



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Executive Office of Environmental Affairs

100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900

Boston, MA 02114-2524

MITT ROMNEY
GOVERNOR

KERRY HEALEY
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

STEPHEN R. PRITCHARD
SECRETARY

Tel. (617) 626-1000
Fax. (617) 626-1181
<http://www.mass.gov/envir>

February 10, 2006

CERTIFICATE OF THE SECRETARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS ON THE ENVIRONMENTAL NOTIFICATION FORM

PROJECT NAME : MVP Sports Stores Inc. d/b/a Decathlon USA
PROJECT MUNICIPALITY : Woburn
PROJECT WATERSHED : Aberjona Watershed
EOEA NUMBER : 13694
PROJECT PROPONENT : Decathlon USA
DATE NOTICED IN MONITOR : January 11, 2006

Pursuant to the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (M.G.L. c. 30, ss. 61-62H) and Sections 11.04 and 11.06 of the MEPA regulations (301 C.M.R. 11.00), I hereby determine that this project **requires** the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

According to the Environmental Notification Form (ENF) the proposed project includes demolition of the existing manufacturing and warehouse buildings on site to accommodate the construction of 96,000 square feet of retail, office, and storage space on a 12.37-acre site in Woburn. The project also includes a parking area containing 500 spaces, landscaping, utilities and recreational areas. The site was formerly used for manufacturing by W.R. Grace and is part of the Superfund cleanup of City Wells G & H. As a result of the cleanup, groundwater remediation will be ongoing long-term on site.

The project is undergoing review and requires the preparation of a mandatory EIR pursuant to Section 11.03 (6)(a)(6) of the MEPA regulations, because during the course of the ENF review it has been determined that the project will generate more than 3,000 new vehicle trips per day and requires a state permit. The project requires a Highway Access Permit from the Massachusetts Highway Department (MHD)

Because the proponent is not seeking financial assistance from the Commonwealth for the project, MEPA jurisdiction extends to those aspects of the project that are within the subject matter of required permits and that may cause significant Damage to the Environment. In this

case, MEPA jurisdiction exists over transportation and traffic issues.

In general, the ENF has resolved most of the environmental issues associated with the project, and has demonstrated that the project design generally minimizes impacts. The project will provide an attractive redevelopment of a Superfund site. However, there are still some outstanding issues that must be resolved particularly in the area of traffic, stormwater and recycling. The following scope is quite narrow, focused primarily on providing additional technical and narrative data to respond to comments, rather than requiring any substantial redesign of the project.

SCOPE

As modified by this scope, the EIR should conform to the general guidance for outline and content contained in section 11.07 of the MEPA regulations. The proponent should circulate the EIR to those who commented on the ENF.

General

The proponent should prepare the EIR in accordance with Section 11.07 of the MEPA regulations as modified by this Certificate. The EIR should contain a copy of this Certificate and a copy of each individual comment letter received. The proponent should circulate the EIR to those parties submitting individual written comments on the ENF; to any state agencies from which the proponent will seek permits or approvals; and to any parties required by regulation. The EIR should respond to the comments received, presenting new analysis where necessary to respond to the comments.

Project Permitting and Regulatory Compliance

The EIR should include a brief description of each state permit or state agency action required for the project. The EIR should demonstrate that the project design would meet any applicable performance standards. The EIR should also discuss the consistency of project design with any applicable state policies. The EIR should describe the local permitting process, and fully explain any design implications or constraints imposed by local requirements.

Comments

The EIR should address the substantive issues raised in the comment letters received and listed at the end of this Certificate. The EIR should present all the necessary additional technical analysis or narrative as necessary to respond to the comments received. The EIR should include a copy of each comment received. The proponent should circulate the EIR to those parties submitting written comments on the ENF.

Mitigation

The EIR should contain a summary of all mitigations measures to which the proponent has committed. Proposed Section 61 Findings for all state agency actions should also be provided.

February 10, 2006

Date


Stephen R. Pritchard

Comments received:

12/26/06	Massachusetts Water Resources Authority
01/30/06	City of Woburn Planning Board
01/30/06	Paul & Lori Medeiros
01/31/06	Office of Transportation Planning, Massachusetts Highway Department
01/31/06	Department of Environmental Protection, NERO
01/31/06	Michael Pascavage, Chairman Cummings Properties, LLC
02/06/06	Stephen Spanos, 1 st Comment Letter
02/07/06	Stephen Spanos, 2nd Comment Letter

SRP/ACC/acc