The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Energy & 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 28, 2008

CERTIFICATE OF THE SECRETARY OF ENERGY & ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS
ON THE
SINGLE ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT

PROJECT NAME:	Burlington Research Center (formerly 43/63 South Avenue Redevelopment)
PROJECT MUNICIPALITY:	Burlington
PROJECT WATERSHED:	Shawsheen River
EEA NUMBER:	14173
PROJECT PROPONENT:	The Gutierrez Company
DATE NOTICED IN MONITOR:	**October 22, 2008**

As Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs, I hereby determine that the Single Environmental Impact Report (Single EIR) submitted on this project **adequately and properly complies** with the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (G. L. c. 30, ss. 61-62I) and with its implementing regulations (301 CMR 11.00).

Project Description

As described in the Single EIR, the project involves the redevelopment of a 16-acre site in Burlington. The proposed project entails the redevelopment an office and light industrial site with an existing total floor area of 225,000 square feet. The proposed redevelopment will consist of the demolition of the three existing buildings and the construction of a total of approximately 590,000 square feet of Class A office, research and development (R&D) and/or bio-tech/life sciences space in two buildings; 10,000 square feet of retail space; and 10,000 square foot, 250-seat restaurant. The project will provide a total of 2,180 parking spaces with a majority of these spaces to be located in a parking structure. The 16-acre site is bounded by Route 3 to the west, Second Avenue to the north, South Avenue to the east, and an auxiliary parking lot to the south. Based on the Single EIR, the project is expected to generate approximately 4,530 new vehicle trips on an average weekday, for a total of 7,020 vehicle trips (accounting for trips generated by

the existing facility). The proposed project will be connected to existing municipal water and sewer service. It will consume approximately 154,000 gallons per day (gpd) of water and will generate approximately 140,000 gpd of wastewater flow.

Jurisdiction

The project is undergoing environmental review and required the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report pursuant to Section 11.03(6)(a)(6) of the MEPA regulations because it requires state permits and because the project will generate more than 3,000 new average daily trips on roadways providing access to a single location. The project requires a State Highway Access Permit from the Massachusetts Highway Department (MassHighway) and a Sewer Connection/Extension Permit from the Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP). The project must also obtain a new Industrial Wastewater Sewer Connection Permit from the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority (MWRA). On November 20, 2008, the MWRA informed the Proponent that a previously issued Industrial Wastewater Sewer Connection Permit issued to an industrial use at 43/63 South Avenue was no longer in effect. The permitted use went out of business in July, 2008 and the MWRA permit was not transferable, and was therefore revoked. The project will also require a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Construction Permit from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The Proponent has received a Special Permit/Site Plan Approval from the Town of Burlington (on July 17, 2008) and an Order of Conditions (on August 18, 2008) from the Burlington Conservation Commission.

Because the Proponent is not seeking financial assistance from the Commonwealth for the project, MEPA jurisdiction is limited to those aspects of the project that may cause Damage to the Environment as defined in the MEPA regulations and that are within the subject matter of required or potentially required state permits. In this case, MEPA jurisdiction extends to transportation, wastewater, wetlands and stormwater.

Project Changes Since the Filing of the Expanded Environmental Notification Form

Since the Expanded Environmental Notification Form (EENF) was reviewed, there have been some minor changes to the project. While the overall scale of the development has not changed since the EENF, the Proponent has incorporated modifications to address issues raised during the EENF review. These changes include building layout, stormwater management and transportation improvements.

Building Layout

The original Project design consisted of two office buildings in a mostly north-south orientation. During early consultations, the MEPA Office suggested the Proponent consider an alternate building orientation; rotating the buildings to a more east-west direction that would allow for greater daylighting and energy efficiency. In addition to the two-building plan, the EENF contained the conceptual evaluation of an alternate three building plan with two of the buildings oriented in an east-west direction. Also in addition to improved daylighting and energy-efficiency, the three-building plan also enhances the fit of the built space on the topography of the site by reducing the earthwork required and using the buildings to traverse the steeper slopes on-site. This orientation reduces required excavation and potential impact to

contaminated soils on-site. As a result of the improved fit and efficiency of the three-building plan, this plan has been advanced and permitted by the Town of Burlington and is presented as the Preferred Alternative in the Single EIR. The Proponent has also committed to a further reduction in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions through a commitment to achieve a 14 percent reduction in energy consumption in the proposed buildings.

Stormwater Management

Due to the contaminated soils on-site from the activities of prior owners, very little infiltration of stormwater was proposed as part of this project so as to not exacerbate contamination issues or interfere with remediation efforts. However, during the review of the Notice of Intent, the Town of Burlington Conservation Commission requested that the Proponent consider additional on-site infiltration to reduce off-site flow further below existing levels to help alleviate downstream flow concerns. To address the Town of Burlington Conservation Commission's request, an area at the southwesterly corner of the site, outside of the contaminated groundwater contributory area, has been modified to serve as a detention and infiltration basin. This area helps address the Conservation Commission's goal of increasing on-site infiltration and further reducing runoff from the property.

Transportation Improvements

During the review of the Expanded ENF, MassHighway identified several areas of potential overlap and conflict with the Project's proposed traffic mitigation measures and that of another nearby project, Northwest Park (EEA # 14000). The overlap occurred mostly at the intersection of Middlesex Turnpike and the I-95/Route 128 Northbound ramps. As a result, several modifications and clarifications to the transportation mitigation package associated with this Project were made under alternate scenarios in which alternate Northwest Park project is constructed or does not move forward.

Review of the Single EIR

The Single EIR included a description of the project, a summary of changes since the filing of the EENF and a list of permits, and approvals, and project phasing. The Single EIR also provides an adequate description and analysis of the project and its alternatives, provides a detailed baseline of environmental conditions, and demonstrates that the project will incorporate all feasible means to avoid potential environmental impacts.

Traffic

The project is expected to generate approximately 4,530 net new average daily trips (adt) for a total of 7,020 vehicle trips. The Proponent prepared and presented a Traffic Impact and Access Study (TIAS) in accordance with Executive Office of Energy & Environmental Affairs (EEA)/Executive Office of Transportation and Public Works (EOTPW) guidelines during the review of the EENF. The Proponent conducted an evaluation of traffic flows and roadway capacity within the TIAS study area under the Existing, No-Build and Build conditions at nearby signalized and unsignalized intersections to determine the impact of the project on the area roadway system. The study included as background several projects that are expected to impact traffic operations within the study area. In particular, Northwest Park (EEA# 14000), an

approximately 3.6 million-square foot mixed-use development that recently completed MEPA review, is expected to significantly affect traffic operations at the I-95 /Route 128 /Middlesex Turnpike interchange and along the Middlesex Turnpike corridor. The analysis revealed that the Burlington Research Center project is not expected to result in an overall change in Levels of Service (LOS) at signalized intersections in the project area.

During the review of the EENF MassHighway requested details on the mitigation commitments and implementation which include mitigation for this project both with and without the implementation of the Northwest Park project. The Single EIR provided the detailed commitments to implement mitigation measures for this project under either scenario.

The proponent has committed to a comprehensive mitigation package that is consistent with the Northwest Park project's development program and its implementation schedule for mitigation. These mitigation measures generally consist of geometric and traffic signalization improvements at the Route 128/I-95/Middlesex Turnpike interchange to address the full build impacts of both projects. I strongly encourage the Proponent to continue to work with the Town of Burlington, the Metropolitan Area Planning Counsel and residents to ensure that traffic impacts associated with the project are appropriately mitigated.

The traffic improvements are proposed to be implemented under two scenarios. The first scenario addresses mitigation requirements if the Project is constructed after Phase I of the roadway improvements to be implemented by the Northwest Park project. As mitigation, the Burlington Research Center proponent would complete the improvements at the I-95 southbound ramp/Middlesex Turnpike intersection as identified in the Final EIR for the Northwest Park project prior to site occupancy. The second scenario addresses mitigation requirements if the Project proceeds before the Northwest Park project. In that case, the Burlington Research Center proponent would implement the improvements outlined in the Phase 2 improvement schedule provided in the Single EIR.

Transportation Demand Management

The Single EIR also included a comprehensive Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program that addresses and supports multimodal transportation in the vicinity of the project. The Proponent has committed to implement strategies related to improving intersection capacity, traffic safety, traffic flow and progression as well as developing a TDM Plan in an effort to reduce project-generated vehicle trips and to minimize peak period traffic demands in the study area. The Proponent will:

- Continue to work with the MBTA and the Town of Burlington B-Line to identify an appropriate location for bus stops near and/or on the site and associated amenities;
- Provide incentives for bicycle use, including a new shared-use bike/pedestrian path that would link to a planned path on an adjacent property, covered/secured bicycle storage, showers, and changing facilities/locker rooms;
- Provide parking to meet, but not exceed, local requirements (proposed 3.57 spaces/1,000 square feet of gross floor area for peak office times versus the local requirement of 4 spaces/1,000 square feet);

- Minimize parking supply through a shared parking approach where the office parking peak times are typically 9AM – 5PM and restaurants/retail uses have extended hours when the office parking could be utilized;
- Delineate a percentage of preferential carpool and vanpool parking spaces near office building entrances as an incentive for ridesharing;
- Delineate a percentage of preferential parking spaces for hybrid and/or alternative-fueled vehicles near office building entrances as an incentive to use clean-fueled vehicles;
- Provide on-site amenities (restaurant, convenience retail) to reduce off-site vehicle trips throughout the day; and
- Establish an on-site coordinator to administer the TDM program;

The Single EIR states that on-site employers will also be encouraged to implement appropriate TDM measures. Potential tenant-based TDM measures include:

- Providing flexible hours so that employees have the option of commuting outside the peak traffic periods. Similar benefits can also be realized through staggered work hours so that employee trips occur over a broader period and thereby reduce peak hour demands;
- Allowing Massachusetts employees to use pre-tax dollars (from both federal and state income and payroll taxes) for the purchase of MBTA transit passes;
- Holding promotional events for cyclists and pedestrians;
- Providing incentives for bicycle and hybrid vehicle commuting;
- Offering direct deposit to employees;
- Providing a guaranteed ride home program to eliminate an often-cited deterrent to carpool and vanpool participation;
- Sponsoring vanpools and subsidizing expenses; and
- Providing subsidies to employees who purchase monthly or multiple trip transit passes.

I strongly encourage the Proponent to join the Transportation Management Association (TMA) that serves the project area.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

The Single EIR included an expanded Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions analysis in response to the Certificate on the EENF and in accordance with the EEA Greenhouse Gas Emissions Policy and Protocol. Additionally, during the Single EIR comment period, the Proponent submitted additional information clarifying the analysis presented in the Single EIR. The Proponent calculated GHG emissions from both the project's mobile and stationary sources. The GHG emissions analysis evaluated the increase in carbon dioxide (CO_2) emissions resulting from project-related traffic and proposed building sources. The Single EIR also outlined a list of LEED (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design) measures and a list of sustainable design elements that will be incorporated into the project.

Reductions in GHG emissions will be achieved through implementation of transportation demand management (TDM) measures, intersection improvements, and building design and operations improvements. The proponent has committed to reducing stationary source GHG emissions by a minimum of 14 percent through building orientation, interior daylighting, sky-

lights, motion-sensor activated lighting and climate controls, high-albedo roofing materials, window glazing, wall insulation, high-efficiency HVAC systems, and pre-occupancy building testing and commissioning. In addition, the Proponent has committed to work with tenants to implement energy efficient designs, materials, equipment, and operations throughout the development. The specific measures are detailed in the section on Mitigation and Section 61 Findings below.

The Single EIR also notes that the project will be designed to be compliant with the Massachusetts State Building Code, and as design progresses and tenants are identified, the Proponent will work to evaluate and encourage the incorporation of energy efficient building systems. The Proponent is reminded that the recently passed Green Communities Act (Chapter 169 of the Acts of 2008) requires that the International Energy Conservation Building Code be adopted and fully integrated into the State Building Code. Therefore, the Proponent should note that the Massachusetts requirements will be changing, and the new code may apply to buildings constructed as part of this project.

The Single EIR provided an analysis of GHG emissions using the EQUEST model to assess the direct and indirect stationary sources of CO_2 and the MOBILE6.2 model to assess transportation mobile sources. Under the Build with Improvements Conditions (2012) the project is estimated to generate 182,728.4 tons per year (tpy) of CO_2 compared to the Build Condition, base case estimate of 183,300.6 tpy CO_2, a difference of 572.2 tons per year. This represents a reduction in direct and indirect stationary emissions of 14 percent. This difference also includes a transportation related emissions reduction of 0.05 percent for the preferred alternative, when compared with the base case under the build condition.

The Single EIR stated that solar photovoltaic (PV) systems are not being included in the project's mitigation commitments even though the proponent was asked to consider PV in the Certficate on the EENF. At a minimum, with the cost of solar PV projected to only decrease in the future, the building should be designed and constructed to be solar-ready, with the HVAC and other roof-based systems located and consolidated on the north facing side and the roof strong enough to support the additional load of 5 – 10 pounds per square foot to facilitate future installation of a PV system. The Massachusetts Department of Energy Resources (DOER) and MassDEP recommend the Proponent consider PV systems through power purchase agreements with third party owners to reduce their electricity costs. The Proponent should consider constructing the facility accounting for the added weight of PV systems so that they may be installed in the future based upon tenant needs.

Although the main sources of GHG, from this project are associated with building heating and cooling, lighting, and vehiclular travel, the energy required to provide potable water and treat wastewater also will be a source of GHG emissions, in particular CO_2. The proponent and future tenants requiring pre-treatment for wastewater should consider energy efficiency when selecting wastewater processing methods and equipment to ensure that the 14 percent GHG reduction promised is realized.

Upon completion of construction, the Proponent should provide a certification to the MEPA Office signed by an appropriate professional (e.g., engineer, architect, general contractor)

indicating that the all of the mitigation measures referenced in below (or equivalent measures that collectively will reduce stationary source and mobile GHG Emissions as indicated in the Single EIR) have been incorporated into the project. The certification should be supported by as-built plans. For those measures that are operational in nature (i.e. TDM, recycling) the Proponent should provide an updated plan identifying the measures, the schedule for implementation and how progress towards achieving the measures will be obtained. MassHighway should incorporate this self-certification requirement into its Section 61 finding for this project.

Sustainable Project Site Design and Planning

The Single EIR describes the following sustainable design measures in the site design of the project. The Proponent will:

- Reduce overall impervious surface area (by almost one acre);
- Minimize the disturbance of currently undisturbed land;
  Avoid and minimize impacts to nearby natural resource areas;
- Coordinate the ongoing remediation of contaminated land with the responsible party;
- Minimize potable water demand through the use of water-efficient plumbing fixtures and stormwater reuse/drought-tolerant planting types for irrigation purposes;
- Incorporate an east/west building orientation for two of the three office buildings to maximize energy efficiency measures;
- Accommodate alternative transportation facilities (i.e., pedestrian and bicycle network);
- Implement transportation demand management initiatives in order to reduce single-occupancy vehicle trips;
- Implement physical and operational traffic mitigation measures in an effort to minimize the traffic congestion and air emissions; and
- Design exterior lighting to minimize both energy consumption and light pollution.

The Proponent has committed to the following building design and systems improvements in the core and shell of the buildings listed below. The Proponent will:

- Maximize window design to take full advantage of daylighting (the currently proposed project);
- Install light-colored reflective roofing materials to reduce 'heat island effect':
- Use hydrochlorofluorocarbon (HCFC) free roof insulation;
- Minimize the number of exterior lighting fixtures to reduce energy demand while utilizing directed fixtures to reduce light spill over off-site;
- Utilize regional manufacturers to the maximum extent feasible;
- Prohibit the use of high volatile organic compounds (VOCs) paint;
- Utilize low-VOC carpet adhesives;
- Provide adequate space for the outfit of recycling storage and ensure that the recycling program can accommodate paper, plastic, glass and aluminum at a minimum;
- Install high-efficiency, programmable and controllable HVAC systems;
- Prohibit the use of CFC-based refrigerants;
- High performance glazing to balance and optimize daylighting, heat loss and solar heat gain performance in all Project buildings;
- Use of HCFC-free wall insulation; and

- Provide daylight dimming sensors and occupancy sensors.

I acknowledge the difficulty in confirming the amount of GHG reductions possible in buildings whose tenants and uses are unknown at the time of MEPA review. However, I share MassDEP's concern that the Proponent's efforts to encourage future tenants to adopt additional GHG mitigation measures may or may not result in tangible GHG reductions. I note that the Proponent has committed to work with all future tenants to identify and implement similar feasible measures within the specific users' space.

Stormwater

The proposed project will be located primarily on previously paved and/or otherwise disturbed land. The majority of the site is covered by the existing buildings and parking field. The project will result in a decrease in impervious surface of approximately 0.44 acres. I note that infiltration of runoff is not proposed on this contaminated brownfield site in order to minimize the potential for stormwater mobilization of the contaminant plume in soil and groundwater.

Stormwater runoff impacts during construction and post-construction were evaluated in the Single EIR. The Single EIR attempted to demonstrate that source controls, pollution prevention measures, erosion and sediment controls, and the post-development drainage system will be designed in compliance with the MassDEP Stormwater Management Policy (SMP) andregulations. The Proponent has committed to:

Enhancing stormwater management and improve water quality; and

- Minimizing potable water demand through the use of water-efficient plumbing fixtures and stormwater reuse/drought-tolerant planting types for irrigation purposes.

In its comments, MassDEP has stated that in reviewing the Single EIR for conformance with the remaining, applicable stormwater management performance standards, it appears that the stormwater management system could be designed for greater conformance with the Stormwater Management performance standards. I encourage the proponent to consider and incorporate MassDEP's detailed comments pertaining to each of the Stormwater management performance standards.

Groundwater and Massachusetts Contingency Plan

The Single EIR reiterates that there are several contaminated areas on-site that are subject to the Massachusetts Contingency Plan (MCP). Groundwater at the site has been contaminated with trichloroethylene (TCE) and tetrachloroethene (PCE) as a result of historical manufacturing operations. A groundwater extraction and treatment system is located at Building 25 and has been in operation since 1986, and includes five extraction wells. The groundwater extraction and treatment system is designed to maintain hydraulic control of the overburden and shallow bedrock plume on the northern side of the property. The project site is within portions of the Zone II and the Zone III upland recharge area for the Town of Burlington's seven municipal wells located in the Vine Brook Aquifer.

The Single EIR has outlined the plan for redevelopment of the project site simultaneously with ongoing and future site remediation activities that are being undertaken by Tyco Electronics, Inc. (Tyco) the responsible party for cleanup. Demolition of Building No. 1 will allow access to a suspected primary source of contamination. Redevelopment work is being planned to accommodate remedial activities. In addition, the proponent has committed to pre-characterize soils in the areas proposed for construction, and include these results in a Release Abatement Measure (RAM) plan that will be coordinated with Tyco and the Town of Burlington Board of Health. As described in the Single EIR, the semi-annual monitoring program for surface and groundwater should be sufficient to monitor contaminant transport during site redevelopment.

Wetlands

According to the Single EIR, the project will alter about 1,795 square feet of a basin which is determined to be Land Subject to Flooding and Inundation, a resource area covered by the Town of Burlington's wetland bylaws. The wetland resource areas to be impacted also includes an intermittent stream, a hydraulic connection between wetlands which will be relocated, and the buffer zone of several Bordering Vegetated Wetlands where impervious pavement is proposed. The Burlington Conservation Commission issued an Order of Resource Area Delineation for the project on June 15, 2007, and an Order of Conditions for the project on August 18, 2008.

Water and Wastewater

The project is expected to use approximately 154,000 gallons per day (gpd) of water and to generate approximately 140,000 gpd of wastewater. I note that the Town of Burlington is subject to a MassDEP Administrative Consent Order (ACO) that requires a 4:1 removal rate for each new project to be connected to the Town's wastewater system. The Town of Burlington has imposed an increase to the requirement by a gallon, for a total requirement for I/I removal of 5:1. The Proponent will also contribute $20,000 dollars for a water quality analysis of the wastewater system.

The project requires a new Industrial Wastewater Sewer Connection Permit from the MWRA. Therefore, the basis for determining pre-project flows cannot be the revoked Industrial Wastewater Sewer Connection Permit allowance. Instead, pre-project flows should be determined from the recent historical wastewater discharge records. Therefore, I strongly encourage the proponent to consult with the MWRA's Toxic Reduction and Control Department (TRAC) which maintains copies of these records.

While the Town of Burlington's sewer system may have adequate capacity to accommodate project flows during dry weather, it is subject to much higher flows during wet weather due to infiltration. To ensure that increased wastewater flows do not exacerbate surcharging and sanitary sewer overflows, the proponent has committed to comply with the Town of Burlington's I/I requirements at a ratio of five gallons of I/I to be removed for every gallon increase in sanitary flow beyond the revoked permit of 140,000 gpd. The proponent must provide updated calculations of pre-project flows, flows from the project once uses are defined,

and the amount of I/I offset to comply with the Town of Burlington's requirements for any future discharge permit.

I note that any use that will occupy the Burlington Research Center and propose to introduce industrial and/or laboratory wastewater into the MWRA sanitary sewer system must obtain a MWRA Sewer Use Discharge Permit. In addition, each occupant of the Burlington Research Center requiring a MWRA discharge permit must have its own accessible sampling discharge point prior to mixing with any other wastewater streams.

I commend the proponent for committing to rainwater harvesting (RWH) to help reduce potable water demand. As LEED certification allows up to seven points for RWH systems, including a point each for reducing water savings by 20, 30, and 40 percent, there is an added incentive to enhance the RWH system to garner as many points as practicable. Rainwater harvesting systems are being used as a source of water for toilets, urinals, water features, cooling towers, and secondary fire suppression.

Construction Period Impacts

The Single EIR included a discussion of construction phasing, evaluated potential impacts associated with construction activities, and proposed feasible measures to avoid or minimize impacts. The proponent should make every effort to recycle or reuse construction and demolition materials. Specifically, the Proponent should commit to developing a construction waste management plan that fully complies with the Massachusetts Waste Bans and establishes a minimum reuse/recycling goal of 50 percent.

Mitigation and Draft Section 61 Findings

The Single EIR included a separate chapter on mitigation measures that included draft Section 61 Findings. The draft Section 61 Findings contained clear commitments to implement mitigation measures, an estimate of the individual costs of each proposed mitigation measure, and identified the parties responsible for implementation. The Proponent has committed to the following mitigation measures below. The Proponent will:

Utilize smart growth principles in the Site's redesign described in detail in the *Sustainable Project Site Design and Planning* section of this certificate;

- Provide significant environmental benefits over the existing condition by expediting remediation, upgrading stormwater management facilities, improving traffic circulation, and replacing outdated buildings with modern amenities and sustainable development elements (including a LEED-equivalent high performance building);
- Provide for up to $1.1 million in transportation improvements;
- Provide direct monetary contributions for infrastructure improvements and studies including: $500,000 towards additional off-site roadway and pedestrian improvements; $40,000 to fund a long-term regional transportation study that will be designed and conducted by MassHighway; and $20,000 for a water consumption and sewer system capacity analysis for the Town of Burlington;
- Provide over five acres open and/or landscaped space with a Conservation Restriction on

the land; and

- Implement a comprehensive Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan, a new shared walking/bicycle path and, potentially, an on-site transit stop within the Project Site as well as a donation of $25,000 to the local Burlington B-Line bus.

I note that these Section 61 findings must be expanded to include GHG mitigation measures in accordance with the GHG Policy. The final Section 61 findings will be included with all state permits issued for this project, and will be considered binding upon the proponent as mitigation commitments. In accordance with Section 11.12 (5) (e) of the MEPA regulations, final Section 61 findings must be forwarded by each permitting agency to the MEPA Office, which will publish a Notice of Availability in the Environmental Monitor.

Conclusion

I find the Single EIR to be adequate and am allowing the project to proceed to the state agencies for permitting. The Single EIR contained adequate information on project impacts and mitigation, and provided the state permitting agencies with sufficient information to understand the environmental consequences of their permitting decisions. No further MEPA review is required.

November 28, 2008
Date

for Ian A. Bowles

Comments received:

11/21/08	Department of Environmental Protection, Northeast Regional Office
11/21/08	Stephen H. Kaiser, PhD
11/21/08	Massachusetts Water Resources Authority
11/21/08	Executive Office of Transportation, MassHighway
11/24/08	Metropolitan Area Planning Council
11/24/08	Proponent's Response to Dr. Stephen H. Kaiser's Comment Letter
11/24/08	Stephen H. Kaiser, PhD, 2nd comment letter

IAB/ACC/acc