



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900
Boston, MA 02114

DEVAL L. PATRICK
GOVERNOR

TIMOTHY P. MURRAY
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

IAN A. BOWLES
SECRETARY

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

November 8, 2007

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

PROJECT NAME : Genzyme Corporation-Allston Landing Facility
Manufacturing Expansion
PROJECT MUNICIPALITY : Boston (Allston)
PROJECT WATERSHED : Charles River
EOEA NUMBER : 14108
PROJECT PROPONENT : Genzyme Corporation
DATE NOTICED IN MONITOR : October 9, 2007

Pursuant to the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (G. L. c. 30, ss. 61-62H) and Section 11.06 of the MEPA regulations (301 CMR 11.00), I hereby determine that this project **does not require** the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

As described in the Environmental Notification Form (ENF), the proposed project consists of a two-phase expansion to the existing Genzyme-Allston Landing facility. The existing facility is referred to as Phase I in the ENF. Phase II consists of a 130,000 square foot (sf) building expansion, installation of three new emergency generators, and construction of 113 new parking spaces. The Phase II expansion includes a combined heat and power plant and approximately 105,000 sf of office and manufacturing support areas (including a cafeteria). Phase III includes construction of a 500-space structured parking garage and a 60,000 sf expansion for manufacturing operations.

According to the ENF, the proposed expansion will result in 570 new vehicle trips per day (for a total of 1,770) and 288 new parking spaces (for a total of 500 spaces). Impervious area will increase from an existing 4.4 acres to 6.1 acres (Phase II) and will be reduced to 5.5 acres in Phase III (due to consolidation of parking into a multi-structured garage). Water use will increase from 179,000 gallons per day (gpd) to 192,000 gpd (Phase II) and 261,000 gpd (Phase III). Wastewater generation will increase from 132,000 gpd to 144,000 gpd (Phase II) and 188,000 gpd (Phase III).



MEPA History

The proponent previously filed an ENF for the project, which was noticed in the December 24, 1991 issue of the Environmental Monitor. The project proposed consisted of the development of 480,000 sf of biotechnology manufacturing and Research and Development (R&D)/corporate headquarters space on an 8.96-acre site, with 760 parking spaces (the corporate headquarters was subsequently constructed at 500 Kendall Street in Cambridge). The Certificate on the ENF (dated March 2, 1992) required an EIR and noted that a waiver was granted to allow commencement of the first phase of the project prior to completion of the EIR. As noted in the ENF Certificate, the project was categorically included for preparation of an EIR because it involved transfer of land from a state agency and was likely to generate more than 3,000 vehicle trips per day. A Final Record of Decision (FROD) granting the Phase I waiver was also issued on March 2, 1992. The proposed Phase I consisted of 90,000 sf of manufacturing space and 120 parking spaces. According to the ENF, traffic impacts were estimated at 350 vehicle trips per day (tpd) for Phase I and 3,116 tpd for full build-out. The proponent subsequently filed a notification of project change in a letter dated April 3, 1992, describing an increase in building space from 90,000 sf to 159,000 sf to meet additional mechanical and circulation space requirements. No further MEPA review was required for the proposed change as further detailed in a letter from the MEPA Office dated April 6, 1992.

Phase I project construction began in 1992 and was substantially completed by June 1994. The proponent filed a Notice of Project Change (NPC) in 2006. As described in the NPC, the project change entailed elimination of all subsequent phases from the project development program because lease rights with the Massachusetts Turnpike Authority (MTA) had expired. As further detailed in the Certificate on the NPC (dated September 14, 2006) the proposed project change was found to be insignificant. No further review of the project under MEPA was required and the previous requirement to submit an EIR was rescinded.

MEPA Jurisdiction and Permitting

The Scope for the EIR was rescinded on the basis that no further development was proposed for the site (NPC Certificate, September 14, 2006). However, the most recent ENF filed by the proponent (EEA#14108) proposes construction of two additional phases of the project. In accordance with 301 CMR 11.01(2)(c), I shall consider the entirety of the project including Phase I and any likely future expansion during MEPA review.

The project initially required a mandatory EIR because it was likely to exceed 3,000 vehicle trips per day. MEPA jurisdiction was broad due to the state agency land transfer from MTA. The proponent's revised analysis of potential traffic impacts indicates that trip generation for the proposed full build-out (1,770 tpd) will be substantially less than the mandatory EIR threshold of 3,000 tpd. I acknowledge the comments from the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) which indicate that the project would exceed mandatory EIR threshold for traffic based on the proposed square footage and use of Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) trip generation rates for an R&D facility. I have considered the comments of MAPC and

DCR and consulted with the Executive Office of Transportation (EOT)¹. Based on consultations with EOT, and as further detailed in the Traffic section below, I am satisfied that the likely trip generation of the project at full build-out, as proposed in the ENF, is substantially lower than the 3,000 trip per day mandatory EIR threshold. Therefore, I am not requiring an EIR for the proposed project. I note that DCR will require additional information and analysis of traffic impacts prior to its issuance of any permit or other agency action.

Since the filing of the ENF in 1992, portions of the project site (previously owned by the MTA) were transferred from MTA to Harvard University. Because of the state agency land transfer, MEPA jurisdiction was, and continues to be, broad and extends to all aspects of the project with the potential to cause Damage to the Environment as defined in the MEPA regulations.

The proposed project is undergoing environmental review pursuant to: Section 11.03(1)(b)(2) of the MEPA regulations because it will result in creation of five or more acres of impervious area; Section 11.03(1)(b)(6) because it requires approval in accordance with M.G.L. c.121A of a fundamental change in an approved urban redevelopment project; Section 11.03(6)(b)(14) and (15) because it will result in generation of 1,000 or more new average daily trips (adt) and construction of 300 or more parking spaces.

The proposed project requires an amendment to a Chapter 121A Approval from the Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA), a Street Opening Permit from the Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR), and may require a Sewer Extension Permit and Air Quality Permits from the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP). The existing facility was authorized under a Chapter 91 License and the proposed expansion may be subject to additional Chapter 91 regulatory requirements. The project is under review by the Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC) and is subject to additional review and permitting by the City of Boston. The project also requires a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction Activities Permit from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

Traffic

As noted in the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC) comment letter, an estimate of trip generation using the Institute of Transportation Engineers (ITE) rates for Research and Development (R&D) facility of 370,000 sf would be 3,025, which would exceed the mandatory EIR threshold. The proponent provided additional information to the MEPA Office during the ENF review, which indicates that the estimated total trip generation of 1,770 at full build-out is based on an average daily trip rate of 3.01 vehicle trips per employee for Land Use Code 110-Light Industrial. In addition, the proponent indicates that the majority of the Genzyme-Allston facility functions are related to manufacturing and most of the R&D activities are located at the Framingham facility.

¹ I note that the proposed project does not require a MassHighway Access Permit and is not subject to EOT jurisdiction

Based on consultations with EOT, it appears that the proponent's trip generation estimates may be reasonable considering that the facility is located in an urban area with access to public transportation and contains a cafeteria, which is likely to reduce employee trips. I note the MAPC estimate of 3,025 is based on the proposed 370,000 sf at full build-out. Given that 25,000 sf of the proposed expansion is for a combined heat and power facility (which will generate minimal traffic) and a portion is for cafeteria (which will not generate any traffic), a conservative estimate of trips would likely be less than 3,000. In addition, considering that the number of employees at full build-out is expected to be 590, trip generation for the proposed project based on 4 trips per day (tpd) per employee (a more conservative estimate than the 3.01 tpd proposed in ENF) would be approximately 2,400 tpd, which is substantially lower than the mandatory EIR threshold of 3,000 trips per day.

I note that DCR will require additional information to evaluate the project as further detailed in its comment letter. DCR has requested an analysis of the expected distribution of trips or anticipated impacts on Levels of Service (LOS) to DCR-owned infrastructure in the area and a construction traffic plan showing proposed routes of access to and from the site. DCR has also expressed concerns regarding potential deterioration of Soldiers Field Road as a result of illegal truck traffic. The proponent should consult with DCR regarding additional information needs and related permitting. I encourage the proponent to explore opportunities to improve the Charles River Basin parkland along Soldiers Field Road in the vicinity of the project as recommended by DCR in its comment letter.

As noted by MAPC in its comment letter, the proposed Harvard Allston Campus Development (EEA# 14069) in the project area will impact many of the same intersections as the Genzyme project. I strongly encourage the proponent to work with Harvard to develop transportation mitigation plans that address the cumulative impacts of both projects.

Wastewater

The proponent should consult with MassDEP, Northeast Regional Office, Bureau of Waste Prevention (BWP) regarding industrial pre-treatment of wastewater and to clarify the basis for wastewater flow estimates in the ENF. Based on the MassDEP comment letter, it appears that the project will require a Sewer Connection/Extension Permit.

Several commenters have highlighted problems associated with excess flows to combined sewer overflows (CSO) and the need for inflow/infiltration (I/I) removal from new wastewater sources. MWRA, as noted in its comment letter, is undertaking a program of wastewater treatment improvements to control CSO discharges, including improvements to minimize CSO discharges at the Cottage Farm facility and at related untreated overflow locations along the Charles River. The proponent should ensure that additional wastewater flows associated with the project are offset by the removal of I/I as required, and should consult with the Boston Water and Sewer Commission and MassDEP on this issue. As noted in the MassDEP, MWRA, and BWSC comment letters, sources of new wastewater flows are subject to I/I removal requirements (a minimum 4:1 ratio is currently used by MassDEP). Based on the wastewater generation estimates for full build-out provided in the ENF, the proponent may need to remove as much as 752,000 gpd of I/I.

Waterways/Chapter 91

A portion of the project site is located on filled tidelands of the Charles River. The proponent should consult with MassDEP regarding any regulatory requirements that may be applicable to the project in the future. As further detailed in the MassDEP comment letter, a new statutory and/or regulatory system may be in place within the next few months that addresses sites located on landlocked tidelands.

Historical and Archaeological Resources

The proposed project is located adjacent to the Charles River Historic District and Soldiers Field Road, properties that are listed in the National and State Registers of Historic Places. The Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC) has expressed concern that the proposed new addition facing the Charles River Historic District will be entirely glass on its east façade. The setting of this historic district and Soldiers Field Road is characterized mainly by the presence of historic and modern red-brick, low rise buildings in both Boston and Cambridge. MHC has determined that the proposed project will have "no adverse" effect provided that alternative designs for the east façade are explored. The proponent should explore alternatives for the east elevation of the proposed Phase II addition that uses a small number of brick elements to break up the massing of the all-glass façade as further detailed in the MHC comment letter. The proponent should consult with MHC regarding the evaluation of alternatives and measures to avoid, minimize or mitigate any significant impacts to state-listed historical resources.

Stormwater

As noted in the DCR comment letter, the lower basin of the Charles River is listed with the EPA and MADEP as impaired due to excessive nutrient levels in the water. The Charles River Watershed Association (CRWA), in its comment letter, has also expressed concern regarding the condition of the lower Charles River and potential pollutant impacts from the project. The proponent should employ Best Management Practices (BMPs) to reduce nutrient loading to the Charles River.

As further detailed in the CRWA comment letter, EPA and MassDEP recently issued a total Daily Maximum Load (TMDL) for nutrients, which documents that phosphorous loadings to the Charles River are contributing to eutrophication and excessive algal blooms, and need to be significantly reduced across the watershed to comply with water quality standards. I strongly encourage the proponent to design the stormwater management system in order to meet nutrient TMDL (65% phosphorous removal) and to incorporate low impact development (LID) techniques as recommended by CRWA. Possible LID measures include stormwater tree planters in parking areas, use of porous asphalt, green roofs, permeable pedestrian areas, rain gardens and other forms of biofiltration. Operational programs to improve water quality and reduce pollutant loadings from the site include weekly sweeping of parking lots and road areas with high efficiency vacuum sweepers, use of catch basin filters for pollutant removal, elimination of fertilizers containing phosphorus, and removal and proper disposal of leaf litter, landscaping

refuse and construction debris. I encourage the proponent to continue consultations with the CRWA on stormwater management issues.

As further detailed in the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority (MWRA) comment letter, the Genzyme facility is served by separate sewer and storm drain systems owned and operated by the Boston Water and Sewer Commission (BWSC) that tie into MWRA's transport and treatment facilities. I note MWRA's comment that the proposed Phase II and III has access to a storm drain and is not located in a combined sewer area. Therefore, discharge of groundwater to the sanitary sewer system associated with the Genzyme facility is prohibited. An EPA/NPDES General Permit for Stormwater Discharges from construction activities will be required. As noted in the MWRA comment letter, the proponent must comply with 360 CMR 10.016, and obtain MWRA approval, if it intends to install gas/oil separator(s) in the proposed 500-car parking garage. The proponent should consult with MWRA on this issue.

Construction Impacts

I strongly encourage the proponent to participate in the MassDEP Diesel Retrofit Program to mitigate construction-period diesel emissions to the maximum extent feasible. The proponent should consult with MassDEP regarding mitigation measures including installation of after-engine emission controls. Off-road equipment engines must use low sulfur diesel (LSD) as required by EPA regulations. I refer the proponent to the MassDEP comment letter for additional guidance on emission controls and other construction-related impacts including solid waste management and asphalt, brick and concrete (ABC) recycling. The proponent should ensure that a Construction Management Plan (CMP) is in place that includes measures to avoid and minimize, or mitigate construction-related impacts.

As noted in the ENF and in MassDEP's comment letter, the project site is regulated under the Massachusetts Contingency Plan (Release Tracking Number RTN 3-0026896). Removal of contaminated soil, pumping contaminated groundwater, or working in contaminated media must be done under the provisions of the M.G.L. c21E/21C and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) and any necessary permits should be obtained beforehand to avoid considerable project delay and administrative penalties.

Air Quality

The ENF indicates that an Air Quality Permit from MassDEP is not required and that the boilers will be subject to the Environmental Result Program (ERP) self-certification requirements. Based on the MassDEP comment letter, additional MassDEP review and pre-installation approval may be required. The proponent should consult with MassDEP to clarify permitting requirements for emergency generators, boilers and other equipment.

Sustainable Design

The proponent is seeking Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED)-Silver certification for the project. I commend the proponent for its commitments to environmental sustainability. As further detailed in the MassDEP comment letter, the

Commonwealth's waste diversion strategy is part of an integrated Solid Waste Master Plan that places a priority on source reduction and recycling. I encourage the proponent to establish and maintain effective waste diversion as part of its sustainable design program and as recommended by MassDEP in its comment letter.

Mitigation

The proponent has committed to implement measures to avoid, minimize and mitigate environmental impacts, including measures to protect water quality, manage stormwater and construction-related traffic, and designing the project to meet LEED-silver certification standards. The proponent has committed to an aggressive Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program that includes transit pass subsidies, a shuttle bus system connecting Genzyme facilities, promotion of ridesharing, and support of bicycling (on-site showers). The proponent has committed to continue coordination on project-related issues with Harvard University and all transportation initiatives in the area. The proponent should develop any additional mitigation plans, as appropriate, in consultation with state agencies.

I am satisfied that any remaining issues associated with the proposed project can be adequately addressed during the state and local permit and review processes. The project as proposed in the ENF requires no further review under MEPA.



Ian A. Bowles, Secretary

November 8, 2007

Comments Received

10/23/2007	Boston Water and Sewer Commission
10/29/2007	Massachusetts Water Resources Authority
10/29/2007	Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection, Northeast Regional Office
10/31/2007	Massachusetts Historical Commission
10/31/2007	Charles River Watershed Association
10/31/2007	Department of Conservation and Recreation
11/01/2007	Metropolitan Area Planning Council

IAB/AE/ae