



DEVAL L. PATRICK
GOVERNOR
TIMOTHY P. MURRAY
LT. GOVERNOR
JEFFREY B. MULLAN
SECRETARY & CEO



November 9, 2009

Since the release of the Draft Environmental Impact Report/Environmental Assessment (DEIR/EA) and Draft Section 4(f) Statement for the Green Line Extension project (filed on October 15, 2009 with the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act), the Massachusetts Department of Transportation has identified some minor errors within the document. Minor refinements and corrections have been made (described below) to ensure accuracy. None of these changes constitute a substantial change to the DEIR/EA.

A version of this errata sheet on the DEIR/EA text has been posted to the project website. Please continue to monitor the website for updates to this sheet at: <http://www.greenlineextension.org/> (see "Reference Materials/Current")

We apologize for any inconvenience or confusion. As always, please do not hesitate to contact Katherine Fichter, Project Manager for the Green Line Extension, at (617) 973-7342 and katherine.fichter@state.ma.us with any questions.

Corrections to the DEIR/EA

The following list identifies corrections made in the DEIR/EA, and provides other clarifying text. Information that is to be deleted is ~~crossed out~~ and information that is to be replaced or added is underlined.

1. **Page ES-32, Paragraph 4, Line 7, Executive Summary: *Land Use, Social, and Economic Resources***

Tax losses would be ~~primarily in Medford (\$205,935) with a small amount (\$6,527) in Somerville~~ \$205,935 in Somerville, \$15,777 in Medford, and \$6,527 in Cambridge for the Proposed Project.

2. **Page ES-39, Paragraph 2, Line 1, Executive Summary: *Noise***

The Proposed Project would expose ~~445~~ 161 residential buildings to moderate (~~445~~ 120) or severe (~~30~~ 41) noise levels, and would expose three institutional buildings (Science and Technology Center, Outside the Line Artist's Studio, and Bacon Hall at Tufts University) to moderate noise levels and one severe institutional impact (the Walnut Street Center, a non-profit support center for adults with developmental disabilities near Union Square).

The Future Full-Build Alternative extension to Mystic Valley Parkway/Route 16 would add ~~55~~ 50 moderate and ~~35~~ 24 severe residential impacts.

3. Page 5-15, Paragraph 2, Line 1, Section 5.3: Socioeconomic Impacts

This alternative has the largest effect on property taxes out of all the Build Alternatives, with more than double the property tax impact of Alternative 1, primarily due to impacts in both Somerville and Medford.

4. Page 5-19, Table 5.3-7

Table 5.3-7 Property Taxes of Real Estate Acquired For Each Alternative

Alternative	Residences		All Other Buildings		Tax Value of Other Land	Total
	#	Tax Value	#	Tax Value		
Alternative 1	0	\$0	6	\$44,074	\$184,165	\$228,239
Alternative 2	0	\$0	9	\$310,302	\$187,545	\$497,847
Alternative 3	2	\$7,835	8	\$58,563 <u>\$50,728</u>	\$246,523	\$305,086
Alternative 4	2	\$7,835	11	\$324,791 <u>\$316,956</u>	\$249,903	\$574,694
Alternative 5	0	\$0	6	\$288,417	\$178,645	\$467,062
Alternative 6	0	\$0	3	\$21,885	\$120,861	\$142,746

5. Page 5-26, Paragraph 3, Line 1, Section 5.4: Environmental Justice

Under Alternative 1 with no mitigation, ~~146~~ 165 sensitive receptors would have moderate to severe noise impacts, including 84 buildings in environmental justice areas. Therefore, approximately ~~57.5~~ 50.9 percent of the noise impacts to sensitive receptors would be in environmental justice areas.

6. Page 5-28, Paragraph 1, Line 1, Section 5.4: Environmental Justice

Under Alternative 2 with no mitigation, ~~236~~ 239 sensitive receptors would have moderate to severe noise impacts, including 93 buildings in environmental justice areas. Therefore, approximately ~~39.4~~ 38.9 percent of the noise impacts to sensitive receptors would be in environmental justice areas.

7. Page 5-29, Paragraph 3, Line 1, Section 5.4: Environmental Justice

Under Alternative 3 with no mitigation, ~~155~~ 174 sensitive receptors would have moderate to severe noise impacts, including 93 buildings in environmental justice areas. Therefore, approximately ~~60.0~~ 53.4 percent of the noise impacts to sensitive receptors would be in environmental justice areas.

8. Page 5-31, Paragraph 2, Line 1, Section 5.4: Environmental Justice

Under Alternative 4 with no mitigation, ~~245~~ 248 sensitive receptors would have moderate to severe noise impacts, including 102 buildings in environmental justice areas. Therefore,

approximately ~~41.6~~ 41.1 percent of the noise impacts to sensitive receptors would be in environmental justice areas.

9. **Page 5-32, Paragraph 2, Line 1, Section 5.4: *Environmental Justice***

Under Alternative 5 with no mitigation, ~~282~~ 285 sensitive receptors would have moderate to severe noise impacts, including 105 buildings in environmental justice areas. Therefore, approximately ~~37.2~~ 36.8 percent of the noise impacts to sensitive receptors would be in environmental justice areas.

10. **Page 5-155, Paragraph 5, Line 1, Section 5.13: *Historic and Archaeological Resources***

Alternative 2 contains ~~four~~ three archaeologically sensitive areas. ~~Three~~ One of these are related to a buried-over section of the historic Middlesex Canal (SMV-HA-1) crossing under the MBTA Lowell Line via a stone arch bridge. ... The ~~fourth~~ second sensitive area is the area of 24 Joy Street and 30 Joy Street identified for Alternative 1.

11. **Page 6-7, Paragraph 2, Line 1, Section 6.5: *Proposed Section 61 Findings***

Five commercial buildings would be purchased and demolished for the Proposed Project that are located within environmental justice area.

12. **Page 6-7, Paragraph 3, Line 2, Section 6.5: *Proposed Section 61 Findings***

Approximately ~~58~~ 51 percent of the noise impacts would be in environmental justice areas.

13. **Page 6-8, Paragraph 4, Line 1, Section 6.5: *Proposed Section 61 Findings***

A total of ~~161~~ 165 noise-sensitive receptors would be exposed to noise impact in the absence of mitigation for the Proposed Project.