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The information requested on this form must be completed to begin MEPA Review in accordance with the provisions of the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act, 301 CMR 11.00.

| Project Name: Charles/MGH Station Accessibility and Modernization |
| Street: Charles Street/Cambridge Street at Charles Circle |
| Municipality: Boston | Watershed: Charles River |
| Universal Tranverse Mercator Coordinates: | Latitude: 42.361050 N |
| NAD 83, Zone 19: 329496.86 m E; 4691942.00 m N | Longitude: -71.070482 W |
| Estimated commencement date: July 2002 | Estimated completion date: December 2003 |
| Approximate cost: $20 million | Status of project design: 90% complete |

Proponent: Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority

| Street: 10 Park Plaza |
| Municipality: Boston | State: MA | Zip Code: 02116 |
| Name of Contact Person From Whom Copies of this ENF May Be Obtained: Andrew Brennan |
| Firm/Agency: MBTA | Street: 10 Park Plaza |
| Municipality: Boston | State: MA | Zip Code: 02116 |
| Phone: 617.222.3126 | Fax: 617.222.1557 | E-mail: abrennan@mbta.com |

Does this project meet or exceed a mandatory EIR threshold (see 301 CMR 11.03)?

- Yes [x] No [ ]

Has this project been filed with MEPA before?

- Yes (EOEA No. _______ ) [x] No [ ]

Has any project on this site been filed with MEPA before?

- Yes (EOEA No. _______ ) [x] No [ ]

Is this an Expanded ENF (see 301 CMR 11.05(7)) requesting:

- a Single EIR? (see 301 CMR 11.06(8)) [x] Yes [ ] No
- a Special Review Procedure? (see 301 CMR 11.09) [x] Yes [ ] No
- a Waiver of mandatory EIR? (see 301 CMR 11.11) [x] Yes [ ] No
- a Phase I Waiver? (see 301 CMR 11.11) [x] Yes [ ] No

Identify any financial assistance or land transfer from an agency of the Commonwealth, including the agency name and the amount of funding or land area (in acres):

A land transfer between the MDC and the MBTA will occur.
Are you requesting coordinated review with any other federal, state, regional, or local agency?

- Yes  Federal Transit Administration
- (Specify)  Metropolitan District Commission  Massachusetts Historical Commission
- No

List Local or Federal Permits and Approvals:

Which ENF or EIR review threshold(s) does the project meet or exceed (see 301 CMR 11.03):

- Land
- Rare Species
- Wetlands, Waterways, & Tidelands
- Water
- Wastewater
- Solid & Hazardous Waste
- Transportation
- Energy
- Air
- Historical & Archaeological Resources
- ACEC
- Regulations

Summary of Project Size & Environmental Impacts

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>LAND</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total site acreage</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New acres of land altered</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres of impervious area</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square feet of new bordering vegetated wetlands alteration</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square feet of new other wetland alteration</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres of new non-water dependent use of tidelands or waterways</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>STRUCTURES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross square footage</td>
<td>2,902 SF</td>
<td>4,235 SF</td>
<td>7,137 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of housing units</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum height (in feet)</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSPORTATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle trips per day</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking spaces</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>(9)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WATER/WASTEWATER</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallons/day of water use</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPD water withdrawal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPD wastewater generation/treatment</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>No increase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of water/sewer mains (in miles)</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

State Permits & Approvals

- Order of Conditions
- Superseding Order of Conditions
- Chapter 91 License
- 401 Water Quality Certification
- MHD or MDC Access Permit
- Water Management Act Permit
- New Source Approval
- DEP or MWRA Sewer Connection/Extension Permit
- Other Permits

*(including Legislative Approvals) – Specify:
CONSERVATION LAND: Will the project involve the conversion of public parkland or other Article 97 public natural resources to any purpose not in accordance with Article 97?
☐ Yes (Specify__________________________________ ) ☑No

Will it involve the release of any conservation restriction, preservation restriction, agricultural preservation restriction, or watershed preservation restriction?
☐ Yes (Specify__________________________________ ) ☑No

RARE SPECIES: Does the project site include Estimated Habitat of Rare Species, Vernal Pools, Priority Sites of Rare Species, or Exemplary Natural Communities?
☐ Yes (Specify__________________________________ ) ☑No

HISTORICAL / ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Does the project site include any structure, site or district listed in the State Register of Historic Place or the inventory of Historic and Archaeological Assets of the Commonwealth?
☑ Yes (Specify: Charles/MGH Station) ☑No

Charles Street/MGH Station is included in the Inventory of Historic and Archaeological Assets of the Commonwealth and has been determined eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places by the Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC). The station is also within the boundaries of the Charles River Basin Historic District, which is listed in the State and National Registers of Historic Places.

If yes, does the project involve any demolition or destruction of any listed or inventoried historic or archaeological resources?
☑ Yes (Specify:_____________________________ ) ☑No

The Charles/MGH Station headhouse is proposed to be demolished. The track and viaduct structure will be reused in place. In addition, the original copper-clad platform will be retained and restored, including the copper panels, multi-pane windows, and cast stone column enclosures.

AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN: Is the project in or adjacent to an Area of Critical Environmental Concern?
☐ Yes (Specify__________________________________ ) ☑No

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project description should include (a) a description of the project site, (b) a description of both on-site and off-site alternatives and the impacts associated with each alternative, and (c) potential on-site and off-site mitigation measures for each alternative (You may attach one additional page, if necessary.)

The proposed project intends to replace the existing 70-year old MBTA station with a new station on an adjacent traffic island so that it can be made accessible. The existing track, viaduct structure, and copper-clad platform will be retained and reused.

The existing Charles/MGH Station was constructed in 1931-32 within the Charles Circle and around the existing Red Line elevated track built in 1912. The station was originally built on a traffic island with an underground passageway to eliminate pedestrian access to the station through the traffic circle. In 1961 overhead walkways were constructed from the north and south sides of the traffic island, replacing the underground passageway (see Attachment A-1 for Existing Conditions). Since the 1961 modifications, the conflict between pedestrians and vehicles has continued to increase in Charles Circle.

The advent of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990 legislation has required the MBTA to carefully focus on issues of access in the planning and modernization of facilities. The ADA, Title II-Public Services, requires public transportation systems to not discriminate against persons with disabilities. Site factors at the Charles/MGH Station offer significant challenges to meeting this mandate and necessitate improvements to property and facilities owned and operated by the Metropolitan District Commission (MDC) and the City of Boston.
The primary objective of the Charles/MGH Station accessibility and modernization project is to meet the specific requirements mandated by the Federal Transit Administration (FTA) for developing a plan to implement system-wide accessibility (known as a “key station plan”) to all those with disabilities by December 31, 2003. Additionally, the MBTA has described a broader list of objectives for the project, including:

- Design a station that provides a patron safety, comfort, and protection from the elements
- Improve pedestrian and vehicular safety at Charles Circle
- Reduce train noise
- Provide links to the area development and Charles River Basin recreational areas
- Develop an architectural expression appropriate as a gateway image to Boston/Cambridge
- Minimize service disruptions during construction
- Incorporate public art into the station design reflecting the history of the district

In addition to the MBTA’s goals for the project, the needs of multiple and varied stakeholders were considered during project planning. The MBTA worked with a number of state and local agencies and interested parties who assisted in the development of this project, including the MDC (owner of the project area land), City of Boston (including the Boston Transportation Department, Boston Redevelopment Authority, and Boston Landmarks Commission [BLC]), the MHC, Massachusetts General Hospital, and Massachusetts Eye and Ear Infirmary. The location of this station, the separate ownership of the pedestrian bridges to the station, and the various ongoing projects within the station area suggest that cooperation and coordination among the appropriate agencies will result in a comprehensive improvement program that will go well beyond the goal of accessibility.

Following extensive study of project alternatives, a preferred alternative has been chosen by the MBTA. The alternative, known as “Option B2.0” proposes a redesigned traffic scheme for Charles Circle (see Attachment A-2). By revising traffic patterns at this busy intersection/rotary, an enlarged island can be carved out, creating the opportunity for an at-grade pedestrian crossing to the station headhouse. A component of the preferred alternative will be roadway changes, including the realignment of the off-ramp lanes from Storrow Drive for cars waiting to exit Charles Circle and the addition of an island that separates eastbound flow on Cambridge Street.

The proposed headhouse is located farther to the east than the existing station, while the platforms are reused in their present position. The track and its supporting structure of piers and girders remain. The existing station headhouse along with its remote stairs and bridges will eventually be demolished, once phased construction of the new station is underway.

At grade level, the new station incorporates the pay plaza. Vertical transportation elements, escalators, stairs, and elevators on each side, connect directly to the inbound and outbound platforms. The platform level is slightly enlarged to accommodate new circulation from below.

The preferred alternative presents many opportunities for the station to become a significant form in the streetscape, a new “gateway” for the city, while satisfying the needs of MBTA riders for access, security, and safety.
LAND SECTION – all proponents must fill out this section

I. Thresholds / Permits
   A. Does the project meet or exceed any review thresholds related to land (see 301 CMR 11.03(1)) ___ Yes _X_ No; if yes, specify each threshold:

II. Impacts and Permits
   A. Describe, in acres, the current and proposed character of the project site, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Footprint of buildings</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2,902 sf</td>
<td>4,235 sf</td>
<td>7,137 SF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roadways, parking, and other paved areas</td>
<td>3.24 ac.</td>
<td>0.10 ac.</td>
<td>3.34 ac.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other altered areas (describe)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undeveloped areas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B. Has any part of the project site been in active agricultural use in the last three years? ___ Yes _X_ No; if yes, how many acres of land in agricultural use (with agricultural soils) will be converted to nonagricultural use?

C. Is any part of the project site currently or proposed to be in active forestry use? ___ Yes _X_ No; if yes, please describe current and proposed forestry activities and indicate whether any part of the site is the subject of a DEM-approved forest management plan:

D. Does any part of the project involve conversion of land held for natural resources purposes in accordance with Article 97 of the Amendments to the Constitution of the Commonwealth to any purpose not in accordance with Article 97? ___ Yes _X_ No; if yes, describe:

E. Is any part of the project site currently subject to a conservation restriction, preservation restriction, agricultural preservation restriction or watershed preservation restriction? ___ Yes _X_ No; if yes, does the project involve the release or modification of such restriction? ___ Yes _X_ No; if yes, describe:

F. Does the project require approval of a new urban redevelopment project or a fundamental change in an existing urban redevelopment project under M.G.L.c.121A? ___ Yes _X_ No; if yes, describe:

G. Does the project require approval of a new urban renewal plan or a major modification of an existing urban renewal plan under M.G.L.c.121B? ___ Yes _X_ No; if yes, describe:

H. Describe the project's stormwater impacts and, if applicable, measures that the project will take to comply with the standards found in DEP's Stormwater Management Policy:

As roadway and other surface modifications resulting from the project will be minor, there will be only minimal changes to the drainage pattern at the project site. Also, only a minimal increase in the percentage of paved area is required to accommodate the new station headhouse and traffic circulation; however, it is not significantly different from the existing conditions. Currently, drainage from the Charles/MGH Station is handled by an MDC-owned storm drain system. The project proposes no changes from the existing condition other than the relocation of a number of catch basins.

I. Is the project site currently being regulated under M.G.L.c.21E or the Massachusetts Contingency Plan? ___ Yes _X_ No; if yes, what is the Release Tracking Number (RTN)?

J. If the project is site is within the Chicopee or Nashua watershed, is it within the Quabbin, Ware, or Wachusett subwatershed? ___ Yes _X_ No; if yes, is the project site subject to regulation under the Watershed Protection Act? ___ Yes _X_ No

K. Describe the project's other impacts on land:
The Charles/MGH Station project will involve the transfer of land between the MDC and the MBTA. Legislation has been filed for the transfer of the MDC land. Land transferred to the MDC, adjacent to Charles Circle and Storrow Drive, will be converted to open space. Land utilized by the MDC for “boulevard purposes” will be transferred to the MBTA and converted to new roadway surfaces.

No structures exist on the MDC parcels proposed to be transferred. The project will result in a net increase of paved surface of approximately 6400 square feet.

The MBTA has not fully identified additional land acquisition needs for temporary laydown facilities. If any property were to be acquired, it would be vacant commercial property; no residential property will be acquired and there will be no displacement of business or residences. If it is determined that property is necessary to be acquired, the MBTA will enter into an agreement to compensate the owner for the property at full market value and will provide displacement assistance.

III. Consistency
A. Identify the current municipal comprehensive land use plan and the open space plan and describe the consistency of the project and its impacts with that plan(s):

The proposed station is consistent with: the MBTA’s Key Station Plan, approved by the FTA; the MDC’s Charles River Basin master planning efforts; the Commonwealth of Massachusetts’ Bicycle Access Policy, and the City of Boston’s plans for the reconstruction of Cambridge Street.

B. Identify the current Regional Policy Plan of the applicable Regional Planning Agency and describe the consistency of the project and its impacts with that plan:

The proposed station is consistent with the Metropolitan Planning Organization’s Regional Transportation Plan. The project is included in the FY 2002 Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) for anticipated 2003 construction.

C. Will the project require any approvals under the local zoning by-law or ordinance (i.e. text or map amendment, special permit, or variance)? Yes ___ No ___; if yes, describe:

D. Will the project require local site plan or project impact review? Yes ___ No; if yes, describe:

RARE SPECIES SECTION

I. Thresholds / Permits
A. Will the project meet or exceed any review thresholds related to rare species or habitat (see 301 CMR 11.03(2))? Yes ___ No ___; if yes, specify, in quantitative terms:

B. Does the project require any state permits related to rare species or habitat? Yes ___ No

C. If you answered "No" to both questions A and B, proceed to the Wetlands, Waterways, and Tidelands Section. If you answered "Yes" to either question A or question B, fill out the remainder of the Rare Species section below.

II. Impacts and Permits
A. Does the project site fall within Priority or Estimated Habitat in the current Massachusetts Natural Heritage Atlas (attach relevant page)? Yes ___ No. If yes,
1. Which rare species are known to occur within the Priority or Estimated Habitat (contact: Environmental Review, Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program, Route 135, Westborough, MA 01581, allowing 30 days for receipt of information):

2. Have you surveyed the site for rare species? ___ Yes ___ No; if yes, please include the results of your survey.

3. If your project is within Estimated Habitat, have you filed a Notice of Intent or received an Order of Conditions for this project? ___ Yes ___ No; if yes, did you send a copy of the Notice of Intent to the Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program, in accordance with the Wetlands Protection Act regulations? ___ Yes ___ No

B. Will the project "take" an endangered, threatened, and/or species of special concern in accordance with M.G.L. c.131A (see also 321 CMR 10.04)? ___ Yes ___ No; if yes, describe:

C. Will the project alter "significant habitat" as designated by the Massachusetts Division of Fisheries and Wildlife in accordance with M.G.L. c.131A (see also 321 CMR 10.30)? ___ Yes ___ No; if yes, describe:

D. Describe the project's other impacts on rare species including indirect impacts (for example, stormwater runoff into a wetland known to contain rare species or lighting impacts on rare moth habitat):

There are no rare or endangered species on or in the vicinity of the project site. The Massachusetts Division of Fisheries and Wildlife confirmed that there are no known rare species of plants or animals or ecologically significant communities in the project area (August 2001). The U.S. Department of Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service also confirmed there are no known federally listed threatened or endangered species in the project area (August 2001). Copies of agency responses are included in Attachment C.

WETLANDS, WATERWAYS, AND TIDELANDS SECTION

I. Thresholds / Permits
   A. Will the project meet or exceed any review thresholds related to wetlands, waterways, and tidelands (see 301 CMR 11.03(3))? ___ Yes ___ No; if yes, specify, in quantitative terms:

   B. Does the project require any state permits (or a local Order of Conditions) related to wetlands, waterways, or tidelands? ___ Yes ___ No; if yes, specify which permit:

   C. If you answered "No" to both questions A and B, proceed to the Water Supply Section. If you answered "Yes" to either question A or question B, fill out the remainder of the Wetlands, Waterways, and Tidelands Section below.

II. Wetlands Impacts and Permits
   A. Describe any wetland resource areas currently existing on the project site and indicate them on the site plan:

   B. Estimate the extent and type of impact that the project will have on wetland resources, and indicate whether the impacts are temporary or permanent:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coastal Wetlands</th>
<th>Area (in square feet) or Length (in linear feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Under the Ocean</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated Port Areas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Beaches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Dunes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrier Beaches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Banks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Intertidal Shores</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Marshes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Under Salt Ponds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Containing Shellfish</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish Runs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Subject to Coastal Storm Flowage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Inland Wetlands
Bank
Bordering Vegetated Wetlands
Land under Water
Isolated Land Subject to Flooding
Bordering Land Subject to Flooding
Riverfront Area

C. Is any part of the project
1. a limited project? ___ Yes ___ No
2. the construction or alteration of a dam? ___ Yes ___ No; if yes, describe:
3. fill or structure in a velocity zone or regulatory floodway? ___ Yes ___ No
4. dredging or disposal of dredged material? ___ Yes ___ No; if yes, describe the volume of dredged
   material and the proposed disposal site:
5. a discharge to Outstanding Resource Waters? ___ Yes ___ No
6. subject to a wetlands restriction order? ___ Yes ___ No; if yes, identify the area (in square feet):

D. Does the project require a new or amended Order of Conditions under the Wetlands Protection Act (M.G.L. c.131A)? ___ Yes ___ No; if yes, has a Notice of Intent been filed or a local Order of Conditions issued? ___ Yes ___ No; if yes, list the date and DEP file number: ___________. Was the Order of Conditions appealed? ___ Yes ___ No. Will the project require a variance from the Wetlands regulations? ___ Yes ___ No.

E. Will the project:
1. be subject to a local wetlands ordinance or bylaw? ___ Yes ___ No
2. alter any federally-protected wetlands not regulated under state or local law? ___ Yes ___ No; if yes, what is the area (in s.f.)?

F. Describe the project's other impacts on wetlands (including new shading of wetland areas or removal of tree canopy from forested wetlands):

III. Waterways and Tidelands Impacts and Permits
A. Is any part of the project site waterways or tidelands (including filled former tidelands) that are subject to the Waterways Act, M.G.L.c.91? ___ Yes ___ No; if yes, is there a current Chapter 91 license or permit affecting
   the project site? ___ Yes ___ No; if yes, list the date and number:

B. Does the project require a new or modified license under M.G.L.c.91? ___ Yes ___ No; if yes, how many
   acres of the project site subject to M.G.L.c.91 will be for non-water dependent use?
   Current ___ Change ___ Total ___

C. Is any part of the project
1. a roadway, bridge, or utility line to or on a barrier beach? ___ Yes ___ No; if yes, describe:
2. dredging or disposal of dredged material? ___ Yes ___ No; if yes, volume of dredged material
   _______
3. a solid fill, pile-supported, or bottom-anchored structure in flowed tidelands or other waterways? ___ Yes ___ No; if yes, what is the base area? _______
4. within a Designated Port Area? ___ Yes ___ No

C. Describe the project's other impacts on waterways and tidelands:

IV. Consistency:
A. Is the project located within the Coastal Zone? ___ Yes ___ No; if yes, describe the project's consistency with policies of the Office of Coastal Zone Management:

B. Is the project located within an area subject to a Municipal Harbor Plan? ___ Yes ___ No; if yes, identify the Municipal Harbor Plan and describe the project's consistency with that plan:
WATER SUPPLY SECTION

I. Thresholds / Permits
   A. Will the project meet or exceed any review thresholds related to water supply (see 301 CMR 11.03(4))? ___ Yes   ___ No; if yes, specify, in quantitative terms:

   B. Does the project require any state permits related to water supply? ___ Yes   ___ No; if yes, specify which permit:

   C. If you answered "No" to both questions A and B, proceed to the Wastewater Section. If you answered "Yes" to either question A or question B, fill out the remainder of the Water Supply Section below.

II. Impacts and Permits
   A. Describe, in gallons/day, the volume and source of water use for existing and proposed activities at the project site:

      Withdrawal from groundwater ________ ________ ________
      Withdrawal from surface water ________ ________ ________
      Interbasin transfer ________ ________ ________
      Municipal or regional water supply ________ ________ ________

   B. If the source is a municipal or regional supply, has the municipality or region indicated that there is adequate capacity in the system to accommodate the project? ___ Yes   ___ No

   C. If the project involves a new or expanded withdrawal from a groundwater or surface water source,
      1. have you submitted a permit application? ___ Yes   ___ No; if yes, attach the application
      2. have you conducted a pump test? ___ Yes   ___ No; if yes, attach the pump test report

   D. What is the currently permitted withdrawal at the proposed water supply source (in gallons/day)? ______
      Will the project require an increase in that withdrawal? ___ Yes   ___ No

   E. Does the project site currently contain a water supply well, a drinking water treatment facility, water main, or other water supply facility, or will the project involve construction of a new facility? ___ Yes   ___ No. If yes, describe existing and proposed water supply facilities at the project site:

      Water supply well(s) (capacity, in gpd) ________ ________ ________
      Drinking water treatment plant (capacity, in gpd) ________ ________ ________
      Water mains (length, in miles) ________ ________ ________

   F. If the project involves any interbasin transfer of water, which basins are involved, what is the direction of the transfer, and is the interbasin transfer existing or proposed?

   G. Does the project involve
      1. new water service by a state agency to a municipality or water district? ___ Yes   ___ No
      2. a Watershed Protection Act variance? ___ Yes   ___ No; if yes, how many acres of alteration?
      3. a non-bridged stream crossing 1,000 or less feet upstream of a public surface drinking water supply for purpose of forest harvesting activities? ___ Yes   ___ No

   H. Describe the project's other impacts (including indirect impacts) on water resources, quality, facilities and services:

III. Consistency -- Describe the project's consistency with water conservation plans or other plans to enhance water resources, quality, facilities and services:
WASTEWATER SECTION

I. Thresholds / Permits
A. Will the project meet or exceed any review thresholds related to wastewater (see 301 CMR 11.03(5))? ___ Yes X No; if yes, specify, in quantitative terms:

B. Does the project require any state permits related to wastewater? ___ Yes X No; if yes, specify which permit:

C. If you answered "No" to both questions A and B, proceed to the Transportation -- Traffic Generation Section. If you answered "Yes" to either question A or question B, fill out the remainder of the Wastewater Section below.

II. Impacts and Permits
A. Describe, in gallons/day, the volume and disposal of wastewater generation for existing and proposed activities at the project site (calculate according to 310 CMR 15.00):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discharge to groundwater (Title 5)</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharge to groundwater (non-Title 5)</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharge to outstanding resource water</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discharge to surface water</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal or regional wastewater facility</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A. Is there sufficient capacity in the existing collection system to accommodate the project? ___ Yes ___ No; if no, describe where capacity will be found:

C. Is there sufficient existing capacity at the proposed wastewater disposal facility? ___ Yes ___ No; if no, describe how capacity will be increased:

D. Does the project site currently contain a wastewater treatment facility, sewer main, or other wastewater disposal facility, or will the project involve construction of a new facility? ___ Yes ___ No. If yes, describe as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater treatment plant (capacity, in gpd)</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer mains (length, in miles)</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title 5 systems (capacity, in gpd)</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E. If the project involves any interbasin transfer of wastewater, which basins are involved, what is the direction of the transfer, and is the interbasin transfer existing or proposed?

F. Does the project involve new sewer service by an Agency of the Commonwealth to a municipality or sewer district? ___ Yes ___ No

G. Is there any current or proposed facility at the project site for the storage, treatment, processing, combustion or disposal of sewage sludge, sludge ash, grit, screenings, or other sewage residual materials? ___ Yes ___ No; if yes, what is the capacity (in tons per day):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment, processing</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combustion</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disposal</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

H. Describe the project's other impacts (including indirect impacts) on wastewater generation and treatment facilities:
III. Consistency -- Describe measures that the proponent will take to comply with federal, state, regional, and local plans and policies related to wastewater management:

A. If the project requires a sewer extension permit, is that extension included in a comprehensive wastewater management plan? ___ Yes ___ No; if yes, indicate the EOEA number for the plan and describe the relationship of the project to the plan.

TRANSPORTATION -- TRAFFIC GENERATION SECTION

I. Thresholds / Permits
A. Will the project meet or exceed any review thresholds related to traffic generation (see 301 CMR 11.03(6))? ___ Yes ___ No; if yes, specify, in quantitative terms:

B. Does the project require any state permits related to state-controlled roadways? ___ Yes ___ No; if yes, specify which permit:

C. If you answered “No” to both questions A and B, proceed to the Roadways and Other Transportation Facilities Section. If you answered “Yes” to either question A or question B, fill out the remainder of the Traffic Generation Section below.

II. Traffic Impacts and Permits
A. Describe existing and proposed vehicular traffic generated by activities at the project site:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of parking spaces</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of vehicle trips per day</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ITE Land Use Code(s):

B. What is the estimated average daily traffic on roadways serving the site?

C. Describe how the project will affect transit, pedestrian and bicycle transportation facilities and services:

III. Consistency -- Describe measures that the proponent will take to comply with municipal, regional, state, and federal plans and policies related to traffic, transit, pedestrian and bicycle transportation facilities and services:

ROADWAYS AND OTHER TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES SECTION

I. Thresholds
A. Will the project meet or exceed any review thresholds related to roadways or other transportation facilities (see 301 CMR 11.03(6))? ___ Yes ___ No; if yes, specify, in quantitative terms:

B. Does the project require any state permits related to roadways or other transportation facilities? ___ Yes ___ No; if yes, specify which permit:

C. If you answered "No" to both questions A and B, proceed to the Energy Section. If you answered "Yes" to either question A or question B, fill out the remainder of the Roadways Section below.

II. Transportation Facility Impacts
A. Describe existing and proposed transportation facilities at the project site:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Length (in linear feet) of new or widened roadway</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Width (in feet) of new or widened roadway</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Change</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other transportation facilities:

B. Will the project involve any

1. Alteration of bank or terrain (in linear feet)?

2. Cutting of living public shade trees (number)?
3. Elimination of stone wall (in linear feet)? ______________

III. Consistency -- Describe the project's consistency with other federal, state, regional, and local plans and policies related to traffic, transit, pedestrian and bicycle transportation facilities and services, including consistency with the applicable regional transportation plan and the FY 2002 TIP, the State Bicycle Plan, and the State Pedestrian Plan:

ENERGY SECTION

I. Thresholds / Permits
A. Will the project meet or exceed any review thresholds related to energy (see 301 CMR 11.03(7))? ___ Yes ___ No; if yes, specify, in quantitative terms:

B. Does the project require any state permits related to energy? ___ Yes ___ No; if yes, specify which permit:

C. If you answered "No" to both questions A and B, proceed to the Air Quality Section. If you answered "Yes" to either question A or question B, fill out the remainder of the Energy Section below.

II. Impacts and Permits
A. Describe existing and proposed energy generation and transmission facilities at the project site:

B. If the project involves construction or expansion of an electric generating facility, what are
   1. the facility's current and proposed fuel source(s)?
   2. the facility's current and proposed cooling source(s)?

C. If the project involves construction of an electrical transmission line, will it be located on a new, unused, or abandoned right of way? ___ Yes ___ No; if yes, please describe:

D. Describe the project's other impacts on energy facilities and services:

III. Consistency -- Describe the project's consistency with state, municipal, regional, and federal plans and policies for enhancing energy facilities and services:

AIR QUALITY SECTION

I. Thresholds
A. Will the project meet or exceed any review thresholds related to air quality (see 301 CMR 11.03(8))? ___ Yes ___ No; if yes, specify, in quantitative terms:

B. Does the project require any state permits related to air quality? ___ Yes ___ No; if yes, specify which permit:

C. If you answered "No" to both questions A and B, proceed to the Solid and Hazardous Waste Section. If you answered "Yes" to either question A or question B, fill out the remainder of the Air Quality Section below.

II. Impacts and Permits
A. Does the project involve construction or modification of a major stationary source (see 310 CMR 7.00, Appendix A)? ___ Yes ___ No; if yes, describe existing and proposed emissions (in tons per day) of:

   Particulate matter
   Carbon monoxide

   Existing Change Total

   __________ __________ __________
Sulfur dioxide
Volatile organic compounds
Oxides of nitrogen
Lead
Any hazardous air pollutant
Carbon dioxide

B. Describe the project's other impacts on air resources and air quality, including noise impacts:

III. Consistency
A. Describe the project's consistency with the State Implementation Plan:

B. Describe measures that the proponent will take to comply with other federal, state, regional, and local plans and policies related to air resources and air quality:

SOLID AND HAZARDOUS WASTE SECTION

I. Thresholds / Permits
A. Will the project meet or exceed any review thresholds related to solid or hazardous waste (see 301 CMR 11.03(9))? ___ Yes _X_ No; if yes, specify, in quantitative terms:

B. Does the project require any state permits related to solid and hazardous waste? ___ Yes _X_ No; if yes, specify which permit:

C. If you answered “No” to both questions A and B, proceed to the Historical and Archaeological Resources Section. If you answered “Yes” to either question A or question B, fill out the remainder of the Solid and Hazardous Waste Section below.

II. Impacts and Permits
A. Is there any current or proposed facility at the project site for the storage, treatment, processing, combustion or disposal of solid waste? ___ Yes _X_ No; if yes, what is the volume (in tons per day) of the capacity:

Existing Change Total
Storage ________ ________ ________
Treatment, processing ________ ________ ________
Combustion ________ ________ ________
Disposal ________ ________ ________

B. Is there any current or proposed facility at the project site for the storage, recycling, treatment or disposal of hazardous waste? ___ Yes _X_ No; if yes, what is the volume (in tons or gallons per day) of the capacity:

Existing Change Total
Storage ________ ________ ________
Recycling ________ ________ ________
Treatment ________ ________ ________
Disposal ________ ________ ________

C. If the project will generate solid waste (for example, during demolition or construction), describe alternatives considered for re-use, recycling, and disposal:

D. If the project involves demolition, do any buildings to be demolished contain asbestos? ___ Yes ___ No

E. Describe the project's other solid and hazardous waste impacts (including indirect impacts):

III. Consistency--Describe measures that the proponent will take to comply with the State Solid Waste Master Plan:
I. thresholds / impacts

A. Is any part of the project site a historic structure, or a structure within a historic district, in either case listed in the State Register of Historic Places or the Inventory of Historic and Archaeological Assets of the Commonwealth?  __X__ Yes  ___ No; if yes, does the project involve the demolition of all or any exterior part of such historic structure?  __X__ Yes  ___ No; if yes, please describe:

Charles Street/MGH Station is included in the Inventory of Historic and Archaeological Assets of the Commonwealth and has been determined eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places by the MHC. The station is also within the boundaries of the Charles River Basin Historic District, which is listed in the State and National Registers of Historic Places. The Charles/MGH Station headhouse is proposed to be demolished. The track and viaduct structure will be reused in place. In addition, the original copper-clad platform will be retained and restored, including the copper panels, multi-pane windows, and cast stone column enclosures.

B. Is any part of the project site an archaeological site listed in the State Register of Historic Places or the Inventory of Historic and Archaeological Assets of the Commonwealth?  ___ Yes  __X__ No; if yes, does the project involve the destruction of all or any part of such archaeological site?  ___ Yes  __X__ No; if yes, please describe:

C. If you answered “No” to all parts of both questions A and B, proceed to the Attachments and Certifications Sections. If you answered “Yes” to any part of either question A or question B, fill out the remainder of the Historical and Archaeological Resources Section below.

D. Have you consulted with the Massachusetts Historical Commission?  __X__ Yes  ___ No; if yes, attach correspondence.

Correspondence is included in Attachment D.

E. Describe and assess the project's other impacts, direct and indirect, on listed or inventoried historical and archaeological resources:

The Charles/MGH Station project proposes the demolition of the existing station and the construction of a new station to the east of the station. Reuse of the existing station has been the subject of several studies undertaken by the MBTA including the most recent alternatives analysis. The results of the studies have concluded that reuse of the station is neither prudent nor feasible. This conclusion is based upon the extensive deterioration of the station and the inability to meet the programmatic needs associated with ADA compliance within the existing station.

Demolition of the National Register-eligible station constitutes an adverse effect under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (36 CFR 800) and M.G.L., Chapter 9, Sections 26-27c, as amended by Chapter 254 of the Acts of 1988 (950 CMR 71). The MBTA and FTA have consulted with the MHC and the BLC. The MHC has issued an adverse effect determination, in compliance with state regulations (950 CMR 71.05). A copy of MHC correspondence is included in Attachment D.

II. Consistency -- Describe measures that the proponent will take to comply with federal, state, regional, and local plans and policies related to preserving historical and archaeological resources:

The project proponent will comply with all federal, state, regional, and local regulations and laws pertaining to preserving and minimizing adverse impacts to historical and archaeological resources.

As identified above, the proponent has initiated the consultation process with the MHC and BLC in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (36 CFR 800) and M.G.L. Chapter 9, Sections 26-27c, as amended by Chapter 254 of the Acts of 1988 (950 CMR 71).
The FTA has determined that the demolition of the station constitutes an adverse effect under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended. Efforts proposed by the FTA to minimize or mitigate the adverse effect include: 1) design review by the MHC and BLC of the proposed new construction to ensure the design is compatible with the historic and architectural qualities of the adjacent historic resources; 2) retention of portions of character defining features of the station, including and 3) photographic documentation of the station.

The FTA and MBTA anticipate ongoing review and consultation with the MHC to finalize a plan to mitigate the adverse effect associated with the demolition of the station. The stipulations will be included in a memorandum to be drafted between the FTA and MHC, with the MBTA and BLC signatories as interested parties.

ATTACHMENTS:

A-1 Plan, at an appropriate scale, of existing conditions of the project site and its immediate context, showing all known structures, roadways and parking lots, rail rights-of-way, wetlands and water bodies, wooded areas, farmland, steep slopes, public open spaces, and major utilities.

A-2 Plan of proposed conditions upon completion of project (if construction of the project is proposed to be phased, there should be a site plan showing conditions upon the completion of each phase).

A-3 Original U.S.G.S. map or good quality color copy (8½ x 11 inches or larger) indicating the project location and boundaries

B List of all agencies and persons to whom the proponent circulated the ENF, in accordance with 301 CMR 11.16(2).

C Massachusetts Division of Fisheries and Wildlife and U.S. Department of Interior/Fish and Wildlife Service correspondence.

D Massachusetts Historical Commission correspondence.

CERTIFICATIONS:

1. The Public Notice of Environmental Review has been/will be published in the following newspapers in accordance with 301 CMR 11.15(1):

   Beacon Hill Times

   February 19, 2002

2. This form has been circulated to Agencies and Persons in accordance with 301 CMR 11.16(2).

   Date: 2/15/02
   Signature of Responsible Officer or Proponent: Andrew D. Brennan

   Date: 02/15/02
   Signature of person preparing ENF (if different from above): Maureen A. Cavanaugh

   Name (print or type): Andrew D. Brennan
   Firm/Agency: MBTA
   Street: 10 Park Plaza
   Municipality/State/Zip: Boston, MA 02116
   Phone: 617-222-3126

   Name (print or type): Maureen A. Cavanaugh
   Firm/Agency: Epsilon Associates, Inc.
   Street: 150 Main Street
   Municipality/State/Zip: Maynard, MA 01754
   Phone: 978-897-7100
## ATTACHMENT B - ENVIRONMENTAL NOTIFICATION LIST

### FEDERAL AGENCIES & OFFICIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/Officer</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Attention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Congressman Stephen E. Lynch</td>
<td>State House, Room 424, Boston, MA 0213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
<td>Transportation Systems Center, Kendall Square, 55 Broadway, Suite 920, Cambridge, MA 02142-1093</td>
<td>Donna Laidley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Transit Administration</td>
<td>Transportation Systems Center, Kendall Square, 55 Broadway, Suite 920, Cambridge, MA 02142-1093</td>
<td>Peggy Griffin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of the Interior</td>
<td>Office of Environmental Project Review, Main Interior Building, MS 2340, 1849 C Street, NW, Washington, DC 20240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STATE AGENCIES & OFFICIALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/Officer</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Attention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Representative Paul C. Demakis</td>
<td>Massachusetts State House, Room 443, Boston, MA 0213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senator Robert E. Travaglini</td>
<td>Massachusetts State House, Room 511 B, Boston, MA 0213</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary Robert Durand</td>
<td>Executive Office of Environmental Affairs, 251 Causeway Street, Suite 900, Boston, MA 02114</td>
<td>David Murphy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Office of Environmental Affairs</td>
<td>251 Causeway Street, Suite 900, Boston, MA 02114</td>
<td>Bob O'Connor, Land Policy Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Office of Environmental Affairs</td>
<td>Northeast Regional Office, 205A Lowell Street, Wilmington, MA 01877</td>
<td>MEPA Coordinator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EOEA/Division of Marine Fisheries
50 A Portside Drive
Pocasset, MA 02559
Attn: Environmental Reviewer

Executive Office of Transportation & Construction
10 Park Plaza, Room 3510
Boston, MA 02116-3969
Attn: Environmental Reviewer

Massachusetts Aeronautics Commission
10 Park Plaza, Rm. 6620
Boston, MA 02116-3966
Attn: MEPA Coordinator

Massachusetts Architectural Access Board
One Ashburton Place, Room 1310
Boston, MA 02108
Attn: Deborah Ryan

Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority
Access Advisory Committee
10 Park Plaza
Boston, MA 02216
Attn: Jane Gunion

Massachusetts Highway Department
Public/Private Development Unit
10 Park Plaza
Boston, MA 02116
Attn: MEPA Coordinator

City Agencies & Officials

City of Boston
Mayor’s Office
Boston City Hall
One City Hall Plaza, 5th Floor
Boston, MA 02201
Attn: The Honorable Thomas Menino

Boston City Council
One City Hall Plaza
Boston, MA 02201
Attn: Mr. Michael Flaherty, President
Boston City Council
Boston City Hall
One City Hall Plaza, 5th Floor
Boston, MA 02201
Attn: Councilor Michael Ross

Boston City Council
Boston City Hall
One City Hall Plaza, 5th Floor
Boston, MA 02201
Attn: Councilor Paul Scapicchio

Boston Board of Health
Boston City Hall
One City Hall Plaza
Boston, MA 02201
Attn: Ellen Lipsey, Executive Director

Boston Civic Design Commission
One City Hall Plaza
Boston, MA 02201
Attn: Executive Director

Boston Commission for Persons with Disabilities
Boston City Hall
One City Hall Plaza, Room 966
Boston, MA 02201
Attn: Stephen Spinetto, Commissioner

Boston Conservation Commission
Boston City Hall
One City Hall Plaza
Boston, MA 02201
Attn: Mr. Timothy Famulare

Interested Parties

Beacon Hill Civic Association
74 Joy Street
Boston MA, 02114
Attn: Suzanne Besser, Executive Director

West End Civic Association
8 Whittier Place, #12F
Boston, MA 02114
Attn: Robin Assaf

MGH/Partners Healthcare
55 Fruit Street
Boston, MA 02114
Attn: John Messervy

Massachusetts Eye and Ear Infirmary
243 Charles Street
Boston, MA 02114
Attn: Robert Biggio

Boston Department of Public Works
Boston City Hall
One City Hall Plaza, Room 714
Boston, MA 02201
Attn: Para Jayasinghe, City Engineer

Boston Environment Department
Boston City Hall
One City Hall Plaza, 8th Floor
Boston, MA 02201
Attn: Antonia Pollak

Boston Landmarks Commission
Boston City Hall
One City Hall Plaza, 8th Floor
Boston, MA 02201
Attn: Richard Mertens

Boston Redevelopment Authority
Boston City Hall
One City Hall Plaza, 9th Floor
Boston, MA 02201
Attn: Ralph DiNesco

Boston Transportation Department
Boston City Hall
One City Hall Plaza, 7th Floor
Boston, MA 02201
Attn: Ralph DiNesco
Maureen Cavanaugh
Epsilon Associates, Inc.
150 Main Street, P.O. Box 700
Maynard, MA 01754-0700

Re: MBTA Charles/MGH Red Line Modernization and Expansion
   Boston, MA
   NHESP File: 01-9237

Dear Ms. Cavanaugh,

Thank you for contacting the Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program for information regarding state-protected rare species in the vicinity of the site identified above.

At this time we are not aware of any rare plants or animals or exemplary natural communities in the area of this site.

This review concerns only rare species of plants and animals and ecologically significant natural communities for which the Program maintains site-specific records. This review does not rule out the possibility that more common wildlife or vegetation might be adversely affected if this site is developed, especially if it will modify currently undeveloped areas. Should site plans change, or new rare species information become available, this evaluation may be reconsidered.

Please call me at (508)792-7270 x.154 if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Christine Vaccaro
Environmental Review Assistant
RE: MBTA Charles/MGH Red Line Modernization and Expansion Boston, MA

August 22, 2001

Maureen Cavanaugh
Epsilon Associates, Inc.
150 Main Street
P.O. Box 700
Maynard, MA 01754-0700

Dear Ms. Cavanaugh:

This responds to your July 19, 2001 letter requesting information on the presence of federally-listed and proposed, endangered or threatened species in relation to the proposed modernization and expansion of the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority’s Red Line Station at Charles/MGH in Boston, Massachusetts. Our comments are provided in accordance with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531-1543).

Based on information currently available to us, no federally-listed or proposed threatened or endangered species under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service are known to occur in the project area. Preparation of a Biological Assessment or further consultation with us under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act is not required. Should project plans change, or additional information on listed or proposed species becomes available, this determination may be reconsidered.

Thank you for your cooperation. Please contact me at 603-223-2541 if we can be of further assistance.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Michael Amaral
Endangered Species Specialist
New England Field Office
Attachment D - Massachusetts Historical Commission Correspondence
January 10, 2002

Cara Metz  
Executive Director  
Massachusetts Historical Commission  
220 Morrissey Boulevard  
Boston, MA 02125

Subject: MBTA Charles/MGH Red Line Station, Boston, MA  
MHC No. 25608

Dear Ms. Metz:

The Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA), in cooperation with the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), has consulted with the Massachusetts Historical Commission regarding the proposed improvements to the Charles/MGH Red Line MBTA Station. The purpose of the project is to make the station compliant with the American with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA); to accomplish safe, barrier-free pedestrian access to the station and platforms; and to modernize the station to be customer friendly, operate optimally, portray an appropriate image as a gateway to Cambridge/Boston, and consider future development of nearby institutions.

The Charles/MGH Station is included in the Massachusetts Historical Commission’s (MHC) Inventory of Historic and Archaeological Assets of the Commonwealth. In addition, the MHC has determined that the property is a contributing property to the Charles River Basin Historic District, a property listed in the National Register of Historic Places. The Charles/MGH Station project proposes the demolition of the existing station and the construction of a new station to the east of the current facility. The existing track, viaduct structure, and original copper clad platform enclosures will be retained and restored.

The MHC has previously reviewed the project under M.G.L. Chapter 9, Sec. 26-27C, as amended by Chapter 254 of the Acts of 1988 (950 CMR 71.00) and determined that the demolition of the station headhouse would have an “adverse effect” on the National Register-eligible property (950 CMR 71.05). In addition, the FTA has previously determined that the proposed undertaking constitutes an adverse effect under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Enclosed is a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for the project, to be executed between the MHC and the FTA with the MBTA and BLC as concurring parties. This MOA will be executed upon completion of the MEPA/NEPA review process. The MOA outlines stipulations to minimize or mitigate adverse project effects. The MBTA proposes to document the station and to continue to consult with the MHC and BLC to ensure the design of the new station is compatible with the historic and architectural qualities of the adjacent historic resources. If the terms of the MOA are acceptable to the MHC. Please indicate to us by
a letter that we can make part our MEPA/NEPA filing, and that the public will be able to review and comment on during our public environmental review.

The proposed project is under a tight schedule to meet its federally mandated December 2003 completion date. Anything you can do to expedite review of the enclosed MOA is greatly appreciated. If you have any questions or comments, please do not hesitate to contact me at 617-222-3126.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Andrew Brennan
Director of Environmental Affairs

Encl.

Cc: Taya Dixon, MHC
    Peter Butler, FTA
    Barbara Boylan, MBTA
    Ellen Lipsey, BLC
December 7, 2001

Richard H. Doyle
Regional Administrator
Federal Transit Administration
Volpe Center
55 Broadway, Suite 920
Cambridge, MA 02142

Re: MBTA Charles/ MGH Red Line Station, Boston, MA, MHC #25608

Dear Mr. Doyle:

Staff of the Massachusetts Historical Commission has reviewed the information you submitted, received November 7, 2001, concerning the proposed project referenced above.

The MBTA Charles Street/ MGH Red Line Station, a property included in MHC’s Inventory of Historic and Archaeological Assets of the Commonwealth, falls within the boundaries of the Charles River Basin Historic District (NR 1978), as part of the station connected with the span and approach to the contributing Longfellow Bridge. The MHC concurred, on March 15, 2000, with the Boston Landmarks Commission that the station would be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places under criteria A and C as a contributing element to the Charles River Basin Historic District if the period of significance were extended, as one of the areas of significance for the nomination is Transportation. Additionally, it is the opinion of the MHC that the station is also individually eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places under criterion A for its associations with the area’s surrounding neighborhood and institutions including the Charles Street Jail and the Massachusetts General Hospital, and its integral association with the Longfellow Bridge, and under criterion C as the only remaining and relatively well-preserved Art Deco above-ground transit station on the MBTA system.

The proposed project consists of the demolition of the existing historic station head house and construction of a new at-grade station on an enlarged Cambridge Street island to allow the station to become compliant with the American with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA).

The MHC concurs with your determination that as currently proposed, the project would have an “adverse effect” on the historic resources listed above (36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)(v) and 950 CMR 71.05(a)). In accordance with 36 CFR 800.6 and 950 CMR 71.07(3), MHC shall consult with FTA and other interested parties to seek ways to avoid, reduce, or mitigate the anticipated adverse effect. Please contact Taya Dixon to arrange for consultation and if you have any questions.

These comments are provided to assist in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (36 CFR 800) and M.G.L., Chapter 9, Sec. 26-27C, as amended by Chapter 254 of the Acts of 1988 (950 CMR 71.00).

Sincerely,

Brona Simon
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer
Massachusetts Historical Commission

xc: Peggy Foley, Federal Transit Administration
Diana Parcon, MBTA
Ellen Lipsey, Boston Landmarks Commission
Jay Wickersham, Executive Office of Environmental Affairs, MEPA Unit
David Balfour, Metropolitan District Commission

220 Morrissey Boulevard, Boston, Massachusetts 02125
(617) 727-8470 • Fax: (617) 727-5128
www.state.ma.us/sec/mhc
Ms. Brona Simon  
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer  
Massachusetts Historical Commission  
220 Morrissey Boulevard  
Boston, Massachusetts 02125

Re: Charles/MGH Red Line Station – Determination of Adverse Effect

Dear Ms. Simon:

The Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) is proposing to utilize Federal Transit Administration (FTA) financial assistance to improve the Charles/MGH Red Line Station. The purpose of the project is to make the station compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA). The proposed project consists of the construction of a new at-grade station on an enlarged Cambridge Street island. This project also involves the demolition of the existing historic station head house.

The Charles/MGH Station is included in the Massachusetts Historical Commission’s (MHC) Inventory of Historic and Archaeological Assets of the Commonwealth and is located within the boundaries of the Charles River Basin Historic District. The MHC and the Boston Landmarks Commission (BLC) concur that the station would be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places under criteria A and C as a contributing element to the Charles River Basin Historic District, if the period of significance were extended. In addition, the MHC considers the station individually eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Based on the above, the FTA has determined that this project will have an adverse effect on the National Register eligible property under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Pursuant to 36 CFR 800.2(c) we are therefore requesting your consultation, along with the BLC, the Metropolitan District Commission (MDC) and the MBTA in the preparation of a Memorandum Of Agreement (MOA). This MOA will include terms to avoid, minimize or mitigate the adverse effects of the proposed project.
Ms. Simon
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By copy of this letter we are notifying the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) of our finding of adverse effect and are inviting them to participate in the consultation process in accordance with 36 CFR 800.6(a)(1).

We look forward to working with you on this project. If you have any questions, please contact Donna Laidley (617) 494-2484.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Richard H. Doyle
Regional Administrator

Cc: A. Brennan, MBTA
    D. Parcon, MBTA
    J. Fowler, ACHP
    D. Balfour, MDC
    E. Lipsey, BLC
November 29, 2000

Barbara J. Boylan
Deputy Director of Design
Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority
Ten Park Plaza
Boston, MA 02116-3974

Re: Charles Street/MGH Red Line Station, Boston (Beacon Hill), MA, MHC #25608

Dear Ms. Boylan,

Staff of the Massachusetts Historical Commission has reviewed the information you submitted, received October 31, 2000, concerning the proposed project referenced above.

The MBTA Charles Street/MGH Red Line Station, a property included in MHC’s *Inventory of Historic and Archaeological Assets of the Commonwealth*, falls within the boundaries of the Charles River Basin Historic District (NR 1978), as part of the station connected with the span and approach to the contributing Longfellow Bridge. The MHC concurred, on March 15, 2000, with the Boston Landmarks Commission, a certified local government, that the station would be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places under criteria A and C as a contributing element to the Charles River Basin Historic District if the period of significance were extended, as one of the areas of significance for the nomination is Transportation. Additionally, it is the opinion of the MHC that the station is also individually eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places under criterion A for its associations with the area’s surrounding neighborhood and institutions including the Charles Street Jail and the Massachusetts General Hospital, and its integral association with the Longfellow Bridge, and under criterion C as the only remaining and relatively well-preserved Art Deco above-ground transit station on the MBTA system.

The MHC has reviewed the detailed design summary report that thoroughly addressed multiple alternatives to meet the MBTA’s goals for safety, accessibility, and future development. It is the understanding of the MHC that the proposed project, “preferred option B2.0,” consists of the construction of a new station at an enlarged Cambridge Street island with at-grade crossing. It is also the understanding of the MHC that the proposed project includes the reconstruction of the existing roadway system that will require the demolition of the existing historic station.

The MHC has determined that as currently proposed, the project would have an “adverse effect” on the National Register eligible property listed above through the destruction of a significant historic property (950 CMR 71.05). In accordance with 950 CMR 71.07(3), MHC requests the opportunity to consult with the project proponent to seek ways to avoid, reduce, or mitigate the anticipated adverse effect.

You should be aware that the demolition of a property included in the MHC’s *Inventory of Historic and Archaeological Assets of the Commonwealth* will require filing an Environmental Notification Form with the Executive Office of Environmental Affairs under the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (301 CMR 11.03(10)).

220 Morrissey Boulevard, Boston, Massachusetts 02125 • (617) 727-8470
Fax: (617) 727-5128 • TTY: (617) 878-3889
www.state.ma.us/sec/mhc
These comments are provided to assist in compliance with M.G.L., Chapter 9, Sec. 26-27C, as amended by Chapter 254 of the Acts of 1988 (950 CMR 71.00) and MEPA. Please contact Taya Dixon, Preservation Planner, at this office to arrange for consultation.

Sincerely,

Judith B. McDonough
Executive Director
State Historic Preservation Officer
Massachusetts Historical Commission

xc: Boston Landmarks Commission
    Jay Wickersham, Executive Office of Environmental Affairs, MEPA Unit
March 27, 2000

Karen Andrews Parker
Cultural Resources Planner
Epsilon Associates Inc
PO Box 700
Maynard, MA 01754-0700

Re: MBTA Charles Street/MGH Red Line Station, Boston, MA, MHC #25608

Dear Ms. Parker,

Staff of the Massachusetts Historical Commission has reviewed the information you submitted, received February 28, 2000, concerning the property referenced above. After review of MHC files and the materials submitted, MHC staff has the following comments.

The MBTA Charles Street/MGH Red Line Station falls within the boundaries of the Charles River Basin Historic District (NR 1978), as part of the station is connected with the span and approach to the contributing Longfellow Bridge. The MHC concurs with the Boston Landmarks Commission, a certified local government, that the station would be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places under criteria A and C as a contributing element to the Charles River Basin Historic District if the period of significance were extended, as one of the areas of significance for the nomination is Transportation. Additionally, it is the opinion of the MHC that the station is also individually eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places under criterion A for its associations with the area's surrounding neighborhood and institutions including the Charles Street Jail and the Massachusetts General Hospital, and its integral association with the Longfellow Bridge, and under criterion C as the only remaining and relatively well-preserved Art Deco above-ground transit station on the MBTA system.

These comments are provided to assist in compliance M.G.L., Chapter 9, Sec. 26-27c, as amended by Chapter 254 of the Acts of 1988 (950 CMR 71.00). Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Taya Dixon
Preservation Planner
Massachusetts Historical Commission

xc: Jennifer Goold, Boston Landmarks Commission