



The preferred route would disturb soils potentially contaminated with wood preservatives, heavy metals and other contaminants deposited from years of train operations. In addition, the machinery and fuels involved in construction, and future disturbance and pollution caused by the use of the access road(s) once in place, pose a threat of environmental harm.

The Project's environmental impacts extend well beyond water and wetlands. The Project would result in the loss of over one million square feet of mature forestland, which would have a large impact on soils and wildlife, and **would alter the local microclimate by changing the winds, temperatures, moisture and light.** This could have a potentially devastating impact on fish and other wildlife that depend on a limited range of water temperatures for living or breeding. A specific example are the native brook trout that rely on a cold water habitat.

Mature and healthy forests are comprised of a mix of tree growth. Clearing the ROW for 6.7 miles, at a width of 30' to 50', of all trees, young and old, would result in a loss of over 26 acres of trees. This is a significant clearing of trees, especially considering the bogs, vernal pools, streams and other wetlands adjacent to the ROW. The loss of habitat and the contribution to climate change, the **impacts on water absorption and soil erosion, and the potential for invasive growth to take root in disturbed areas are critical concerns that cannot be fully mitigated.**

The ENF discusses protection of endangered species, which impacts a small percentage of the land to be cleared. However, as natural areas in the region are rapidly shrinking, remaining large areas of habitat such as the MBTA ROW are critical to protect wildlife regardless of their endangered status. In addition, in the near future NHESP will be publishing changes to the endangered species and protected habitats lists, which may impact the Project analysis.

The Project would alter approximately 320,000 square feet of jurisdictional wetland resource areas and permanently fill nearly 13,000 square feet of bordering vegetated wetlands, a significant environmental impact. **Wetlands are protected resources which perform critical functions including flood control and pollution filtering, and are a valuable habitat for diverse wildlife. Wetland replication may be attempted, but it is extremely difficult and more frequently fails than succeeds.** In addition, the **construction of replication areas frequently results in the cutting of more trees and the loss of more upland forest.**

Wetland resource areas were rated differently in the different towns, with areas protected by local bylaws getting points only in those towns. Although Hudson doesn't currently have a local wetlands protection bylaw, its natural resources are as valuable as

those in other communities. The loss of potential vernal pools, buffer zones for vernal pools and intermittent streams, and other bylaw-protected resources should receive as much weight in Hudson as in neighboring towns.

The Commission feels that **not enough attention and weight was paid to the proximity of the Project to the watersheds and aquifers** surrounding the five Hudson town wells (the Chestnut, Cranberry and Kane wellhead areas), which provide water for over 20,000 people. The ROW transverses two Zone II protection areas and is close to several Zone 1 protection areas associated with those wellhead areas. Eversource must provide baseline information to establish the water quality in these wellhead areas and develop a plan to ensure that water quality remains at or above present levels. The rating of “3” for wellhead areas is insufficient.

If the preferred route were to be approved, the Commission feels strongly that the development and implementation of a comprehensive management plan would be required for the entire corridor, including a **policy on pesticide application, invasive control, mowing, and other activities in perpetuity**. In particular no herbicides could be allowed in Zone I and Zone II of public wells, within 100 feet of a certified or potential Vernal Pool, or within 100 feet of a Bordering Vegetated Wetland or other jurisdictional wetland resource area. In addition, a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan would be required to protect groundwater during construction, and measures would be required to prevent increased storm water runoff during construction and future operation of the Project. The depth, flow, recharge and quality of groundwater must be maintained in order to ensure safe operation of public wells. All hazardous and contaminated materials in and along the ROW would need to be identified and mitigated, and no liquid contaminants could be used during construction. The protective environmental measures required for construction, the mitigation required after construction, and the maintenance costs to manage the environmental impacts of ongoing use of the corridor would all add significant costs to the Project.

MEPA review must include careful consideration of the Project’s alternatives. **The environmental impacts have been understated for the Project’s impacts along the MBTA ROW, and overstated for the alternative Project design for installation of the transmission lines entirely under existing roads.** The Project’s alternative route under existing roads must be better assessed, described, and compared to the Preferred Route along the ROW, to ensure that feasible alternatives with less environmental impacts are carefully considered and vetted during the MEPA process.

All of the information discussed above must be part of the documentation provided to and considered by MEPA in its review of the Project’s environmental impacts, avoidance, minimization, and mitigation, and environmental alternatives, right up

though the Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIR) and the Certificate issued by the state Secretary of Energy and Environmental Affairs. The Commission feels that it is imperative that a full environmental review is conducted and that the EIR process be completed.

In conclusion, if the cost of the Project were calculated using a full cost accounting, including the costs of lost environmental services, the potential of increased flooding and pollution due to the loss of water absorption and filtering by wetlands and tree roots, contributions to climate change, and the other environmental impacts discussed above, it would be much higher than the current estimates indicate.

Thank you for your consideration of our concerns.

For the Commission,



Pam Helinek  
Conservation Agent, Town of Hudson

cc: Tom Moses, Executive Assistant, Town of Hudson  
State Senator Jamie Eldridge  
State Representative Kate Hogan  
Alison Field-Juma, OARS  
Debbie Dineen, Sudbury Conservation Commission  
Priscilla Ryder, Marlborough Conservation Commission