

## **P.0 MassDOT Preface to the DEIR**

This Preface has been prepared by MassDOT, which is solely responsible for its content. The Preface documents MassDOT's compliance with the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA), provides a summary of the environmental review process for the South Coast Rail Project, summarizes MassDOT's civic and agency involvement process, and identifies MassDOT's Preferred Alternative. This Preface summarizes the requirements of the Secretary of EOEEA's Certificate on the Environmental Notification Form and how the Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report addresses each specific requirement. Chapter 7 of this DEIS/DEIR and the Appendix with Response to Comments on the Environmental Notification Form have also been prepared solely by MassDOT.

### **P.1 BACKGROUND**

The South Coast Rail Project is an initiative of the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) and the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) to bring public transportation to the South Coast region to increase access to transit for an underserved area of the state, increase transit ridership, improve regional air quality, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, and support opportunities for smart growth and economic development.

This Project is a priority transportation initiative for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts by the Patrick-Murray Administration, as documented in the April 2007 *South Coast Rail: A Plan for Action*.<sup>1</sup>

Prior to 1958, the Middleborough, Stoughton and Attleboro rail lines were part of the Old Colony Railroad System that provided service to Fall River and New Bedford from Boston's South Station, via Canton Junction, along the Stoughton Branch railroad. Since discontinuation of this service, commuter rail has only been available to southeastern Massachusetts along the Boston-Providence Shore Line, with stops in Attleboro and South Attleboro, and the Old Colony Middleborough Line, which terminates in Lakeville. However, none of these provide an opportunity for commuters from the Fall River or New Bedford areas to easily or efficiently access rail transportation to Boston.

The South Coast Rail Project, to restore passenger rail service to the South Coast region, has been extensively studied in different configurations for almost twenty years. In 2002, a Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR), prepared by the MBTA, concluded that the Stoughton Alternative was the most practicable and feasible of the alternatives and identified it as the preferred route. On August 30, 2002, the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) Secretary of Environmental Affairs issued a Final Certificate (Executive Office of Environmental Affairs [EOEA] File #10509) stating that the FEIR adequately and properly complied with the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) and its implementing regulations. The Certificate authorized MassDOT to proceed with planning for the South Coast Rail Project as an extension of the existing Stoughton Line.

Section 404 of the Clean Water Act requires a Department of the Army permit for the discharge of dredged or fill material in waters of the United States. Accordingly, for the project to proceed to construction, it is necessary for MassDOT to obtain a Section 404 permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (the Corps) and for the Corps to conduct a federal environmental review in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

<sup>1</sup> Commonwealth of Massachusetts and Executive Office of Transportation and Public Works. *South Coast Rail: A Plan for Action*. April 4, 2007.

The Commonwealth recognizes that the final determination of a recommended alternative must occur through a combined state and federal environmental review. Therefore, the Patrick-Murray Administration took a fresh look at the alternatives through a transparent and comprehensive evaluation.

The Corps and MEPA have agreed to coordinate the environmental review for the Project. The Corps, the lead federal agency for the environmental review pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, has prepared this federal Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), which MassDOT adopts as its state-required Environmental Impact Report (EIR). The coordinated environmental review process began with a joint federal/state scoping process. MassDOT, as the lead state agency, submitted an Environmental Notification Form (ENF) to EOEEA<sup>2</sup> on November 15, 2008 for public review under MEPA, concurrent with the Corps' public scoping process under NEPA. The Secretary of EOEEA issued a Certificate on the ENF, and a Scope for the Draft EIR, on April 3, 2009. This Draft EIR meets the requirements established in the Certificate, as described in detail in this Preface and the Response to Comments appendix to the DEIS/DEIR.

## **P.2 PROJECT GOALS**

The purpose of the South Coast Rail project is to more fully meet the existing and future demand for public transportation between Fall River/New Bedford and Boston, Massachusetts to enhance regional mobility, while supporting smart growth planning and development strategies in affected communities.

The Corps, for purposes of Section 404 review, has adopted a modification of this statement as its "overall project purpose": The purpose of the South Coast Rail project is to more fully meet the existing and future demand for public transportation between Fall River/New Bedford and Boston, Massachusetts to enhance regional mobility. MassDOT believes that the two purpose statements are consistent, and recognizes that the Corps will not consider the relative ability of the DEIS/DEIR alternatives to support smart growth planning in its determination of the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative (LEDPA).

While other important goals of the project are identified in Chapter 2 of the DEIS/DEIR, the joint environmental review document does not fully articulate MassDOT's goals of smart growth.

### **P.2.1 SMART GROWTH**

MassDOT has retained the smart growth language in the Commonwealth's project purpose because transportation and land use planning need to be integrated in order to achieve the full benefits of the investment and to spur sustainable development. Conversely, transportation infrastructure which encourages economic and housing growth is likely to result in uncontrolled growth (sprawl) if not combined with smart growth planning and strategies.

Smart growth means concentrating development in places that are already served by infrastructure and preserving natural areas and their resources. Smart growth development is typically compact, transit-oriented, walkable, and bicycle-friendly, and can include neighborhood schools, complete streets, and mixed-use development with a range of housing choices. Smart growth values long-range, regional sustainability over short-term benefits. Its goals are to achieve a unique sense of community and place;

<sup>2</sup> Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs, formerly the Executive Office of Environmental Affairs.

expand the range of transportation, employment, and housing choices; equitably distribute the costs and benefits of development; preserve and enhance natural and cultural resources; and promote public health.

Over the last decades, the South Coast has been less characterized by smart growth than by exurban sprawl, the decline of gateway cities, and the consumption of natural areas at a rate that far exceeds the population growth rate. This type of uncontrolled growth results in the loss of farms, fields and forests, and damages the character of the historic villages and cities within the region. The following text describes the growth-related concerns within the South Coast region.

### **P.2.2 POPULATION AND LAND USE**

- The South Coast Rail corridor has been growing faster than the state as a whole and is part of a “sprawl frontier” of low-density development spreading out from Greater Boston. The communities with most developable land have the least capacity to manage growth in terms of infrastructure, existing plans and policies, and municipal staff.
- Semi-rural communities located between I-495 and I-195, including Rehoboth, Dighton, Berkley, and Rochester, are most vulnerable to unplanned growth because they lack infrastructure, land protection for key parcels, and, often, town staff, to help them plan.
- Although 15 percent of South Coast Rail corridor land is permanently protected, important habitat and resource areas are not yet effectively protected by a network of connected land.
- Although job concentrations continue to be important in corridor cities, low-density sprawl along major highways also increasingly characterizes business and job locations.
- While many communities have added zoning and other tools to promote more compact development patterns, in most cases these tools have been little used and the South Coast lags behind other regions of the state in the adoption of innovative smart growth planning policies.

### **P.2.3 ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT**

- Between 1976 and 2000, job growth in the South Coast Rail corridor lagged behind Massachusetts, which in turn lagged behind the United States as a whole. Over half the manufacturing jobs in the corridor disappeared, with construction, retail, wholesale trade, and services replacing manufacturing.
- The competitive advantages of the South Coast Rail corridor today are in costs of production: labor, land, energy, and to a lesser degree, taxes. Lower housing costs help reduce the cost of labor.
- The barriers to economic growth in the South Coast Rail corridor include access to labor and labor skill levels.
- Potential growth industries include: distribution, office related industries, health care and social services, food processing, hospitality, chemical manufacturing, electronics and construction.
- Economic indicators for Fall River and New Bedford show that those communities have significantly lower median household incomes, education levels, housing values and per capita local tax receipts than the South Coast Rail corridor as a whole and the state as a whole, while experiencing nearly twice the unemployment rate of the rest of the region and the state.

The region needs economic growth. The poor connectivity to the metropolitan Boston area constrains economic activity in the South Coast region. Sound transportation can be the difference between steady growth and economic stagnation. Roads, rails, airports, and ports provide the necessary support for national and international shipping, while affordable, convenient public transportation links local economies, housing markets, and recreational and educational opportunities.

#### P.2.4 THE PROJECT'S ROLE IN SUPPORTING REGIONAL SMART GROWTH

To manage the region's rapid growth and prepare for and maximize the benefit of the new transit service, the South Coast region needs intentional planning for smart growth development and environmental preservation. The scale and geographic reach of the South Coast Rail Project offer an unprecedented opportunity to shape growth so that the Project helps preserve environmental resources. By partnering with municipalities to jointly plan the transportation project along with local land use, the Project can help cluster people and jobs near train stations, opening up new economic development opportunities, while directing growth away from natural areas.

To further these Project goals, MassDOT and the Executive Office for Housing and Economic Development created the *South Coast Rail Economic Development and Land Use Corridor Plan*<sup>3</sup> (the Corridor Plan). The implementation of the Corridor Plan supports the Commonwealth's sustainable development principles, including revitalizing gateway cities and focusing growth in places that make sense.

The Corridor Plan's economic analysis demonstrated that better transit connections between the South Coast and metropolitan Boston will generate economic development and new jobs within the Commonwealth by 2030 – about two-thirds of which would locate in the South Coast region with the remaining third in Boston-Cambridge and other communities outside the region.

This new economic activity within the Commonwealth would be a consequence of travel cost savings and improved business and labor productivity brought about by the accessibility (shorter travel times) and mobility (mode choice) improvements of commuter rail. Because commuter rail would offer an attractive, reliable alternative to auto trips from the South Coast to Boston, many of the job increases expected to take place within the South Coast are likely to be in the higher paying professional services sectors. Improved access to employment markets in Boston would provide employment opportunities for the New Bedford and Fall River labor force. Better transit could also allow limited "reverse commutes" from area communities like Taunton to New Bedford and Fall River, which would thereby gain access to a larger labor pool within the southeastern Massachusetts region.

In addition to predicting the economic benefits of South Coast Rail, the Corridor Plan developed:

- The Corridor Map: This map is a regional blueprint for smart growth. Developed through a process of local, regional and state review, the map designates over 33 Priority Development Areas (places with the best capacity or potential to accommodate new development, including downtowns, major job centers, and future South Coast Rail station areas) and over 70 Priority Protection Areas (land or environmental resources that need protection through planning regulation, conservation or acquisition).
- Station Area Development Plans: Proposed South Coast station sites have been identified both to serve existing residents and businesses and to provide opportunities for new transit-oriented development around stations. Today, more than 40,000 households and over 55,000 jobs are situated within one mile of the proposed transit stations, offering commuters the option to walk or bike to the train. By 2030, given expected growth, transit in place, and the implementation of the Corridor Plan, we project additional 9,000 households and 11,000 jobs to locate within one mile of

<sup>3</sup> Goody Clancy. 2009. *South Coast Rail Economic Development and Land Use Corridor Plan*. June, 2009. Prepared for the Massachusetts Executive Office of Transportation and the Executive Office of Housing and Economic Development.

station areas. High levels of private sector investment could be attracted to station-served areas such as Hicks-Logan-Sawyer in New Bedford and Davol Street in Fall River, as well as areas in Taunton, Raynham and other corridor communities.

- **State Commitments:** The Commonwealth has committed \$300,000 each year for the past three years in technical assistance to help 31 cities and towns implement the Corridor Plan. Annual technical assistance at this level is expected to continue during the Project development phase to help municipalities preserve priority protection areas, guide development to priority development areas, and create zoning around station areas. The Commonwealth has also committed to implementing the policies to support the Corridor Plan. Most recently, Governor Patrick signed Executive Order 525, which directs state agencies to align infrastructure investments in water, wastewater, transportation, housing and economic development and land preservation funding to support preservation and development in the areas identified as priorities in the Corridor Map.

The Corridor Plan offers the communities in the region, from the cities to the suburban towns to the smaller rural towns, both a vision and a set of recommendations that can shape growth in locally preferred, sustainable ways that preserve the region's distinctive character and high quality of life.

### **P.3 CIVIC AND AGENCY INVOLVEMENT**

To ensure effective and inclusive outreach to stakeholders throughout the various stages of Project development, MassDOT has implemented a comprehensive community involvement process for the South Coast Rail Project that includes an Interagency Coordinating Group, the Southeastern Massachusetts Commuter Rail Task Force (Commuter Rail Task Force), and an extensive Civic Engagement process.

#### **P.3.1 INTERAGENCY COORDINATING GROUP**

MassDOT convened an Interagency Coordinating Group of federal and state regulatory agencies to guide the environmental review process. The group includes representatives of:

- United States Army Corps of Engineers
- United States Environmental Protection Agency
- United States Fish and Wildlife Service
- Federal Highway Administration
- Federal Transit Administration
- National Marine Fisheries Service
- Narragansett Indian Tribe
- Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head (Aquinnah)
- Massachusetts Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs
- Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act Office
- Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority
- Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection
- Massachusetts Office of Coastal Zone Management
- Massachusetts Department of Conservation and Recreation, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern Program
- Massachusetts Department of Fish and Game, Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program
- Massachusetts Historical Commission
- Southeastern Regional Planning and Economic Development District

This group began meeting in September 2007 and met monthly through November 2009, and less frequently through July, 2010. The group meets with the objective of streamlining the environmental review process for the Project by reaching consensus on key items, including project purpose and need, scope of alternatives for study, methodology for obtaining data, and analysis of data. Table P-1 lists Interagency Coordinating Group meeting topics and dates.

In addition, as required by the Secretary's Certificate on the ENF, a working group was formed to develop a scope for the analysis of greenhouse gas emissions and the potential secondary effects of the proposed Project with, and without, the implementation of the Corridor Plan. Participants in this working group included representatives of the EPA, Corps, and DEP.

A full record of group-approved meeting minutes is posted on MassDOT's Project website: [www.mass.gov/southcoastrail](http://www.mass.gov/southcoastrail).

### **P.3.2 COMMUTER RAIL TASK FORCE**

The 2000 MEPA Certificate for the New Bedford/Fall River Commuter Rail Extension Supplemental Draft EIR recognized the induced growth that could result from the project and called for a growth management task force to be created. In 2004, the Commuter Rail Task Force was formed to help the region prepare for the impacts of the re-introduction of passenger rail to the South Coast. Its membership includes representatives from the MBTA, regional transit authorities, cities and towns, environmental groups, and business and economic development organizations. Currently, the group is staffed by the Southeastern Regional Planning and Economic Development District and chaired by John Bullard.

The Commuter Rail Task Force provides a forum for state officials and local representatives to review and discuss all aspects of the Project and to work toward consensus on strategies and actions to plan ahead for new growth in the region. The Task Force provides advice and assistance to MassDOT and the MBTA in the design of the Project and in the implementation of the *South Coast Rail Economic Development and Land Use Corridor Plan*.

### **P.3.3 CIVIC ENGAGEMENT**

MassDOT and the MBTA have launched a robust Civic Engagement process to seek fresh, new ideas to help better design the project and address the concerns of the region's residents. Outreach includes community meetings with corridor municipalities, briefings for area legislators, large civic engagement meetings for members of the public, and small focused meetings on particular aspects of the Project that are of interest to individuals and community groups throughout the corridor.

MassDOT launched a Project website (<http://www.mass.gov/southcoastrail>) to provide updated Project information such as news releases, the Phase 1 Alternatives Analysis report, preliminary findings of the Corridor Plan, maps, materials from the civic engagement meetings, Interagency Coordinating Group meeting materials and minutes, and past environmental documents (including the September 1995 ENF, July 1999 DEIR, October 2003 Supplemental DEIR, and April 2002 FEIR). The website is updated regularly.

Aside from the Project website, interested parties, elected officials, and residents are notified of upcoming meetings and new information through fact sheets, newspaper announcements, flyers and posters, cable-televised meetings, and/or e-mail notifications.

**Table P-1 Interagency Coordinating Group Meetings to Date**

<b>Meeting Topic</b>	<b>Date</b>
Project Kickoff and Introduction	September 25, 2007
Project Purpose and Need – Draft	October 23, 2007
Project Purpose and Need – Draft: Phase 1 Screening Criteria	November 27, 2007
Project Purpose and Need – Draft: Phase 1 Screening Criteria; Review of Civic Engagement Input	December 19, 2007
Project Purpose and Need – Final: Phase 1 Screening Criteria	January 3, 2008
Phase 1 Screening Criteria – Final: Range of Phase 1 Alternatives	January 10, 2008
Phase 1 Analysis – Step 1 Screening Criteria Results	February 14, 2008
Phase 1 Analysis – Concurrence on Step 1 Screening Criteria Results; Review Step 2 Results	February 21, 2008
Phase 1 Analysis – Step 2 Concurrence; Review Step 3 Results and Conclusion of Phase 1	February 28, 2008
Phase 1 Analysis – Concurrence on Step 3 Results	March 4, 2008
Phase 1 Analysis – Draft Report; Review of Civic Engagement Input; Step 4 (Circling Back) Analysis	March 21, 2008
Phase 1 Analysis – Concurrence on Advancing Alternatives	April 1, 2008
Smart Growth Corridor Plan	May 27, 2008
Ridership Modeling; Role of the Interagency Coordinating Group	June 19, 2008
Environmental Data Collection Protocols, Potential Station Locations and Rail Operational Analysis	July 17, 2008
Proposed Station Locations; Environmental Review; Data Collection Protocols and Modeling	September 16, 2008
Preliminary Assessment of Alternatives; Environmental Notification Form	October 24, 2008
Discussion on Content of Environmental Notification Form	December 15, 2008
ENF Comments from MEPA; Priority Mapping; Ridership Memo	January 22, 2009
Supplemental Ridership Memo	February 26, 2009
Subcommittee Meeting on Wetlands	April 16, 2009
Subcommittee Meeting on Greenhouse Gases	May 5, 2009
Subcommittee Meeting on Secondary and Cumulative Growth Impacts	May 7, 2009
CAPS model; Secondary Growth Methodology; Wetlands Mapping Methodology	June 18, 2009
CAPS model; Secondary Growth and GHG methodology	July 21, 2009
Rail and Bus operations; Corridor Plan	August 20, 2009
DEIS Process; Secondary Growth Impacts Methodology and Results: Alternatives Analysis	October 22, 2009
CAPS Results' Secondary Growth Impacts	November 12, 2009
Subcommittee meeting on wetland mitigation	February 1, 2010
Subcommittee meeting on wetland mitigation	May 22, 2010
Alternatives Analysis	July 21, 2010

### **P.3.4 CIVIC ENGAGEMENT FOR THIS DEIS/DEIR**

MassDOT is committed to helping the public better understand this complex environmental document so the public and other interested parties can provide informed comments on substantive environmental issues to MEPA and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. MassDOT will hold public information meetings/workshops during the review process, and MassDOT has published a “Readers’ Guide to the DEIS/DEIR” and Fact Sheet which summarizes MassDOT’s understanding of this document’s main findings. These documents are available on the project website, [www.mass.gov/southcoastrail](http://www.mass.gov/southcoastrail). Information on public meetings will be posted on the website as well as through the local media and through the Project’s e-mail list. To sign up for e-mail notifications, please send an email to: [kristina.egan@state.ma.us](mailto:kristina.egan@state.ma.us).

### **P.4 MASSDOT’S PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE**

MassDOT has identified the Stoughton family of alternatives as the Commonwealth’s preferred corridor for the South Coast Rail Project. MassDOT recognizes that the Corps of Engineers has not yet determined the Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA) as required by the USEPA’s Section 404 (b)(1) Guidelines.<sup>4</sup> However, MassDOT is required by the MEPA office to identify its proposed action in order to initiate MEPA review, and has therefore chosen to identify a preferred corridor in the state portion of this Draft Environmental Impact Statement/Environmental Impact Report to facilitate review of the South Coast Rail Project under the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act and inform the scope of study needed for the Final Environmental Impact Report.

The Stoughton Alternatives (electric and diesel modes) would extend existing Stoughton Line commuter rail service to Fall River and New Bedford using existing commuter rail lines to Stoughton Station, restored commuter rail lines from Stoughton Station to Taunton, and existing freight rail lines from Taunton to Fall River and New Bedford. These alternatives meet the project purpose of more fully meeting the existing and future demand for public transportation between Fall River/New Bedford and Boston, Massachusetts to enhance regional mobility, while supporting smart growth planning and development strategies in affected communities. MassDOT believes this family of alternatives best balances transportation and environmental benefits with environmental impacts.

MassDOT understands that there are many environmental concerns about the Stoughton Alternatives, particularly because this corridor crosses the Hockomock Swamp ACEC on a historic railroad bed. We have looked carefully at these environmental issues and have incorporated a trestle into the design to minimize impacts to wetlands and wildlife. Our analysis indicates that the Stoughton Alternatives are permissible. Adequate mitigation will need to be provided, particularly for impacts to wetlands, wildlife habitat, rare species and water quality. Although the Stoughton corridor would have environmental impacts, it provides the greatest transportation benefits and – unlike the other corridors – fully meets the project purpose.

The Attleboro Alternatives would result in a service that did not meet the MBTA’s Service Delivery Policy for on-time performance, thereby resulting in an unacceptable level of delays. These alternatives would also have a negative cascading effect on the performance of other commuter rail lines that share the same tracks. The Attleboro Alternatives also have a substantially higher cost, are significantly more difficult to construct, and would have nearly double the amount of wetland acreage impacts as the

---

<sup>4</sup> 40 CFR 230 et seq.

Stoughton Alternatives. The Whittenton Alternatives would require a longer trip time and, correspondingly, result in fewer vehicle miles travelled avoided (when compared to the other rail alternatives), as well as providing fewer air quality and climate benefits. The Whittenton corridor would use an alignment through downtown Taunton that would result in 13 grade crossings in a three-mile stretch of the corridor through downtown Taunton, raising safety concerns and increasing noise impacts. The Rapid Bus alternative requires longer trip times and results in significantly fewer riders than the rail alternatives. The Rapid Bus option is also unreliable due to traffic delays.

MassDOT has not identified a preferred mode for the Stoughton Alternatives. The electric mode provides more transportation benefits and is more expensive to construct. Electric power has substantial transportation, air quality, and climate benefits, but would have slightly larger wetland impacts and greater visual impacts to historic resources.

The MEPA procedures require that the proponent provide a detailed analysis of “the Project” in the DEIR, as well as an analysis of alternatives to the Project. The intent of these regulations is for the Final Environmental Impact Report to provide sufficient information on the Project to allow state agencies to make decisions on their actions (funding and environmental permits). Typically, the Secretary of EOEEA issues a Certificate on the Draft EIR that requires the proponent to prepare a Final EIR containing specific and detailed information on the impacts and mitigation commitments of the proposed action. Because public comment is essential to developing the Certificate and Scope for the FEIR, MassDOT has identified a preferred corridor for the Project to facilitate public comment and the MEPA Scope for the FEIR. However, the Corps’ NEPA regulations for the Regulatory Program<sup>5</sup> do not require a preferred alternative, as the Corps is neither a proponent nor opponent of the proposed action. The Corps has indicated that it cannot identify the LEDPA until it has considered public comments submitted in response to the DEIS.

## **P.5 REQUIREMENTS OF THE SECRETARY’S CERTIFICATE**

This section of the Preface documents how the DEIS/DEIR responds to the requirements under MEPA, as set forth in the Secretary’s Certificate on the ENF. The Certificate required that MassDOT prepare a Draft EIR in accordance with the general guidance in the MEPA regulations (Section 11.07), including maps, plans and other graphics, environmental impacts, a list of permits required, and a list of all applicable MEPA review thresholds. The Certificate required that the document provide a Summary with a discussion of the Project’s purpose and need and associated goals and objectives, a detailed Project description addressing all components of the Project alternatives, and an assessment of environmental impacts including temporary, permanent, secondary and cumulative impacts. Table P-2 identifies where specific information required by the Certificate can be found in this DEIS/DEIR. The *Responses to Comments on the Environmental Notification Form* section of this DEIS/DEIR provides a detailed response to each of the requirements of the Secretary’s Certificate.

The DEIS/DEIR evaluates seven build alternatives at the conceptual design level, and estimates the environmental impacts of each alternative based on GIS-level information. The Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA), when identified by the Corps, would be advanced to prepare a more definitive and precise estimate of environmental impacts based on field delineation of resources and a more detailed preliminary and final engineering design information. Because the alternatives evaluated in this DEIS/DEIR have substantially different levels of environmental impacts (which are of

<sup>5</sup> 33 CFR 325, Appendix B

necessity only estimates at this design stage) and would impact environmental resources in different locations, it is not practical to provide a fully detailed mitigation plan for each alternative and resource at this stage of Project development. This DEIS/DEIR provides an overview and outline of the mitigation measures that would be developed for the LEDPA, and establishes a framework for the ultimate, specific mitigation commitments of the South Coast Rail Project. The EOEEA has agreed that this is the appropriate level of information for the DEIS/DEIR, and has waived the requirements to include detailed wetland mitigation plans in this document.

**Table P-2  
Summary of the Requirements of the Secretary's Certificate on the ENF**

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Requirement</b>	<b>Addressed in DEIS/DEIR Section(s)</b>
Land Alteration	Provide an analysis of land impacts, by type	Section 4.2.3
	Describe the parking plans for each station	Section 3.2.5.2.
Alternatives	Include the Whittenton Electric Alternative	Section 3.2.1.4
	Evaluate secondary growth impacts for each alternative under three scenarios	Section 5.3.1
	Provide an expanded description of the No-Build Alternative, including the estimates for reduction of VMT	Sections 3.2.1.1 and 3.2.4.3
	Provide detailed cost estimates for each alternative, and indicate how the proposed transportation project and the Corridor Plan will be financed	Sections 3.2.5.2 and 3.2.5.3
	Identify proposed layover, storage and maintenance facilities and evaluate impacts	Section 3.2.5, and Chapter 4
Ridership	More fully explain the ridership model.	Section 3.2
	Present the results of the ridership analysis and include a breakdown that shows ridership numbers for each station area. Clarify the number of new transit trips from the New Bedford/Fall River region. Clarify how many of the increased trips are a result of riders switching modes.	Section 3.2.4.3
	The modeling should reflect actual current fares and realistic future fares for the build and forecast years, and discuss how the model accounts for fare changes over time.	Section 3.2.4.2
	Provide well documented, valid projections of ridership	Section 3.2.4.3
Secondary Growth	Present a robust and thorough analysis of the secondary and cumulative impacts, based on three scenarios	Sections 5.3 and 5.4
	Evaluate the alternatives on the basis of smart growth principles, and discuss the findings, recommendations, and implementation of the Corridor Plan	Section 5.3.1.3

**Table P-2 (Continued)**  
**Summary of the Requirements of the Secretary's Certificate on the ENF**

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Requirement</b>	<b>Addressed in DEIS/DEIR Chapter(s) and Section(s)</b>
Air Quality	Consult with DEP on methodology, and convene a working group to develop the methodology for assessing GHG emissions and secondary growth	Sections 4.9.1.3 and 4.9.5.1
	Include analysis of mesoscale, microscale, and GHG emissions for each alternative and station site	Sections 4.9.1.3, 4.9.2, and 4.9.4
	Propose construction and operational air quality mitigation measures	Sections 4.9.2 and 4.9.3 Chapter 7
Transportation	Provide an analysis of the impacts of each alternative on traffic congestion, at the local and regional level.	Section 4.1.4.2
	Evaluate the potential impacts of construction and operations on existing transit services and transportation systems	Section 4.1.4.2
	Provide an analysis of grade crossings and the traffic and safety impacts for each alternative	Section 4.1.4.2
	Describe proposed station and TOD facilities, including interconnectivity between transit systems	Section 3.2.5.2; Section 5.3.1.3
Endangered Species	Provide a detailed analysis of the relative impacts of the alternatives on state-listed species.	Section 4.15.3
	Discuss the MESA permitting process, and provide a detailed description of proposed mitigation measures	Sections 4.15.4.2 and 4.15.3.6 Chapter 7
	Provide an update on consultation with the NHESP	Section 4.15.1.3
Wetlands	Provide a detailed analysis of the relative impacts of the alternatives on all regulated wetland resource areas, including secondary and cumulative impacts and the ecological integrity of wetlands	Section 4.16.3
	Discuss the wetland delineation methodology used in the DEIS/DEIR	Section 4.16.3.2
	Evaluate potential impacts associated with herbicide use	Section 4.16.3
	Describe how the project will meet the regulatory standards for a variance under the Wetlands Protection Act	Section 4.16.4.1
	Include information on stream crossings and outstanding resource waters	Sections 4.16.2 and 4.16.3
	Include a detailed description of mitigation measures for each of the alternatives	Section 4.16.3.6 Chapter 7

**Table P-2 (Continued)**  
**Summary of the Requirements of the Secretary's Certificate on the ENF**

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Requirement</b>	<b>Addressed in DEIS/DEIR Chapter(s) and Section(s)</b>
Waterways/ Chapter 91	Provide detailed information on waterways and identify areas and structures that are subject to Chapter 91	Section 4.18.3.2
	Address compliance with waterways regulations concerning ACECs	Section 4.18.4.2
Biodiversity	Evaluate direct and indirect impacts to wildlife and their habitats, particularly with respect to ACECs and other sensitive ecosystems	Section 4.14.3
	Provide a comprehensive analysis of biodiversity values and impacts associated with each alternative	Section 4.14.3.4
	Include a detailed mitigation plan to address biodiversity impacts	Section 4.14.3.6 Chapter 7
Water Quality	Provide a detailed analysis of potential impacts to public and private water supplies	Section 4.17.3
Article 97 Lands	Include a detailed analysis of the impacts of each alternative on protected public open space	Section 4.10.3
Environmental Justice	Describe benefits to environmental justice communities and identify any potential for disproportionate impacts to EJ communities	Section 4.4.3
Fishery Resources	Evaluate potential impacts to fishery resources, and demonstrate how the project will be designed to meet applicable standards for river and stream crossings.	Section 4.14.3
Coastal Resources	Discuss the compatibility of the New Bedford and Fall River rail stations with existing and future marine industrial uses in the area, including compatibility with uses of the Designated Port Area.	Sections 4.18.3 and 4.18.5
	Evaluate potential impacts to coastal resources of stormwater runoff. Describe proposed stormwater management practices.	Section 4.18.5.1; Section 4.17.3, Section 4.17.3.6
	Evaluate the impacts of the project on atmospheric deposition of nitrogen compounds into coastal embayments	Section 4.9.2.11
	Include an evaluation of the project's consistency with CZM's program policies	Section 4.18.5
Cultural Resources	Describe potential impacts to cultural resources, including historic and archaeological resources, sites of significance to native people, and the Taunton Wild and Scenic River.	Sections 4.8.3 and 4.8.4; Section 4.5.3
	Describe measures to mitigation for adverse impacts	Section 4.8.5 Chapter 7

**Table P-2 (Continued)**  
**Summary of the Requirements of the Secretary's Certificate on the ENF**

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Requirement</b>	<b>Addressed in DEIS/DEIR Chapter(s) and Section(s)</b>
Noise and Vibration	Include an analysis of noise and vibration impacts, and evaluate measures to avoid and minimize impacts, including impacts to wildlife	Section 4.6.3 and Section 4.7.3
Stormwater	Evaluate the potential stormwater impacts associated with construction and operation of each of the alternatives, and demonstrate how the project will comply with applicable regulations.	Section 4.17.3
Oil and Hazardous Materials	Include a draft soil management plan in the DEIR	Section 4.12.4
Monitoring and Evaluation	Include a draft monitoring and evaluation plan for the long-term assessment of project impacts and mitigation	To be included in FEIR
Mitigation	Include a separate chapter on mitigation measures, including a summary table and proposed Section 61 Findings for all state permits.	Chapter 7: Proposed Mitigation and MassDOT Proposed Section 61 Findings
Response to Comments	Include a response to comments, with a copy of the Certificate and each comment letter received on the ENF and the Ridership Memorandum	Appendix 8.2-A
Circulation	Copies of the DEIR should be sent to the list of "comments received" in the Certificate, and circulated in compliance with Section 11.16 of the MEPA regulations. A copy of the DEIR should be made available for public review in the public libraries in the region	Chapter 9: Distribution List