination and Public Involvement,** of the DEIS for further details.
USEPA: Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	Ensure that meetings are scheduled at a time and location that is accessible for community participants. Accessibility can be enhanced by scheduling meetings on multiple dates, after work hours, and on weekends as appropriate.	Public meetings have been strategically scheduled to maximize attendance. This includes hosting numerous virtual public meetings, as well as both daytime and evening sessions of open house events. These in-person open houses are held at convenient and accessible locations. Feedback from past attendees informed this scheduling approach, ensuring accessibility for working residents and families. Meeting schedules and locations are posted on the Program website. Refer to **Chapter 6, Agency Coordination and Public Involvement,** of the DEIS for further details.
USEPA: Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	Provide ample notice of meetings and commenting opportunities so that community members have sufficient time to prepare and participate.	MassDOT provides a minimum of two weeks' notice for all public meetings and open houses. Announcements are made through numerous channels including website updates, email blasts, social media, press releases, paid advertisements, and coordination with stakeholders. Refer to **Chapter 6, Agency Coordination and Public Involvement,** of the DEIS for further details.

Commenter	Comment	Response
USEPA: Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	Promote engagement opportunities within appropriate outlets used by affected communities, such as newspapers, radio, and social media.	MassDOT leverages numerous communication channels, including social media posts to Instagram, Facebook, and X (formerly known as Twitter), press releases to dozens of local newspapers and media outlets, as well as announcements on regional radio stations. Refer to **Chapter 6, Agency Coordination and Public Involvement,** of the DEIS for further details.
USEPA: Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	Ensure that all project-related information is conveyed using plain language so community members of varied reading proficiencies can readily understand.	MassDOT is committed to using plain language in Program materials to ensure accessibility for individuals with varied reading proficiencies. Examples include simplified FAQs and clear, visual presentations shared during public meetings and in materials available on the Program website. At the open houses, materials such as graphics and displays are used to minimize technical and confusing language, straightforward terminology to explain bridge design and environmental impacts. Refer to **Chapter 6, Agency Coordination and Public Involvement,** of the DEIS for further details.
USEPA: Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	We also encourage MassDOT to identify a point of contact who can address issues and concerns raised by the public throughout the construction period.	To minimize the impacts of construction noise, MassDOT will ensure an active and responsive public outreach program during construction to coordinate construction activities and schedules, and work with local communities to address concerns. MassDOT will provide numerous options for engagement and outreach during construction operations. This will include dedicated staff to assist with community questions and concerns.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Campanini, Patricia	Could we see a model of the new proposed bridges with the locations that are proposed? It is hard to conceptualize the proposals from drawings. Similar to when architects create models of proposed buildings it would be useful for the public to visualize what is being proposed. Of course as a Bourne resident and business owner it is that much more important. I know there is an open house scheduled for 5/13. It would be great to see the model then. If not then as soon as possible and at a place for the public to view it in person.	Physical models are not currently available. MassDOT continues to consider ways to best present Program information and details to the public. Please note that past materials including Public Meeting presentations and Open House graphics are available on the Program website.
Donoghue, Jim	I am looking to register for the Open House to be held in Bourne on May 13th, could not find where	Registration was not required to attend the open house held on May 13, 2024. The event was fully open to the public, with attendees able to visit at any time during the scheduled hours. This event was advertised on the Program website and through numerous methods include social media, email blasts, press releases, and paid advertisements. Information on future events will continue to be posted on the Program website and shared with the public.
Heisler, Kenneth	Wow. The public information meeting in Buzzards Bay on May 13th was outstanding. I came a sceptic, and left a believer!	Thank you for the feedback and comment.
Marsh, Jane	Is there a place to put a personal email address so the person can receive updates on the timing of work to be completed on the bridges as well as the replacement of the bridges	Yes, individuals can sign up for email updates through the Cape Cod Bridges Program website. By subscribing, you will receive regular updates about project timelines, construction phases, and public engagement opportunities.
Pavan, Michael	When will the proposed plans shown at the May 13 Cape Cod Bridges review Open House be put online? I gave my email address	Materials from the open house held on May 13, 2024, as well as other past open houses and public meetings, are posted to the Program website.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Pavan, Michael	I just commented, but your map on the second page only allows 1 pinpoint. My interest is in both Cape Cod bridges and all 4 areas of road connections, so I put the pinpoint in the middle of the Canal.	The Public Involvement Management Application mapping tool is used to manage public comments efficiently and provide a general location for feedback. Your input is noted, and we will explore options regarding the pinpoint functionality.
Pavan, Michael	Cape Cod Bridges review Open House May 13, 2024 Noon-3pm, 5-8pm Veterans' Memorial Community Center 239 Main St, Buzzards Bay Here are my thoughts: OPEN HOUSE: Plans presented should have been online before the Open House to give the Public time to review them beforehand. Withholding online copies from the Public limits the ability to study and comment on them, so some of my comments may not be as complete or specific as possible, or able to refer to individual proposals by their 'official' names. - 1 week later, plans are still not online. WHEN WILL THESE PLANS BE ONLINE FOR THE PUBLIC TO MORE FULLY REVIEW?	All graphics and displays presented at the open house on May 13, 2024, are available on the Program website.
Pavan, Michael	BRIDGES DESIGN: Bridge proposals seem good, better oriented plan option boards could show if the Pedestrian/Bicycle shared use path is on the correct side of each bridge. I didn't have much time to look at the Sagamore road connections as it was already after 3pm, and I was only able to stop by briefly after 5pm.	MassDOT appreciates your suggestion regarding the orientation of the graphics. We also understand that schedules can limit the time attendees have to attend events. As such, multiple sessions are scheduled for open house events, and graphics are posted online for public review.
Pavan, Michael	At the Open House all were 'greeted' at the door to "Sign In" with name, email address, and zip code. - 1 week later, no follow up email sent yet I asked if I would be able to submit my comments by email, so I could think them out more fully than if I had to write them down on the small comment sheets offered. Not send a follow up email that could be replied to, seems to not want fuller comments.	The email subscription signup at the Open House was available for members of the public to sign up for any future email distributions. The Program team consistently distributes email blasts which include links to the online comment form. Public input is always accepted via this online comment form. Additionally, materials from past events can be found on the Program website.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Pavan, Michael	The URL www.mass.gov/cape-cod-bridges on the refrigerator magnet given out is: "404 We can't find that page" Correct URL seems to be: www.mass.gov/cape-cod-bridges-program - 1 week later, the wrong (incomplete) URL has not been connected to the correct URL (to make the magnet URL work)	The magnets distributed at the Open House included the correct link for the Program website, which is www.mass.gov/cape-bridges. We have also confirmed that the QR code redirects to the Program website.
Pavan, Michael	The Open House displays orientation diagram was off by 90 degrees. "Sign In" was shown at bottom right, instead of bottom left - consequently the whole diagram was off.	These suggestions are noted and will be considered for future graphics and events.
Pavan, Michael	There was a useless? 'yarn diagram' which attempted to show 'bridge uses'?, but just looked like an over-simplified bridge outlined with yarn.	These suggestions are noted and will be considered for future graphics and events.
Pavan, Michael	Plan options for bridges and road connections were shown on (3'x 4' or 5') photo boards, with each proposal marked on them. - North was not always at the top, so that consistent orientation was not possible. - Some boards had 'match lines' requiring one to imagine where a location shown elsewhere fit in. - Presenters often referred to to adjacent landmarks not shown to justify proposed plans. Boards should have been larger to include all relevant locations and landmarks. Digital Simulations changed screens too rapidly, and presenters were unable to adjust speed or pause them.	These suggestions are noted and will be considered for future graphics and events.

Commenter	Comment	Response
York, John	Alternatives Presented at the Cape Bridges Open House, May 13, 2024 The Canal Bridges Program Team presented a very informative Cape Bridges Open House on Monday, May 13, 2024. It was wonderful to see the Project Team sharing information with the public. The story boards and plans presented at the Open House have for the first time provided sufficient detail to begin to understand the impact of MassDOT's proposal. Images from some, but not all, of the story boards presented at the Open House are available via links on the "Program Documents" page of the Cape Cod Bridges website. Open House - May 13, 2024 Presentation Materials https://www.mass.gov/doc/cape-cod-bridges-program-open-house-boards-may-13-2024/download	All graphics and displays presented at the open house on May 13, 2024, are available on the Program website.
Anonymous	I'd love to help, my grandfather worked on the original bridge. Getting FE civil.	We encourage you to continue to monitor the Program website for opportunities to participate such as public meetings, open houses, and other events.
Anonymous	Outstanding presentations, looks great. Can't wait for it all to begin	Thank you for the feedback and comment.
Anonymous	Comment about advertising on channel 7 and other TV channels	MassDOT distributes press releases to over 150 local, state, and regional media outlets to announce details regarding Program updates, milestones, public events, and notable developments. Providing information to the media helps to amplify the Program and further spread information to members of the public and stakeholders.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Anonymous	Comment about advertising the time commitment, 30 minutes-1 hour rather than 3 hour commitment.	Open house events are designed to provide flexibility for attendees to visit at their convenience and review materials at their own pace. These events are informal, allowing participants to come and go as needed without committing to the entire duration. This format ensures sufficient time for personalized discussions with project team members, reviewing display boards, and asking questions.
Anonymous	Need public meetings. Not zoom.	MassDOT offers opportunities for both in-person and virtual engagement to optimize the public outreach process. This includes in-person events such as attending farmers markets, community meetings, and hosting open houses. In-person meetings will continue to be scheduled to provide opportunities for face-to-face engagement.
Anonymous	I love the displays here. I would prefer to purchase a 8 x 10 soft cover copy of the lovely photos shown here at the school.	Program materials including open house graphics are hosted digitally on the Program website. While physical copies are not available for purchase, you may download and print images from the site.
Anonymous	Trump 2024.	Thank you for the comment.

2.13 Recreation

Table 2-14 provides comments and responses related to parks, recreational facilities, and open space, including public access.

Table 2-14. Recreation Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comment	Response
USEPA: Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	We encourage FHWA and MADOT to fully describe any potential permanent or temporary impacts to parks and recreational space within the project area associated with project construction and operation.	**Section 4.17, Public Parks, Recreational Facilities, and Open Space** of the DEIS discusses proposed temporary and permanent effects to parks, recreation areas, and open spaces, and presents minimization and mitigation measures to address temporary and permanent effects. **Chapter 5, Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation,** of the DEIS provides additional information on mitigation measures to be developed in coordination with public park owners and operators.
Massachusetts Department of Fish and Game (DFG): Douglas H. Cameron Director/Chief Engineer	The Cape Cod Bridges Project will need to be consistent with MA CZM Public Access Policies #1 - #3. Policy #1. Project development of coastal sites shall be subject to the state waterways regulations (The Public Waterfront Act, M.G.L., Ch. 91) and shall promote general public use and enjoyment of the water's edge. Policy #2. Improve public access to existing coastal recreational facilities and ensure that the adverse impacts of development proposed near existing public access areas and recreations sites are minimized. Policy #3. Expand existing recreation facilities and acquire and develop new public access for coastal recreation.	Thank you for your comment. The Cape Cod Bridges Program acknowledges the need to align with the Massachusetts Coastal Zone Management (CZM) Public Access Policies. The project will adhere to state waterways regulations under the Public Waterfront Act (M.G.L., Ch. 91) and support the goals of ensuring public access to coastal facilities, minimizing adverse impacts, and expanding recreational opportunities. These considerations are being integrated into the project review and design process. For more details, please refer to **Section 4.9, Wetlands and Floodplains, Section 4.11, Threatened, Endangered, and Protected Species and Habitats,** and **Section 4.12, Coastal Zone Consistency,** of the DEIS.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Town of Bourne: Mary Jane Mastrangelo, Bourne Select Board Chair	The configuration of the bridges and all related infrastructure alternative analysis needs to make sure that both during and after the project the operations of the Bourne Scenic Park are taken into consideration. The Scenic Park campground is a great recreational and economic asset that provides recreational access to the Canal for campers and provides patrons for local businesses. Keeping the campground viable during and after construction should be included in the project review.	The Cape Cod Bridges Program recognizes the importance of the Bourne Scenic Park as a recreational and economic asset for the region. MassDOT is working with USACE and the Bourne Recreation Authority (BRA) to minimize disruptions to the park and ensure its continued viability during and following completion of the Bourne Bridge. The minimization and mitigation measures will be finalized in coordination with the USACE and BRA and integrated into project design. Additional details on the evaluation of potential impacts to Bourne Scenic Park and minimization and mitigation strategies are presented in **Section 4.12, Coastal Zone Consistency,** and **Chapter 5, Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation,** of the DEIS.
Town of Bourne: Mary Jane Mastrangelo, Bourne Select Board Chair	The configuration of the bridges and all related infrastructure alternative analysis needs to make sure that both during and after the project, habitat, boating and fishing which are essential to the economic and environment of the region should be considered in evaluating alternatives.	The Cape Cod Bridges Program is committed to protecting critical habitats, boating activities, and fisheries, recognizing their significance to the region's economic and environmental well-being. The evaluation of alternatives included natural resource protection as a Program goal. Refer to **Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives,** of the DEIS for a summary of the phased analyses that were conducted for the Program. Please refer to the following sections of the DEIS for discussions of potential impacts and mitigation measures: **Section 4.4, Marine Transportation, Traffic, and Safety,** including boating; and **Section 4.11, Threatened, Endangered, and Protected Species and Habitats,** including fisheries and critical habitats. Strategies to minimize potential adverse effects on these resources are being incorporated into the planning and design of the project.

2.14 Right-of-Way

Table 2-15 provides comments and responses related to effects of the Program upon residential and commercial properties, including MassDOT's right-of-way acquisition process

Table 2-15. Right-of-Way Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comment	Response
USEPA: Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	These [property] acquisitions and all means of avoiding/reducing acquisitions will need to be fully discussed in the EIS. Meaningful engagement with affected property owners is recommended.	The Right-of-Way (ROW) acquisition process will follow the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act (Uniform Act), which ensures fair treatment and compensation for all property owners. Notifications about potential property acquisitions will occur as part of this transparent and equitable process. MassDOT is committed to working closely with property owners, offering one-on-one discussions to address individual concerns and provide detailed information. Conversations with property owners cannot begin until early acquisition approval from FHWA or until certain requirements associated with the environmental process have been met. More details about the ROW process and property considerations are included in **Section 4.8, Property Acquisition, Displacement, and Relocation,** of the DEIS.
Amado, Amelia	When will the ROW acquisition process start/When will the notification of eminent domain be made? And what is the width from the abutment being taken—will it extend more than 200 feet wide??	

Commenter	Comment	Response
Notick, Samantha	Also, unrelated to the exhibit, I'm wondering how the new construction might affect the areas around the current bridges (which side of each the new bridges will be built on), as I live close to one of them and I understand projects of this kind can involve eminent domaining. This is only out of curiosity! Thank you for your time, Notick, Samantha	While the exact alignments of the new bridges relative to the existing ones will be finalized through the NEPA process and detailed of the DEIS, MassDOT is committed to minimizing disruptions and keeping the community informed every step of the way. The ROW acquisition process will be conducted in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act (Uniform Act), ensuring fairness, transparency, and support for affected property owners. As part of this process, MassDOT will engage directly with property owners to discuss potential impacts, offer assistance, and answer any questions. We encourage you to attend public open houses or contact the project team directly for tailored discussions. For more information on alignment considerations and ROW procedures, please refer to **Section 4.8, Property Acquisition, Displacement, and Relocation,** of the DEIS.
Lyons, Jeanmarie	I own a property near the Sagamore Bridge. How will the new Bridge affect my home? What if it is in the way of the proposed Bridge? Thank you.	The Cape Cod Bridges Program is committed to minimizing impacts to nearby properties, including homes close to the proposed bridge locations. The Right-of-Way (ROW) acquisition process will follow the guidelines of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act (Uniform Act), which ensures fair treatment of property owners. If your property is affected, MassDOT will engage with you directly to discuss the process, provide detailed information, and address concerns. The design process is ongoing, and specific impacts to individual properties will be identified as plans are refined. For updates on the project, please visit the Program website at MassDOT Cape Cod Bridges Program. Additional details are available in **Section 4.7, Community Facilities,** and **Section 4.8, Property Acquisition, Displacement, and Relocation,** of the DEIS.

2.15 Roadways

Table 2-16 includes comments and responses related to existing roadway conditions, the proposed interchange approach network development and assessment process, traffic, and safety.

Table 2-16. Roadways Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comment	Response
Town of Bourne, Mary Jane Mastrangelo: Bourne Select Board Chair	The configuration of the bridges and all related infrastructure alternative analysis needs to make sure that both during and after the project the local transportation infrastructure network in the community stays connected for all users including school bus, auto, bicycle and pedestrian users giving them access to businesses, schools, municipal services and other transportation resources.	Thank you for your comment regarding maintaining connectivity to community facilities throughout the project. The Cape Cod Bridges Program has carefully considered accessibility for all users, including school buses, autos, bicycles, and pedestrians, both during construction and upon project completion. Under the Build Alternative, the program is designed to improve traffic operations and reduce congestion, ensuring better access to community facilities. Additionally, the proposed construction of shared-use paths across the replacement bridges and connections to local roadways and the Cape Cod Canal service roads would enhance multimodal access between the mainland and Cape Cod. During construction, the project will prioritize maintaining all vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian connections to minimize disruptions. Please refer to **Section 4.6.4, Land Use, Zoning, and Community Cohesion,** and **Section 4.7, Community Facilities,** of the DEIS for further details

Commenter	Comment	Response
Town of Bourne, Mary Jane Mastrangelo: Bourne Select Board Chair	The configuration of the bridges and all related infrastructure alternative analysis needs to make sure that both during and after the project the community of Bourne local traffic pattern connections to the bridge project study areas are taken into consideration during and after bridge reconstruction to avoid the gridlock on local roads this is a problem now.	Thank you for your comment regarding local traffic patterns and gridlock concerns during and after construction. The Cape Cod Bridges Program has prioritized maintaining efficient traffic flow and minimizing impacts on local roads throughout the project. The Build Alternative includes design considerations to improve traffic operations, reduce congestion, and enhance access to community facilities. During construction, the overarching staging and sequencing strategy focuses on maintaining vehicle, bicycle, and pedestrian connectivity. Traffic management plans will be implemented to address potential gridlock and ensure safe and efficient traffic patterns. Also refer to **Appendix 3.2, Construction Approach Technical Report,** of the DEIS.
Town of Bourne, Mary Jane Mastrangelo: Bourne Select Board Chair	The configuration of the bridges and all related infrastructure alternative analysis needs to make sure that both during and after the project there are no dead-end frontage roads created that don't have an option to directly connect to the main road.	Thank you for your comment regarding the potential creation of dead-end frontage roads. The Cape Cod Bridges Program is designed to avoid such outcomes by ensuring that all frontage roads provide direct and efficient connections to the main roadways. The project aims to maintain comprehensive connectivity for all users, including vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians, while reducing congestion and improving traffic flow. The program's traffic and design team continues to evaluate roadway connections as part of the planning process. For additional details, please refer to **Chapter 3, Proposed Actions and Alternatives,** of the DEIS.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Goddard, Phil	There is a major problem with getting down Sandwich Road by the Technical School. Will MassDOT improve that access? Once that road gets backed up, it is a big problem.	The preferred alternative includes a grade-separated diamond interchange at the Bourne South quadrant, designed to alleviate congestion and improve traffic flow by separating regional and local traffic. Traffic analysis indicates that westbound traffic from State Route 25 to Sandwich Road is expected to shift to Scenic Highway, reducing backups on Sandwich Road and improving operations near the Technical High School. Key improvements include a single-lane dogbone roundabout to enhance traffic efficiency and safety, as well as upgrades to the Trowbridge and Sandwich Road underpass, including a relocated Technical High School driveway and enhanced pedestrian and bicyclist access. MassDOT continues to evaluate intersection designs through the Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) process to ensure the best outcomes for safety and traffic operations at the UCT driveway at Sandwich Road. For additional information, please refer to **Section 4.2, Transportation, Traffic, and Safety**, and **Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives,** of the DEIS.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Goddard, Phil	60% of the traffic coming from Bourne goes to the mid-cape highway and a lot of that converges to a single road. For the 44 connection crossover off 495 to Route 3, I recommend that people coming from north of 44 be aware that they can cross over to Route 3 and relieve some of that cross di-lateral traffic from west to east at the bridge area and move it north. Is there a way to let people know that connection is available to relieve traffic impacts? Could that reduce impacts of travel to the Cape?	The Build Alternative outlined of the DEIS is designed to address many of the traffic challenges in the bridge area. For example, the DEIS anticipates that eastbound traffic from State Route 25 to U.S. Route 6 will shift from Sandwich Road to the Scenic Highway, reducing congestion near the bridges and improving travel times significantly—from 24.2 minutes to 18.4 minutes under the Build Alternative. We appreciate your suggestion to explore ways to direct more traffic further north, away from the bridge area, by promoting alternative routes such as Route 3 via I-495 and Route 44. While the DEIS does not specifically include plans for signage or public awareness campaigns to inform travelers about these routes, this is an important consideration. MassDOT will evaluate opportunities for incorporating strategies, such as new signage or public awareness initiatives, as part of broader traffic management discussions. For more information on traffic projections and planned improvements, please refer to **Section 4.2, Transportation, Traffic, and Safety,** of the DEIS.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Kay, Steve	I live on Brigatine Passage Drive. How does Sagamore affect that?	Thank you for your question regarding Brigantine Passage Drive and its relationship to the Sagamore Bridge project. The Direct Connection to State Road Option, which is under consideration, would relocate the Route 6/Route 3 northbound off-ramp and connect it to State Road north of Scenic Highway/Meetinghouse Lane. This would remove the existing northbound off-ramp to Scenic Highway/Meetinghouse Lane and modify signalized intersections to accommodate new lane configurations. While this realignment would bring the roadway infrastructure closer to Brigantine Passage Drive, the project has been carefully designed to minimize local impacts while improving overall traffic flow and safety. Additionally, the proposed design includes shared-use paths along Scenic Highway and Meetinghouse Lane, providing improved multimodal access to the surrounding areas. For further information, please refer to **Chapter 3, Proposed Actions and Alternatives**, of the DEIS.
Ketch, Kristofer	As a resident that lives in a neighborhood along the canal off Sandwich Road, I drive over the bridges four times a day to get to and from work for the majority of the past 12 years. I do not like seeing the new proposed roadway connections for Bourne south that I saw at the open house. They would make driving safer, but could exacerbate congestion. Rotaries are a poor choice for the bridge connections mainly because we are a tourist destination, and we get too many drivers from out of state that have different rotary laws. New York is one example where their laws have vehicles in the rotary yield to traffic entering the rotary. Ideally there should be a national standard for rotaries since the confusion in who yields to who makes rotaries unsafe and traffic does not flow as designed for the rotary causing them to	Thank you for your comment and detailed perspective on the proposed roadway connections for Bourne South. We understand your concerns about the potential for increased congestion and the challenges associated with rotaries, particularly in areas with varying traffic patterns and visitor demands. The current design for Bourne South proposes a grade-separated diamond interchange to replace the Bourne Rotary, aiming to alleviate congestion, improve safety, and enhance traffic flow by separating through traffic from local traffic. This design is supported by traffic modeling and analysis conducted during the development of the DEIS, which suggests it will provide significant operational benefits over the existing rotary configuration. Specifically, the diamond interchange would reduce conflict points and delays, creating a more predictable and safer driving environment.

Commenter	Comment	Response
	not achieve outcomes as modeling predicts. I also don't think rotaries should be used unless traffic entering the rotaries are paced by speed humps so the dominate flow of traffic does not speed through the rotary making it difficult for other rotary connections to enter the rotary. Lima, Peru paces their merging traffic using speed humps and for intersections too and I thought it worked well controlling traffic when there is congestion. If traffic flow is too heavy and sustained from any one direction, then others have hard time entering the rotary, and speed humps would control vehicle speed when entering the rotary. I have heard the recent reconfiguration of the rotary in Middleborough improved the rotary. I never saw it before, but now I see it often and it is difficult to enter the rotary because of vehicles speeding through the rotary. You often have to floor it to enter the rotary.	Your suggestion regarding the use of speed humps and national standards for rotary design is appreciated. While speed humps are generally not incorporated into high-capacity intersections like this, the proposed design does include features such as a dogbone roundabout at the ramp terminus of the proposed diamond interchange to enhance flow and safety. MassDOT continues to evaluate intersection designs through the Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) process at other locations to ensure the best outcomes for safety and traffic operations. Additionally, pedestrian safety will be addressed through features like Pedestrian Hybrid Beacons, improving visibility and driver awareness.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Ketch, Kristofer	Instead I previously submitted a PDF of my own sketch of a new alternative that has a couple of one way areas creating basically a larger rotary but not a true rotary because it was not one way all the way around the loop. Going under the bridge would be a one way south eliminating the dangerous left turn. Heading north on Sandwich Road would be one way at base of bridge so all Sandwich South traffic would go under the bridge. The road going up the hill near base of the bridge by State Police would still be two way and going north from there toward Sandwich Road would be two way until reaching where traffic coming off the bridge could turn right to head South down toward the schools.	Thank you for your detailed suggestion and for sharing your alternative design. The Cape Cod Bridges Program has carefully evaluated a range of configurations to improve safety and traffic operations, including eliminating dangerous turning movements and reducing congestion near the bridges. While the proposed design does not include the specific elements of your suggestion, the improvements under the preferred alternative aim to address similar concerns by incorporating grade-separated interchanges and streamlined traffic flow on Sandwich Road and nearby connections. Your input is appreciated and contributes to the discussion of how to best meet the program's goals. For more detailed information about the proposed improvements, please refer to **Section 4.2, Transportation, Traffic, and Safety**, of the DEIS. We encourage you to review **Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives**, and **Section 4.2, Transportation, Traffic, and Safety**, of the DEIS for a more detailed explanation of the traffic modeling and design considerations for the Bourne South area.
Kleindinst, Judy	Are there any plans to upgrade Sandwich Road on the south side of the canal from two lanes to four?	There are currently no plans to upgrade Sandwich Road from two lanes to four lanes as part of the Cape Cod Bridges Program. The Program scope prioritizes improvements directly related to the bridges and their immediate approaches.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Lambdin, Barb	I have been very impressed with the thoroughness of the process so far but am very much opposed to a 60-mph speed limit on the bridges. There are no roads on Cape Cod that have anything higher than 55-mph. With cars merging and exiting from the bridges 60mph seems foolhardy. Is it possible that the speed limit could be reduced to 50mph?	The design speed of 60 mph for the Sagamore Bridge is based on the functional classification of Route 6 and the need to accommodate various users, including trucks. The steepness of the ramp grades has been reduced to improve safety and comfort. While a lower speed limit was considered, the design team determined 60 mph to be appropriate for safety and operational consistency. For additional details, refer to **Section 4.2, Transportation, Traffic, and Safety,** of the DEIS.
Lewko, Karen	I attended the recent open house at the Bourne community center. I really prefer the "flyover" for the Bourne Bridge. I live in the area and the intersection with Scenic Park and Nightingale is really horrible.	Thank you for sharing your feedback and for attending the open house at the Bourne Community Center. We appreciate your preference for the flyover design at Bourne North and your observations regarding the challenges at the Scenic Park and Nightingale Road intersection. The directional interchange option with the flyover ramp at Bourne North, which has been identified as the recommended alternative, is designed to alleviate congestion and improve traffic flow by enabling free-flowing movements. This includes a direct connection ramp from Scenic Highway to Route 25, bypassing Belmont Circle, which would address the operational concerns raised about this area. MassDOT is also evaluating intersection controls at the intersection at Scenic Highway/Nightingale Road/Andy Oliva Drive through the Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) process to determine the best approach to facilitate safe pedestrian crossings and manage vehicular flow. For further details, refer to **Section 4.2, Transportation, Traffic, and Safety,** of the DEIS.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Pavan, Michael	SAGAMORE SOUTH: "Sagamore South" road connections plan with new Cranberry Highway to Factory Outlet Wy to Mid-Cape Connector connection; US-6 westbound exit to Cranberry Highway with new 2 way connection to Sandwich Rd; and new entrance (from Mid-Cape Connector) to Sagamore Bridge seem to be the best plan.	Thank you for your thoughtful feedback regarding the Sagamore South road connections plan. The program team appreciates your support for elements of the proposed design, including the Cranberry Highway extension, connections to the Mid-Cape Connector, and improved access points. These components were carefully developed to enhance traffic flow, improve safety, and provide multimodal connectivity for vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclists. The design incorporates a new two-way connection to Sandwich Road and a new entrance from the Mid-Cape Connector to Sagamore Bridge, as highlighted in your comment. These improvements aim to alleviate congestion, enhance regional connectivity, and support access to key destinations. Your input affirms the importance of these design elements, and we encourage you to continue sharing your insights as the program progresses. For more detailed information, please refer to **Section 4.2, Transportation, Traffic, and Safety,** of the DEIS.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Pavan, Michael	**BOURNE SOUTH:** "Bourne South" road connections plans are not good. - Plans should allow for: Making MA-28 southbound into Frontage Rd (to Otis Rotary): 1 southbound lane; 2 northbound lanes (1 through, 1 for left turns into businesses) Making MA-28 northbound into MA-28 southbound New MA-28 northbound (just east of existing MA-28 northbound) New railroad connection (east of new MA-28 northbound) from along Canal (between new Bridge and Upper Cape Cod Tech) to Joint Base Cape Cod existing rail. - Entering the Cape, Bourne Bridge should 'fly over' existing Rotary to a fork (right to MA-28 south, left to Sandwich Rd and if necessary a Local Traffic exit) & vice versa. - If possible Local Traffic exit should be (before flyover) to existing Rotary (probably reduced to a Roundabout) for State Police barracks, Trowbridge Rd, and Frontage Rd. - Trowbridge St (at Rotary) to Sandwich Rd Pedestrian/Bicycle path backtracks behind State Police barrack, should instead be more direct, connecting to Sandwich Rd further north to accommodate grade difference.	Thank you for your thoughtful suggestions regarding the Bourne South roadway connections. The proposed design, which includes a grade-separated diamond interchange, aims to enhance safety, reduce congestion, and improve traffic flow while addressing multimodal accommodations such as shared-use paths and pedestrian-friendly infrastructure. We appreciate your detailed input, including suggestions to re-route MA-28 southbound and other roadway adjustments. Many aspects of the current design have been developed to address similar concerns and incorporate considerations for local and regional traffic. For example, the design eliminates conflicts between regional and local traffic through a combination of improved ramp geometry and enhanced intersection controls. Details on the proposed Bourne South design, including traffic flow changes and intersection improvements, can be found in **Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives,** and **Section 4.2, Transportation, Traffic, and Safety,** of the DEIS. Your feedback will be shared with the design team for further review as the project progresses.
Pavan, Michael	**BOURNE NORTH:** "Bourne North" road connections plan needs improvement, this is the most complex area. The plan and plan board(s) should include "Bourne Rotary N". -'Directional Interchange'? plan with MA-25 eastbound to "Bourne Rotary N" and Scenic Highway northbound/US-6 eastbound exit; and ramp from Scenic Highway southbound/US-6 westbound (over Nightingale Rd) to MA-25 westbound was best; as this removes most of the traffic from "Bourne Rotary N". - Existing MA-25 westbound exit should be moved closer to the new	Thank you for your suggestions regarding the Bourne North roadway connections. The Directional Interchange Option (BN-14.4b) was selected as the recommended alternative to replace the Bourne Rotary. This design provides direct connection ramps for regional traffic on MA-25 and U.S. Route 6 (Scenic Highway), allowing vehicles to bypass Belmont Circle, thereby improving traffic flow and reducing congestion. The proposed design also includes multimodal features, such as shared-use paths and pedestrian-friendly infrastructure, to enhance safety and accessibility for all users.

Commenter	Comment	Response
	higher (3 lane) Bourne Bridge and loop back over MA-25 merging with the new MA-25 eastbound exit to "Bourne Rotary N" and Scenic Highway northbound/US-6 eastbound. - IF existing "Bourne Rotary N" to MA-25 westbound ramp (now needed only for local traffic) can be replaced with a left turn from Main St northbound (between the new Bridge and Nightingale Rd in a signalized intersection) which then merges with Scenic Highway southbound/US-6 westbound ramp to MA-25 westbound, this will remove the remaining non-Local traffic from "Bourne Rotary N". Main St northbound would be 1 through lane, 1 left on Nightingale Rd lane, and 1 1eft onto MA-25 westbound ramp. Main St southbound would be 1 lane (or 1 through lane and 1 right turn lane just to Nightingale Rd). - Then existing north side of "Bourne Rotary N" (that Bourne Bridge Approach rd connects with) could be 2 way with a Roundabout (or Light) at each end; AND "Bourne Rotary N" could be made smaller on only the west side of the wetlands (now within Rotary) as it will be only for Local Traffic (all Bourne Bridge/MA-25 to/from Scenic Highway/US-6 connections can be made via limited access highway).	We value your input, including suggestions to retain additional lanes and implement roundabout features for local traffic. These ideas align with considerations that have been integrated into the current design, such as maintaining access for local traffic while prioritizing improved operations for regional freight and passenger traffic. The project team will continue to evaluate feedback like yours as part of the design refinement process. For more information on the proposed design, traffic analysis, and how it addresses regional and local traffic needs, please refer to **Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives,** and **Section 4.2, Transportation, Traffic, and Safety,** of the DEIS.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Ryan, Sandra	The intersection of cranberry highway to Adams Street is very dangerous for people on foot to cross from upper Adams to lower Adams. With increased traffic it will be almost impossible to use. Please consider signage to slow down in the village, a cross walk or other ways for drivers to be aware of the situation. Thank you	Thank you for your comment regarding the intersection of Cranberry Highway and Adams Street and the challenges for pedestrians crossing safely. The program team recognizes the importance of pedestrian safety and accessibility, especially as traffic patterns evolve with the proposed improvements. The current design includes multimodal accommodations, such as shared-use paths and sidewalks, to enhance safety for pedestrians and cyclists in the area. Additionally, the program team will evaluate the need for signage, crosswalks, and other traffic calming measures to ensure pedestrian safety at key locations like this intersection. Public feedback plays a critical role in shaping these safety measures, and your input is appreciated as the design progresses. For more information on pedestrian and bicycle improvements, please refer to **Section 4.2, Transportation, Traffic, and Safety,** of the DEIS.
Sparkes, Michael	The operations slide indicated that the bridge replacement design includes consideration of improved traffic throughout, traveling on and off the Cape. While the design includes the same number of travel lanes, it is anticipated that the traffic throughout will be improved by increasing lane width, elimination of the Bourne rotary, and added auxiliary on/off lanes. Do you have any metrics of how much travel improvement might be improved by the new bridges?	The new bridges and associated improvements are anticipated to significantly enhance traffic flow across the Cape Cod Canal. Key factors contributing to these improvements include increased lane widths, the elimination of the Bourne Rotary, and the addition of auxiliary on/off lanes. According to the DEIS, overall network-wide travel times during the Fall Weekday PM Peak Hour are estimated to decrease by 22.2% under the 2050 Build Alternative compared to the No Build Alternative. Additionally, travel times across the Sagamore and Bourne Bridges are projected to decrease substantially, with reductions of up to 57% in some cases. For additional details, refer to **Section 4.2, Transportation, Traffic, and Safety,** of the DEIS and **Appendix 4.2, Traffic Engineering Technical Report.**

Commenter	Comment	Response
Troyer, Doug	When will interchange options for Bourne be finalized? My understanding is that there are now two current options – a Diamond Interchange and a Single Point Interchange option.	After evaluating the alternatives, the Diamond Interchange has been identified as the preferred option for the Bourne South quadrant. This option best meets the Cape Cod Bridges Program's Purpose and Need by improving mobility, safety, and traffic flow while reducing congestion. Specific details about the Diamond Interchange and its benefits can be found in **Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives,** of the DEIS.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Vaughan, John	Re: New Paint Hi Folks, The new paint on the Bourne rotary looks great. I was there this morning at rush hour. (Did you know the Cape has rush hour traffic?) Another sign, bigger and sooner, would help direct traffic better. The electric signs help but even earlier as one approaches the bridge would be better. The paint, however, doesn't address the real problem of getting on and off the Cape. The real problem is "The Crisscrossers". Say you are driving south on Route 3, going to the Cape. You will come to the Sagamore bridge but you want to get to Route 28 south. You need to crisscross over to Bourne. You can do that just before the Sagamore bridge or just after. Either way you will enjoy stop lights, weaving, merging, and stupefying rotaries. If you're going to the Cape via Route 25 east but want to get to Route 6 east, you're a Crisscrosser too. You have the added benefit of stopping all traffic going Route 28 north at the Bourne rotary causing a mile long backup every workday. The problem with getting on and off the Cape is not the through traffic or the local traffic, it's The Crisscrossers. This is not a summer or a summer weekend problem, although more traffic does exacerbate the fundamental problem.	The proposed improvements under the Cape Cod Bridges Program aim to improve traffic operations, particularly around the Bourne and Sagamore Bridges. The Program includes reconfiguring interchanges to reduce weaving, merging, and stop lights while maintaining safe and efficient operations for all users. For example, the preferred alternatives eliminate existing rotaries and introduce grade-separated interchanges to streamline travel on and off Cape Cod. We understand your concern about traffic challenges related to the Cape's unique economic and commuter patterns. While the Program aims to improve regional mobility and safety, certain broader economic and housing challenges fall outside its scope. For more details, please refer to **Chapter 2, Program Purpose and Need,** and **Section 4.2, Transportation, Traffic, and Safety,** of the DEIS.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Vaughan, John	The problem is related to Cape economics. Work on Cape Cod is low-paying and the housing is high-priced. So, people who work on the Cape commute from off-Cape; and, people who live on the Cape, work off-Cape. The Expressway flows into Boston in the morning and out in the afternoon. On the Cape, however, traffic flows both ways both in the morning and the afternoon. Double trouble. (Note: new bridges will not eliminate The Crisscrossers. It would be a shame to spend all that money to fix the bridge problem and not fix the traffic problem.) Solution? A short, purpose-built, high-traffic-conductance connector before getting to the bridges that connects Route 3 to Route 25. That is, a high speed crisscross before the bridges. Then all traffic coming to the Cape becomes through traffic. There must be some rights-of-way for the power lines that are located along the Plymouth/Bourne Town line that could be leveraged/used to situate a connector. Good location, the lines run north/south from Route 3 to Route 25 and beyond.	Thank you for your suggestion of a short bypass or connector road to alleviate traffic near the bridges. The Cape Cod Bridges Program includes improvements designed to enhance regional traffic flow and safety, including reconfiguring interchanges and adding auxiliary lanes to support increased mobility. While the Program focuses on addressing congestion at the bridges and immediate surrounding areas, broader bypass solutions or new road connections are not currently within its scope.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Vaughan, John	To make the roadway a high-traffic-conductance connector, two things: 1) eliminate weaving by making all exit ramps come before entrance ramps in both directions for both highways and, 2) build the ramps with pairs of lanes - twice as many lanes for the half speed ramps as for the full speed highway means equal throughput. These two constraints can be met with a design that looks a little different but it has a smaller environmental footprint and is probably cheaper to build. (couldn't attach here). If you can make this happen you will make a lot of your fellow Commonwealthers very happy. There's probably a Duck Boat Parade in it for you! Respectfully, Vaughan, John	Thank you for your thoughtful suggestions regarding improving traffic flow and minimizing environmental impact. The Cape Cod Bridges Program has considered various design features to enhance traffic operations and reduce weaving, such as improved interchange configurations and ramp alignments. The proposed design includes dedicated ramps and streamlined traffic movements to improve safety and efficiency while balancing environmental considerations and constructability. We appreciate your engagement and ideas, and we encourage you to review the program's detailed plans and analyses, which are available in **Section 4.2, Transportation, Traffic, and Safety,** of the DEIS.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Wilson, Rob	Regarding the Bourne southside interchanges, my idea would be to have service roads on either side, a crossover bridge farther south near the auto shop, have traffic counterclockwise, and have a diverging diamond under the ramp up to the bridge to connect Trowbridge and Sandwich Roads.	MassDOT evaluated several interchange options, including the recommended Diamond Interchange Option (BS-2). This design eliminates the Bourne Rotary and replaces it with a grade-separated diamond interchange that improves traffic flow and safety by allowing through movements on Route 28 to bypass intersections with non-mainline roadways. The Diamond Interchange Option incorporates a single-lane dogbone configuration to enhance operations, reduce delays, and improve safety by minimizing conflict points. This layout allows direct access for frontage road users to the Route 28 southbound on-ramp and improves connectivity to Trowbridge and Sandwich Roads. Additionally, the design includes a Shared Use Path (SUP) and traffic control devices to enhance multimodal connectivity and improve bicyclist and pedestrian safety. MassDOT is continuing to refine these designs through the Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) process to ensure the selected option meets the program's goals for mobility, safety, and connectivity. For more detailed information, please refer to **Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives,** and **Section 4.2, Transportation, Traffic, and Safety,** of the DEIS.

Commenter	Comment	Response
York, John	Another central feature of the proposed build alternatives that directly benefits through traffic but provides little or no advantage for local users is the significantly increased design speed on the bridge spans. This volitional decision was included for all build alternatives from the beginning of the design process. In other words, the design speed has been an immutable given condition in all presentations to the public. I have not seen any justification provided, other than the obvious increase in capacity (measured in vehicle crossings per hour, day or year) and the obvious decrease of travel time and increase of convenience for through traffic users. This advantage for through traffic users comes at a cost to local roadways users including motorists making local cross-canal trips (see discussion, above, of use case 8, below), but most importantly is a major driver of cost of expensive roadway elements such as increased length of approaches, elevated on and off ramps, flyover interchange bridges and resulting complex interchange options. The project team has implied that there may be safety advantages to the increased design speed, but has not provided any numerical or statistical analysis to support this assertion. An assertion that increased speed will improve safety is contrary to commonly available statistics, and should be supported by engineering analysis and case studies of comparable real world examples.	The replacement bridges and associated roadway improvements are designed to prioritize benefits for local users by enhancing safety, connectivity, and convenience. Local users will benefit from optimized interchange layouts that reduce congestion, improved signage for clearer navigation, and dedicated paths for pedestrians and cyclists that enhance accessibility. These enhancements ensure smoother traffic flow for local trips, reduce delays, and support multimodal transportation. These considerations are based on feedback from public engagement sessions and engineering analyses. Further details are provided in **Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives,** of the DEIS

Commenter	Comment	Response
York, John	Application of the fundamental principle of Environmental Justice to the present Program requires that the Program attend to the needs and desires of impacted Environmental Justice populations, as voiced by those populations, to a similar extent and with similar application of resources as the project serves the needs and desires of users who benefit most from this Program. I am not saying that the proposed bridge design speed must be reduced. I appreciate the project team's motivation to provide desired outcomes. I am suggesting that this major project provide the same level of benefits and quality of outcomes to other users as it provides to through highway traffic crossing the bridges. If the project has funds sufficient to cover then costs of the proposed increase, then it should also fund improvements to local vehicle, cyclist and pedestrian safety on the impacted road. If reducing the proposed increase of bridge design speed is the best way to elevate the safety and quality of outcomes for the local community, including proximate Environmental Justice populations, then reducing the proposed increased speed is a positive action that should be taken to provide for improved outcomes. If the currently proposed design speed is essential to deliver desired performance improvements, the Program Team should incorporate features to provide equivalent quality of convenience and safety for local vehicle traffic, cyclists and pedestrians on, entering, crossing and exiting from MacArthur Boulevard.	In accordance with Executive Order 14173 and the U.S. Department of Justice February 5, 2025, memorandum, "Rescinding 'Environmental Justice" Memoranda," Environmental Justice is not a criterion for consideration for NEPA review. The proposed bridge design incorporates features that aim to provide equitable benefits for local communities, including improved safety, accessibility, and convenience for all users. Local users, including school buses and pedestrians, will benefit from dedicated pedestrian and bicycle paths, enhanced roadway connectivity, and traffic calming measures near key areas like MacArthur Boulevard. These measures improve access to local facilities, schools, and markets, while mitigating potential adverse impacts like increased traffic or noise. Further details are provided in **Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives,** of the DEIS.

Commenter	Comment	Response
York, John	Priority of User Groups and Environmental Justice: Bridge and interchange designs presented at the May 13 Open House demonstrate the priorities of project decision makers with respect to various user groups. The priority order of roadway users appears to be: 1. Through motor vehicles from Route 25 to Route 28 via the Bourne Bridge, Route 3 to Route 6 via the Sagamore Bridge, and Route 25 to Scenic Highway (or visa versa) 2. Local motor vehicle traffic crossing a bridge 3. Non-motorized users crossing a bridge to or from a Canal Path 4. Local motor vehicle traffic not crossing a bridge 5. Non-motorized users not crossing a bridge, or crossing a bridge to or from any location other than a Canal path. Users at number 1 in the priority order have all of their needs and desires provided, to or in excess of requirements. Users at 2 or 3 in the priority order receive some attention and have some of their needs met. The project is still less attentive to the needs of users groups 4 and 5, and fails to meet US DOT and MassDOT standards for the non-motorized users at the bottom of the priority order.	For detailed information on MassDOT's methodology for identifying and evaluating bridge design and interchange options, please see **Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives,** of the DEIS and the supplemental **Attachment 2, Cape Cod Bridges Program Highway Interchange Approaches Detailed Assessment Report** to **Appendix 3.1.** MassDOT identified transportation and contextual performance measures (measures of effectiveness) to evaluate the options in accordance with its Project Development and Design Guide. The guide defines transportation performance measures as the means to evaluate how the transportation facility functions and accommodates its users, and it defines contextual performance measures as the means to evaluate how the transportation facility relates to its physical surroundings and community function. MassDOT did not weigh evaluation criteria or rank specific users in its evaluation.

Commenter	Comment	Response
York, John	As described above, the currently depicted build alternatives provide ample service improvement for through motor vehicles, but far less for local traffic and multi-modal users. The program team might not be aware of this disparity, but should be. To better understand and resolve this disparity, the Program Team should consider specific users and their needs. Analyzing specific use cases is a good way to understand the suitability of any option and to compare performance of alternatives. A "use case" should specify: 1. A user's origin and destination 2. mode of travel 3. purpose of the trip 4. other factors related to the user's objectives or desires in making the trip. Analysis of performance of a roadway network alternative in meeting the user's needs should include: 1. A narrative description of the route followed to accomplish the trip identifying each roadway segment along the route, navigational movements within the route (turns, merges, roadway crossings, etc), assumed user speed on each segment of the route, assumed time duration of each navigational movement and assumed location, density and speed of other users on each route segment and at each navigational movement. 2. Quantitative performance measures including route distance, trip time, variability of trip time, fuel consumption, number and type of hazards encountered,	The Cape Cod Bridges Program will provide improvements to the local network as well as to local operations and safety. MassDOT has undertaken extensive evaluation and analysis of highway interchange options. This analysis utilized numerous evaluation criteria and objectives including considerations for local traffic and multimodal users. Please refer to **Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives,** of the DEIS and the supplemental **Attachment 2, Cape Cod Bridges Program Highway Interchange Approaches Detailed Assessment Report** to **Appendix 3.1** for further details.

Commenter	Comment	Response
York, John (continued from previous page)	As described in the discussions of use cases 6 and 7, the increased design speed proposed for the Bourne Bridge, along with associated roadway geometry improvements, would deliver freeway acclimated drivers to the open access, multi-user and sub-standard MacArthur Boulevard roadway without geometric or visual cues to alert drivers of the transition. The safety issues created by this volitional design decision are not academic. These are real world impacts to real people, local residents, local roadway users, local law enforcement policing this roadway, bulk haulers with twenty tons of construction and demolition debris or 10,000 gallons of gasoline, school busses, fish marketers delivering the local catch to markets in Boston, New Bedford and New York, and yes, pedestrians and cyclists in that mix, and yes, the occasional impaired operator driving the wrong way on the roadway. 3. Qualitative measures of user safety, user comfort, convenience, and reliability. Analyses should be prepared for each use case, on the existing roadway network and each proposed roadway network alternative, during peak and off-peak traffic conditions. (Refer to Comments I-90.21-90.28 with regard to Use Cases)	

Commenter	Comment	Response
Young, David	What will happen to Route 6 and 6A between the bridges?	Improvements to Route 6 and 6A between the bridges are being considered as part of the Cape Cod Bridges Program. However, the scope is focused on the immediate bridge and approach areas to ensure safe and efficient traffic flow. Minor adjustments may occur to align with the broader transportation system. For additional details, refer to **Section 4.2, Transportation, Traffic, and Safety,** of the DEIS.
Anonymous	Comment with drawing attached of suggested connections and alignments.	Thank you for the comment and feedback. MassDOT appreciates your input, and all comments are considered by the Program Team.
Anonymous	Bourne interchange northbound traffic heading to Sandwich Road should not enter the rotary. There should be a slip lane before the rotary to take you to upper Cape and beyond.	MassDOT will evaluate adding a slip lane from the proposed Northbound Off-Ramp to Sandwich Road Eastbound movement, however, this Program prioritizes safety, and further analysis is required to better understand the relationship of a slip lane with the proposed shared-use path that would cross the slip lane and how to safely control both vehicular and multimodal traffic. Further details on these improvements can be found in **Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives,** of the DEIS.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Anonymous	Bourne Bridge. Diamond interchange for Bourne N.G go to Sarasota Florida and University Avenue. It is hard to figure out in traffic backs up at the lights. On ramp option is the best only one traffic light.	The diamond interchange configuration was selected as the recommended approach for the Bourne South quadrant based on its ability to best meet the Cape Cod Bridges Program's Purpose and Need, including improving mobility, safety, and connectivity for all users. Specifically, the design eliminates the Bourne Rotary and introduces a grade-separated interchange to allow for efficient through movements on State Route 28, bypassing intersections with non-mainline roadways. This grade separation improves connectivity, alleviates congestion, and enhances the overall operations for freight, passenger vehicles, and bus transit traffic. Compared to an on-ramp approach, the diamond interchange provides a more comprehensive solution to managing traffic flows, particularly at high-volume intersections. While an on-ramp approach might reduce some local traffic conflicts, it lacks the regional benefits of a grade-separated design, which minimizes potential delays, reduces conflict points, and ensures smoother traffic flow for both local and regional travelers. Details on the rationale for this design, including its alignment with the program goals and traffic performance metrics, are available in **Chapter 2, Program Purpose and Need,** and **Section 4.2, Transportation, Traffic, and Safety,** of the DEIS.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Anonymous	Hi, thank you for today. We live in nightingale Road in Bourne. The Route 6 is dangerous right now. Truckers and cars speeding. July and August back up and at times they block the light. My wife and I strongly recommend the flyover for Bourne North.	Thank you for your comment regarding the traffic and safety concerns at Route 6 and Nightingale Road in Bourne. The recommended alternative (BN-14.4b) includes improvements designed to enhance traffic flow, safety, and multimodal accommodations in this area. This Directional Interchange Option introduces a new flyover ramp that allows vehicles traveling from Scenic Highway to Route 25 to bypass Belmont Circle, eliminating the need for an additional traffic signal and reducing congestion. Similarly, a direct connect ramp from Route 25 eastbound to Scenic Highway provides efficient access to Scenic Highway eastbound. To further improve traffic flow and safety, the existing southbound off-ramp will be revised to create an option lane, improving geometry and driver decision sight distances. MassDOT is also evaluating intersection controls at the intersection at Scenic Highway/Nightingale Road/Andy Oliva Drive through the Intersection Control Evaluation (ICE) process to determine the best approach to facilitate safe pedestrian crossings and manage vehicular flow. Additionally, this option prioritizes multimodal enhancements by reducing Scenic Highway from four lanes to three, creating space for a 12-foot-wide shared-use path (SUP) on the south side of Scenic Highway connecting to Belmont Circle and a six-foot-wide sidewalk on the north side. The flyover ramp also includes a grade-separated crossing for pedestrians and bicyclists, enhancing connectivity and safety. More detailed information can be found in **Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives,** and **Section 4.2, Transportation, Traffic, and Safety**, of the DEIS.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Anonymous	Bourne North crossing: directional interchange option is the preferred. Neither southbound option is good.	The Directional Interchange Option (BN-14.4b) has been identified as the recommended alternative for Bourne North. The design team appreciates your input on the southbound options and continues to refine these elements to ensure the best possible outcomes for all users. For more details on the evaluation process and design considerations, please refer to **Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives,** of the DEIS.
Anonymous	I choose the flyover for Bourne North.	The Directional Interchange Option (BN-14.4b), which includes the flyover ramp, has been selected as the recommended alternative. For more details on the evaluation process and design considerations, please refer to **Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives,** of the DEIS.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Anonymous	Serious concern about the lack of planning on improving Sandwich Rd between the two bridges. The new bridges will increase the flow over the canal, but traffic will grind to a halt when trying to proceed down Sandwich Road. Consider constructing a bypass road between the two bridges.	Thank you for your comment regarding traffic along Sandwich Road. The Cape Cod Bridges Program has carefully evaluated traffic patterns, including the impact on Sandwich Road, as part of the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. Under the Build Alternative, travel times along Sandwich Road are expected to improve due to the redistribution of traffic to Scenic Highway. Traffic analysis (**Table 7-4** of the DEIS) indicates that the primary eastbound route from State Route 25 to U.S. Route 6 would shift from Sandwich Road to Scenic Highway, resulting in shorter travel times and reduced congestion along Sandwich Road. Additionally, the elimination of the Bourne Rotary and its replacement with a grade-separated diamond interchange will enhance traffic operations for regional and local movements. These improvements are anticipated to reduce backups and delays along Sandwich Road, contributing to smoother traffic flows and increased connectivity for all users in the area. For further details, we encourage you to review the transportation analysis in **Section 4.2, Transportation, Traffic, and Safety,** of the DEIS.
Anonymous	I really like the Bourne North Crossing: directional interchange option is best.	Thank you for your comment supporting the Directional Interchange Option (BN-14.4b), which has been selected as the recommended alternative. For more information on the evaluation process and design details, please refer to **Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives,** of the DEIS.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Anonymous	Comment card demonstrating a crossing over cranberry highway to connect upper and lower at Street.	The proposed design under the Westbound On-Ramp Option (SS-3.1A) for the Sagamore area addresses the suggestion of creating improved crossings and connectivity along Cranberry Highway. Specifically, the Cranberry Highway Extension will enhance multimodal connections by creating a new link between the Mid-Cape Connector and Cranberry Highway, supporting better access for local neighborhoods and businesses. This option includes pedestrian and bicycle accommodations through a shared-use path (SUP) and additional bicycle/pedestrian improvements along Cranberry Highway, fostering safe and accessible routes. Moreover, the realignment of ramps and modifications to lane configurations at key intersections will improve traffic operations, accommodate revised patterns, and reduce congestion. The new signalized intersections and adjustments to access driveways for local businesses, such as Market Basket and the former Christmas Tree Shops area, further integrate local and regional connectivity. For more detailed information, please refer to **Section 4.2, Transportation, Traffic, and Safety,** and **Section 4.4, Marine Transportation, Traffic, and Safety,** of the DEIS.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Anonymous	In consideration of traffic flow, there does not seem to be much thought to the upper Cape and Falmouth with the influx of trucks and other large vehicles going to the woods hole ferries.	Thank you for your comment regarding traffic flow to the Upper Cape and Falmouth, particularly for trucks and other large vehicles heading to the Woods Hole ferries. The proposed improvements at Bourne South include a grade-separated diamond interchange, which is designed to optimize freight and truck traffic by providing uninterrupted southbound movements along State Route 28. By bypassing intersections with non-mainline roadways, this configuration ensures smoother, more efficient traffic flow and reduces congestion. Additionally, the design enhances connectivity and safety for all roadway users, aligning with the Cape Cod Bridges Program's Purpose and Need. For further details, please refer to **Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives,** and **Section 4.2, Transportation, Traffic, and Safety,** of the DEIS.

2.16 Scenarios

Table 2-17 includes comments and responses related to different scenarios of pedestrian and bicycle use and proposed accommodations.

Table 2-17. Scenarios Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comment	Response
York, John	Here are eight examples pedestrian/bicycle use cases. Five of these address mobility through and around the Bourne South Interchange, and do not involve crossing the bridge. These are chosen to elevate users currently on the bottom of the priority order. Cases 4 and 5 involve crossing the Sagamore Bridge, are intended to put a face on the question of connector path length and its impact on origin to destination crossing distance, as well as the question of which side of the bridge should have the path. It is difficult to understand why the project team has located the proposed Sagamore Bridge shared-use path on the west side of the bridge as opposed to the existing sidewalk location on the east side of the bridge. The proposed west side location creates problems because the infrastructure served by the sidewalk is east of the bridge. The present sidewalk serves that infrastructure well. The proposed path does not serve that infrastructure well. Federally funded projects are supposed to consider options to increase use of pedestrian, bicycle and transit modes. Federal rules for sidewalk replacement prohibit removal of an existing sidewalk unless it is replaced by a sidewalk providing equal or improved level of service. (Also refer to Comments I-90.24 and I-90.25)	The Cape Cod Bridges Program prioritizes safe and efficient pedestrian and bicycle access. An extensive and exhaustive evaluation process was performed to determine which side of the bridge would receive the shared use path facility. Multiple factors were evaluated as part of the decision-making process including proximity to key destinations such as Market Basket, Sandwich Road and the Canal Path, designing to meet ADA/AAB regulations requiring a 4.5% longitudinal grade for ped/bike facilities, and impact to existing right-of-way, public, commercial and residential properties. Maintaining accessibility guidance requires a longer path to accommodate the grade differences on either side of the bridge. As stated in the comment, sidewalk replacements must match or improve upon the existing condition. The existing path connection at Sagamore Bridge Walkway will be maintained but is proposed to include a new connection under the bridge to meet the new connection on the west side of the bridge. This connection matches the existing facility needs, and the proposed shared use path exceeds the existing sidewalk design.

Commenter	Comment	Response
York, John	Use Cases: 1. A high school math teacher rides a bicycle to work, and coaches the hockey team after school. How does he get from the High School to Gallo Ice Arena? Now he has inspired some team members to do the same. What is the best route for them to ride as a group from the high school to Gallo Arena?	As described in **Section 4.3, Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities,** of the DEIS, the Build Alternative proposes the installation of new sidewalk and shared-use-path (SUP) infrastructure for bicyclists and pedestrians within the project limits. Under Build Alternative conditions, bicyclists would be able to safely and conveniently navigate Trowbridge Road, the dogbone interchange replacing the existing Bourne Rotary, and Sandwich Road. A new 12-foot-wide SUP would provide continuous, west-to-east connectivity across the Bourne South project limits. This SUP would enhance multimodal access throughout the corridor and support safe travel for both bicyclists and pedestrians. Rather than placing crosswalks at every intersection, pedestrian and bicycle accommodations would be strategically located to balance safety, visibility, and traffic operations. The provision of off-road shared use paths and facilities would reduce potential conflicts with pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists by providing physically separated travel areas for non-motorized road users, enhancing safety and comfort for individual and group travelers, alike.

Commenter	Comment	Response
York, John	2. A 14 year old who lives in Gray Gables is a recreational skater, and also a huge baseball fan. She loves to ride her bike on the Canal Path, which her parents let her do with her friends. How would they get to Doran Field (at the Upper Cape Regional Technical School) to watch a Bourne Braves game? How would they get to and from Gallo Ice Arena for public free skate ice time?	As described in **Section 4.3, Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities,** of the DEIS, the Build Alternative would provide bicyclist and pedestrian connectivity from the existing SUP facilities along the Canal Service Road (Canal Path) via the existing rail crossing within the Bourne Recreation area. The rail crossing would be signalized with warning beacons, providing a safe connection for all users. The Build Alternative would provide connectivity to the crossing via the installation of a SUP along Sandwich Road, on which bicyclists and pedestrians could safely and comfortably access the Upper Cape Regional Technical School and Gallo Ice Arena. The SUP fully extends to the grounds of the Upper Cape Regional Tech and to the Gallo Ice Arena.
York, John	3. A friend from Sagamore wants to join the others for free skate. He will be riding his bicycle on the Canal path from Sagamore. How would he get from the Canal path to Gallo Arena?	This traveler could access the North Canal Service Road east of the Sagamore Bridge, cross via the SUPs provided on the Sagamore Bridge or Bourne Bridge, and then follow the same path as outlined in Scenario 2.
York, John	4. A member of the Bourne Council on Disabilities lives in the Canal View Apartments at 860 Sandwich Road in South Sagamore. The Council meets once a month, in Bourne's North Sagamore Fire Station at 51 Meetinghouse Lane, a short distance from the bridge. The Council member uses the sidewalk of the Sagamore Bridge to get to Council meetings. The distance is 1.2 miles. It takes about 24 minutes to make the trip. (Also refer to Comment I-90.15)	As described in **Section 4.3, Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities,** of the DEIS, under the Build Alternative, pedestrians will experience significantly safer and comfortable travel conditions within the project limits due to the installation of separated sidewalks and SUPs. Under these conditions, a pedestrian could access the Sagamore Bridge via the proposed SUP on Sandwich Road, traverse the bridge via a new SUP, stop to admire the sunset safely and comfortably by resting at benches along the path, and connect to Scenic Highway and Meetinghouse Lane via a continuous SUP with crosswalks at all intersections. For both use cases, the trip distances, crossing times, and sunrise views will be comparable to existing conditions, but both trips will be significantly safer and more enjoyable under the Build Scenario.

Commenter	Comment	Response
York, John	5. The same Council member commutes to Boston four days a week. The council member takes an early morning bus from the park and ride at the north side of the bridge, and enjoys watching the sunrise over Cape Cod Bay from the sidewalk of the bridge on the way to the bus. The crossing from apartment to bus stop is 0.8 miles and takes about 16 minutes. What will be the trip distance and crossing time via the new bridge? How will the sunrise look? (Also refer to Comment I-90.15)	Please refer to Scenario 4.
York, John	A note on use Cases 4 and 5, and path placement on east or west span of proposed new Sagamore Bridge: MassDOT says the reason they have proposed to locate the shared-use path on the west side of the Sagamore Bridge is because a path on the east side, the side of the current sidewalk, would require too much real estate taking for the connector paths, but that does not make sense. The new bridge will be west of the of the old bridge. There should be plenty of state owned real estate where the old bridge used to be. (Refer to Comments I-90.24 and I-90.25 with regard to Cases 4 and 5.)	The Sagamore Bridge SUP would provide users with connections east and west of the bridge across the footprint of the existing (demolished) bridge. East of the Sagamore Bridge, the SUP would connect the Park and Ride lot to the Sagamore Recreation Area and North Canal Service Road. Real estate is more limited due to the existing Starbucks. The SUP west of the bridge would reduce the number of multimodal crossings, providing safety benefits, and would contribute to more efficient roadway geometry within the Sagamore project limits.

Commenter	Comment	Response
York, John	6. A person working hard to get by is temporarily living with a friend in an apartment at Harmony Hill Road, just off MacArthur Boulevard, about 2 miles south of the Bourne Rotary. He works weekend night shifts in Providence, RI, and walks 2.3 miles north, mostly along the south-bound breakdown lane of MacArthur Boulevard, from the apartment to the Trowbridge Road park and ride bus stop on Fridays, Saturdays and Sundays at about 4 PM. What would his walking route be with the new bridge and interchange? How many road crossings would he make in or near the proposed interchange? Is there a crosswalk for each of these crossings? Approaching the interchange on his way north, would he cross over from MacAthur Boulevard to Frontage Road or stay on MacArthur Boulevard? How would he cross over onto Frontage Road? Would his trip along MacArthur Boulevard, from Harbor Hill Road to Frontage Road or where ever he leaves MacArthur Boulevard, be safe? What signage or road geometry would alert Route 25 drivers traveling over the bridge and proceeding south that the limited access highway has ended and there may be pedestrians and cyclists in the roadway? Would these drivers notice the signs? How large would the signs be and where will they be posted? (Please specify MUTCD designation and dimensions of a sign you might anticipate using.)	As described in **Section 4.3, Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities,** of the DEIS, the Build Alternative proposes the installation of a new SUP along the western side of MacArthur Boulevard beginning approximately at the Bourne High School Recreational Fields. This SUP travels north along MacArthur Boulevard and provides connectivity to the Trowbridge Road SUP for bicyclists and pedestrians. Potential conflicts with pedestrians, cyclists, and motorists would be reduced for bicyclist and pedestrian travelers along the off-road SUP, enhancing safety and comfort. Pedestrians accessing the Cape Side Convenience bus stop on Trowbridge Road could safely traverse MacArthur Boulevard via a crosswalk connecting to a SUP, that would provide direct connectivity to the bus stop and only require crossing two additional crosswalks to reach the bus stop. Safety countermeasures will be provided at crosswalks. All signage will follow federal and state regulations dictating size and legibility and will be placed along MacArthur Boulevard at key junctures to maximize visibility for drivers, pedestrians, and bicyclists. The crosswalks and road geometry would be designed to prioritize safety for all road users and would be compliant with all relevant state and federal safety regulations.

Commenter	Comment	Response
York, John (continued from previous page)	Note on case 6, above This person exists, or did until he was hit by two cars while trying cross Trowbridge Road to get to the bus. He survived, but one month after the crash it was not clear how much cognitive function he would recover. The current "project area" for the Bourne Bridge replacement does not include the Trowbridge Road transit (bus) stop located a few hundred feet from the Bourne Rotary. One of the proposed Bourne South Interchange plans shows a Trowbridge Road crosswalk, another shows a system of three crosswalks that might or might not get one from Frontage Road or MacArthur Boulevard to the Trowbridge Road bus stop.	
York, John	The point of case 6 is that there are low-income Environmental Justice populations in Bourne. These EJ populations are correctly identified in MassDOT's Environmental Notification Form (ENF) for the Bridges Program, filed in June of 2023, but otherwise have been and are being ignored by MassDOT.	In accordance with Executive Order 14173 and the U.S. Department of Justice February 5, 2025, memorandum, "Rescinding 'Environmental Justice" Memoranda," Environmental Justice is not a criterion for consideration for NEPA review.
York, John	7. An employee at the Bourne Department of Integrated Solid Waste Management (ISWM) facility lives on Cotuit Road in Bourne Village and walks or rides a bicycle to work. How will that employee reach the ISWM facility? If the employee walks or rides via Waterhouse Road, how will the pedestrian crossing of MacArthur Boulevard be marked, signed and signaled? What will alert freeway acclimated drivers proceeding south from the bridge and provide them guidance and opportunity to stop?	Bicyclists and pedestrians can utilize Waterhouse Road's existing sidewalk to safely navigate the trip from Cotuit Road to MacArthur Boulevard Road. However, due to the MA-R9-15* sign posting, bicyclists and pedestrians are currently prohibited from using Route 28, and there is no proposed bicycle or pedestrian infrastructure at this juncture. *Mass Amendments to the MUTCD 2022: At ramps to limited access highways where travel is restricted to motor vehicles, only, a PEDESTRIANS, BICYCLES, HORSES PROHIBITED (MA-R9-15) sign shall be used.

Commenter	Comment	Response
York, John	8. A staff person at the Jonathan Bourne Library at 22 Sandwich Road in Bourne Village on the Cape Cod side of the Canal, or the Bourne School Administration Building at 35 Sandwich Road, wants to have lunch with a friend who works at Town Hall, located at 24 Perry Avenue in Buzzards Bay Village, on the mainland side of the Canal. They decide to get a take out lunch from the Bourne Community Building cafe at 239 Main Street on the mainland side of the Canal and eat outdoors at Three Mile Look, a Town owned park overlooking the Canal. The Town Hall friend offers to pick up their lunches and meet the Library staff person at Three Mile Look. What would be the walking trip distance and travel time to walk from the Library to Three Mile Look? What would be the distance and travel time to return? Would walking be a viable option for a one hour lunch time round trip? What would be the trip distance and travel time by car? What would be the driving speeds and fuel use? With the proposed replacement bridge and roadways, what would be the wallking distance, walking time, driving distance, driving time and fuel use. Would the build option provide any improvement over the no build option? (Also refer to Comment I-90.16)	Please refer to prior responses that describe the sidewalk and SUP connectivity proposed north and south of the Cape Cod Canal at the Bourne Bridge. Walking trip distance and travel time would be comparable to existing conditions. Driving trip distance and travel time by car would also be comparable, unless this use case takes place during the summer months, in which travel time by car under the Build Alternative would be reduced slightly due to an improvement in local connections and decrease in vehicle congestion resulting from improved road geometry.

Commenter	Comment	Response
York, John	Case 8 involves a pedestrian round trip crossing the Bourne Bridge with limited time to make the trip. Due to excessive walking distance, neither the existing bridge nor proposed new bridge provide a walkable option for a simple trip from Bourne Village to Buzzards Bay and back. With the proposed replacement bridge and interchanges, walking distance and time, the limiting factors, would be greater, i.e., worse, than with the existing bridge and roadways. The would be pedestrian is forced to drive to make the trip. For the driving option, proposed Bourne South interchange alternatives would have longer trip distances and longer travel times due to increased interchange complexity and long on and off ramps. Speed increases on the short length of the bridge span would not offset increased on and off ramp travel travel time. Total travel time via the proposed bridge and interchanges might be the same as or slightly longer than via the existing bridge and interchanges, but fuel use via the proposed alternatives would certainly be greater due to increased distance, increased speeds and increased acceleration and deceleration. Thus, the proposed build alternatives would not improve the viability of the walking option, but would increase the time, fuel cost and environmental impact of the driving option. The local roadway user, whether pedestrian or motorist, is paying in time and dollars for time and economic advantages provided to through traffic users.	Multimodal improvements within the Program include serving interests to those who walk and bike to work, school, for leisure, exercise, and other purposes. While the Program is improving multimodal accommodations to improve walking times and shorten trip durations, there are other factors that are incorporated into the design that the design team is still coordinating with MassDOT and the Town of Bourne to incorporate into the 25% design plans.

Commenter	Comment	Response
York, John	It is worth noting that a simple, proven and commonly employed multi-modal solution, a cross-canal water taxi, would allow safe, convenient, comfortable short-distance pedestrian travel between Bourne Village and Buzzards Bay, would qualify for Federal Highway funding as a component of a Federally established Maritime Highway, would qualify for several transit funding opportunities including zero-emission transit vehicle funding, and would boost the Bridges Program's standing as an innovative program when applying for Federal discretionary funds. Not only would such a transit feature boost funding opportunities for the Bridges Program, but it would allow this program to meet its fundamental obligation to provide viable cross-canal connectivity for pedestrians. Currently proposed bridge alternatives do not meet that obligation. It is also worth noting that such a multi-modal solution fits well within the stated scope of the Bridges Program and as an innovative, multi-modal local connectivity solution that could be implemented as a stand-alone project ahead of completion of other components, falls within several of this program's prioritized categories of component projects. I do not include a use case 9. What could be use case 9 occurred on May 10 this year and is reported in the online version of the Bourne Enterprise newspaper, but as of this writing has not been published in the print version. https://www.capenews.net/bourne/news/one-arrested-after-two-vehicle-crash-on-bourne-bridge/article_07989d21-f71a-552d-87fe-bc2f548cf927.html	Please note that the existing canal is a federal navigational channel, and a cross-canal water taxi is not feasible nor safe per USACE regulations.

2.17 Socioeconomics

Table 2-18 includes a comment and response related to socioeconomic considerations.

Table 2-18. Socioeconomics Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comment	Response
Anonymous	Economic impacts! I am concerned about another route 25 impact.	The DEIS addresses economic considerations associated with the project, including regional and local economic impacts, changes in transportation patterns, and how these factors may influence surrounding areas. The Build Alternative is expected to lead to economic benefits including increased access to jobs, consumer expenditures, and time savings. For a detailed discussion, please refer to **Section 4.5, Socioeconomics,** of the DEIS.

2.18 Utilities

Table 2-19 includes comments and responses related to existing utilities.

Table 2-19. Utilities Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comment	Response
USEPA: Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	The Supplementary Notice of Intent document notes that the natural gas infrastructure may be routed beneath the Cape Cod Canal via directional drilling. We recommend that the potential impacts associated with relocation of these utilities be incorporated into the EIS analysis of impacts along with a discussion of the timing of the utility relocation and a general discussion of steps taken to minimize project impacts from the utility work.	Please note that the relocation of the gas line beneath the Cape Cod Canal is a separate project by the utility companies. The environmental impacts from this separate work will be addressed in its own NEPA environmental review under the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and environmental permitting. The Cape Cod Bridges Program is coordinating closely with this utility project regarding schedule to ensure each project can coexist within the same general vicinity of one another.
Pepe, Monica	Regarding the gas lines that need to be disconnected and relocated, is there any anticipated impact to nearby businesses or residences while this work is being conducted?	While the relocation of utilities, including gas lines, is an essential component of the overall infrastructure improvements, this work is managed as a separate project by the utility companies. MassDOT is collaborating closely with these entities to ensure that impacts to nearby businesses and residences are minimized.

2.19 Water

Table 2-20 includes comments and responses related to the Program's effect on wetlands, floodplains, and waterways, stormwater, and water quality.

Table 2-20. Water Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comment	Response
USEPA: Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	The EIS should present a discussion of wetlands, streams and other waters of the United States including the Cape Cod Canal that may be directly or indirectly impacted during project construction and operation. We recommend that the wetland analysis in the EIS focus on these potential impacts and that the EIS describe the design/construction measures that will be implemented to avoid and minimize construction and operation impacts across all alternatives.	Please refer to **Section 4.9, Wetlands and Floodplains,** of the DEIS for pertinent information relative to the affected environment and mitigation measures that will be employed during construction and operations.
USEPA: Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	Where temporary or permanent fill is proposed or will otherwise impact wetlands or other waters of the United States, the EIS should explain how the activity will comply with EPA's Clean Water Act regulations issued under Section 404 (b)(l), referred to as "EPA's 404 (b)(l) Guidelines." We also recommend that the EIS include an evaluation of how each alternative can be designed to avoid, or where unavoidable, minimize direct and indirect impacts to wetlands and other waters. The evaluation of direct and indirect impacts should fully consider both temporary and permanent impacts. The evaluation of indirect impacts should include construction related indirect impacts, post construction water quality impacts (both positive and negative) and potential erosion and sedimentation impacts.	Please refer to **Section 4.9, Wetlands and Floodplains,** of the DEIS for discussion of avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures associated with the construction and operation of the Build Alternative, consistent with Clean Water Act 404 (b)(I) guidelines. Please also refer to **Appendix 4.9, Attachment 2, Conformance with Performance Standards of the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act,** for additional details.

Commenter	Comment	Response
USEPA: Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	All construction practices which will be utilized to avoid and minimize impacts to wetlands and waters should be documented in the EIS. The EIS should also include a discussion of anticipated compensatory mitigation for unavoidable direct and indirect impacts to wetlands and other waters.	Please refer to **Section 4.9, Wetlands and Floodplains,** of the DEIS for discussion of construction period best management practices that will be utilized to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts to wetlands and waterways. Please also refer to **Appendix 4.9, Attachment 2, Conformance with Performance Standards of the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act,** for additional details.
USEPA: Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	We encourage close coordination with MA DEP, the United States Coast Guard, EPA, and others, regarding the proposed wetland and waterway work. EPA intends to continue to coordinate closely with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, FHWA and MassDOT on these issues as the environmental review for the project progresses.	MassDOT will continue to coordinate with MA DEP, the USCG, USEPA, USACE, and other Cooperating Agencies through the completion of NEPA and as the Build Alternative is advanced through design permitting.
USEPA: Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	The EIS should describe how the bridge and roadway components of the project will be designed to accommodate significant rainfall events/extreme weather and flooding both during construction and operation. The analysis should identify areas where stormwater management systems and culverts must be sized (or replaced) to accommodate the increased precipitation frequency, intensity, and associated flooding being experienced due to climate change.	Please refer to **Section 4.10, Water Quality and Stormwater,** of the DEIS for an analysis regarding water quality and stormwater. Please note that this assessment includes information regarding methodologies for predicting future rainfall projections used to inform proposed stormwater control measures.

Commenter	Comment	Response
USEPA: Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	Other measures that will be required to accommodate increases in flooding or the siting of project components in the floodplain should also be described.	Please refer to **Section 4.9, Wetlands and Floodplains,** of the DEIS for assessment of the effects to special flood hazard areas and provision of compensatory flood storage in encroachment areas as required by applicable regulatory requirements under the Wetlands Protection Act. Please also refer to **Appendix 4.9, Attachment 2, Conformance with Performance Standards of the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act,** for additional details.
USEPA: Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	We recommend that the EIS include an analysis of proposed construction phase stormwater controls to demonstrate that applicable water quality standards will not be violated. The discussion should specifically describe how stormwater runoff from the proposed bridges and new and reconfigured project roadways will be managed to prevent degradation of water quality.	Please refer to **Section 4.10, Water Quality and Stormwater,** of the DEIS for relevant information on the construction-related and operational effects of the Build Alternative on stormwater and water quality.
USEPA: Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	In addition, we recommend that a detailed analysis of water quality impacts be provided for each construction scenario considered in the EIS.	Please refer to **Section 4.10, Water Quality and Stormwater,** of the DEIS for relevant information on the construction-related and operational effects of the Build Alternative on stormwater and water quality.

Commenter	Comment	Response
USEPA: Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	We recommend that the EIS provide details regarding the design parameters and performance standards that will be targeted for components of the stormwater management system proposed for the project (both for the bridges and proposed roadway enhancements).	Please refer to **Section 4.10, Water Quality and Stormwater,** of the DEIS for an analysis regarding stormwater and water quality. Please note that the stormwater management system under the Build Alternative would be designed to comply with the Massachusetts Stormwater Management Standards as enforced through the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act Regulations and the 401 Water Quality Certification Regulations. Please refer to the supporting Technical Report (**Appendix 4.10**) for additional details.
USEPA: Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	The EIS should provide details to explain how the project will comply with MS4 and other water quality permitting requirements.	Please refer to **Section 4.10, Water Quality and Stormwater,** of the DEIS as well as **Appendix 4.10, Water Quality and Stormwater Technical Report,** for a discussion of compliance with applicable regulatory requirements.
USEPA: Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	We also recommend that the EIS provide a description of the proposed maintenance protocols for the stormwater system and a description of design measures proposed to avoid erosion at any proposed discharge locations. Improvements to stormwater management (when compared to current conditions) brought about by the new infrastructure should be highlighted.	MassDOT will prepare a post construction Operations and Maintenance (O&M) Plan, which will be included in the Stormwater Management Report to be filed in accordance with permitting requirements under Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act. Please refer to **Appendix 4.10, Water Quality and Stormwater Technical Report,** for maintenance protocols associated with the long-term operation of the Build Alternative.

Commenter	Comment	Response
USEPA: Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	We recommend that the EIS provide sufficient information to fully assess the potential for impacts to groundwater (contamination) during construction and operation of the project. The discussion should identify measures to prevent impacts to the aquifer including Best Management Practices (BMPs) that will be utilized during the project construction period and how stormwater management structures will be maintained to sustain designed pollutant removal capabilities over the life of the project.	Please refer to **Section 4.10, Water Quality and Stormwater,** of the DEIS for a discussion of avoidance, minimization, and mitigation of impacts to groundwater.
DFG, Douglas H. Cameron Director/Chief Engineer,	As identified in the "Supplementary Notice of Intent Document" the following state authorizations are required, specifically. 1. MassDEP Chapter 91 License under the Massachusetts Public Waterfront Act (310 CMR 9.00); 2. Massachusetts Office of Coastal Zone Management (MA CZM) Federal Consistency Review under Coastal Zone Management Act (321 CMR 20.00)	MassDOT is coordinating with Massachusetts Executive Office and Energy and Environmental Affairs (EEA) and MassDEP to determine the applicability of MGL Chapter 91 for proposed bridge replacements over Cape Cod Canal. Please refer to **Section 4.12, Coastal Zone Consistency,** for further details regarding an assessment of compliance with CZM policies.