



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

Charles D. Baker
GOVERNOR

Karyn E. Polito
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

Matthew A. Beaton
SECRETARY

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

May 26, 2017

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

PROJECT NAME : South Coast Rail – Phase 1 Service
PROJECT MUNICIPALITY : South Coast Region
PROJECT WATERSHED : Buzzards Bay, Taunton River, Mount Hope Bay
EEA NUMBER : 14346
PROJECT PROPONENT : Massachusetts Department of Transportation
DATE NOTICED IN MONITOR : March 22, 2017

Pursuant to the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA; M.G.L. c. 30, ss. 61-62I) and Section 11.10 of the MEPA regulations (301 CMR 11.00), I have reviewed the Notice of Project Change (NPC) and hereby determine that this project change requires the preparation of a Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (DSEIR). This Certificate includes a Scope for the DSEIR.

A Certificate on the Final EIR (FEIR) for the South Coast Rail (SCR) was issued on November 11, 2013. It indicated that the FEIR adequately and properly complied with MEPA and its implementing regulations and that the project could proceed to permitting. MassDOT filed a NPC to address potential environmental impacts associated with a proposal to provide interim rail service from Fall River and New Bedford (Phase 1) prior to construction of the South Coast Rail project (Full Build). The NPC describes the interim service and identifies associated changes and potential environmental impacts.

MEPA review is intended to facilitate environmental planning for projects requiring Agency Action; it is not a permitting process. MEPA requires public study, disclosure, and development of feasible mitigation for a proposed project. It does not pass judgment on whether a project is environmentally beneficial, or whether a project can or should receive a particular permit. Those decisions are left to the permitting agencies. MEPA review occurs before permitting agencies act, to ensure that the permitting agencies understand the environmental impacts of a project.

MEPA review of South Coast Rail has included extensive and detailed analysis of routes, technology and operations to meet the project goal of providing rail service to Fall River and New Bedford. The MEPA process has provided a forum for identifying and disclosing the actions State Agencies will take on this project and environmental impacts associated with a project. Throughout MEPA review, including review of the NPC, there has been robust commentary on the project design and selection of alternatives. The Scope for the DSEIR is limited to the proposed changes associated with Phase 1 of the project. The Scope is not intended to, nor should it be construed to, reopen environmental review of the entire South Coast Rail project and selection of the Stoughton Electric Alternative as the Preferred Alternative.

I am requiring a DSEIR rather than the Single Supplemental EIR as requested by MassDOT; however, I note that the MEPA regulations include a “rollover provision” at 11.08 (8)(b). It indicates that upon review of a Draft EIR (DEIR), I may determine that no substantive issues remain to be addressed and:

- publish notice in the next Environmental Monitor that the DEIR shall be reviewed as a Final EIR (FEIR); *or*
- require the Proponent to file a Response to Comments on the DEIR and Proposed Section 61 Findings and publish notice in the next Environmental Monitor that the responses and findings shall be filed, circulated, and reviewed as a FEIR.

If MassDOT fully addresses the Scope contained herein, I will consider application of this provision.

Project Change

The NPC indicates that, in 2016, a review of construction costs for the Full Build estimated it would cost \$3.3 billion with service beginning in 2028. MassDOT is proposing to phase construction of the project to provide service to the South Coast Region much sooner than would be possible if it were constructed at one time. MassDOT estimates that Phase 1 will cost approximately \$1.1 billion and service is projected to start in 2024. The NPC indicates that MassDOT will continue to design and advance the South Coast Rail Project.

Phase 1 consists of the construction and operation of commuter rail service from Fall River and New Bedford to the Middleborough Commuter Rail Line via Cotley Junction and the Middleborough Secondary Line. Phase 1 will provide service using the Middleborough/Lakeville Main Line from South Station in Boston to Pilgrim Junction in Middleborough, where the rail intersects the Middleborough Secondary at the existing Middleborough Layover facility. Service will extend from Pilgrim Junction to South Station in Boston via the Middleborough/Lakeville Main Line. The Middleborough Secondary Line, an active freight line, will be reconstructed and expanded.

The section of the project from the New Bedford Main Line and the Fall River Secondary Line extending to Cotley Junction is referred to as the Southern Triangle. The Southern Triangle is common to Phase 1 and Full Build and underwent MEPA review as part of the South Coast Rail project. The Southern Triangle includes the two terminal Stations - Whale’s Tooth Station in New Bedford and Fall River Depot Station in Fall River.

Phase 1 will include the following improvements along the Middleborough Secondary: reconstruction of existing single track from Pilgrim Junction to Cotley Junction, including culvert replacements and retaining wall construction;¹ four bridge replacements; new signal/communications systems; positive train control; and upgrades to five grade crossings. MassDOT will evaluate whether the Phase 1 section of the Middleborough Secondary will be fully or partially double-tracked.

Interim service will be more limited and will result in longer travel times from the terminal stations to Boston compared to Full Build. Phase 1 will include two to three peak-period trains from and to each terminal station. Phase 1 will include construction of the terminal stations, King's Highway Station in New Bedford, a new station in East Taunton, and modification of the Middleborough/Lakeville Main Line Station (for a cross-platform transfer) or a new station in Middleborough. MassDOT is evaluating whether the Freetown and Battleship Cove Stations will be constructed as part of Phase 1 interim service or as part of Full Build. Because the stations proposed for the South Coast Rail in Taunton are north of Cotley Junction they are not included in Phase 1. MassDOT is proposing a new station in East Taunton and considering a potential shuttle to various locations in Taunton.

The NPC notes that Phase 1 will have independent utility because the capital construction elements will provide improved and faster service along a critical freight corridor and, upon Full Build, it will provide redundancy and resiliency for service disruptions. In addition, the NPC indicates that Phase 1 could continue to provide a connection between Bridgewater State College and the Fall River/New Bedford area in the long term.

Original Project Description and Procedural History

The South Coast Rail project consists of the development of a public rail system to connect the cities of Fall River and New Bedford to Boston and enhance regional mobility, while supporting smart growth planning and development strategies in affected communities. Fall River and New Bedford are historically underserved areas with respect to public transportation options. The South Coast Rail is a priority transportation initiative and a component of MassDOT's efforts to increase transit access throughout the Commonwealth.

The South Coast Rail will provide commuter service to South Station using the Northeast Corridor, Stoughton Line, New Bedford Main Line, and Fall River Secondary Line. The New Bedford to Boston route is 54.9 miles long and the Fall River to Boston route is 52.4 miles long. Travel time during peak periods on the New Bedford line and the Fall River line are estimated at 77 minutes and 75 minutes, respectively. The project requires upgrades to track infrastructure along the existing Stoughton line including reconstruction of tracks from Canton Junction to Stoughton, construction of new tracks from Stoughton to Winter Street in Taunton, for a distance of 15 miles, on an abandoned right-of-way (ROW) which crosses through the Hockomock Swamp and the Pine Swamp. Reconstruction of tracks is also proposed from Winter Street in Taunton to Weir Junction, a distance of 1.7 miles. The project requires reconstruction of tracks in the Southern Triangle. Infrastructure improvements associated with the project include constructing, reconstructing, or widening 45 bridges, and constructing or reconstructing 46 at-grade railroad crossings.

¹ Upgrades will be coordinated with current MassDOT State of Good Repair program along this alignment

The project includes ten new rail stations: North Easton, Easton Village, Raynham Park, Taunton, Taunton Depot, King's Highway, Whale's Tooth, Freetown, Fall River Depot, and Battleship Cove. New stations will include high-level platforms (4 feet above track), canopies, commuter parking, a drop-off area for buses, and areas for kiss and ride. Platforms will be designed to handle a 9-car train set (approximately 800 feet long). The station designs include bike storage areas and pedestrian connections to neighboring streets.

The project includes two overnight layover facilities, one on the New Bedford Main Line (Wamsutta site) and one on the Fall River Secondary (Weaver's Cove East site). Independent of the South Coast Rail project, MassDOT is proposing an expansion of South Station (SSX) as well as mid-day layover facilities in Boston to address existing and future Massachusetts Bay Transit Authority (MBTA) and Amtrak capacity needs.² SSX will support infrastructure requirements associated with this project.

Numerous alternatives were introduced in the Environmental Notification Form (ENF) and reduced to eight alternatives for evaluation in the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Report (DEIS/R). The DEIS/R presented electric and diesel options for three rail routes; Attleboro, Stoughton, and Whittenton (a variant of the Stoughton route), as well as a Rapid Bus route, and a No-Build/Enhanced Bus scenario. The Certificate on the DEIS/R indicated that MassDOT had adequately supported the advancement of the Stoughton Electric Alternative as the Preferred Alternative in the FEIS/R. The Scope for the FEIS/R outlined the outstanding issues that were required to be addressed, including the development of specific and detailed mitigation plans.

For the purpose of the FEIS, ACOE continued to analyze alternatives as part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process, including the Whittenton Alternative. Because a joint Federal/State review document was filed, the FEIS/R included additional analysis of the Whittenton Alternative. Upon review of the FEIS/R, ACOE determined that the Stoughton Alternative was the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA).

The FEIS/R evaluated the relative benefits and impacts of this large-scale transportation infrastructure project. Amongst the project's benefits are improved access to transit and the corresponding traffic, safety, air quality, and GHG reduction benefits associated with increased use of public transit. The project also has significant potential to facilitate sustainable land use and development patterns and will service Environmental Justice communities. The proposed route does however involve substantial environmental impacts. The FEIS/R refined impact estimates associated with alteration of wetlands and elimination or fragmentation of habitat (including rare species habitat and loss of biodiversity). It identified impacts to the Hockomock Swamp Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC), which is one of the largest unfragmented wetland systems in the state, and the Pine Swamp conservation area in Raynham. The Certificate on the FEIS/R emphasized that the benefits and impacts of the South Coast Rail project are significant and acknowledged that any project of this scope and scale will bear environmental impacts.

The Certificate on the FEIS/R was issued on November 1, 2013 and indicated that the FEIS/R adequately and properly complied with MEPA and its implementing regulations and that the project

² The layover facility was most recently addressed in the South Station Expansion Project (EEA #15028).

could proceed to State permitting. Because the project, and associated wetland mitigation was presented at a conceptual design level in the FEIS/R, the Certificate on the FEIS/R included a requirement that MassDOT continue to consult with the Interagency Coordinating Group (ICG) wetlands subgroup on the development of mitigation for impacts to wetlands and rare species. It also required that the plan be published through the MEPA Office for public review and comment to provide an opportunity to gather additional input from State Agencies, advocacy organizations, municipalities and the public on the mitigation plan. MassDOT has continued to design and advance the South Coast Rail Project since issuance of the Certificate.

Interagency and Community Involvement

As noted previously, the project underwent joint environmental review. Throughout project development, MassDOT has conducted an extensive stakeholder involvement process that included the ICG, the Southeastern Massachusetts Commuter Rail Task Force, and a broad civic engagement process. MassDOT held six public meetings prior to filing the NPC regarding potential phasing of the project.

These efforts are complemented by the South Coast Rail Economic Development and Land Use Corridor Plan (Corridor Plan) which has been developed in conjunction with the communities and regional planning agencies (RPAs). The Corridor Plan identifies sustainable development principles to manage both the projected growth in the region under business as usual conditions and the induced growth associated with the project. MassDOT, other State Agencies, the RPAs, and municipalities have made significant progress in implementation of the Corridor Plan.

The NPC indicates that MassDOT will continue interagency coordination and reestablish the NEPA and the Wetland Mitigation Working Group to facilitate the preparation and review of the supplemental MEPA and NEPA documents and to develop a final wetland mitigation plan consistent with local, State, and federal permitting requirements.

I have received numerous comments from public officials, State Agencies, environmental advocates, local residents, and other members of the public concerning the proposed interim measure (Phase 1) and associated environmental impacts. I thank the many parties who have provided comments on the NPC and the many agencies that have participated in its development. In particular, I note the comments from Senator Michael J. Rodrigues, Senator Marc R. Pacheco, President Pro Tempore, Senator Julian Cyr, Representative Robert M. Koczera, Representative Carole A. Fiola, Representative Susan Williams Gifford, Representative William C. Galvin, Representative Louis L. Kafka, Representative Dylan Fernandes, Representative Claire D. Cronin, Representative William M. Straus, Representative Shaunna L. O'Connell, Representative Keiko Orrall, and Representative Antonio Cabral. Comments were received from City of Taunton Mayor Thomas C. Hoyer, Jr., the Town of Middleborough, the Town of Lakeville, the Town of Canton, the Town of Stoughton, the Town of Wareham, the Town of Bourne, and the Town of East Bridgewater.

I appreciate the ongoing participation of, and comments provided by, stakeholders during the environmental review of this project and Phase 1. This Certificate requires MassDOT to continue its commitment to stakeholder outreach and public input as it prepares the DSEIR for Phase 1 and simultaneously proceeds through design and permitting of Full Build, including consultation with the wetlands subgroup and the smart growth subgroup of the ICG and publication of a final mitigation plan and revised Section 61 Findings for public review and comment through the MEPA Office.

Permitting and MEPA Jurisdiction

The proposed project was subject to MEPA review because it is being undertaken by a State Agency and because it met or exceeded the review thresholds set forth in the MEPA regulations, including thresholds for a mandatory EIR. The project underwent environmental review pursuant to the following sections of the MEPA regulations: Section 11.03(6)(a)(1)(5) because it involves construction of a new rail or rapid transit line along a new, unused or abandoned right-of-way; Section 11.03(3)(a)(1)(a) because it will result in alteration of more than one acre of Bordering Vegetated Wetlands (BVW); Section 11.03(3)(a)(2) because it involves alteration requiring a Variance in accordance with the Wetlands Protection Act (WPA); Sections 11.03(1)(a)(1) and (2) because it will result in alteration of 50 or more acres of land and creation of 10 or more acres of new impervious area; Section 11.03(11)(b) because it is located within a designated ACEC; Section 11.03(1)(b)(3) because it involves conversion of land held for natural resource purposes in accordance with Article 97 of the Amendments to the Constitution of the Commonwealth; Section 11.03(2)(b)(2) because it would result in more than two acres of disturbance of designated priority habitat that results in a take of a state-listed species; and Section 11.03(10)(b)(1) and (2) because it may result in demolition of a part of a state-listed historic structure or destruction of a state-listed archaeological site. The project may also meet or exceed other MEPA review thresholds depending upon its final design.

The project required a 401 Water Quality Certification (WQC), a Chapter 91 (c. 91) License, and a Variance from the WPA and the WQC regulations from the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP). The project also required local Orders of Conditions under the WPA (and, on appeal only, Superseding Order(s) from MassDEP). Other permits or approvals required for the project include a Conservation and Management Permit (CMP) from the Division of Fisheries and Wildlife, Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program (NHESP), a land disposition agreement with the Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR) as well as approval from the legislature and the Division of Capital Asset Management (DCAM) for a disposition of land protected by Article 97 of the Amendments to the Constitution of the Commonwealth. The project is subject to review by the Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC) and the Massachusetts Office of Coastal Zone Management (CZM). At the Federal level, the project required a Section 404 permit from ACOE, an Air Quality Conformance Determination, a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction General Permit (CGP) from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and is subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA). The project is subject to the MEPA Greenhouse Gas Emissions Policy and Protocol (GHG Policy). The project is also subject to the Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs' (EEA's) Environmental Justice (EJ) Policy.

Phase 1, considered on its own, would likely have been subject to MEPA review and required the preparation of a mandatory EIR pursuant to Section 11.03(3)(a)(2) because it is being undertaken by a State Agency and it may require a Variance in accordance with the WPA. Phase 1 also exceeds the ENF threshold pursuant to Section 11.03(2)(b) because it may result in more than two acres of disturbance of designated priority habitat that results in a take of a state-listed species. Dependent upon final design, Phase 1 may also meet or exceed other MEPA review thresholds

Phase 1 will require a 401 WQC from MassDEP and will likely require a CMP from NHESP. Phase 1 may also require a c. 91 License and a Variance from the WPA and WQC regulations from

MassDEP. Phase 1 is subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) by MHC. The project is subject to the EEA EJ Policy and the GHG Policy and Protocol.

Phase 1 will require Orders of Conditions from local Conservation Commissions. It will require a NPDES CGP from EPA. ACOE is considering whether or not Phase 1 will require a Supplemental EIS (SEIS).

Because the proposed project is being undertaken by a State Agency MEPA jurisdiction is broad and extends to all aspects of the project that are likely, directly or indirectly, to cause Damage to the Environment as defined in the MEPA regulations.

Single EIR Request

MassDOT submitted an NPC and requested that I allow the filing of a Single Supplemental EIR, rather than a Draft and Final EIR. A Single EIR may be allowed, provided I find that the NPC: a) describes and analyzes all aspects of the project and all feasible alternatives, regardless of any jurisdictional or other limitation that may apply to the Scope; b) provides a detailed baseline in relation to which potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures can be assessed; and, c) demonstrates that the planning and design of the Project uses all feasible means to avoid potential environmental impacts.

Consistent with this request, MassDOT submitted an NPC that was subject to an extended comment period of 30 days. The comment period was further extended an additional 28 days to provide additional time for comments on the NPC.

Conclusion

Based on review of the NPC, consultation with State Agencies and review of comment letters, I have determined that the project requires filing of a DSEIR. MassDOT should prepare a DSEIR consistent with the Scope outlined below. As noted previously, if the DSEIR is responsive to this Scope, I will consider application of the rollover provision.

I reiterate that the DSEIR is limited to the phasing of the project and associated changes, including, but not limited to, construction within the Middleborough Secondary, changes in station locations/new stations and impacts associated with the use of diesel locomotives for Phase 1 and electrification upon Full Build. Elements of the project that were included in prior MEPA documents and certified in the Certificate on the FEIS/R, which are not affected by project changes, may proceed prior to completion of the DSEIR for the project changes.

SCOPE

General

MassDOT should prepare a DSEIR in accordance with the general guidance for outline and content found in Section 11.07 of the MEPA regulations as modified by this Scope. The DSEIR should include maps, plans and other graphics that describe existing and proposed conditions, environmental impacts, proposed structures, and other project components. I encourage MassDOT to consult with the ICG to determine the appropriate scale to use for DSEIR graphics. The DSEIR should include a project summary and schedule, a list of permits and approvals required and a description of any changes since the filing of the NPC.

The project description and assessment of impacts should include construction and operational phases, and include rail alignment, stations and layover facilities, and substations. The impact assessment should include temporary and permanent impacts, direct and indirect impacts, and secondary and cumulative impacts. Impact analysis provided in the DSEIR should be conducted consistent with the methodology applied in the DEIS/R and the FEIS/R, to the extent possible and updated as necessary, to support comparison of impacts and benefits.

The NPC indicates that diesel trains will be used for Phase 1 service because neither the Middleborough Secondary nor the Middleborough/Lakeville Line can support electric train service. Electrification would require installation of overhead catenary for Phase 1 as well as the Middleborough Line extending to Boston. The NPC indicate that these conditions are likely to result in lower ridership and thus lower reductions in vehicle miles of travel (VMT) than projected for full build. The SDEIR should address how transition from Phase 1 and use of diesel trains to electrification for full build would be implemented.

Monitoring and Reporting Plan

Changes associated with phasing of the project should be incorporated into the long-term evaluation and monitoring plan which will include periodic reporting to the public and other agencies on progress. The DSEIR should identify how Phase 1 will be incorporated into the reporting (e.g. publication of a separate/interim report) and how phasing may shift commencement of activities timelines. The first report was scheduled to be issued four years after the SCR is put into service and subsequent reports were to be issued every three years, for a maximum of 20 years.

The DSEIR should provide an update on the monitoring and collection of data. MassDOT should extend its commitment to use the Conservation Assessment and Prioritization System (CAPS) analysis to evaluate the effectiveness of wetland replication/restoration sites and culvert design associated with Phase 1.

Alternatives Analysis

Numerous routing and mode options were evaluated in the ENF (65 alternatives) and reduced to eight alternatives for evaluation in the DEIS/R. The DSEIR should address alternatives MassDOT considered for phasing of the project to provide service prior to 2028 and the criteria used to evaluate

alternatives. The DSEIR should analyze operational and service options and station locations within Phase 1 including the following:

- a. A “one-seat ride” from Fall River/New Bedford by providing a cross platform connection (sync up trains from each terminus) north of the Middleborough/Lakeville Station for passengers to board the Middleborough commuter rail service;
- b. A “one-seat ride” from Fall River and New Bedford including relocated Middleborough/Lakeville Station to a point north or west of Pilgrim Junction;
- c. Station locations for East Taunton and relocated Middleborough/Lakeville Station; and
- d. Construction of Freetown and Battleship Cove stations in Phase 1 or Full Build.

The DSEIR should include a comparative analysis of the environmental impacts of the alternatives and impacts on service, constructability, schedule, and cost. The DSEIR should evaluate how Phase 1 may affect, delay or accelerate, previously assessed issues related to public transit equity, service distribution and ridership, air quality and climate change, and opportunities for smart growth and sustainable development. It should present the results of the ridership analysis for alternatives and provide a rationale for the selection of the Phase 1 Preferred Alternative and elimination of other alternatives from further consideration. It should describe the relative importance and weighting of factors such as ridership, cost and smart growth planning in the evaluation process.

Land Alteration

The NPC indicates that Phase 1 elements are not located within an ACEC, will not result in new impacts to open space, or require the disposition of Article 97 lands. The DSEIR should include cumulative totals for land alteration and impervious area, as well as a breakdown for specific elements of the project such as stations and layover facilities. It should identify the different types and amounts of land altered, including forest; woodland; wetland resource areas; wetland buffer; priority habitat; previously disturbed area (specify land type/use). The DSEIR should describe proposed parking plans for each new or relocated station and how it will be designed to minimize impervious area and land alteration.

Ridership Projections

MassDOT has indicated it will provide updated travel demand modeling to project ridership and vehicle miles travelled (VMT) for full build of the South Coast Rail Project and for Phase 1. I note that it will include extension of daily commuter rail service south of the Middleborough/Lakeville Station to Buzzards Bay in the model to assess impacts and benefits; however, this service is not included in either Phase 1 or full build of the project. The ridership model is a critical component of the DSEIR and will inform the station alternatives, air quality analysis and the WPA variance application.

The DSEIR should identify any changes to the model, sources of data, and assumptions used as inputs to the model since it was used to evaluate the full build of the project. I expect MassDOT will consider the comments from agencies, municipalities, RPAs and others regarding the inputs to the

ridership model. The modeling should incorporate station locations and/or grade crossings associated with Phase 1. It should include an estimated cost per rider based on the results of the ridership analysis for each alternative.

Because the model may be sensitive to cost, relative travel times, income and other demographic data, there may be some uncertainty in the estimation of each of these variables. The DSEIR should consider presenting a range of projected boardings for each alternative (rather than a single number) based on consideration of uncertainty factors and sensitivity of the model. MassDOT should consult with the ICG to determine the appropriate level of detail for a sensitivity analysis in the DSEIR. The DSEIR should confirm the forecast year and provide justification for its selection.

The DSEIR should describe boarding and linked trip data, the origin and destination of new and existing riders, and whether they represent new riders or mode shifts. The DSEIR should clarify how many of the increased trips projected for rail are a result of riders switching mode from bus service or automobile use, and explain how this is accounted for in the overall assessment of air quality benefits. The DSEIR should include information on fares and parking fees, and other aspects of financing for the transit system and address how the model accounts for fare changes over time. The DSEIR should also discuss how future developments that may affect ridership numbers are accounted for in the alternatives analysis.

Secondary Growth and Cumulative Impacts

Development along the South Coast Rail project corridor has been guided by the Corridor Plan. Executive Order 525 (EO 525) requires state investments to be consistent with the recommendations of the Corridor Plan to the maximum extent feasible. It acknowledges that State actions have significant potential to leverage local and private investments in the priority areas. Phase 1 will result in a change in the proposed development schedule for the South Coast Region. Phase 1 service will include fewer stations that will initially be constructed for the SCR Project. The effects of Phase 1 on smart growth measures, including TOD, will depend in part on ridership and induced growth expectations based on the more limited elements that will be constructed for Phase 1. The DSEIR should evaluate any changes in cumulative impacts in each resource category resulting from phasing of the project.

The DSEIR should address how sustainable growth associated the South Coast Rail project will be affected by Phase 1, including relocation and/or delayed construction of stations. It should identify public infrastructure investments, land preservation funding, identification of Priority Development Areas (PDAs) and Priority Planning Areas (PPAs) that may shift or be introduced as a result of routing interim service along the Middleborough Secondary line. MassDOT should describe how efforts to provide technical assistance to municipalities in Phase 1 will be implemented.

Environmental Justice

The DSEIR should address how changes proposed in Phase 1 may effect Environmental Justice populations (EJ) and discuss relevant State and federal policies including the EEA Environmental Justice Policy (EJ Policy). The EJ Policy was designed to improve protection of low income and communities of color from environmental pollution as well as promote community involvement in planning and environmental decision-making to maintain and/or enhance the environmental quality of their neighborhoods. The DSEIR should include maps that identify the location of EJ populations in the

Phase 1 area. The DSEIR should identify any potential for disproportionate impacts on EJ communities that may result from the proposed project, and any proposed mitigation. The DSEIR should describe specifically how the project will provide tangible benefits to the EJ communities. The DSEIR should discuss strategies to enhance public participation in the environmental review process and describe outreach efforts to EJ communities.

The DSEIR should evaluate impacts related, but not limited to noise, vibration, air quality, increased property values, and tax revenue, residence, business, or job losses associated with property acquisition.

Climate Change

The DSEIR should discuss the project within the context of the Global Warming Solutions Act of 2008 (GWSA), Executive Order 569: *Establishing An Integrated Climate Change Strategy for the Commonwealth* (EO 569) and the MassDOT GreenDOT Policy. EO 569 was issued on September 16, 2016. It recognizes the serious threat presented by climate change and directs agencies within the administration to develop and implement an integrated strategy that leverages state resources to combat climate change and prepare for its impacts. The Order seeks to ensure that Massachusetts will meet GHG emissions reduction limits established under the GWSA and will work to prepare state government and cities and towns for the impacts of climate change. The GHG Policy and requirements to analyze the effects of climate change through EIR review is an important part of a statewide strategy.

Greenhouse Gas Emissions

This project is subject to review under the May 5, 2010 MEPA GHG Policy. The FEIS/R included an analysis of GHG emissions for the SCR Project. This analysis should be updated and revised to identify GHG emissions associated with Phase 1 and Full Build of the project. It should be based on the methodology used in the FEIS/R, updated as appropriate (e.g. updated travel demand model, use of current emission rates). It should include, but is not limited to, emissions associated with motor vehicles, diesel trains, electric trains, stations, layover facilities and buildings. The DSEIR should describe how Phase 1 will avoid, minimize and mitigate GHG emissions to the maximum extent feasible.

Train stations will not include conditioned spaces; therefore, opportunities to reduce stationary GHG emissions are limited. The DSEIR should identify total stationary source emissions for Phase 1 and full build, evaluate opportunities to reduce emissions associated with Phase 1 (e.g., solar photovoltaic, LED lighting) and identify associated emissions reductions. I refer the Proponent to the guidance and recommendations provided in the comments from the Massachusetts Department of Energy Resources (DOER) regarding stationary sources. For measures that are not adopted, the DSEIR should provide technical and cost justification. In the event that changes result in conditioned stations, MassDOT should consult with MEPA and DOER regarding the stationary source analysis.

As part of the air quality and GHG emissions analysis of Phase 1, the DSEIR should address the effect of rail transit on freight services such as shift from freight lines to roadways that might result in increased truck traffic.

Adaptation and Resiliency

The NPC emphasizes the benefits of construction of the Middleborough Secondary Line to climate adaptation and resiliency of the Full Build project. The DSEIR should demonstrate how design will increase the resiliency of Phase 1, and Full Build, to the effects of climate change, including measures to address potential impacts associated with more frequent and intense precipitation and flooding.

The DSEIR should evaluate measures to maintain the operational capability of energy and other systems including elevation of tracks and stations and over-sizing of compensatory flood storage areas and stormwater recharge and treatment areas to address increases in the frequency and level of precipitation (e.g., design for peak stream flow).

Air Quality

The DSEIR should evaluate air quality impacts of Phase 1 consistent with the analysis provided in the FEIS/R. It should include a mesoscale analysis that evaluates regional air quality impacts of Phase 1 with respect to National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), nitrous oxides (NO_x), carbon dioxide (CO₂), carbon monoxide (CO), and Particulate matter 2.5 micrometers and 10 micrometers in diameter (PM_{2.5} and PM₁₀). The analysis should include existing and future conditions within the Phase 1 study area. The DSEIR should describe compliance with the Clean Air Act Amendments and NAAQS.

Consistent with previous analysis, the DSEIR should also include a microscale analysis to determine if Phase 1 will cause or exacerbate existing CO, PM_{2.5}, or PM₁₀ at localized "hotspots". The DSEIR should explain the methodology used for the mesoscale and microscale analyses and include model input data such as vehicle emission factors. The analysis should address emission impacts from both automobiles and locomotives in the vicinity of proposed transit stations and commuter parking areas. The air quality and emissions analysis should include emissions from trains while idling as well as when moving.

The air quality analysis should include, but is not limited to, diesel rail, electric rail, stations and layover facilities. It will be informed by updated regional travel demand models to project reductions in VMT. The DSEIR should describe how Phase 1 will meet federal locomotive standards. The DSEIR should propose construction and operational air quality mitigation measures.

Traffic and Transportation

The DSEIR should include a revised transportation analysis, including reductions in traffic congestion by improving public transit and the impacts associated with construction and induced growth. In the context of the project's purpose and need, the DSEIR should include data on current and projected traffic congestion, and current and future demographic and economic data, to support evaluation of Phase 1 and its anticipated benefits.

The DSEIR should evaluate potential impacts of Phase 1 on existing transit services and transportation systems, including roadways, rail, and freight lines, South Station and other existing

stations. The DSEIR should respond to the comments and concerns raised by municipalities potentially affected by Phase 1 alternatives.

The transportation analysis should evaluate potential impacts on traffic, including operations (level of service (LOS) evaluation) associated with Phase 1. Study intersections may need to be adjusted or added based on proposed locations of the new station facilities. It should include impacts associated with roadway intersection and bridge reconstruction associated with Phase 1. Potential traffic impacts associated with Phase 1 should be evaluated, including station variants. The DSEIR should identify specific commitments to address traffic impacts and ensure safe, multi-modal access to the stations.

The DSEIR should provide a breakdown of proposed ridership for each station into arrival and departure modal split data for park & ride, drop-off, walk, bicycle, and transit users. This data should be used to define proposed infrastructure improvements, including platforms, stations, parking, drop-off and bicycle facilities. MassDOT should consider how it can work with municipalities to support pedestrian and bicycle access to transit stations. The DSEIR should include a parking needs assessment, and provide detail on proposed parking, including number and type of parking, for each of the proposed station sites.

The DSEIR should identify all grade crossings associated with Phase 1 which were not previously analyzed. It should identify existing and proposed crossings for each municipality and provide an analysis of traffic and safety impacts. High-accident locations should be identified.

The DSEIR should describe how Phase 1 can support interconnectivity between proposed stations and other commuter services to maximize the benefits of the proposed transit project. The DSEIR should describe plans for expanded bus and shuttle connections and, in particular, provide an assessment of the feasibility of shuttle service from locations in Taunton to the proposed East Taunton Station. MassDOT should address how it could coordinate with Regional Transit Authorities (RTAs) and Transportation Management Associations (TMAs) to improve connectivity.

Wetlands, Water Quality and Wildlife Habitat

The DSEIR should identify conservation areas (bioregions) which could potentially be impacted by Phase 1. The DSEIR should identify ecosystems within each conservation area that would be impacted by the Phase 1 alternatives, and include a quantitative and qualitative analysis of impacts to wetlands and water quality, wildlife habitat, water supply, and floodplain. The DSEIR should evaluate direct and indirect environmental impacts on wildlife and their habitats including but not limited to: hydrological changes; fragmentation of habitat and populations; edge effects; noise and vibration; and restrictions to wildlife mobility. The DSEIR should identify any potential impacts to migratory birds and their habitats, including Important Bird Areas (IBAs).

The DSEIR should include an analysis of biodiversity value in the Phase 1 project area and potential impacts. If areas of high conservation and habitat value are identified within Phase 1, MassDOT should use the CAPS model to provide a quantitative assessment of ecological integrity and compare the relative impacts of Phase 1. The DSEIR should include a description of the methodology and assumptions, and supporting maps/graphics indicating biodiversity values for the Phase 1 project area.

Wetlands

The NPC indicates that Phase 1 (not including the proposed stations) will alter 10,000 sf of BVW. Impacts to Inland Bank, Land Under Water (LUW), Bordering Land Subject to Flooding (BLSF), and Riverfront Area will be identified in the DSEIR.

The project is subject to Federal, State, and local wetland permitting jurisdiction, each with its own performance standards and regulations. The Conservation Commissions in Taunton, Raynham, Middleborough, and Lakeville will review the project to determine its consistency with the WPA, the Wetlands Regulations (310 CMR 10.00), and associated performance standards, including the Stormwater Management Standards (SMS). As applicable, MassDEP will assess the project's consistency with the WPA, the 401 WQC regulations (314 CMR 9.00) and the c. 91 regulations (310 CMR 9.00). ACOE will review the project to determine its consistency with Section 404 of the Federal Clean Water Act.

To initiate wetlands permitting, MassDOT indicates that it will file Notices of Intent (NOI) with communities along the Southern Triangle prior to filing the DSEIR. An Order of Conditions issued by a local Conservation Commission is not a Permit, as that term is defined in the MEPA regulations; therefore, MassDOT may initiate wetlands permitting prior to completion of MEPA review. MassDOT anticipates that NOIs will be filed at a 30% design level.

The DSEIR should include a description of wetland systems identified along the proposed alignments for Phase 1 for track construction/reconstruction (single and double tracking), culvert/bridge replacement, retaining wall construction, and upgraded grade crossings, and at the proposed station sites.

Maps, plans, and other graphics should be provided to supplement the narrative and show the specific locations and extent of wetland impacts. The DSEIR should include tables to summarize wetlands impacts for each alternative. MassDOT should consult with the ICG regarding changes to the methodology used for the analysis of wetlands functions and values, compared to the FEIS/R. The DSEIR should include tables to summarize wetlands impacts for each alternative. The DSEIR should identify cumulative impacts for each wetland resource area and by municipality. The DSEIR should separately quantify impacts to wetlands for each project component (tracks and stations). The DSEIR should describe how proposed work in wetland resource areas will meet applicable performance standards and address whether or not a variance will be required for Phase 1.

The DSEIR should describe and quantify alterations to floodplains (BLSF) and discuss how floodway and floodplain crossings will comply with applicable regulatory standards. The DSEIR should evaluate potential flood level increases during the 100-year flood, and include supporting hydrological and hydraulic analyses. The DSEIR should include flood compensation calculations based on most recently available flood profile data, including preliminary Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM). The DSEIR should identify the location(s) and amount of compensatory storage that will be provided for all loss of BLSF and demonstrate that it will be provided for BLSF at or near the points of impact. To facilitate permitting, MassDEP recommends that hydraulic and floodplain studies be undertaken prior to submission of permits.

Stormwater

The project will create approximately three acres of new impervious area. The DSEIR should address how Phase 1 will comply with the Wetlands Regulations and associated stormwater management standards (SMS) for work proposed in wetland resource areas and buffer zones. The stormwater analysis and mitigation should include the rail tracks as well as new/relocated station sites and parking lots. The DSEIR should include stormwater management plans indicating how stormwater will be collected, treated, and discharged.

The DSEIR should provide analysis and demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 310 CMR 10.05(6)(k) to the maximum extent practicable for all project elements within or discharging to wetland resource areas or their buffers including layover facilities, stations and park-and-ride lots. The DSEIR should provide additional stormwater treatment for layover facilities and stations classified as Land Uses with Higher Potential Pollutant Loading (LUHPPLs) subject to review pursuant to the WPA and WQC regulations. The DSEIR should provide appropriate setbacks and treatment for stormwater discharges to or near a critical area, such as vernal pools or public drinking waters.

The DSEIR should evaluate Low Impact Development (LID) practices to manage stormwater at proposed stations, and parking areas such as: smaller parking stalls and circulation lanes; porous pavement; pavement disconnection versus traditional curb and gutter drainage; retention of existing mature non-invasive plants; exfiltrating bioretention in place of raised traffic islands; and tree box filters. It should identify where and how LID measures have been incorporated into the project design and operation.

Variances

The DSEIR should address how MassDOT will address project phasing within the context of requests for a variance from the WPA performance standards (310 CMR 10.05(10)) which require MassDOT to:

1. Demonstrate that there are no reasonable conditions or alternatives that will allow the project to proceed in compliance with the wetlands regulations;
2. Propose mitigation measures that will allow the project to be conditioned so as to contribute to the protection of the interests identified in the WPA; and
3. Demonstrate that the variance is necessary to accommodate an overriding community, regional, state or national public interest.

The DSEIR should include information to address variance requests (WPA and WQC). MassDEP comments indicate that the benefits cited as the project purpose were intended to serve as the basis for demonstrating that the project constituted an overriding public purpose. In support of a request for a variance, the DSEIR should include a comprehensive qualitative and quantitative assessment of those public interests MassDOT seeks to advance, including improvements to address public transportation needs, air quality and public safety. The DSEIR should present an analysis based on core benefit metrics such as improvements to transportation capacity, ridership, and reduction in vehicle miles traveled, air pollutants, traffic congestion and accidents. The DSEIR should specifically identify and quantify the environmental benefits expected from the proposed smart growth aspects of the project, and provide details on how these benefits would be secured (for example, by obtaining land preservation

restrictions on sensitive habitat corridors). MassDEP has also requested that the DSEIR include the most advanced project design for Phase 1 to avoid subsequent redesign and permit amendments which could delay the permitting process.

401 Water Quality Certification

The DSEIR should include information on the number and location of stream crossings associated with Phase 1 and address compliance with the Stream Crossing Standards. The DSEIR should include cross-sections for proposed culverts and bridges and provide detailed designs, to the extent practicable. The DSEIR should evaluate which culverts appear to provide hydrologic control of an upstream wetland. The DSEIR should evaluate potential direct and indirect hydrological changes for bridges and culverts, including those that may impact adjoining wetlands. The DSEIR should evaluate opportunities for maximizing hydrological connections between wetlands for enhancement and restoration as well as for flood capacity.

The DSEIR should evaluate potential impacts to fisheries resources. The DSEIR should describe BMPs for erosion and sedimentation controls and time-of-year (TOY) restrictions on construction activity to avoid and minimize impacts to fisheries resources. Information provided on culvert and bridge reconstruction and replacement, including consistency with Stream Crossing Standards, should address protection of fisheries including passage for diadromous species. The comments from the Massachusetts Division of Marine Fisheries (DMF) indicate that TOY restrictions may apply for in-water work to minimize impacts. I encourage MassDOT to consult with DMF, MassDEP, and NHESP prior to filing the DSEIR.

Outstanding Resource Waters

The DSEIR should identify and describe any discharges to ORW associated with Phase 1 alternatives, and where a variance is required pursuant to 310 CMR 4.00, the DSEIR should provide documentation to support the request. Comments from NHESP address the methodology to quantify direct wetland and vernal pool impacts and develop appropriate mitigation. MassDOT should identify potential vernal pools by applying field methodology according to NHESP vernal pool certification criteria and work should be conducted during appropriate spring months. Vernal pools should be certified where criteria warrant and the extent of vernal pool habitat, including migratory pathways, should be field verified. Potential vernal pool identification and certification should be conducted for areas within the ROW of the rail alignment and within 750 feet of the ROW, as well as within and near station sites, and construction staging areas. As additional project impact areas are identified (e.g., upland mitigation areas), the vernal pool identification and certification process should be applied. The DSEIR should include the results of potential vernal pool investigations associated with Phase 1, including a description and mapping of those meeting the criteria for certification.

If mitigation for Phase 1 is required, the DSEIR should consider expansion of existing vernal pools that will receive fill and plantings to help maintain healthy vernal pool ecosystems (shading, temperature regulation, and invasive species minimization) and support reestablishment of native vegetation.

Vegetation Management and Herbicide Use

The DSEIR should evaluate potential impacts to sensitive receptors such as wetland resources, public or private drinking water supplies, Priority Habitat, aquatic organisms and water quality associated with the use of herbicides along the ROW. The DSEIR should outline any restrictions on herbicide application, identify areas proposed for herbicide use and identify areas that would be designated as "no spray" areas. Specific locations should be identified on project plans. The DSEIR should describe ROW maintenance and associated Vegetation Management Plans (VMPs). The DSEIR should describe monitoring, identification and control of nuisance, non-native and/or invasive species.

Mitigation

The DSEIR should demonstrate that the project will avoid, minimize or mitigate impacts to wetland resource areas and water quality to the maximum extent practicable. It should outline a comprehensive mitigation program designed to meet ACOE, MassDEP, and local bylaw requirements and performance standards. This mitigation program should include construction period measures, post-construction period monitoring and restoration/compensation, and measures to promote wildlife habitat and to remove/prevent the establishment of invasive species.

MassDOT should use the CAPS model to evaluate the effects of specific mitigation measures and the restoration potential of identified mitigation sites. The DSEIR should describe detailed compensatory mitigation for alteration of all resource areas, potential wetland restoration, and describe the rationale for site selection. The DSEIR should describe in quantitative and qualitative terms the extent to which the mitigation proposed will support biodiversity conservation and otherwise reduce or mitigate project-related impacts.

MassDOT should consult with the MEPA Office regarding timing of wetlands permitting and variances with the development and publication of the mitigation plan for wetlands and rare species which was required by the FEIS/R Certificate.

Rare Species and Wildlife

Portions of the Middleborough Secondary are mapped as *Priority* and or *Estimated Habitat* for the following state-listed species: Three-angled Spike-sedge (Endangered plant); Plymouth Gentian (plant of Special Concern); Long's Bulrush (Threatened plant); Pine Barrens Bluet (Threatened damselfly); and Eastern Box Turtle (reptile of Special Concern). These species and their habitats are protected pursuant to the Massachusetts Endangered Species Act (MESA, MGL c.131A) and its implementing regulations (321 CMR 10.00). MassDOT initiated preliminary consultations with NHESP to discuss and evaluate potential concerns.

Widening the embankment as part of track modifications may impact wetlands containing these plant species and result in the loss of vegetation within turtle habitat. Phase 1 may include impacts to rare species or their habitats associated with vegetation removal along the edges of the freight rail line and reconstruction of culverts and bridges over waterways.

MassDOT should consult with NHESP regarding the methodology for habitat analysis and surveys. The DSEIR should describe how potential impacts of the alternatives will be avoided and

minimized, and describe in quantitative and qualitative terms any unavoidable impacts associated with Phase 1, including indirect impacts associated with loss of migratory routes (barrier effect); increase in habitat fragmentation resulting from ROW maintenance; increased mortality of turtles crossing tracks; and clearing in the vicinity of vernal pools. The DSEIR should identify existing and proposed wildlife crossings (e.g. culverts and bridges) and barrier designs, measures to minimize turtle mortality during and after construction, and long-term measures to minimize impacts to state-listed species associated with regular operation and maintenance of the rail line.

The South Coast Rail project will likely result in a take of the Eastern Box Turtle and the Middleborough Secondary represents a phase of a larger common project such that NHESP indicates that it is likely that Phase 1 will require a CMP and additional net-benefit mitigation. The DSEIR should address how the project will meet performance standards, including the long-term “net benefit” standard in 321 CMR 10.23 and provide mitigation plans developed in consultation with NHESP.

Waterways

The NPC indicates that new Phase 1 elements are not located within tidelands or Coastal Zone; however, some areas/activities may be located within c. 91 jurisdiction. The DSEIR should indicate whether Phase 1 will affect jurisdictional waterways that were not previously reviewed and, if so, the DSEIR should describe the proposed work and applicable c. 91 standards. I refer MassDOT to MassDEP's comment letter for additional guidance on c. 91 jurisdiction, permitting and information that should be included in the DSEIR.

Phase 1 may traverse Zone I and II areas of public drinking water supplies. The DSEIR should identify potential impacts to public and private water supplies, existing and planned, and surface waters during construction and operation of Phase 1. The DSEIR should describe measures to avoid and minimize, or mitigate adverse impacts.

Noise and Vibration

Phase 1 will introduce potential impacts from noise and vibration to the corridor along the Middleborough Secondary ROW and I have received comments from abutters highlighting these concerns. The NPC indicates that the analysis will assume that horns will be sounded at all grade crossings.

The DSEIR should include an analysis of noise and vibrational impacts associated with Phase 1 areas that were not assessed in prior MEPA review. The analysis should be consistent with the methodology used for prior MEPA review, including application of the Federal Transit Authority (FTA) Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment Guidelines. It should identify relevant land use categories, metrics for evaluating transit-related impacts, information on background noise levels and monitoring locations. It should discuss consistency with applicable state and federal guidelines and regulations, including the MBTA's noise mitigation policy. The DSEIR should evaluate measures to avoid and minimize noise and vibration impacts, including plantings and other noise barriers, and describe proposed mitigation.

Cultural Resources

The DSEIR should describe potential impacts associated with Phase 1 (direct, indirect, temporary, and permanent) to scenic, cultural, historic and archaeological resources, including the National Wild and Scenic Taunton River and sites of significance to native people. The DSEIR should evaluate impacts to cultural resources associated with, but not limited to, noise and vibration, traffic, visual, physical modifications, and air quality. The NPC indicates that additional archaeological and historic surveys will be conducted along the Middleborough Secondary and at new station locations. The NPC indicates that MassDOT will work with ACOE, MHC, and other Section 106 parties to update the draft Programmatic Agreement (PA), which was developed as part of the review of the overall project, to accurately reflect the conditions and effect of Phase 1.

The results of archaeological and historic investigations conducted for Phase 1 should be summarized without revealing sensitive archaeological site locational information. The DSEIR should describe measures to avoid and minimize adverse impacts, and propose mitigation for any unavoidable impacts to cultural resources.

MHC requests that project information including scaled existing and proposed conditions plan and the draft Cultural Resources Management Plan be submitted for its review and comment as they are developed, along with ACOE's findings and determinations regarding potential effects and opinion regarding the need for additional archaeological survey.

Oil and Hazardous Materials

MassDOT will conduct environmental site assessments for the Middleborough Secondary, the new station in East Taunton and the potential new station in Middleborough to assess the potential for encountering hazardous materials during construction at these locations and to identify remediation. The DSEIR should characterize the existing and anticipated solid and hazardous waste generated for Phase 1 (new stations and track upgrades). It should address MassDEP comments regarding development of a soils management plan to manage risk of exposure to materials during construction.

Mitigation and Section 61 Findings

The DSEIR should include a separate chapter on mitigation measures, which should include a summary table of all mitigation commitments. This chapter should include draft Section 61 Findings for each State Agency Action. Any changes to mitigation and/or draft Section 61 Findings associated with Phase 1, which were identified in prior MEPA review, should be noted. The DSEIR should describe proposed mitigation measures for Phase 1, contain clear commitments to implement mitigation measures, estimate the individual costs of each proposed measure, identify the parties responsible for implementation, and contain a schedule for implementation.

Responses to Comments

The DSEIR should contain a copy of this Certificate and a copy of each comment letter received. In order to ensure that the issues raised by commenters are addressed, the DSEIR should include direct responses to comments to the extent that they are within MEPA jurisdiction. This directive is not

intended, and shall not be construed, to enlarge the scope of the DSEIR beyond what has been expressly identified in this certificate.

Circulation

MassDOT should circulate the DSEIR to those parties who commented on the ENF, DEIS/R, FEIS/R, this NPC, to any State and municipal agencies from which MassDOT will seek permits or approvals, and to any parties specified in section 11.16 of the MEPA regulations. To save paper and other resources, MassDOT may circulate copies of the DSEIR to commenters other than State Agencies in a digital format (e.g., CD-ROM, USB drive) or post to an online website. However, MassDOT should make available a reasonable number of hard copies to accommodate those without convenient access to a computer to be distributed upon request on a first come, first served basis. MassDOT should send a letter accompanying the digital copy or identifying the web address of the online version of the DSEIR indicating that hard copies are available upon request, noting relevant comment deadlines, and appropriate addresses for submission of comments. The DSEIR submitted to the MEPA office should include a digital copy of the complete document. A copy of the DSEIR should be made available for review at the Public Libraries in the South Coast region municipalities. I encourage continued public engagement during preparation and review of the DSEIR.



May 26, 2017

Date

Matthew A. Beaton

MAB/PPP/ppp

Comments Received:

03/23/2017	Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE)
05/19/2017	Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP)
04/14/2017	Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC)
05/17/2017	Massachusetts Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program (NHESP)
04/20/2017	Massachusetts Division of Marine Fisheries (DMF)
05/22/2017	Massachusetts Department of Energy Resources (DOER)
04/03/2017	State Representative Robert M. Koczera
04/05/2017	State Representative Carole A. Fiola
04/13/2017	State Senator Michael J. Rodrigues
04/20/2017	State Representative Susan Williams Gifford
04/20/2017	State Representative William C. Galvin and State Representative Louis L. Kafka
04/21/2017	State Representative Dylan Fernandes and State Senator Julian Cyr
05/02/2017	State Representative Louis L. Kafka and State Representative Claire D. Cronin
05/16/2017	State Representative William M. Strauss (House Chair Joint Committee on

Transportation)
05/18/2017 State Representative Shaunna L. O'Connell
05/19/2017 State Representative Keiko Orrall
05/19/2017 State Senator Marc R. Pacheco, President Pro Tempore
05/19/2017 State Representative Antonio Cabral
03/22/2017 Dr. T.K. Roy
03/22/2017 Chuck Hanegan
03/23/2017 Andrew Januse
03/23/2017 Brenda Moreira
03/23/2017 Steve Castellina
03/24/2017 Marc Craig
03/24/2017 Karen Vergoni
03/24/2017 Katie Murray
03/24/2017 Becca Britt
03/26/2017 Eileen Marum
03/27/2017 Paul Letendre
03/27/2017 Paul Newman
03/29/2017 Robert S. Chase
04/03/2017 Bristol County Chamber of Commerce
04/05/2017 Stephen P. Kobialka
04/06/2017 Gabe Tempestoso
04/08/2017 Ross Woodfall
04/10/2017 Randi Pacheco
04/13/2017 Matthew Gorham
04/13/2017 P. Cook
04/14/2017 Town of Canton Board of Selectmen
04/14/2017 Independence Associates, Inc.
04/15/2017 Lisa K. Ray
04/17/2017 Ron Blau
04/18/2017 Carolyn Lattin
04/18/2017 William Cantor
04/18/2017 Mark Hess
04/21/2017 Dawn Quirk
04/21/2017 Samuel Clemens
04/21/2017 Stephen C. Smith
04/21/2017 Middleboro Conservation Commission
04/21/2017 Brenda Moreira (2)
04/21/2017 Todd Kohn
04/21/2017 Town of Stoughton
04/22/2017 Becca Britt (2)
04/22/2017 Roseanne Felago
04/24/2017 Town of Middleborough Board of Selectmen
04/24/2017 Mary Agnes Murphy
04/24/2017 Town of Lakeville Board of Selectmen
04/24/2017 John Dufresne
04/25/2017 Bourne Republican Town Committee
04/26/2017 Old Colony Planning Council (OCPC)

04/28/2017 James MacDonald
04/28/2017 Jan Elliot
04/29/2017 Olivia M. White
05/01/2017 Paul and Pearl Bacdayan
05/02/2017 South Shore Chamber of Commerce
05/03/2017 Nolan Kitts
05/04/2017 Massachusetts Maritime Academy
05/05/2017 Rail to Boston Coalition
05/09/2017 David J. Cavanaugh
05/10/2017 George Slade
05/11/2017 Ralph Hawkins
05/11/2017 Ralph Hawkins (2)
05/11/2017 Lisa Boragine
05/11/2017 Scott Martin
05/12/2017 Eileen Dufresne
05/13/2017 Richard Giampietro
05/13/2017 Katherine Kiritsis
05/13/2017 Marie Duggan
05/13/2017 John Dufresne (2)
05/13/2017 Richard Conron
05/13/2017 Virginia McKenna
05/14/2017 Elizabeth Brown
05/14/2017 Lloyd Mendes
05/14/2017 John Read
05/15/2017 James Hornsby
05/15/2017 Steve Voluckas
05/15/2017 Louis Gitto
05/15/2017 Nancy Lee Wood
05/15/2017 Judith Caporiccio
05/15/2017 Kelly Churbuck
05/15/2017 Joseph Callahan
05/15/2017 Town of East Bridgewater Board of Selectmen
05/15/2017 Dottie and Dana Dudley
05/15/2017 William and Cheryl Gay
05/16/2017 Pamela Jernberg
05/16/2017 Lisa Kopecky
05/16/2017 Nancy Davies
05/16/2017 Steve Doire
05/17/2017 Rosa De Oliveira
05/17/2017 Donald L. Cleary
05/17/2017 Andrew Rys
05/17/2017 Carolyn M. Basler
05/17/2017 Grant Taylor
05/17/2017 John Tehan
05/18/2017 Town of Wareham Board of Selectmen
05/18/2017 Paul Bacdayan (2)
05/18/2017 Peter Fuller

05/18/2017 Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility (PEER)
 05/18/2017 Andrew Farrer
 05/18/2017 Alan Johnson
 05/18/2017 Brian Sullivan
 05/18/2017 Robert Wood
 05/18/2017 Southeastern Regional Planning and Economic Development District (SRPEDD)
 05/18/2017 Gail Coelho
 05/18/2017 Cape Cod Commission (CCC)
 05/18/2017 Allin Frawley, Chairman of the Town of Middleborough Board of Selectmen
 05/18/2017 Allin Frawley, Chairman of the Town of Middleborough Board of Selectmen (2)
 05/18/2017 Bill Reidy
 05/18/2017 Anna Mae Baker
 05/18/2017 Stephen McKinnon
 05/18/2017 Sara Arbour
 05/19/2017 James Dufresne
 05/19/2017 Ruth Chicca
 05/19/2017 Lisa DaCosta Lopez
 05/19/2017 New Bedford Area Chamber of Commerce
 05/19/2017 Donna Kulpa
 05/19/2017 Mass Audubon
 05/19/2017 Linda Callahan
 05/19/2017 Victoria Taylor
 05/19/2017 Thomas C. Hoye, Jr., Mayor of Taunton
 05/19/2017 Cathleen M. Salley
 05/19/2017 Massachusetts Sierra Club
 05/19/2017 Town Middleborough Board of Selectmen (2)
 05/19/2017 Wendy M. Graca
 05/19/2017 Douglas White
 05/19/2017 Taunton Business Improvement District/ Downtown Taunton Foundation
 05/19/2017 Sherry Costa Hanlon
 05/19/2017 Sabrina Davis
 05/19/2017 Kathy Zagzebski
 05/19/2017 SouthCoast Development Partnership
 05/19/2017 Joseph A. Tutino
 05/19/2017 Heather and Doug Lewis
 05/19/2017 Amy Sharpe
 05/19/2017 Rita Rooney
 05/19/2017 Robert J. Kelly
 05/19/2017 Arthur Battistini
 05/19/2017 Stacey Fernandes
 05/19/2017 Celeste Dufresne
 05/19/2017 Andrew Jennings

Comments submitted to MassDOT and provided to the MEPA Office:

04/06/2017 State Senator Marc R. Pacheco
 03/22/2017 Lisa Rudenstein

03/23/2017 Margaret Russell
03/24/2017 Michael Margulis
03/26/2017 Malcolm Boyd
03/28/2017 Anita
04/12/2017 Richard S. Prone
04/13/2017 Holly McNamara
04/23/2017 Paul Aleixo
04/25/2017 Amy Sharpe
04/12/2017 City of Taunton
04/28/2017 Rita Anne Garrick
04/29/2017 Brian McCarthy
05/01/2017 Karen Brown
05/04/2017 Justin Rogers
05/04/2017 Sallie K. Riggs
05/04/2017 Jeanne Azarovitz
05/04/2017 James Currin
05/10/2017 Diane Wignall
05/11/2017 Janet Cooke
05/12/2017 City of New Bedford
05/15/2017 Massachusetts Sierra Club
05/15/2017 Janet Cooke (2)
05/16/2017 Daniel Doucette
05/17/2017 Teresa Robinson
05/18/2017 Nora Bicki

Jacob Correia
Robert J. la Tremouille
Jonathan Gray