



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

July 18, 2008

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

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

PROJECT NAME : Ambulatory Care Center/Medical Offices
PROJECT LOCATION : 620 Washington Street - Winchester
PROJECT WATERSHED : Boston Harbor
EOEA NUMBER : 14264
PROJECT PROPONENT : Winchester Hospital
DATE NOTICED IN MONITOR : June 11, 2008

Pursuant to the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (G. L., c. 30, s. 61-62H) and Sections 11.06 of the MEPA regulations (301 CMR 11.00), I hereby determine that the above project requires the preparation of a mandatory Environmental Impact Report (EIR).

According to the Expanded Environmental Notification Form (ENF), the proposed project consists of the construction of a 239,000-square foot (sf) outpatient ambulatory care center and medical offices with 956 parking spaces. The project would be constructed in three phases. The 2005 Phase includes the partial demolition and renovation of the existing Winn Watch building (65,650 sf) for use as a 39,335-sf oncology treatment facility and the construction of a 2,000-sf linear accelerator vault. The oncology treatment facility and the linear accelerator vault have been completed and are operating. The portion of the 2005 Phase remaining includes the demolition of portions of the Winn Watch building and the rehabilitation of three Massachusetts Water Resources Authority (MWRA) sewer lines which traverse the property. This is the subject of the proponent's Phase I Waiver request. The 2010 Phase includes the construction of an approximately 100,000-sf new ambulatory care center, medical offices, and 4,000-sf of ancillary retail space with a 506-space parking garage. The proponent will retain 52 surface parking spaces. The 2015 Phase includes the construction of approximately 99,500-sf of additional ambulatory care and medical office space with an additional 406 new structured parking spaces. The proponent would remove eight surface parking spaces. The project site contains about 11.05 acres.

The project is subject to a mandatory EIR pursuant to Section 11.03(6)(a)(6) of the MEPA regulations because it will generate 3,000 or more new vehicle trips. It may require a Construction Dewatering Permit, a Fossil Fuel Emission Permit, and an Air Quality Permit for an emergency generator from the Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP). The project requires one or more 8(m) Permits from the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority (MWRA). The Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC) has evaluated the projects' impacts and the proponent will enter into a Memorandum of Agreement with MHC and the Winchester Historical Commission. The project will require a Determination of Need and Construction Approval from the Massachusetts Department of Public Health. The project must comply with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for stormwater discharges from a construction site. It will require Orders of Conditions from the Winchester Conservation Commission for work associated with each of the phases. Because the proponent is seeking financial assistance from the Commonwealth for the project from the Massachusetts Health and Educational Facilities Authority (MHEFA), MEPA jurisdiction extends to any aspects of the project that may have significant environmental impacts.

Access to the proposed site is from two existing driveways connecting to Washington Street. Eventually these two driveways will be consolidated into one signalized driveway at Washington Street. The proponent has provided two methods for estimating the number of trips generated by the project. It has estimated that the project will generate approximately 3,740 new trips to the site, which is based on data from the proponent's existing operations.

The proposed project will be connected to existing municipal water and sewer service. It will consume approximately 20,078 gallons per day (gpd) of water and will generate 18,254 gpd of wastewater flow.

The proponent has requested a Phase I Waiver, which is discussed in a Draft Record of Decision dated July 18, 2008.

SCOPE

This EIR should follow the MEPA Regulations at 301 CMR 11.07 for outline and content, as modified by this scope. It should address the comments listed at the end of this Certificate, to the extent that they are within the required scope, and should include a copy of this Certificate.

Project Description

The EIR should provide a detailed project description with a summary/history of the project. It should include existing and proposed site plans. The EIR should identify the project phasing. It should discuss the consistency of the project with local and regional growth management and open space plans, Executive Order 385 (Planning for Growth), and the Master

Plan for Winchester

Alternatives Analysis

In addition to the No-Build Alternative and the Preferred Alternative, the EIR should discuss alternative building configurations on the site that might result in fewer impacts to stormwater and the Aberjona River floodplain. The proponent should develop an alternative that is designed to eliminate the large stormwater storage tank under the garage. This alternative should look at accommodating stormwater storage and infiltration from the project using other methods that appear more feasible than the Preferred Alternative. The EIR should also evaluate the proposed site layout and describe alternative site layouts that were considered in the Section 106 historical review process for the project. This analysis should provide a comparison of the differences between the environmental impacts associated with each of the alternative building designs and site layouts.

Traffic

The Expanded ENF's traffic study was prepared in conformance with the Executive office of Energy and Environmental Affairs (EEA/the Executive Office of Transportation (EOT) Guidelines for EIR/EIS Traffic Impact Assessment. It analyzed traffic impacts by determining the levels-of-service (LOS) at the following intersections: Washington Street/Montvale Avenue; Washington Street/proposed site driveway; Washington Street/Forest Street; Washington Street/Cross Street/Kenwin Road; Washington Street/Sunset Road; Washington Street/Brookside Avenue; Cross Street/Holton Street/Lowell Avenue; Cross Street/Forest Street; and Forest Street/Highland Avenue/Sawmill Brook Road. The LOS analysis included both the morning and evening weekday peak hours, volume-to-capacity ratios, a traffic distribution map, and background growth from other proposed projects in the area. The EIR should summarize the results of the traffic study (LOS analysis) in the Expanded ENF. The proponent should expand the traffic study to include the intersections of Montvale Avenue and the I-93 ramps, as recommended by Massachusetts Highway Department (MassHighway).

The ENF examined present (2007) and future (2012 and 2017) build and no-build traffic volumes for all impacted roadways and intersections. It developed trip generation estimates based on data provided by the proponent and its existing operations. It also utilized Land Use Code (LUC) 610 (Hospital) as a worst case scenario. The EIR should identify why it did not utilize LUC 630 (Clinic). LUC 630 seems more appropriate, and indicates that the project would generate about 7,517 new weekday trips. The MEPA Office has reviewed other similar hospital expansions, such as EEA# 13262, which was also a 100,000 sf ambulatory care center, and the proponent used LUC 610 to estimate trip generation. The trip generation rates should be based on the use of the proposed space/building program and trip generation estimations. At a minimum, the EIR should base trip generation on LUC 610 as have most other similar projects, unless the proponent can adequately justify another method.

The EIR should discuss the suitability of proposed changes to traffic signals. Any MassHighway or municipal plans for the reconstruction of roadways in the vicinity of the project should be discussed in the EIR. Traffic accident history for the three most recent years for which data are available was reviewed in the ENF. However, the EIR should update this traffic accident data and respond to the concerns of inaccuracies in the accident data as detailed in the letter submitted by Christian Nixon. The EIR should also update the traffic accident analysis for the enlarged study area.

The EIR should provide the details of the proponent's proposed traffic monitoring program for each phase of the project. This traffic monitoring program will ensure that the trip generation estimates are accurate and that the proponent has mitigated the traffic impacts from this project. The comment letter from Christian Nixon points out that any changes to the health care model being used for the space proposed at the new facility may affect the estimated number of trips generated by the project.

Parking

Parking at the site will include approximately 912 parking spaces in a parking structure and 44 surface parking spaces. The EIR should discuss how the proponent estimated parking demand for the project. It should identify the number of parking spaces required by zoning. It should describe any proposed valet parking at the project site. The EIR should describe and show the location of any proposed off-site parking for this facility and/or Winchester Hospital.

Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities

The EIR should provide a map showing existing and proposed pedestrian/sidewalk facilities, which are proposed for the project. It should identify the proposed bicycle facility improvements included with this project.

Transportation Demand Management (TDM) and Public Transportation

The proponent is providing the following TDM measures at the Winchester Hospital (WH), and it is proposing to provide these TDM measures at 620 Washington Street:

- On-site Transportation Coordinator;
- Ridesharing Program;
- Preferred parking for ridesharing;
- Guaranteed Ride Home Program;
- Contact the MBTA regarding the potential provision of transit service;
- A secure bicycle rack with showers and lockers for employees;
- Flextime to employees;
- Vanpool assistance and subsidy program;
- Transit information at the Winchester Hospital lobby;

- Shuttle Bus service with connections to Winchester Hospital and off-site parking;
- Monitoring Program for TDM Program; and
- Information on transportation options to new employees at their orientation.

The EIR should identify any additional TDM measures that the proponent has committed to implementing. The EIR should identify MBTA bus routes and stops in the neighborhood of the project site. Private shuttle buses (the WH Bus) and their service routes should be identified and included.

Air Quality/Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Policy

Because this is a state-funded project that requires a mandatory EIR, the project is subject to the EEA's GHG Emissions Policy and Protocol. The EIR must demonstrate consistency with the analysis and mitigation provisions therein. This Policy is available on-line at <http://www.mass.gov/envir/mepa/pdf/misc/GHG%20Policy%20FINAL.pdf>. The Expanded ENF did not include a GHG analysis. The EIR should quantify GHG emissions associated with the full-build out for each phase. It should identify the total emissions of carbon dioxide (CO₂) associated with each project alternative and evaluate measures to reduce GHG. The EIR should identify the additional GHG emissions that will be generated from vehicle congestion, which is projected to result from the no-build alternative, and compare it to the CO₂ generated by the alternatives that the proponent contends will reduce congestion, in order to make an informed choice of a Preferred Alternative. It should identify the vehicle miles traveled (VMT) associated with the build-out of each alternative.

The proponent should demonstrate in the EIR that it has evaluated and committed to GHG-reduction measures consistent with the MEPA GHG Emissions Policy. The proponent should clarify which specific measures it will implement, provide supporting modeling data that reflects the implementation of these measures, and clearly depict how these measures reduce GHG emissions under the 2012 and 2017 Build with Mitigation scenarios. The EIR should reflect a commitment to pursue additional GHG mitigation measures in response to the modeling. If the proponent chooses not to model a specific mitigation measure recommended by MassDEP/Division of Energy Resources (DOER) because it determines the measure to be infeasible for this particular project, the EIR must justify why modeling was not conducted. If, after further evaluation of a GHG mitigation measure using energy modeling software, the proponent does not propose to implement the measure, the EIR should provide technical and cost analyses to document the rationale for not making the commitment. I strongly encourage the proponent to consult with the MEPA Office, MassDEP and DOER prior to submission of the EIR with regard to the anticipated content of the GHG analysis.

The GHG analysis should clearly present modeling data inputs, the results of calculations used to quantify the Existing Condition, the Build Condition, and the impact of proposed emissions-reduction mitigation. In the EIR, the proponent should fully explain any trade-offs inherent in the evaluation of GHG reduction measures, such as increased impacts on some

resources to avoid impacts to other resources.

The EIR should address MassDEP's concerns as stated in its comment letter. The EIR should demonstrate that the Preferred Alternative would achieve significant reductions in GHG emissions with building designs, selection of building materials, and water and sewer infrastructure upgrades, and efficiencies that reduce and/or offset the fossil fuel energy demand of the project. It should provide technical and cost analyses to document the rationale for not making a commitment to mitigation measures.

Wetlands

According to the information provided in the Expanded ENF, the project site contains Bordering Vegetated Wetlands (BVW) and other wetland resource areas. The project will replicate approximately 123,457 cubic feet of Bordering Land Subject to Flooding (BLSF). The proponent is proposing to disturb 63,421 sf of Riverfront Area (RA), and it will restore approximately 44,673 sf of RA. The proponent is proposing to provide 38,311 cubic feet of filling in the floodplain. The EIR should identify the wetland resource area impacts for each alternative within the study area.

All resource area boundaries, riverfront areas, applicable buffer zones, 100-year flood elevations, 500-year floodplains, vernal pools (both certified and potential), and public and private wellhead protection areas should be clearly delineated on readable plans. Wetland resource areas that have been delineated in the field should be surveyed, mapped, and located on the plans. Each wetland resource area and riverfront area should be characterized according to 310 CMR 10.00. The text should explain whether the local conservation commission has accepted the resource area boundaries and any disputed boundary should be identified. For each of the alternatives, the EIR should quantify the amount of direct wetland resource area alterations proposed. The EIR should include tables specifying the amount of resource area impacts.

The Commonwealth requires that all feasible means to avoid and reduce the extent of wetland alteration be considered and implemented. The EIR should examine alternatives that avoid impacts to wetland resource areas, their associated buffer zones, riverfront protection areas and 100-year flood plain areas. Where it has been demonstrated that impacts are unavoidable, the EIR should demonstrate that these 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).

Floodplain filling should be replaced equally, at each one-foot increment of elevation. The EIR must identify the proponent's plans for wetland restoration within the project area. For any amount of required wetlands replication, a detailed wetlands replication plan should be provided in the EIR, which, at a minimum, includes: replication location(s) delineated on plans at a scale no greater than one inch = 100 feet, elevations, typical cross sections, test pits or soil boring logs, groundwater elevations, the hydrology of areas to be altered and replicated, list of

wetland plant species in the areas to be altered and the proposed wetland replication species, planned construction sequence, and a discussion of the required performance standards and monitoring.

The EIR should provide sufficient information to demonstrate that this project would be consistent with the Town of Winchester Flood Control Project (EEA # 13046), that flooding will not be exacerbated, and that flood storage capacity would be maximized to support the Town's project to the greatest extent feasible.

Drainage

The EIR should evaluate potential drainage impacts from the project. It should include a detailed description of the site's existing drainage system design in the construction area and identify any proposed changes, including a discussion of the alternatives considered along with their impacts. The EIR should present drainage calculations such as the rates for stormwater runoff for the 10, 25, and 100-year storm events. It should identify the quantity and quality of flows.

Proposed activities, including construction mitigation, erosion and sedimentation control, phased construction, and drainage discharges or overland flow into wetland resources, should be evaluated. The location of detention/infiltration basins and their distances from wetland resource areas, and the expected water quality of the effluent from these basins should be identified. This analysis should address current and expected post-construction water quality of the predicted final receiving water bodies. The drainage analysis should insure that on- and off-site wetland resource areas are not impacted by changes in stormwater runoff patterns.

The EIR should address the performance standards of MassDEP's Stormwater Management Policy. It should demonstrate that the project is consistent with this policy. The proponent should use the MassDEP Stormwater Management Handbook when addressing this issue.

MassDEP has requested that the proponent evaluate an alternative location for the stormwater detention system that is proposed to be located beneath the proposed parking garage structure. It states that the maintenance, repair, and replacement requirements for this system appear to be impracticable, if not infeasible, for an infiltration system beneath a building.

The EIR should discuss the consistency of the project with the provisions of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency for stormwater discharges from construction sites. It should include a discussion of best management practices employed to meet the NPDES requirements, and should include a draft Pollution Prevention Plan.

A maintenance program for the drainage system will be needed to ensure its

effectiveness. This maintenance program should outline the actual maintenance operations, sweeping schedule, responsible parties, and back-up systems.

Drinking Water/Wastewater

The EIR should explain any impacts from the project on the drinking water supply and distribution system. It should explain how the proponent estimated the 20,078 gpd of water consumption. The EIR should propose mitigation, if necessary. It should identify how the proponent determined that the wastewater flow would be 18,254 gpd. The EIR should outline the proponent's efforts to reduce water consumption and thereby reduce wastewater generation. It should identify any capacity deficiencies within the municipal wastewater system to handle the project's additional wastewater flows. In its comment letter, MassDEP is requesting this proponent to consider Infiltration/Inflow (I/I) reduction at a minimum of a 4:1 ratio (61,204 gpd). The EIR must address this I/I issue and work closely with the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority (MWRA) and MassDEP.

Construction Issues

The EIR should include a construction management plan that describes the project's phasing, erosion and sedimentation controls, monitoring, and contingencies. It should identify any amount of fill material required to bring the site above the 100-year flood level and estimate the number of truck trips per day to complete the filling. Truck routes to the proposed construction site should be identified in the EIR. The EIR should specify construction hours and any impacts expected during peak travel hours on local roadways.

Hazardous Wastes

The EIR should present a summary of the results of hazardous waste studies and remediation efforts undertaken at the project site by the proponent to comply with the Massachusetts Contingency Plan, 310 CMR 40.0000.

Historical Resources/Cultural Issues

The existing Winn Watch building is included in the Massachusetts Historical Commission's (MHC) Inventory of Historic and Archaeological Assets of the Commonwealth. The MHC has requested additional photographs, the Sanborn maps or other maps showing the project site in the past and specific construction dates. The EIR should address MHC's concerns. It should provide a copy of the Memorandum of Agreement between the proponent, MHC, and the Winchester Historical Commission.

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 building. 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.

Mitigation

The EIR should include a separate chapter on mitigation measures. This chapter on mitigation should include draft Section 61 Findings for all state permitting agencies. The draft Section 61 Findings should contain a clear commitment to mitigation, an estimate of the individual costs of the proposed mitigation and identify the parties responsible for implementing the mitigation. A schedule for the implementation of mitigation should also be included. The EIR should list the mitigation measures proposed for each phase of the project.

In the Expanded ENF, the proponent has committed to provide the following mitigation measures:

- Install interim improvements at the Washington Street/Montvale Avenue intersection;
- Construct dedicated turning lanes onto Washington Street and the install a traffic signal with marked crosswalks and pedestrian signals at the northern site driveway;
- Replicate 123,457 cubic feet of floodplain of the Aberjona River;
- Adjust the traffic signal timing and construct a new turning lane at the Washington Street/Forest Street intersection;
- Place the 2.74-acre southern parcel under a Conservation Restriction;
- Restore 44,673 sf of previously degraded Riverfront Area (RA);
- Rehabilitate portions of the MWRA sewer infrastructure on the project site;
- Allow access to and construct a new section of the proposed Tri-Community Bikeway on the project site for public use;
- Provide traffic calming measures for the Sunset Road and Brookside Avenue neighborhoods;

- Develop a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) Program;
- Provide 4:1 Infiltration/Inflow removal to the sewershed; and
- Provide improved sidewalks along Washington Street.

Response to Comments

In order to ensure that the issues raised by commenters are addressed, the EIR should include a response to comments. This directive is not intended to, and shall not be construed to enlarge the scope of the EIR beyond what has been expressly identified in this certificate.

Circulation

The EIR should be circulated in compliance with Section 11.16 of the MEPA regulations and copies should also be sent to the list of “comments received” below and to Winchester and Woburn officials. A copy of the EIR should be made available for public review at the Winchester and Woburn Public Libraries.

July 18, 2008

DATE



Ian A. Bowles

Comments received

VHB, 6/13/08
MHC, 6/20/08
VHB, 6/26/08
Ann Sera, 6/30/08
VHB, 7/1/08
Prassede Calabi & James Wilkinson, 7/6/08
Prassede Calabi, 7/7/08
Tania C. Novak, 7/7/08
James and Mizue Krygowski, 7/8/08
MWRA, 7/9/08
Marion E. Gordon, 7/9/08
Richard C. and Helen M. Burke, 7/10/08
Mystic River Watershed Association, 7/10/08
Mindy Arbo, 7/10/08
Winchester Town Manager, 7/10/08
MassDEP/NERO, 7/11/08
EOT, 7/11/08
Pamela Barnes Dill, 7/11/08

EEA #14264

ENF Certificate

July 18, 2008

Representative Carl M. Sciortino Jr., 7/11/08

Gerald R. Rondoe, 7/11/08

Ann Sera and nine other individuals, 7/11/08

Meredith Mason Crowley, 7/11/08

Winchester Historical Commission, 7/11/08

Christian Nixon, 7/11/08

Epsilon, 7/15/08

Ann Sera, 7/16/08

14264enf

IAB/WTG/wg