



Cape Cod Bridges Program

Bourne, Massachusetts

Appendix 6.3 Responses to Draft Environmental Impact Statement 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 June 2026

massDOT
Massachusetts Department of Transportation

Table of Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Response to Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comments	1
2.1	Air Quality	5
2.2	Proposed Action and Alternatives	6
2.3	Additional and Interim Improvements	21
2.4	Adaptation and Resiliency	22
2.5	Construction Approach	24
2.6	Indirect and Other Effects	31
2.7	Funding	35
2.8	Transportation, Traffic, and Safety	36
2.9	Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities	53
2.10	Maritime Transportation, Traffic, and Safety	79
2.11	NEPA Process	80
2.12	Public Involvement	81
2.13	Public Parks, Recreational Facilities, and Open Space	88
2.14	Right-of-Way	94
2.15	Socioeconomics	100
2.16	Land Use, Zoning, and Community Cohesion	103
2.17	Threatened, Endangered, and Protected Species and Habitats	106
2.18	Utilities and Services	108
2.19	Solid and Hazardous Waste Material Management	109
2.20	Water Resources	109
2.21	Visual Resources	116
2.22	Cultural Resources	118

Tables

Table 2-1.	Comments Received on the DEIS	2
Table 2-2.	Comment Themes and Table References	4
Table 2-3.	Air Quality Comments and Responses	5
Table 2-4.	Proposed Action and Alternatives Comments and Responses	6
Table 2-5.	Additional and Interim Improvements Comments and Responses	21
Table 2-6.	Adaptation and Resiliency Comments and Responses	22
Table 2-7.	Construction Approach Comments and Responses	24
Table 2-8.	Indirect and Other Effects Comments and Responses	31
Table 2-9.	Funding Comments and Responses	35
Table 2-10.	Transportation, Traffic, and Safety Comments and Responses	36
Table 2-11.	Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities Comments and Responses	53
Table 2-12.	Maritime Transportation, Traffic, and Safety Comments and Responses	79

Table 2-13.	NEPA Process Comments and Responses	80
Table 2-14.	Public Involvement Comments and Responses	81
Table 2-15.	Public Parks, Recreational Facilities, and Open Space Comments and Responses	88
Table 2-16.	Right-of-Way Comments and Responses.....	94
Table 2-17.	Socioeconomics Comments and Responses	100
Table 2-18.	Land Use, Zoning, and Community Cohesion Comments and Responses.....	103
Table 2-19.	Threatened, Endangered, and Protected Species and Habitats Comments and Responses.....	106
Table 2-20.	Utilities and Services Comments and Responses.....	108
Table 2-21.	Solid and Hazardous Waste Material Management Comments and Responses.....	109
Table 2-22.	Water Resources Comments and Responses	109
Table 2-23.	Visual Resources Comments and Responses	116
Table 2-24.	Cultural Resources Comments and Responses.....	118

Attachments

Attachment 1: Draft Environmental Impact Statement Public Hearing Transcript

Acronyms and Abbreviations

Acronym/Abbreviation	Definition
ACHP	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
CCRTA	Cape Cod Regional Transit Authority
CMR	Code of Massachusetts Regulations
DEIS	Draft Environmental Impact Statement
EEA	Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs
EFH	Essential Fish Habitat
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
ESA	Endangered Species Act
FEIS	Final Environmental Impact Statement
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
MassDOT	Massachusetts Department of Transportation
MA WPA	Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act
MGL	Massachusetts General Law
MPO	Metropolitan Planning Organization

Acronym/Abbreviation	Definition
MRER/EA	Major Rehabilitation Evaluation Report/Environmental Assessment
MUTCD	Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
PIMA	Public Involvement Management Application
PIP	Public Involvement Plan
Program	Cape Cod Bridges Program
PROWAG	Public Right-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines
RTP	Regional Transportation Plan
SUP	Shared-use path
TMP	Traffic Management Plan
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
VAI	Vanasse and Associates Inc.

1 Introduction

This Responses to Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comments Appendix¹ has been prepared in support of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) and Record of Decision for the Cape Cod Bridges Program (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 Decision Making 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 Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comments

FHWA is responsible for filing the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for publication of the Notice of Availability in the Federal Register, which establishes a period of not fewer than 45 days and no more than 60 days for comments on the DEIS. The Notice of Availability for the DEIS was published in the Federal Register on November 21, 2025 (90 CFR 52660), and public comments on the DEIS were accepted for 45 days following publication of the Notice of Availability. In accordance with 23 CFR 771.111(h)(2)(iii), the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) is responsible for conducting the DEIS public meetings and/or public hearings in coordination with FHWA. A public hearing was held on December 16, 2025, and MassDOT accepted comments through January 5, 2026. The Public Hearing Transcript is provided in **Appendix 6.3, Attachment 1, Draft Environmental Impact Statement Public Hearing Transcript**. The comments submitted on the DEIS are compiled in **Appendix 6.3, Attachment 2, Draft Environmental Impact Statement Comments**, which presents the full range of input received during the public comment period. In preparing the FEIS, MassDOT prioritized providing detailed responses to comments that warranted explicit responses or clarification.

In total, 53 members of the public provided comments on the DEIS between November 21, 2025, and January 5, 2026, via the in-person public hearing, MassDOT website, Public Involvement Management Application (PIMA), and/or email correspondence to FHWA and MassDOT.

¹ This appendix has been newly prepared for inclusion in the FEIS and was not part of the previously submitted DEIS; therefore, “New Text” formatting has not been applied.

Table 2-1 identifies the agencies, organizations, and individuals that provided comments on the DEIS. **Table 2-2** provides the overarching comment themes and the corresponding table where the individual comments and responses are provided (**Table 2-3 through Table 2-22**).

Table 2-1. Comments Received on the DEIS

Agency	Commenter	Type
Individual	Aiden Boni	Public Involvement Management Application (PIMA)
Individual	Andrew Carter	PIMA
Association to Preserve Cape Cod	Association to Preserve Cape Cod	Letter
Individual	Bill Sullivan	Email
Individual	Bill Sykes	PIMA
Cape Cod Commission	Cape Cod Commission	Letter, PIMA
Individual	Catherine Roberts	Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) Website
Individual	Dan Lewis	PIMA
Individual	David Michael Race	PIMA
Individual	David Nagle	MassDOT Website
Individual	David Sutter	PIMA
Individual	Diane DeLuc	PIMA
Individual	Don Hayward	PIMA
Individual	Elise Hugus	PIMA
Individual	Emily Paskewicz	MassDOT Website
Foss Marine Terminal	Foss Marine Terminal	Public Hearing
Individual	Gary Dayton	Public Hearing
Individual	Jay Batson	Public Hearing, Email, PIMA
Individual	Joan Hendel	Public Hearing
Individual	John Thompson	PIMA
Individual	John York	Public Hearing, Email, PIMA
Individual	Kathryn Scott	PIMA
Individual	Ken Cheitlin	PIMA
Individual	Kenny Rogers	MassDOT Website

Agency	Commenter	Type
Individual	Leon Weatherell	PIMA
Outriders Inc.	Lew Lasher/Outriders Inc.	PIMA
Individual	Luka Govedic	MassDOT Website
Individual	Mark Hendel	Public Hearing
Individual	Mary Ann Bassett	PIMA
Individual	Mary Jane Mastrangelo	MassDOT Website
Individual	Matthew Dillon	Letter
Individual	Maureen Boyd	PIMA
Individual	Michaela Bingham	PIMA
Individual	Michael Caron	PIMA
Individual	Paul Tilton	PIMA
Individual	Peter Bertling	PIMA
Individual	Richard Jordan	PIMA
Individual	Ross Kessler	PIMA
Sierra Club	Sierra Club	Letter
Individual	Stephan Zaets	PIMA
Individual	Stephen Buckley	Public Hearing
Individual	Susan Baracchini	Public Hearing
Individual	Sylvia Goodale	PIMA
Department of Public Works	Town of Sandwich Department of Public Works	Letter
Individual	Tsmsrs Race	PIMA
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Letter
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	Letter
Vanasse and Associates Inc.	Vanasse & Associates Inc.	Letter

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

Table 2-2. Comment Themes and Table References

Topic	Table Where Comment(s) is Listed
Air Quality	Table 2-3
Proposed Action and Alternatives	Table 2-4
Additional and Interim Improvements	Table 2-5
Adaptation and Resiliency	Table 2-6
Construction Approach	Table 2-7
Indirect and Other Effects	Table 2-8
Funding	Table 2-9
Transportation, Traffic, and Safety	Table 2-10
Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities	Table 2-11
Maritime Transportation, Traffic, and Safety	Table 2-12
National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Process	Table 2-13
Public Involvement	Table 2-14
Public Parks, Recreational Facilities, and Open Space	Table 2-15
Right-of-Way	Table 2-16
Socioeconomics	Table 2-17
Land Use, Zoning, and Community Cohesion	Table 2-18
Threatened, Endangered, and Protected Species and Habitats	Table 2-19
Utilities and Services	Table 2-20
Solid and Hazardous Waste Material Management	Table 2-21
Water Resources	Table 2-22
Visual Resources	Table 2-23
Cultural Resources	Table 2-24

2.1 Air Quality

Table 2-3 provides comments and responses related to air quality.

Table 2-3. Air Quality Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comment	Response
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA): Timothy Timmermann, Director, Office of Environmental Review	EPA acknowledges the FHWA commitment in the Draft EIS to provide a quantitative analysis of projected emission increases during construction in the Final EIS. We stand ready in our capacity as a cooperating agency to conduct a rapid review of an administrative draft of the quantitative analysis prior to publication of the Final EIS to confirm that it adequately describes and addresses construction period impacts.	A quantitative mobile-source construction emissions analysis has been completed for the Final Environmental Impact Statement. The analysis evaluates projected emissions from diesel truck traffic and marine vessel activity during construction and compares those emissions to the applicable EPA <i>de minimis</i> thresholds. Additional details are provided in Section 4.13, Air Quality , of the Final Environmental Impact Statement. As part of the Cooperating Agency coordination process, the Massachusetts Department of Transportation provided EPA with an administrative draft of the construction emissions analysis for review prior to publication of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

2.2 Proposed Action and Alternatives

Table 2-4 includes comments and responses related to the proposed action and alternatives.

Table 2-4. Proposed Action and Alternatives Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comment	Response
Anonymous	This entire project should be canceled. We should not be building state Bridges over a federal canal. If the federal government does not want to build a bridge over their canal we should fill in the canal and return the area to its natural state. Then build a simple road on top of it.	The need for the proposed action is driven by the deteriorated condition and outdated design of the existing 1930s bridges. Chapter 2 of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) provides a detailed explanation of the Cape Cod Bridges Program's (Program) Purpose and Need Statement. Cape Cod Canal is an economically important navigation channel operated and maintained by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). It provides passage for a wide variety of vessel types. In USACE's Major Rehabilitation Evaluation Report and Environmental Assessment for the Cape Cod Canal Highway Bridges (March 2020), USACE reported that the canal is used each year by more than 3,000 cargo vessels, at least 750 fishing vessels, 150 to 200 military vessels, and more than 4,000 recreational vessels. The Program builds on USACE's Major Rehabilitation Evaluation Report and Environmental Assessment, which found that replacing the Sagamore and Bourne Bridges with modern structures offers the most cost-effective, safe, and reliable long-term solution for highway access to and from Cape Cod. During the scoping phase for the Program's EIS, the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) conducted an independent conceptual screening of 12 alternatives presented by USACE in its Major Rehabilitation Evaluation Report and Environmental Assessment, which included deauthorization and filling-in the Cape Cod Canal land

Commenter	Comment	Response
		cut. However, this alternative was not retained for detailed study in the EIS. Cape Cod Canal is a vital coastal waterway that supports significant spawning, foraging, and migration habitat for a diverse range of marine species protected under federal environmental laws, including the Endangered Species Act, Marine Mammal Protection Act, and Magnuson Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. Filling in even a portion of the canal would disrupt this ecological corridor and eliminate critical habitat for protected marine species. In addition, Cape Cod Canal is a congressionally authorized federal navigation project, and neither MassDOT nor USACE has the authority to deauthorize or otherwise discontinue its federally mandated navigation function. Any action to deauthorize the canal would require an act of Congress, which is outside the scope of the Program.
Anonymous	This entire project should be canceled. We should not be building state Bridges over a federal canal. If the federal government does not want to build a bridge over their canal we should fill in the canal and return the area to its natural state.	MassDOT determined that filling in Cape Cod Canal is not reasonable based on the high costs, extent of adverse effects to the coastal environment, and anticipated substantial adverse socioeconomic effects. Filling in the canal would severely affect environmental resources protected under other federal statutes, including the EFH of multiple species protected under the Magnuson Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act; the endangered North Atlantic Right Whale, protected under the ESA; and non-ESA listed whales, dolphins, porpoises, and seals protected under the Marine Mammal Protection Act. Additionally, because the canal is a federally authorized Civil Works Project, the Canal Deauthorization Alternative is not within MassDOT's authorization. Further, this alternative would result in substantial adverse effects to Cape Cod residents and

Commenter	Comment	Response
		visitors who use the canal facilities for recreation. Please refer to Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives, of the FEIS for more information. The canal is an economically important navigation channel that provides passage for a wide variety of navigation. The largest commercial vessels that transit the eastern seaboard, such as large oil tankers and container ships, typically have drafts too deep to use the canal. However, other large civilian, military, and commercial vessels with drafts of 32 feet or less use the canal on a regular basis. USACE’s MRER/EA indicates that many of the automobile carriers and cruise ships (the largest ships to use the canal) have designs that include 135-foot clearances. According to the MRER/EA, canal traffic in 2018 totaled more than 21,700 vessels. While the total number of vessels through Cape Cod Canal has decreased since the 2018 volume reported in USACE’s MRER/EA, the decrease is largely due to a decline in fishing vessels and pleasure craft (vessels under 65 feet in length) using the canal. The number of larger commercial and industrial vessels (vessels over 65 feet in length) using the canal has generally been consistent since 2020. Additionally, according to USACE’s Waterborne Commerce Statistics Center, cargo vessel trips through the canal substantially increased in 2023, the most recently reported year, since 2018. Please refer to Section 4.4, Maritime Transportation, Traffic, and Safety, of the FEIS for additional information.
Mary Ann Bassett	I really don't understand why replacing bridges over a manmade canal is the best option. While initially the canal positively impacted shipping, it seems like the only use for it now is pleasure boats. Fill it in, remove the two points on and two	The need for the proposed action is driven by the deteriorated condition and outdated design of the existing 1930s bridges. Chapter 2 of the Final EIS provides a detailed explanation of the Program’s Purpose and Need Statement.

Commenter	Comment	Response
	points off Cape, and have multiple smaller access points. Bridges create bottlenecks, whether they are old or new.	Cape Cod Canal is an economically important navigation channel operated and maintained by USACE. It provides passage for a wide variety of vessel types. In USACE’s Major Rehabilitation Evaluation Report and Environmental Assessment for the Cape Cod Canal Highway Bridges (March 2020), USACE reported that the canal is used each year by more than 3,000 cargo vessels, at least 750 fishing vessels, 150 to 200 military vessels, and more than 4,000 recreational vessels. The Program builds on USACE’s Major Rehabilitation Evaluation Report and Environmental Assessment, which found that replacing the Sagamore and Bourne Bridges with modern structures offers the most cost-effective, safe, and reliable long-term solution for highway access to and from Cape Cod. During the scoping phase for the Program’s EIS, MassDOT conducted an independent conceptual screening of 12 alternatives presented by USACE in its Major Rehabilitation Evaluation Report and Environmental Assessment, which included deauthorization and filling-in the Cape Cod Canal land cut. However, this alternative was not retained for detailed study in the EIS. Cape Cod Canal is a vital coastal waterway that supports significant spawning, foraging, and migration habitat for a diverse range of marine species protected under federal environmental laws, including the Endangered Species Act, Marine Mammal Protection Act, and Magnuson Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. Filling in even a portion of the canal would disrupt this ecological corridor and eliminate critical habitat for protected marine species. In addition, Cape Cod Canal is a congressionally authorized federal navigation project, and neither MassDOT nor USACE has

Commenter	Comment	Response
		the authority to deauthorize or otherwise discontinue its federally mandated navigation function. Any action to deauthorize the canal would require an act of Congress, which is outside the scope of the Program.
Matthew Dillon	The bridge replacement project premise is wrong. The bridges are not functionally obsolete, the Cape Cod canal is. As such the bridges should not be replaced as planned. The canal should be filled in and the land should be used for additional roadways both highway and local, green space, ponds, parks, solar farms, recreational areas, and housing. 40 - 50 boats per day (mostly leisure) travel through the canal. 100,000 vehicles travel on and off the cape. This disparity is remarkable when you think about it and makes the filling in of the canal a no-brainer for anyone interested in good governance and return on investment. The canal itself is not big enough to accommodate modern shipping vessels which are over 1000 feet. The benefit of filling the canal is that at a fraction of the cost, the state reaps enormous environmental, quality of life, and economic benefits. After the new roadways are put in service, the bridges could remain in place as footbridges which would serve as historical monuments and tourist attractions. It doesn't make sense to spend \$4.6 Billion to essentially end up right where we are today: two bridges, and lots of traffic and congestion. Filling the canal would allow for several pressure relief points and eliminate the choke points. While the canal is filled and repurposed with new roadways, the bridges would remain in use which would be highly preferable to cape cod residents and visitors. There would be less interruption to cape cod traffic while the new connections are being built and the new roadways could offer both a free option and a toll option to continue allowing free	The need for the proposed action is driven by the deteriorated condition and outdated design of the existing 1930s bridges. Chapter 2 of the Final EIS provides a detailed explanation of the Program's Purpose and Need Statement. Cape Cod Canal is an economically important navigation channel operated and maintained by USACE. It provides passage for a wide variety of vessel types. In USACE's Major Rehabilitation Evaluation Report and Environmental Assessment for the Cape Cod Canal Highway Bridges (March 2020), USACE reported that the canal is used each year by more than 3,000 cargo vessels, at least 750 fishing vessels, 150 to 200 military vessels, and more than 4,000 recreational vessels. The Program builds on USACE's Major Rehabilitation Evaluation Report and Environmental Assessment, which found that replacing the Sagamore and Bourne Bridges with modern structures offers the most cost-effective, safe, and reliable long-term solution for highway access to and from Cape Cod. During the scoping phase for the Program's EIS, MassDOT conducted an independent conceptual screening of 12 alternatives presented by USACE in its Major Rehabilitation Evaluation Report and Environmental Assessment, which included deauthorization and filling-in the Cape Cod Canal land cut. However, this alternative was not retained for detailed study in the EIS.

Commenter	Comment	Response
	passage, but collecting revenue from those who can afford it. Or one of the connections could be a resident only / discounted roadway or tunnel. The opportunity to build a 21st century community asset is amazing, rare, and requires good stewardship. Please do not spend \$4.6 Billion to stay in place. Spend that money elsewhere where it will deliver a better return and a better life for the residents of Massachusetts. I would be happy to discuss further and get the word out if you would like. Thanks so much for your time.	Cape Cod Canal is a vital coastal waterway that supports significant spawning, foraging, and migration habitat for a diverse range of marine species protected under federal environmental laws, including the Endangered Species Act, Marine Mammal Protection Act, and Magnuson Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. Filling in even a portion of the canal would disrupt this ecological corridor and eliminate critical habitat for protected marine species. In addition, Cape Cod Canal is a congressionally authorized federal navigation project, and neither MassDOT nor USACE has the authority to deauthorize or otherwise discontinue its federally mandated navigation function. Any action to deauthorize the canal would require an act of Congress, which is outside the scope of the Program.
Don Hayward	Having observed commercial ship traffic traverse the CCC since 1945 with 31 years of employment at the Canal Generation Station I have concluded the following. 1. That 125 foot high bridges cannot be justified by a cost benefit analysis of "commercial ship use/count. 2. That the alternatives of dam/causeway constructed in the appropriate place between the two bridges with a double sluiceway containing tidal generators for the "Green God of clean energy" and the creation of two "recreational" marine development regions for commercial expansion and a two bridge/1 dam six lane causeway access for the price of a single center dam construction. 3. That a third moderately elevated six lane causeway that would preserve transit of barges, tugs, fishing boats and most recreational sailing craft that would have little or no impact on traffic flow while being constructed and provide an additional six lanes of traffic flow for the price of one moderately	Cape Cod Canal is an economically important navigation channel operated and maintained by USACE. It provides passage for a variety of vessel types. In USACE's Major Rehabilitation Evaluation Report and Environmental Assessment for the Cape Cod Canal Highway Bridges (March 2020), USACE reported that the canal is used each year by more than 3,000 cargo vessels, at least 750 fishing vessels, 150 to 200 military vessels, and more than 4,000 recreational vessels. The existing highway bridges were constructed to provide 135 feet of vertical clearance, a height necessary to accommodate the commercial, military, and other deep-draft vessels that rely on the canal as a federally authorized route. To support bridge permitting for the Program under the General Bridge Act of 1946, USACE, in partnership with MassDOT, requested a Preliminary Navigation Clearance Determination (PNCD) from the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG). USCG approved a

Commenter	Comment	Response
	elevated bridge. 4. Cost benefit analysis mandatory and a count of # of commercial ships needing 125 foot clearance for the last five years publicly available with associated recommendations. for alternatives to obsolete 125 foot high bridges over what has become a primarily recreational waterway. Thank you for your consideration of cost benefits to the region.	PNCD establishing an increased vertical clearance of 138.3 feet above mean high water and maintaining 500 feet of horizontal clearance for the replacement bridges. This determination reflects USCG’s statutory responsibility to ensure the bridges do not unreasonably obstruct the free navigation of the waters the bridges are constructed over. A copy of USCG’s PNCD concurrence letter is provided in Appendix 4.4, Attachment 2, of the Final EIS. During the scoping phase for the Program’s EIS, MassDOT conducted an independent conceptual screening of 12 alternatives presented by USACE in its Major Rehabilitation Evaluation Report and Environmental Assessment for the Cape Cod Canal Highway Bridges (March 2020), including replacement of both highway bridges with low level causeways. However, this alternative was not retained for further study in the EIS because it failed to meet the Program’s purpose and need. The Low-Level Causeways Alternative would replace both existing highway bridges with low-elevation roadways across Cape Cod Canal. Tidal flow would be maintained through large culverts, effectively converting the canal into an estuarine system. The canal and surrounding areas, including those near Bourne Bridge, are located within high-risk flood zones. Low-level causeways would be increasingly vulnerable to flooding from fluctuations in sea level and coastal storm surge, leading to frequent overtopping, reduced reliability, and unsafe travel conditions. These vulnerabilities would impair mobility and hinder emergency response during public health events or disasters.

Commenter	Comment	Response
David Nagle	These bridges are incredibly important to our State as a whole. They are outdated and in need of replacement. It is of utmost importance that we undertake the job of replacing them now as soon as possible.	MassDOT recognizes that Sagamore and Bourne Bridges are critical transportation links for the region and the Commonwealth. The Program is advancing the replacement of Sagamore Bridge as Phase 1, with construction anticipated to begin in winter 2027/spring 2028. Replacement of Bourne Bridge will advance as Phase 2, as funding becomes available.
Emily Paskewicz	On behalf of the East Coast Greenway Alliance, which currently uses the Sagamore bridge to connect our Alternate Route through Cape Cod, we are strongly in favor of the build alternative and really look forward to the massive public benefits that will be provided through replacing both of these bridges.	Comment received. Thank you for your support of the Build Alternative for the Program.
John Thompson	The state needs to poached a double deck bridge or tunnel that will minimized residents properties from being demolished.	During the scoping phase for the Program’s EIS, MassDOT conducted an independent conceptual screening of 12 alternatives presented by USACE in its Major Rehabilitation Evaluation Report and Environmental Assessment for the Cape Cod Canal Highway Bridges (March 2020), including replacement of one or both highway bridges with one or more highway tunnels beneath Cape Cod Canal. Tunnel or tube crossings were found to be significantly more complex than bridge replacement due to the need for deep excavation below the canal, extensive groundwater management, and sophisticated ventilation and life-safety systems. A tunnel alternative would also require major reconfiguration of existing approach highways to achieve the necessary tunnel entrance and exit grades, while tying into existing land elevations on both sides of the canal. In addition, tunnels would not meet the Program’s purpose of improving cross-canal mobility for all users, as pedestrians and bicyclists cannot be accommodated in tunnels due to air quality and safety

Commenter	Comment	Response
		constraints. Tunnels also impose vertical clearance limitations that would restrict the movement of oversized commercial vehicles that depend on the bridges as a key freight corridor. For these reasons, the Tunnel Alternative was not retained for detailed study in the EIS. A double-deck bridge was not identified within the range of alternatives during the EIS scoping process. As described in Appendix 3.1, Attachment 1, MassDOT identified four bridge structure types as the most efficient options for the required 525- to 820-foot canal span, including: truss, box-girder, arch, and cable-stayed. These structure types meet the functional and aesthetic needs of the crossing, while keeping span lengths to the minimum necessary. The bridge types most suitable for a double-deck configuration are long-span suspension bridges and cable-stayed bridges, which typically require 900-foot-plus spans to be structurally efficient. A double-deck configuration would also require the upper roadway to sit about 25 feet above the lower deck. Achieving this height would force the approach roads and interchanges on both sides of the canal to be significantly larger and more complex. This added height and span length would introduce greater construction complexity, extend the construction period, and create increased right-of-way and environmental impacts. For these reasons, a double-deck bridge is not a practicable alternative.
John Thompson	I think this design is going to displace many residents from Cape Cod. A tunnel or even a double deck tied arch of your design will help save most residents from losing there homes. Please consider either option.	During the scoping phase for the Program’s EIS, MassDOT conducted an independent conceptual screening of 12 alternatives presented by USACE in its Major Rehabilitation Evaluation Report and Environmental Assessment for the Cape Cod Canal Highway Bridges (March 2020), including replacement

Commenter	Comment	Response
		of one or both highway bridges with one or more highway tunnels beneath Cape Cod Canal. Tunnel or tube crossings were found to be significantly more complex than bridge replacement due to the need for deep excavation below the canal, extensive groundwater management, and sophisticated ventilation and life-safety systems. A tunnel alternative would also require major reconfiguration of existing approach highways to achieve the necessary tunnel entrance and exit grades, while tying into existing land elevations on both sides of the canal. In addition, tunnels would not meet the Program’s purpose of improving cross-canal mobility for all users, as pedestrians and bicyclists cannot be accommodated in tunnels due to air quality and safety constraints. Tunnels also impose vertical clearance limitations that would restrict the movement of oversized commercial vehicles that depend on the bridges as a key freight corridor. For these reasons, the Tunnel Alternative was not retained for detailed study in the EIS. A double-deck bridge was not identified within the range of alternatives during the EIS scoping process. As described in Appendix 3.1, Attachment 1, MassDOT identified four bridge structure types as the most efficient options for the required 525- to 820-foot canal span, including: truss, box-girder, arch, and cable-stayed. These structure types meet the functional and aesthetic needs of the crossing, while keeping span lengths to the minimum necessary. The bridge types most suitable for a double-deck configuration are long-span suspension bridges and cable-stayed bridges, which typically require 900-foot-plus spans to be structurally efficient. A double-deck configuration would also require the

Commenter	Comment	Response
		upper roadway to sit about 25 feet above the lower deck. Achieving this height would force the approach roads and interchanges on both sides of the canal to be significantly larger and more complex. This added height and span length would introduce greater construction complexity, extend the construction period, and create increased right-of-way and environmental impacts. For these reasons, a double-deck bridge is not a practicable alternative.
Leon Wetherell	Why two bridge replacements? Just because there are currently two bridges, doesn't mean we need two new ones. Every island, peninsula, and major river that I know of, has only one. The new Mario Comeau bridge in NY handles at least the same amount of traffic as going onto and off Cape Cod. Why not build a single new bridge with four to six lanes in each direction and link Rt6 and Rt28 with two lane roads directly from the new bridge, to the East. The same to Rt3 and Rt495 to the West. The cutovers would be greatly reduced to just a few weeks once the new bridge and infrastructure is completed.	The need for the proposed action is driven by the deteriorated condition and outdated design of the existing 1930s bridges, not maritime navigation or commercial vessel traffic in Cape Cod Canal. Chapter 2 of the Final EIS provides a detailed explanation of the Program's Purpose and Need Statement. The Program builds on USACE's Major Rehabilitation Evaluation Report and Environmental Assessment, which found that replacing Sagamore and Bourne Bridges with modern structures offers the most cost-effective, safe and reliable long-term solution for highway access to and from Cape Cod. During the scoping phase for the EIS, MassDOT conducted an independent conceptual screening of 12 alternatives presented by USACE in its Major Rehabilitation Evaluation Report and Environmental Assessment for the Cape Cod Canal Highway Bridges (March 2020), including replacement of both highway bridges with one centrally located mid-canal crossing. However, this alternative was not retained for detailed study in the EIS because it failed to meet the Program's Purpose and Need Statement. A single mid-canal highway bridge would be located farther from the established residential, commercial, and employment centers on both the Cape Cod and mainland sides of Bourne. As

Commenter	Comment	Response
		a result, it would increase travel distances and increase travel times for daily cross-canal trips. Construction of a mid-canal replacement bridge would also require major realignment of surrounding highways and local roads on both sides of Cape Cod Canal. These realignments would trigger major utility relocations, encroachments into Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) mapped floodplains, as well as impacts to Article 97-protected open space. A mid-canal location would also directly conflict with sensitive areas of Joint Base Cape Cod, including the Camp Edwards Wildlife Management Area, where conservation lands and habitat protections severely limit opportunities for roadway expansion. Critically, a single mid-canal crossing would eliminate system redundancy, leaving the Cape Cod region with only one point of access for emergency response, evacuation, and essential services. This loss of redundancy would significantly reduce regional resilience during storms, major incidents, or other events requiring rapid, reliable egress of high-traffic volumes from Cape Cod.
Richard Jordan	Please stop the project as it is not needed and is widely expensive. The bridges are not needed because we now have modern navigation systems, not available when the bridges were built in the 1930s. The primary benefit of the canal today is for luxury recreational vessels as they make up the bulk of the canal traffic. Only 20 commercial vessels per day use the canal - those over 65 feet. Larger deep draft vessels requiring more than 32 feet of draft cannot use the Canal and must go around the canal. The cost of replacing the bridges has escalated dramatically from \$2B to \$4B or \$5B or more. We have much more pressing	The need for the proposed action is driven by the deteriorated condition and outdated design of the existing 1930s bridges, not maritime navigation or commercial vessel traffic in Cape Cod Canal. Chapter 2 of the FEIS provides a detailed explanation of the Program’s Purpose and Need. The Program builds on USACE’s Major Rehabilitation Evaluation Report and Environmental Assessment, which found that replacing Sagamore and Bourne Bridges with modern structures

Commenter	Comment	Response
	priorities for that much money. We should figure out the cost to re-build the land crossings with tubes (and no bridges) to allow the tidal flow to continue. This would keep the Canal as a recreational asset. The bridges are an antiquated relic from times when navigation systems were not available.	offers the most cost-effective, safe, and reliable long-term solution for highway access to and from Cape Cod. During the scoping phase for the EIS, MassDOT conducted an independent conceptual screening of 12 alternatives presented by USACE in its Major Rehabilitation Evaluation Report and Environmental Assessment for the Cape Cod Canal Highway Bridges (March 2020), including replacement of one or both highway bridges with one or more highway tunnels beneath Cape Cod Canal. Tunnel or tube crossings were found to be significantly more complex than bridge replacement due to the need for deep excavation below the canal, extensive groundwater management, and sophisticated ventilation and life-safety systems. A tunnel alternative would also require major reconfiguration of existing approach highways to achieve the necessary tunnel entrance and exit grades, while tying into existing land elevations on both sides of the canal. In addition, tunnels would not meet the Program’s purpose of improving cross-canal mobility for all users, as pedestrians and bicyclists cannot be accommodated in tunnels due to air quality and safety constraints. Tunnels also impose vertical clearance limitations that would restrict the movement of oversized commercial vehicles that depend on the bridges as a key freight corridor. For these reasons, the Tunnel Alternative was not retained for detailed study in the EIS.
Ken Cheitlin	Please consider including a new rail line as part of the Cape Cod Bridges Program. The line would run from the most feasible part of the existing rail line along the Canal, inland to the Bourne ISWM facility and, if needed, on to the transfer station on Joint Base Cape Cod. Such a new track would not only better serve the needs of JBCC and the four UPPER Cape Towns, but it would	MassDOT does not plan to incorporate new transit or rail services as part of this Program, as such initiatives fall outside of its purpose, scope, and funding structure. Regarding the effects of the Program on use of the Canal Service Roads at the bridge sites, the shared-use path connection from

Commenter	Comment	Response
	allow for replacement of the existing Falmouth Secondary line with the proposed Shining Sea Bikeway Extension/Bourne Rail Trail. That new multi-modal trail would serve as important mitigation for the longterm loss of the trail along the Canal that will be necessitated by construction of the new bridges.	Sandwich Road to south Canal Service Road at Keith Field Recreation Area will be implemented in Phase 1 of the Sagamore Bridge Project in the Sagamore South quadrant; as one of the earliest actions of construction, MassDOT's intention is to minimize the effects of the Program's construction upon canal service road users.
Mark Medeiros	Are there any current considerations to add a rail line to the Bourne bridge replacement? As a lifelong resident I can't see any way around future MBTA rail extension to Hyannis.	MassDOT does not plan to incorporate new transit or rail services as part of this Program, as such initiatives fall outside of its purpose, scope, and funding structure.
Robert Atkinson Jr.	The project displays do NOT show the homes and businesses that will be taken by eminent domain for the project! It would help the public to show where those properties are located, so we can determine if the takings are necessary, and if there are alternatives to demolition of the properties in question! I suspect that MassDOT isn't interested in working with the affected owners, and would rather pay them off and smash the homes flat, simply because it's easier than working with the affected homeowners to move the homes to another location! Prove me wrong! Show me where the affected properties are, then tell me why demolition is the only option to moving the affected homes! My guess is that moving the homes is more expensive and more inconvenient to MassDOT than demolition, but the affected homeowners won't give rat's behind about the cost or inconvenience to MassDOT, if they could keep their homes! They could sue in court, and tie up the project for years, just like what happened to the proposed rebuilding of the I-93/I-95 interchange on the Reading/Stoneham line! Local residents sued to stop that project cold, and as a result, the most accident-prone intersection in the Commonwealth still hasn't been fixed almost twenty (20) years later! Don't let local homeowners stop	Refer to Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives, including the supporting alternatives analysis reports, for a discussion of the proposed action and alternatives. The Preferred Alternative was identified, in part, because it results in the least amount of right-of-way impacts, including property takings. Refer to Section 4.8, Property Acquisition, Displacement and Relocation, for a discussion of MassDOT's property acquisition and relocation process, including properties proposed for full acquisition, coordination with affected property owners, and available mitigation measures.

Commenter	Comment	Response
	this project too! Get the homeowners happy and keep them happy! Move the houses, don't just demolish them, and get this project moving!	
Carmel Watson	What plan is in place for the people who have to cross the Cape Bridges when one becomes too unsafe to travel and the other one is under construction.?	Refer to Appendix 3.2, Construction Approach Technical Report , for a description of how travel across the bridges will be maintained during construction. In accordance with the MassDOT-USACE Memorandum of Understanding, referenced in Chapter 1, Introduction , and included as Appendix 1, Attachment 4 , USACE will continue to maintain the bridges, including conducting repairs as needed, until completion of the replacement bridges.

2.3 Additional and Interim Improvements

Table 2-5 includes comments and responses related to additional and interim improvements.

Table 2-5. Additional and Interim Improvements Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comment	Response
Cape Cod Commission	Staff suggest that MassDOT evaluate the potential to implement interim improvements to the Bourne Rotary (ex. a second receiving lane onto Sandwich Road that was once contemplated), early action on planned improvements in the area (ex. the planned Sandwich Road at Upper Cape Tech roundabout), beneficial turn restrictions or reinforcement of existing turn restrictions on area roadways.	In 2023, the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) implemented short-term safety and traffic-flow improvements at Bourne Rotary (MassDOT Project No. 610542) in advance of the major changes planned under the Cape Cod Bridges Program. Under the proposed design, Bourne Rotary will be replaced with a grade-separated interchange to address longstanding safety, congestion and operational issues. Currently, no additional interim improvements are planned at Bourne Rotary prior to the full reconstruction.
Vanasse and Associates Inc.	VAI requests the exploration of an additional turn lane at the signalized intersection such that vehicle queues do not inhibit the circulation of the roundabout at Market Basket's proposed main entrance. The queue lengths should be reviewed at all peak hours for potential impacts to the Cranberry Highway Extension at the DSM driveway and at the nearby Route 3 northbound ramp intersection.	As the design has been advanced, the lane arrangement on the Cranberry Highway westbound approach to Mid-Cape Connector has been revised to provide a double left-turn lane and an exclusive right-turn lane. This configuration improves traffic operations at the intersection. Additional detail is provided in Appendix 4.2, Traffic Engineering Technical Report , of the Final Environmental Impact Statement.

2.4 Adaptation and Resiliency

Table 2-6 includes comments and responses related to adaptation issues and infrastructure resiliency.

Table 2-6. Adaptation and Resiliency Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comment	Response
Catherine Roberts	I am glad that bridge height is being raised 3.3 feet to account for projected sea level rise...and I am curious if the models are really suggesting only 3.3 feet of sea level rise, because the models I have seen suggest more extreme sea level rise. Perhaps the new bridges need to be raised even higher?	The First Coast Guard District (now the Northeast Coast Guard District) issued a Preliminary Navigation Clearance Determination dated March 11, 2025, to the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). The determination stated that the replacement Sagamore and Bourne Bridges should provide at least 138.3 feet of vertical clearance (above existing mean high water) and at least 500 feet of horizontal clearance to not unreasonably obstruct the free navigation of the waters over which the bridges are constructed. The USACE scenario-based sensitivity analysis published in the Cape Cod Canal Highway Bridges Major Rehabilitation Evaluation Report and Environmental Assessment in 2020 identified that through 2125, intermediate sea level change rates would increase sea levels approximately 2.8 feet. If changes in relative sea level elevation exceed 3.3 feet, navigation may be temporarily impacted at high tides or under conditions when there is less than 135 feet of vertical clearance. Please refer to Section 4.21, Adaptation and Resiliency , of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for more information.
Peter Bertling	As a Resident of Cape Cod, I am writing to formally request that MassDOT explore the integration of biochar-augmented materials in the construction of the new Sagamore Bridge spans and associated roadway approaches. As Massachusetts aims to lead the nation in decarbonizing infrastructure, the Cape Cod Bridges Program represents a generational opportunity to utilize	The design of the Sagamore Bridge replacement and associated roadway approaches is being advanced using materials and specifications that comply with current MassDOT standards, American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) requirements, and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) guidance. Biochar-modified concrete,

Commenter	Comment	Response
	"carbon-negative" materials. Biochar a stable, carbon-rich substance produced via pyrolysis offers specific technical and environmental benefits that align with the goals of this \$4.5 billion project: Carbon Sequestration: Replacing a small percentage of Portland cement with biochar can sequester approximately 2 to 3 tons of CO2 for every ton of biochar used, helping MassDOT meet the aggressive greenhouse gas reduction mandates of the Massachusetts Decarbonization Roadmap. Enhanced Marine Durability: The Sagamore Bridge operates in a high-chloride, salt-spray environment. Biochar acts as an internal curing agent, reducing concrete permeability and micro-cracking. This protection of the internal steel rebar can extend the structural lifespan of the bridge, reducing long-term maintenance costs for the Commonwealth. Stormwater Filtration: The Cape Cod Canal ecosystem is highly sensitive to nitrogen and heavy metal runoff. I urge you to consider biochar-amended soils in the project's bioswales and shared-use paths to provide superior natural filtration of roadway pollutants before they reach our waterways. Pavement Resilience: Biochar-modified asphalt has shown increased resistance to rutting and heat-related deformation, a critical feature as we prepare Cape Cod's infrastructure for rising average temperatures. Given that local facilities in Massachusetts are already beginning to produce biochar for industrial use, a local supply chain is viable. I respectfully ask that the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) include a feasibility study or a pilot program for biochar-augmented concrete and stormwater management systems for the Sagamore Bridge. Thank you for your dedication to building a safer, more resilient Cape Cod.	asphalt, and soil media are not currently included in MassDOT's approved materials specifications, and additional research, testing, and standard-development would be required before these materials could be incorporated into a major federally funded bridge project. MassDOT will continue to monitor emerging technologies and sustainable construction practices, including carbon-reducing and carbon-sequestering materials.

2.5 Construction Approach

Table 2-7 includes comments and responses related to construction sequencing, construction-period impacts, and construction duration.

Table 2-7. Construction Approach Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comment	Response
Cape Cod Commission	MassDOT should evaluate the potential for early action items that could be advanced on an accelerated timeline to alleviate traffic disruptions during bridge construction activities.	The construction sequence is being developed with the goal of removing live traffic from the existing bridges as early as possible. In addition, the phasing aims to introduce grade separation and new ramp connections at the earliest feasible stages of construction. Please refer to Appendix 3.2, Construction Approach Technical Report , of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for additional information on early action items.
Dan Lewis	Many thanks to the Commonwealth for getting us to this point as the existing bridges are long overdue for replacement. I am concerned about the length of time to just get the new Sagamore Bridge constructed. Based on my understanding, construction will begin in 2027 and the first new span will be completed in 2033 --- 6 years. I recall when the overpasses on I-93 north of Boston were replaced one at a time over a weekend. While I acknowledge these bridges are significantly larger and much more complex, I hope some efficiencies can be explored. I'm assuming the Corps of Engineers who maintain these bridges today have an annual budget, along with contingency funds, should something major arise. I would propose to distribute the annual budget and some portion of contingency to the contractor for each year that the bridge is completed early. For example, if the bridge is completed in 2031, 2 years early, they would receive a payment of two year's maintenance and a portion of the contingency funds. Just an idea to help move this wonderful project along to completion sooner and then get to	The construction duration reflects the scale and complexity of delivering a new, modern major bridge crossing while maintaining traffic across Cape Cod Canal throughout the project. The Sagamore Bridge Project (Phase 1 of the Program) is being advanced using a design-build delivery approach, which integrates design and construction under a single contract and allows the contractor to propose innovative methods, sequencing, and efficiencies that can reduce overall duration. The Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) will consider appropriate contractual incentive mechanisms that comply with Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) requirements and support timely delivery of the project.

Commenter	Comment	Response
	the Bourne bridge replacement. Thank you for your consideration of this idea.	
Diane DeLuc	Localized construction impacts require additional assessment and mitigation. Residents, businesses, and communities in the immediate vicinity of Bridges program construction and demolition activities but not subject to eminent domain takings will be subject to years of inconvenience, disruption, noise, and air pollution.	MassDOT acknowledges that residents, businesses, and communities located near construction and demolition activities may experience localized noise, air quality, and traffic impacts during the construction period. The project will incorporate measures, such as a comprehensive Transportation Management Plan, dust and emission controls, and noise mitigation strategies, to minimize disruption for nearby residents and businesses. MassDOT will provide timely public communication regarding construction schedules and activities to help residents and businesses anticipate upcoming work and maintain access throughout the construction period.
Emily Paskewicz	I would be curious to see the pedestrian and cyclist detour plans, when available, for during construction.	As the design advances, and construction staging is refined, detailed construction detour plans for people walking and biking will be developed and shared with the public. These plans will identify safe, clearly marked routes and will be coordinated with local communities to minimize disruptions.
Foss Marine Terminal	The New Bedford Foss Marine Terminal agrees that there is a pressing need for the improvement of access between Cape Cod and the rest of Massachusetts. We would like to see as part of the bridge replacement process an assessment of the local port infrastructure which could support the build-out and long-term maintenance of the new bridge spans. We noted in the DEIS and other MassDOT materials that each bridge demolition and replacement would take approximately 8 to 10 years with in-water work occurring over multiple phases. The bridge replacement program can require up to 16 vessels consisting of work barges, delivery barges, tugboats, and support	The specific selection of staging areas, mobilization sites, and port facilities will ultimately be determined by the awarded contractor(s). Contractors are responsible for developing detailed construction means and methods, including identifying the port facilities that best meet their operational needs, while complying with all project constraints and regulatory requirements.

Commenter	Comment	Response
	launches that can be used on each side of the canal during marine-based construction activities, including installing and removing temporary works and assisting in the construction of some permanent works. All of the waterborne construction activities, the construction materials, the demolition debris, each of the new 616-foot-long bridge arches which can be erected off-site and floated on barges to the bridge site, and thus, I'm very excited for that part -- will all need to be mobilized from a local port facility and will occur over a 10-year period or longer, and we'd like to see a plan regarding sites of mobilization. New Bedford is not only a working waterfront community which is close to the project, but also a designated port area and an environmental justice community according to Massachusetts criteria. New Bedford could benefit significantly from hosting a portion of the work vessels, equipment, health components, et cetera, and should be considered. We request that MassDOT undertake a regional ports assessment to identify the options for logistical mobilization of the waterborne construction activities, and that New Bedford be a part of that assessment.	

Commenter	Comment	Response
Gary Dayton	Hi, my name is Gary Dayton. I live in Buzzards Bay. Question I have is, on the other side of the Bourne Rotary, will all its entrance and exit points be in place before the new bridge is put in place? That's kind of question number one.	As part of the Bourne Bridge replacement project, the existing Bourne Rotary will be removed in its entirety and replaced with a modern, grade-separated interchange. This new design is intended to separate local and regional traffic, reducing conflict points and improving overall safety and efficiency for all entrance and exit movements in the area. MassDOT has developed its construction staging approach to maintain safe and reliable access throughout construction. While some connections will be built in phases, all necessary access to and from the area will remain available while the new interchange and bridge are constructed.
Gary Dayton	Question number two is, will -- I believe if I understood it properly -- the new span will be put in place and accept all the new traffic both ways before the second span will be put in place, and the current bridge will have to be taken down before that. Can somebody give me an idea of the duration of that process? Thank you.	The current plan for the replacement bridges is to construct the first new span while the existing bridge remains in service. Once that initial span is complete, traffic in both directions will be shifted onto the new bridge span temporarily. This bridge sequencing allows the existing bridge to be removed and creates the space needed to build the second new span. After the second span is finished, each bridge will carry one direction of travel in the final configuration. The Program is advancing the replacement of Sagamore Bridge as Phase 1, with construction anticipated to begin in winter 2027/spring 2028. By 2033, traffic is expected to shift onto the newly constructed span before demolition of the existing bridge and completion of the second span. Substantial completion of the entire Sagamore Bridge Replacement Project is anticipated in spring 2037. The replacement of Bourne Bridge will be advanced as Phase 2 of the Program. MassDOT anticipates that Bourne Bridge construction would begin approximately one year after

Commenter	Comment	Response
		Sagamore construction starts, pending the availability of remaining federal funding needed to advance the project. More detailed schedule information for the Bourne Bridge Replacement Project will be shared as the project secures funding.
Town of Sandwich Department of Public Works	The Town emphasizes the importance of early coordination with municipal emergency officials and timely public notifications to minimize delay, confusion, and safety risks. Sandwich stands ready to assist with these planning efforts.	MassDOT's construction contract will require the selected contractor to develop and implement a comprehensive Transportation Management Plan to minimize traffic disruption, safety risks, and delays during construction. This plan will be developed in coordination with municipal emergency officials and other key stakeholders, and it will include timely public communication to support safety, mobility, and access throughout the construction period.
Vanasse and Associates Inc.	It is understood that customers are expected to have full access to Market Basket during construction. As such, we request that certain conditions be included in the contract documents as assurances that the supermarket can operate effectively at current levels and continue to be able to service customers at the high level they have become accustomed to, during the anticipated decade-long construction period. Paved two-way access shall be maintained during all business hours of Market Basket. Signage along the Mid-Cape Connector and Sandwich Road shall be displayed stating that Market Basket is open to during construction. Request black out construction days west of Route 6 and south of Sandwich Road during the week around each major holiday (Christmas, Thanksgiving, and especially Memorial Day, July 4th, and Labor Day).	Maintaining access to Market Basket (Factory Outlet Way) during construction is a priority for MassDOT. As part of ongoing coordination with Vanasse and Associates Inc., MassDOT will continue to work collaboratively to address site-specific access and operational needs. The Design-Builder will be required to prepare a TMP for MassDOT's review and acceptance. The TMP will include measures to maintain paved two-way access to Market Basket (Factory Outlet Way) during business hours, provide advance notification of temporary changes, and coordinate construction sequencing to minimize disruptions. Requirements for access continuity will be incorporated into contract documents and monitored throughout construction.

Commenter	Comment	Response
	DSM would also request to have the entire summer as a blackout date, given the extensive customer trips generated during the summer months. If that is not practically feasible, we request consideration of reduced or night work hours proximate to the DSM property for the length of the summer months. Fencing with visual screening shall be located around the perimeter of the work zone at the north side of the Factory Outlet Way such that Market Basket property does not visually look like a work zone. The contractor shall perform daily street sweeping, as needed, on Factory Outlet Way/Cranberry Highway Extension and the reconfigured DSM driveways. Advanced notice shall be provided to Market Basket for any anticipated impacts relative to the operation and maintenance of the property. The contractor shall provide weekly schedule updates for work that impacts DSM traffic and property. The contractor shall provide to the store manager points of contact for daily operations.	
David Schlottenmier	Please include hedge, trees or other barriers to reduce highway noise intrusion into our neighborhoods! I like the pedestrian and bike trails, but please use some of the space to plant thick layer of trees or bushes that will grow thick and tall. The road and bridge design and layout look fine. I am hopeful that some consideration will be made to accommodate local traffic during construction.	Appendix 3.2, Construction Approach Technical Report and Section 4.2, Transportation, Traffic, and Safety, describe the approach to accommodate local traffic during construction. Also refer to Appendix 3.2, Attachment 5, for the Program's landscaping plans, and Section 4.15, Visual Resources, for a discussion of MassDOT's approach for implementing an extensive landscaping plan following construction completion.
Yiber Berisha	They should hire local/Town of Bourne Trucking companies small businesses at least as courtesy at 20%-30% and small businesses. To help growth.	As indicated in Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives, MassDOT proposes to construct the Program as a Design-Build project. As a Design-Build project, contractor teaming and use of

Commenter	Comment	Response
		local businesses are at the discretion of the Design-Builder. Subcontracting and teaming opportunities will be handled through the procurement process.

2.6 Indirect and Other Effects

Table 2-8 includes comments and responses related to projects with the potential for indirect effects.

Table 2-8. Indirect and Other Effects Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comment	Response
Diane Deluc	My comments are driven by concern over long-term region-wide impacts — and lost opportunities — that would result if the Bridges megaproject is implemented as presented in the DEIS. This concern is exacerbated by a significant change in the regulatory review and permitting process detailed in the MEPA Certificate on the Bridges program’s Environmental Notification Form issued by Energy & Environmental Affairs Secretary Tepper on July 7, 2023. This change, not mentioned in the DEIS, only recently came to my attention: The Cape Cod Commission is not planning to conduct a Development of Regional Impact (DRI) review, as required under § 12(i) of the Cape Cod Commission Act, St. 1989, c. 716! Legal justification for the lack of a DRI review of this MassDOT project is requested, as the Commission was created to supplement local, state-level, and federal-level reviews by requiring project proponents to comprehensively identify and mitigate all Cape-wide impacts to ensure consistency with the goals and objectives of the Cape Cod Regional Policy Plan.	The Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) concurs with the letter the Cape Cod Commission (Commission) sent to the Secretary of the Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs (EEA), which states “Understanding that the Cape Cod Commission does not have any direct regulatory jurisdiction over the Project, Commission staff look forward to collaborating with the Applicant to address issues of regional significance as the permitting and review process advances.” However, the Commission has been and will continue to be extensively involved in review of the Cape Cod Bridges Program (Program). The Commission has been involved in developing planning documents for the Program and has participated in the review of the Program via additional mechanisms: as a Section 106 Consulting Party and a member of the Cape Cod Bridges Advisory Group. MassDOT will continue to coordinate with the Commission throughout design and construction of the Program.
Diane Deluc	It appears to me that portions of the DEIS are based on debatable assumptions and constrained analyses, leading to Mass DOT's conclusion that implementation of the Bridges program will not have significant region-wide effects on traffic congestion, development pressures, natural resources, the economy, and quality of life and, thus, that no mitigation is required to address the long-term operational impacts of	A memorandum was prepared to respond to comments on the topic of induced demand and induced development. Please refer to Appendix 4.22, Assessment of Induced Demand and Induced Development, of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for further information.

Commenter	Comment	Response
	expanded roadways and more automobiles and trucks crossing the Cape Cod Canal. To resolve these shortcomings, I request that the following additional analyses be conducted on the path toward approval of a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Bridges program: Traffic and socioeconomic studies should be expanded to recognize the obvious and consider a broader range of future possibilities.	
Sierra Club	Sierra Club is concerned over possible long-term region-wide impacts—and lost opportunities—that would result if the Bridges program is implemented as presented in the DEIS. Dedicated shared-use paths on both bridges plus improved connectivities for pedestrians and cyclists are important steps in the right direction, but the DEIS concludes that implementation of the Bridges program will not have significant region-wide effects on traffic congestion, development pressures, natural resources, the economy, and quality of life. As a result, the DEIS concludes that no mitigation is required to address the long-term operational impacts of expanded roadways—and more automobiles, trucks, and people—crossing the Cape Cod Canal.	A memorandum was prepared to respond to comments on the topic of induced demand and induced development. Please refer to Appendix 4.22, Assessment of Induced Demand and Induced Development , of the FEIS for further information.
Sierra Club	DEIS conclusions regarding regional and long-term impacts are based on flawed scoping, constrained analyses, and debatable assumptions. To resolve this and related process shortcomings, Sierra Club requests that additional analyses be conducted in preparing the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Bridges program...expanded canal crossings will have massive economic, environmental, and social implications across the entire region for the remainder of the 21st century. Concluding otherwise is nonsensical—as is the Cape Cod Commission’s decision to not review the Bridges program as a development of regional impact as required under state law—	The FEIS assesses the potential economic, environmental, and social effects of the Build Alternative. Please refer to Section 4.22, Indirect Effects, of the FEIS for the Program’s evaluation of potential indirect effects spanning the broader Cape Cod region. Additionally, refer to Appendix 4.22, Assessment of Induced Demand and Induced Development, of the FEIS for further information. MassDOT concurs with the letter the Commission sent to EEA, which states “Understanding that the Cape Cod Commission does not have any direct regulatory jurisdiction over the Project, Commission staff look forward to collaborating with the

Commenter	Comment	Response
	and suggestive of a coordinated campaign to accelerate bridge replacement while avoiding impact mitigation.	Applicant to address issues of regional significance as the permitting and review process advances.” However, the Commission has been and will continue to be extensively involved in reviewing the Program. The Commission has been involved in developing planning documents for the Program and has participated in the review of the Program via additional mechanisms: as a Section 106 Consulting Party and a member of the Cape Cod Bridges Advisory Group. MassDOT will continue to coordinate with the Commission throughout design and construction of the Program
Diane DeLuc	While possible effects on new residential growth may be constrained by market conditions and available undeveloped land as stated in the DEIS, the potential for residential redevelopment—based on changes in local zoning and state law and the availability of centralized wastewater infrastructure—should be quantified.	The FEIS evaluates direct and indirect effects that are reasonably foreseeable and have a clear causal relationship to the proposed action — the replacement of the Cape Cod Canal bridges and associated interchange network. Changes in residential redevelopment driven by local zoning, state policy, or wastewater infrastructure expansions are independent actions outside the Federal Highway Administration’s (FHWA) regulatory authority. Because the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) does not require agencies to predict broader market-driven or state or local policy-driven behavioral responses, the FEIS does not quantify potential residential redevelopment.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Sierra Club	While possible effects on new residential growth may be constrained by market conditions and available undeveloped land as stated in the DEIS, the potential for residential redevelopment—based on changes in local zoning and state law and the availability of centralized wastewater infrastructure—should be quantified.	The FEIS evaluates direct and indirect effects that are reasonably foreseeable and have a clear causal relationship to the proposed action — the replacement of the Cape Cod Canal bridges and associated interchange network. Changes in residential redevelopment driven by local zoning, state policy, or wastewater infrastructure expansions are independent actions outside FHWA’s regulatory authority. Because NEPA does not require agencies to predict broader market-driven or state or local policy-driven behavioral responses, the FEIS does not quantify potential residential redevelopment.
Diane DeLuc	The prospect of increased commercial development, additional sprawl, and associated impacts on resources, quality of life, and visitor experiences—should also be examined, given DEIS findings that the new bridges will increase the Cape’s popularity as a tourist destination.	The FEIS addresses potential commercial and residential development effects, including induced growth and associated impacts, in Section 4.22, Indirect Effects —specifically in Sections 4.22.2.2 (Regional Development Trends and Growth Assumptions), 4.22.2.3 (Induced Travel Demand), and 4.22.2.4 (Induced Development) . These sections evaluate reasonably foreseeable development patterns based on available data, regional trends, and established NEPA methodologies.
Sierra Club	The prospect of increased commercial development, additional sprawl, and associated impacts on resources, quality of life, and visitor experiences—should also be examined, given DEIS findings that the new bridges will increase the Cape’s popularity as a tourist destination.	The FEIS addresses potential commercial and residential development effects, including induced growth and associated impacts, in Section 4.22, Indirect and Cumulative Impacts — specifically in Sections 4.22.2.2 (Regional Development Trends and Growth Assumptions), 4.22.2.3 (Induced Travel Demand), and 4.22.2.4 (Induced Development) . These sections evaluate reasonably foreseeable development patterns based on available data, regional trends, and established NEPA methodologies.

2.7 Funding

Table 2-9 includes comments and responses related to Program funding.

Table 2-9. Funding Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comment	Response
Joan Hendel	My name is Joan Hendel, and I would like to know, in writing for all the public to see, what happens if you do not get this money from the federal funding? That's been a topic, and the public wants to know how the Commonwealth is going to support the building of these bridges with \$1.7 billion that you're expecting from them. That's a real possibility that you won't get it because of the current administration has talked about freezing and withholding funds. We would like to know in writing, on paper, in a public meeting where you're expecting to get that money from.	The Sagamore Bridge Replacement Project is fully funded. The secured \$2.4 billion budget comprises \$1.72 billion in federal grants and \$700 million in state matching funds. Federal funding sources include awards under the federal Mega Program and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Bridge Investment Program. These funds, combined with the committed state funds, establish a secure and fiscally constrained funding plan for the Sagamore Bridge Replacement Project. The Bourne Bridge Replacement Project is not currently funded. The Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) are actively pursuing federal discretionary grant funding to advance the project. This has included the submission of a Bridge Investment Program grant application in August 2025, which requested approximately 50% federal funding with the remaining 40% to be provided by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. As of June 2026, MassDOT is still awaiting a funding determination from the U.S. Department of Transportation. If full funding for Bourne Bridge is not secured, USACE will continue to own, operate, and maintain the existing Bourne Bridge, consistent with its current responsibilities, as part of the Cape Cod Canal Federal Navigation Project. MassDOT will continue to share updates publicly as funding decisions are made and as the Cape Cod Bridges Program progresses.

2.8 Transportation, Traffic, and Safety

Table 2-10 includes comments and responses related to Transportation, Traffic, and Safety.

Table 2-10. Transportation, Traffic, and Safety Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comment	Response
Diane DeLuc	To increase the use of buses for getting across the canal, both during and after construction, accelerating redevelopment of the undersized park-and-ride lot at the Route 6-Route 132 interchange is essential. Subsidizing commuter use of Peter Pan and Plymouth & Brockton bus services should be studied, as costs are currently prohibitive. Expanded roles for the Cape Cod Regional Transit Authority (CCRTA) should be examined, as the Cape & Islands economy has become increasingly dependent on workers living off Cape, and local businesses are concerned that such workers may be less willing to travel over the canal during construction.	Redevelopment of the Route 132 park and ride lot in Barnstable is already advancing through a separate MassDOT capital project and is currently anticipated to be advertised for construction bids in Federal Fiscal Year 2026. The Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) does not plan to subsidize commuter fares for private carriers or expand the Cape Cod Regional Transit Authority's (CCRTA) service role as part of the Cape Cod Bridges Program (Program). Regional transit priorities are being advanced through the Cape Cod Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), which invests in bus service, fleet modernization, and transit-supportive facilities to strengthen mobility across the region. MassDOT will implement a comprehensive Transportation Management Plan (TMP) to support mobility during construction. The TMP will include measures to manage traffic operations, coordinate with rail service and bus operators, and provide real-time information to the public. The TMP will be actively monitored and adjusted as needed throughout construction to minimize disruption and maintain access for workers, residents, and visitors.
Sierra Club	To increase the use of buses for getting across the canal, accelerating the redevelopment of the undersized park-and-ride lot at the Route 6-Route 132 interchange is essential. Subsidizing commuter use of Peter Pan and Plymouth & Brockton bus services should be studied, as costs are currently prohibitive.	Redevelopment of the Route 132 park and ride lot in Barnstable is already advancing through a separate MassDOT capital project and is currently anticipated to be advertised for construction bids in Federal Fiscal Year 2026.

Commenter	Comment	Response
	Expanded roles for the Cape Cod Regional Transit Authority (CCRTA) should be examined, as the Cape & Islands economy has become increasingly dependent on workers living off Cape, and local businesses are concerned that such workers may be less willing to travel over the canal during construction.	The Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) does not plan to subsidize commuter fares for private carriers or expand the Cape Cod Regional Transit Authority's (CCRTA) service role as part of the Cape Cod Bridges Program (Program). Regional transit priorities are being advanced through the Cape Cod Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), which invests in bus service, fleet modernization, and transit-supportive facilities to strengthen mobility across the region. MassDOT will implement a comprehensive Transportation Management Plan (TMP) to support mobility during construction. The TMP will include measures to manage traffic operations, coordinate with rail service and bus operators, and provide real-time information to the public. The TMP will be actively monitored and adjusted as needed throughout construction to minimize disruption and maintain access for workers, residents, and visitors.
Elise Hugus	The design of the new bridges shouldn't just incorporate the needs of cars and trucks. The Cape's traffic problems and pollution concerns will never be solved if the design doesn't include biking, pedestrian, and rail options too. I urge you to include a separate, accessible and safe pedestrian/bike lane across both bridges, and a modern rail connection. This could mean an additional rail line under the bridge (to alleviate pressure on the also-aging rail bridge) or simply a rail spur from the existing bridge to connect to the commuter rail and transfer stations at the Bourne ISWM facility and at Joint Base Cape Cod. Fast and efficient train service will be a tremendous help to residents and visitors who need alternatives to driving and the bus monopoly, as well as the construction industry that needs a reliable disposal service without putting additional pressure on	The Program includes a dedicated, fully separated shared-use path on each replacement bridge, providing safe and accessible accommodation for pedestrians and bicyclists. These facilities will connect existing and planned multimodal networks on both sides of Cape Cod Canal, improving non-motorized travel options for residents, commuters, and visitors. MassDOT does not plan to incorporate new transit or rail services as part of this Program, as such initiatives fall outside of its purpose, scope, and funding structure. Regional transit priorities are being advanced through the Cape Cod TIP, which funds bus service enhancements, fleet modernization, and transit-supportive facilities to strengthen mobility across the region.

Commenter	Comment	Response
	our limited rail infrastructure. As your office is likely aware, the current rail system cannot accommodate frequent commuter trains and is currently only in use for a trash train and summer sightseeing tour. We deserve a modern rail line, and the ability to repurpose the current F2 line that serves the trash train for a multimodal trail connecting the upper Cape.	
Susan Baracchini	I'm concerned about the options for ulterior alternative modes of transportation to get to the Outer Cape [...] nobody seems to have mentioned any alternative modes of getting people on and off Cape during the construction. And multiple modes of access will be imperative to get people so the Cape and especially the Outer Cape, doesn't become a ghost town.	The Program is focused on replacing the Sagamore and Bourne highway bridges and improving their roadway approaches; it does not include development of new regional transportation modes. To ensure continued mobility during construction, MassDOT will implement a comprehensive MP that includes traffic operations strategies, transit coordination, and continuous monitoring so that adjustments can be made as conditions evolve. These measures are designed to help maintain dependable access for residents, workers, and visitors across the canal throughout the construction period.
Association to Preserve Cape Cod	The DEIS states that, "it is not anticipated that there would be a significant increase in the number of trips that would otherwise not travel to Cape Cod due to congestion ... [and]... the total number of daily vehicle trips are not anticipated to increase as a result of the Cape Cod Bridges Program..." APCC continues to question this conclusion based on a logical assumption that increased bridge capacity combined with improved travel times would be an attractive incentive for more regionally-based tourism to come to the Cape, as well as for Cape residents to be more willing to travel off-Cape more often.	The Program's 2050 travel demand model assumes a conservative 0.7% annual increase in visitor trips, despite evidence that overall demand is constrained by non-transportation factors, such as seasonal rental availability, lodging costs, attraction capacity, and parking supply, rather than by bridge capacity. As a result, visitor demand is expected to remain relatively insensitive to localized transportation or operational improvements. Additionally, any travel time savings are expected to have an insignificant effect on discretionary trip-making because discretionary trips frequently occur off peak, when operational benefits are smaller.. Please refer to Appendix 4.22, Assessment of Induced Demand and Induced Development , of the FEIS for further information regarding induced demand.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Association to Preserve Cape Cod	APCC is therefore disappointed by the absence of discussion in the DEIS about utilizing planning for the bridges construction project to incorporate opportunities and incentives for reducing bridge traffic through public transit, rail, etc., as opposed to personal automobile use.	MassDOT does not plan to incorporate new transit or rail services as part of this Program, as such initiatives fall outside of its purpose, scope, and funding structure. Regional transit priorities are being advanced through the Cape Cod TIP, which funds bus service enhancements, fleet modernization, and transit-supportive facilities to strengthen mobility across the region.
Diane DeLuc	A broad portfolio of options infrastructure upgrades plus bus, rail, and ferry should be studied for mitigating additional traffic and congestion on a Cape-wide basis. As outlined in the DEIS, the Bridges program includes important features for pedestrians and cyclists, but these modes have limited applicability and the overall focus of investment remains centered around personal automobiles and commercial vehicles crossing the canal. Effective and affordable multimodal alternatives are needed for residents and visitors, employers and workers, and businesses and consumers during construction and to mitigate Cape-wide impacts attributable to long-term operations. Updated and expanded traffic studies noted above are expected to identify antiquated and undersized interchanges and intersections likely to be overwhelmed by additional automobiles and trucks coming over higher-capacity bridges. Some areas already recognized as pinch points or safety hazards needing investment may require a higher level of priority in transportation improvement plans to ensure that upgrades are in place before the new spans are operational. Similarly, transit investments warrant fresh consideration.	The Program does not include the development of new transit or rail services or the advancement of Cape-wide roadway improvements, as these elements fall outside of its purpose and scope. Its scope is limited to replacing the existing Cape Cod Canal highway bridges and reconfiguring the immediate approach roadways needed to improve cross-canal mobility and accessibility for all road users. Regional transit priorities are being advanced through the Cape Cod TIP, which funds bus service enhancements, fleet modernization, and transit-supportive facilities to strengthen mobility across the region. Any future multimodal improvements, including transit, rail, or ferry service changes, would need to be evaluated and implemented by the responsible agencies through separate project development efforts.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Sierra Club	A broad portfolio of multimodal options—infrastructure upgrades plus bus, rail, and ferry—should be studied for mitigating additional traffic and congestion and associated growth pressures on a Cape-wide basis, with the most effective solutions added to the project scope. As outlined in the DEIS, the Bridges program includes important features for pedestrians and cyclists, but these modes have limited applicability, and the overall focus remains centered around personal automobiles and commercial vehicles crossing the canal. Updated and expanded traffic studies and socioeconomic analyses highlighted above are expected to identify antiquated and undersized interchanges and intersections likely to be overwhelmed by additional vehicles and people traveling over higher-capacity bridges. Some areas already recognized as pinch points or safety hazards needing investment may require a higher level of priority in transportation improvement plans to ensure that upgrades are in place before the new spans are operational. Similarly, transit investments warrant fresh consideration, as effective and affordable multimodal alternatives are needed for residents and visitors, employers and workers, and businesses and consumers—during construction and to mitigate Cape-wide impacts attributable to long-term operations.	The Program does not include the development of new transit or rail services or the advancement of Cape-wide roadway improvements, as these elements fall outside of its purpose and scope. Its scope is limited to replacing the existing Cape Cod Canal highway bridges and reconfiguring the immediate approach roadways needed to improve cross canal mobility and accessibility for all road users. Regional transit priorities are being advanced through the Cape Cod TIP, which funds bus service enhancements, fleet modernization, and transit-supportive facilities to strengthen mobility across the region. Any future multimodal improvements, including transit, rail, or ferry service changes, would need to be evaluated and implemented by the responsible agencies through separate project development efforts.
Cape Cod Commission	Bourne South Park and Ride – Commission staff suggest MassDOT consider developing a new Park and Ride facility south of the Canal in the vicinity of the Bourne Bridge to accommodate short-term and overnight parking for those coming from Bourne/Falmouth area.	MassDOT will continue to consider opportunities to enhance multimodal access and parking infrastructure within the Project Limits and in the vicinity of Bourne Bridge, including evaluating concepts such as park-and-ride facilities, as appropriate.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Cape Cod Commission	As part of mitigation efforts to reduce and manage traffic congestion, Commission staff strongly suggest MassDOT prioritize funding and construction of Barnstable Route 132 Park and Ride Expansion project (#610800) as soon as possible as an advance construction activity.	Redevelopment of the Route 132 park and ride lot in Barnstable (MassDOT #610800) is already advancing through a separate MassDOT capital project and is currently anticipated to be advertised for construction bids in Federal Fiscal Year 2026.
Cape Cod Commission	With significant changes proposed to the transportation infrastructure within the Project area, opportunities to plan for and support future infrastructure projects should be explored.	Redevelopment of the Route 132 park and ride lot in Barnstable is already advancing through a separate MassDOT capital project and is currently anticipated to be advertised for construction bids in Federal Fiscal Year 2026. MassDOT will continue to pursue funding opportunities for other transit priorities through separate initiatives advanced in coordination with the Cape Cod Metropolitan Planning Organization and other regional partners.
Luka Govedic	It is not believable that additional traffic capacity will not result in VMT increases. I would like to see more data on how the build alternatives fit the 2050 DOT goal to reduce VMTs as it seems like they will increase VMTs. Also there is no evidence shown that the no build alternative will increase air pollution due to "idling", while the build alternative will certainly increase pollution due to an increase in VMTs. I'm not saying we should choose the no build alternative, I just believe that more mitigation of the negative effects is needed. The shared use path is a start but not enough. One of the bridges should include an immovable 2-track railway connection for all of Cape cod to the rest of Massachusetts. Two tracks are needed for redundancy and to absorb future growth in the corridor. At the very least, bridges should be built with provisions for the rail to be added later, like the Tappan Zee bridge in NY, although it's worth noting	Table 4.13-2 in the Section 4.13, Air Quality of the Final Environmental Impact Statement indicates that the 2050 Build Alternative is projected to reduce daily vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and vehicle hours traveled (VHT), compared to the 2050 No Build Alternative. Consequently, the 2050 Build Alternative is expected to reduce daily pollutant emissions, including carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, and particulate matter. MassDOT does not plan to incorporate new transit or rail services as part of this Program, as such initiatives fall outside of its purpose, scope, and funding structure. Its scope is limited to replacing the existing Cape Cod Canal highway bridges and reconfiguring the immediate approach roadways needed to improve cross-canal mobility and accessibility for all road users. From an engineering standpoint, designing the new bridges to incorporate rail service would require substantially flatter grades than highway standards allow, along with substantially higher

Commenter	Comment	Response
	that provisions alone don't meet the DOT and states own climate goals and VMT reduction goals	structural loading capacity, wider bridge decks, and miles of approach track on each side of Cape Cod Canal. These features would greatly expand the project footprint and introduce additional property acquisition needs, community disruption, and environmental impacts that are beyond the scope and intent of this Program.
Andrew Carter	There appears to be a singular focus on vehicle transportation, and the planning documents do not speak to passenger rail. If we are replacing the Cape Cod canal bridges, we should not miss the opportunity to consider rail. Over 100 years ago, one could take the train all the way to Provincetown. Now we have the Cape Cod Flyer, which runs very limited service due to the old rail bridge. We should use this opportunity to plan for rail as part of the Cape Cod canal bridge replacements. Cape Cod is a delicate ecosystem that is at the forefront of climate change. It is also a region with high housing costs, difficulty recruiting workers, and traffic during the high season. Rail would reduce traffic and emissions and provide opportunities for individuals who may live off cape to access employment. Investment in rail would also allow individuals who reside on the Cape to access jobs, healthcare, and other benefits in Boston without having to use single occupancy vehicles. It would seem to me that daily commuter rail service from Hyannis to Boston should be the goal. This is a once in a generation chance to improve transportation on Cape Cod. Failure to incorporate rail into the design will only lead to greater congestion, emissions, and higher housing costs.	MassDOT does not plan to incorporate new transit or rail services as part of this Program, as such initiatives fall outside of its purpose, scope, and funding structure. Its scope is limited to replacing the existing Cape Cod Canal highway bridges and reconfiguring the immediate approach roadways needed to improve cross-canal mobility and accessibility for all road users. From an engineering standpoint, designing the new bridges to incorporate rail service would require substantially flatter grades than highway standards allow, along with substantially higher structural loading capacity, wider bridge decks, and miles of approach track on each side of Cape Cod Canal. These features would greatly expand the project footprint and introduce additional property acquisition needs, community disruption, and environmental impacts that are beyond the scope and intent of this Program.
Cape Cod Commission	Commission staff suggest MassDOT coordinate with the MBTA and USACE to potentially extend Cape Flyer seasonal rail service	MassDOT will not be pursuing plans to extend CapeFLYER seasonal rail service at this time. To ensure continued mobility during construction, MassDOT will implement a comprehensive

Commenter	Comment	Response
	in the shoulder months to assist with increased public transportation options during the Canal Bridges project.	TMP that includes traffic operations strategies, transit coordination, and continuous monitoring so that adjustments can be made as conditions evolve. These measures are designed to help maintain dependable access for residents, workers, and visitors across the canal throughout the construction period.
Diane DeLuc	A variety of rail possibilities should be studied for impact mitigation during construction and long-term operations. Running the Cape Flyer on a weekday commuter schedule connecting Hyannis with South Station could reduce bridge crossings without requiring significant investment. Bringing commuter rail to Buzzards Bay, in and of itself, is not a mitigation option, but aligning CCRTA bus service at the station with train departures and arrivals could help. Bigger picture, regular service to Buzzards Bay represents an important step toward restoring commuter rail over the canal into Hyannis and North Falmouth. Track and station upgrades consistent with this larger goal should thus be included in the FEIR scope. For example, the Bourne rail station, which needs to be relocated as part of the Bridges program, could be positioned near the junction between the Cape Main Line and Falmouth Secondary.	The Program does not include the development of new transit or rail services, nor does it include rail infrastructure upgrades or long-term commuter rail expansion. These initiatives fall outside of the Program’s purpose and scope, which is limited to replacing the existing Cape Cod Canal highway bridges and reconfiguring the immediate approach roadways needed to improve cross canal mobility and accessibility for all road users. Regional transit priorities are being advanced through the Cape Cod TIP, which funds bus service enhancements, fleet modernization, and transit-supportive facilities to strengthen mobility across the region. To ensure continued mobility during construction, MassDOT will implement a comprehensive TMP that includes traffic operations strategies, transit coordination, and continuous monitoring so that adjustments can be made as conditions evolve. These measures are designed to help maintain dependable access for residents, workers, and visitors across the canal throughout the construction period.
Sierra Club	A variety of rail possibilities should be studied for impact mitigation during construction and long-term operations. Running the Cape Flyer on a weekday commuter schedule connecting Hyannis with South Station could reduce bridge crossings without requiring significant investment. Bringing commuter rail to Buzzards Bay, in and of itself, is not a mitigation option, but aligning CCRTA bus service at the station with train	The Program does not include the development of new transit or rail services, nor does it include rail infrastructure upgrades or long-term commuter rail expansion. These initiatives fall outside of the Program’s purpose and scope, which is limited to replacing the existing Cape Cod Canal highway bridges and reconfiguring the immediate approach roadways needed to improve cross-canal mobility and accessibility for all road users.

Commenter	Comment	Response
	departures and arrivals could help. Bigger picture, regular service to Buzzards Bay represents an important step toward restoring commuter rail over the canal into Hyannis and North Falmouth. Track and station upgrades consistent with this larger goal should thus be included in the FEIS scope. For example, the Bourne rail station, which needs to be relocated as part of the Bridges program, could be positioned near the junction between the Cape Main Line and Falmouth Secondary.	Regional transit priorities are being advanced through the Cape Cod TIP, which funds bus service enhancements, fleet modernization, and transit-supportive facilities to strengthen mobility across the region. To ensure continued mobility during construction, MassDOT will implement a comprehensive TMP that includes traffic operations strategies, transit coordination, and continuous monitoring so that adjustments can be made as conditions evolve. These measures are designed to help maintain dependable access for residents, workers, and visitors across the canal throughout the construction period.
Ken Cheitlin	I suggest that we incorporate in the bridges project a design for a new railroad track running inland from the Canal rail line to JBCC and/or the new transfer station being built at the Bourne ISWM facility. We will be disturbing the entire Canal corridor between Monument Beach and Sagamore to build the two new bridges. So, it makes sense to design the new rail line (or at least the launching point of the line) now, even if the line isn't built at the same time as the bridges.	MassDOT does not plan to incorporate new transit or rail services as part of this Program, as such initiatives fall outside of its purpose, scope, and funding structure. Its scope is limited to replacing the existing Cape Cod Canal highway bridges and reconfiguring the immediate approach roadways needed to improve cross-canal mobility and accessibility for all road users. From an engineering standpoint, designing the new bridges to incorporate rail service would require substantially flatter grades than highway standards allow, along with substantially higher structural loading capacity, wider bridge decks, and miles of approach track on each side of Cape Cod Canal. These features would greatly expand the project footprint and introduce additional property acquisition needs, community disruption, and environmental impacts that are beyond the scope and intent of this Program.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Tsmrs Race	Reconstruction plans for the Bourne Bridge should include plans for a new modern rail line from Joint Base Cape COD through the new transfer station at the Bourne ISWM facility to the canal rail line. It should be incorporated into the infrastructure redesign of the bridge project. The line would serve the military as well as future waste disposal proposals currently underway at the Joint Base facility.	MassDOT does not plan to incorporate new transit or rail services as part of this Program, as such initiatives fall outside of its purpose, scope, and funding structure. Its scope is limited to replacing the existing Cape Cod Canal highway bridges and reconfiguring the immediate approach roadways needed to improve cross-canal mobility and accessibility for all road users. From an engineering standpoint, designing the new bridges to incorporate rail service would require substantially flatter grades than highway standards allow, along with substantially higher structural loading capacity, wider bridge decks, and miles of approach track on each side of Cape Cod Canal. These features would greatly expand the project footprint and introduce additional property acquisition needs, community disruption, and environmental impacts that are beyond the scope and intent of this Program.
Bill Sullivan	Rail transportation that exists on the Cape in the form of the “Dinner Train” and the “CapeFlyer” are a novelty items. Major infrastructure changes will need to occur in order to have rail service that runs on a daily schedule. A large percentage of Barnstable, Plymouth and Bristol County commuters use the bridges spanning the Canal on a daily basis. Exploring the possibilities towards lowering the amount of bridge traffic by incorporating rail service into the new Bourne Bridge design needs consideration. There is rail bed in place between the Marlborough MBTA station and Joint Base Cape Cod. Upgrading the train corridor and building a regional transportation hub on the base would make both the “south coast” and the cape realistically accessible to one another. Upgrades would also make commuting to	MassDOT does not plan to incorporate new transit or rail services as part of this Program, as such initiatives fall outside of its purpose, scope, and funding structure. Its scope is limited to replacing the existing Cape Cod Canal highway bridges and reconfiguring the immediate approach roadways needed to improve cross-canal mobility and accessibility for all road users. From an engineering standpoint, designing the new bridges to incorporate rail service would require substantially flatter grades than highway standards allow, along with substantially higher structural loading capacity, wider bridge decks, and miles of approach track on each side of Cape Cod Canal. These features would greatly expand the project footprint and introduce additional property acquisition needs, community disruption,

Commenter	Comment	Response
	Boston/Amtrak possible. The biggest challenge is the rerouting the tracks to bypass the antiquated elevator bridge onto the proposed new Borne Bridge. Unfortunately the Commonwealth has taken the position that the incline is too steep for a train to function. Wouldn't any competent engineer be able to figure out how to make it work? Those involved in the decision-making for some reason been unable to see this as a once in a lifetime quality of life opportunity.	and environmental impacts that are beyond the scope and intent of this Program.
Association to Preserve Cape Cod	Despite statements in the DEIS to the contrary, APCC also still has concerns about the potential for increased bridge capacity and improvements to connecting roadways generating secondary commercial and residential growth in the canal region and beyond.	The Build Alternative is not expected to generate new development on Cape Cod beyond what is already forecasted. While transportation projects can sometimes influence growth patterns, this Program does not change regional access, open new land for development, or create new travel corridors. The replacement bridges maintain the same functional connections that exist today; therefore, they do not introduce the types of network changes typically associated with induced development. Cape Cod's broader demographic and infrastructure conditions further limit the potential for additional growth regardless of transportation improvements, as explained in Appendix 4.22, Assessment of Induced Demand and Induced Development , of the FEIS.
Town of Sandwich Department of Public Works	The Town requests an assessment of summer peak conditions in Sandwich under the Build scenario to better understand likely outcomes during the most congested periods and to manage public expectations accordingly.	Traffic operations for the summer Saturday peak are included in Appendix 4.2, Traffic Engineering Technical Report , of the FEIS.
Town of Sandwich Department of Public Works	The Town requests that the queue analysis be expanded to include Sandwich intersections during fall and summer peak periods.	Tabulated queue lengths for intersections within the regional Study Area are included in the attachments to Appendix 4.2, Traffic Engineering Technical Report , of the FEIS.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Town of Sandwich Department of Public Works	The Town requests comparative queue maps showing No-Build conditions versus the Build scenario traffic conditions for the Sandwich road network.	Tabulated No Build and Build queue lengths for intersections within the regional Study Area are included in the attachments to Appendix 4.2, Traffic Engineering Technical Report , of the FEIS.
Town of Sandwich Department of Public Works	The DEIS suggests these secondary impacts in the Canal area will be alleviated by the Program; the Town requests clarification on whether similar benefits are expected in Sandwich.	While the Project Limits are not within the town of Sandwich, roadways and intersections within Sandwich are anticipated to see some benefits that are related to reduction in congestion and travel times. Queuing and congestion that currently extend from the Project Limits into Sandwich are expected to be reduced during the peak hours. Please refer to Appendix 4.2, Traffic Engineering Technical Report , of the FEIS for more information.
Diane DeLuc	Also, the DEIS traffic study area must be expanded to include the entire Cape. Ripple effects of higher volumes of vehicles crossing the bridges” potentially at higher speeds should be examined across downstream interchanges and intersections, from Routes 28 and 151 toward Falmouth and Mashpee and from Routes 6 and 6A eastward through upper, mid, lower, and outer Cape communities.	MassDOT has conducted additional analyses on potential traffic impacts, including induced demand. Please refer to Appendix 4.22, Assessment of Induced Demand and Induced Development , of the FEIS for further information regarding induced demand.
Sierra Club	The traffic study area must include the entire Cape. Ripple effects of higher volumes of vehicles crossing the Canal at higher speeds should be examined across downstream interchanges and intersections, from Routes 28 and 151 toward Falmouth and Mashpee and from Routes 6 and 6A eastward through upper, mid, lower, and outer Cape communities.	MassDOT has conducted additional analyses on potential traffic impacts, including induced demand. Please refer to Appendix 4.22, Assessment of Induced Demand and Induced Development , of the FEIS for further information regarding induced demand.
Sierra Club	Traffic and socioeconomic studies should be expanded to recognize the obvious and consider a broader range of future possibilities. Key DEIS conclusions are based on an assertion that doubling available traffic lanes and adding turn lanes will not	MassDOT has conducted additional analyses on potential traffic impacts, including induced demand.

Commenter	Comment	Response
	represent an expansion of roadway capacity, as well as a single-point projection that the Cape’s year-round population will undergo a substantial decline through 2050. In addition, assuming no latent transportation demand and no induced demand strains credulity, ignoring long standing challenges—physical constraints and psychological barriers—associated with crossing the current bridges and navigating the canal region nor the “if you build it, they will come” reality of expanded transportation infrastructure.	Refer to Appendix 4.22, Assessment of Induced Demand and Induced Development , of the FEIS for further information regarding induced demand.
John York	Signage on MacArthur Boulevard: The Massachusetts Addendum to the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (Massachusetts MUTCD) includes a sign, designated MA-R9-15, to be posted at ramps to limited access roadways to indicate that pedestrians, bicycles and horses are prohibited, and includes instructions for how and where the sign(s) should be posted. Among these requirements is that a MA-R9-15 sign should be posted at every access point, and should be visible to a pedestrian or other non-motorized user entering the exit ramp of the access point. This makes sense as pedestrians are generally instructed to walk against the traffic.	The Program will not be introducing pedestrian and bicycle accommodations along State 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.
Vanasse & Associates Inc.	Considering the extensive changes in the roadway network local to the DSM property and the degradation in operations at intersections proximate to the DSM property, VAI requests localized origin destination models that isolate the Sagamore South interchange, plus scenarios involving origin-destinations to the east of Route 6.	MassDOT is coordinating with Vanasse & Associates Inc. (VAI) and Market Basket (DSM Property Group) to discuss access and travel concerns within the Sagamore South interchange. Formal agreements with the property owner regarding impacts and compensation will be handled through the right-of-way acquisition process.
Vanasse & Associates Inc.	We request that the Sidra analysis results of the roundabout at DSM’s proposed main access to the Cranberry Highway Extension be provided and included in future reports.	MassDOT is coordinating with VAI and the DSM Property Group to discuss access and travel concerns within the Sagamore South interchange. Formal agreements with the property owner

Commenter	Comment	Response
		regarding impacts and compensation will be handled through the right-of-way acquisition process.
Anonymous User	I have reviewed and my comment is this TOTALLY OVERDONE with 3 lanes each bridge with a bike/pedestrian as we'll still only have 2 lanes to travel "cautiously" on Route 6. The mindset of travelers will be to speed over and continue with this same behavior to destinations and you may have less traffic "issues" ON the bridge BUT you'll see a dramatic INCREASE in crashes once over the bridge especially on SANDWICH side. CHAOS will rein over so you may want to think about a helicopter pad for transit to CCH along with HUGE FLASHING SPEED LIMIT SIGNS. MORE IS NOT ALWAYS BETTER.	The purpose of the Program is to improve cross-canal mobility and accessibility between Cape Cod and mainland Massachusetts for all road users and to address the increasing maintenance needs and functional obsolescence of the aging Sagamore and Bourne Bridges. One of the needs of the Program is to improve vehicular traffic operations. Heavy traffic volumes, coupled with the geometrically deficient features of the bridges and their immediate approaches, contribute to poor traffic operations during peak travel periods and crash rates that are considerably higher than the statewide average for similar facilities. Please refer to Chapter 2, Program Purpose and Need, of the FEIS for more information. Each crossing includes four 12-foot-wide through-traffic lanes (two in each direction), two 12-foot-wide auxiliary lanes (one in each direction), a shoulder, a separation median, and one bidirectional shared-use path separated from vehicular traffic. The addition of the auxiliary lanes, which are common throughout Massachusetts, is to facilitate safer entering and exiting at the interchanges and are necessary to meet current design standards at these locations. They are not through-traffic lanes and will not extend beyond the interchanges to the north and south of Cape Cod Canal. MassDOT confirmed the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' (USACE) determination that the "Replacement plus additional lanes" alternative is not reasonable. Providing additional through-travel lanes would require considerable modifications to the regional highway network on both sides of Cape Cod Canal. These modifications would carry substantially higher construction costs

Commenter	Comment	Response
		and create extensive environmental, land use, and community impacts. Further, this alternative is beyond the intended Purpose and Need the Program.
Town of Sandwich Department of Public Works	For example, travelers previously using the Bourne Bridge to reach destinations such as Mashpee might choose the Sagamore Bridge if travel times improve. Do the traffic demand models account for this possibility, and if so, what are the projected impacts on Route 130 and surrounding corridors?	Any shifts in route choice resulting from improved travel times are already reflected in the Build Alternative travel demand model. However, localized traffic analysis in Mashpee was not conducted because the area lies outside the defined traffic analysis limits.
Cape Cod Commission	For a project of this scale, MassDOT should prioritize the early development of a comprehensive Traffic Management Plan (TMP) that considers all travel modes and actively involves all relevant stakeholders from the outset.	The awarded Design-Builder will be required to develop and implement a comprehensive TMP, addressing all travel modes including vehicle, public transit, rail, bicycle, pedestrian, and accessibility needs. The TMP must identify potential impacts of construction activities, outline mitigation measures to maintain safe and efficient movement for all modes, and include provisions for stakeholder communication and ongoing monitoring. Please refer to Section 4.2 Transportation, Traffic and Safety , of the FEIS for additional information.
Cape Cod Commission	MassDOT should establish a Canal Area Traffic Operations Center (TOC) dedicated to real-time monitoring, communication, and adaptive management of traffic throughout the Canal Bridges construction period.	MassDOT will require the Design-Builder to create a comprehensive TMP that limits traffic disruptions during construction and outlines how work zones will be managed and communicated to the traveling public. The Design-Builder will be required to implement Smart Work Zone Systems to monitor traffic throughout construction and update the TMP according to construction-period traffic conditions. Please refer to Section 4.2, Transportation, Traffic, and Safety , of the FEIS for further details regarding construction-period traffic management.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Cape Cod Commission	Commission staff urge MassDOT to address safety issues on the Scenic Highway from Herring Pond Road/Bournedale Road including the installation of a median.	The referenced section of Scenic Highway is outside of the Program’s limits of work. MassDOT will continue to monitor conditions along this section of Scenic Highway and will coordinate with local and regional partners to address safety needs through a separate roadway project.
Aiden Boni	Why are there bridges increasing travel lanes. This, as we all know, will only lead to more vehicles, more traffic and congestion and more emissions. How is this at all in line with the state’s environmental mandates? This is so clearly against it and should be considered a complete joke! How do we call ourselves the most progressive state and we continue to get this completely wrong. This is disgraceful to the people of Massachusetts. If the great employees of MASSDOT want to help the people of Massachusetts, these bridges should not include more lanes, keep them the same as minimum. There should also be investment in other transportation modes along with this. This is a joke and the state should not be allow this to be built as proposed.	The replacement bridges are not increasing the number of through-travel lanes. Each new bridge will continue to provide two through lanes in each direction, consistent with the existing structures. The inclusion of full shoulders and auxiliary lanes is required to meet current highway design and safety standards, which call for adequate space for disabled vehicles, emergency response, and safer merging and exiting movements. These features improve reliability and reduce incident-related congestion; they are not intended to expand general-purpose capacity. The Program’s Build Alternative includes a dedicated, fully separated shared-use path on each replacement bridge, providing safe and accessible accommodation for pedestrians and bicyclists. These facilities will connect existing and planned multimodal networks on both sides of the canal, improving non-motorized travel options for residents, commuters, and visitors. MassDOT does not plan to incorporate new transit or rail services as part of this Program, as such initiatives fall outside of its purpose, scope, and funding structure. Regional transit priorities are being advanced through the Cape Cod TIP, which funds bus service enhancements, fleet modernization, and transit-supportive facilities to strengthen mobility across the region.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Kathrynn Scott	While I fully support the replacement of these bridges, I do have a question regarding the new design. Do I understand this correctly that these will be 6 lane bridges? 3 lanes for each direction? My question is are you going to be redesigning the highway to accommodate this? Right now it's two lanes going into two lanes and at peak, it's standstill traffic. You will need to increase the lanes to match the bridges.	To clarify, the replacement bridges will not have six through-travel lanes. Each bridge will continue to provide two through lanes in each direction, matching the existing configuration. The new bridge design includes full shoulders and auxiliary lanes to meet current highway safety and design standards. These features are not additional through lanes. Shoulders provide space for disabled vehicles and emergency response, and auxiliary lanes support safer merging and exiting movements. These elements improve safety and reliability but do not expand general-purpose capacity. Auxiliary lanes on the replacement bridges will only operate between the on- and off-ramps and will not extend beyond the interchanges on both sides of the canal.
David Sutter	The planned Sagamore bridge replacement is massive and garish. It is proven that adding lanes to a highway does not reduce traffic. Wider lanes--in addition to additional lanes--are pointless and encourage folks to drive their kid-killing SUVs down the cape where they take up valuable space. We should not be developing the cape more in order to serve the needs of seasonal residents and Airbnb renters who drive up costs and contribute to the degradation of the local environment. Many of New England's highways being two lanes, and thus as non-intrusive as possible, is a gift, which I thought distinguished New Englanders from at least some of the dumb urban planning which happens in other parts of the country. Tourism of--and for--the rich is killing the Cape. No one should be serving such an industry. Without adjustments for the sake of this industry, lower costs could accommodate more year-long residents and our coastal towns would have a life apart from their two-week-per-year residents.	The scale of the replacement structures reflects modern engineering standards for safety, seismic resilience, emergency access, and multimodal accommodation. To clarify, the replacement bridges will not add through-travel lanes. Each bridge will continue to provide two through lanes in each direction, consistent with the existing bridges. The new design includes full shoulders and auxiliary lanes to support safer merging, exiting, and incident response, but these features do not function as additional general-purpose lanes. MassDOT evaluated traffic operations using the fall weekday PM peak period, which represents most consistently congested conditions outside of the summer tourist season.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Catherine Roberts	The preferred plan seems smart to me. Will going from 3 lanes on the bridges down to 2 lanes on the highway cause backup congestion?	To clarify, the replacement bridges will not include three through-travel lanes in each direction. Each bridge will continue to provide two through-lanes per direction, consistent with the existing bridges. The additional width in the new design accommodates full shoulders and auxiliary lanes, which operate only between on- and off-ramps to support safer merging and exiting movements. The project is designed to maintain the number of general-purpose lanes, while improving safety, reliability, and overall traffic operations.

2.9 Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities

Table 2-11 includes comments and responses related to proposed pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

Table 2-11. Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comment	Response
Cape Cod Commission	Commission staff encourage MassDOT to consider coordinating with USACE to install additional bike racks and bike repair stations along the Canal Service Road area to assist with improving the bicycling experience and network.	The Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) is designing features and amenities for the Cape Cod Bridges Program's (Program) pedestrian and bicycle facilities and shared-use paths (SUP), including bicycle parking. MassDOT will coordinate with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) as appropriate.
David Michael Race	This project should include extending the Shining Sea bikeway in Falmouth by removing the F2 line and building the Bourne Rail To Trail, connecting the Shining Sea bikeway in Falmouth with the Cape Cod canal, and consider a new rail spur to connect the Bourne ISWM transfer station.	This falls outside the Program's established goals and objectives; therefore, it was not included in the evaluation. Phases 1 through 4 of the Bourne Rail Trail are listed in Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives, Table 3-2, Transportation Improvement Program Projects, 2026-2030.
John York	Further, please respond to indicate the timetable by which the Program team anticipates their proposed pedestrian	Maintaining pedestrian and bicycle connectivity during construction is a priority, and improving accommodations for

Commenter	Comment	Response
	improvements to Sandwich Road will be completed and in use by the public. Along with that estimated completion date, please discuss possible turns of events, such further or indefinite delays of funding for Bourne Bridge Replacement (MassDOT Project 613678) and what the timetable would be under those circumstances.	pedestrians and bicyclists is a core element of the Program’s Purpose and Need. Construction of the replacement Sagamore and Bourne Bridges is anticipated to occur over eight to 10 years, with construction of the replacement Sagamore Bridge expected to begin first (currently anticipated in fall 2027). Construction of each bridge will occur over multiple phases. Early construction activities identified in Phase 1 are expected to include constructing and opening SUP connections between Sandwich Road and Canal Service Road with improvements along those portions of Sandwich Road to minimize pedestrian and bicycle disruptions and maintain pedestrian and bicycle connectivity throughout construction as much as possible. Construction of the replacement Bourne Bridge will follow Sagamore Bridge. Specific construction phasing for Bourne Bridge is still being developed. However, consistent with Program goals, maintaining or improving pedestrian and bicycle access throughout the Study Area will be a priority during all phases of work. For more information, refer to Appendix 3.2, Construction Approach Technical Report, of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). MassDOT and USACE are continuing to pursue all available funding opportunities necessary to advance the Bourne Bridge replacement project as expeditiously as possible. If funding for the Bourne Bridge is not immediately secured, USACE will continue to operate and maintain the existing Bourne Bridge, including conducting ongoing maintenance and repairs.
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	No discussion of maintenance of shared use facilities in built alt.	Section 4.3, Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities, of the FEIS has been revised to indicate that upon completion of construction, MassDOT will be responsible for the long-term operation and maintenance of the SUPs, including paths located on USACE’s

Commenter	Comment	Response
		property. Final commitments will be refined as part of the ongoing USACE Section 408 permitting and review process.
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Change "USACE owns and maintains these service roads...." to "USACE <u>operates</u> and maintains these services roads...."	Where applicable, text in the FEIS has been revised to indicate that the United States owns and USACE operates and maintains the Canal Service Roads as part of the Cape Cod Canal Federal Navigation Project.
Mary Jane Mastrangelo	It is unclear from the Project Limits map whether the Park and Ride and Bus transportation hub is included in the Project Limits and it should be. How the new Sagamore bridge will connect and improve Pedestrian and Bicycle access to this location is a very important consideration. Both of the new bridges should have pedestrian accommodations and one of the bridges should have multi-modal accommodations.	Bourne Park and Ride is located outside the Program Limits. However, the multimodal accommodations proposed as part of the Program will provide direct connectivity to the facility. A separated, multimodal facility is included on the eastbound span of the Sagamore Bridge crossing and on the southbound span of the Bourne Bridge crossing, ensuring continuous and safe access for users. Please refer to Section 4.3, Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities, of the FEIS for more information.
John York	I want you to answer the question of what modeling you used to determine pedestrian behavior.	Pedestrian and bicycle modeling to estimate future or projected use of the SUPs was not conducted. The Program's Purpose and Need do not include operational analysis or demand forecasting for pedestrian or bicycle travel. Rather, the Program is intended to improve accommodations for pedestrians and bicyclists by providing safe, accessible, and compliant multi-use facilities within the project area. This purpose is being met through the provision of continuous and compliant facilities and, where feasible, by addressing critical gaps in the existing pedestrian and bicycle network. As a result, future operational or usage modeling for pedestrians and bicyclists was not required to support the Program's objectives.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Emily Paskewicz	On behalf of the ECGA, I am thrilled to see the inclusion of 2 way bike lanes on both bridges, in addition to wide sidewalks. I would encourage the design team to work towards the widest possible bike lanes and shared use path widths as use is likely to be very significant once the bridges are complete and only increase over time.	The proposed multimodal facilities exceed current design standards, offering generous widths that enhance comfort and safety for all users. Each crossing includes facilities up to 20 feet wide at their maximum. SUPs are consistently 12 feet wide, and sidewalks are designed at 6 feet wide, providing ample space for both pedestrian and bicycle travel.
Town of Sandwich Department of Public Works	Integration and coordination of the Bridge Program concepts with the Sandwich projects is essential as we move forward with both projects.	MassDOT will coordinate with the Town of Sandwich throughout design and construction of the Program to minimize conflicts and ensure consistency with the Town's other ongoing and planned projects.
Bill Sykes	I support the Bourne Bridge multimodal path but urge MassDOT to replace the at-grade Sandwich Rd crossing with a grade-separated multimodal overpass. (Project File 608020, project_id 13868) Reasons: (1) More than a dozen major cycling events each year (e.g., Pan-Mass Challenge, Best Buddies) would create continuous crossings, heightening safety risks for both drivers and path users. (2) Everyday path use will surge once a practical crossing exists. (3) Event cyclists descending the bridge will face large-group downhill stops, increasing crash potential. (4) Most path users must immediately cross Sandwich Rd to reach the primary destination the south-side Canal Bikeway. (5) The expected use level is not adequately addressed by the proposed flashing-light control; a full (HAWK) signal or grade separation is the only safe solution. (6) Planned youth access to the ice rink from the bridge approach further exposes inexperienced riders to vehicle conflict. A simple, cost-effective solution exists: keep the path elevated and use the planned retaining wall as the beginning of a light, ramped overpass. It maintains traffic flow,	MassDOT re-evaluated a grade-separated SUP crossing east of Bourne Bridge and determined it remains unreasonable due to high construction and maintenance costs and the need for extensive retaining walls to meet approach grades. MassDOT confirms that the proposed at-grade crossing meets all safety criteria and will include enhanced safety features, such as high-visibility markings, lighting, warning signs, and Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons. Please refer to Section 4.3, Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities, of the FEIS for further details regarding the evaluation of a grade-separated SUP crossing.

Commenter	Comment	Response
	greatly improves safety, and aligns with the Commonwealth's vision for a lasting, high-impact project. Signed,	
Jay Batson	I support the Cape Cod Bridges Project and appreciate the ambition and quality of the overall design. I am writing in alignment with other public commenters requesting reconsideration of the planned at-grade termination of the Bourne South Quadrant shared-use path at the Canal Service Road. This design presents avoidable safety, operational, and environmental concerns, particularly given event-scale bicycle usage and the canal bikeway connection. A straightforward alternative exists: a lightweight, grade-separated pedestrian and bicycle overpass that leverages the existing elevation and already-planned structures. I am submitting a detailed formal comment by mail requesting that MassDOT prepare a preliminary design and comparative cost estimate (capital and operating) for this overpass versus the current at-grade solution (per instructions here: https://www.mass.gov/doc/massdot-cape-cod-bridges-public-meeting-flyer-121625/download) I respectfully ask that this issue and requested analysis be fully considered as part of the project record.	MassDOT re-evaluated a grade-separated SUP crossing east of Bourne Bridge and determined it remains unreasonable due to high construction and maintenance costs and the need for extensive retaining walls to meet approach grades. MassDOT confirms that the proposed at-grade crossing meets all safety criteria and will include enhanced safety features, such as high-visibility markings, lighting, warning signs, and Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons. Please refer to Section 4.3, Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities , of the FEIS for further details regarding the evaluation of a grade-separated SUP crossing.
Michael Bingham	I support the Bourne Bridge multimodal path but urge MassDOT to replace the at-grade Sandwich Rd crossing with a grade-separated multimodal overpass. (Project File 608020, project_id 13868) Reasons: (1) More than a dozen major cycling events each year (e.g., Pan-Mass Challenge, Best Buddies) would create continuous crossings, heightening safety risks for both drivers and path users. (2) Everyday path use will surge once a practical crossing exists. (3) Event cyclists descending the bridge will face large-group downhill stops, increasing crash potential. (4) Most path users must immediately cross Sandwich Rd to reach the	MassDOT re-evaluated a grade-separated SUP crossing east of Bourne Bridge and determined it remains unreasonable due to high construction and maintenance costs and the need for extensive retaining walls to meet approach grades. MassDOT confirms that the proposed at-grade crossing meets all safety criteria and will include enhanced safety features, such as high-visibility markings, lighting, warning signs, and Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons.

Commenter	Comment	Response
	primary destination- the south-side Canal Bikeway. (5) The expected use level is not adequately addressed by the proposed flashing-light control; a full (HAWK) signal or grade separation is the only safe solution. (6) Planned youth access to the ice rink from the bridge approach further exposes inexperienced riders to vehicle conflict. A simple, cost-effective solution exists: keep the path elevated and use the planned retaining wall as the beginning of a light, ramped overpass. It maintains traffic flow, greatly improves safety, and aligns with the Commonwealth's vision for a lasting, high-impact project.	Please refer to Section 4.3, Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities , of the FEIS for further details regarding the evaluation of a grade-separated SUP crossing.
Jay Batson	I'm a resident of Bourne. I'm here to comment on the impacts of the currently proposed termination of the Bourne South Quadrant Shared-Use Path. As written in Section 4.3.2 of the current DEI plan, the plan brings the high-volume bike and pedestrian facility -- which by the way, we compliment you for a wonderful plan to come across the bridge -- but after you get off the bridge, it brings the facility down to an at-grade crossing at the Canal Service Road, controlled only by a flashing beacon. That decision has real environmental and safety consequences. First, it creates persistent and pervasive vehicle start-stop-and-go conditions, particularly during the summer when there are high numbers of organized and/or unorganized bike rides drive tens of thousands of users a year. You already know the ones that are easy like the Pan-Mass Challenge or the Best Buddies Ride, but there are dozens other, from the MassBay Coalition to informal bike rides all day, every day. The resulting ingestion and emissions from the constant start-stop of all the vehicles that will be stopping on Canal Service Road are not meaningfully accounted for in the current DEIR. Second, the at-grade approach requires all kinds of soil retention and structures and	MassDOT re-evaluated a grade-separated SUP crossing east of Bourne Bridge and determined it remains unreasonable due to high construction and maintenance costs and the need for extensive retaining walls to meet approach grades. MassDOT confirms that the proposed at-grade crossing meets all safety criteria and will include enhanced safety features, such as high-visibility markings, lighting, warning signs, and Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons. Please refer to Section 4.3, Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities, of the FEIS for further details regarding the evaluation of a grade-separated SUP crossing.

Commenter	Comment	Response
	all kinds of rain mitigation because of all the pavement that you're adding with all the big, long Bourne South Path that exists on that south side. Again, with all maintenance impacts, sand removal for washdown down the path and everything else. Happily, there's a clear and environmentally superior alternative, a lightweight, grade-separated bike and pedestrian overpass that leverages the existing elevation that's already there that you plan on working with. They already incorporated project plan and eliminated the need for traffic control devices altogether on Canal Service Road. My request is simple and squarely within the purpose of this review, that MassDOT provide a preliminary design and comparative cost estimate for an overpass like this so the environmental operational benefits can be properly evaluated alongside the current at-grade proposal. I have with me, if you'd like to see the names of another dozen active residents who are standing behind this proposal, as well as the explicit support management of the two largest events on the Cape, the Pan-Mass Challenge and the Best Buddies Rides. before the prior comment period was now closed, and I was hoping to see some comment about this in the current draft. I didn't see anything about it. I think he might be able to tell you more about whether -- where I put this and where it might go. But essentially, think of it going alongside of the berm that's currently at the -- on the high side of there, going straight down into the Bourne Recreational Park. It goes straight down there, not take any more land. It's simple to do and helpful for everybody.	
Jay Batson	I here reference the public comment I made in the Dec 16, 2025 Public Meeting regarding the Draft EIS, and the as-planned exit of the multi-modal path onto an at-grade crossing on the south	MassDOT re-evaluated a grade-separated SUP crossing east of Bourne Bridge and determined it remains unreasonable due to high construction and maintenance costs and the need for

Commenter	Comment	Response
	quadrant of the Bourne Bridge plan. Because this comment form does not permit me to attach a PDF, I have sent a full comment in both email and postal mail to Luisa Paiewonsky referencing Project File 608020. The condensed version of my public comment is this: The current DEIS planning for an at-grade crossing does not adequately evaluate the impact of the following predictable factors: - New everyday use is unexamined. The new multimodal facility on the bridge will likely create much higher than current cross-bridge use, and interactions with traffic at the planned crossing. - Event scale use is not assessed. More than a dozen existing organized rides cross the bridge each year, bringing thousands of riders. The burden of an at-grade crossing is high for both the organizers and the users. - Canal bikeway destination required at-grade crossing for every user. Nearly all users will be headed to the bikeway, triggering constant user/vehicle interactions. - Youth access risks. The plan explicitly plans to connect the multimodal facilities to the ice rink - yet forces youth to (needlessly) cross a roadway after crossing the bridge. - Flashing beacon mismatch. The plan assumes users will stop traffic by using the signal; but cyclists with downhill momentum will (rightly or wrongly) be unlikely to stop to trigger the light. - Water runoff management. The current descent path presents substantial hard surface requiring rainwater management & disposal. - Erosion control. The path must be cut into a hillside, removing mature growth, implying ongoing erosion control. - Automobile emissions increase. While minor, vehicle start/stop implies an increase in CO2 missions. I propose an alternate solution - a light, ramped, grade-separated bike & walker overpass at this location to eliminate all the above problems entirely. My PDF comment (mentioned above) illustrates this more completely. My requested action is to have	extensive retaining walls to meet approach grades. MassDOT confirms that the proposed at-grade crossing meets all safety criteria and will include enhanced safety features, such as high-visibility markings, lighting, warning signs, and Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons. Please refer to Section 4.3, Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities, of the FEIS for further details regarding the evaluation of a grade-separated SUP crossing.

Commenter	Comment	Response
	MassDOT prepare a preliminary design & comparative cost estimate (capital and operating) for the proposed lightweight overpass, sufficient to evaluate it as a reasonable alternative to the planned at-grade crossing, permitting MassDOT to determine whether the overpass better meets the project's purpose & need while reducing reasonably foreseeable adverse effects on the human & natural environment.	
Jay Batson	my issue is that the bike path makes a long descent to the canal access road, then crossed it (a busy) street; instead, I propose NOT building that long descent (that you have to handle anyway) and instead build a multi-modal overpass over the canal access road, descending across the existing parking lot owned by the Commonwealth, exiting there and avoiding the traffic crossing altogether.)	MassDOT re-evaluated a grade-separated SUP crossing east of Bourne Bridge and determined it remains unreasonable due to high construction and maintenance costs and the need for extensive retaining walls to meet approach grades. MassDOT confirms that the proposed at-grade crossing meets all safety criteria and will include enhanced safety features, such as high-visibility markings, lighting, warning signs, and Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacons. Please refer to Section 4.3, Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities , of the FEIS for further details regarding the evaluation of a grade-separated SUP crossing.
John York	I wonder whether there is a pedestrian equivalent of the bicyclist right to operate statute of MGL ch. 85 §11B. I do not know the answer, but suspect the answer may be in common law or case law rather than codified in a statute [...] something along the lines of: A public way is a public way, and therefore, a member of the public, unadorned by any device such as a motor vehicle or bicycle, may not be excluded from use of that way. Can you shed any light on this question? Is my suspicion correct?	Different sections of Massachusetts General Law (MGL) Chapter 85 state the following: “Section 2B. The department for purpose of promoting public safety upon limited access and express state highways, may from time to time make, alter, rescind or add to regulations to exclude, govern and restrict the use of such state highways by horse-drawn vehicles, bicycles, pedestrians, and vehicles determined by the department, because of their type or because of materials or products being transported, as unsafe for limited access and express state highways, bridges, tunnels or overhead highway structures, which regulations may provide penalties for

Commenter	Comment	Response
		the violation thereof not exceeding thirty-five dollars for each offense, excepting regulations prohibiting the transportation of unsafe materials or products, the penalties for violation of which shall not exceed five hundred dollars for each offense. The department for the purpose of promoting public safety and convenience during periods of commuter and holiday traffic, inclement weather conditions or construction activity, or for other good cause, may promulgate rules and regulations limiting the time and hours of travel of vehicles one hundred and two inches in width, semi-trailers of up to and including 53 feet in length when operating in semi-trailer unit and tandem units, as defined in section one of chapter ninety, on the National Network, as defined in section nineteen F of chapter ninety, and routes of reasonable access, as designated by the department under provisions of section nineteen G of chapter ninety, or any parts thereof, and such rules and regulations may provide penalties for the violation thereof not exceeding five hundred dollars for each offense. The state police, may, during declared weather emergencies order all trucks off of the roads. Section 2E. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 18 of chapter 90, the department for purposes of public safety and convenience may from time to time by regulations exclude persons and vehicles from state highways or portions thereof for such periods as it may deem necessary.” MassDOT’s Pedestrian Transportation Plan provides additional information on State Roads Performance and local road performance.

Commenter	Comment	Response
John York	For the portion of MacArthur Boulevard to be impacted and reconstructed by the Bridges Program, from the present Bourne Rotary south to the Bourne Integrated Solid Waste Management Facility, the Bridges Program team has elected to provide no facilities for pedestrians or bicycles, while adherence to MassDOT’s Healthy Transportation Policy and related engineering directives would require a separated facility for bicycles and facilities for pedestrians on both sides of the roadway. It is hard to understand why the Bridges Program team has elected to diverge from standard and accepted MassDOT Policy. In explaining and defending their proposed Bourne South interchange plans, members of the Bridges Program team, including MassDOT officials and the Program Development contractor’s lead engineer for roadway design have stated that pedestrians and bicycles are not allowed on MacArthur Boulevard, and therefore the Healthy Transportation Policy Directive does not apply to this roadway. The following are questions for MassDOT and the Cape Cod Bridges Program, and observations related to the questions. Please provide a response to each of the following questions, and comments on my observations where you believe comments are warranted. 1. Are MassDOT the Cape Cod Bridges Program team certain that MassDOT can and has banned pedestrians and bicycles from operating on the segment of Route 28, commonly known as MacArthur Boulevard, between the Bourne Rotary and the Otis Rotary in the Town of Bourne?	The Program will not be introducing pedestrian or bicycle accommodations along State 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
John York	2. Has the Bridges Program team conferred with MassDOT legal counsel and/or the MassDOT Office of Highway Safety on this matter?	MassDOT has reviewed and considered the issue of pedestrian and bicycle access restrictions along State Route 28. The comment regarding potential coordination with MassDOT Legal Counsel and the Office of Highway Safety has been noted as part of this review.
John York	3. Is the Program team aware of the Functional Road Classification of this roadway segment?	The functional classification of State Route 28 (MacArthur Boulevard) is designated as a Principal Arterial – Partial Access Highway, reflecting its role as a high-capacity corridor with controlled access characteristics.
John York	4. Has the Program team considered MGL Chapter 85 Section 11B and CMR 720 9.09?	MassDOT has reviewed and considered the referenced statutory and regulatory provisions in relation to the pedestrian and bicycle access restrictions along State Route 28.
John York	5. Is the Program team familiar with the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), the Massachusetts Supplement to the MUTCD (Massachusetts MUTCD) and the specifications in these documents for signage prohibiting pedestrians and bicycles?	The Program has been designed in accordance with the most current Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD) 11th Edition and all associated MassDOT amendments, ensuring consistency with federal and state traffic control standards.
John York	You're claiming that 30 years from now in the traffic conditions that you know perfectly 30 years from now you can predict to one-tenth of a minute the travel times of cars –excuse me—22 years from now in the year 2050. So there's a--that's another problem this report has, completely disparate treatment of vehicles versus pedestrians and bicycles, which is in violation of MassDOT policy that this project and all of your written stuff claims that you are meeting. You are not meeting the requirement of healthy transportation directive of your own MassDOT that says during the planning process that pedestrians and bicycles shall have the same opportunity to review plans and comment on them as any other roadway user. So that is putting	Pedestrian and bicycle modeling to estimate future or projected use of the SUPs was not conducted. The Program's Purpose and Need do not include operational analysis or demand forecasting for pedestrian or bicycle travel. Rather, the Program is intended to improve accommodations for pedestrians and bicyclists by providing safe, accessible, and compliant multi-use facilities within the project area. This purpose is being met through the provision of continuous and compliant facilities and, where feasible, by addressing critical gaps in the existing pedestrian and bicycle network. As a result, future operational or usage modeling for pedestrians and bicyclists was not required to support the Program's objectives. The Program's Purpose and

Commenter	Comment	Response
	you on notice. I'm not asking a question to you on that one. You are not compliant with that policy, and I know that you try very hard to do that and so it's sad to see how under-resourced this project is because of the shortcuts you had to use for pedestrians and bicycles.[...]I will close by saying to pretend that a superhighway, high-rise bridge 150 feet off the water in any way will ever constitute a suitable pedestrian crossing. Parents won't let their kids cross them. It doesn't matter how beautiful that bike path is. Your plans aren't going to change the minds of parents worrying about their kids getting home from school.	Need include improving accommodations for pedestrians and bicyclists, and this objective is being met through the incorporation of safe, fully compliant multi-use facilities throughout the Project Limits. Where feasible, additional connections are being introduced to close critical gaps in the existing pedestrian and bicycle network, strengthening overall system continuity and accessibility. MassDOT will prepare and submit a Design Justification Workbook to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) that documents how the Program meets applicable MassDOT design standards and Healthy Transportation Plan requirements and identifies any variances that may be necessary.
John York	I am shocked to see CMR 720 9.09 requires pedestrians to use only the unfinished shoulder. That might be advisable in some or most cases, but in some cases is not at all safe and/or is impossible. I guess I frequently violate CMR when I walk or cycle to attend public meetings of the Bourne Recreation Authority (a public body) held at the Authority's business offices at the Gallo Ice Arena. My choices for pedestrian or bicycle access to Gallo Arena are limited to travel along the dangerous, essentially shoulderless Sandwich Road, which I thought was at least legal, or violating railroad trespass law by crossing MassDOT Rail Division owned RR tracks at a well used by unauthorized crossing. It is clearly safer to cross the tracks than walk by road, but I thought I was following the law by using the full access public roadway. There are two areas along that roadside where there are steel guardrails right at the edge of the pavement, and thick cat brier, poison ivy, etc. on the outside of the guardrails. On the	Ongoing coordination with MassDOT Rail and Transit is underway to advance the inclusion of four rail crossings that will link the MassDOT multimodal network to USACE's Canal Service Road. In addition, the Program incorporates two SUPs along both sides of Sandwich Road extending to Gallo Ice Arena, strengthening multimodal connectivity throughout the corridor. Please refer to Section 4.3, Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities, and Chapter 5, Final Section 4(f) Evaluation, of the FEIS for more information.

Commenter	Comment	Response
	paved roadway is fog line which varies from 6 to 16 inches from the guardrail and edge of pavement. What to do?	
John York	I walk on the pavement against the traffic when I see no approaching vehicles. When there are approaching vehicles I jump onto the top of the guardrail and stand there gingerly until the vehicles pass and there is another no-traffic window of opportunity. I typically am performing this maneuver while walking my bicycle, which I ride from my house to this brief but dangerous segment of Sandwich Road. I suppose it might be an option to ride with the traffic on the right side of Sandwich Road, but I also suppose I would not live to relate the experience. I prefer walking where I can see the oncoming traffic, and jump onto the guardrail when necessary. I suppose that is because I prefer to be in control of my own destiny. The good news of CMR 720 9.08 and 9.09 might be that now I can trespass across the rail line and claim that it was the safer of two illegal options for access to the BRA offices. So what about Sandwich Road?	The Program includes two SUPs along both sides of Sandwich Road extending to Gallo Ice Arena, enhancing multimodal access and providing a continuous, safe connection for pedestrians and bicyclists. Please refer to Section 4.3, Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities, of the FEIS for further details.
John York	After several years receiving complaints and requests for pedestrian improvements, MassDOT continued to claim improvements were not warranted, until eventually, on June 7 this year, a Bourne Police officer was struck by a car while providing a traffic safety detail required by MassDOT's failure to provide for roadway safety at the entrance to the Upper Cape Cod Regional Technical High School, close by the Gallo Arena. After that accident, MassDOT reviewed the specifics of Sandwich Road and determined a traffic light could be warranted at the	MassDOT is coordinating closely with the Governor's office and FHWA to proactively identify and pursue funding opportunities that will support the implementation of these improvements.

Commenter	Comment	Response
	Upper Cape Tech entrance. MassDOT immediately installed the traffic light, but no crosswalk and no sidewalks, claiming a crosswalk could not be warranted without sidewalks, and that sidewalks are not in their immediate plans. MassDOT now proposes adding shared use paths on both sides of Sandwich Road as part of their proposed Bourne Bridge replacement project. The problem for me and others is the Bourne Bridge project is currently not funded and might not be implemented for several or many years.	
John York	Another place in Bourne, and also in the proposed project work area of the Bourne Bridge replacement project, where walking on the unfinished shoulder can be quite difficult is along Route 28 south of the current Bourne Rotary at the Cape Cod end of the Bourne Bridge. The Bridges Program team currently plans to provide no pedestrian or bicycle facilities along this stretch of roadway, claiming that bicycle and pedestrians are currently excluded. The problem with that rationale is that it does not seem likely that bicycles and pedestrians are currently legally excluded. (See my email of November 14, 2025, to MassDOT Major Projects and copied to you, for my comments concerning the status of this roadway with respect to pedestrian and/or bicycle use.)	Different sections of MGL Chapter 85 state the following: “Section 2B. The department for purpose of promoting public safety upon limited access and express state highways, may from time to time make, alter, rescind or add to regulations to exclude, govern and restrict the use of such state highways by horse-drawn vehicles, bicycles, pedestrians, and vehicles determined by the department, because of their type or because of materials or products being transported, as unsafe for limited access and express state highways, bridges, tunnels or overhead highway structures, which regulations may provide penalties for the violation thereof not exceeding thirty-five dollars for each offense, excepting regulations prohibiting the transportation of unsafe materials or products, the penalties for violation of which shall not exceed five hundred dollars for each offense. The department for the purpose of promoting public safety and convenience during periods of commuter and holiday traffic, inclement weather conditions or construction activity, or for other good cause, may promulgate rules and regulations limiting the time and hours of travel of vehicles one hundred and two inches in width, semi-trailers of up to and including 53 feet in length when operating in semi-trailer unit and tandem units, as

Commenter	Comment	Response
		defined in section one of chapter ninety, on the National Network, as defined in section nineteen F of chapter ninety, and routes of reasonable access, as designated by the department under provisions of section nineteen G of chapter ninety, or any parts thereof, and such rules and regulations may provide penalties for the violation thereof not exceeding five hundred dollars for each offense. The state police, may, during declared weather emergencies order all trucks off of the roads. Section 2E. Notwithstanding the provisions of section 18 of chapter 90, the department for purposes of public safety and convenience may from time to time by regulations exclude persons and vehicles from state highways or portions thereof for such periods as it may deem necessary.” MassDOT’s Pedestrian Transportation Plan provides additional information on State Roads Performance and local road performance.
John York	My response of 6:28 PM yesterday was lengthy but hastily written. I have now read CMR 720 9.09 more carefully, and also CMR 720 9.08. I now see that my admittedly alarming approach to walking along Sandwich Road is not only in compliance with CMR 720 9.08 and 9.09, but is exactly what is recommended. Yipes!! So much for my excuse to trespass across the tracks. I guess I have been following instructions all along. I still won’t try that on the Bourne Bridge. I’d rather take my chances clambering over snow banks on the unplowed sidewalk.	USACE operates and maintains the existing Sagamore and Bourne Bridges and will remain responsible for snow removal and general maintenance of the existing bridges’ sidewalks. Once the new bridge crossings are complete, MassDOT will assume ownership and maintenance responsibilities for the new structures and the associated multimodal networks, with the exception of the Canal Service Roads, which will continue to fall under USACE’s jurisdiction.

Commenter	Comment	Response
	Maybe the Army Corps could figure out how to clear the bridge sidewalks as they already do for the 13 miles of Service Road shared-use path along the sides of the Canal.	
John York	Another such location is along State Road, also known as Massachusetts Bicycle Route 1, also known as the Claire Saltonstall Memorial Bikeway, in the Sagamore North interchange. Failure to provide necessary pedestrian or bicycle facilities along the full length of Massachusetts Bicycle Route 1 within the project area has no explanation and no merit. This failure stands out as particularly egregious given the name and stated purpose of the Claire Saltonstall Memorial Bikeway, to honor the memory of a young woman killed while riding on the roadway of Route 25 in Wareham, on her way to Cape Cod. Attached below is a brief history of Massachusetts Bicycle Route 1, as seen through the eyes of one has lived through the relevant events.	The Program delivers targeted improvements within the defined Study Area, addressing current multimodal and infrastructure needs. Future planning efforts for potential enhancements along Route 1 are being coordinated with MassDOT and the region's metropolitan planning organizations (MPO) to ensure consistency with broader transportation goals and long-range network development.
Michael Caron	I participate in the MS-150 bicycle ride from Quincy to Provincetown where we have almost 1,000 people that have to dismount and walk over the bridge today in bicycle shoes, which is very dangerous.	The Program will enhance safety for pedestrians and bicyclists by providing a continuous, fully separated facility across both bridge crossings, reducing conflicts with vehicular traffic and creating a more predictable and comfortable travel environment for all users.
John York	In 2019, MassDOT initiated the Cape Cod Canal Area Transportation Improvement Program, now called the Cape Cod Bridges Program, a 4.5 billion dollar program to replace the Federally owned and maintained Bourne and Sagamore Bridges with new, state owned bridges and to rebuild the roadway interchanges at each end of each bridge. Although the Bridges Program Management Team has stated that the Program will meet the goals of MassDOT's Healthy Transportation Policy,	The current design does not accommodate dedicated bike lanes on State Road. Instead, a separated SUP is provided along the east side of State Road within the Project Limits, offering a safe and continuous multimodal connection for pedestrians and bicyclists.

Commenter	Comment	Response
	current (2025) Bridges Program proposals for interchange replacement do not provide required pedestrian and bicycle facilities alongside all roadways to be rebuilt or replaced in the Program area. One notable area where the Bridges Program fails to provide all necessary pedestrian facilities is State Road (formerly Route 3A) in the Sagamore north interchange, where Massachusetts Bicycle Route 1 utilizes that roadway. That is where the Claire Saltonstall route stands now. Personally, I am not sure it ever was a good idea for MassDOT to get into the business of recommending on-the-road bike routes. That certainly is not what Claire's father, William Saltonstall had in mind when he sponsored funding to build and name an off-road bikeway from Boston to Cape Cod.	
John York	[...]you're going to add nine new miles of shared-use path, three of those miles at least are because of the extra distance you've added to existing crossings and taking credit for those as adding new shared-use path. You don't add any connectivity with those. When you say we add nine miles, it sounds like you're adding nine miles' worth of connectivity. Don't take credit for the ones that don't create connectivity. So, my question, that question getting in there was please tell me and show me the models you used to predict increased pedestrian usage on which you base your conclusion in the environmental impact statement that this project will increase community cohesion. There's a similar phenomenon at the Bourne crossing. It's not quite as bad. The problem with the Bourne crossing, especially the south side, is that yes, the path over the bridge is safer, but you've added a significant number of major high-speed roadway crossings that those pedestrians will have to do to get from one side to the other and I don't see you counting them anywhere in	Most of the existing pedestrian and bicycle network does not meet current Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements or Public Right-of-Way Accessibility Guidelines (PROWAG). The proposed design brings these facilities into full compliance, which necessitates flatter longitudinal grades and, as a result, longer multimodal corridors to achieve the required accessibility standards. Pedestrian and bicycle modeling to estimate future or projected use of the SUPs was not conducted. The Program's Purpose and Need do not include operational analysis or demand forecasting for pedestrian or bicycle travel. Rather, the Program is intended to improve accommodations for pedestrians and bicyclists by providing safe, accessible, and compliant multi-use facilities within the project area. This purpose is being met through the provision of continuous and compliant facilities and, where feasible, by addressing critical gaps in the existing pedestrian and bicycle network. As a result, future operational or usage

Commenter	Comment	Response
	determining whether pedestrians or parents are going to allow their kids to walk home from school across the bridge, which is a major part of community cohesion. So, I don't see the analysis, but when I read the report, I see you're predicting within a tenth of a minute the travel time for cars to get from approaching on 25 to go across Scenic Highway and over the Sagamore Bridge.	modeling for pedestrians and bicyclists was not required to support the Program's objectives.
Lew Lasher/ Outriders Inc.	In the plans for the Sagamore Bridge, there is a significant safety problem at the north end of the bridge. Traveling northbound, the shared-use path (SUP) along the Sagamore bridge continues along the west side of the on-ramp from eastbound Scenic Highway (Route 6). Near the foot of this on-ramp, pedestrians and cyclists must cross a non-signalized crosswalk, across two lanes of highway traffic on the ramp, to reach the new SUP that continues eastward along the south side of Scenic Highway towards other destinations (notably, to the Claire Saltonstall Bikeway, also known as "Bike Route One", which follows State Road to connect to Plymouth and Boston). The lack of a traffic signal at this crosswalk presents an unreasonable risk for pedestrians and cyclists. The ideal solution, to ensure pedestrian/cyclist safety and accommodate motor traffic, would be a button-operated traffic signal. Given that pedestrians and bicycles would be relatively infrequent, the impact on traffic flow would be minimal. Ideally, (a) the button should trigger the "bicycle phase" with minimal delay, (b) the duration of the "bicycle phase" need be no longer than the time for pedestrians to cross the two lanes, and (c) the signals facing the crosswalk should display a red or green bicycle symbol, to increase usage/compliance by bicyclists. It would also be helpful to place a "bicycle/pedestrian crossing" sign at the crosswalk.	The crossing in question, located across the U.S. Route 6 eastbound on-ramp, will be controlled by a proposed traffic signal as part of the project design. In addition to the vehicular signal heads serving the on-ramp movement, the crossing will be equipped with pedestrian and bicycle signal indications provided on separate signal faces, consistent with the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), 11th Edition (with Revision 1), and the Massachusetts Amendments to the MUTCD. Pedestrian signal heads, including WALK/DON'T WALK indications with countdown displays, where applicable, are governed by MUTCD Chapter 4E, while bicycle signal faces are addressed in the 11th Edition updates to Chapter 4, which formally recognize and standardize bicycle-specific signal indications at locations where bicycle movements require positive control that is separate from general traffic. The Massachusetts Amendments adopt these provisions as the controlling standard statewide and apply them to all MassDOT projects advertised after March 7, 2026. Accordingly, the design for this specific crossing includes: • A fully signalized on-ramp crossing, stopping ramp traffic during pedestrian and bicyclist phases. • Dedicated pedestrian signal indications and dedicated bicycle signal indications, rather than reliance on unsignalized crossings or warning-only devices.

Commenter	Comment	Response
		Signal timing and phasing developed using MUTCD and MassDOT guidance for vulnerable road users, recognizing the ramp geometry, operating speeds, visibility concerns (including glare and fog), and the fact that this crossing will initially serve as the primary access point to the shared-use path. Please refer to Appendix 3.2, Attachment 2, Proposed Conditions Plans, of the FEIS.
Lew Lasher/ Outriders Inc.	In the plans for the Bourne Bridge, there is a significant safety problem involving the temporary sidewalk that would serve pedestrians and cyclists during the construction period. As described in section 4.3.4.6 ("Construction-Period Effects") of the DEIS, a temporary sidewalk will be constructed along the east side of the new northbound bridge span, which will serve cyclists and pedestrians until the completion of the permanent shared-use path on the new southbound bridge span. At the north end of the bridge, to access this temporary sidewalk would be via a highway on-ramp, described in the DEIS as "the westbound on-ramp". This on-ramp lacks separation from motorized traffic to protect pedestrians and cyclists. At an Open House meeting on September 25, 2025 staff stated that this information is not up-to-date: the current plan is to construct a new path, that would pass underneath the bridge/highway, to provide access to the temporary Bourne Bridge pedestrian/bicycle sidewalk. The DEIS needs to be updated with a description of this new, much safer plan, and with maps to illustrate the access routes, in both the North and South Quadrants, to the temporary sidewalk.	Information regarding construction sequencing and pedestrian and bicycle access during construction is provided in Appendix 3.2, Construction Approach Technical Report, of the FEIS. Appendix 3.2, Attachment 4, Construction Schematics, of the FEIS includes additional illustrations of temporary pedestrian and bicycle connections.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Emily Paskewicz	It's encouraging to see the significant need for improved bike and pedestrian infrastructure highlighted here.	Thank you for your comment.
John York	Also please forward these comments, including the attached correspondence, to the US Army Corps of Engineers, your partners in the Cape Cod Bridges Program, so that you might include in your response to me any response the Corps might have with respect to my interpretation of how CMR 720 9.08 and 9.09 might apply to the Bourne or Sagamore Bridge during snow and/or ice events.	USACE is a Cooperating Agency in the environmental review process for the Program. These Cooperating Agencies will be part of the review process for any comments received regarding the Draft Environmental Impact Statement, prior to the issuance of a combined FEIS and Record of Decision document by FHWA.
John York	For the record, there is no MA-R9-15 sign, nor any other sign to indicate any users are prohibited from MacArthur Boulevard, that would be visible to a pedestrian entering MacArthur Boulevard from Waterhouse Road. The absence of any prohibition sign would be obvious to anyone who had visited the site, either as a pedestrian or in a drive-by observation from within a motor vehicle. Paragraph 4 of Section 2A.04 Design of Signs, on page 40 in the 11th Edition of the Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), December, 2023, states: The basic requirements of a sign are that it be legible to those for whom it is intended and that it be understandable in time to allow for a proper response. Massachusetts General Laws (MGL chapter 85 section 11B) and the Code of Massachusetts Regulations (CMR 720 9.08 and 9.09) do not allow excluding of or bicycles from public ways other than limited access freeways or expressways. Roadway safety on partial access or full access roadways is best provided by safe pedestrian and bicycle facilities serving the properties located along the corridor, rather than by attempting to prohibit vulnerable users where they have need for access and there is no legal authority for exclusion. MacArthur Boulevard is one of several locations within the Cape	MacArthur Boulevard is classified as a Principal Arterial. MA-R9-15 signs are posted along MacArthur Boulevard at Bourne and Otis Rotaries indicating that pedestrians and bicyclists are prohibited along this portion of the corridor. MassDOT supports this prohibition due to safety, operational, and right-of-way considerations. MassDOT will consider additional MA-R9-15 signage to enhance safety and more effectively communicate this prohibition. No pedestrian or bicycle facilities are proposed along MacArthur Boulevard as part of the Program.

Commenter	Comment	Response
	Cod Bridges Program Area where the Programs proposed plans for connecting interchanges fail to provide pedestrian and bicycle facilities that would be required by Directive P-13-0001.	
John York	The DEIS is shameful and it's false information about existing conditions in the town of Bourne. And to have it say that it'll get the pedestrian at the end of Waterhouse Road will see a sign telling them they're prohibited from entering MacArthur Boulevard is wrong for several reasons. One, that sign does not exist; two, the pedestrians are allowed on the roadway, and it's in the DEIS, both of those pieces of false information, which are fundamental to someone reading that DEIS to understand the impacts of this project and to be able to comment on the DEIS in an informed manner. The DI-EIS is not suitable for comment. It doesn't provide correct information necessary for the public to comment, and that I would say is shameful.	MacArthur Boulevard is classified as a Principal Arterial. MA-R9-15 signs are posted along MacArthur Boulevard at Bourne and Otis Rotaries indicating that pedestrians and bicyclists are prohibited along this portion of the corridor. MassDOT supports this prohibition due to safety, operational, and right-of-way considerations. MassDOT will consider additional MA-R9-15 signage to enhance safety and more effectively communicate this prohibition. No pedestrian or bicycle facilities are proposed along MacArthur Boulevard as part of the Program.
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	"MassDOT will then own, operate, and maintain the completed bridges and approaches as part of the system of state highways", but discussions indicate pathways and other areas of the project fall outside that "state highway system" such that MassDOT will not be fully responsible for their daily operation and all aspects of maintenance of them post-construction. For example, SUP areas within USACE property. So MassDOT is not viewing all SUP areas as within that highway system and those will be approached differently in terms of maintenance obligations, indicating land use nature and project need is different, sufficient to lead to the real estate interest acquired to be different as well.	Text has been revised to indicate that following completion of the Program, MassDOT will own, operate, and maintain the completed bridges and will be responsible for long-term operations and maintenance of the SUPs, including paths located on USACE's property. Final commitments will be refined as part of the ongoing USACE Section 408 permitting and review process.

Commenter	Comment	Response
John York	Another location where Program plans fails to comply with MassDOT's Healthy Transportation Policy is the Sagamore Bridge itself, where the proposed twin spans would have a single shared-use path on the west side of the west span, but no pedestrian or bicycle facility on the east side of the span, which is the location of the sidewalk on the current Sagamore Bridge. The proposed west side shared use path would more than double the walking distance, and is essentially useless for many or most pedestrian trip origins and destinations of current or probably future pedestrian users. I have submitted comments and intend to submit further comments concerning Program shortfalls in the two locations in Sagamore.	As part of the Build Alternative, MassDOT is committed to providing safe and efficient pedestrian and bicycle access consistent with MassDOT's Healthy Transportation Plan. The Build Alternative includes SUPs at each bridge crossing and multimodal facilities throughout the interchange approach networks within the Project Limits. In accordance with MassDOT design guidance, a SUP provided on one side of the roadway meets the minimum controlling criteria for accommodating bi-directional pedestrian and bicycle travel. Additional information is provided in Appendix 3.2, Attachment 2, Proposed Conditions Plans, of the FEIS.
John York	If it turns out that there is reduced pedestrian usage because the pedestrian crossings are not suitable, would your conclusion be that you have reduced community confusion and cohesion? For example, if you live at Canal View Apartments. Right now if you live there, you can walk eight-tenths of a mile to our only regional transit facility maintained by MassDOT in our town, even though we're required to build all this housing for those transit uses, which is the parking lot; 0.8 miles to walk from our high-density housing to the park and ride, take the bus to Boston. With your plan, I would like to say, be able to say that it's 1.8 to 2.2 miles of a walk. Unfortunately, according to your DEIS quote, "We did not analyze walking distance or trip time for pedestrians." A 2.2-mile walk, if that's what it happens to be, if you're not going to provide us that information, is not a walkable distance according to the accepted standards of transportation planning. And I would like to know how you model pedestrian behavior to	During design development, the intent was to preserve existing and anticipated desire lines, which represent user-preferred routes, to keep the path network intuitive while still meeting ADA and PROWAG requirements. As much of the current pedestrian and bicycle network does not comply with these standards, the proposed design brings all facilities into full alignment with ADA and PROWAG. Achieving this level of accessibility requires flatter, longitudinal grades, which in turn lengthens portions of the multimodal network to ensure safe, comfortable, and compliant travel for all users. Pedestrian and bicycle modeling to estimate future or projected use of the SUPs was not conducted. The Program's Purpose and Need do not include operational analysis or demand forecasting for pedestrian or bicycle travel. Rather, the Program is intended to improve accommodations for pedestrians and bicyclists by providing safe, accessible, and compliant multi-use facilities within the project area. This purpose is being met through the provision of continuous and compliant facilities and, where

Commenter	Comment	Response
	determine that there would be increased usage, and I would like to see your model. And in this report, even though for pedestrians you did not analyze walking distance or time, which if you actually try to get somewhere as a pedestrian, that's all that really matters. That was at the top two things, yes, safety matters, too. And yes, these sidewalks will be safer, 2-miles-long safer.	feasible, by addressing critical gaps in the existing pedestrian and bicycle network. As a result, future operational or usage modeling for pedestrians and bicyclists was not required to support the Program's objectives.
Cape Cod Commission	To ensure that these users can safely navigate the new and existing facilities, MassDOT should coordinate with USACE and the Towns of Bourne and Sandwich to deploy and maintain appropriate wayfinding signage.	As described in Section 4.2, Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities, of the FEIS, wayfinding and interpretive elements are planned throughout the Project Limits to help users navigate the SUP network, learn about their surroundings, and enhance the overall multimodal experience. MassDOT will coordinate with USACE, Cape Cod Commission, and the Towns of Bourne and Sandwich during the development and installation of appropriate wayfinding signage associated with the new SUPs, trail connections, and access points to parks and recreation areas.
John York	Another place in Bourne where CMR 720 [9.08 and] 9.09 might have surprising implications would be on the Bourne and Sagamore Bridge spans. Each span has a sidewalk on one side. As shown in the first of the two photos, attached below in my previous email, MassDOT's signage instructs pedestrians and bicycles to use the sidewalk when crossing the Bourne Bridge. The second photo in my previous email shows a sign warning bridge sidewalk users that the sidewalk is not kept clear of snow or ice. When combined with CMR 720 9.09, does this mean pedestrians are supposed to walk in the travel lane of the bridge when the sidewalk is blocked by snow ???!	USACE operates and maintains the existing Sagamore and Bourne Bridges and will remain responsible for snow removal and general maintenance of the existing bridges' sidewalks. Once the new bridge crossings are completed, MassDOT will assume ownership and maintenance responsibilities for the new structures and the associated multimodal networks, with the exception of the Canal Service Roads, which will continue to fall under USACE's jurisdiction.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Janice Hughes	Sagamore North Bridge - recreation path/sidewalk needs to be extended to Fieldwood Drive. 1st neighborhood to provide safe access. Road between Fieldwood and DOT Barn is extremely narrow and dangerous. You are adding traffic to this area; no one can access the path from neighborhoods of 3A. Fieldwood is the first road with access	The current design for the Sagamore North quadrant terminates near the MassDOT Maintenance Facility. MassDOT considered extending the project limits of work further north; however, this option would result in substantial additional environmental and right-of-way impacts and was not advanced as part of the Build Alternative. MassDOT District 5 is aware of this connectivity gap and will continue to evaluate opportunities to address such gaps as part of future long-range planning efforts. We appreciate your input.
David Race	Public Comment to MADOT – Recreation I support converting the F2 rail corridor into a rail-to-trail extension of the Shining Sea Bikeway. Both Bourne and Falmouth support this direction, and that local agreement should carry significant weight. The Shining Sea Bikeway is widely recognized as Falmouth’s top tourist attraction and a major economic driver. Extending it north would bring similar year-round business activity to Bourne by connecting the Upper Cape directly to the Cape Cod Canal path. This project is especially important as Bourne faces years of disruption from the planned replacement of the Sagamore Bridge and Bourne Bridge. A continuous trail would provide a safe, reliable north–south route for local trips while road access is strained, helping residents move around town and helping businesses remain accessible during construction. Expanded rail service is already limited by the Cape Cod Canal railroad bridge, a single aging lift bridge that constrains train frequency and reliability. That crossing — not the F2 corridor — is the real bottleneck for future rail growth. Converting the corridor to a trail would deliver immediate public benefits: stronger local business activity, safer non-car travel, reduced short car trips during bridge construction, and a more compatible use through	The rail-to-trail extension is outside the Program’s established goals and objectives; therefore, it was not included in the evaluation. Phases 1 through 4 of the Bourne Rail Trail are listed in the 2026-2030 Transportation Improvement Program, , as listed in Table 3-2 of Chapter 3, Proposed Action and Alternatives. These improvements are being advanced through separate planning initiatives.

Commenter	Comment	Response
	residential areas. I respectfully urge MassDOT to advance planning and design for rail-to-trail conversion of the F2 corridor in partnership with Bourne and Falmouth. Thank you for your consideration.	

2.10 Maritime Transportation, Traffic, and Safety

Table 2-12 includes comments and responses related to maritime transportation, traffic, and safety.

Table 2-12. Maritime Transportation, Traffic, and Safety Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comment	Response
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Attachment 1 - Meeting minutes suggestion formal initiation of S408 and Attachment 2 - USCG letter providing Preliminary Navigation Clearance Determination are not included in Appendix.	Appendix 4.4, Maritime Transportation, Traffic, and Safety, Attachments 1 and 2 , will be provided in the Final Environmental Impact Statement.
Cape Cod Commission	In an effort to reduce vehicle and truck trips over the Canal bridges, Commission staff suggest MassDOT assess any opportunities to implement additional ferry service.	The Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) will not be pursuing plans to implement additional ferry service at this time. MassDOT will monitor traffic impacts during construction and assess whether evolving conditions warrant provision of traffic management measures beyond those included in the Design-Builder's Traffic Management Plan (TMP).
Diane DeLuc	Expanded ferry service also deserves attention, both for freight and passenger travel. Currently, trucks destined for - or returning from - Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket must cross the canal and navigate densely populated areas to and from ports in Woods Hole and Hyannis.	MassDOT will not be pursuing plans to implement additional ferry service at this time. MassDOT will monitor traffic impacts during construction and assess whether evolving conditions warrant provision of traffic management measures beyond those included in the Design-Builder's TMP.
Sierra Club	Expanded ferry service also deserves attention, both for freight and passenger travel. Currently, trucks destined for—or returning from—Martha's Vineyard and Nantucket must cross the canal and navigate densely populated areas to and from ports in Woods Hole and Hyannis.	MassDOT will not be pursuing plans to implement additional ferry service at this time. MassDOT will monitor traffic impacts during construction and assess whether evolving conditions warrant provision of traffic management measures beyond those included in the Design-Builder's TMP.

2.11 NEPA Process

Table 2-13 includes comments and responses related to the Program Purpose and Need, alternatives development, Program scope, environmental impact statement scoping process, and environmental impact statement development.

Table 2-13. NEPA Process Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comments	Response
Cape Cod Commission	A number of regional plans, including the Cape Cod Regional Policy Plan ("RPP"), Cape Cod Regional Transportation Plan, and Cape Cod Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy, identify that safe and reliable transportation connections over the Cape Cod Canal are vital to the long-term economic vitality of the region. As stated in the DEIS, "the purpose of the Program is to improve cross-canal mobility and accessibility between Cape Cod and mainland Massachusetts for all road users and to address the increasing maintenance needs and functional obsolescence of the aging Sagamore and Bourne Bridges." The focus on improving both mobility and accessibility is essential to delivering a Project that will meet both regional and local transportation needs of the region.	Thank you for your support of the Cape Cod Bridges Program's Purpose and Need.
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Change "These service roads, which the USACE owns and maintains as part of the Cape Cod Canal Federal Navigation Project" to "These service roads, which the USACE operates and maintains as part of the Cape Cod Canal Federal Navigation Project,"	The Final Environmental Impact Statement has been corrected to reflect that the United States owns, and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers operates and maintains the Canal Service Roads as part of the Cape Cod Canal Federal Navigation Project.

2.12 Public Involvement

Table 2-14 includes comments and responses related to the Program’s public involvement process and agency coordination.

Table 2-14. Public Involvement Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comment	Response
Cape Cod Commission	Commission staff encourage MassDOT to support the establishment of a TMA for the Cape Cod region.	The awarded Design-Builder will be required to develop and implement a comprehensive Traffic Management Plan (TMP) that addresses all travel modes. The TMP will be coordinated with local and regional stakeholders, law enforcement, emergency management personnel, and local and regional municipal officials to communicate construction activities and impacts to the surrounding regions.
Cape Cod Commission	To ensure coordinated communication and effective management, MassDOT should convene a regional stakeholder working group, modeled on the successful approach used during the Bourne Bridge Maintenance project. This group should include local, regional, and state partners and meet regularly to facilitate collaboration, share data, and maintain transparent communication with the public and local businesses.	As detailed in Chapter 6, Agency Coordination and Public Involvement , of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) has established an Advisory Group to support focused coordination with key stakeholders within the Study Area and to gather community input on design alternatives, environmental considerations, and construction-related topics. Feedback received through this group will continue to inform decisions through design and construction. Advisory Group members represent a range of federal, state, regional, and local stakeholder interests.
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Why was the Narragansett Tribe excluded from the DEIS distribution list?	The Narragansett Tribe has been added to the FEIS Distribution List and will receive a copy of the FEIS. A link to the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) posted on the MassDOT Cape Cod Bridges website (https://www.mass.gov/cape-cod-bridges-program) was provided to the Narragansett Tribe on January 30, 2026, via direct email. No responses or comments have been received to date.

Commenter	Comment	Response
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	The Bourne Historical Commission and the Sandwich Historical Commission are identified as Consulting Parties under both Appendix 4.16 and Chapter 4 of the Main Report. However, neither is included in the DEIS Distribution List in Chapter 8 under "Other Parties and Interest Groups." Is there a reason these two groups were excluded from the distribution list? Will they receive copies of the report to comment on in accordance with Section 106?	The Bourne and Sandwich Historical Commissions have been added to the FEIS Distribution List and will receive a copy of the FEIS. A link to the DEIS posted on the MassDOT Cape Cod Bridges website (https://www.mass.gov/cape-cod-bridges-program) was provided to the two commissions on January 30, 2026, via direct email. No responses or comments have been received to date.
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) is identified as a Consulting Party in Appendix 4.1 and Chapter 4 of the Main Report but excluded from the DEIS Distribution List in Chapter 8. Has the ACHP accepted your invitation for consultation, and will they be participating in this Section 106 review? Their response should be documented somewhere in the report or appendix.	On July 17, 2025, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) notified the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) that based upon information that was provided regarding the potential adverse effects on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-eligible Sagamore and Bourne Bridges, the Cape Cod Bridges Program (Program) did not meet its criteria for involvement in reviewing individual Section 106 cases. Therefore, ACHP determined that its participation in the consultation to resolve adverse effects would not be needed. This response is documented in the Programmatic Agreement. Please refer to Appendix 4.16, Attachment 1, Appendix E , of the FEIS. FHWA and MassDOT have continued to inform ACHP of the Program's consultation process, including meetings and follow-up correspondence. Pursuant to Section 800.6(b)(1)(iv), a copy of the executed Programmatic Agreement and supporting documentation was filed with ACHP to complete the requirements of Section 106.
Stephan Zaets	Hello, I am requesting attachments to the following Technical Report: Appendix 3.2 - Construction Approach Technical Report Appendix 4.2 - Traffic Engineering Technical Report	Comment received. MassDOT provided the requested attachments to this individual.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Anonymous Speaker	I'll second the complaint about maybe not engaging the cyclist community. All the people I have on my list wish they'd have been more involved.	MassDOT developed a comprehensive Public Involvement Plan (PIP) to guide the outreach and engagement process for the Program. This document details the process of engaging and informing the public and the comprehensive, inclusive, and effective strategies used to solicit feedback from key stakeholders and the local communities to successfully implement the Program. Further information on MassDOT's public outreach program, which has been implemented consistently with the PIP, can be found in Chapter 6, Agency Coordination and Public Involvement, of the FEIS.
John York	If you were doing your job the way you're required to, you would have had more community input. You would have spoken more to the pedestrians and bicyclists before you make the claims that you make in this DEIS. And the reward that we have now is we can comment on the DEIS, and we can see your responses after, simultaneously when the record of decision is issued. In other words, it's a done deal now. So, you guys need to do better public involvement. And besides being in violation of MassDOT's Healthy Transportation Policy, this meeting itself and the whole process is in violation of MassDOT's Public Participation Plan.	MassDOT held a Public Hearing regarding the DEIS on December 16, 2025. MassDOT developed a comprehensive PIP to guide the outreach and engagement process for the Program. This robust document details the process of engaging and informing the public and the comprehensive, inclusive, and effective strategies used to solicit feedback from key stakeholders and the local communities to successfully implement the Program. Further information on MassDOT's public outreach program, which has been implemented consistently with the PIP, can be found in Chapter 6, Agency Coordination and Public Involvement, of the FEIS.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Cape Cod Commission	Commission staff suggest the FEIS should detail any differences, if any are anticipated, in public involvement and stakeholder coordination processes compared to the traditional design-bid-build approach.	The public involvement process and required steps are driven by funding sources and applicable laws like the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act, not by whether procurement follows a design-build or design-bid-build process. The public involvement requirements and processes are generally the same for both design-build and design-bid-build.
Cape Cod Commission	Commission staff encourage continued coordination with and participation from major stakeholder agencies at the state, regional, and local level to leverage the technical and local expertise across disciplines.	As detailed in Chapter 6, Agency Coordination and Public Involvement , of the FEIS, MassDOT has coordinated with federal, state, regional, and local stakeholders throughout the environmental review process and will continue this coordination throughout design and construction.
Cape Cod Commission	MassDOT should work with Joint Base Cape Cod leadership to determine if there are opportunities to use some of the roadway infrastructure within Joint Base Cape Cod to alleviate traffic impacts during construction for local residents.	MassDOT will coordinate with Joint Base Cape Cod as a local stakeholder throughout the development of design and construction.
John York	I believe I am on the Cape Cod Bridges Program email list for program updates. I did not receive an email notice of the release of the DEIS, the December 16, 2025, DEIS public hearing/meeting, nor the DEIS public comment period, although I believe others did receive such a notice on or about November 21, 2025. If possible, please include in your response answers to the three numbered requests in my email of November 28. If you can, please verify whether a notice of the DEIS release, public comment period, and/or public hearing was sent to my email address. 3. Please take whatever steps you can to correct any problem that may have resulted in me not receiving the notice that others received. Thank you for any help you can provide.	Comment received. MassDOT followed up with the individual directly to confirm their subscription status and ensure future receipt of program notifications.

Commenter	Comment	Response
John York	If it's determined that the DI-EIS is not suitable to meet its purposes, what will you do? I want to know what you will do to provide opportunity for the public to comment having been properly informed of the facts on the ground.	The Program's Purpose and Need guides the identification and evaluation of reasonable alternatives for the Program. The DEIS and FEIS both identify the Replacement Highway Bridges Built to Modern Design Standards alternative as a reasonable alternative and the Preferred Alternative because it best meets the Program's Purpose and Need while considering environmental and other factors. If, during the NEPA process, FHWA and MassDOT had determined that the DEIS did not adequately reflect the Program's Purpose and Need, FHWA would have been required to revise the Purpose and Need and/or the range of alternatives, as appropriate, and provide additional opportunity for agency and public review before making a decision. In this case, FHWA and MassDOT have determined that the Purpose and Need is appropriate and that the Preferred Alternative satisfies the Program's Purpose and Need.
John York	I tried to read the legal notices. I saw one that ran in Provincetown that had the word "meeting" uniformly, no word "hearing." The one that ran in our local Bourne Enterprise was identical, except you replaced all the -- all the places that said "meeting" was replaced with "hearing." There's a difference. When you run a legal ad and help advertise to the public, you need to do one or the other. You need to do it. And according to MassDOT's Public Participation Plan, what I just said should be in the record the same as any written comment.	Verbal public comments delivered at the DEIS Public Hearing were transcribed and considered as comments on the DEIS. The Public Hearing Transcript is provided in Attachment 1, Draft Environmental Impact Statement Public Hearing Transcript. These comments are recorded and addressed within this chapter of the FEIS.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Diane DeLuc	Across all of these needed assessments, outside experts should be engaged in study planning, execution, and review to ensure that state-of-the-art methodologies are applied, findings are subject to rigorous peer review, and a comprehensive base of data and information is available to inform assessments of region-wide impacts and mitigation requirements.	Throughout development of the environmental impact statement (EIS), FHWA and MassDOT have engaged qualified subject-matter consultants to support study planning, technical analysis, and documentation across all resource areas. The analyses use accepted industry-standard methodologies consistent with applicable federal and state technical standards and regulatory requirements. As part of the NEPA EIS process, FHWA and MassDOT have also engaged federal and state Cooperating Agencies to provide technical input and review of the EIS analyses and assist in identifying mitigation measures, as warranted.
Sierra Club	Across all of these needed assessments, outside experts should be engaged in study planning, execution, and review to ensure that state-of-the-art methodologies are applied, findings are subject to rigorous peer review, and a comprehensive base of data and information is available to inform assessments of region-wide impacts and mitigation requirements.	Throughout development of the EIS, FHWA and MassDOT have engaged qualified subject-matter consultants to support study planning, technical analysis, and documentation across all resource areas. The analyses use accepted industry-standard methodologies consistent with applicable federal and state technical standards and regulatory requirements. As part of the NEPA EIS process, FHWA and MassDOT have also engaged federal and state Cooperating Agencies to provide technical input and review of the EIS analyses and assist in identifying mitigation measures, as warranted.
Beth Friend	I would suggest someone get on the air with ED Lambert WXTK - He is on the air daily with half-truths-lies and fear mongering. For example, "there's no money," "they never researched any other areas to put it," "They're lying to the public."	MassDOT has engaged in public outreach and media communication efforts to provide accurate information about the Cape Cod Bridges Program. This has included participation in media interviews, including an interview with Ed Lambert on WXTK FM on January 29, 2026.
Brandy Muz	Hello, I'm the reporter/editor for Wareham Week and we were looking for information on how construction might impact Wareham traffic in the coming months and years. As Cape traffic	MassDOT will continue to provide updates on construction activities, schedules, and anticipated travel conditions through the Program's website at https://www.mass.gov/cape-cod-

Commenter	Comment	Response
	already affects Wareham in the summer we figure some backups might be present and want our readers to know as the weather improves when they can expect delays. As well this is our means to open a line of communication going forward. Thank you.	bridges-program, where the public can access the most current information.
Walter Robinson	I would like to be notified when Bourne Rotary will be dug up. I assume the shrubs that spell Cape Cod will be removed. One of my hobbies is Bonsai and I think one or more could make great Bonsai. Some of my friends at the Cape Cod Bonsai Club might be interested also.	Information on construction timing, including activities associated with the Bourne Rotary, will be provided as the project advances. Refer to the Program's website, https://www.mass.gov/cape-cod-bridges-program, for updates on construction schedules. Specific decisions regarding the removal or disposition of existing landscaping features will be determined during final design and construction, including coordination with applicable agencies and property owners.

2.13 Public Parks, Recreational Facilities, and Open Space

Table 2-15 provides comments and responses related to public parks, recreational facilities, and open space, including public access, and recreational amenities.

Table 2-15. Public Parks, Recreational Facilities, and Open Space Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comment	Response
Ross Kessler	I am with the Mass Division of Marine Fisheries. At some point in the design process there were plans to incorporate a cantilevered fishing pier into the footings of at least one side of one of the piers. Cape side, Bourne bridge I believe. I reached out to John Smith and Mark Kolonoski last week and have not received a response. Is this item still in any of the plans?	At each bridge crossing, the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) is proposing to create a publicly accessible walkway or viewing platform at the top of the delta pier footing at the same elevation as the Canal Service Road. Installation of a riprap pier protection system may diminish opportunities for fishing at these locations. Please refer to Section 4.15, Visual Resources , of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for a conceptual depiction of the proposed walkway or viewing platform.
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	3.1 acres or 4.1 acres?	Construction of the Bourne Bridge Project would result in a use of 4.1 acres of Bourne Recreation Area due to the construction footprint required for the Cape Cod Bridges Program (Program). As noted in Chapter 5, Final Section 4(f) Evaluation , of the FEIS, MassDOT is proposing to permanently relocate features of the Bourne Recreation Area approximately 0.75 miles east to the Gallo Ice Arena parcel within Cape Cod Canal Federal Navigation Project land to mitigate for direct use. Upon completion of the Bourne Bridge Project, MassDOT will establish a 3.1-acre long-term access agreement, which may consist of a permanent easement or other form of permanent access rights from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) on the former Bourne Recreation Area site for maintenance of the Bourne Bridge.

Commenter	Comment	Response
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Any part of the 0.51 acres of direct use for maintenance of the bridges actually includes sq ft of added shared-use path area as well? The SUP connection work is described as being done to meet 4(f) minimizing harm/enhancement to Sag rec area based on Table 5.3 and not for purposes of maintenance of the bridges.	The area of proposed direct use, identified as 0.51 acres in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and reduced to 0.49 acres in the FEIS, would be required for operation and maintenance of the Sagamore Bridge, including the shared-use path (SUP) connection. While the primary purpose of the SUP connection would be to meet the Program's Purpose and Need (specifically, to improve accommodations for pedestrians and bicyclists), it would provide secondary benefits to users of Sagamore Recreation Area in the form of additional multimodal connections. In light of USACE's comment noting that this should not be considered both a direct use and a measure to minimize harm, it is no longer considered a measure to minimize harm and has been removed from the discussion in Chapter 5, Final Section 4(f) Evaluation, Section 5.5.3 , of the FEIS.
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	4(f) does not require exchanging the 1.3 acres of BRA owned land needed for direct use with a similar acreage of USACE owned land within the FNP to mitigate for direct use. Where the process to dispose of USACE land, absent special legislation, requires screening for other DoD and Federal agency uses, as well as McKinney screening, and cannot be transferred directly to BRA, there is no way to guarantee that USACE lands can be successfully transferred to the BRA and that disposal process contains insufficient certainty such that it arguably does not satisfy 4(f) to say that FNP land will be used to make BRA whole to satisfy MassDOT's 4(f) obligations.	MassDOT continues to coordinate with USACE to identify feasible solutions for mitigating the direct use of the Bourne Recreation Authority-owned property within Bourne Scenic Park that meet the requirements of Section 4(f) and other U.S. Department of Defense laws and policies related to disposition of land.
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Maybe the first time the term "USACE owned" is used, we include a footnote that explains the United States owns the CCC FNP and USACE administers, operates, and maintains the land. For ease of use, we refer to it as USACE-owned.	MassDOT has revised references to ownership of the Cape Cod Canal Federal Navigation Project wherever applicable in the FEIS to clarify ownership and administration between the United States and USACE.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Association to Preserve Cape Cod	APCC looks to the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for a more detailed discussion of proposed mitigation for federal, state and municipal land impacts, including compensation to replace permanently impacted Article 97 lands with land of equal or greater size and quality, as required by the state’s Public Lands Preservation Act. Replacement land should be contiguous with other permanently protected land to maximize the quality of open space areas. For temporary impacts to protected lands, the FEIS should provide specific information on appropriate restoration mitigation. APCC stresses that impacts to protected open space and Article 97 lands should, first and foremost, be avoided whenever possible, and encourages MassDOT to continue to study project plans for opportunities to reduce open space, park and recreational land impacts.	MassDOT has continued to refine proposed mitigation measures for federal, state, and municipal land impacts since the DEIS. MassDOT will continue to find opportunities to avoid impacts as design progresses. Please refer to Section 4.17, Public Parks, Recreational Facilities, and Open Space , of the FEIS, for further details regarding updated mitigation measures to impacted federal, state, and municipal lands.
Cape Cod Commission	Staff support MassDOT’s ongoing coordination with these entities and recommend including more details on impacts to these areas and proposed mitigation measures in the FEIS, as well as any Article 97 land disposition requirements under the Public Lands Preservation Act.	Please refer to Section 4.17, Public Parks, Recreational Facilities, and Open Space , of the FEIS, for further details regarding updated mitigation measures to impacted federal, state, and municipal lands, including Article 97 lands. Chapter 5, Final Section 4(f) Evaluation , of the FEIS, provides an update on coordination with property owners, including Section 4(f) officials with jurisdiction.

Commenter	Comment	Response
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	SUP characterized as minimizing harm to BSP negatively impacted rec area in this table, also necessary for maintenance of bridge? 5.8.3.3. states primary purpose of this SUP is not recreation.	MassDOT is proposing two different SUPs in the context of the Bourne Recreation Area: • The SUP at the existing Bourne Recreation Area located beneath the Bourne Bridge, which is the SUP referenced in Chapter 5, Final Section 4(f) Evaluation, Section 5.8.3.3, of the FEIS. • The SUP at the relocated recreation area, which is a measure to minimize harm by providing multimodal access to the relocated recreation area from Sandwich Road. Neither SUP is considered a use of Bourne Recreation Area. The Program's construction footprint necessitates relocation of Bourne Recreation Area regardless of the permanent SUP being proposed in the existing Bourne Recreation Area. The SUP at the new location is proposed to enhance multimodal facility access and is considered a measure to minimize harm. Where appropriate, MassDOT has clarified in Table 5-8 in Chapter 5, Final Section 4(f) Evaluation, of the FEIS, which of the two SUPs associated with Bourne Recreation Area is being discussed and the primary purpose for its inclusion in the Bourne Bridge Project.
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	"Sidewalk and SUP crosswalk" are described as being included in a .61 acre perm easement area, is there an actual SUP separate not part of that perm .61 acreage? Described as no rec purpose for improvements at Gallo. What area is needed for bridge maintenance, if any, at Gallo? Is it fair to say that there are areas considered SUP along the actual bridge roadway that are of a different nature than what is described as SUP at Gallo that does not directly abut an actual roadway and is considered mitigation of negative rec	The proposed roadway improvements along Sandwich Road that would result in a direct use of Gallo Ice Arena include pedestrian and bicycle accommodations and roadway safety improvements on Sandwich Road from the Upper Cape Cod Regional Technical School to Gallo Ice Arena. MassDOT is undertaking these improvements based on requests from Bourne Recreation Authority (an Official With Jurisdiction for Gallo Ice Arena) and the technical school (an adjacent landowner) during stakeholder coordination meetings. The proposed improvements are not directly tied to maintenance and operation of Bourne Bridge.

Commenter	Comment	Response
	impacts vs. a SUP that is an "appurtenance" to a vehicular road that is part of the "highway system"?	The proposed access reconfiguration to Gallo Ice Arena from Sandwich Road, the addition of sidewalks and SUP connections, and the facility's parking lot circulation improvements would enhance the recreational opportunities provided by Gallo Ice Arena, as they would directly improve accessibility and safety for all arena users. As such, and in consideration of the request for this inclusion made by Bourne Recreation Authority (an Official With Jurisdiction), these improvements have been presented as enhancements to Gallo Ice Arena's recreational features. Please refer to Chapter 5, Final Section 4(f) Evaluation , of the FEIS.
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	SUP appears separate from perm easement for sidewalk along the roadway, see above is the term SUP being used to describe both things that are appurtenant to the new roadway like a sidewalk vs purely a rec feature used to mitigate negative rec impacts and what is the basis for the need for all SUP, regardless of that difference in nature, to be perm acquisition areas?	Sidewalks and SUPs adjacent to state-owned roadways will be incorporated into the state's right-of-way. Sidewalks and SUPs included as recreational features away from roadways will be placed within a permanent easement, with ownership retained by MassDOT. The Canal Service Roads will continue to be owned and maintained by USACE.
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Since 1966, the USACE has operated or leased lands within the Cape Cod Canal FNP for recreational uses.	This statement has been corrected in Chapter 5, Final Section 4(f) Evaluation , of the FEIS.
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Change "publicly owned park and recreation areas owned and operated by the USACE" to "publicly owned park and recreation areas owned by the United States and operated by the USACE." May need to add "owned and operated by the Town of Bourne" at the end of sentence	MassDOT has revised references to ownership of the Cape Cod Canal Federal Navigation Project wherever applicable in the FEIS to clarify ownership by the United States and administration by USACE.
Dave Hunter	Bourne is and will continue to be a drive-through town if a "downtown" common area is not created for the community. The town is so spread out and has no gathering spot. Local businesses fail because they are spread out and	This recreation and business area proposal is outside the Program's established goals and objectives. For discussion of recreational amenities to be included in the Program, refer to Chapter 5, Final Section 4(f) Evaluation . For a discussion of the pedestrian/bicycle

Commenter	Comment	Response
	have no organized business district. We live on the canal and will be moving to another town before our child enters school. My proposal would be a recreation and business area that Bourne residents can take pride in. A few waterfront restaurants, shops, ice cream, and a recreation and community center are all connected by the public paths of the canal. Something is needed between Sandwich Marina and the Lobster Trap, or residents will continue to leave for Falmouth, Plymouth, and Sandwich, where the towns are not spread out, and fly over towns.	facilities to be included in the Program, refer to Section 4.3, Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities.

2.14 Right-of-Way

Table 2-16 provides comments and responses related to effects of the Program on residential and commercial properties, including MassDOT's right-of-way acquisition process.

Table 2-16. Right-of-Way Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comment	Response
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	To the extent permanent easement authorized for USACE owned areas given disconnect between what features qualify as "road" and appurtenances (ex. culverts and drainage facilities) to support permanent out grant for public road/street vs. what areas of the project are not appurtenant to the road itself so as to fall under that authority. The EIS states in the Intro at 1.2.3. that "MassDOT will then own, operate, and maintain the completed bridges and approaches as part of the system of state highways", but discussions indicate pathways and other areas of the project with tangential connection to the highway are outside of that scope, i.e. are not part of that "state highway system" such that OMRRR does not solely fall on MassDOT, so if MassDOT has bifurcated those areas of the project as not in the scope of the highway system, they likewise feel outside of scope of falling under a road and appurtenances permanent easement. Grantee holds full obligation to inspect and repair road and appurtenances within easement area under standard USACE perm road easement. Standard perm road easement retains Fed Gov right to enter as needed for gov purposes, including flowage. Canal may require additional retention of rights for activities in the easement area for purposes of navigation. Standard termination clause allows to terminate w/30 days written notice.	The Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) continues to coordinate with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) through the right-of-way acquisition process and Section 408 permission process to reach agreements on ownership, access, operation, and maintenance of proposed Cape Cod Bridges Program (Program) facilities, including roadways, shared-use paths, and stormwater control measures.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Diane DeLuc	The FEIS should provide more specificity on anticipated impacts and proposed mitigation measures, potentially including compensation to support relocation.	Section 4.8, Property Acquisition, Displacement, and Relocation , of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), provides an updated quantification of the number of property acquisitions and easements required for the Build Alternative. The Program would result in 30 full acquisitions, 59 partial acquisitions, and easements on 143 properties. This section also provides an update on relocation plans associated with the displacement of residences and businesses, including compensation.
Vanasse & Associates Inc.	The enclosed parking study found that the Market Basket will be losing an estimated 178 parking spaces due to the ROW takings associated with the bridge project. In addition to this, parking observations conducted in May through July of 2023 show that the 178-space reduction in parking spaces available to Market Basket will fall short of satisfying its existing demand by 64 parking spaces. As set forth in the enclosed parking analysis, this shortfall is expected to increase substantially when accounting for future growth and site evolution.	Through the right-of-way acquisition process, MassDOT is coordinating with Market Basket on operational strategies, such as parking management, signage, or striping adjustments to manage operational needs following completion of the Sagamore Bridge Project. MassDOT is also coordinating with Market Basket regarding potential future parking demand scenarios related to possible store expansion.
Maureen Boyd	It is very important to me that my house is not taken in the bridge replacement. I also worry about noise, traffic, and air pollution. Please know that our quality of life is at stake.	Section 4.8, Property Acquisition, Displacement, and Relocation , of the FEIS provides an updated quantification of the number of property acquisitions and easements required for the Build Alternative, including the 30 full acquisitions required for the Program.
Sylvia Goodale	The design and location of the new bridges should NOT result in the destruction of complete neighborhoods, where many have people have spent their whole lives. This IS an ecological and economic impact of huge proportion.	The new alignment and areas needed for construction staging and the demolition of the existing bridges and interchange improvements would result in unavoidable property impacts. Section 4.8, Property Acquisition, Displacement, and Relocation , of the FEIS discusses mitigation that MassDOT will provide to compensate for these impacts.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Anonymous Speaker	It's a question of timing. Just before Christmas, time of year when we're supposed to be joyous, we get this letter,[...] I was the third built house in that development in 1958[...] I've lived there forever, and I get a notice a month before Christmas saying they're taking my house on January the 8th, [...] I think the state has no heart. They could have waited until after January the 1st.[...] What would a couple of weeks or a month have been? It would have been helpful to me anyway, to lose my home.	The timing of the notices was intended to avoid the holidays by sending letters in November and scheduling actions for early January.
Mark Hendel	I'm a resident of the Round Hill neighborhood and I have a couple questions. They're all related on behalf of the residents of the neighborhood. One of the slides you just had up there says that you need to evaluate impacts before making decisions. But there have been a lot of decisions made about the takings of the properties. In particular, we've been told both in public and in private that nobody's rushing us out of our homes. Three of our neighbors have received their appraisals and are being asked as early as January 9th to sign a document transferring ownership over to the state of Massachusetts. That sounds like rushing. One of your slides said, according to the environmental study, we can't cut trees down until after November because of the bats. So, you're at least talking at the end of November of '26, possibly '27, before anything can be done to the Round Hill neighborhood. You also mentioned in your presentation that you're following the rules of the relocation, the federal relocation rules, but our neighbors who received their appraisal only got a number. They didn't get a full packet of comparables that were used to make the decision, nor an explanation of how the amount was reached, and they also had not received an offer of a comparable home for them	MassDOT submitted two early acquisition requests to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) that were both approved. The first request addressed the early acquisition of 15 total properties (13 residential and two commercial properties) that require a full acquisition to construct the new Sagamore Bridge structure and mainline approaches. The second request involved the early acquisition of five additional properties — two residential, one municipally owned, and two commercial properties. Four of these would require full acquisition, while one would require a partial acquisition of a multi-tenant commercial property to accommodate construction of the new Sagamore Bridge structure and its mainline approaches. The acquisition of these properties was necessary regardless of which interchange options were selected. FHWA approved these requests on December 11, 2024, and July 28, 2025, respectively. The appraisal process began early, after receiving federal approval, to avoid rushing residents out before construction begins in late 2027 and to give homeowners time to plan. Appraisals were issued gradually to avoid flooding the local housing market. All federal and state regulations are being followed, and property

Commenter	Comment	Response
	to move to. So, some of our neighbors are going to be signing a document on January 9th to sign over the deed and title to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. The Commonwealth and MassDOT has confirmed orally with us that no one's going to force us out, no one's going to knock on our door and tell us we have to get out, but we don't have that in writing. And so, these are all concerns about what process you are following and why you aren't matching. I mean, I've read the regulations. They're actually understandable for your average person. Why aren't you following those?	acquisition is necessary due to the scale of the project in a dense neighborhood. Once deeds are recorded in January, homeowners have up to three years to appeal the compensation offered. MassDOT emphasizes that owners are entitled to just compensation, that values are determined through a multi-step appraisal process, and that relocation expenses are covered. MassDOT also notes that residents may be allowed to stay in their homes temporarily through rental agreements after transfer of ownership, and that relocation specialists are available to help homeowners find new housing.
Joan Hendel	The other question I have is recently, you have created a new law for mental health services for those who are affected by eminent domain. I would like to know how you plan on disseminating that information to the public, to those who are affected currently and in the future, because we have read that, and it's very not private really, because as we understand it, it says that MassDOT will commiserate with a -- the therapy, the therapist, and decide whether you've had enough therapy or not. And I would like to see that law in public display so that the public will know that they have these services available to them. I'd like to know your plan for that.	MassDOT clarifies that it is not a law but a policy allowing eligible residents to access services. The Commonwealth does not participate in therapy; it only ensures providers are licensed and manages funding limits. MassDOT acknowledges the need to better disseminate information about these services and may post details on its website or share them with affected neighborhoods.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Susan Baracchini	So, I'm curious how much time any of the people in the program have spent in the area of study, in the last 10 years, last 15 years? How often do you come to Cape Cod? Do you live here? Do you vacation here? ...without having a real pulse on the area, the traffic, the schools, the vacationers, the sale of homes, the low inventory of homes available, my heart goes out to the families who will lose their homes because you can't replace them. You can put a house in another piece of a town, but you can't replace a home in or close to the canal or the Cape like you could. Inventory is so low the homes that have been sold. So I mentioned the school. Declining numbers is real because young people can't afford to live here.	The new alignment and areas needed for construction staging and the demolition of the existing bridges and interchange improvements would result in unavoidable property impacts. Please refer to Section 4.8, Property Acquisition, Displacement, and Relocation , of the FEIS, which discusses mitigation that MassDOT will provide to compensate for these impacts.
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Long term incorporation of the USACE land holdings since unclear what interests will be permanent.	MassDOT has clarified that real estate interests necessary to support the operation of the Program on USACE land holdings will be in the form of long-term access agreements, which may consist of a permanent easement or other form of permanent access rights from USACE. MassDOT continues to coordinate the most appropriate vehicle for transfer of property ownership, access, and maintenance rights with USACE as part of the right-of-way acquisition process.
Vanasse & Associates Inc.	It is expected that DSM will be compensated for the design, permitting and construction of the required septic system replacement/relocation. VAI requests that the project and compensation schedule be structured so that DSM will have sufficient time to bring the new the septic improvements online.	The DSM Property Group will be compensated for the design, permitting, and construction of the replacement and/or relocation of the existing septic system through the right-of-way acquisition process. Coordination of the septic system replacement will be incorporated into the overall project schedule to ensure adequate time for design, permitting, construction, testing, and activation of the new system prior to any disruption of the existing system.

Commenter	Comment	Response
James Coogan	It would be a good idea for the state to rethink the requirement that former property owners will have to pay rent should they wish to stay in their homes until construction begins. It's really adding insult to injury and a bad public relations look. The requirement should be rescinded. These people are going through financial and emotional trauma. Letting them stay rent free would be applauded by people who feel the state is not sensitive to those losing their homes.	MassDOT recognizes that property acquisition and relocation can be difficult for affected property owners. Refer to Section 4.8, Property Acquisition, Displacement and Relocation , for a discussion of MassDOT's property acquisition and relocation process, including policies, requirements, and available mitigation measures for affected property owners.
David Collins	WHAT ABOUT THE HOUSES ON THWE WEST SIDE OF ELEANOR, WHAT ARE YOU DOING TO HELP THESE PEOPLE?????	MassDOT recognizes that residents in areas affected by the Program, including those near Eleanor Street, may be concerned about potential property impacts. Refer to Section 4.8, Property Acquisition, Displacement and Relocation , for a discussion of MassDOT's property acquisition and relocation process, including mitigation measures available to affected property owners.
Kathy Harris	Extend sidewalk, bike path on Sagamore Recreational Area to Fieldwood Drive to give neighbors access to path. Road between Fieldwood and DOT Barn is extremely dangerous, and the project will add traffic to the area.	The current design for the Sagamore North quadrant terminates at the MassDOT Maintenance Facility. MassDOT considered extending the project limits of work further north; however, this option would result in substantial additional environmental and right-of-way impacts and was not advanced as part of the Preferred Alternative. MassDOT District 5 is aware of this connectivity gap and will consider it in future long-range planning efforts. We appreciate your input.

2.15 Socioeconomics

Table 2-17 includes comments and responses related to socioeconomics.

Table 2-17. Socioeconomics Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comment	Response
Diane DeLuc	Demographic scenarios reflecting a range of possibilities should be considered, factoring in the potential for in-migration and population growth as local, regional, and state officials pursue myriad pathways toward increasing available and affordable year-round housing stock and businesses implement creative strategies for providing workforce housing.	Please refer to Section 4.5, Socioeconomics, Section 4.5.2.2 , of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), which provides population, household, and employment projections for 2030, 2040, and 2050 using the UMass Donahue Institute’s Population, Household, and Employment Projections 2010-2050 Statewide Model. This model applies a component-of-change approach based on fertility, mortality, migration, and baseline population data. In addition to the Donahue Institute projections, Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT), in collaboration with the Cape Cod Commission, developed a modified set of population, household, and employment projections based on sensitivity testing of historical trends in both the year round and tourist sectors of the economy. The results of these analyses are projections of growth that exceed those forecast by the Donahue Institute and are deemed to allow for reasonably foreseeable changes not reflected in the Donahue projections, which are based strictly on historical birth and death rates and net immigrations. Consistent with National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements, the FEIS relies on long-term, data-driven projections that represent the best available information, evaluate reasonably foreseeable effects, and avoid speculative forecasting. In addition, NEPA requires that only those changes that are induced by and attributable to the Proposed Action (Build Alternative) be evaluated in an environmental impact statement. While the potential for in-migration and additional residential growth associated with

Commenter	Comment	Response
		evolving housing initiatives is acknowledged, such outcomes must be supported by measurable demographic data before being incorporated into formal projections. Accordingly, the socioeconomic analysis reflects empirically grounded trends rather than hypothetical scenarios.
Sierra Club	Demographic scenarios reflecting a range of possibilities should be considered, factoring in the potential for in-migration and population growth as local, regional, and state officials pursue myriad pathways toward increasing available and affordable year-round housing stock and businesses implement creative strategies for providing workforce housing.	Please refer to Section 4.5, Socioeconomics, Section 4.5.2.2, of the FEIS, which provides population, household, and employment projections for 2030, 2040, and 2050 using the UMass Donahue Institute’s Population, Household, and Employment Projections 2010-2050 Statewide Model. This model applies a component-of-change approach based on fertility, mortality, migration, and baseline population data. In addition to the Donahue Institute projections, MassDOT, in collaboration with the Cape Cod Commission, developed a modified set of population, household, and employment projections based on sensitivity testing of historical trends in both the year round and tourist sectors of the economy. The results of these analyses are projections of growth that exceed those forecast by the Donahue Institute and are deemed to allow for reasonably foreseeable changes not reflected in the Donahue projections, which are based strictly on historical birth and death rates and net immigrations. Consistent with NEPA requirements, the FEIS relies on long-term, data-driven projections that represent the best available information, evaluate reasonably foreseeable effects, and avoid speculative forecasting. In addition, NEPA requires that only those changes that are induced by and attributable to the Proposed Action (Build Alternative) be evaluated in an environmental impact statement. While the potential for in-migration and additional residential growth associated with evolving housing initiatives is

Commenter	Comment	Response
		acknowledged, such outcomes must be supported by measurable demographic data before being incorporated into formal projections. Accordingly, the socioeconomic analysis reflects empirically grounded trends rather than hypothetical scenarios.
Emily Paskewicz	The positive economic impacts of vastly improved bike/pedestrian accommodations should also be considered.	The Draft Environmental Impact Statement monetizes vehicular transportation benefits because federal guidance and long-established analytical frameworks focus on vehicle-based metrics, such as travel time savings, vehicle operating costs, shipper/logistics costs, and safety benefits. These metrics are standardized, widely accepted, and supported by tools such as TREDIS and R/ECON, which produce monetized outputs that meet NEPA requirements for economic analysis. While the Draft Environmental Impact Statement qualitatively discusses pedestrian and bicyclist benefits, including safety, connectivity, and accessibility, federal guidance does not yet provide equally robust or nationally consistent methods for monetizing these improvements. As a result, their economic effects are reflected qualitatively rather than through standardized dollar-based estimates.

2.16 Land Use, Zoning, and Community Cohesion

Table 2-18 includes comments and responses related to land use, zoning, and community cohesion.

Table 2-18. Land Use, Zoning, and Community Cohesion Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comment	Response
Association to Preserve Cape Cod	APCC urges the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) to work to further minimize the number of acres to be cleared, both permanently and temporarily, and to utilize regionally appropriate native plantings to recreate natural landscapes within the project area. APCC also recommends that project planning strive to significantly reduce reliance on landscaped turf areas and replace those areas with naturalized landscaping. Loss of tree coverage should be mitigated with appropriate-scale tree planting to replace lost habitat and to mitigate loss of carbon sequestration.	The landscaping and reforestation plan includes significant tree planting efforts to restore and enhance the Project Limits. Larger, caliper-size trees are proposed along roadways, at roundabouts, in passive parks, and along the shared-use paths (SUP) using native species (or native cultivars where appropriate). Approximate reforestation acreages for the Cape Cod Bridges Program (Program) are provided in Section 4.6, Land Use, Zoning, and Community Cohesion, of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). The locations of tree planting and reforestation extents are provided in Appendix 3.2, Attachment 5, Landscaping Plans, of the FEIS. Landscaped turf areas are intended to be minimal and in targeted locations, including along street tree planting at local roads and small areas in parks for passive recreation, and to blend with existing conditions along mainly residential properties at the Project Limits. For most areas, the Program is proposing naturalized landscaping through reforestation efforts (mixed trees, shrubs, and specialized seeding) and using several varieties of native seed mixes. Please refer to Section 4.6, Land Use, Zoning, and Community Cohesion, Section 4.6.5, Mitigation, of the FEIS for details regarding the minimization of tree clearing, revegetation of cleared areas, and additional mitigation measures related to land alteration.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Cape Cod Commission	Staff encourage MassDOT to consider any further opportunities to minimize clearing through the FEIS and final design stages.	As design advances, additional opportunities to reduce impacts, such as alternative construction methods, utility consolidation, and habitat connectivity improvements, will continue to be evaluated. Early planting of fast-growing native species will help accelerate canopy recovery and provide near-term ecological benefits, supporting long-term environmental goals. Please refer to Section 4.6, Land Use, Zoning, and Community Cohesion, Section 4.6.5, Mitigation, of the FEIS for details regarding the minimization of tree clearing, revegetation of cleared areas, and additional mitigation measures related to land alteration.
Cape Cod Commission	As MassDOT refines the areas to be cleared, Staff recommend a natural resources inventory of these areas be conducted by a qualified professional.	To prepare the landscaping plans, the Program’s landscape architects participated in site visits with Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) landscape architects to review typical native landscape vegetation and assess representative plant communities within the Program Limits, including developing an inventory of existing trees and understory. The intent of the site visits was to enhance and encourage reforestation and complement and mimic the existing plant communities. As discussed in Section 4.6, Land Use, Zoning, and Community Cohesion, Section 4.6.5, Mitigation, of the FEIS, the landscape design consists of several landscape types that represent the primary landscape and planting types throughout the Program Limits. The intent of the landscape design is to restore the disturbed sites and to integrate the new infrastructure into the existing landscape, blending with existing conditions where possible.
Cape Cod Commission	Plant species native to Cape Cod should be used in the landscaping plans, including for lawns and buffers to the greatest extent possible.	The landscaping plan incorporates native plant species and mimics the existing diverse plant communities to the maximum extent possible, including protecting the existing Pitch Pine Forest in the Sagamore North quadrant.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Cape Cod Commission	Commission staff reviewed the Visual Impact Assessment and suggest additional landscaping, wall treatments, and other buffering measures to minimize visual impacts of the Project are particularly important at the following locations: SS2 – View from Eleanor Avenue, facing northeast, SS4 - View from Cranberry Highway at Adams Street, facing west; BN2 - View from Nightingale Road at Scenic Highway, facing south; BN3 - View from Scenic Highway, facing west; BS2 - View from Cumberland Farms Parcel, facing northeast; and BS3 - View from Sandwich Road, facing west. The following locations would also benefit from more substantial plantings and vegetation along roadways or in roundabouts and medians to enhance the pedestrian or shared-use path user experience: SS3, SS4, BN2, BN3, BS2, and BS3. The FEIS should provide greater detail regarding the landscaping treatments within medians, roundabouts, and along pedestrian and shared-use paths.	Landscaping will enhance pedestrian facilities and SUPs by adding shade, reducing heat impacts, and improving visual quality. Shade-focused plantings will be placed along the south and west sides of SUPs and in hardscape areas, while pedestrian facilities, such as trailheads, medians, and roundabouts, will receive new vegetation to replace impervious surfaces where feasible. Street trees and buffer plantings will provide shade and screening, and lawn areas will be used to blend with existing landscapes. Roundabout plantings will follow MassDOT design guidelines, and more detailed, diverse plantings will be reserved for highly visible, easily maintained locations. Specific landscaping locations are provided in Appendix 3.2, Attachment 5, Landscaping Plans, of the FEIS. Please refer to Section 4.6, Land Use, Zoning, and Community Cohesion, Section 4.6.5, Mitigation, of the FEIS for details regarding the landscaping and revegetation plans for the Program. Also refer to Section 4.15, Visual Resources, of the FEIS for enlarged partial plans of MassDOT’s proposed landscape design, including visual inventory locations.

2.17 Threatened, Endangered, and Protected Species and Habitats

Table 2-19 includes comments and responses related to threatened, endangered, and protected species and habitats.

Table 2-19. Threatened, Endangered, and Protected Species and Habitats Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comment	Response
Association to Preserve Cape Cod	APCC urges MassDOT to continue project planning efforts to avoid potential impacts to rare species and habitat. If impacts cannot be avoided, APCC recommends that the FEIS demonstrate how every effort is being made to minimize impacts. APCC looks to the FEIS for more definitive information on the likelihood of impacts to rare species and plans for appropriate mitigation.	The Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) has consulted and will continue to consult with federal and state agencies to avoid and/or minimize impacts to species and habitats. Additionally, MassDOT is continuing to consult with the Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program (NHESP) regarding the development of a Massachusetts Endangered Species Act (MESA) Conservation and Management Permit (CMP) for the Bourne Bridge project from the Massachusetts Division of Fisheries and Wildlife (MassWildlife). Per 321 Code of Massachusetts Regulations (CMR) 10.23, the CMP application must show that the Cape Cod Bridges Program (Program) has avoided, minimized, and mitigated impacts to state-listed species in accordance with applicable performance standards. Please refer to Section 4.11, Threatened, Endangered, and Protected Species and Habitats, of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for further details regarding proposed impacts and mitigation measures to state-listed species, including measures to avoid and/or minimize impacts.
Cape Cod Commission	Additional information on consultations with state agencies, potential need for a Conservation Management Permit through the Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program, and proposed mitigation measures should be included in the FEIS.	MassDOT is continuing to consult with MassWildlife's NHESP regarding the potential for a take of state-protected species and the requirement for a MESA CMP from MassWildlife. Please refer to Section 4.11, Threatened, Endangered, and Protected Species and Habitats, of the FEIS for further details regarding proposed mitigation measures.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Cape Cod Commission	MassDOT should also inspect structures for nesting birds and develop mitigation measures to avoid impacts to any nesting birds that may be present on the existing bridge structures.	MassDOT will implement all required protection measures for federal- and state-protected species, including birds, during construction. Please refer to Section 4.11, Threatened, Endangered, and Protected Species and Habitats , of the FEIS for additional details regarding protection measures. MassDOT will inspect bridge structures for nesting birds and follow prescribed avoidance and minimization measures to prevent disturbance to any active nests. MassDOT will continue to coordinate with MassWildlife to ensure protection measures are implemented as required.
Cape Cod Commission	Staff recommend an invasive species management plan be developed and included with the FEIS.	Invasive species will be removed and replaced with native, site appropriate plantings suited to Cape Cod's climate. The landscaping plan emphasizes diverse, resilient vegetation that supports pollinators and wildlife, withstands sun and wind exposure near bridges, and uses seed mixes designed to promote long-term health while preventing the return of invasive species. Please refer to Section 4.6, Land Use, Zoning, and Community Cohesion , of the FEIS, for further details regarding the management of invasive species and native planting.
Cape Cod Commission	Staff support recommendations to monitor the eelgrass beds before and after construction and compensate for impacts through coordinated consultation with federal and state agencies. Additional details on consultations with these agencies should be included in the FEIS.	MassDOT continues to work with the issuing authorities including the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries), and Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) to determine a viable mitigation strategy for eelgrass mitigation. The final eelgrass mitigation approach/strategy will be included in the respective permit applications to federal and state agencies. Please refer to Section 4.11, Threatened, Endangered, and Protected Species and Habitats and Appendix 4.11 , of the FEIS for further details regarding eelgrass mitigation measures and updated agency coordination.

2.18 Utilities and Services

Table 2-20 includes comments and responses related to existing utilities and services.

Table 2-20. Utilities and Services Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comment	Response
Anonymous User	Curious as to interruption time period for sagamore beach residents during the Eversource Electric Transmission Lines phase. I'm assuming we will be affected dramatically since the work of lines surrounds us. (Williston Rd) Ps, Nice job on the DEIS summary -very easy to comprehend and follow.	The projects proposed by Eversource are independent and outside of the Cape Cod Bridges Program study area. Refer to Eversource's Major Massachusetts Projects for more information (www.eversource.com/residential/about/transmission-distribution/projects/massachusetts-projects/).
Emily Paskewicz	Curious as to interruption time period for sagamore beach residents during the Eversource Electric Transmission Lines phase. I'm assuming we will be affected dramatically since the work of lines surrounds us. (Williston Rd) Ps, Nice job on the DEIS summary -very easy to comprehend and follow.	The projects proposed by Eversource are independent of and outside the study area of the Cape Cod Bridges Program. Refer to Eversource's Major Massachusetts Projects for more information (www.eversource.com/residential/about/transmission-distribution/projects/massachusetts-projects/).
Cape Cod Commission	Additionally, staff encourage MassDOT to invest in fiber optic infrastructure within the Canal Area to support smart traffic signals, real-time monitoring, and adaptive traffic management.	The Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) is proposing new Smart Work Zone Systems infrastructure as part of the Program, including fiber-supported field devices, real-time traffic monitoring equipment, and adaptive-ready signal controllers, which together will support smart signals and adaptive traffic management in the Cape Cod area.

2.19 Solid and Hazardous Waste Material Management

Table 2-21 includes comments and responses related to solid and hazardous waste material management.

Table 2-21 Solid and Hazardous Waste Material Management Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comment	Response
Association to Preserve Cape Cod	It is equally important that project planning includes the adoption of an effective spill prevention plan to avoid impacts to drinking water resources.	As described in Section 4.18, Solid and Hazardous Material Management , of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS), the Design-Builder will prepare a Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure Plan outlining the measures that will be implemented to plan for, prevent, contain, and respond to accidental releases of oil and hazardous materials during construction, in accordance with 40 Code of Federal Regulations 112.

2.20 Water Resources

Table 2-22 includes comments and responses related to wetlands, floodplains, waterways, stormwater, water quality, and coastal zone consistency.

Table 2-22. Water Resources Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comment	Response
Association to Preserve Cape Cod	APCC recommends that the FEIS propose ways to further avoid permanent project impacts to wetlands and wetland buffers, including potentially altering the SUP location near Nightengale Pond. Where impacts are still unavoidable, impacts should be effectively minimized and mitigated to preserve the quality and function of the wetland resources.	Impacts to wetland resource areas associated with Nightingale Pond remain unchanged from those presented in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) and have been avoided and minimized to the maximum extent practicable. Retaining walls will be constructed to minimize the extent of fill in jurisdictional resources associated with Nightingale Pond. Mitigation for unavoidable impacts to wetland resource areas associated with Nightingale Pond will be implemented in accordance with federal and state requirements, including federally regulated Relatively

Commenter	Comment	Response
		Permanent Waters and state-regulated Inland Bank, Land Under Water, and Bordering Land Subject to Flooding. The proposed resource area mitigation will be hydrologically connected to Nightingale Pond and constructed as an expansion of the Pond to preserve and maximize the quality and function of the wetland resource areas, so they function similarly to existing resource conditions.
Cape Cod Commission	Additional details on proposed mitigation, including provisions for long-term monitoring and adaptive management of wetland replacements to ensure their success, should be provided in the FEIS.	There have been no changes to the proposed mitigation measures for inland resource impacts beyond those disclosed in the DEIS, which include restoration, wetland replication, and providing compensatory flood storage. The Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) is continuing to coordinate with regulatory agencies through wetlands permitting processes to include provisions for long-term monitoring and adaptive management of wetland replacements to ensure their success, which will be documented in permit conditions.
Cape Cod Commission	Staff support a thorough review of flood risk under proposed conditions and updates to the emergency traffic plan and safety signage. More detailed information on the flood risk anticipated under proposed conditions, as well as mitigation actions to address potential future flooding should be included in the FEIS.	All impacts to inland floodplains, regulated as Bordering Land Subject to Flooding under the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act (MA WPA), will be mitigated by providing compensatory flood storage on a foot-by-foot basis at each elevation. Therefore, no change in inland flood risk or elevations would occur from the Program. The current MA WPA regulations do not include performance standards for Land Subject to Coastal Storm Flowage. Section 4.9, Wetlands and Floodplains, of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) describes the Program's compliance with MA WPA performance standards for these resource areas. Sagamore and Bourne Bridges span the tidal waters of Cape Cod Canal, which is directly connected to Cape Cod Bay on the east and Buzzards Bay on the west. Coastal floodplain elevations at these locations are controlled by ocean tides, coastal storm surge, and wave processes, rather than riverine hydraulics. Because coastal flood levels in tidal systems are driven by oceanic processes, localized highway

Commenter	Comment	Response
		encroachments, such as riprap pier protection, are not expected to alter floodplain elevations. Therefore, no change in coastal flood risk or elevations would occur from the Program.
Cape Cod Commission	MassDOT should reduce impacts along the pond shore to the greatest extent feasible and provide additional details on proposed alterations and mitigation in the FEIS.	Impacts to wetland resource areas associated with Nightingale Pond remain unchanged from those presented in the DEIS and have been avoided and minimized to the maximum extent practicable. Retaining walls will be constructed to minimize the extent of fill in jurisdictional resources associated with Nightingale Pond. Mitigation for unavoidable impacts to wetland resource areas associated with Nightingale Pond will be implemented in accordance with federal and state requirements, including federally regulated Relatively Permanent Waters and state-regulated Inland Bank, Land Under Water, and Bordering Land Subject to Flooding. The proposed resource area mitigation will be hydrologically connected to Nightingale Pond and constructed as an expansion of the Pond to preserve and maximize the quality and function of the wetland resource areas, so they function similarly to existing resource conditions.
Cape Cod Commission	The FEIS should confirm any impacts within sub-areas of the floodplain, and mitigation should be identified in conformance with floodplain regulations.	Section 4.9, Wetlands and Floodplains, Section 4.9.4, Build Alternative, of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) describes impacts to floodplains that would result from the Program, including areas regulated under the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act (MA WPA) as Bordering Land Subject to Flooding and Land Subject to Coastal Storm Flowage. The Program’s conformance with 23 Code of Federal Regulations 650 with respect to wetlands or floodplains is described in Section 4.9, Wetlands and Floodplains, Section 4.9.6, Regulatory Compliance, of the FEIS. Appendix 4.9, Attachment 2, of the FEIS describes the Program’s compliance with MA WPA performance standards for these resource areas.

Commenter	Comment	Response
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Wetlands reviewed by the Corps Regulatory Division in the field on 10/7/2025 do not appear to be shown in the figures. It is unclear if this is because they are outside of the work footprint or because they have been assumed non-jurisdictional. Note that without having completed an approved jurisdictional determination (AJD) we cannot say which wetlands are federally jurisdictional and which are not.	Section 4.9, Wetlands and Floodplains , of the FEIS has been updated to present the vegetated wetlands reviewed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' (USACE) Regulatory Division. All vegetated wetlands have been presumed to be federally jurisdictional in this analysis.
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Impact figures are somewhat misleading in that they do not show the rip-rap pier protection in the channel, which constitutes the largest impact to WOTUS. Although potential impacts from the rip-rap are noted in a footnote below the figures, it would be clearer to show the impact footprint on the figures.	Figures in Section 4.9, Wetlands and Floodplains , of the FEIS have been updated to depict the footprint of the proposed riprap pier protection system.
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	The NEPA alternatives analysis will likely not be sufficient to complete the 404(b)(1) alternatives analysis and determine the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative (LEDPA). Additional details on impacts associated with various alternatives, including alternative alignments and pier protection systems, will likely be required.	MassDOT will provide additional details regarding impacts of various alternatives, including alignments and pier protection systems, in the Section 404 permit application submitted to USACE in accordance with the requirements of Section 404(b)(1).
Association to Preserve Cape Cod	The project applicant should also continue to study potential refinement to project plans to minimize impacts to coastal resource areas to the maximum extent possible and to also review and revise mitigation plans in the FEIS, as appropriate.	There are no requirements for mitigation for state-regulated coastal resource areas. Section 4.9, Wetlands and Floodplains, Section 4.9.5 , of the FEIS describes the Program's compliance with state and federal requirements and guidance for wetland mitigation. After construction, temporary structures would be removed, disturbed riprap and slopes would be restored as feasible, pier protection would be installed, and remaining areas would be allowed to restore naturally.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Cape Cod Commission	Staff encourage the use of low impact infrastructure wherever practical. As design plans advance, stormwater control measures should be distributed throughout the Project Site and appropriately integrated with the surrounding restored landscapes, so they appear natural and contribute to the creation of habitat. All stormwater control measures should be designed to remove total suspended solids, metals, pathogens as well as phosphorus and nitrogen, given the Project's proximity to fresh and saltwater resources and public drinking water supply areas.	In accordance with the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) Stormwater Management Standard 4 (Water Quality), the proposed stormwater control measures will be designed to provide 80% total suspended solids reduction from total impervious area within the Study Area, as feasible. The proposed infiltration basins are effective in removing metals, nitrogen, and phosphorus by allowing water to infiltrate the soil where it can filter out the pollutants, and they have been designed to meet ranges in the MassDEP Stormwater Handbook for pollutant removal efficiencies of infiltration basins. The target reduction for pathogens in stormwater is two to three orders of magnitude, which is generally expected to be achieved by the implementation of proposed stormwater control measures. Please refer to Section 4.10, Water Quality and Stormwater, Section 4.10.7, Mitigation, of the FEIS for details on proposed stormwater control measures, including their integration with surrounding landscapes and distribution throughout the Project Limits.
Cape Cod Commission	A Stormwater Management Report, including drainage details, calculations, catchment areas, the amount of clearing and grading, and an operation and maintenance plan should be provided in future submissions to ensure the Project will comply with the Massachusetts Stormwater Handbook and other applicable standards. To avoid adverse impacts to the Upper Cape Water Supply Reserve, Bourne Water District Wellhead Protection Areas, and potential public water supply areas, MassDOT should continue exploring opportunities to reduce impervious cover, minimize disturbance, and minimize tree and vegetation clearing to the maximum extent practicable, while improving on existing stormwater treatment and infiltration.	A Stormwater Management Report will be provided as part of the MA WPA and Section 401 Water Quality Certification permitting processes. Appendix 4.10, Section 8, Regulatory Compliance, of the FEIS provides an update on the Program's compliance with Massachusetts Stormwater Management Standards. Please refer to Section 4.10, Water Quality and Stormwater, Section 4.10.7, Mitigation, of the FEIS, for further details regarding stormwater control measures and regulatory compliance. Also, refer to Section 4.6, Land Use, Zoning, and Community Cohesion, of the FEIS for MassDOT's efforts to reduce impervious surfaces and minimize tree clearing.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Association to Preserve Cape Cod	APCC commends MassDOT for its commitment to using green infrastructure for stormwater management and encourages final project planning to strive for exceeding relevant stormwater treatment standards.	Thank you for your comment. Appendix 4.10, Section 8, Regulatory Compliance , of the FEIS provides an update on the Program's compliance with Massachusetts Stormwater Management Standards.
Association to Preserve Cape Cod	APCC recommends that the FEIS show more details for the proposed stormwater pollution prevention plan described in the DEIS, including efforts to protect wetland resources from potential construction impacts.	A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be prepared in accordance with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Discharges from Construction Activities. The SWPPP will include construction-period best management practices that will be implemented to meet the Order of Conditions issued by the Bourne Conservation Commission under MA WPA (310 Code of Massachusetts Regulations [CMR] 10.00), which includes protection of wetland resources from potential construction impacts.
Association to Preserve Cape Cod	Appropriate measures should be further studied and proposed in the FEIS to ensure avoidance of impacts to the two water supply areas within the Plymouth/Carver Sole Source Aquifer in the Bourne North construction quadrant as well as the Cape Cod Sole Source Aquifer located south of the canal.	The proposed stormwater control measures for the Build Alternative would improve the treatment and quality of the runoff that is eventually discharged to the Plymouth/Carver and Cape Cod Sole Source Aquifers, which remains unchanged from the DEIS. Please refer to Section 4.10, Water Quality and Stormwater , of the FEIS for further details regarding proposed stormwater control measures and sole source aquifer protections.

Commenter	Comment	Response
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency	The proposed project will require an EPA Sole Source Aquifer (SSA) Review. The Draft EIS describes general engineering concepts regarding stormwater management such as impervious shoulders, infiltration basins, outfalls, and deep sump catch basins. More detailed information will be needed to support EPA's SSA review. We recommend that MassDOT coordinate with EPA to begin the SSA review process once draft engineering design plans are available. Please contact EPA Region 1's SSA Coordinator, Kira Jacobs at jacobs.kira@epa.gov. For more information also please visit https://www3.epa.gov/region1/eco/drinkwater/pc_ole_source_aquifer.html	MassDOT has initiated coordination with EPA to begin the sole source aquifer review process and will submit draft engineering design plans to EPA to complete this process.

2.21 Visual Resources

Table 2-23 includes comments and responses related to the Program’s effect on visual resources.

Table 2-23. Visual Resources Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comment	Response
Kenny Rogers	The new bridges will be an iconic gateway to Cape Cod. To emphasize the beauty of the bridges, what are the considerations for accent lighting? The lighting for the Zakim Bridge in Boston is a great example of how color lighting can make the bridge a landmark for the city. The same consideration should be done for the new Cape Cod bridges.	The Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) has developed an aesthetic lighting concept for the bridges that accounts for the historically low-light environment of Cape Cod Canal and its abutting land. MassDOT is proposing understated, low-level lighting of the interior spaces of the bridge arch and different bridge components, such as the bridge cables, inner piers, and inner delta frames. Please refer to Section 4.15, Visual Resources , of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS).
Cape Cod Commission	MassDOT proposes to provide standard roadway and pedestrian-scale lighting along the bridges, the approach highway networks, and shared-use paths as well as aesthetic bridge lighting concepts that propose low-level lighting of the bridge arch and other components. Staff recommend any proposed lighting should be designed to avoid impacts on wildlife.	The design incorporates roadway lighting, pedestrian-scale lighting, and aesthetic bridge lighting. All lighting systems comply with federal and state requirements related to light pollution, spill control, and minimization of adverse impacts to wildlife. Light trespass outside of the State Highway Layout will be eliminated to the greatest extent possible, especially in environmentally sensitive areas, such as wetlands and forested areas.
Cape Cod Commission	Staff recommend the Proponent include additional detail on lighting and landscaping elements with accompanying graphics and views from visual inventory locations.	Section 4.15, Visual Resources , of the FEIS includes updated information on proposed lighting, landscaping, and other visual design treatments, along with representative graphics and simulated views from visual inventory locations. These refinements incorporate further development of design and address visual effects associated with bridge, roadway, and shared-use path improvements. MassDOT will continue to refine lighting and landscape elements during final design and in coordination with local stakeholders.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Lew Lasher	My comment is in response to the graphics from the 20 Jan 2026 Recreation open house, and, in particular, on the topic of "Recreational Pathway Signage and Access". I recommend that pathway signage include wayfinding toward the two MBTA rail stations (Buzzards Bay and Bourne). The Cape Flyer is a popular service for intermodal visits (on foot or by bicycle) to, for example, the Canal paths. But the train stations are not that easy to find, and it would be good if people did not miss the train because they couldn't find the station. The "Recreational Map" (on page 31 of the PDF file containing the graphics from the Recreation Open House) showed, in its legend, a graphic symbol for Cape Flyer stops. But I couldn't find this symbol being used on the map to indicate the location of the Buzzards Bay train stop, and the indication for the Bourne train stop did not seem to correspond with the current location of that train stop. At any rate, wayfinding signs on the Canal paths would be very helpful.	MassDOT recognizes the importance of clear and effective wayfinding signage, including connections to multimodal transportation options such as nearby rail stations. Refer to Section 4.15, Visual Resources, for a discussion of wayfinding signage to be included in the Program. Appendix 4.15, Visual Impact Assessment, provides illustrative examples of how wayfinding elements are incorporated into landscape plans. Wayfinding details will continue to be refined as design progresses.

2.22 Cultural Resources

Table 2-24 includes comments and responses related to cultural and historic resources.

Table 2-24. Cultural Resources Comments and Responses

Commenter	Comment	Response
Cape Cod Commission	The Proponent developed a Draft Programmatic Agreement that outlines the Section 106 obligations that must be met and how to fulfill them. One of the stipulations is the production of an Historic American Engineering Record (“HAER”) which discusses the physical history of the bridge structures, including historical context, design and structural information, construction history and mechanics, and a bibliography that lists sources of information and other potential sources not investigated. Staff recommend the Proponent thoroughly document the bridges and provide contemporary photographs of the bridges in addition to historical images within the HAER, as well as document their replacement.	Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) documentation will be prepared in accordance with the “Guidelines for Historical Reports (2008, updated December 2017),” provided by the National Park Service. HAER documentation requirements include historical and current photographs of the structures.
Cape Cod Commission	Commission staff note that there is an inventoried historic district near the Project Site recorded in MACRIS as South Sagamore, ID BOU.V, with a nomination form received by MHC in September 2000. Staff encourage the Proponent to pay particular attention to tree removal and other vegetation removal within this area, working to preserve the landscaping as much as possible, and provide a more detailed landscaping plan in future submissions.	The Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) is committed to minimizing tree removal and vegetation disturbance to the extent practicable, as discussed in Section 4.6, Land Use, Zoning, and Community Cohesion, of the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). The FEIS includes updated tree clearing limits (Appendix 3.2, Attachment 3) and landscaping plans (Appendix 3.2, Attachment 5). As demonstrated in the revised tree clearing plan, no trees will be removed in front of inventoried buildings in the Massachusetts Cultural Resource Information System (MACRIS) inventoried district BOU.V. As discussed in Section 4.16, Cultural Resources, Section 4.16.4, of the FEIS, to avoid an adverse effect on a National Register-eligible

Commenter	Comment	Response
		property, MassDOT would provide landscaping around the proposed public parking lot within its viewshed. Section 4.15, Visual Resources, of the FEIS, also provides updated landscaping and aesthetic design treatments, including graphics and views from certain locations. MassDOT will continue to refine landscaping and vegetation protection measures during final design to preserve existing vegetation and landscaping where feasible.
Cape Cod Commission	Additional stipulations in the Draft Programmatic Agreement include fabricating at least one interpretive historic panel for installation at each of the pedestrian overlooks along each bridge and salvaging the original bridge plaques at both existing bridges. Staff suggest the Proponent describe what information will be included in the historic panels and their potential design. Retaining a piece of the structures for display either with the panels or separately may also be appropriate.	As indicated in the Programmatic Agreement (Appendix 4.16, Attachment 1 of the FEIS), the subject of the interpretative panel will be determined in consultation with the Section 106 consulting parties. The Programmatic Agreement includes a stipulation for the adaptive reuse of bridge components. MassDOT will investigate the salvage and reuse of materials from the bridges for application in the Project Limits.
Cape Cod Commission	Additionally, staff suggest the Proponent work to preserve and provide protections to other threatened historic and cultural resources within and near the project area as mitigation for the unavoidable impacts to the historic bridges and Canal area.	In accordance with 36 Code of Federal Regulations 800, MassDOT will continue to implement required measures to avoid, minimize, and mitigate effects on historic properties to the maximum extent practicable. Protections for historic and cultural resources are established through the Programmatic Agreement and will be carried out throughout the duration of construction.

Commenter	Comment	Response
Cape Cod Commission	Additional archeological investigation does not appear necessary, but the Proponent should be prepared to address any unanticipated archaeological resources identified during construction.	Unanticipated archaeological discoveries during construction are addressed in the Programmatic Agreement among the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Massachusetts State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), and MassDOT. The Programmatic Agreement is provided in Appendix 4.16, Attachment 1 , of the FEIS. In accordance with the Programmatic Agreement, any archaeological resources identified during construction will be evaluated and managed in coordination with FHWA, MassDOT, SHPO, Tribal Historic Preservation Officers, and other consulting parties.
Cape Cod Commission	Staff support the addition of these amenities to enhance the user experience and encourage MassDOT to incorporate educational or interpretive signage at these locations with information about the history and uses of the canal and bridges.	The Programmatic Agreement (Appendix 4.16, Attachment 1 of the FEIS) includes a stipulation to prepare and fabricate at least one interpretive panel for installation at the pedestrian overlook along each bridge. The subject of the interpretive panel will be determined in consultation with the Section 106 consulting parties. Additionally, as discussed in Section 4.15, Visual Resources , of the FEIS, MassDOT is designing features and amenities for the Cape Cod Bridges Program's (Program) pedestrian and bicycle facilities and shared-use paths, including themed interpretive and wayfinding signage.
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	Under Section 4.2 Methodology, Appendix 4.16 includes the following: "Documentation of coordination with the SHPO, including consultation and concurrence, is provided in Attachment 1." However, no Attachment 1 is included in this review package. Is there a correspondence sub-appendix associated with Appendix 4.16? The Corps will need to review all previous consultation files in accordance with Section 106.	Appendix 4.16, Attachment 1 , of the FEIS includes the Programmatic Agreement and all previous consultation documentation (Appendices A through H).

Commenter	Comment	Response
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	When will the final PA, inclusive of comments made by USACE, be provided to USACE for confirmation?	MassDOT provided the Draft Final Programmatic Agreement to USACE, as well as other Consulting Parties, on January 12, 2026. MassDOT then incorporated the comments by the Consulting Parties. Appendix 4.16, Attachment 1 , of the FEIS provides the Final Programmatic Agreement.