

No.	MEPA Comment	Response
SC-1	Additional analysis of water supply and wastewater disposal options are necessary to fully evaluate the impacts of the project change.	Under the preferred MWRA/Weymouth/SRA permanent water supply solution, Weymouth and the Base receive water from the donor Quabbin tributary watersheds (Chicopee and Nashua River Basins). The Weymouth/SRA MEPA filing, which was filed on May 31, 2024 (the “Weymouth/SRA MEPA filing”) covers the transfer of water from the Chicopee and Nashua River Basins to the Boston Harbor and South Coastal River Basins. The wastewater solution for the Project has a Town-by-Town approach: (i) wastewater generated from the Weymouth portion of the Base will continue to discharge to the Weymouth collection system; (ii) wastewater generated from the Abington portion of the Base will discharge to the Abington collection system; and (iii) wastewater generated from the Rockland portion of the Base will have individual on-site septic systems. See Sections 4.0 and 5.0 of this Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Report (DSEIR) for detailed water and wastewater analyses.
SC-2	The DSEIR should also provide comprehensive analysis of all other project impacts, including potential impacts to EJ populations over a 1 or 5 mile radius as applicable, and mitigation measures.	As noted in the NPC, the Project predates the MEPA EJ policy. However, as described in the Public Involvement Plan attached as Appendix E and in Section 2.0 of this DSEIR, the DSEIR analyzes potential impacts to any EJ Populations within the 5-mile Designated Geographic Area (DGA) and the Project complies with the strategies and recommendations in the MEPA Public Involvement Protocol for Environmental Justice Populations.
SC-3	The DSEIR should follow Section 11.07 of the MEPA regulations for outline and content and provide the information and analyses required in this Scope.	The outline and content of this DSEIR follows the MEPA regulations as informed by the Secretary’s Certificate on the December 2023 NPC and comments received.
SC-4	It should clearly demonstrate that the Proponent will avoid, minimize and mitigate Damage to the Environment to the maximum extent practicable through project alternatives and design.	The Project has been designed to avoid potential environmental impacts to the greatest extent practicable. Where complete avoidance is not possible, such impacts will be minimized and mitigated through the measures described in the DSEIR (see Section 12.0 for Mitigation). Overall, the Project’s benefits will far outweigh potential impacts.
SC-5	The DSEIR should identify any further changes to the project change since the filing of the 2023 NPC.	Since the filing of the December 2023 NPC, the Proponent has been continuing review and coordination with State agencies, including MassDEP, MassDOT, MBTA, NHESP, MWRA and WRC. Such ongoing agency coordination has enabled the Proponent to clarify estimated water and sewer consumption and estimated trip generation and transit mode analyses, define preferred permanent water and wastewater solutions along with transportation improvements and ongoing monitoring strategies, and present a robust and continuing public outreach approach that is consistent with MEPA’s current EJ policies (including hosting public information sessions prior to making this DSEIR filing for the benefit of EJ and non-EJ populations alike).
SC-6	It should identify and describe state, federal, and local permitting and review requirements associated with the project change and provide an update on the status of each of these pending actions.	Section 1.3 addresses the anticipated permits and approvals, as well as the local planning and regulatory controls applicable to the Project. The status of the anticipated permits and approvals is addressed in Table 1.1.
SC-7	The DSEIR should include a description and analysis of applicable statutory and regulatory standards and requirements, and a discussion of the project change’s consistency with those standards.	Each of the technical sections of the DSEIR provide discussion of the regulatory standards specific to the respective technical topic as well as an update of agency coordination.
SC-8	As detailed below, the Proponent should provide a substantive responses to each comment rather than providing a reference to a section of the DSEIR.	The Proponent prepared an exhaustive Response to Comments (see Section 13.0) that addresses each of the substantive comments that were submitted regarding the December 2023 NPC.

No.	MEPA Comment	Response
SC-9	The DSEIR should include detailed site plans for existing and post-development conditions at a legible scale. Plans should clearly identify buildings, interior and exterior public areas, impervious areas, transportation improvements, pedestrian and bicycle accommodations, and stormwater and utility infrastructure.	Detailed site plans for existing and post-development conditions have been provided in the DSEIR. See Figures ES-1, 1-2, 1-4 through 1-8, 6-2 and 8-2 of this DSEIR and those Figures included in the TIA Supplement attached as Appendix C.
SC-10	The DSEIR should provide detailed plans, sections, and elevations to accurately depict existing and proposed conditions, including proposed above- and below-ground structures, on- and off- site open space, and resiliency and other mitigation measures.	Site plans included in this DSEIR show conceptual development plans, including major roadway networks, pedestrian and bicycle connectivity, open space and stormwater management facilities. See Figures 1-4 through 1-8 and 8-1.
SC-11	The DSEIR should provide conceptual plans, review potential impacts of off-site water, sewer, and transportation impacts, and discuss any additional permitting for those structures and the entity responsible for seeking permits and approvals.	Conceptual improvement plans for the off-site roadway and intersection improvements were provided as a part of the December 2023 TIA that accompanied the 2023 NPC. New or updated concept plans are included in TIA Supplement attached as Exhibit C where these improvements have been updated or alternative improvement strategies have been evaluated. The preferred MWRA/Weymouth/SRA permanent water supply solution provides for the Town of Weymouth and the Base to receive water from the donor Quabbin tributary watersheds (Chicopee and Nashua River Basins); the Weymouth/SRA MEPA filing provides this information, and is summarized in Section 4.0 of this DSEIR. The wastewater solution for the Project has a Town-by-Town approach described in Section 5.0 of this DSEIR. Any permitting related to these infrastructure improvements is summarized in Section 1.3.
SC-12	As requested by MassDEP, the DSEIR should include an organization chart depicting the relationships, authorities, roles, and responsibilities, including but not limited to the three municipalities, the SRA, and any other relevant entities.	Such relationships, authorities, roles and responsibilities are as set forth in the 2014 Enabling Legislation (as the same may be amended).
SC-13	The DSEIR should review how the Proponent will coordinate construction of infrastructure, including but not limited to roadways, stormwater, water supply, and wastewater collection systems, that will become the property of any municipality or other quasi- municipal authority to ensure the design and construction meet the standards of that entity.	Details regarding construction of any infrastructure for the preferred MWRA/Weymouth/SRA permanent water supply solution is set forth in the Weymouth/SRA MEPA filing. Wastewater infrastructure will be completed, as needed, in compliance with any applicable SRA and/or Town standards, consistent with the Enabling Legislation (as the same may be amended). The transportation improvement program that is outlined in Section 3.0 includes a discussion on coordination with state and local agencies to advance the improvements in an effective manner that leverages opportunities to enhance planned improvements by others in the area.

No.	MEPA Comment	Response
SC-14	The DSEIR did not identify a preferred alternative to support the water/wastewater needs of the project, and Agency comments raise serious concerns about groundwater and water quality impacts that may result from a full buildout of the project.	The preferred MWRA/Weymouth/SRA permanent water supply solution provides for the Town of Weymouth and the Base to receive water from the donor Quabbin tributary watersheds (Chicopee and Nashua River Basins). The Weymouth/SRA MEPA filing covers the transfer of water from the Chicopee and Nashua River Basins to the Boston Harbor and South Coastal River Basins. The wastewater solution for the Project has a Town-by-Town approach: (i) wastewater generated from the Weymouth portion of the Base will continue to discharge to the Weymouth collection system; (ii) wastewater generated from the Abington portion of the Base will discharge to the Abington collection system; and (iii) wastewater generated from the Rockland portion of the Base will have individual on-site septic systems.
SC-15	The lack of clear documentation supporting a viable solution for water/wastewater needs and the lack of a preferred alternative for this critical infrastructure component precludes the advancement of this project to a Final EIR.	The preferred MWRA/Weymouth/SRA permanent water supply solution provides for the Town of Weymouth and the Base to receive water from the donor Quabbin tributary watersheds (Chicopee and Nashua River Basins). The Weymouth/SRA MEPA filing covers the transfer of water from the Chicopee and Nashua River Basins to the Boston Harbor and South Coastal River Basins. The wastewater solution for the Project has a Town-by-Town approach: (i) wastewater generated from the Weymouth portion of the Base will continue to discharge to the Weymouth collection system; (ii) wastewater generated from the Abington portion of the Base will discharge to the Abington collection system; and (iii) wastewater generated from the Rockland portion of the Base will have individual on-site septic systems.
SC-16	The DSEIR should provide a full alternatives analysis to support a preferred alternative as related to water/wastewater needs, as detailed in the Water Supply and Wastewater sections below. The alternatives analysis should be adequate to support an ITA application to the WRC, as referenced in WRC comments.	The Proponent met with WRC on April 22, 2024 and discussed the necessary ITAs and the ITA requirements. This DSEIR filing covers the "secondary" discharges ITAs of wastewater transfers into the Taunton River Basin (see Section 5.0). The transfer of water from the Chicopee and Nashua River basins to the Boston Harbor and South Coastal River basins is covered in the Weymouth/SRA MEPA filing.
SC-17	To the extent the selected alternative for water supply is the MWRA connection, the Proponent should coordinate with the Town of Weymouth to present information consistent with disclosures to be provided in the upcoming filing by the Town.	Since filing the December 2023 NPC, Weymouth has decided to apply to join the MWRA, as detailed in its recently-filed joint MWRA/SRA MEPA EENF filing. This joint Weymouth/SRA MWRA connection has been identified as the preferred permanent water solution in light of the great progress that has been made, along with the clear mutual benefits of an integrated and comprehensive regional solution, rather than the SRA independently pursuing a water supply for the Base alone.
SC-18	The DSEIR should provide an analysis of all impacts associated with the level of development proposed by the project, and clearly document that the project will take all feasible measures to avoid, minimize and mitigate impacts commensurate with the proposed level of development.	The Project has been designed to avoid potential environmental impacts to the greatest extent practicable. Where complete avoidance is not possible, such impacts will be minimized and mitigated through the measures described in the DSEIR (see Section 12.0 for Mitigation). Overall, the Project's benefits will far outweigh potential impacts.

No.	MEPA Comment	Response
SC-19	As the 2023 NPC describes changes to a previously proposed project, it is not a new project filing subject to the new EJ regulations and protocols. Nonetheless, given the scope and scale of this revised development plan, the MEPA Office has determined that these new rules shall apply to this review. The Proponent has agreed to undertake outreach and analysis consistent with these new rules. 4	As noted in the NPC, the Project predates the MEPA EJ policy. However, as described in the Public Involvement Plan attached as Appendix E and in Section 2.0 of this DSEIR, the DSEIR analyzes potential impacts to any EJ Populations within the 5-mile Designated Geographic Area (DGA) and the Project complies with the strategies and recommendations in the MEPA Public Involvement Protocol for Environmental Justice Populations.  In accordance with the Scope set forth in the Secretary’s Certificate on the December 2023 NPC, the Proponent created a Public Involvement Plan (PIP) to formalize its public involvement strategy, goals, and framework for ongoing public involvement in the Project, in terms of outreach to both EJ Populations and the general public. The PIP was prepared with reference to and is consistent with the recommended public involvement strategies of the MEPA Public Involvement Protocol for Environmental Justice Populations (January 1, 2022). The PIP also summarizes outreach activities prior to filing the December 2023 NPC and those conducted during preparation of this DSEIR. See the full PIP in Appendix E for additional information.
SC-20	The 2023 NPC indicated that the DGA for the project is one mile; however, as noted below, the DGA should be confirmed in the DSEIR and outreach/analysis extended to five miles as appropriate.	Because the Project is expected to generate 150 or more average ADTs of diesel traffic over a duration of one year or more, a 5-mile Designated Geographic Area (DGA) was selected for evaluation of baseline conditions and potential Project-related impacts to EJ Populations. Consistent with the DGA, each of the EJ criteria were evaluated within 5 miles of the Site using the EOEEA EJ Map Viewer. See Section 2.0 for additional details.
SC-21	The Proponent should establish a public involvement plan to engage EJ populations located within the identified DGA for the proposed development.	The PIP is described in Section 2.3 and the full PIP is provided in Appendix E.
SC-22	The DSEIR should describe the components of the public involvement plan and should contain a full description of measures the Proponent intends to undertake to promote public involvement by such EJ populations during the remainder of the MEPA review process, including a discussion of any of the best practices listed in the MEPA EJ Public Involvement Protocol that the Proponent intends to employ.	As noted in the NPC, the Project predates the MEPA EJ policy. However, as described in the Public Involvement Plan attached as Appendix E and in Section 2.0 of this DSEIR, the DSEIR analyzes potential impacts to any EJ Populations within the 5-mile Designated Geographic Area (DGA) and the Project complies with the strategies and recommendations in the MEPA Public Involvement Protocol for Environmental Justice Populations. See the full PIP in Appendix E for additional information regarding ongoing public involvement and outreach strategies.
SC-23	The DSEIR, or a summary thereof, should be distributed to all CBOs and tribes included in the “EJ Reference List” provided by the MEPA Office, and the Proponent should obtain an updated list from the MEPA Office to ensure that outdated contacts are removed and new ones added.	The Proponent provided Advance Notice of this filing by submitting an EJ Screening Form to CBOs including tribal organizations active within the DGA or statewide. In compliance with the MEPA Public Involvement Protocol for Environmental Justice Populations, CBOs included in this outreach were those listed on the EJ Reference List provided by the EOEEA EJ Director, as summarized in Table 2.2. In addition, the Proponent conducted its own research and consulted with local communities surrounding the Site to identify its own list of additional CBOs. The list represents the interests of residents in the 12 municipalities within the 5-mile DGA, including Abington, Avon, Braintree, Brockton, Hanover, Hingham, Holbrook, Quincy, Randolph, Rockland, Weymouth, and Whitman. Additional organizations identified by the Proponent through previous outreach activities were also provided Advance Notice and are summarized in Table 2.3.

No.	MEPA Comment	Response
SC-24	The Proponent is encouraged to consult with the EEA EJ Director and the MEPA Office regarding community engagement strategies appropriate for the project change, well before the filing of the DSEIR.	Table 2.4 of the DSEIR identifies the various community outreach meetings, including those meetings with the EEA EJ Director on EJ engagement strategies. Meetings with the EJ Director were held on March 23, March 29, and April 3, 2024. Such meetings informed the strategies included in the PIP attached as Appendix E.
SC-25	Prior to filing the DSEIR, the Proponent should conduct at least one public informational meeting targeted to residents within EJ populations within the DGA.	The Proponent hosted a Public Information Meeting on April 10, 2024 at the Brockton Public Library. The purpose of the meeting was to provide an opportunity for CBOs to learn more about the Project, ask questions, and provide comments. See Appendix E, Public Involvement Plan, Section E.5, for additional information.
SC-26	To facilitate public participation, the Proponent should work with neighborhood and civic groups within the DGA to plan and schedule the meeting and provide refreshments, childcare, travel subsidies and/or other accommodations to promote attendance.	The Proponent has had several outreach meetings since filing the NPC. Refer to Appendix E (PIP) for additional details regarding when and where these meetings took place and the accommodations provided.
SC-27	The Proponent is directed to coordinate with the Town of Weymouth to hold joint public informational sessions on this project and water supply issues, prior to filing the DSEIR.	The Proponent hosted a Joint Public Information Meeting with the Town of Weymouth on April 11, 2024 at the Weymouth High School. The Joint Public Information Meeting was intended to provide a general update on the Project and the plans to bring water supply to the Base. See Appendix E, Public Involvement Plan, Section E.5, for additional information.
SC-28	The DSEIR should include a separate section on “Environmental Justice,” and should include a baseline assessment of any existing “unfair or inequitable Environmental Burden and related public health consequences” impacting EJ Populations in accordance with 301 CMR 11.07(6)(n)(1) and the MEPA Interim Protocol for Analysis of EJ Impacts.	<p>As noted in the NPC, the Project predates the MEPA EJ policy. However, as described in the Public Involvement Plan attached as Appendix E and in Section 2.0 of this DSEIR, the DSEIR analyzes potential impacts to any EJ Populations within the 5-mile Designated Geographic Area (DGA) and the Project complies with the strategies and recommendations in the MEPA Public Involvement Protocol for Environmental Justice Populations. See the full PIP in Appendix E for additional information regarding ongoing public involvement and outreach strategies.</p> <p>Section 2.4 of this DSEIR includes a baseline assessment of any existing “unfair or inequitable Environmental Burden and related public health consequences” impacting EJ Populations in accordance with 301 CMR 11.07(6)(n)(1) and the MEPA Interim Protocol for Analysis of EJ Impacts.</p>
SC-29	The DSEIR should also include an analysis of the impacts of the proposed development to determine whether the project may result in disproportionate adverse effects, or increase the risks of climate change, on the identified EJ population, in accordance with 301 CMR 11.07(6)(n)(2) and the MEPA Interim Protocol for Analysis of EJ Impacts.	Overall, the Project’s benefits will far outweigh potential impacts, and there are not expected to be disproportionate adverse effects to EJ Populations. The Proponent used the Resilient MA Team Climate Resilience Design Tool (the RMA Tool) to analyze the risks associated with climate change at the Site, as more fully described in Section 2.4.3, and determined there will be an insignificant impact to air quality and no disproportionate effects to EJ Populations. The Project will provide substantial benefits to EJ and non-EJ Populations alike through creating housing and job opportunities, enhancing open space, and generally improving the Site as compared to existing conditions. See Section 12.0 for details regarding the Project’s robust mitigation package and draft Section 61 findings.

No.	MEPA Comment	Response
SC-30	The DSEIR should analyze impervious surfaces added by the project and the extent of tree removal, including implications for potential stormwater flooding and heat effects in the surrounding neighborhoods.	The Project will mitigate extreme heat and urban heat island effect by preserving over 60% of the Site as open space. In these areas, pervious surfaces and tree canopy (with minimal tree removal for grassland restoration) will help moderate ambient air temperature in adjacent developed areas. Additional landscaping greenspace within the portion of the Site proposed for development will have this same effect. See Section 2.5.4, Urban Heat Island and Section 2.5.5, Water Resources, for additional detail. The Project will not cause stormwater flooding in the surrounding neighborhoods. The Stormwater Management Plan (SMP) included in Appendix D demonstrates how the Project's BMPs will be designed to accommodate the 2070 100-year 24-hour storm event (10.7 inches of rainfall) and significantly reduce the future fully developed peak runoff in major storms events.
SC-31	Given that the project site is located within several EJ census blocks, analysis of the stormwater management system should specifically assess whether flooding risks may be exacerbated for nearby EJ populations, including under future climate conditions.	The projected increase in extreme precipitation at the Site associated with climate change, as identified in the RMAT Tool, has the potential to result in flooding at the Site; however, the Proponent prepared a comprehensive stormwater management plan (see Section 6.0 for more detail) to mitigate any potential flooding impacts that could affect the homes of EJ and non-EJ Populations.
SC-32	The DSEIR should analyze any other relevant short-term and long-term environmental or public health impacts of the project, including construction period activities and impacts of off-site water withdrawals on environmental and recreational resources.	Analysis of Project impacts during construction and operation periods on EJ communities is provided in Section 2.5, including air quality and GHG emissions, traffic, soils and dewatering, urban heat islands, and water resources.
SC-33	If any disproportionate adverse effects or increased risks of climate change are identified, the DSEIR must include a discussion of proposed mitigation and include such measures in draft Section 61 findings.	Overall, the Project's benefits will far outweigh potential impacts, and there are not expected to be disproportionate adverse effects to EJ Populations. The Proponent consulted the Resilient MA Team Climate Resilience Design Tool (the RMAT Tool) to understand the risks associated with climate change at the Site, as more fully described in Section 2.4.3. The Project will provide substantial benefits to EJ and non-EJ Populations alike through creating housing and job opportunities, enhancing open space, and generally improving the Site as compared to existing conditions. See Section 12.0 for details regarding the Project's robust mitigation package and draft Section 61 findings.
SC-34	Particular focus should be given to benefits that serve to promote the equitable distribution of Environmental Burdens and Environmental Burdens, in accordance with "Environmental Justice Principles" as defined in 301 CMR 11.02.	Overall, the Project's benefits will far outweigh potential impacts, and there are not expected to be disproportionate adverse effects to EJ Populations. The Proponent assessed existing unfair or inequitable environmental burdens and related public health consequences impacting EJ Populations within the DGA. The Proponent utilized additional data layers through the MassDPH EJ Tool to determine other potential sources of pollution within the five-mile DGA radius of the Site. The DGA covers over 116 square miles and the Project will provide substantial benefits to EJ and non-EJ Populations alike through creating housing and job opportunities, enhancing open space, and generally improving the Site as compared to existing conditions. Additionally, the Project has been designed to avoid potential environmental impacts to the greatest extent practicable. Where complete avoidance is not possible, such impacts will be minimized and mitigated through the measures described in detail in Section 2.5.

No.	MEPA Comment	Response
SC-35	Because total traffic generation is well over mandatory EIR thresholds, the DSEIR should provide a supplemental air quality analysis consistent with the MassDEP Guidelines for Performing Mesoscale Analysis of Indirect Sources (1991), as indicated in the Mobile Source/Air Quality Scope below.	A supplemental air quality analysis was prepared for the Project, the results of which indicate that there will be minimal impacts to EJ Populations within 1 mile of the Site (see Section 9.0). Impacts will be even less beyond 1 mile (i.e., within the 5-mile DGA) since trucks traveling beyond a 1-mile radius of the Site are further dispersed as they travel to and from various destinations. Any such impacts will be mitigated by proposed Project transportation measures, including a robust TDM program. See the TIA Supplement attached as Appendix C for additional details regarding transportation mitigation.
SC-36	The DSEIR should also identify any air quality related indicators in EPA's EJ Screen that are elevated at or above the 80th percentile of statewide average and provide these data for any EJ populations that may be impacted by the project's traffic impacts.	The DGA is below the 80th percentile in Massachusetts (the threshold stated in the Scope set forth in the Secretary's Certificate on the December 2023 NPC) for all air quality-related environmental indicators provided in the EJ Screen.
SC-37	As minimum, this documentation should include all EJ populations within 1 mile of the project site, and, to the extent a 5-mile DGA is applicable, those populations adjacent to anticipated routes of travel for project-generated truck traffic over a 5-mile radius (including travel along state and interstate highways).	Because the Project is expected to generate 150 or more average ADTs of diesel traffic over a duration of one year or more, a 5-mile Designated Geographic Area (DGA) was selected for evaluation of baseline conditions and potential Project-related impacts to EJ Populations. Consistent with the DGA, each of the EJ criteria were evaluated within 5 miles of the Site using the EOEEA EJ Map Viewer. See Section 2.0 for additional information. EJ populations within the 1- and 5-mile DGAs are shown on Figure 2-1.
SC-38	The DSEIR should specifically assess the distribution of diesel-generated vehicle trips during the course of the day (both weekday and weekend) and analyze routes of travel around the project site and proximity to EJ populations.	A mesoscale air quality analysis of mobile sources was performed to determine the possible disproportionate effects the Project may have on the EJ populations within 1 mile of the Project (see Sections 9.2.2 and 9.2.3 for additional detail). The results of the mesoscale air quality analyses show that the Project will have an insignificant impact on air quality in EJ and non-EJ Populations alike. The highest number of truck trips will occur within 1 mile of the Site. Diesel trucks traveling beyond the 1-mile radius are further dispersed and have less of an impact in EJ communities within 5 miles as they travel to and from various destinations.
SC-39	If, based on the trip distribution analysis to be provided in the DSEIR, truck trips are likely to travel along local roadways through and adjacent to EJ populations, the DSEIR should discuss what potential measures could be deployed to reduce impacts, including re-routing of truck trips or limiting the times of day for travel.	Truck trips are expected to be oriented to/from Route 3 with the exception of local deliveries. Best efforts will be made to limit truck traffic to off-peak traffic periods while limiting activities during hours of darkness where such activities would occur adjacent to residential areas. See Chapter 3.0 and the TIA Supplement for additional information.
SC-40	The DSEIR should indicate whether any of the identified EJ populations described above are located adjacent to any of the intersections analyzed in the traffic study, and indicate the level of service changes, if any, at those locations.	Truck trips are expected to be oriented to/from Route 3 with the exception of local deliveries and the impacts of these activities were fully assessed in the December 2023 TIA that accompanied the 2023 NPC. Where these impacts resulted in an increase in delay that caused a change in LOS, improvements have been proposed and considered as a part of the air-quality analysis detailed in this DSEIR.

No.	MEPA Comment	Response
SC-41	To the extent any identified locations are outside the traffic study area for the project, the DSEIR should provide analysis to estimate the increase in traffic at those locations relative to existing conditions, and a discussion of whether the increase will materially impact air quality. The analysis could take the form of review of existing traffic volumes and air monitoring data at the specified locations, or other quantitative modeling. This analysis should include figures with accompanying narratives.	The study area that was assessed as a part of the December 2023 TIA and the TIA Supplement includes the locations where the potential impacts of the Project would be material.
SC-42	The DSEIR should discuss the extent to which proposed or already implemented roadway mitigation and Transportation Demand Management (TDM) measures will serve to reduce vehicle traffic, including delivery trucks, associated with project operations.	Section 3.0 includes a comprehensive TDM program that includes specific measures to reduce vehicular traffic, including delivery trucks. See also the December 2023 TIA and the TIA Supplement.
SC-43	The DSEIR should also discuss other potential mitigation measures, such as early adoption of federal and state clean truck mandates for any fleet vehicles.	Section 3.0 includes a refined and expanded transportation improvement program for the Project that is designed to off-set the predicted impact of the Project. See also the December 2023 TIA and the TIA Supplement.
SC-44	The project should make all feasible efforts to incentivize the use of electric vehicles.	The TDM program includes specific measures to encourage the use of EVs through the installation of EV charging stations and preferential parking will also be provided for EVs.
SC-45	The DSEIR should confirm the number of diesel truck trips anticipated for the project and, if over 150 adt, expand public outreach activities over a 5 mile radius. The analysis of EJ impacts should also include all EJ populations within the 5 mile DGA.	Because the Project is expected to generate 150 or more average ADTs of diesel traffic over a duration of one year or more, a 5-mile Designated Geographic Area (DGA) was selected for evaluation of baseline conditions and potential Project-related impacts to EJ Populations. Consistent with the DGA, each of the EJ criteria were evaluated within five miles of the Site using the EOEEA EJ Map Viewer. Section 3.0 provides truck trip estimates for the Project on a daily and peak-hour basis, and includes the anticipated travel routes for trucks.
SC-46	The DSEIR should include a separate section on “Public Health,” and discuss any known or reasonably foreseeable public health consequences that may result from the environmental impacts of the project change. Particular focus should be given to any impacts that may materially exacerbate “vulnerable health EJ criteria,” in accordance with the MEPA Interim Protocol for Analysis of EJ Impacts	Section 2.0 of this DSEIR addresses Environmental Justice and Public Health. The Proponent assessed existing unfair or inequitable environmental burdens and related public health consequences impacting EJ Populations within the DGA. The Proponent utilized additional data layers through the MassDPH EJ Tool to determine other potential sources of pollution within the five-mile DGA radius of the Site. The DGA covers over 116 square miles and the Project will provide substantial benefits to EJ and non-EJ Populations alike through creating housing and job opportunities, enhancing open space, and generally improving the Site as compared to existing conditions. Additionally, the Project has been designed to avoid potential environmental impacts to the greatest extent practicable. Where complete avoidance is not possible, such impacts will be minimized and mitigated through the measures described in detail in Section 2.5. Overall, the Project’s benefits will far outweigh potential impacts, and there are not expected to be disproportionate adverse effects to EJ Populations.



No.	MEPA Comment	Response
SC-47	In addition, other publicly available data, including through the DPH EJ Tool, should be surveyed to assess the public health conditions in the immediate vicinity of the project site, in accordance with 301 CMR 11.07(6)(g)10.	The Proponent also consulted the MassDPH EJ Tool to survey public health conditions and other potential sources of pollution proximate to the Site including, but not limited to, air operating permits, hazardous waste treatment, storage, and disposal facilities, groundwater discharge permits, underground storage tanks, MassDOT roads, power plants, etc. See Section 2.4.2 for additional detail.
SC-48	All environmental indicators from the EPA EJ Screen (including air quality related factors, wastewater discharge, and proximity to Superfund sites) should be reviewed for a 1-mile radius around the project site, and a comparison of percentile rankings as between EJ and non-EJ census block groups should be presented.	The Proponent consulted the EPA EJ Screen tool, which provides percentile ranking by census block group, compared against statewide averages, for 13 environmental indicators. The Proponent used the environmental indicators to assess the potential environmental exposures that further create unfair or inequitable environmental burdens on EJ Populations. The EJ Screen assessed the five-mile DGA around the Site. As described in Section 2.4.4 and shown in Table 2.9, the DGA is below the 80th percentile in Massachusetts for all air quality-related environmental indicators provided in the EJ Screen.
SC-49	Any impacts associated with the project that could materially exacerbate existing public health conditions in and around the project site should be analyzed.	The Project is not anticipated to materially exacerbate existing public health conditions in and around the Site. Overall, the Project's benefits will far outweigh potential impacts, and there are not expected to be disproportionate adverse effects to EJ Populations.
SC-50	To the extent any required Permits for the project contain performance standards intended to protect public health, the DSEIR should contain specific discussion of such standards and how the project intends to meet or exceed them.	State permits required for this Project are outlined in Table 1.1. The only permit which contains performance standards to protect public health includes the ITA for wastewater which is described in detail in Section 5.0.
SC-51	The DSEIR should contain a specific discussion of applicable federal and state cleanup standards, such as M.G.L. 21E Massachusetts Contingency Plan (MCP), intended to protect public health and how the project intends to meet or exceed those standards.	Section 10.0 provides information regarding the federal and state cleanup standards applicable to the Site and the Project. The Navy has responsibility for hazardous material assessment and remediation, with oversight from the EPA and involvement of MassDEP. The Proponent is aware of, and will comply with, all laws applicable to it and the Site related to the assessment and remediation of hazardous materials. The Proponent will also comply with all applicable Site Activity and Use Limitations, Land Use Restrictions, and similar deed restrictions.
SC-52	It should review all measures that will be implemented during the construction period to minimize impacts to nearby residents through the spread of contaminated materials remediated on-site, including dust control, storage of contaminated water or soil, management of dewatering operations, or transported off-site.	Certain portions of the Site are currently subject to LUCs with requirements concerning the management of soil and/or groundwater during construction. In order to ensure the safety of all EJ and non-EJ Populations, proper management of construction activities in accordance with all LUCs is one of the Proponent's top priorities. All excavation in areas subject to LUCs will be conducted in accordance with the terms of those LUCs. See also Section 11.0 regarding Construction Period mitigation measures to be implemented.
SC-53	The DSEIR should discuss whether the expansion in wastewater usage from the proposed development will result in a material increase in wastewater discharge into state and federal waters, and if so, where those discharges will occur (i.e., at the point of ultimate treatment).	Section 5.0 of the DSEIR discusses the Town-by-Town permanent solution for wastewater discharge, which involves improvements and discharge into the Weymouth and Abington sewer systems and the implementation of on-Site septic to serve the Rockland portion of the Base. This DSEIR filing covers the "secondary" discharges ITAs of wastewater transfers into the Taunton River Basin. The transfer of water from the Chicopee and Nashua River basins to the Boston Harbor and South Coastal River basins is covered in the Weymouth/SRA MEPA filing.

No.	MEPA Comment	Response
SC-54	The DSEIR should discuss whether air quality in and around the project site will be impacted from the increase in traffic resulting from the project, and focus on any areas where EPA EJ Screen indicators are elevated above 80th percentile of statewide average (for both EJ and non-EJ areas around the site).	As described in Section 9.2.2, the mesoscale analysis predicts that the emissions of VOC and NOx, DPM/PM10 and PM2.5 in the Project study area for the 2043 Full Build cases will be larger than the emissions for the 2043 No-Build case; however, the results of the updated mesoscale air quality analysis demonstrate that the Project will have an insignificant impact on the regional air quality. Details are provided in Section 2.1.3 of Appendix G. The Project will mitigate potential air quality impacts by committing to several TDM measures, discussed in Section 2.1.4 of Appendix G. The roadway improvements at seventeen intersections and TDM measures will improve traffic operations, reduce Project generated vehicle trips, and reduce Project-related motor vehicle air pollutant emissions. As described in Section 2.4.4 and shown in Table 2.9, the DGA is below the 80th percentile in Massachusetts for all air quality-related environmental indicators provided in the EJ Screen.
SC-55	The DSEIR should discuss what benefits the project will offer to improve the public health of surrounding residents, including environmental remediation efforts, open space and recreational opportunities, multimodal accommodations for biking and walking, and other relevant environmental benefits.	As detailed throughout the DSEIR and summarized in Sections 2.0 and 12.0, public health benefits include, but are not limited to, the following: - The Proponent, in coordination with the Navy, will continue to ensure that hazardous materials at the Site are handled in a manner that is protective of public health. - New development will be organized around a system of open space greenways, connecting approximately 885 acres of large open spaces and around which new commercial and residential areas and the long-promised town center will be built. - Comprehensive TDM measures including an on-Site subsidized Tri-Town TMA shuttle service and bike share and provisions of on-Site secure bicycle parking.
SC-56	As requested by MassDOT, the DSEIR should provide unadjusted trip generation estimates, including an estimate of the number of truck trips, and document the method used to account for internal and diverted link trips.	Unadjusted trip-generation calculations and an explanation as to how both the internal trips and diverted link trips were calculated is included in the TIA Supplement attached as Appendix C.
SC-57	The 2023 NPC did not identify expected mode shares; this information should be provided in the DSEIR.	Section 3.0 and the TIA Supplement include a detailed analysis of the expected travel mode shares for the Project.
SC-58	Prior to completing the DSEIR, the Proponent should consult with MassDOT and CTPS on the appropriate background growth rate to use for this analysis and provide updated volume projections, if necessary.	In conjunction with the preparation of this DSEIR, the Proponent met with MassDOT, the MBTA and BAT, to confirm background growth rates and accuracy of volume projections set forth in the December 2023 TIA and the TIA Supplement, as appropriate.
SC-59	The DSEIR should review potential mitigation measures to minimize impacts at these intersections.	Section 3.0 and the TIA Supplement include a refined and expanded transportation improvement program for the Project that is designed to off-set the predicted impact of the Project.
SC-60	The DSEIR should include an evaluation of alternative traffic control measures, such as roundabouts at these locations.	Section 3.0 and the TIA Supplement include a detailed analysis of alternative traffic control measures to the installation of traffic control signals at the identified intersections.
SC-61	As noted above, any disproportionate effects on surrounding EJ populations and air quality should be adequately studied, based on assessment of traffic impacts at these locations.	As demonstrated throughout the DSEIR and Section 9.2, the Project will provide substantial benefits to Environmental Justice (EJ) and non-EJ Populations alike through creating housing and job opportunities, enhancing open space, and generally improving the Site as compared to existing conditions and there are not expected to be disproportionate adverse effects to EJ Populations. The results of the EJ air quality analysis demonstrate that the Project will have an insignificant impact on the air quality in the EJ communities.

No.	MEPA Comment	Response
<b>SC-62</b>	The DSEIR should include an analysis for each transit service based on metrics established by the MBTA Service Delivery Policy (SDP).	Section 3.0 and the TIA Supplement include a detailed transit analysis for the Project based on the metrics defined in the MBTA Service Delivery Policy (SDP).
<b>SC-63</b>	It should contain an assessment of how riders, particularly during the MBTA peak periods, are expected to access the site via transit, and estimate the additional ridership on the Old Colony Commuter Rail Line and what time of day those impacts will occur.	The transit analysis that is presented in the TIA Supplement includes a detailed discussion of how riders will access transit and provides estimated ridership by mode and line.
<b>SC-64</b>	The Proponent should work with the MBTA Service Planning Department to ensure that it has access to the most recent and most relevant ridership and operational statistics for both lines.	The Proponent met with the MBTA to discuss the Project and the methodology for transit analysis that is presented in Section 3.0 and the TIA Supplement.
<b>SC-65</b>	The DSEIR should include a comprehensive discussion of mitigation measures to address the project change's transit impacts on the Commuter Rail Line.	Section 3.0 and the TIA Supplement include a detailed discussion on connectivity and mitigation measures for transit, including the Commuter Rail.
<b>SC-66</b>	The Proponent should consult with MassDOT and the MBTA to identify the level of transit improvements required along with a schedule of implementation to address potential constrained capacity conditions.	The Proponent met with MassDOT and the MBTA during the preparation of this DSEIR to discuss the transit system and the impacts of the Project.
<b>SC-67</b>	The DSEIR should include a summary of the transit analysis to demonstrate that the proposed improvements would maintain or improve MBTA Service Standards compared to future No- Build conditions based on the phases of the project.	Section 3.0 and the TIA Supplement include a summary of the transit analysis and a discussion of potential improvement measures that will be advanced as a part of the Project with the appropriate state and local agencies.
<b>SC-68</b>	The DSEIR should describe the potential transit shuttle between SWNAS, the MBTA Commuter Rail Station, and the MBTA Red Line, identify the demand for the shuttle service and include a commitment to provide adequate service and frequency to encourage usage.	Section 3.0 and the TIA Supplement include a discussion of the SWNAS shuttle service, including the service route, frequency and usage.
<b>SC-69</b>	The DSEIR should review how residents, customers or employees using the shuttle bus service will get from the South Weymouth station to the site, including a description of pedestrian accommodations between the station and key locations within the project site.	Section 3.0 includes a discussion on how residents, employees and customers will access the SWNAS shuttle service and a description of pedestrian and bicycle accommodations that will like the Project to the central transit hub within the site and to the South Weymouth MBTA station.
<b>SC-70</b>	It should evaluate potential measures for managing pedestrian crossings and rail crossings to ensure safe, accessible travel for customers.	Section 3.0 and the TIA Supplement include a discussion of potential improvements to the rail crossing across Trotter Lane.

No.	MEPA Comment	Response
SC-71	The Proponent should consult with area regional transit authorities such as the Brockton Area Transit Authority (BAT) to evaluate the feasibility of providing service to the site, which should complement existing and proposed services, such as the shuttle system, to increase service frequency.	The Proponent met with BAT to discuss expanding transit service to the Site. As a result of these discussions that Project has been designed in a manner to support future service by BAT.
SC-72	The DSEIR should review the timing of any proposed improvements relative to the MBTA's Better Bus Project to evaluate whether project implementation will align with the timing of bus electrification in this area.	The MBTA's Better Bus Project program was reviewed during the preparation of this DSEIR. At this time, the program does not contemplate expanded bus service to the Site. That being said, the Town of Weymouth and the Proponent are continuing discussions with the MBTA concerning extension of the Route 226 bus to serve the Project.
SC-73	The DSEIR should review how the project change will be constructed to create a pedestrian and bicycle network along the gateway roadways (Shea Memorial Drive, Bill Delahunt Parkway and Patriot Parkway/Trotter Road) to connect to Route 18, Weymouth Street and Hingham Street (via Reservoir Park Drive) and in proposed greenways.	Section 3.0 and the TIA Supplement include a detailed discussion on the planned pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure within the Site and the planned improvements to extend these accommodations along the gateway roadways.
SC-74	All intersections within the study should include adequate width, pedestrian signals, and walk/do not walk indicators crossing.	As further detailed in the TIA Supplement, pedestrian and bicycle improvements will be completed as a part of the intersection and roadway improvements that will be advanced as a part of the Project.
SC-75	The DSEIR should review how pedestrian and bicycle facilities will be accommodated within the proposed open space design, including the linear greenways.	Section 3.0 and the TIA Supplement include a description and supporting graphics illustrating the planned pedestrian and bicycle network within the Site.
SC-76	It should review nearby existing trail systems and describe potential connections between proposed on-site open space and paths.	Section 3.0 and the TIA Supplement include a description and supporting graphics illustrating the planned pedestrian and bicycle network within the Project site, including potential connections to existing and proposed paths.
SC-77	In the absence of such a ready reference for parking supply, the DSEIR should provide an analysis of the anticipated parking demand for each development phase and proposed use; the projected parking demand at different times of day; the expected parking duration; and the type of parking (surface or structured).	Section 3.0 and the TIA Supplement include a detailed parking strategy for the Project that establishes parking maximums to achieve a balanced parking supply that reflects the trip-reduction goals of the Project.
SC-78	The DSEIR should summarize parking policies that could be implemented to minimize parking demand and automobile use, such as charging market rates for parking, parking cash-out policies for employees, parking fees for residents with multiple vehicles, unbundling residential parking from rents, shared parking, parking banks/landscape reserves, and other demand-reduction policies for employees and residents of the site.	Section 3.0 and the TIA Supplement include a detailed parking demand management program for the Project that includes many of the suggested measures.

No.	MEPA Comment	Response
SC-79	The DSEIR should provide an analysis of the feasibility of implementing a shared parking program and estimate the potential reduction in the number of parking spaces at the site.	Section 3.0 and the TIA Supplement include a detailed parking strategy for the Project that reflects a shared parking approach where applicable.
SC-80	It should describe a how potential parking areas will be banked and left undeveloped until there is a demonstrated need for additional parking.	Land banking of parking has been defined as a parking demand management strategy, as detailed in the TIA Supplement.
SC-81	The proposed parking supply should be adjusted as implementation of TDM measures reduce auto trips and encourage non-auto modes of travel.	The parking demand management strategies and parking ratios will be reviewed, refined and adjusted as a part of the transportation monitoring program. See the TIA Supplement for additional detail.
SC-82	The Proponent should evaluate options for providing a central location for shuttle bus services with adequate amenities such as bus shelters or near locations with climate-controlled waiting areas.	Section 3.0 and the TIA Supplement include a discussion on the design elements and a potential location for a central transit hub within the Project.
SC-83	As noted above, the Proponent should consult with BAT other local and regional transportation service providers address any gaps in MBTA weekend transportation services, including connections to the MBTA Red Line.	The Proponent met with MassDOT and the MBTA during the preparation of this DSEIR to discuss the transit system and opportunities for the SWNAS shuttle to supplement weekend service for trips associated with the Project.
SC-84	The DSEIR should describe the full range of TDM measures being considered by the proponent and how those TDM concepts will be incorporated into the operations of the site and its different tenants.	Section 3.0 and the TIA Supplement include a detailed TDM program for the Project that defines how the specific measures will be incorporated into the operations of the site and its different tenants.
SC-85	It should propose how the effectiveness of the TDM measures can be tracked and evaluated during operations.	Section 3.0 and the TIA Supplement include the trip reduction goals for the TDM program and defines how these goals will be measured.
SC-86	The Proponent should provide ample bicycle parking; on-site showers, lockers, and changing facilities; and financial incentives to encourage employees or customers to walk, bicycle, or ride public transit to the site.	The TDM program detailed in the TIA Supplement includes a discussion on bicycle parking and building amenities that will be used to encourage the use of alternative modes of travel to SOVs.
SC-87	The DSEIR should review the recommendations for minimizing parking supply and encouraging alternative modes of travel provided in the comment letters submitted by MassDOT and the Metropolitan Area Planning Council (MAPC).	Section 3.0 and the TIA Supplement include a detailed parking management program that establishes maximum parking ratios and includes parking demand strategies to reduce the amount of parking that is constructed as a part of the Project.
SC-88	As recommended by MassDOT, a full TIA should be prepared and submitted for review at each of the development tiers identified above so that the project's impacts can be evaluated and the mitigation program reassessed.	The TIA Supplement includes a draft scope of work for the preparation of Tiered TIAs for the Project, as developed in consultation with MassDOT.

No.	MEPA Comment	Response
SC-89	Future TIAs should use the data from the most recent monitoring report to conduct the analysis.	As detailed in the TIA Supplement, the Tiered TIAs will use the data from the most recent traffic monitoring program to establish baseline (existing) conditions.
SC-90	The DSEIR should fully address the issues raised in comment letters and describe water supply options that minimize capacity and environmental constraints.	The Proponent has prepared an exhaustive Response to Comments (Section 13.0) that addresses each of the substantive comments that were submitted regarding the December 2023 NPC.
SC-91	The Proponent did not indicate how long a connection to the City of Brockton or Aquaria water systems would take; this should be provided in the DSEIR.	As detailed in Section 4.0, the preferred permanent water supply solution is to have Weymouth/SRA join the MWRA water system and not draw upon Brockton and/or the Aquaria Water Treatment Plant.
SC-92	The Proponent should consult with MassDEP and Weymouth prior to filing the DSEIR and provide an updated analysis of this interim water supply option, if necessary.	The Proponent consulted with the Town of Weymouth and MassDEP prior to filing this DSEIR. Section 4.2.2 describes the interim water supply solution that was informed, in part, by such discussions.
SC-93	The Proponent should consult with MassDEP regarding the appropriate analysis to be presented in the DSEIR which addresses this impact.	The Proponent consulted with MassDEP and the WRC prior to filing this DSEIR. As directed by the WRC, the water demand estimate for the Project has been revised and is based on using 65 rgpcd for residential uses and Title 5 for non-residential uses. This results in a water demand of approximately 1.04 mgd ADD and 1.41 mgd MDD at full build-out. The design flow was also compared to the actual demand of 50 rgpcd based on the consumption in Weymouth and ARJWW. See Section 4.2.1, Table 4.1.
SC-94	As requested by the WRC, the following information should be provided in the DSEIR to clarify the permitting strategy pursued by the Proponent and provide disclosure to inform a future ITA application:	The Proponent met with WRC on April 22, 2024 and discussed the necessary ITAs and the ITA requirements. The transfer of water from the Chicopee and Nashua River basins to the Boston Harbor and South Coastal River basins is covered in the Weymouth/SRA MEPA filing. This DSEIR filing covers the "secondary" discharges ITAs of wastewater transfers into the Taunton River Basin.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A thorough alternatives analysis of water supply and wastewater disposal options, with the preferred alternatives finalized, including a discussion of wastewater reuse and all on-site and in-basin water supply and wastewater disposal options. Information on Weymouth's water conservation measures, including recent residential usage expressed as gallons per capita per day (rgpcd) and unaccounted-for water should be provided, and the DSEIR should specify the source basin(s) of the preferred alternatives.</li> </ul>	Under the preferred MWRA/Weymouth/SRA water supply solution the Town of Weymouth and the Base receive water from the donor Quabbin tributary watersheds (Chicopee and Nashua River Basins). The Weymouth/SRA MEPA filing covers the transfer of water from the Chicopee and Nashua River Basins to the Boston Harbor and South Coastal River Basins. The wastewater solution for the Project has a Town-by-Town approach: (i) wastewater generated from the Weymouth portion of the Base will continue to discharge to the Weymouth collection system; (ii) wastewater generated from the Abington portion of the Base will discharge to the Abington collection system; and (iii) wastewater generated from the Rockland portion of the Base will have individual on-site septic systems. No wastewater reuse is proposed for the Project. The Weymouth/SRA MEPA filing includes information on Weymouth's water measures, including recent residential usage (rgpcd) and unaccounted-for water.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A plan of the project site which delineates the municipal and basin boundaries and depicts the areas of the site that will be receiving new water and wastewater service in relation to the municipal and basin boundaries.</li> </ul>	Figure 5-1 delineates the municipal and basin boundaries and depicts the areas on the Site that will be receiving new water and wastewater service in relation to the municipal and basin boundaries.

No.	MEPA Comment	Response
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarification of the estimated water demand, expressed as both average day demand (ADD) and maximum day demand (MDD).</li> </ul>	<p>As directed by the WRC, the water demand estimate for the Project has been revised and is based on using 65 rgpcd for residential uses and Title 5 for non-residential uses. This results in a water demand of approximately 1.04 mgd ADD and 1.41 mgd MDD at full build-out. The design flow was also compared to the actual demand of 50 rgpcd based on the consumption in Weymouth and ARJWW. See Section 4.2.1, Table 4.1.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The expected maximum day water and wastewater flows for the developable area in each municipality, and further refined by basin if a municipality has SWNAS developable land area in more than one basin.</li> </ul>	<p>As shown on Figure 5-1, Weymouth has developable land in the Boston Harbor and South Coastal River Basins; however, all its wastewater will discharge to the Boston Harbor Basin. Rockland also has developable land in the Boston Harbor and South Coastal River Basins but its wastewater will discharge to on-site septic systems located in the Boston Harbor River Basin. Abington's developable land all lies within the South Coastal River Basin but its wastewater will discharge to the Taunton River basin (as does 95% of Abington's existing sewer system).</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Because the method of estimating water demand by using Title 5 estimated flows plus 10% may lead to overestimated residential demand, the DSEIR should provide an estimate of water demand using the current MA Water Conservation Standards and MA WRC Water Needs Forecasting methodology, which assume 65 residential gallons per capita per day (rgpcd); this is higher than the actual rgpcd for both Weymouth and Abington- Rockland Joint Water Works since 2016.</li> </ul>	<p>As directed by the WRC, the water demand estimate for the Project has been revised and is based on using 65 rgpcd for residential uses and Title 5 for non-residential uses. This results in a water demand of approximately 1.04 mgd ADD and 1.41 mgd MDD at full build-out. The design flow was also compared to the actual demand of 50 rgpcd based on the consumption in Weymouth and ARJWW. See Section 4.0, Table 4.1.</p>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A discussion on water conservation measures including the use of plumbing fittings, fixtures, and appliances that comply with 225 CMR 9.00: Appliance energy-efficiency standards, testing and certification program (<a href="https://www.mass.gov/regulations/225-CMR-900-appliance-energy-efficiency-standards-testing-and-certification-program">https://www.mass.gov/regulations/225-CMR-900-appliance-energy-efficiency-standards-testing-and-certification-program</a>) and a description of any proposed outdoor water use. Please discuss how all applicable MA Water Conservation Standards will be met (<a href="https://www.mass.gov/doc/massachusetts-water-conservation-standards-2/download">https://www.mass.gov/doc/massachusetts-water-conservation-standards-2/download</a>).</li> </ul>	<p>As discussed in Section 4.2.4, the new buildings and their fixtures and appliances will all meet water conservation and energy efficiency codes in effect when built. The Project will incorporate native, drought tolerant street trees. The planned central greenway will not be irrigated in its entirety but may have specific park and play areas that may have irrigation systems. Stormwater basins will be incorporated into the central greenway and will be a created wetland feature.</p>
SC-95	<p>The Proponent should consult with the WRC prior to preparing these analyses.</p>	<p>The Proponent met with WRC on April 22, 2024 and discussed the necessary ITAs and the ITA requirements.</p>
SC-96	<p>The DSEIR should present a clear preferred alternative for water supply, and indicate whether interim solutions are also required and what permitting and approval would be needed for such interim solutions.</p>	<p>As detailed in Section 4.0, the Proponent has identified the Weymouth/SRA/MWRA as the preferred permanent water supply solution. Under such preferred permanent water supply solution, the Town of Weymouth and the Base receive water from the MWRA source waters (Quabbin and Wachusett Reservoirs) located in the Chicopee and Nashua River basins. The Weymouth Water and Sewer Agreement is being amended for redevelopment of the Base. The water under this Agreement (as the same may be amended) will be sufficient to supply the programmed redevelopment in Weymouth until the new MWRA transmission main is operational.</p>

No.	MEPA Comment	Response
SC-97	To the extent ITA approval is required, relevant information pertaining to the ITA application should be presented in the DSEIR, in consultation with the WRC. As noted below, the project may also face constraints with respect to wastewater capacity.	The Proponent met with WRC on April 22, 2024 and discussed the necessary ITAs and the ITA requirements. The transfer of water from the Chicopee and Nashua River basins to the Boston Harbor and South Coastal River basins is covered in the Weymouth/SRA MEPA filing. This DSEIR filing covers the "secondary" discharges ITAs of wastewater transfers into the Taunton River Basin.
SC-98	To the extent this constraint results in a need to modify project size or design, corresponding changes to water supply needs and permitting strategy should be reflected in the DSEIR. The DSEIR should review potential water-conservation measures, including reuse of grey water and rainwater.	As discussed in Section 4.2.4, the Project will incorporate water conserving plumbing fixtures, high efficiency appliances and incorporate drought-tolerant landscaping. The Project will consider incorporating rainwater capture and reuse methods, to the extent applicable. As detailed in Section 5.0 of this filing, the preferred wastewater alternative is a Town-by-Town approach of discharge to public sewers or septic systems; therefore, the reuse of greywater for non-potable uses such as irrigation is not feasible.
SC-99	The DSEIR should review ecological conditions in local water supplies and tributaries and provide an analysis of potential impacts of additional water withdrawals on water quality and aquatic resources, including fish runs.	The preferred MWRA/Weymouth/SRA permanent water supply solution eliminates any impacts to the fisheries resources in the Taunton and Jones River basins. When implemented, the connection has the hydraulic capacity (15.6 mgd) and the MWRA system has the immediate supply capacity (7.5 mgd) to meet the demands of the Town of Weymouth and the Base redevelopment without using Weymouth's groundwater resources or Whitman's Pond, ending the herring run impacts.
SC-100	It should review the sustainability of water supplies under future climate conditions.	The preferred MWRA/Weymouth/SRA permanent water supply solution provides the opportunity for emergency supply relief for adjacent South Shore communities once the proposed modifications to the Blue Hills Tanks are completed, which results in an estimated available MWRA capacity of 15.6 mgd (MDD).
SC-101	The Proponent should consult with appropriate agencies prior to filing the DSEIR, and should respond fully to comments from MassDEP and MWRA, which are incorporated by reference herein.	The Proponent has consulted with MassDEP regarding the projected flow values for the Project. The Proponent will continue to coordinate with the MWRA, MassDEP, and the Town of Weymouth regarding Weymouth wastewater flows and potential I/I mitigation work. See Section 13.0, Table 13.2 for Response to Comments from State Agencies, for detailed responses to comments on the December 2023 NPC.
SC-102	As requested by MassDEP, the DSEIR should provide additional details regarding the projected flows that are proposed to go to each treatment facility.	The Proponent has consulted with MassDEP regarding the projected flow values for the Project. The Proponent will continue to coordinate with the MWRA, MassDEP, and the Town of Weymouth regarding Weymouth wastewater flows and potential I/I mitigation work. See Section 5.0, Table 5.1 for proposed wastewater flows for each Town at full buildout.
SC-103	The Proponent should consult with the MWRA regarding any modeling that should be performed to assess impacts to its system.	The Proponent met with the MWRA on May 1, 2024 and agreed to work with the Town of Weymouth on providing a detailed hydraulic model analysis of the potential flows passed downstream to the MWRA system. The Town's modeling to date of the Weymouth system showed elimination of surcharging in the interceptor with larger diameter pipes and the 5-year, 24-hour design storm.
SC-104	The Proponent should consult with the MWRA to determine the analyses that should be provided in the DSEIR.	The Proponent met with the MWRA on May 1, 2024 and agreed to work with the Town of Weymouth on providing a detailed hydraulic model analysis of the potential flows passed downstream to the MWRA system. The Town's modeling to date of the Weymouth system showed elimination of surcharging in the interceptor with larger diameter pipes and the 5-year, 24-hour design storm.



No.	MEPA Comment	Response
SC-105	The DSEIR should identify potential mitigation measures that may be necessary to provide capacity for project flows.	The Proponent has been working closely with the Abington Department of Public Works (DPW), the Rockland Sewer Commission and the Town of Weymouth, in consultation with the MWRA Sewer Division, to analyze the sewerage systems' capacities to meet future demands (including those generated by the Project). The Proponent will support capacity improvements in the towns of Weymouth and Abington through the payment of mitigation and other fees over the proposed buildout period.
SC-106	The DSEIR should confirm the volume of project-generated flows and the existing capacity of Brockton's wastewater treatment facility.	Abington has recently improved its system connection to Brockton. Adding the Base flow into the North Abington system will require some local small diameter sewer (6-inch, 8-inch) increases to connect to the main capacity in the system. The Proponent has been meeting with the Town's DPW officials regarding the necessary improvements and implementation of same. Most of the Abington sewer collection system discharges to the Brockton regional wastewater treatment plant. That plant has been upgraded and has capacity. Future development of the Abington portions of the Base can proceed using existing capacity available within Abington's sewer system via the Brockton intermunicipal agreement
SC-107	The DSEIR should review Rockland's Comprehensive Wastewater Management Plan (CWMP) and any actions required to be implemented in response to the EPA Order.	The Proponent has reviewed Rockland's CWMP and met with the Rockland Sewer Commission and their consultants on several occasions. As described in Section 5.0, the Base will not be tying into the Rockland WWTP. Given the significant I/I problem in the Rockland system and how long it will take the Town to resolve their issues, the Proponent has adjusted the approach in Rockland and is planning approximately 85,000 gpd of septic systems on the east side of the Base
SC-108	It should evaluate whether the proposed wastewater system improvements will result in adequate capacity for the collection, treatment, and disposal of the 0.4 mgd of wastewater anticipated to be generated by uses proposed in the Rockland portion of the site.	As described in Section 5.0, the Base will not be tying into the Rockland WWTP. Given the significant I/I problem in the Rockland system and how long it will take the Town to resolve their issues, the Proponent has adjusted the approach in Rockland and is planning approximately 85,000 gpd of septic systems on the east side of the Base. This portion of the Base has the most favorable soils for on-site wastewater disposal and a large portion of the Rockland land area is outside of the PFAS plume area and the controlled Navy groundwater treatment area. These would be individual septic systems built over the build-out period on separate lots as development opportunities in the Rockland portion of the Base arise.
SC-109	It should identify wastewater management improvements that may be necessary for the Proponent to implement to ensure that wastewater capacity is present in this system.	As described in Section 5.0, the Base will not be tying into the Rockland WWTP. Given the significant I/I problem in the Rockland system and how long it will take the Town to resolve their issues, the Proponent has adjusted the approach in Rockland and is planning approximately 85,000 gpd of septic systems on the east side of the Base. This portion of the Base has the most favorable soils for on-site wastewater disposal and a large portion of the Rockland land area is outside of the PFAS plume area and the controlled Navy groundwater treatment area. These would be individual septic systems built over the build-out period on separate lots as development opportunities in the Rockland portion of the Base arise.
SC-110	The supplemental analysis of this alternative to be provided in the DSEIR should address comments submitted by the Rockland Board of Sewer Commissioners.	The Proponent has prepared an exhaustive Response to Comments (Section 13.0) that addresses each of the substantive comments that were submitted regarding the December 2023 NPC.

No.	MEPA Comment	Response
SC-111	The DSEIR should provide a map of all wetland resource areas on the site, including vernal pools, floodplain mapped by FEMA and any unmapped areas subject to flooding, and discuss potential activities that may be constructed in these areas.	Figure 7-1 depicts wetlands on the Site such as bordering vegetated wetlands, riverfront areas, and certified and potential vernal pools. Figure 7-2 depicts the mapped and unmapped flood plains at the Site. Section 7.2 describes activities that may be proposed in jurisdictional areas.
SC-112	It should identify all proposed structures and activities within the ORW and address how the project will comply with appropriate wetlands and water quality standards.	No work is proposed in any ORWs at the Site. As described in Section 6.0 and Section 7.2.6, in order to increase protection of the ORW along the Old Swamp River, the stormwater management basin for the Old Swamp River subbasin discharging downstream of the Parkway will be an infiltration basin planned to significantly reduce peak discharges and increase groundwater recharge and base flow in the Old Swamp River. For each future basin, site specific soil capacity and conditions will be assessed as development proposals are permitted and constructed. There will be no stormwater discharges within Zone A. The Project will implement, where feasible and appropriate, infiltration BMPs to reduce pollutants from entering the Old Swamp River and French's Stream.
SC-113	I note that MassDEP has proposed changes to the stormwater regulations; all stormwater management systems must comply with the requirements in effect when they are permitted.	The Stormwater Management Plan (SMP) included in Appendix D demonstrates how the Project will meet the proposed stormwater regulations contained in the " <i>Draft Massachusetts Stormwater Management Handbook, dated December 2023</i> ". A specific project review process has been developed by which individual development projects will be reviewed for consistency with the SMP, thereby ensuring ongoing compliance with applicable regulations.
SC-114	The DSEIR should describe potential stormwater management measures to reduce the impairments of the Old Swamp River and French Stream and meet the requirements of the TMDLs	As described in more detail in Section 6.2.1, the stormwater management basin for the Old Swamp River subbasin discharging downstream of the Bill Delahunt Parkway will be an infiltration basin planned to significantly reduce peak discharges, improve water quality, and increase groundwater recharge to Old Swamp River. The Phase 1 basin for the French's Stream subbasin will be a created wetland wet basin. The extended detention time, sun light exposure and associated bioremediation will provide both pathogen and nitrogen removal before discharging to French's Stream. For each future basin, site specific soil capacity and conditions will be assessed as each development project is proposed and permitted. The Project will implement, where feasible, infiltration BMPs to reduce pollutants from entering Old Swamp River and French's Stream.
SC-115	the DSEIR should provide additional information regarding the design of the proposed, stormwater management system, potential low-impact design (LID) and green infrastructure measures and the capacity of the stormwater management system under future climate conditions.	The Project's stormwater management system will incorporate low-impact development (LID) and green infrastructure measures to the maximum extent practicable. See Section 6.2.2 for additional details. The Stormwater Management Plan (SMP) included in Appendix D demonstrates how the Project's BMPs will be designed to accommodate the 2070 100-year 24-hour storm event (10.7 inches of rainfall) as recommended by the RMAT Output Report.

No.	MEPA Comment	Response
SC-116	For a project to qualify for a CMP, the applicant must demonstrate that the project has avoided, minimized and mitigated impacts to state-listed species consistent with the following performance standards: (a) adequately assess alternatives to both temporary and permanent impacts to the state-listed species, (b) demonstrate that an insignificant portion of the local population will be impacted, and (c) develop and agree to carry out a conservation and management plan that provides a long-term net benefit to the conservation of the state- listed species.	As described in more detail in Section 8.2.4, as part of the request for an amended and restated CMP, the Proponent will demonstrate that the 2023 Modified Development Program has avoided, minimized, and mitigated impacts to State-listed species through incorporation of applicable performance standards. In order to provide a long-term net benefit for the grassland species and the Eastern Box Turtle, the Proponent proposes to permanently protect 519 acres of habitat as shown on Figure 8-1. In addition, the Proponent anticipates updating the applicable 2009 CMP commitments for the amended and restated CMP as noted in the DSEIR.
SC-117	The DSEIR should provide an update on any additional consultations with NHESP regarding mitigation measures and permitting.	Since the issuance of the December 2023 NPC Certificate, the Proponent has met on multiple occasions with NHESP, including virtual meeting presentations and in-person meetings at NHESP headquarters. The Proponent continues to work with NHESP to identify impacts to rare species performed to date under the 2009 CMP, finalize impacts under the 2023 Modified Development Program, and focus on the mitigation actions noted above for the anticipated amended and restated CMP.
SC-118	It should describe how the proposed open space and public paths will be designed in coordination with areas of protected rare species habitat.	It is anticipated that all trails located in or near to the existing grassland habitat and proposed grassland mitigation areas will be located at edges of the habitat so as to avoid interference when the habitat is being utilized by the avian grassland species. If needed, trails and paths will be located away from the central cores of the habitat to allow for recreational activity such as bird watching, while not impacting the actual rare species.
SC-119	While this NPC is not formally subject to this new requirement, in consideration of the scale and long-buildout period of the project, the DSEIR should include an output report from the MA Resilience Design Tool, and review potential climate resilience strategies to be undertaken by the project based on the recommendations provided in the output report.	The Proponent consulted the RMA Tool to understand the risks associated with climate change at the Site. The Project was identified as having a high risk for Extreme Precipitation – Urban Flooding, Extreme Precipitation – Riverine Flooding, and Extreme Heat. Due to its inland location, the Site is not exposed to Sea Level Rise/Storm Surge. The Project received a high score for Ecosystem Service Benefits. See Appendix F for RMA Tool Output Report and potential resilience strategies. See also the Stormwater Management Plan (SMP) included in Appendix D.
SC-120	The DSEIR should review the feasibility of constructing the stormwater management system with sufficient capacity to accommodate projected 24-hour rainfall depth over future planning horizons, as reported by the Tool.	The Stormwater Management Plan (SMP) included in Appendix D demonstrates how the Project's BMPs will be designed to accommodate the 2070 100-year 24-hour storm event (10.7 inches of rainfall) as recommended by the RMA Output Report.

No.	MEPA Comment	Response
SC-121	It should review site exposures associated with riverine flooding, if applicable, and review strategies to minimize extreme heat effects.	As discussed in Section 6.2.3, the Project's BMPs will be designed to accommodate the 2070 100-year 24-hour storm event (10.7 inches of rainfall) as recommended by the RMA Output Report. BMPs have been sized so that proposed development peak discharge rates do not exceed existing peak discharge rates for the 2070 100-year 24-hour storm event. As detailed in Section 2.5.4, the Project will mitigate extreme heat and urban heat island effect by preserving approximately 885 acres as open space and protected rare species habitat, which is over 60% of the total Site. In these areas, pervious surfaces and tree canopy will help moderate ambient air temperature in adjacent developed areas. In the areas of the Base slated for redevelopment, open expanses of pavement or with limited vegetation will be replaced with new landscaping, either as new open space, parks and greenways, or as new streets lined with street trees providing tree canopy and shade that doesn't exist today.
SC-122	The DSEIR should review additional measures improve the resiliency of proposed buildings, including but not limited to, minimizing water use and incorporating Low Impact Design (LID) and green infrastructure in the design of exterior areas.	As discussed in Section 4.2.4, the new buildings and their fixtures and appliances will all meet water conservation and energy efficiency codes in effect when built. The project will incorporate native, drought tolerant street trees. The planned central greenway will not be irrigated in its entirety but may have specific park and play areas that may have irrigation systems. As discussed in Section 6.2.2, the stormwater management system will incorporate low-impact development (LID) and green infrastructure measures to the maximum extent practicable.
SC-123	The proposed residential buildings designed to meet a HERS rating of 52 will not be permissible under the SC starting in July 2024.	The Project has committed to the recommended HERS 35 design for all single family and 4-unit or less townhouses.
SC-124	Comments provided by DOER indicate that substantial incentives are available from MassSave for constructing buildings meeting a lower HERS The DSEIR should provide the analysis of alternative building designs requested in DOER's comment letter, including designs with lower HERS ratings, Passivehouse multifamily buildings, and the use of electric air source heat pumps to supply hot water in all buildings.	New single-family detached homes and 4-unit or less townhouses will meet HERS 35 with air source heat pump space heating and air source heat pump water heating. New multi-family buildings will meet Passivehouse standards, specifically Phius CORE 2021. The Project will pursue Mass Save incentives for HERS 35 and Passivehouse.
SC-125	The DSEIR should include a revised analysis that estimates the mobile-source GHG emissions within the transportation study area with and without the implementation of the proposed roadway improvements and TDM measures.	The revised mesoscale analysis included an analysis of the 17 intersections with roadways and intersections improvements to calculate the potential CO2 emissions reductions based on improvements in vehicle delays provided in the traffic analysis. See Appendices G and H for additional detail.
SC-126	The DSEIR should identify additional mitigation measures to offset the project's mobile-source emissions.	A list of transportation improvement measures (TDMs) was provided in the NPC and is restated (updated as appropriate) in the DSEIR to offset CO2 mobile source emissions. See Section 12.0 and the TIA Supplement.
SC-127	At a minimum, the Proponent should commit to a providing EV charging stations and increasing the number of proposed EV-ready spaces.	Per Section 12.0 and the attached TIA Supplement (Appendix C), the Project will provide EV charging initially and expand the number of EV charging spaces as demand warrants overtime. 20% of passenger vehicle parking spaces will be EV-ready for the multi-family residential buildings, and 10% of passenger vehicle parking spaces will be EV-ready for the other commercial buildings. One EV-ready space for each single-family home and townhouse unit will be provided.

No.	MEPA Comment	Response
SC-128	The analysis did not estimate reductions in emissions due to construction of roadway improvements proposed in the 2023 NPC, which could be expected to minimize emissions as a result of reduced delays; this analysis should be provided in the DSEIR.	It is anticipated that construction will occur in phases over a 12-15 year period; thus, calculating reductions in emissions due to construction of roadway improvements cannot be done at this time.
SC-129	The DSEIR should provide an expanded mesoscale analysis which includes pollutants associated with diesel traffic including DPM, PM2.5 and NOx.	An expanded mesoscale analysis, which includes pollutants associated with diesel traffic including DPM, PM2.5 and NOx, was performed and summarized in this DSEIR (see Section 9.2.2).
SC-130	The DSEIR should whether air quality will degrade at intersections where the LOS will degrade to LOS F.	The revised mesoscale analysis included an analysis of the 17 intersections with roadways and intersections improvements to calculate the potential emissions reductions based on improvements in vehicle delays provided in the traffic analysis. See Appendices G and H for additional detail.
SC-131	The analysis should review publicly available air monitoring data and data from the DPH EJ Tool to assess whether any EJ areas near those locations have elevated health risks associated with air pollution and elevated risk factors in the EPA EJ Screen tool.	The public health analysis summarized in Appendix H was based on the DPH EJ Tool to assess whether any EJ areas near those locations have elevated health risks associated with air pollution and elevated risk factors in the EPA EJ Screen tool.
SC-132	The DSEIR should review measures to minimize and mitigate impacts at these intersections.	The revised mesoscale analysis included an analysis of the 17 intersections with roadways and intersections improvements to calculate the potential emissions reductions based on improvements in vehicle delays provided in the traffic analysis. See Appendices G and H for additional detail.
SC-133	The DSEIR should include a discussion of how the remediation of the site and removal of asbestos will be protective of public health during the construction and post-construction periods.	Pre-demolition surveys, including asbestos surveys, will be conducted, and submitted to the corresponding Town with the building/ demolition permits. The Proponent shall comply with all laws applicable to it and the Site related to the assessment and remediation of hazardous materials, including without limitation 310 CMR 40.0000, and the laws and regulations related to the removal of asbestos. As required, the Proponent will engage a Licensed Site Professional, pursuant to 310 CMR 40.0000. See Sections 10.2.2 and 11.2 for additional detail.
SC-134	The DSEIR should describe how asbestos will be removed in accordance with applicable regulations.	Should any asbestos containing materials be discovered during any pre-demolition surveys or during the course of demolition, they will be abated by a licensed contractor in accordance with MassDEP Asbestos regulations.
SC-135	The DSEIR should supplement the outline of the CMP provided in the 2023 NPC with detailed mitigation measures that will be implemented to minimize construction period impacts.	See Sections 11.2.2 and 11.2.3 for additional detail regarding Construction Period mitigation measures.
SC-136	It should review the phasing of the demolition of existing buildings and describe how existing structures will be demolished.	As discussed in Section 11.0, existing buildings at the Site will be demolished, as necessary, over the course of full buildout of the Project (12-15 years). The Proponent will comply with all applicable solid waste regulations in connection with solid waste (including Asphalt, Brick and Concrete (ABC) Rubble) and/or recyclable material generated in conjunction with Project demolition (including any removal of the existing debris piles). For any demolition, all applicable construction- and demolition-related regulations will be complied with and each of the Towns retains building review and approval authority through their respective inspectional services departments for development within each Town's boundaries.

No.	MEPA Comment	Response
SC-137	The DSEIR should describe measures to vegetate and stabilize disturbed sites until they are developed.	As described in Section 11.2.2, to the extent a newly disturbed Site will not be fully developed for an extended period of time, the Proponent will work to implement erosion control measures such as deploying haybales and silt control measures, including hydroseeding.
SC-138	The DSEIR should describe solid waste to be removed from the site, including debris fields, and how these materials will be managed and removed from the site.	The general contractor for each portion of Project development will be responsible for the reprocessing and recycling of construction waste. There will be specific requirements to ensure that construction procedures allow for segregation, reprocessing, reuse, and recycling of materials. In any event, construction and demolition waste will be removed from the Site via licensed waste haulers to a licensed recycling center for separation, reprocessing, and recycling. For materials that cannot be recycled, solid waste will be transported in covered trucks to an approved solid waste facility, in accordance with MassDEP Regulations for Solid Waste Facilities. All waste containers will be covered prior to exiting the Site. The Proponent will comply with all applicable solid waste regulations in connection with solid waste (including ABC Rubble) and/or recyclable material generated in conjunction with Project demolition (including any removal of the existing debris piles) and construction.
SC-139	The project should include measures to reduce construction period impacts (e.g., noise, dust, odor, solid waste management) and emissions of air pollutants from equipment, including anti-idling measures in accordance with the Air Quality regulations (310 CMR 7.11).	The Proponent will require contractors to implement measures to reduce noise, dust, odor, solid waste and air pollutant emissions per state and local regulations. See Section 11.2.2 for additional information.
SC-140	I encourage the Proponent to require that its contractors use construction equipment with engines manufactured to Tier 4 federal emission standards, or select project contractors that have installed retrofit emissions control devices or vehicles that use alternative fuels to reduce emissions of volatile organic compounds (VOCs), carbon monoxide (CO) and particulate matter (PM) from diesel-powered equipment.	The Proponent will require contractors to use construction equipment with engines manufactured to Tier 4 federal emission standards, or select project contractors that have installed retrofit emissions control devices or vehicles that use alternative fuels to reduce air pollutant emission from diesel-powered equipment. See Section 11.2.2 for additional information.
SC-141	Off-road vehicles are required to use ultra-low sulfur diesel fuel (ULSD).	The Proponent will require contractors to use ultra-low sulfur diesel fuel (ULSD).
SC-142	If oil and/or hazardous materials are found during construction, the Proponent should notify MassDEP in accordance with the Massachusetts Contingency Plan (310 CMR 40.00).	The Navy has responsibility for hazardous material assessment and remediation, with oversight from the EPA and involvement of the MassDEP. The Proponent is aware of, and will comply with, all laws applicable to it and the Site related to the assessment and remediation of hazardous materials, including without limitation 310 CMR 40.0000, and the laws and regulations related to (a) the removal of asbestos; (b) underground storage tanks; and (c) the generation, storage, and management of regulated waste. The Proponent will also comply with all applicable Site Activity and Use Limitations, Land Use Restrictions, and similar deed restrictions. See Section 10.2.1 for additional detail.

No.	MEPA Comment	Response
SC-143	All construction activities should be undertaken in compliance with the conditions of all State and local permits.	As detailed in the draft Construction Management Plan in the December 2023 NPC, as supplemented in this filing, the Proponent will ensure that general contractors performing demolition and construction activities at the Site in connection with the Project will comply with applicable laws and take appropriate steps to minimize the potential impacts of such activities. See Section 11.0 for additional information.
SC-144	I encourage the Proponent to reuse or recycle construction and demolition (C&D) debris to the maximum extent.	As detailed in Section 11.2.3, the general contractor for each portion of Project development will be responsible for the reprocessing and recycling of construction waste. There will be specific requirements to ensure that construction procedures allow for segregation, reprocessing, reuse, and recycling of materials. In any event, construction and demolition waste will be removed from the Site via licensed waste haulers to a licensed recycling center for separation, reprocessing, and recycling.
SC-145	The Proponent should review MassDEP's comment letter, which provides additional details on applicable regulations and standards.	Detailed responses to MassDEP comments are provided at the beginning of Table 13.2 (Response to Comments).
SC-146	The DSEIR should include a separate chapter summarizing all proposed mitigation measures including construction-period measures. This chapter should also include a comprehensive list of all commitments made by the Proponent to avoid, minimize and mitigate the environmental and related public health impacts of the project, and should include a separate section outlining mitigation commitments relative to EJ populations. The filing should contain clear commitments to implement these mitigation measures, estimate the individual costs of each proposed measure, identify the parties responsible for implementation, and contain a schedule for implementation.	A draft MassDOT Letter of Commitment requesting the issuance of a Section 61 Finding is provided in Section 12.2.1 of this DSEIR.
SC-147	The list of commitments should be provided in a tabular format organized by subject matter (traffic, water/wastewater, environmental justice, etc.) and identify the Agency Action or Permit associated with each category of impact.	Table 12.1 outlines the proposed mitigation implementation plan organized by subject matter and responsible party.
SC-148	Draft Section 61 Findings should be separately included for each Agency Action to be taken on the project.	Draft Section 61 Findings are provided in Section 12.2 for MassDOT and NHESP. In addition, there is a draft Stationary Source GHG Emissions Self-Certification.
SC-149	The filing should clearly indicate which mitigation measures will be constructed or implemented based upon project phasing to ensure that adequate measures are in place to mitigate impacts associated with each development phase.	Mitigation measures are described in detail in Section 12.0. Proposed mitigation measures specific to the Construction Period are detailed in Section 11.2.2.

No.	MEPA Comment	Response
<b>SC-150</b>	The DSEIR should contain a copy of this Certificate and a copy of each comment letter received on the 2023 NPC.	A copy of the Secretary's Certificate on the December 2023 NPC is included in Appendix A. A copy of each comment letter received on the 2023 NPC is included in Appendix B.
<b>SC-151</b>	It should include a comprehensive response to comments on the 2023 NPC that specifically address each issue raised in the comment letter; references to a chapter or sections of the DSEIR alone are not adequate and should only be used, with reference to specific page numbers, to support a direct response.	The Proponent has prepared an exhaustive Response to Comments (Section 13.0) that addresses each of the substantive comments that were submitted regarding the December 2023 NPC.
<b>SC-152</b>	The Proponent should circulate the DSEIR to each Person or Agency who commented on the 2023 NPC, each Agency from which the Proponent will seek Permits, Land Transfers or Financial Assistance, and to any other Agency or Person identified in the Scope.	The Proponent circulated the DSEIR to circulate the DSEIR to each Person or Agency who commented on the December 2023 NPC, each Agency from which the Proponent will seek Permits, Land Transfers or Financial Assistance, and to any other Agency or Person identified in the Scope. See Appendix I.
<b>SC-153</b>	Per 301 CMR 11.16(5), the Proponent may circulate copies of the EIR to commenters in CD-ROM format or by directing commenters to a project website address. However, the Proponent must make a reasonable number of hard copies available to accommodate those without convenient access to a computer and distribute these upon request on a first-come, first-served basis.	The Proponent directed commenters to where the DSEIR filing was available electronically, as well as offered to provide hard copies as requested. The Proponent has provided hard copies that have been requested to date.
<b>SC-154</b>	The Proponent should send correspondence 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 Cover letter includes 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.
<b>SC-155</b>	Copies of the DSEIR should be made available for review at the public libraries of Abington, Rockland, and Weymouth.	Hard copies of the filing are available for review at Abington Public Library, Rockland Memorial Library and Tufts Library.