



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>

June 30, 2006

CERTIFICATE OF THE SECRETARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS
ON THE
NOTICE OF PROJECT CHANGE

PROJECT NAME: Massachusetts General Hospital New Ambulatory Building
PROJECT MUNICIPALITY: Boston
PROJECT WATERSHED: Boston Harbor
EOEA NUMBER: 12362
PROJECT PROPONENT: Massachusetts General Hospital
DATE NOTICED IN MONITOR: May 24, 2006

Pursuant to the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (M. G. L. c. 30, ss. 61-62H) and Section 11.10 of the MEPA regulations (301 CMR 11.00), I have reviewed the Notice of Project Change (NPC) submitted on this project and hereby determine that it **does not require** further MEPA review.

The NPC has been submitted because the Massachusetts General Hospital (MGH) proposes an approximately 180,000 square foot (sf) addition to the previously approved New Ambulatory Building. The New Ambulatory Building completed MEPA review in October of 2001. The project described in the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) included the development of approximately 640,000 sf of ambulatory care and medical office space, together with an approximately 725-space below-grade parking garage on MGH's campus located off of Cambridge Street in downtown Boston.

The project described in the FEIR included two phases: Phase 1, which has been constructed and is now known as the Yawkey Center for Outpatient Care, is located south of Fruit Street and was built on top of the existing Northeast Proton Therapy Center and spans the eastern portion of the Charles Street Jail site towards Cambridge Street. Phase 2

(now referred to as Building 2) is scheduled to begin construction in 2007. Building 2 will be located north of Fruit Street at the site of the Vincent/Burnham and Clinics Buildings, the demolition of which has been mitigated through a Memorandum of Agreement with the Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC) and the Boston Landmarks Commission dated April 2001. All parking to serve both phases was built with Phase 1; no new parking is proposed for Phase 2 of the addition.

This NPC is being submitted because a long-range strategic planning initiative undertaken by MCH has identified the need to augment existing and planned facilities with an increased number of inpatient beds. MGH proposes to add approximately 180,000 square feet (sf) to the already approved Building 2. The additional square footage will include up to 150 new inpatient beds and sterile processing space. A portion of the 180,000 sf will be located above the approved Building 2 and a portion will be below Building 2.

The project as originally proposed was subject to MEPA review and required an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) pursuant to 301 CMR 11.03(6)(a)(6) since it was expected to generate over 3,000 new vehicle trips per day. The project also required review due to the proposed demolition of a portion of a structure listed in the State Register of Historic Places. The project required a Sewer Connection Permit from the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), and possibly a Groundwater Discharge Permit. The project received financial assistance from the Commonwealth's Health and Education Financing Authority (HEFA) and therefore MEPA jurisdiction extended to all potential significant environmental impacts associated with the project.

A new round of HEFA financing will be required for Phase 2 of the project. In addition, the changes proposed in the NPC require that MGH obtain a state Department of Public Health Determination of Need. Lastly, a modification to the existing DEP Sewer Connection Permit that was issued in August 2003 will be sought.

The height of the proposed addition to Building 2 will be approximately 41 beyond the previously approved height, resulting in a total height of approximately 182 feet. MHC has stated that it is unable to comment substantively on the additional height proposed for Building 2 without further information. The proponent should submit to MHC photographs of a model of the new construction or a computer-generated image of the new building as it would appear in the context of existing buildings. MHC states in its comments that it is also particularly interested in materials to be used for the new construction.

The Boston Groundwater Trust (the Trust) has raised some significant concerns about the proposed changes to the project. While the originally proposed project included relatively limited below-grade construction, the project as outlined in the NPC includes two full floors and the loading dock below grade, raising concerns about groundwater depletion. The proponent should note comments from the Trust regarding waterproofing all construction; the development of a recharge system for infiltration; and the monitoring of groundwater levels before, during and after construction. The proponent should share groundwater monitoring data with the Trust.

The sewer system in the vicinity of the MGH campus is owned and maintained by the Boston Water and Sewer Commission (BWSC). The addition to Building 2 will result in the generation of an additional 30,000 gallons per day (gpd) of wastewater and will require an additional 33,000 gpd of water. The proponent should note comments from DEP regarding the need for infiltration/inflow (I/I) removal at a ratio of 4:1. The proponent should work with DEP and the BWSC on this issue.

The stormwater drainage system used by MGH is owned and maintained by the BWSC. The Building 2 addition will not enlarge the building footprint and will not result in an increase stormwater runoff from the campus. Although no new impervious area will be created with the construction of Building 2, the proponent should note comments from the Boston Water and Sewer Commission (BWSC) regarding the use of particle separators and oil traps in the project's stormwater management system. The proponent should also work with the BWSC to promote public education about stormwater by installing "Don't Dump" plaques at the site.

When Phase 1 of the project was constructed, a full set of transportation mitigation actions were also implemented, including: the widening of Parkman Street; creation of a new campus access point on Cambridge Street; a new on-site roadway circulation system; and the contribution of \$2.5 million to the Massachusetts Bay Transit Authority (MBTA) for the Charles/MGH MBTA Station reconstruction. The plans for Building 2 rely on the previously implemented mitigation actions and do not alter traffic circulation or increase the parking supply. The addition to Building 2 as outlined in the NPC is expected to generate 920 new daily vehicle trips. The proponent states in the NPC that this additional traffic is not anticipated to have a noticeable impact on traffic operations at intersections around the perimeter of the campus or on roads internal to the campus as MGH has committed that no new on-campus employee parking will be provided.

In addition, as planning has proceeded for Building 2, MGH has developed a set of additional transportation mitigation activities including: upgrading the front entry to the hospital which will improve circulation and create a better pedestrian environment; the construction of a wide sidewalk along the building's Fruit Street frontage; the construction of pedestrian and intersection improvements at the intersection of Blossom Street and Parkman Street; and an improved truck dock under Building 2 which will reduce auto/truck conflicts on Blossom Street.

In response to comments from the City of Boston Environment Department, the proponent should address concerns about noise from truck maneuvers, loading activities and mechanical equipment. The proponent should also seek to reduce construction period air emissions by participating in DEP's Clean Air Construction Initiative (CACI).

MGH states in the NPC that it will continue to evaluate the project against the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) ratings system and the Green Guidelines for Healthcare Construction. The proponent should note comments from the City of Boston Environment Department regarding the use of green roofs.

Based on a review of the information provided in the NPC, and after consultation with the relevant public agencies, I find that the potential impacts of this project change do not warrant the preparation of an EIR. No further MEPA review is required at this time.

June 30, 2006

Date


Stephen R. Pritchard

Comments Received:

6/19/2006 Massachusetts Historical Commission
6/22/2006 Boston Groundwater Trust
6/22/2006 Boston Water and Sewer Commission
6/22/2006 City of Boston Environment Department
6/23/2006 Department of Environmental Protection, Northeast Regional Office

SRP/BA/ba