



The Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs
100 Cambridge Street, Suite 900, Boston, MA 02114
www.Mass.gov/EEA | Tel: (617) 626-1000 | Fax: (617) 626-1081

Maura T. Healey
Governor

Kimberley Driscoll
Lieutenant Governor

Rebecca L. Tepper
Secretary

**Response to Comments on
Draft Regulatory Amendments Proposed by the
Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) Office**

MEPA Regulations at 301 CMR 11.00

January 16, 2026

**Regulatory Authority:
M.G.L. c. 30, §§ 61 to 62L**

Background

On September 12, 2025, notice was published in the Massachusetts Register of proposed amendments to regulations of the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) Office at 301 CMR 11.00. The amendments proposed to streamline MEPA review of qualifying housing projects to meet the Commonwealth's housing production goals. These amendments are consistent with actions to boost housing production as outlined in the [Comprehensive Housing Plan for 2025-29](#) and a corresponding recommendation of the [Unlocking Housing Production Commission](#) formed in 2024.¹ They are also consistent with the mandate of MEPA to ensure that covered agencies study the impact of proposed actions on the natural environment and to use all practicable means and measures to avoid or minimize impacts. In addition to qualifying housing, the amendments seek to expedite reviews for certain ecological restoration projects as defined in Wetlands Protection Act (WPA) regulations at 310 CMR 10.00, and to streamline reviews of conceptual urban renewal plans and similar planning documents.

The MEPA Office held public hearings and solicited comments on the proposed amendments in accordance with M.G.L. Chapter 30A. On September 12, 2025, the MEPA Office published notice of the public hearings and public comment period in the Boston Globe, Worcester Telegram & Gazette, Berkshire Eagle, and Cape Cod Times. The MEPA Office also notified a wide range of stakeholders through its email distribution lists and additional outreach. Three public hearings were held via Zoom on October 14-15, 2025, and a fourth was added and held via Zoom on October 22, 2025. Six individuals provided prepared testimony and others asked clarifying questions during the public hearings. The public comment period was extended by ten days and closed on November 10, 2025.

In September 2021, the MEPA Office formed a [MEPA Advisory Committee](#),² consisting of over 20 stakeholder groups and agency representatives, to provide input on regulatory amendments that went into effect on December 24, 2021. The MEPA Advisory Committee continued to meet in early 2022, and informed a second set of regulatory changes made effective on January 6, 2023. For the regulatory proposal described herein, the MEPA Office convened a meeting of the MEPA Advisory Committee on October 23, 2025, which was open to the public.

Response to Comments on Regulatory Amendments

The MEPA Office appreciates the comments received on the draft regulatory amendments. Written comments were received from the following organizations and individuals.³

¹ <https://www.mass.gov/news/governor-healey-files-mass-ready-act-to-strengthen-infrastructure-and-prepare-for-disasters>; <https://www.mass.gov/news/unlocking-housing-production-commission-releases-recommendations-for-producing-more-housing-lowering-costs>

² See <https://www.mass.gov/info-details/mepa-advisory-committee>

³ All written comments received are posted on the MEPA website at <https://www.mass.gov/info-details/comments-received-on-proposed-mepa-regulatory-amendments>.

Organizations	Individuals	Form Letters
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 495 MetroWest Partnership • A Better City • Alternatives for Community and Environment • Association to Preserve Cape Cod • Cambridge Redevelopment Authority • Cape Cod Commission • Citizens' Housing and Planning Association • Gateway Cities Legislative Caucus • Greater Boston Real Estate Board and Massachusetts Association of Realtors • Home Builders and Remodelers Association of Massachusetts • Innes Land Strategies Group • Joint Letter from MassAudubon and 28 others • Joint Letter from Massachusetts Rivers Alliance and 18 others • Lake Archer Association • Lisciotti Development • Massachusetts Association of Conservation Commissions • Massachusetts Community Development Corporation • Massachusetts Association of Regional Planning Agencies • Massachusetts Housing Partnership • MassDEP Wetlands Program • MassINC • Massachusetts Water Resources Authority • Massachusetts Water Works Association • Metropolitan Area Planning Council • Mystic River Watershed Association • NAIOP • Northern Middlesex Council of Governments • Post Road Residential • Representative Carole Fiola (State Representative, 6th Bristol District) • The Nature Conservancy • Trees as Public Good • Valley Community Development • Wood Partners 	Haily Brady Eli Susskind Mary Parsons Meghan Perry Jane Schnitzer Diane Holdgate Kate Splaine Will Willauer Jack Weinhold Linda Derensis Wil Saunders Anne Mckinnon Kristen Mello David Stoff	Form letter supporting ecological restoration streamlining (84 signatories) Form letter opposing environmental streamlining (11 signatories)

<p><i>Additional comments on special review procedure for urban renewal plans:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Greater Worcester Land Trust • MassINC • Quincy Dept of Planning and Community Development 		
---	--	--

General comments

1. *Comment:* Several comments indicated support for streamlining MEPA reviews of qualifying housing projects, stating that the Commonwealth is undergoing a dire housing crisis that is negatively impacting economic vitality. Comments noted that the added time and cost associated with MEPA environmental reviews are key hurdles to housing production. Other comments supported the qualifying housing approach in the regulatory proposal, indicating that it aligns with the Healey-Driscoll Administration's goals of encouraging infill and transit-oriented development and compact, sustainable land-use patterns.

Response: The MEPA Office appreciates these comments, which reflect the intent of the proposed regulatory amendments to support housing production while minimizing environmental impacts. The qualifying housing criteria set forth in *new* 301 CMR 11.01(2)(c)1. and 2. seek to identify characteristics of housing projects for which significant environmental impacts are avoided and minimized, such that additional MEPA review would provide limited benefit to the environment. Accordingly, projects meeting such criteria will not be presumed likely or reasonably likely to cause Damage to the Environment, and will require only an Environmental Notification Form (ENF) filing, unless an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is required at the discretion of the EEA Secretary in accordance with 301 CMR 11.06(7)(a).

2. *Comment:* In contrast to the above, several comments, including a form letter petition joined by 11 individual signatories, noted objections to any streamlining of environmental regulations. The comments state that private development should not be prioritized over protection of natural resources, and that MEPA review provides meaningful opportunities for public participation in reviews of proposed projects. Some comments referenced the broad definition of "Damage to the Environment" in M.G.L. c. 30, § 61, and indicate that the qualifying housing criteria do not cover all types of impacts reflected in this definition.

Response: The MEPA Office acknowledges the overarching mandate of MEPA, stated in M.G.L. c. 30, § 61, to ensure that covered agencies study the impact of proposed actions on the natural environment and to use all practicable means and measures to avoid or minimize impacts. As noted above, the qualifying housing criteria set forth in *new* 301 CMR 11.01(2)(c)1. and 2. will support this mandate by identifying characteristics of housing projects for which significant environmental impacts are avoided and minimized, such that additional MEPA review would provide limited benefit to the environment. Accordingly, projects meeting such criteria will not be presumed likely or reasonably likely to cause Damage to the Environment. This language does not mean, however, that a project meeting the qualifying housing criteria are wholly exempt from MEPA review; instead, an ENF filing would still be required, and such filing (consistent

with current practice) will provide disclosures of all relevant impacts anticipated to result from the project, including the types of impacts reflected in the definition of “Damage to the Environment” in M.G.L. c. 30, § 61 and incorporated into MEPA review thresholds. The absence of EIR also does not exempt the project from other forms of required permitting. Pursuant to 301 CMR 11.06(7)(a) and consistent with current practice, the EEA Secretary will retain discretion to determine if impacts are significant so as to warrant EIR review.

Comments Related to Qualifying Housing

3. *Comment:* Several comments, while supporting the overall intent of the regulatory proposal, provided suggestions for modifying the qualifying housing criteria set forth in *new* 301 CMR 11.01(2)(c)1. and 2.

Suggestions for broadening qualifying housing criteria (to streamline more projects) include the following:

- Reduce minimum residential percentage in 301 CMR 11.01(2)(c)1.a. from 67% to 55% of gross square area
- Eliminate density criterion in 301 CMR 11.01(2)(c)1.b.
- Eliminate the mapping layers for infill criterion in 301 CMR 11.01(2)(c)1.c. and increase the limit on alteration of previously undeveloped land to 25 acres with no requirement for tree retention or mitigation
- Eliminate flood hazard criterion in 301 CMR 11.01(2)(c)1.d.
- Eliminate requirement to consult with the Massachusetts Department of Transportation (MassDOT) and the Massachusetts Bay Transportation Authority (MBTA) for projects proposing over 3,000 New average daily trips (adt) of traffic to a single location in 301 CMR 11.01(2)(c)1.g.

Suggestions for narrowing qualifying housing criteria (to streamline less projects) include the following:

- Add wetland resource areas to the mapping layers in infill criterion in 301 CMR 11.01(2)(c)1.c., together with open space requirement (other related comments also suggest strengthening tree retention requirements)
- Expand flood hazard criterion in 301 CMR 11.01(2)(c)1.d. to deny streamlining for new projects proposed within the 500-year FEMA floodplain (not just 100-year floodplain) and use future flood mapping in lieu of FEMA maps
- Expand energy efficiency criterion in 301 CMR 11.01(2)(c)1.e. to require compliance with Specialized Opt-In Code (not just Stretch Code) as a condition of streamlining
- Expand criterion in 301 CMR 11.01(2)(c)1.e. to deny streamlining if a project will require a new water supply from a groundwater source or new wastewater treatment
- Expand criterion in 301 CMR 11.01(2)(c)1.g. to require a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) plan as a condition of streamlining and limit applicability of

criterion for projects located near environmental justice (EJ) areas meeting “Vulnerable Health EJ Criteria”⁴

- Add affordability requirement and other mitigation measures for EJ communities, such as an indoor air quality management plan
- Add requirement for use of Low Impact Development (LID) techniques and minimum sizing for stormwater management systems
- Add criterion prohibiting streamlining for projects sited within or near hazardous facilities and environmental cleanup sites

The MEPA Office appreciates the detailed feedback and suggestions for refining the proposed qualifying housing criteria in the draft regulatory proposal. The Office has carefully considered all comments received, and is electing to promulgate the final regulation with modest changes as listed below.

The MEPA Office notes that the qualifying housing criteria were carefully crafted to identify and define characteristics of projects that are not likely or reasonably likely to cause Damage to the Environment, while also supporting the Commonwealth’s housing goals. The criteria were developed in close collaboration with the Executive Office of Housing and Livable Communities (EOHLC), the Office of Climate Innovation and Resilience (OCIR), MassDOT, MBTA and other partner agencies, and projects meeting them can be fairly said to have been designed from the start to be housing-centered (*i.e.*, actually deliver housing versus other land uses), make efficient use of land, avoid areas with the highest resource value, be energy-efficient for residents, and appropriately consider climate change impacts and effects. As noted above, other impacts as reflected in MEPA review thresholds will be disclosed and evaluated in the ENF, consistent with current practice. With these conditions, additional EIR review is not anticipated to result in further benefits to the environment, as the criteria provide appropriate incentives for development that is consistent with the above principles. This approach is consistent with long-standing sustainable development principles in effect in the Commonwealth,⁵ and considers emerging data and science related to climate change. Additional examples from other states support the proposition that dense, infill housing development located close to transit can be presumed to minimize environmental impacts by reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and associated air quality and public health impacts for surrounding communities.⁶

While the MEPA Office will not be making substantial changes to the qualifying housing criteria as proposed in the draft regulation, the Office does plan to track data on new projects seeking streamlining under the new criteria after the implementation date. The MEPA Office plans to make such data publicly available, and will conduct an internal review after at least two years of

⁴ Four vulnerable health EJ criteria (heart attack hospitalization, childhood asthma, childhood blood lead, and low birth weight) are tracked in the Massachusetts Department of Public Health (DPH)’s EJ Tool. See <https://matracking.ehs.state.ma.us/Environmental-Data/ej-vulnerable-health/environmental-justice.html>.

⁵ See, e.g., <https://www.mass.gov/doc/notice-of-funding-availability-commonwealths-sustainable-development-principles/download>; <https://www.mass.gov/doc/massworks-sustainable-development-principles/download> (updated January 2025).

⁶ See, e.g., Technical Advisory on Evaluating Transportation Impacts in CEQA [California Environmental Quality Act], December 2018 (at 13-15) (stating that lead agencies “generally should presume” that certain project types, including residential, proposed within one-half mile of an existing major transit stop “will have a less-than-significant impact on VMT,” for purposes of conducting environmental reviews under CEQA).

implementation to determine whether any further changes, including regulatory amendments, may be needed to enhance the effectiveness of this proposal or to address unintended consequences.

The MEPA Office also notes that, partly in response to comments raising questions about the ongoing availability of data related to forest carbon stocks, EEA has chosen to make publicly available a new data layer, titled the “Massachusetts Forest Carbon Top Quintile” data layer, delineating areas containing the top quintile (20%) carbon stocks statewide. As this data layer is anticipated to remain the definitive data source for assessing eligibility for MEPA streamlining, the language in 301 CMR 11.01(2)(c)1.c. will be amended, as shown below, to reference this data layer and remove the reference to future guidance to be issued by the EEA Secretary.

4. *Comment:* Several comments addressed projects covered by *new* 301 CMR 11.01(2)(c)2., specifically, those that do not exceed mandatory EIR thresholds but must undergo EIR review due to geographic proximity to EJ populations.⁷ Some commenters suggested eliminating the EIR requirement for all such projects, without consideration of any qualifying housing criteria. Other commenters suggested applying the same qualifying housing criteria in 301 CMR 11.01(2)(c)1. to all projects, thereby eliminating the separate category of streamlining in 301 CMR 11.01(2)(c)2.

After considering these comments, the MEPA Office is electing to promulgate the final regulation as reflected below, without modifying or eliminating the separate category of streamlining in 301 CMR 11.01(2)(c)2. As stated, the qualifying housing criteria identify characteristics of housing projects for which significant environmental impacts are avoided and minimized, and which therefore are not presumed likely or reasonably likely to cause Damage to the Environment. Projects that do not exceed “mandatory EIR” thresholds in MEPA regulations, including those that otherwise would be required to conduct EIR solely due to location, by definition have lower environmental impacts and are generally smaller in scope and scale than projects that exceed such higher-level thresholds. Given their lesser impacts, it is the judgment of the MEPA Office, given the Office’s prior experience reviewing similar projects, that modified implementation of the qualifying housing criteria will be adequate to avoid or minimize environmental impact, such that projects meeting the modified criteria should not be presumed likely or reasonably likely to cause Damage to the Environment. Conversely, projects not meeting the modified criteria will continue to require EIR review pursuant to MEPA review thresholds and the mandates of the Climate Roadmap Act. Contrary to the suggestion in some comments, it is the view of the MEPA Office that the EIR requirement cannot be removed for this category of projects, without consideration of *any* environmental criteria, as this would risk contravening statutory directives.

5. *Comment:* Several comments suggested that projects seeking to meet qualifying housing criteria should be required to file an “Expanded ENF” with additional content, for instance, a listing of project mitigation measures similar to so-called “Section 61 Findings” (under M.G.L. c. 30, § 61) required for EIR projects. Comments emphasize the importance of extending protections to communities that have historically borne a disproportionate burden

⁷ This requirement was added by St. 2021, c. 8, § 57 (the “Climate Roadmap Act”), which also enacted in statute the definition of “Environmental Justice Population” in M.G.L. c. 30, § 62.

of pollution, environmental hazards, and systemic disinvestment, and suggest that qualifying housing criteria take account of the state's obligation to Affirmatively Further Fair Housing (AFFH). Comments recommend at least a 45 day notification period that includes proactive outreach strategies and reporting back on that engagement in the MEPA filing.

Response: While the MEPA Office acknowledges the underlying intent of the Climate Roadmap Act to enhance environmental reviews of projects proposed near historically burdened communities, the Act did so by requiring EIR for projects that are “likely to cause Damage to the Environment” and located within a certain distance from EJ populations. As stated, the qualifying housing criteria in *new* 301 CMR 11.01(2)(c)1. and 2. seek to ensure that housing projects minimize their environmental impacts in a manner that allows for a streamlined ENF review without EIR. It would counteract these streamlining goals to require additional content through an Expanded ENF filing. The MEPA Office notes, however, that it intends to amend the ENF form with a compliance checklist for projects to demonstrate consistency with the required criteria, including proposed measures to avoid, minimize and mitigate impacts. Disclosures related to project impacts and benefits for surrounding EJ communities are already required as part of the Environmental Justice section of the ENF form. The MEPA Office will review this and other sections to determine whether enhancements may be warranted to support the goals of this regulatory amendment. Under 301 CMR 11.05(6), any amendments to the ENF form shall be published in the *Environmental Monitor* with the effective date. The MEPA Office notes that a 45-day advance notification is already required under 301 CMR 11.05(4)(b).

6. *Comment:* Some comments noted ambiguities in certain terms used in the qualifying criteria. Specifically, several comments requested that allowable *non*-residential uses in *new* 301 CMR 11.01(2)(c)1.a., include cultural, educational, community and/or civic uses (in addition to supportive commercial use) as these types of uses are often included in development projects as community benefits and should be encouraged. Other comments requested clarification of the terms “transit oriented development district” and “mixed-use district,” in *new* 301 CMR 11.01(2)(c)1.g., indicating that use of these terms varies across municipalities and throughout the Massachusetts General Laws.

Response: The MEPA Office will revise 301 CMR 11.01(2)(c)1.a. and (c)1.g., as shown below, in response to these comments. The Office agrees that inclusion of cultural, educational, community and/or civic uses in Section 11.01(2)(c)1.a., without changing the required percentage (maximum 33%) of non-residential uses, is appropriate in light of existing industry practice. The Office will remove references to “transit oriented development district” and “mixed-use district,” in 11.01(2)(c)1.g., to provide clarity, and will make other technical edits to this provision as shown below. The condition to site a project within one-half of a public transit stop already addresses the concept of “transit oriented development,” such that reliance on certain types of zoning districts by a municipality does not appear necessary. To allow for equitable application of this criterion to projects proposed throughout the Commonwealth, the term “public transit stop” will be construed to mean all public transit serviced by the MBTA or other local or regional transit authority established pursuant to M.G.L. c. 161B, § 3 or § 14. A requirement to consult with the applicable local or regional transit authority will be added to this criterion as indicated below.

Comments Related to Single Family Homes

7. *Comment:* Several comments raised questions regarding the proposed exemption for single family home projects that require MEPA review solely due to an appeal of an Order of Conditions to MassDEP for a Superseding Order of Conditions (SOC) under the Wetlands Protection Act (WPA), M.G.L. c. 131, § 40. Comments questioned whether streamlining reviews of single family homes would support the goal of boosting housing production. Other comments suggested that a MassDEP SOC be removed as a basis for MEPA jurisdiction even for larger housing projects.

Response: As stated in the Background Document issued with the draft regulation, the MEPA Office proposed a narrow exemption for single family home projects that, while involving some level of impact (typically, to coastal wetlands), may not benefit from an added layer of MEPA review in addition to review by MassDEP. In light of comments received, the MEPA Office has elected to proceed with a modest expansion of this exemption to include multifamily housing projects proposing up to 50 units. This change better aligns with the overall goal of incentivizing housing production, while limiting the exemption to projects with less impacts.

Comments Related to Ecological Restoration

8. *Comment:* Numerous comments, including a form letter petition joined by 84 individual signatories, overwhelmingly supported the proposal to streamline “Ecological Restoration Limited Projects” as defined in the WPA that do not qualify for existing streamlining in 301 CMR 11.01(2)(b)4. (which is limited to “full” Ecological Restoration Projects that meet all relevant standards under WPA regulations). As the proposal extends streamlining only to Ecological Restoration Limited Projects that do not exceed “mandatory EIR” thresholds, several comments urged the MEPA Office to expand this streamlining to include even projects that exceed such higher-level thresholds.

Response: While the MEPA Office supports ecological restoration activity, particularly to combat growing climate change risks, the Office intends to finalize this proposal as written in the draft regulation. As stated in MEPA regulations, the mandatory EIR thresholds in 301 CMR 11.03 identify projects or aspects thereof that are presumed to have “particularly significant environmental impacts,” and for which an EIR is presumed to benefit the environment. See 301 CMR 11.11(2). Given the large scale of some ecological restoration activity—many extending well beyond the 10-acre EIR threshold for wetlands alteration—the MEPA Office is not currently in a position, absent additional data or information, to determine that *all* such projects, regardless of scope and scale, should be excluded from the presumption of environmental impact stated in 301 CMR 11.11. The Office notes, however, that EEA and its agencies are currently considering ways to streamline “nature based solutions” (NBS), as indicated in the MassReady Act filed by Governor Healey.⁸ Future reforms to address NBS could include changes to MEPA reviews.

The MEPA Office further notes that a companion proposal to revise the definition of “Replacement Project” to include replacement activities that do not require permitting for *new or*

⁸ <https://www.mass.gov/info-details/mass-ready-act>

increased impacts did not receive any comments in favor or opposed to the proposal. Accordingly, the Office intends to finalize with this amendment without change.

Comments Related to Urban Renewal Plans and Special Review Procedure

9. *Comment:* Several comments, including from the MassINC Gateway Cities Innovation Institute and network of leaders from 26 mid-sized cities, as well as several municipal redevelopment authorities, overwhelmingly supported the proposal to streamline reviews of conceptual urban renewal plans (URPs), where no other work, project, or activity exceeding MEPA review thresholds is proposed. Comments indicate that the EIR requirement for URPs has created delays, during which time redevelopment authorities could not take action to address properties creating public health and safety risks for the neighborhood. One comment expressed opposition to this proposal, noting that URPs have historically worked alongside other discriminatory policies like redlining to concentrate undesirable land uses and associated pollution, public health, and socio-economic harms in low-income neighborhoods and communities of color; the comment states that EIR review would address the indirect impacts that may flow from planning documents intended to spur redevelopment.

Response: The MEPA Office appreciates the diverse perspectives presented on URPs and acknowledges the historical context of URPs. The Office notes, however, that this threshold (formerly in 301 CMR 11.03(1)(b)6.) was originally inserted as an “ENF” (not “mandatory EIR”) threshold, meaning that URPs generally underwent an ENF-level review for many decades except in instances where the redevelopment agency engaged in development activity together with the planning process. Multiple redevelopment authorities have indicated to the MEPA Office that the process of developing URPs has undergone substantial changes in the last decades, and now include more opportunities for public engagement separate and apart from the MEPA review process. Given this input, the MEPA Office intends to finalize this proposal as proposed in the draft regulation, which would create a new category of threshold in 301 CMR 11.12 (now titled, “Regulations and Planning”) and move the former 301 CMR 11.03(1)(b)6. to this section. In turn, projects exceeding any threshold in 301 CMR 11.12 are no longer presumed “likely or reasonably likely to cause Damage to the Environment,” provided an ENF is filed.

As stated in the Background Document issued with the draft regulation, the MEPA Office also issued for public comment a proposed Special Review Procedure (SRP) under 301 CMR 11.09, as an alternative to a regulatory change, to simplify reviews of URPs and subsequent development projects within the urban renewal area. In light of divergent comments received on the SRP, including suggestions for new or changed content, the MEPA Office will continue to consider the SRP as a complement to this regulatory change, but will *not* publish a final SRP together with the final regulation. Redevelopment authorities wishing to develop an individualized SRP for a specific project should contact the MEPA Office for guidance.

* * * * *

Final Regulatory Amendments

Based on the responses to comments above, the following modest changes have been made to the final regulations, as compared to the draft regulations.

11.01: General provisions

- *Existing* 301 CMR 11.01(2)(b)3. has been revised to read as follows:
 3. The review thresholds do not apply to: a lawfully existing structure, facility or activity; Routine Maintenance; a Replacement Project; any Project consisting solely of one single family dwelling or multifamily housing of up to 50 dwelling units for which the only required Agency Action is a Superseding Order of Conditions from the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection; or a Project that is consistent with a Special Review Procedure review . . .
- *New* 301 CMR 11.01(2)(c)1.a. has been revised to read as follows:
 - a. devotes 67% or more of the gross floor area of the Project to residential uses, with the remainder devoted to supportive commercial, cultural, educational, community and/or civic uses. For the purpose of this 301 CMR 11.01(2)(c)1.a., gross floor area shall not include parking, utility space, and other ancillary spaces not intended for exclusive occupancy by the user or tenant
- *New* 301 CMR 11.01(2)(c)1.c. has been revised to read as follows:
 - c. alters up to 5 acres of previously undeveloped land; or alters up to 10 acres of previously undeveloped land and the Project proposes a tree retention and replanting plan that demonstrates measures to minimize tree removal and replace removed trees to the maximum extent practicable. To satisfy this 301 CMR 11.01(2)(c)1.c., no portion of the Project site shall include any land where projected total ecosystem carbon stocks for the Project site are in the top quintile statewide, as defined by the Massachusetts Forest Carbon Top Quintile data layer issued by EEA United States Forest Service's National Forest Carbon Monitoring System, Total Ecosystem Carbon in 2070 data layer, or a comparable data source that the Secretary may adopt through guidance; . . .
- *New* 301 CMR 11.01(2)(c)1.g. has been revised to read as follows:
 - g. generates fewer than 3,000 New adt of traffic on roadways providing access to a single location; or generates fewer than 6,000 New adt of traffic on roadways providing access to a single location if the Project is located either in a transit oriented development district or mixed-use district or less than within one-half mile from of a public transit stop with an existing or proposed safe and accessible path of travel to the Project site. Projects with over 3,000 or more New adt, prior to filing the ENF, must consult with the Massachusetts Department of Transportation and with the Massachusetts Bay Transit

Transportation Authority or applicable local or regional transit authority established pursuant to M.G.L. c. 161B, § 3 or § 14 prior to filing the ENF.

- *New* 301 CMR 11.01(2)(c)4. has been revised to read as follows:
 4. Any Project that meets or exceeds any review threshold in 301 CMR 11.03(12), provided that the Project does not independently propose any work, project or activity that exceeds any other review threshold in 301 CMR 11.03(1) through (11).

11.05: ENF Preparation and Filing (technical edit)

- 301 CMR 11.05(4)(d) has been revised as follows for consistency with other references to single family dwellings throughout 301 CMR 11.00:
 - (d) Any project consisting of one single family home dwelling shall be exempt from the requirements of this 301 CMR 11.05(4).

11.17: Transition Rules

- The date on which the new amendments to 301 CMR 11.00 take effect for new project filings has been changed to January 30, 2026. Consistent with 301 CMR 11.15(2)(b), the MEPA Office will begin to accept new project filings seeking to proceed under the amended regulation, starting with the February 3-17, 2026 filing cycle.