

Maura T. Healey GOVERNOR

Kimberley Driscoll LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR

> Rebecca L. Tepper SECRETARY

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

> Tel: (617) 626-1000 Fax: (617) 626-1081 http://www.mass.gov/eea

April 1, 2024

CERTIFICATE OF THE SECRETARY OF ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS ESTABLISHING A SPECIAL REVIEW PROCEDURE

PROJECT NAME:Reserved Channel DevelopmentPROJECT MUNICIPALITY:BostonPROJECT WATERSHED:BostonEEA NUMBER:16802PROJECT PROPONENT:OPG MP Parcel Owner (DE) LLC, OPG 370 West First Owner(DE) LLC and OPG 655 Summer Owner (DE) LLCONNITOR:February 23, 2024

Pursuant to the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (G.L. c. 30, ss. 61-62L) and Section 11.09 of the MEPA regulations (301 CMR 11.00), I hereby establish a Special Review Procedure ("SRP") to guide MEPA review of the above-referenced project. The Proponent's request to establish this SRP was published in the Environmental Monitor on February 23, 2024 for a 20-day public review and comment period, together with a request for nomination for a Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC). A CAC with the membership described below is hereby established along with this SRP.

Project Description

OPG MP Parcel Owner (DE) LLC, OPG 370 West First Owner (DE) LLC and OPG 655 Summer Owner (DE) LLC (collectively "OxP" or the "Proponent"), affiliates of Oxford Properties Group and Pappas Enterprises, Inc., have requested a Special Review Procedure ("SRP") under MEPA to govern the review of the Reserved Channel Master Plan Development (the "Master Plan Project") of approximately 42 acres of land within South Boston along West First Street, E Street, Summer Street, and Pappas Way (the "Master Project Site"). The Master Project Site includes approximately 38.6 acres of land which is ground-leased by the Proponent from the Massachusetts Port Authority ("Massport"), with the remaining approximately 3.4 acres owned in fee by the Proponent. The Master Plan Project is anticipated to redevelop the site through the establishment and construction of new open space, roadways, and mixed-use building projects. Programmatically, the Project aims to address needs, both present and future, with housing, ground-floor retail amenities, and flexible commercial spaces.

The Proponent intends to develop approximately 12.9 acres of the Master Project Site as the first phase (as further described herein, the "Phase 1 Project"). The portion of the Master Project Site identified for the Phase 1 Project comprises approximately 10.9 acres of land ground leased from Massport with the remaining approximately 2.0 acres owned in fee by the Proponent, and is located along West First Street, E Street, and Pappas Way (the "Phase 1 Project Site"). The Phase 1 Project is currently being reviewed through the City of Boston (the "City")'s Article 80 Development Review process. According to the Project Notification Form (PNF) filed by the Proponent with the City, Phase 1 consists of the construction of eight new buildings with a combined gross square footage of 1,739,000 square feet (sf) of commercial and residential uses; 2.41 acres of open spaces; a 1.0-acre waterfront open space; and new roadways.

Jurisdiction and Permitting

The Master Plan Project is undergoing MEPA review and is subject to a mandatory EIR because it requires Agency Actions and, based on the conceptual development program identified above, is anticipated to meet/exceed several mandatory EIR thresholds. Specifically, the project is anticipated to meet or exceed the following thresholds:

- 301 CMR 11.03(1)(b)(1): Direct alteration of 25 or more acres of land, unless the Project is consistent with an approved conservation farm plan or forest cutting plan or other similar generally accepted agricultural or forestry practices;
- 301 CMR 11.03(3)(b)(5): New or existing unlicensed non-water dependent use of waterways or tidelands;
- 301 CMR 11.03(5)(b)(4)(a): New discharge or expansion in discharge to a sewer system of 100,000 or more gpd of sewage, industrial wastewater, or untreated stormwater;
- 301 CMR 11.03(6)(a)(6): Generation of 3,000 or more New adt on roadways providing access to a single location;
- 301 CMR 11.03(6)(a)(7): Construction of 1,000 or more New parking spaces at a single location; and,
- 310 CMR 11.03(6)(b)(1)(a): Construction of a new roadway one-quarter or more miles in length.

The project is also required to prepare an EIR pursuant to 301 CMR 11.06(7)(b) because it is located within a Designated Geographic Area (DGA) (currently anticipated to be 1 mile) round one or more Environmental Justice (EJ) Populations. Additional thresholds may be identified in future filings.

Agency Actions include Land Transfers from Massport, and are expected to include a Temporary Construction Dewatering Permit(s) and Sewer Use Discharge Permit(s) from the Massachusetts Water Resources Authority (MWRA); and a Chapter 91 License from the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP). The project is subject to the MEPA GHG Policy and Protocol (GHG Policy) and requires a Public Benefit Determination (PBD). During the course of design and review, additional Agency Actions may be identified and will be provided for in the appropriate MEPA document.

In addition, the project requires one or more Orders of Conditions from the Boston Conservation Commission (or in the case of an appeal, a Superseding Order of Conditions from MassDEP), a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Construction General Permit (CGP) from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and potentially, a Section 404 Permit from the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) and review from the Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC) in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended (36 CFR 800) and M.G.L. c. 9 ss. 26-27C (950 CMR 71).

The project requires a Land Transfer in the form of an amendment to an existing long-term lease or one or more new long-term lease(s) from Massport. The project site is also located on filled tideland areas subject to c. 91 licensing. Therefore, MEPA jurisdiction extends to all aspects of the project that are likely, directly or indirectly, to cause Damage to the Environment pursuant to 301 CMR 11.01(2)(a)(3).

SPECIAL REVIEW PROCEDURE

The Proponent requested the establishment of an SRP, including establishment of a CAC, to govern MEPA review of the phased buildout of the site. The Proponent indicates that an SRP would help to ensure that early actions are compatible with the long-term vision for the Master Plan Project Site and its environs and to identify a framework for mitigation over the course of development, which is anticipated to occur over 20 or more years. The Proponent states that the Master Plan Project will seek to avoid or minimize impacts on the environment and public health while creating a development that will provide new housing, jobs, open space, and economic activity. The SRP would include a comprehensive approach for the review of the Master Plan Project, including the Phase 1 Project, as well as future phases of development. Each filing would account for the cumulative impact of the full build project, and ensure appropriate mitigation commensurate with impacts.

Based on the circumstances of this project, I find that an SRP, established pursuant to 301 CMR 11.09(1) and 11.09(4)(b), will benefit the environment and serve the purposes of MEPA by providing meaningful opportunities for public review, analysis of alternatives, and consideration of cumulative environmental impacts. The procedures set forth in this SRP shall apply to development in the planning area described above. As further described below, the impacts and mitigation measures associated with the Phase 1 project will be included within the baseline conditions in the evaluation of the impacts and mitigation measures for each future development project in the planning area. Subsequent reviews will consider the cumulative impacts of the Full Build Project prior to issuance of final Section 61 Findings. The development of Phase 1 will proceed in such a way that only the minimum infrastructure, including roadways and utilities, reasonably needed to support Phase 1 will be constructed in the initial phase, and conceptual alternatives analysis of the roadway network will be evaluated in the initial Master Plan filing.

Citizen Advisory Committee

To assist in review of the Master Plan Project over the 20+ year planning horizon, the Proponent requests that the Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs establish a Citizens Advisory Committee ("CAC"). The CAC will serve as a conduit for public input and review of the Phase 1 Project and the Master Plan Project including parcels that are owned in fee by the Proponent. The Boston Planning & Development Agency ("BPDA") and the Proponent will be represented on the CAC to play a coordinating function for CAC meetings and deliberation.

As noted, the Phase 1 Project is currently under review through the City's Article 80 process. A CAC has been formed to serve as the advisory body for the Article 80 process, and will serve in lieu of the agency's customary Impact Advisory Group ("IAG") for the Article 80 process. Once the MEPA CAC is formed under the SRP, it will serve as a common body for both the City's Article 80 process and the MEPA review process under this SRP.

The purpose of the CAC will be to provide input and guidance to the Proponent, the City, and MEPA and EEA Secretary throughout the review process for the Master Plan Project and Phase 1 Project by reviewing and submitting comments on documents as well as offering feedback during meetings with the Proponent. The Proponent shall provide administrative support for the CAC, and meetings shall be scheduled in consultation with CAC members, Massport, and the City. The MEPA Office shall be included on invitations for all CAC meetings, and shall provide input on the agendas and format for CAC meetings.

It is envisioned that the CAC will meet in advance of and throughout the formal review process. The CAC will ordinarily be provided with advance copies of any review document called for in the SRP, if requested by the CAC, and shall be included on all distribution lists for SRP filings. CAC meetings shall be coordinated to align with review procedures pending with the City and MEPA.

The CAC will consist of community stakeholders whose interests represent the broader community impacted by the Master Plan Project, and will include the existing CAC members already appointed for the City's Article 80 process. The existing CAC in place for the Article 80 process was formed with the following nominations:

(1 nomination) Mayor of Boston
(1 nomination) Mayor's Commission for Persons with Disabilities
(2 nominations) District City Councilor
(2 nominations) State Representative
(2 nominations) State Senator
(2 nominations) United States Congressman
(2 nominations) Proponent (OxP)
(6 nominations) Self-nominations accepted by BPDA

In an effort to establish a CAC that is diverse in affiliation and experience and fairly represents a range of viewpoints and priorities, additional CAC nominations were solicited by the Secretary and the request for nominations was published together with the Proponent's SRP. The MEPA Office and the City also undertook efforts to reach out to community leaders from EJ populations within the anticipated 1-mile DGA. Based on these efforts, three additional members were added to the CAC. If, based on review of future filings, it appears that the DGA for the project should be expanded, or in the event of

departures or changes to organizational staff, the Secretary shall have discretion to add or remove members, in consultation with the City. If the CAC is unlikely to be able to carry out its functions over the entire 20-year buildout of the Master Plan Project, the CAC may be disbanded and/or reestablished at a future time, at the Secretary's discretion, following the issuance of the Certificate on the FEIR for the Master Plan Project.

Public Outreach

In addition to establishing the CAC, the Proponent shall also conduct public outreach to surrounding communities, including environmental justice (EJ) populations within the designated geographic area ("DGA") of the project site prior to initiating each phase of development under the Master Plan Project. The Proponent shall propose a Public Involvement Plan (PIP) for the Master Plan Project as part of the initial filing described below, which shall be provided to the CAC for its review and comment as well as to the MEPA and EEA EJ Offices prior to filing. The PIP should be maintained as a living document and revisited periodically during the 20+ year buildout of the Master Plan Project, in consultation with the MEPA Office and EEA EJ Office and through continued conversations with the CAC and input from community members. The PIP shall reflect consistency with best practices as outlined in MEPA EJ protocols, and shall include the following minimum components:

- Provide notification of all public meetings, including CAC meetings, and filings under the SRP through a broad range of media such as email listserv, project distribution list, project website, flyers/mailings, and published notice in local newspapers, in a manner that effectively alerts stakeholders to scheduled meetings and filings. All notifications shall be translated into languages as identified in the PIP;
- Conduct periodic community-based outreach in various forms, including distribution of project information at community fairs or other local gathering places, door-to-door mailings, pop up events at local venues, and other efforts to spread word in places where the community is located; specific timing and methods may be further described in the PIP;
- Hold at least one public meeting in advance of the Master Plan Project filing or subsequent EIR, as well as in advance of each subsequent PCN or EIR filing under the SRP, with specific focus on EJ populations, including language interpreters and translated written materials;
- Maintain and update a project website or linked websites which includes the SRP and al filings submitted under the SRP and the City on the Master Plan Project. Provide e-mail addresses for interested parties to use for submitting input and feedback; and
- Continue to meet with public officials (e.g. state legislators and local leaders, transportation officials, and others) to provide updates and to inform those officials of future plans;
- Propose concrete procedures for the CAC to provide feedback on project filings, including through written surveys or public comments, and to provide formal mechanisms for the Proponent to respond to feedback received so that it is clear how the Proponent has modified, if at all, the project to respond to community concerns.

Master Plan and Phase 1 Filing

The Proponent will undertake the standard MEPA review process for the Master Plan Project, including the filing of an Environmental Notification Form (ENF), Draft Environmental Impact Report

(DEIR), and Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR). Within these filings, the Phase 1 Project will also be reviewed in more detail to allow for the Phase 1 Project to complete MEPA review and proceed to state permitting. To the extent practicable, the comment period on any MEPA review documents (except for a Final EIR) submitted in a similar timeframe with a filing for the City's Article 80 review shall coincide with the comment period established by the City.

Review of the Master Plan

It is expected that the information provided during the review of the Master Plan Project will be sufficient to enable a conceptual review of cumulative impacts associated with the Master Plan Project, including any common infrastructure components (such as roadways, water/wastewater expansions and utilities) that will serve the entire Master Plan Site. Review of the Master Plan Project is expected to include the following elements, as may be modified or supplemented by the Secretary's Certificate on the ENF and/or DEIR:

- Conceptual description of the Master Plan Project based on available information, such as the number of buildings, square footages, building heights, uses, parking, open space, and related infrastructure, and a phasing plan that describes how the full buildout of the project is anticipated to proceed (including the types of buildings and uses contemplated in future phases);
- Alternatives analysis describing the various build alternatives considered for the Master Plan Project, including at least one reduced build alternative and a zoning compliant alternative;
- An initial description of the cumulative impacts and a mitigation framework for the future buildout of the Master Project Site for each major impact category (transportation, stormwater, wetlands, climate change, environmental justice, etc);
- Analysis of the transportation impacts over the full 20+ year planning horizon and potential mitigation measures, including anticipated roadway layout and connections; the filing should address consistency with other state and local planning efforts such as the South Boston Transportation Action Plan, South Boston Seaport Strategic Transit Plan, and transportation planning for the Raymond L. Flynn Marine Park;
- Description of proposed measures to address climate change, including building energyefficiency, structure/building elevation, stormwater design, and contributions to district-wide solutions to minimize area flooding; the filing should address consistency with applicable local, state and federal standards, policies and guidance related to climate change in place at the time of review, and should address opportunities for district energy solutions, EV/PV installations, and other best practices to reduce the project's carbon footprint;
- An analysis of impacts to EJ populations within the DGA of the Master Plan Project Site and mitigation measures, in accordance with MEPA EJ protocols and other applicable policies or protocols of the City and Massport in place at the time of review;
- Analysis of infrastructure needs and associated impacts and mitigation measures, including utility connections, roadway network, water/wastewater connections and timelines for buildout by phase;
- Identification of construction-period mitigation measures that will be required to be implemented; and
- Demonstration of conformance with the standards under the Massachusetts Public Waterfront Act, M.G.L Chapter 91 ("Chapter 91"), including any applicable standards reflected in any

Municipal Harbor Plans (MHP) or Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) between MassDEP and Massport.

• Demonstration of conformance with the standards under the Public Benefits Determination (PBD) regulations

Review of the Phase 1 Project

The Phase 1 Project will include analysis of alternatives for Phase 1 and all applicable environmental impacts in accordance with the MEPA regulations as defined in 301 CMR 11.00, as may be modified through the Secretary's Certificate on the ENF and/or DEIR. Description of the Phase 1 Project shall address consistency with the Master Plan Project and mitigation framework, and shall demonstrate that the Phase 1 Project is severable from the remainder of development on the Master Plan Site, will not preclude alternatives for remainder of the buildout of the Master Plan Project, and will construct only the minimum infrastructure, including roadways and utilities, reasonably needed to support Phase 1. Issuance of the Secretary's Certificate on the final filing will conclude MEPA review of the Phase 1 Project, and shall mean that Agency Actions may be taken as related to Phase 1.

Subsequent Filings

Unless adequately described and analyzed in the DEIR and FEIR and specifically identified in the FEIR Certificate as requiring no further MEPA review, future phases of the Master Plan Project beyond Phase 1 will require preparation of more detailed information on each phase in the form of Project Commencement Notices ("PCN"), in lieu of following customary MEPA procedures. PCNs will be submitted to MEPA for Agency and public review, and shall be filed for each phase regardless of whether that phase independently meets or exceeds MEPA review thresholds under 301 CMR 11.03. Agencies shall not take required Agency Actions for individual projects until MEPA review on each phase is complete. PCNs may address one or more phases within the Master Plan Project depending upon design advancement and construction scheduling. The Proponent and Massport currently contemplate that each future phase will be submitted to the City for Article 80 review voluntarily. The content of the PCN should be consistent with filings made under the City's Article 80 process, to the extent practicable.

Each PCN will include information commensurate with that typically found in an EENF and include a detailed project narrative, a quantification of project-related impacts, including a comparison to impacts anticipated for the applicable parcel under the Master Plan Project, and an updated table showing cumulative impacts of the entire Master Plan Project.

Specific procedures are as follows:

The MEPA EJ Screening Form, or any successor form or required document, shall be circulated at least 30 days prior to filing the PCN to an EJ Reference List provided by the MEPA Office. The MEPA Office will develop a standard EJ Reference List for the Master Plan Project, which may be updated over time as needed. Additional pre-filing outreach to surrounding EJ populations within the DGA of the Master Project Site shall be conducted consistent with the established PIP for the project. The EJ Screening Form shall be translated into languages applicable, as designated in the PIP. If deemed complete by MEPA, the PCN will be noticed in the Environmental Monitor for a 30day comment period with the MEPA Certificate to be issued within 7 days of the close of the comment period. For a PCN that includes information on multiple buildings or other complex components, the Secretary shall coordinate an extended comment period with the Proponent up to 30-days (unless further extended at the request of the Proponent) with the MEPA Certificate to be issued on a corresponding certificate deadline on the MEPA calendar. The comment period may be further extended in accordance with 301 CMR 11.06(3). Upon review of the PCN, the Secretary shall issue a Certificate indicating whether an EIR is required, and there shall be a presumption of a Single EIR for any phase that is deemed consistent with the Master Plan Project and mitigation framework. The Secretary shall also have discretion to determine that no further MEPA review is required for any particular phase.

Each PCN shall include a discussion of any MEPA review thresholds exceeded for that phase and identify proposed mitigation measures and shall discuss any other environmental impacts itemized in an ENF form (such as water/wastewater demand) anticipated from the phase even if they do not exceed review thresholds. Any technical analyses used to support this discussion, including stormwater reports, traffic studies, water/wastewater reports, and/or wetlands delineations, shall be submitted with the PCN.

PCNs shall include an analysis of the project's consistency with the Master Plan Project. An alternatives analysis should be presented within the parameters and uses allowed under the Master Plan Project; however, any change in land use should be supported by an expanded alternatives analysis with comparison of impacts and justification for selection of the preferred alternative.

Each PCN shall include all required attachments for an ENF applicable at the time of the submission. The PCN should comply with the MEPA Interim Protocol for Climate Adaptation and Resiliency (or successor policy or amendment in effect at the time of filing). The PCN should also address compliance with local, state, and federal standards, policies and guidance related to climate resilience in effect at the time of filing and applicable to the phase. The PCN should describe any adaptive management strategies being considered including contributions to regional solutions.

PCNs shall include an analysis of greenhouse gas emissions. The GHG analysis may be combined with the analysis provided to the City; however, it must include all information and analyses specified in the MEPA Greenhouse Gas Emissions Policy and Protocol (or successor policy or amendment in effect at the time of filing) for any conditioned building spaces and mobile sources. Should the phase be demonstrated to meet best practices for energy efficiency for the proposed building type, the Proponent may request an opt-out of modeling requirements. The Proponent shall consult with DOER and the City to seek input on the proposed opt-out prior to filing. Projects qualifying for such opt-outs must still describe the proposed energy efficiency measures of the building in the PCN in a format recommended by DOER/MEPA.

Each PCN shall include a copy of a transportation study consistent with, or, if a permit from MassDOT is required, an analysis prepared in accordance with MassDOT/EEA Transportation Impact Assessment Guidelines. In addition, the PCN should include a review of the PCN project's consistency with the Master Plan Project traffic study assumptions and mitigation, as well as consistency with updated transportation planning conducted by the City and state for the areas surrounding the Master Plan Project Site. Review of the PCN's consistency with the Master Plan Project traffic study shall

include an updated analysis of future Full Build conditions based on the updated traffic data used to prepare the PCN's traffic analysis, a review of completed transportation mitigation, an assessment of the success of the mitigation, and a review of the adequacy of transportation mitigation measures proposed in the analysis conducted for the Master Plan. The mitigation plan should consider any state or local planning efforts or studies that may be applicable to the Master Plan Site, as well as any recommended mitigation measures. Mitigation for each phase should be commensurate with impacts, and include a timeline and schedule for implementation to ensure that mitigation measures are in place when construction is planned to occur. The Phase 1 project shall be included in baseline conditions when analyzing the impacts of future phases.

Each PCN must provide analysis of EJ impacts consistent with the MEPA Interim Protocol for Analysis of Project Impacts on Environmental Justice Populations (or successor protocol in effect at the time of filing) and other applicable policies or protocols of the City and Massport in effect at the time of filing.

Each PCN must provide a list of final mitigation commitments for the phase under review, as well as updated commitments for the Master Plan Project, in a tabular format organized by subject matter (traffic, water/wastewater, GHG, environmental justice, etc.) and identify any Agency Actions associated with each category of impact. The list shall identify mitigation commitments already completed, as well as timelines and responsible parties for outstanding commitments. The list shall be used by Agencies to update Section 61 findings as appropriate.

Project Changes

Once the final filing for the Master Plan Project, or for a PCN filed for a phase of the project, is determined adequate by the Secretary through the issuance of a final Certificate, in the event the Proponent or its successor(s) desire to make material changes to the Master Plan Project or of a phase reviewed in a PCN, a Notice of Project Change ("NPC") to the Master Plan Project or the PCN will be filed in accordance with 301 CMR 11.10.

- NPCs will be noticed in the Environmental Monitor for public review.
- Upon review of the NPC, the Secretary shall determine if the impacts of the change are significant such that further MEPA review may be required. If overall impacts as reflected in MEPA review thresholds are reduced from the Master Plan Project, there shall be presumption that no further MEPA review is required; however, MEPA review thresholds shall not be dispositive in the Secretary's determination of significance.
- ◆ Because the Master Plan Project is a conceptual planning document for a 20+ year buildout, it is acknowledged that modest changes to the uses, building square footage, and other parameters of each phase of development may become necessary over time. Unless such changes rise to the level of a material change to the Master Plan Project, it is anticipated that each phase will be filed in the form of a PCN as outlined above, in lieu of an NPC for that particular phase. The Proponent should consult with the MEPA Office to determine the appropriate filing procedure for any particular phase.

Interim Updates

The Proponent or its successor(s) shall prepare an Interim Update upon the ten-year anniversary of the SRP Certificate, and each five years thereafter only if no filings are submitted under the SRP during those time frames. The ten/five-year update shall be published in the Environmental Monitor for a 30-day public review and comment period, unless extended with consent of the Proponent or its successor(s). The update shall include a comparison of the cumulative impacts of projects approved and/or constructed as compared to the Master Plan Project, review of mitigation completed and outstanding, and any additional mitigation required.

The Interim Update will include an update on the status of individual development projects within the Master Project Site and a description of any material changes to the Master Plan Project from that described in the FEIR. It shall include a description of any plans for development anticipated within the next five-year period.

Upon review of the ten/five-year update and public comments received, the Secretary shall issue a certificate determining whether the Interim Update complies with the requirements of the SRP, and identifying any specific information that may be required in future updates. If the Interim Update is deemed inadequate, the Secretary may require one or more Supplemental Interim Updates.

Circulation Requirements

The MEPA documents submitted pursuant to this SRP shall be subject to the circulation requirements of Sections 11.16 of the MEPA regulations. Specifically, the Master Plan ENF and each PCN submitted for each subsequent phase of development shall be treated as an ENF and circulated pursuant to 301 CMR 11.16(2); in addition, the PCN shall be circulated to anyone who previously commented on the Master Plan ENF or other prior filing under this SRP, as well as to the EJ Reference List as updated by the MEPA Office. Any EIR submitted under this SRP shall be subject to 301 CMR 11.16(3), and shall also be circulated to anyone who previously commented on the ENF or other prior filing under this SRP, and the EJ Reference List as updated by the MEPA Office. NPC filings should be circulated in accordance with PCN procedures. As noted above, each MEPA filing shall be circulated to the CAC for review prior to filing, and any distribution list developed under the PIP shall be used to circulate all filings under the SRP.

Modification and Term of the Special Review Procedure

If the Proponent wishes to change any provision in this SRP, they may submit a written request for modification of the SRP. The Secretary will then review the request and issue an Amended SRP if appropriate. As noted above, the composition of the CAC may be modified by the Secretary, in consultation with the City, as needed.

This SRP, including the CAC, is proposed to remain in effect for 20 years from the date of this SRP or when the development program described herein and in the Master Plan Project filing is complete, whichever is later. This term is subject to the project change and lapse of time provisions under 301 CMR 11.10, as modified by this SRP; lapse of time provisions shall not apply for the first ten years after issuance of this SRP. The Proponent, Massport, MEPA Office, and the City shall meet periodically to confer as to need to amend or terminate the SRP based on updated circumstances over the 20+ year term of the SRP.

Conclusion

The signatures below indicate consent by the Proponent and Massport to the establishment of a Special Review Procedure and the specific provisions outlined in this Certificate. The Proponent and Massport shall ensure compliance with this SRP by any third party developer or other entity contracted to carry out the projects that are subject to the procedures set forth in this SRP. This SRP shall be posted on the MEPA website.

April 1, 2024

Reberca Tepper, Secretary Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs

April 1, 2024

OPG MP Parcel Owner (DE) LLC, OPG 370 West First Owner (DE) LLC, and OPG 655 Summer Owner (DE) LLC

By:

Name: Mark McGowan Title: Vice President

April 2, 2024

Altary

Andrew G. Hargens Chief Development Officer Massachusetts Port Authority