



# *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>

August 16, 2006

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

PROJECT NAME : Stoneham Crossing Retail and Office Redevelopment Project  
PROJECT MUNICIPALITY : Stoneham  
PROJECT WATERSHED : Boston Harbor (Mystic)  
EOEA NUMBER : 13836  
PROJECT PROPONENT : 225 Fallon Road Realty LLC (c/o The Richmond Company, Inc.)  
DATE NOTICED IN MONITOR : July 10, 2006

Pursuant to the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (G. L. c. 30, ss. 61-62H) and Section 11.03 of the MEPA regulations (301 CMR 11.00), I hereby determine that this project **requires** the preparation of a mandatory Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

As described in the Expanded Environmental Notification Form (EENF), the project includes the demolition of the existing 65,610 square foot (sf) commercial office headquarters complex and the redevelopment of the property through the construction of a 133,000 sf home improvement center (including a 28,000 sf garden center), expected to be occupied by a Home Depot, and a 15,000 sf, 3-story office building (5,000 sf footprint). The project site is approximately 16.2 acres in area located on the north side of Fallon Road, immediately west of the terminus of the southbound exit ramp of Exit 35, off Interstate 93 (I-93) in Stoneham. The western boundary of the project site also comprises the municipal boundary between the Towns of Stoneham and Winchester. Adjacent uses include other industrial/commercial uses along Fallon Road, Interstate 93, and residential uses within the Town of Winchester to the west of the project site. The site is proximate to the northern section of the Middlesex Fells Reservation owned and operated by the Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR). Roadways within the project vicinity are maintained by several entities including the Massachusetts Highway Department (MHD), DCR, and the Town of Stoneham. The project will result in the

creation of 4.9 acres of additional impervious area (for a total of 10.8 acres), and 312 new parking spaces (for a total of 534). The project will include the modification/expansion of a primary access driveway and secondary driveway, relocated utilities, construction of retaining walls and site grading and the filling of 4,910 sf of Bordering Vegetated Wetlands (BVWs).

Post-construction storm water runoff rates and volumes will be controlled through the proposed stormwater management facilities, with the use of Best Management Practices (BMPs) that comply with DEP standards. Sediment and erosion control measures will be implemented to manage stormwater runoff and minimize erosion during construction. The proponent has identified preliminary mitigation measures to alleviate traffic impacts due to an anticipated increase in traffic trips associated with the project, including the creation of dedicated turn lanes, intersection realignment, and traffic signals, along with the implementation of Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures.

This project is subject to a mandatory EIR pursuant to Sections 11.03(6)(a)(6) of the MEPA regulations because it will generate 3,000 or more new vehicle trips. An indirect State Highway Access Permit from MHD will be required because the project abuts Interstate 93. The project will also require a highway access permit from DCR for improvements and use of DCR jurisdictional roadways. It must comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency for stormwater discharges from a construction site of over one acre. The project will require an Order of Conditions from the Stoneham Conservation Commission (or a Superseding Order of Conditions from the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) if the local Order is appealed) for work within wetland resource areas. The project will likely require an 8(m) permit from the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority (MWRA). Additional wetland-related permits may be necessary from DEP (most notably a Section 401 Water Quality Certificate) or the Army Corps of Engineers based upon final design. The project will require a Special Permit/Site Plan Review from the Stoneham Planning Board.

Because the proponent is not seeking financial assistance from the Commonwealth for the project, MEPA jurisdiction extends to those aspects of the project that may have significant environmental impacts and that are within the subject matter of required or potentially required state permits. In this case, MEPA jurisdiction exists over traffic/transportation, wetlands, and stormwater management.

#### Request for Single EIR

In accordance with Section 11.05(7) of the MEPA regulations, the proponent has submitted an Expanded ENF with a request that I allow the proponent to fulfill its EIR obligations under MEPA with a Single EIR, rather than require the usual two-step Draft and Final EIR process. The Expanded ENF received an extended public comment period pursuant to

Section 11.06(1) of the MEPA regulations. I have reviewed the proponent's request for a Single EIR in accordance with Section 11.06(8) of the MEPA regulations, and I find that the proponent has not met the criteria to allow the granting of a Single EIR review process. While the proponent has generally provided baseline data from which to measure potential environmental impacts and mitigation opportunities, the absence of a thorough alternatives analysis within the Expanded ENF does not afford me the opportunity to evaluate that all feasible means to avoid potential environmental impacts have been identified and discussed.

Therefore, the proponent must prepare a Draft and a Final EIR in fulfillment of the requirements of Section 11.03 of the MEPA regulations.

### **SCOPE**

#### General

The EIR should follow the general guidance for outline and content contained in section 11.07 of the MEPA regulations, as modified by this Certificate.

#### Project Description and Permitting

The EIR should include a detailed description of the proposed project, including as much information as possible on lighting, grading, landscaping, and buffers between the site and adjacent uses. The EIR should also include existing and proposed grading plans. The EIR should identify and describe any project phasing. The EIR should characterize adjacent uses (commercial and residential) and their relationship to the proposed project.

The EIR should briefly describe each state permit required for the project, and should demonstrate that the project meets any applicable performance standards.

#### Alternatives

The EIR should analyze the following alternatives:

- No-Build Alternative;
- Preferred Alternative as proposed by the proponent; and
- A Reduced Impact Alternative, incorporating a reduction in impervious surfaces and utilization of low-impact design development techniques to reduce stormwater runoff and eliminate or substantially reduce wetland impacts.

The proponent should also consider alternative site configurations, if feasible, that may reduce overall site impacts through the relocation of buildings, loading areas or site driveways. If alternative site configurations are not feasible, the proponent should

explain why.

The EIR should identify the impacts for each of the alternatives, on land alteration (impervious area), traffic, parking, drainage, and wetlands in a tabular format. This table, along with a supporting narrative, should provide a comparative analysis that clearly shows the differences between the environmental impacts associated with each of the alternatives. The proponent should provide information regarding project economics that will help inform any determination of which alternatives are truly feasible. Additional alternatives regarding location and layout of intersection improvements are identified later within this Certificate.

The EIR should identify and explain any project phasing, including potential impacts on construction sequencing and traffic patterns. It should discuss how this project is compatible with Executive Order 385 – Planning for Growth, by discussing its consistency with local land use plans (not local zoning) and any applicable regional plans.

#### Land Alteration

The EIR should provide clear summaries of existing and proposed changes on site with regard to impervious areas, altered areas and undeveloped areas. Inconsistencies within the Expanded ENF associated with changes to land should be resolved and clarified.

The project, as currently designed, results in impervious coverage over much of the site. For each alternative, the EIR should quantify the amount of land altered, the amount of earth work involved in meeting final grades, anticipated locations and heights of retaining walls, and the amount of impervious surfaces created. The EIR should identify areas of rock outcroppings or bedrock that will be blasted to accommodate the development project. The EIR should investigate all feasible methods of avoiding, reducing, or minimizing impacts to land. The EIR should include elevations and cross-sections of the proposed berm and fence buffer area to be created along the western property line, along with the relationship of abutting properties to the berm and proposed retail building. The EIR should include plans that clearly depict areas anticipated to be cleared of vegetation in association with site development.

#### Traffic and Transportation

The proposed project is anticipated to generate 3,260 new vehicle trips on an average weekday and will require an Indirect State Highway Access Permit. Permits related to traffic mitigation on parkways will be required from DCR. Project area roadways are controlled by multiple jurisdictions, including MHD, DCR, and the Town of Stoneham. MHD has outlined within their comment letter a generally limited scope of information to be provided within the EIR. Other State agencies (notably DCR and the Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC)) and individuals have expressed concern with regards to the potential traffic and transportation

related impacts associated with the proposed project. The EIR should strive to address these concerns as summarized below as a means to identify and confirm that measures have been taken to avoid, minimize and mitigate damage to the environment. The EIR should discuss, and provide supporting documentation, each traffic-related comment, particularly those submitted by Abend Associates, within the Response to Comments section of the EIR. Additional information provided in the EIR should conform to the EOEA/EOT Guidelines for Traffic Impact Assessment.

The EIR should discuss the proponent's coordination efforts with MHD, DCR and municipalities to address regional and local traffic concerns within this area. The EIR should clearly identify which entities maintain jurisdiction of roadways within the project vicinity and their relationship to proposed traffic mitigation areas.

The EIR should present additional information beyond that provided in the EENF regarding existing and proposed traffic conditions within the project area during the weekday morning peak hour. The nature of the proposed use may create substantial weekday morning peak hour traffic that should be assessed to determine if additional mitigation measures may be necessary. Data from actual Home Depots or similar home improvement stores located in comparable Massachusetts retail markets should be incorporated within the traffic analysis for comparative purposes, with a methodology and sample size clearly stated regarding the origin of trip generation rates. Information regarding impacts to traffic volume, peak periods, queue length and traffic signalization should be addressed based upon modified or additional traffic data presented in the EIR.

The Interstate 93 Exit 35 interchange at Fallon Road is not a full access interchange. Traffic cannot access the project site from I-93 northbound, nor can traffic access I-93 southbound from the project site. A portion of the traffic will utilize Exit 34, accessed via Route 28 within the Middlesex Fells, to reach the project site or depart from the project site to I-93. I request that impacts to traffic at the I-93/Route 28 interchange (exit 34) be examined within the EIR to confirm that additional mitigation measures will not be required as a direct result of this project.

### *Traffic Mitigation Measures*

The EIR should include conceptual plans for the proposed roadway improvements that should be sufficient detail to verify feasibility of constructing such improvements. The conceptual plans should clearly show proposed lanes widths and offsets, layout lines and jurisdictions, and the land uses (including access drives) adjacent to areas where improvements are proposed. Environmental impacts associated with each improvement location should be identified and quantified within the EIR (i.e. stormwater, wetlands, etc.). The EIR should identify how each roadway improvement is consistent with applicable design and performance

standards based upon roadway jurisdiction. The EIR should discuss the right-of-way (ROW) implications of widening and describe how such ROWs would be acquired, if applicable. The EIR should provide the most current information on the construction schedule for any roadway improvements in the area.

The EIR should identify appropriate mitigation measures for areas where the project will produce impacts on local and regional traffic operations, especially where delay and queue length increases at intersections. The proponent should provide a clear commitment to implement mitigation measures and should describe the timing of their implementation based on the phases of the project, if any. The EIR should outline commitments or the status of negotiations with town and State officials regarding a definition of fair share or the cost of roadway improvements proposed at the following intersections: the Route 28/North Border Road/South Street, the Route 28/Marble Street/Summer Street intersection, and the Park Street/Forest Street/Marble Street intersection.

The proposed traffic mitigation includes signalization for the Fallon Road/Park Street/I-93 northbound on-ramp and realignment of a section of North Border Road/Park Street. DCR has identified the section of North Border Road/Park Street, between Marble Street and continuing south of Fallon Road, as a part of the DCR parkway system. The proposed improvements affecting North Border Road/Park Street will require a DCR Construction and Engineering Permit. The proponent must consult with DCR with regards to this proposed mitigation measure to ensure that mitigation efforts presented in the EIR are viable from a legal, planning and operation perspective.

The proponent should coordinate with the Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program to verify that areas of proposed traffic improvements are not located within areas regulated under the Massachusetts Endangered Species Act.

#### *Truck Traffic*

The EIR should discuss measures that can be taken to restrict truck deliveries during peak hours to minimize traffic impacts on the project area and during early or later business hours to limit noise impacts to abutting properties. The proponent should indicate steps to be implemented to reduce idling of trucks on the project site. The EIR should identify existing truck route restrictions within the project area and identify primary routes of truck traffic trips to and from the project site from Interstate 93 or other primary roadways. Impacts of truck travel restrictions should be considered in the overall traffic analysis with regards to trip distribution, queue length, and volume.

#### *Pedestrian and Bicycle Movement*

Given the anticipated traffic flows within and adjacent to the Middlesex Fells (and DCR public pool facility) and proposed traffic/intersection improvements along DCR parkways, the

EIR should present information detailing anticipated impacts to bicycle and pedestrian usage and safety within the project vicinity. The EIR should present measures or mitigation for identified impacts to bicycle and pedestrian circulation along DCR parkways and primary access routes to the Middlesex Fells Reservation.

### *Transportation Demand Management*

The EIR should include a comprehensive Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan that investigates all feasible measures aimed at reducing site trip generation. The TDM plan should include specific measures that have been successful in reducing trip generation for retail and/or office projects. The TDM plan should also identify the existing modes along the corridor such as transit, walking, and bicycling; analyze their existing and future conditions based on the project's impacts; and provide improvements to attract mode usage. The proponent should develop transportation and parking demand management measures to reduce single passenger automobile trips to the project and encourage ridesharing by employees to the site through the use of preferential parking. The proponent should provide a clear commitment to implement and continuously fund any evaluated TDM measures deemed feasible to sustain and increase mode usage.

### Historic and Cultural Resources

The Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC) states that the project is within the vicinity of the Middlesex Fells Historic District and that the Middlesex Fells Reservation Parkways are listed in the Nation Register of Historic Places. The EIR should include a discussion of the impact of proposed traffic volumes and mitigation efforts on North Border Road and improvements to the intersection at North Border Road, South Street and Route 28 in relation to historic resources. The EIR should include a viewshed analysis to take into account the potential effects of the new construction at the site on the character and setting of the adjacent and proximate historic properties identified by the MHC in their comment letter.

The EIR should present an intersection alternatives analysis for the realignment of North Border Road/Park Street with consideration for the significant character-defining features of the section of DCR parkway that will be affected and an evaluation of the impact of the proposed roadway alterations on those features. Consideration within this intersection alternatives analysis should be given to the presence of the adjacent Middlesex Fells Historic District.

### Parking

The EIR should describe the rationale for providing parking spaces in excess of those required by the Town of Stoneham's zoning regulations. If possible, the EIR should provide data from other comparably sized Home Depots in similar markets regarding parking demand

generated by the project. The EIR should discuss the feasibility of an alternative with fewer spaces or reserve parking within the subject property that may only be used if demand warrants, and could be left in an unimproved (i.e. non-altered or landscaped) condition, in lieu of pavement. Such an alternative should investigate a reduction in pavement near Wetland D and the wetlands buffer zone. Alternative parking layouts and scenarios should include a tabulation of impacts on impervious surfaces and wetland resource areas (and buffer zones) in comparison to the Preferred Alternative. The EIR should identify reserved parking areas for employee ridesharing or other comparable Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures. Bicycle parking/storage areas should be identified on a plan.

The EIR should address the impact of existing parking along Fallon Road (a private way) with the anticipated traffic generation by the proposed Home Depot. The EIR should provide an update on coordination efforts with other property owners and tenants along Fallon Road to reduce or eliminate parking on Fallon Road.

### Wetlands

The Commonwealth has endorsed a “No Net Loss Policy” that requires that all feasible means to avoid and reduce the extent of wetland alteration be considered and implemented. The EIR should conform to this approach by first examining options that avoid impacts to wetland resource areas, their associated buffer zones, riverfront protection areas and 100-year flood plain areas, if applicable. Where it has been demonstrated that impacts are unavoidable, the EIR should illustrate that the impacts have been minimized, and that the project will be accomplished in a manner that is consistent with the Performance Standards of the Wetlands Regulations (310 CMR 10.00).

The EENF identified five areas of wetlands (Series “A” through Series “E”). The EIR should characterize each wetland area and identify the significance of all the wetland resources present, including value to public and private water supply, flood control, storm damage prevention, prevention of pollution, and fisheries and wildlife habitat (the EENF focused solely on alteration and mitigation of Series “B” and Series “E”). The EIR should analyze both direct and indirect (i.e. changes in drainage patterns) impacts on wetlands and habitat resulting from the project. The EIR should provide detail regarding impact to wetlands and wetland buffer zones related to site grading, impervious areas, and other site development features.

The EIR should evaluate any wetlands impacts associated with project-specific off-site traffic mitigation. The project, as presented in the EENF will affect a total of 4,910 square feet of BVWs. If additional wetland areas are identified in association with off-site improvement areas, additional DEP permits may be necessary, because the project and its mitigation areas will be viewed cumulatively. The EIR should demonstrate that the proponent has minimized impacts (to both on-site and adjacent off-site wetlands) to the maximum feasible extent. The EIR should



explain any local wetland requirements, and how compliance with these requirements affects project design.

The EIR should identify and quantify wetlands replication areas, and demonstrate that altered wetland functions will be restored. The EIR should address the project's compliance with DEP replication guidelines and performance standards. Replication areas should be provided at a ratio of at least 2:1 in accordance with DEP requirements.

DEP has identified an area of potential wetland change within the project site. The EIR should provide a history of wetland permitting on site to confirm if this area of wetland alteration was previously reviewed under the Wetlands Protection Act. If approval is not found for this alteration, it should be added to the tally of wetlands alteration for the project in the EIR and the current Notice of Intent (NOI) submittal to the Stoneham Conservation Commission and DEP.

### Water Quality

Conflicting information has been presented with regards to the hydrological connection of the project area with that of the public drinking water supply, the North Reservoir, located within the Middlesex Fells Reservation. According to MassGIS data, the project site is located within an Outstanding Resource Water (ORW) associated with the North Reservoir. Supplemental information provided by the project proponent indicates no hydrologic connection between stormwater runoff and wetland areas on the project site and this ORW. The EIR should include information that clarifies the connection (or absence of a connection) between on-site wetlands and drainage areas to the ORW associated with the North Reservoir. Information presented should include calculations, hydrological analyses and supporting graphics to demonstrate the relationship of the on-site drainage and the ORW.

If the wetlands on the project site are hydrologically connected to a public water supply, the project will require an individual 401 Water Quality Certificate from DEP. In this case, the EIR should present an alternatives analysis that considers measures to avoid, minimize and mitigate wetland impacts that is consistent with that required under the 401 Water Quality Certificate permitting process.

### Drainage

The project, as currently designed, will create substantial new impervious surfaces. The EIR should demonstrate that source controls, pollution prevention measures, erosion and sediment controls during construction, and the post-development drainage system will be designed to comply with the Massachusetts Stormwater Management Policy standards for water quality and quantity impacts and with the Town of Stoneham's NPDES Storm Water Program. If the project lies within an ORW, the drainage system should be designed to meet the Critical Area

Standard 6 of the DEP Stormwater Management Policy. Calculations, stormwater system design plans at a readable scale, conceptual designs for BMPs, and supporting information should be provided to affirm that the stormwater system design provides adequate protection for wetland resources in conformance with the Policy and the Town's NPDES Storm Water General Permit. Additionally, the EIR should describe any drainage impacts associated with the proposed off-site roadway improvements. The EIR should address the impact that stormwater runoff from the site may have on adjacent properties with regards to quality and quantity of flows with a comparison of existing and proposed conditions.

The EIR should address impacts of salt and sand associated with parking lot snow removal on the quality and quantity of stormwater runoff, functionality of BMPs, and viability of wetland areas for each alternative. Snow disposal areas should be graphically depicted on a site plan showing relationship to catch basins and wetland areas.

As part of the alternatives analysis, the proponent should investigate opportunities to reduce impervious surfaces and to implement Low Impact Development (LID) techniques. The proponent should discuss opportunities to incorporate LID stormwater management techniques within the project site, and if not feasible, shall provide a discussion supporting this conclusion. Case study examples of low impact development techniques, which reduce imperviousness on redevelopment sites with significant parking, are available in the *Low Impact Development for Big Box Retailers* report, prepared for the USEPA Office of Water, November 25. The document is available at the following website: <http://www.lowimpactdevelopment.org>. Additionally, I recommend that the proponent consider Integrated Management Practices (IMPs) for quantitative and contaminant control of stormwater.

According to the Water Resources Commission's *Stressed Basins in Massachusetts* report, the project site is within the high stressed area of the Boston Harbor basin. The proponent has presented some mechanisms to promote groundwater recharge through stormwater infiltration. I request that the proponent consult with the Town of Stoneham and the MHD to ensure that the infiltration system design for this project conforms to the NPDES permit requirements of both parties (as applicable). Confirmation of conformance with applicable NPDES permits should be presented in the EIR.

#### Water / Wastewater

The EIR should clarify the length and location of the proposed water and sewer mains, and identify any proposed off-site improvements associated with water and wastewater. The EIR should identify the location of the 48-inch reinforced concrete water main adjacent to Interstate 93, which is part of the MWRA's water distribution system. The proponent should contact the MWRA to confirm the appropriate permitting process and to ensure that this water main will not be detrimentally affected by the proposed development and report on this in the EIR. The EIR

should outline water use reduction measures to be implemented within the building and exterior garden center in association with sustainable design principles. I encourage the proponent to consider xeriscaping opportunities associated with on-site landscaping to reduce water consumption.

### Demolition / Construction Period

The EIR should present a discussion of potential construction period impacts (including but not limited to noise, vibration, dust, and traffic flow disruptions) and analyze and outline feasible measures, which can avoid or eliminate these impacts. Due to the density of the development and its close proximity to residential uses, I encourage the proponent to consider participating in DEP's Diesel Retrofit Program based upon DEP's recommendation. The Diesel Retrofit Program consists of an engine retrofit program and/or use of low sulfur fuel to reduce exposure to diesel exhaust fumes and particulate emissions during construction.

The EIR should outline the proposed methodology for demolition on site and removal of demolition debris. The proponent has stated that asphalt, bricks, concrete and structural metal will all be recycled as part of the demolition process. DEP encourages the project proponent to incorporate construction and demolition waste recycling activities as a sustainable measure for the project. The EIR should describe how demolition activities will be performed in compliance with both Solid Waste and Air Pollution Control regulations, pursuant to M.G. L. Chapter 40, Section 54. The proponent should also estimate worst-case noise levels during construction and any blasting activities.

The EIR should outline potential construction related traffic impacts and mitigation associated with intersection upgrades and realignment.

### Sustainable Design

To the maximum feasible extent, the proponent should incorporate sustainable design elements into the project design. The EIR should summarize the proponents' efforts to obtain a Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Certification for the buildings. The basic elements of a sustainable design program may include, but not be limited to, the following measures:

- Optimization of natural day lighting, passive solar gain, and natural cooling;
- Use of energy efficient HVAC and lighting systems, appliances and other equipment, and use of solar preheating of makeup air;
- Favoring building supplies and materials that are non-toxic, made from recycled materials, and made with low embodied energy;
- Provision of easily accessible and user-friendly recycling system infrastructure into

- building design;
- Development of a solid waste reduction plan;
  - Development of an annual audit program for energy consumption, waste streams, and use of renewable resources;
  - LEED certification; and
  - **Water conservation and reuse of wastewater and stormwater.**

The EIR should include a narrative describing Home Depot's corporate policies regarding waste reduction, water use, and other sustainable design initiatives.

### Mitigation

The EIR should include a separate chapter summarizing mitigation measures. The mitigation section should include a draft Section 61 Finding for each state agency that will issue permits for the project. The draft Section 61 Finding should contain a clear commitment to implement mitigation measures, estimate the individual costs of the proposed mitigation, and identify the parties responsible for implementation. A schedule for the implementation of mitigation should also be included.

### Comments/Circulation

The EIR should contain a copy of this Certificate and a copy of each comment received. The EIR should respond fully to each substantive comment received to the extent that it is within MEPA jurisdiction. The EIR should present additional technical analysis and/or narrative as necessary to respond to the concerns raised.

The proponent should circulate the EIR to those parties who commented on the ENF, to any state agencies from which the proponent will seek permits or approvals, and to any parties specified in section 11.16 of the MEPA regulations. A copy of the EIR should be made available for review at the Stoneham and Winchester Public Libraries.

August 16, 2006

Date

  
Robert W. Gollidge, Jr.

### Comments Received:

07/31/2006	Linda Corapi
07/31/2006	Douglas and Mary Carey
08/01/2006	Mary Fallon Doucette
08/02/2006	Ellen and John Sharpe

08/02/2006 Robert and Eleanor Santosuosso  
08/03/2006 Bryan Hamlin  
08/07/2006 Dr. Tapan K. and Mrs. Arundhati Gupta  
08/07/2006 Lynda Chapman  
08/07/2006 Scott and Diane Lopez  
08/07/2006 Ed Curley  
08/07/2006 Stacey Curley  
08/07/2006 Hubert Holley  
08/08/2006 Stephen Hussar  
08/08/2006 Mike Ryan, Friends of the Middlesex Fells Reservation  
08/08/2006 Alison Doane  
08/08/2006 Karen Johnson  
08/08/2006 Melanie Cimini  
08/08/2006 Massachusetts Water Resources Authority (MWRA)  
08/08/2006 Department of Environmental Protection (DEP)  
08/08/2006 Executive Office of Transportation (EOT)  
08/09/2006 John O'Quinn  
08/09/2006 David Haberman  
08/09/2006 Joanne Dorr  
08/09/2006 Stephanie Leonard  
08/09/2006 Massachusetts Historical Commission  
08/09/2006 Melvin Kleckner, Town Manager, Town of Winchester  
08/09/2006 Department of Conservation and Recreation  
08/09/2006 Joseph Teneriello, Citizens for the Ethical Development of the Fallon Road Area  
08/09/2006 Abend Associates on behalf of William R. Hassett, Park Avenue LLC  
08/09/2006 Mystic River Watershed Association  
08/13/2006 Fred and Diane Mosely

RWG/HSJ/hsj