

**Scoping Report**  
**Proposed Mashpee Wampanoag Initial**  
**Reservation and Destination Resort Casino**  
**Middleborough and Mashpee, Massachusetts**

**Prepared For:**  
**Bureau of Indian Affairs**

**Prepared By:**  
**TetraTech Rizzo**  
**Amy Green Environmental Consulting**

**September 30, 2008**

## Table of Contents

1.0	Introduction.....	3
2.0	Purpose and Need .....	3
3.0	Alternatives Being Considered .....	5
3.1	Alternative A and B - Mashpee Sites.....	6
3.1.1	Proposed Housing .....	6
3.1.2	Proposed Tribal Facility Expansion.....	7
3.2	Alternative A and B – Middleborough Site .....	7
3.2.1	Alternative A Option 1 – Preferred.....	7
3.2.2	Alternative A Option 2 .....	8
3.2.3	Alternative A Option 3 .....	8
3.2.4	Alternative B.....	8
3.2.5	Alternative C – No Action Alternative .....	9
4.0	Alternatives Eliminated From Consideration .....	9
4.1	Alternatives Suggested During Scoping That Will Not Be Analyzed .....	9
4.1.1	Middleborough and Mashpee Properties as Separate Actions.....	9
4.1.2	Additional Sites .....	10
4.1.3	Impacts of Subjecting Actions to State Law.....	10
4.2	Mashpee Alternatives .....	11
4.3	Financial Venture Alternatives .....	11
4.4	Casino Site Plan Alternatives.....	11
4.5	Other Alternatives Considered.....	11
5.0	Scoping Summary .....	11
5.1	Notice of Intent .....	12
5.2	Public Information Meetings .....	12
5.3	Written Comment .....	13
5.4	Significant Issues Raised During Scoping .....	13
6.0	Cooperating Agencies.....	13

## **List of Tables**

Table 1	Summary of Alternatives
Table 2	Proposed EIS Outline
Table 3	Summary of Verbal Comment – March 25, 2008
Table 4	Summary of Verbal Comment – March 26, 2008
Table 5	Summary of Written Comment

## **List of Appendices**

Appendix A	Notice of Intent to Prepare and Environmental Impact Statement
Appendix B	Public Notice
Appendix C	Consultation Letter
Appendix D	March 25, 2008 Scoping Meeting Sign In Sheets
Appendix E	March 26, 2008 Scoping Meeting Sign In Sheets
Appendix F	Scoping Meeting PowerPoint Slides
Appendix G	March 25, 2008 Transcript (On CD)
Appendix H	March 26, 2008 Transcript (On CD)
Appendix I	Written Comments (On CD)
Appendix J	Comments Handed in on March 25, 2008 (On CD)

## 1.0 Introduction

The Council on Environmental Quality Regulations at 40 CFR 1501.7 requires an early and open process to determine the scope of issues to be addressed and for identifying the significant issues related to a proposed action. The process is termed “scoping”. The scoping process is used to learn the concerns of individuals, groups and agencies about a proposed project. This report summarizes the scoping process undertaken for the proposed Mashpee Wampanoag Initial Reservation and Destination Resort Casino in Middleborough and Mashpee, Massachusetts. This report also includes a statement of the purpose and need for the project (Section 2.0) and the alternatives to be considered (Section 3.0)

## 2.0 Purpose and Need

The Tribe has requested that the Bureau of Indian Affairs take land into trust in order to establish an initial reservation and to provide revenues toward meeting the Tribe’s economic needs and self-determination. The subject properties include approximately 140 acres in Mashpee and approximately 539 acres in Middleborough. The proposed action will also provide economic benefits to the local and regional economies.

The lands in Mashpee have been owned or used by the Tribe or by organizations controlled by or related to the Tribe for many years, and are currently used for tribal administration and cultural purposes, and as open space. For the most part these uses will not change, although some lands would be acquired for tribal member housing. The lands in Mashpee are unsuitable for gaming or other economic development, however, and thus the Tribe also proposes the acquisition of the lands in Middleborough for the purpose of developing and operating a gaming facility. The purpose of this action is to meet the Tribe’s economic needs through the use of the development tools provided by the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (IGRA, 25 U.S.C. 2701 *et seq.*). One of IGRA’s purposes is “to provide a statutory basis for the operation of gaming by Indian tribes as a means of promoting tribal economic development, self-sufficiency, and strong tribal governments.” 25 U.S.C. 2702 (1). Gaming is a revenue source with relatively high profit margins that maximizes income from development risks and costs when compared to other types of enterprises. It also is a means of economic development that will afford the opportunity for the Tribe to exercise tribal sovereignty. Gaming provides a revenue stream that is dependable, can maximize net revenues, and minimizes risk so that the Tribe can protect its members and its ability to fulfill its responsibilities under its governmental and social programs.

The proposed lands in Mashpee total approximately 140 acres on nine parcels. As a newly recognized tribe, the Mashpee Wampanoag Tribe’s lands are not held in trust by the United States, but instead are held either by the Tribe in its own name, by non-profit entities owned or controlled by the Tribe or by the Town of Mashpee which has held legal title to historic tribal lands for over 100 years. The parcels include the tribal meeting house, cemetery, parsonage, museum, tribal offices and a burial site. Two parcels are currently vacant and are needed to address the shortage of housing for tribal members. These uses are central to tribal self-

determination. Acquisition of these lands into trust will facilitate tribal self-determination and will preserve those lands for future generations of Mashpee Indians.

The Tribe has serious, systemic, long-term financial needs. The Tribe currently has 1,531 members, the majority of whom live within 10 miles of Mashpee and 50 miles of Middleborough. These are the members who are most likely to be positively affected by the enhancement and extension of tribal benefits and services made possible by the generation of gaming revenue. In addition, it is anticipated that an undetermined number of the remaining members who do not currently live in the immediate tribal service area will want to relocate closer once there are additional jobs, housing and social services available. There is serious unemployment among tribal members with few job opportunities within the Town of Mashpee. The income of many tribal members is below the poverty level. The development of a gaming facility and resort in Middleborough will create many employment opportunities for tribal members, both short-term during its construction and, for the long term, during its ongoing operations.

Many members of the Mashpee Tribe also have ongoing health issues that the income from the gaming project can be used to address. A 2002 health survey conducted by the Tribe together with the Massachusetts Department of Health found that the percentage of Wampanoags in poor health was two times higher than the general adult Massachusetts populations and that the percentage of Wampanoags in poor emotional health was one and a half times higher than the adult Massachusetts population. Revenues from gaming will allow the Tribe to address these issues and provide needed support.

Gaming revenues can also be used to meet tribal housing needs. Currently, the Tribe has serious unmet housing needs for its members. In recent years, the real estate market on Cape Cod and in Mashpee in particular has sky-rocketed, inflating housing prices and creating a scarcity of affordable housing. Indeed, in Mashpee itself, new construction has been dominated by second home and upscale housing which tribal members cannot afford. Although a number of tribal members reside on ancestral home lots along historic Main Street, recent zoning laws preclude them from further subdividing these lots for housing for relatives. Though no housing will be constructed on or at the gaming site, the revenues generated by the facility will allow the Tribe to fund housing construction within Mashpee. Revenues will also support and extend other tribal programs that target the Mashpee tribal community, such as the Wampanoag Housing Program and the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIHEAP). The gaming revenues will also enable construction of needed facilities, which will allow elders to remain in the geographical heart of the tribal community.

The gaming revenues will also greatly enhance the Tribe's ability to preserve its history and community by funding the preservation and restoration of such culturally significant sites as the Parsonage, the Mashpee Museum, the "ancient ways" (ie, historic trails and paths), and the historic Indian burial ground as well as historic family burial grounds scattered throughout the Town of Mashpee. Gaming revenues will also be used to enhance and extend the various educational, cultural and employment programs and services the Tribe offers to Mashpee children and youth. Programs designed to teach cultural values, traditions and skills, such as the Tribal Youth Council, Youth Cultural Activities, Mashpee Wampanoag Youth Survival Skills training, and the Youth Sobriety Pow Wow, will benefit from gaming revenues as they reinforce

awareness of Mashpee cultural heritage, socialize the children for their adult roles and reinforce kinship connections from one generation to the next. The Language Reclamation Project, GED tutoring and education scholarships, services offered by the Tribal Council, will also benefit from increased funding and allow for the preservation of Mashpee cultural traditions at the same time they prepare the future generations to survive and prosper in the larger society.

In order to realize the Tribe’s need for economic development, the Tribe proposes to establish a gaming operation of a size that maximizes revenues, is competitive with other existing and proposed establishments, and creates a draw for potential patrons. Such a gaming operation would meet the Tribe’s need. An appropriately sized gaming operation would provide the Tribe with revenue to expand tribal services, protect the Tribe’s heritage, diversify the Tribe’s economy, purchase usable lands, and would be a large step towards self-determination and economic self-sufficiency. In addition, the establishment of trust lands in Mashpee will provide a base for the governmental, social and cultural center of the Tribe.

This goal is best met by the construction of a Class III Destination Resort Casino, although phased construction (ie, an initial Class II casino) may be necessary.

### 3.0 Alternatives Being Considered

Three alternatives, Alternatives A (Preferred), B and C (No Action) are considered in this DEIS. Alternatives A and B differ in the Middleborough component of the project; the Mashpee components (as described in Section 3.1) are the same for each of those Alternatives. This section describes how these alternatives were selected and describes them. Table 1 provides a summary description of the Mashpee and Middleborough alternatives. Table 2 (found at the end of this text) provides a summary of the proposed DEIS outline.

**Table 1 Summary of Mashpee and Middleborough Alternatives**

Parcel	Existing Condition	Alternative A			Alternative B	Alternative C - No Action
		Option 1 (Preferred)	Option 2	Option 3		
Mashpee Parcel 1	Parsonage	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change
Mashpee Parcel 2	Museum	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change
Mashpee Parcel 3	Vacant Land	Housing	Housing	Housing	Housing	Minimal Housing
Mashpee Parcel 4	Vacant Land	Housing	Housing	Housing	Housing	No change
Mashpee Parcel 5	Old Indian Meeting House	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change
Mashpee	Cemetery	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change

Parcel	Existing Condition	Alternative A			Alternative B	Alternative C - No Action
		Option 1 (Preferred)	Option 2	Option 3		
Parcel 6						
Mashpee Parcel 7	Tribal offices	Expansion of tribal services and facilities	Expansion of tribal services and facilities	Expansion of tribal services and facilities	Expansion of tribal services and facilities	No change
Mashpee Parcel 8	Vacant land	Expansion of tribal services and facilities	Expansion of tribal services and facilities	Expansion of tribal services and facilities	Expansion of tribal services and facilities	No change
Mashpee Parcel 9	Burial ground	No change	No change	No change	No change	No change
Middleborough	Vacant land	Class III Destination Resort Casino (moderate scale) and hotel with golf course	Class II gaming facility; small scale	Class II gaming facility; moderate scale	Class III Destination Resort Casino (large scale) with two hotels, convention center, golf course and water park	No change

### 3.1 Alternative A and B - Mashpee Sites

The Tribe is proposing to have nine parcels in Mashpee taken into trust. In both Alternative A and B, Parcels 1, 2, 5, 6, and 9, containing the Parsonage, Museum, Old Indian Meeting House, cemetery and a burial site, respectively, will not be changed, other than maintenance and repairs. Parcels 3 and 4, which are currently vacant, are proposed for future housing projects. Parcel 7, which currently includes the Tribal Council offices and adjacent Parcel 8 are proposed for expansion of Tribal service and facilities. These two projects are described below.

#### 3.1.1 Proposed Housing

As discussed in Section 2.0, many Tribal members have unmet housing needs. In response, the Tribe's Housing Department has set an objective to provide affordable housing to low and moderate income Tribal members. In addition to efforts such as rental assistance, a homeownership program and emergency housing assistance, the Tribe is proposing construction of affordable single family homes on Parcels 3 and 4. Definitive plans have not been developed and likely will not be for several years. For the purposes of the DEIS, therefore, a conceptual phased program will be considered. Housing Phase I would be the construction of single family homes along Meetinghouse Road to meet immediate needs. Housing Phase II would provide additional housing that would better meet the tribe's long term housing needs.

### **3.1.2 Proposed Tribal Facility Expansion**

In order to provide the necessary supplemental services the Tribe requires, expansion at the Tribal Council office location is proposed. Definitive plans for the expansion have not been developed to date. Needs that have been identified include additional office and meeting space, parking, and recreational fields. The DEIS will provide information on the proposed concept.

## **3.2 Alternative A and B – Middleborough Site**

Three gaming alternatives are analyzed in the DEIS. Alternatives A and B would be paired with the proposed projects in Mashpee described in Section 3.1.1 and 3.1.2. Table 1 summarizes the main program elements of Alternatives A and B. Alternative C is the No Action Alternative. The casino alternatives are described below.

### **3.2.1 Alternative A Option 1 – Preferred**

Alternative A Option 1 (A-1) includes Phase I Class III gaming (moderate scale) and a Phase II golf course, as described below.

**Alternative A-1 Phase I – Class III Gaming.** Phase I of Alternative A-1 would consist of Class III gaming facilities and supporting operations, including a 1,000 room hotel. The main facility would offer 4,000 video lottery terminals (VLT) machines and 200 gaming tables. The facility would include retail and a 5,000 seat event center. The remainder of the facility would include a wide range of entertainment facilities such as specialty bars and restaurants, retail, children’s areas, a multi-purpose area, employee area and back of house. Restaurants would provide a variety of options from brand name franchises to a food court. Twenty-four hour service would be available. In order to minimize the footprint of the facility, gaming, retail and food services would be offered on two floors. The event area would be used for events such as sports venues. Patron parking would be in a garage and under the casino as well as surface lot spaces.

Employee services would be provided in a separate building located to the north. The structure would include space for emergency services. Warehousing and storage would be provided in a separate building in this area, as well. There would be surface parking spaces in this area. A service station and convenience store would be located at the entrance.

Site runoff would be controlled through infiltration, stormwater management basins and Stormwater Management Practices. Wetland creation areas would be located at the northern end of the property. Utilities (water, sewer, electric and possibly gas) would be provided by connection to municipal services. Access would be directly to Route 44

**Alternative A-1 – Phase II.** Phase II would provide additional recreational opportunities for the Destination Resort Casino. An 18-hole golf course is proposed for the northern portion of the site. The proposed design includes a club house and proshop.

### **3.2.2 Alternative A Option 2**

Alternative A Option 2 (A-2) includes a small Phase I Class II gaming facility which could be upgraded to a larger Class II or a Class III in future phases. A Class II facility would not require a Compact with the Commonwealth. Alternative A-2 would consist of a Class II gaming facility that would include gaming and retail space as well as a small area of food and beverage venues. Employee services and warehousing would be included in the casino footprint. Parking would be provided in surface lots for employees and patrons. Alternative A-2 would not include a hotel, event center or gas station. Site runoff would be controlled through infiltration, stormwater management basins and Stormwater Management Practices. Wetland creation areas would be located at the northern end of the property. Utilities (water, sewer, electric and possibly gas) would be provided by connection to municipal services. Access would be indirectly to Route 44, via Precinct Road.

### **3.2.3 Alternative A Option 3**

Alternative A Option 3 (A-3) includes a moderate Phase I Class II gaming facility which would be upgraded to Class III in future phases. Alternative A-3 would consist of a Class II gaming facility that would include gaming and retail space. Both of these areas would include a small area of food and beverage venues. Employee services and warehousing would be provided in a separate area. Parking would be provided in surface parking spaces, valet spaces under the casino, and a parking structure. Alternative A-3 would not include a hotel or gas station, but would include an event center. Site runoff would be controlled through infiltration, stormwater management basins and Stormwater Management Practices. Wetland creation areas would be located at the northern end of the property. Utilities (water, sewer, electric and possibly gas) would be provided by connection to municipal services. Access would be indirectly to Route 44, via Precinct Road.

### **3.2.4 Alternative B**

Alternative B includes a Phase I Class III facility with more amenities than Alternative A, and a Phase II golf course that also includes a water park and hotel, as described below.

**Alternative B – Phase I.** Alternative B Phase I is the largest scale alternative and includes a 1,200 room hotel, a large element of retail, and an 80,000 sf convention center, as well as a 5,000 seat event center. Similar to Alternative A, the remainder of the Alternative B facility would include a wide range of entertainment facilities such as specialty bars and restaurants, retail, children’s areas, a multi-purpose area, employee area and back of house. Patron parking will be in a garage and under the casino as well as in surface lot spaces.

Employee services would be provided in a separate building located to the north. The structure would include space for emergency services. Warehousing and storage would be provided in a separate building in this area, as well. There would be an employee parking garage and surface parking spaces in this area. A service station and convenience store would be located at the entrance.

Site runoff would be controlled through infiltration, stormwater management basins and Stormwater Management Practices. Wetland creation areas would be located at the northern end of the property. Utilities (water, sewer, electric and possibly gas) would be provided by connection to municipal services. Access would be directly to Route 44.

**Alternative B – Phase II.** Alternative B Phase II incorporates a comprehensive recreational component in support of the Destination Resort Casino. This includes an 18-hole par 71 (6,400 yard) golf course, a 30,000 sf water park, and a 200 room hotel.

### **3.2.5 Alternative C – No Action Alternative**

The No Action Alternatives will assume no land to trust action. Most of the Mashpee parcels will continue to be assumed to maintain their existing uses. The parcels that are proposed for housing under a land to trust action, are assumed to support zoning-compliant housing as part of the No Action Alternative. The No Action Alternative at the tribal offices parcels will assume a small expansion. In Middleborough, the No Action Alternative will assume no construction on the site. Given that the analysis period is approximately 10-20 years and that there was a subdivision plan previously proposed for part of the Middleborough site, this project will also be considered.

## **4.0 Alternatives Eliminated From Consideration**

In generating the Alternatives described in Section 3.0, a number of options were considered, but rejected. The DEIS will detail these options and the reasons for rejection. These options include options suggested during Scoping, other lands, financial ventures, casino locations, and site plans

### **4.1 Alternatives Suggested During Scoping That Will Not Be Analyzed**

#### **4.1.1 Middleborough and Mashpee Properties as Separate Actions**

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts suggested analyzing the Mashpee and the Middleborough properties, taking only one or the other into trust, which would normally be a reasonable suggestion. However, there are limitations pertinent to the properties within this specific Tribal application, which clearly have already been considered a part of the Tribe's screening to meet 25 CR 151 criteria. Mashpee properties are clearly not suitable for gaming due to the local agreement signed as a result of the local anti-gaming sentiment, and the Middleborough properties are not optimal for housing or government operation due to the fact that the Tribal government office as are not located there. Accordingly, the analysis of bringing only specific Tribal properties into trust would not be consistent with documented Congressional support of both Tribal economic enterprises (Middleborough properties) and Tribal self determination (Mashpee properties) as documented within the application, as is therefore not considered a reasonable alternative under NEPA for this application. The determination process outlined within 25 CFR 151 considers jurisdictional impacts and other factors of concern to the Commonwealth, and as such the BIA must defer to that process for those issues. The 25 CFR 151 provides specific criteria that the Secretary must consider before bringing property into trust. Under 25 CFR 151 the Secretary has been provided the discretion to take all, some or none of the

parcels into trust and the decision may deviate from the NEPA alternatives. The Secretary could select only the Mashpee or Middleborough properties based on the 25 CFR 151 criteria. The selection could also be affected by current Department policy. Accordingly, the concerns of the Commonwealth are already addressed through the 25 CFR 151 process which is commenced shortly after the NEPA process is completed.

#### **4.1.2 Additional Sites**

The Commonwealth of Massachusetts request that the BIA analyze sites other than those proposed by the Mashpee Wampanoag, such as urban areas, cannot be accommodated since the BIA's authority is limited to responding to the Tribe's application and we do not have the authority to require the Tribe to pursue other properties.

#### **4.1.3 Impacts of Subjecting Actions to State Law**

Although requested by the Commonwealth, the BIA cannot analyze impacts of subjecting Mashpee Wampanoag Tribal trust lands to State law since that is a violation of 25 USC 465. Since the Supreme Court's *Cherokee v Georgia* decision in 1831, and as reinforced by *Worcester v Georgia* in 1832, State laws governing Indian tribes are not considered valid. The Federal fee-to-trust decision is not subject to State environmental laws, such as the Massachusetts Environmental Protection Act (MEPA). MEPA requirements are not applicable and will not be considered in the Federal decision. Application of MEPA for approval of off-site road construction and other similar off-site infrastructure impacts must be conducted under the auspices of the jurisdictional government for that activity, and the impact information included in this EIS. Since neither the State nor local governments requested cooperating agency status when invited, MEPA content or format requirements will not be part of this EIS. However, the information published in this EIS will be considered public information, and may be used or adapted for MEPA compliance.

The following excerpt from the recent Oneida Record of Decision written by the Solicitor's Office explains the Department position that may be useful in regard to the Commonwealth's suggested alternatives.

“The Federal government supports tribal self-determination. Congress enacted the IRA to counteract the precipitous decline in the economic, cultural, governmental, and social wellbeing of Indians. The IRA reflects a Federal policy of encouraging tribal self-government, both politically and economically. *See Morton v. Mancari*, 417 U.S. 535, 542 (1974). Other statements of Federal support for tribal self-determination are contained, for example, in the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975. *See* 25 U.S.C. s 4501. One of the mechanisms under the IRA for fostering tribal self-determination and self-governance is the acquisition of land in trust. *See* 25 U.S.C. s 465. Congress only requires trust lands to comply with Federal and tribal standards. It would undermine tribal self-governance to compare and contrast tribal laws against state and local laws, and require equivalency between them as a prerequisite for placing land into trust. While the Secretary is required to consider potential jurisdictional problems and land use conflicts, these disputes need not be resolved prior to approval of a trust application. *See, e.g., State of South Dakota and Moody County v. Acting Great Plains Regional Director*, 39 IBIA 283, 299-300 (2004), *aff'd South Dakota v. U.S. Department*

*of the Interior*, 401 F. Supp.2d 1000 (D.S.D. 2005), *aff'd*, 487 F3d 548 (8<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2007); *State of South Dakota and Bennett County v. Acting Great Plains Director*, 39 IBIA 301, 309 (2004); *Avoyelles Parish v. Eastern Area Director*, 34 IBIA 149, 155 (1999).”

## **4.2 Mashpee Alternatives**

Options considered for housing and facility expansion at the Tribal offices will be described.

## **4.3 Financial Venture Alternatives**

The Tribe considered various financial venture alternatives as a way of improving its economic self-sufficiency to satisfy tribal needs. A casino resort operation was considered the only feasible option that met the Tribe’s basic purpose and need. Gaming is a revenue source with relatively high profit margins that maximizes income to development risks and costs when compared to other types of enterprises. Furthermore, a casino operation would allow the Tribe to take advantage of the gaming opportunities afforded it under IGRA. No other project type, such as manufacturing, light industry, retail or housing could be expected to generate revenues significant enough to meet the tribe’s economic needs. It also creates minimal potential operational environmental impacts, particularly in comparison to manufacturing and industrial alternatives. Lastly, a casino allows the Tribe to create quality employment opportunities in a safe environment.

## **4.4 Casino Site Plan Alternatives**

Once the proposed site location alternative was identified, on-site planning began. Several on-site layouts for Phase I and II were considered in order to determine what alternative would be most feasible and would present the lowest level of environmental impacts. Criteria that were considered in making the layout decision included the size of the facilities in relation to the parcels, the ability to cluster the main facilities in one area to minimize the impacted area, ease of operations, and ability to avoid environmental impacts to wetlands. Site plan alternatives considered numerous alternatives for site circulation, building configuration, hotel size, parking, hotel size, footprint minimization, recreation component (ie, golf course and water park) as well as phasing. Access alternatives to the site were also considered. Class II and Class III gaming alternatives are both considered and analyzed. Plans that were considered but rejected will be described in the DEIS

## **4.5 Other Alternatives Considered**

Other options will also be explored in the EIS. These will include various offsite roadway improvement alternatives, as well as alternative for provision of water supply and wastewater treatment.

## **5.0 Scoping Summary**

Scoping is an integral part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) review process because it allows interested parties an opportunity to participate in developing a list of issues that

will be discussed in an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). As stated in the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) NEPA Handbook, 30 BIAM Supplement 1, paragraph 6.3B, the preparation of an EIS begins with the scoping process. Paragraph 6.3B further states that the required public notice for the scoping process be included in the Notice of Intent to Prepare and EIS.

## **5.1 Notice of Intent**

A Notice of Intent (NOI) to Prepare an EIS (Appendix A) was published in the Federal Register on March 10, 2008 with a 30-day comment period that ended April 9, 2008. Public notices were also published in The Middleboro Gazette, Cape Cod Times, and The Enterprise on March 6, 2008, and in the Mashpee Enterprise on March 7, 2008 (Appendix B). During the scoping period, comments on the project and the EIS could be sent to the BIA or could be submitted during the public informational meetings that were held during the scoping period. A Consultation letter pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106, has also been sent to the Wampanoag Tribe of Gay Head/Aquinnah (Appendix C).

## **5.2 Public Information Meetings**

Public information meetings were held on Tuesday March 25, 2008 at the Middleborough High School, 71 East Grove Street, Middleborough, Massachusetts and on Wednesday March 26, 2008 at the Mashpee High School, 500 Old Barnstable Road, Mashpee, Massachusetts. The meetings were announced in the NOI and published newspapers. The meetings began at 6:00 and lasted until all comments had been received (approximately 9:30 at Middleborough and 6:30 at Mashpee). The purpose of the meetings was to solicit public comments, views and suggestions to be addressed in the EIS. Meetings began with a short presentation followed by maximum opportunity for verbal comments.

Attendees were asked to sign in if they wished to make comment. Sign in sheets for March 25 and March 26 are provided in Appendices D and E, respectively. Mr. Kurt Chandler, BIA Eastern Area Regional Environmental Scientist, acted as moderator, advised attendees of the court reporters, and explained that purpose of the meeting was to accept comments and concerns which the EIS would analyze for the public. Mr. Chandler introduced the speakers, outlined the structure of the evening, described the opportunities for public input and explained the role of the BIA in the EIS process.

Mr. Shawn Hendricks, Jr, Chairman of the Mashpee Wampanoag then spoke on tribal objectives and backgrounds. Ms. Amy Green, Principal of Amy Green Environmental Consulting, LLC, contractor to prepare the EIS gave a PowerPoint slide show to illustrate the lands proposed for trust, the proposed project, and information on the EIS process and contents. Copies of the slides are provided in Appendix F. Mr. Chet MacGee of the BIA Eastern Area then reiterated the structure for giving verbal comment. Mr. Ed Ionata, Vice President of TetraTech Rizzo, contractor for the EIS preparation, called commenters in the order they had signed in. Once everyone who had signed in had given comment, people who had not signed in were invited to comment, and people who had already commented were invited to provide additional comment.

At both scoping meetings, two certified court reporters were present to produce a transcript of the evening. The transcripts for Middleborough and Mashpee are provided in Appendices G and H, respectively. Capacity at the Middleborough venue was approximately 1,800, with approximately 330 people attending and 66 making comment (including repeats). Capacity at the Mashpee venue was approximately 600, with approximately 120 attending and 6 making comment.

### **5.3 Written Comment**

Written comments were also accepted through April 9, 2008. A total of 175 comments, including commenters who submitted more than one letter and 34 letters of support, were received. There were also 80 form letters of support. Copies of written comments are provided in Appendix I. At Middleborough, speakers notes (mostly either copies of verbal testimony or letters that were submitted later) were also left with the BIA (Appendix J).

### **5.4 Significant Issues Raised During Scoping**

Tables 3 through 5 provide a summary of comments received during the scoping process for the verbal and written comments. These tables refer to the identification numbers written on the transcripts and comment letters in Appendices G, H and I. These tables indicate the section of the EIS that will address the issue. Table 2 provides the proposed EIS outline.

The vast majority of the comments related to the proposed casino. Little comment was received on the proposed action of Mashpee, and those comments were supportive. For the casino, the majority of comments revolved around the following environmental topics:

- Regional and local aquifer and water supply impacts
- Surface water and groundwater quality, particularly for the Nemasket River
- Direct and indirect wetland impacts
- Impacts to wildlife, including threatened and endangered species
- Local and regional traffic impacts
- Local and regional socioeconomic impact, including community services

## **6.0 Cooperating Agencies**

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) requested in their comment letter that they be considered a Cooperating Agency. The BIA is evaluating that requests and expects to prepare a Memorandum of Agreement with the USACE to establish that process.

Table 2. Proposed EIS Outline (may be subject to change)

<p>1.0 Introduction</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Tribal Background</li> <li>▪ Environmental Permits</li> <li>▪ Coordination</li> <li>▪ Schedule</li> </ul> <p>2.0 Purpose and Need</p> <p>3.0 Project and Alternatives Description</p> <p>3.1 Mashpee Project Description and Alternatives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Proposed Housing</li> <li>▪ Proposed Tribal Facility Expansion</li> <li>▪ Mashpee Site Alternatives</li> </ul> <p>3.2 Middleborough Project Alternatives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Financial Venture Alternatives</li> <li>▪ Casino Location Alternatives</li> <li>▪ Gaming Size</li> <li>▪ Access Alternatives</li> <li>▪ Casino Site Plan Alternatives</li> <li>▪ Recreational Alternatives</li> </ul> <p>4.0 Affected Environment (Mashpee)</p> <p>For each of the nine parcels review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Land Resources</li> <li>▪ Water Resources</li> <li>▪ Living Resources</li> <li>▪ Wetlands</li> <li>▪ Cultural Resources</li> <li>▪ Socioeconomic Conditions</li> <li>▪ Community Infrastructure</li> <li>▪ Utilities</li> <li>▪ Resource Use Patterns</li> <li>▪ Transportation</li> <li>▪ Air Quality</li> <li>▪ Other Values</li> </ul> <p>5.0 Affected Environment (Middleborough)</p> <p>5.1 Land Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Topography</li> <li>▪ Soils</li> <li>▪ Geology</li> </ul>	<p>5.2 Water Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Groundwater</li> <li>▪ Surface Water and Drainage</li> </ul> <p>5.3 Living Resources</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Ecosystem and Biological Community</li> <li>▪ Upland Vegetation</li> <li>▪ Fish and Wildlife</li> <li>▪ Threatened and Endangered Species</li> </ul> <p>5.4 Wetlands</p> <p>5.5 Cultural Resources</p> <p>5.6 Socioeconomic Conditions</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Tribal Conditions</li> <li>▪ Project Area Conditions</li> <li>▪ Environmental Justice</li> </ul> <p>5.7 Community Infrastructure</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Criminal Justice System</li> <li>▪ Fire Protection</li> <li>▪ Emergency Services</li> <li>▪ Schools</li> <li>▪ Recreation/Open Space</li> </ul> <p>5.8 Utilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Water Supply</li> <li>▪ Wastewater Treatment</li> <li>▪ Electrical Services</li> <li>▪ Gas and Fuel Oil</li> <li>▪ Telephone and Cable</li> <li>▪ Solid Waste</li> </ul> <p>5.9 Resource Use Patterns</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Hunting, Fishing and Gathering</li> <li>▪ Timber Harvesting</li> <li>▪ Agriculture</li> <li>▪ Mining</li> <li>▪ Recreation</li> <li>▪ Land Use Plans</li> </ul> <p>5.10 Transportation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Study Area</li> <li>▪ Traffic Volumes</li> <li>▪ Traffic Operations</li> </ul>
---	---

Table 2

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Regional Traffic</li> <li>▪ Public Transportation</li> <li>5.11 Air Quality <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Monitored Levels and Standards</li> <li>▪ Mesoscale Analysis</li> </ul> </li> <li>5.12 Other Values <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Wilderness</li> <li>▪ Noise</li> <li>▪ Visual</li> <li>▪ Public Health and Safety</li> </ul> </li> <li>6.0 Environmental Consequences (Mashpee) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>6.1 Parcels 3 and 4 - Proposed Housing <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Land Resources</li> <li>▪ Water Resources</li> <li>▪ Living Resources</li> <li>▪ Wetlands</li> <li>▪ Cultural Resources</li> <li>▪ Socioeconomic Conditions</li> <li>▪ Community Infrastructure</li> <li>▪ Utilities</li> <li>▪ Resource Use Patterns</li> <li>▪ Transportation</li> <li>▪ Air Quality</li> <li>▪ Other Values</li> </ul> </li> <li>6.2 Parcels 7 and 8 - Proposed Tribal Offices Expansion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Land Resources</li> <li>▪ Water Resources</li> <li>▪ Living Resources</li> <li>▪ Wetlands</li> <li>▪ Cultural Resources</li> <li>▪ Socioeconomic Conditions</li> <li>▪ Community Infrastructure</li> <li>▪ Utilities</li> <li>▪ Resource Use Patterns</li> <li>▪ Transportation</li> <li>▪ Air Quality</li> <li>▪ Other Values</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>7.0 Environmental Consequences (Alternative A Option 1) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>7.1 Land Resources</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Earthwork</li> <li>▪ Erosion and Sediment Control</li> <li>7.2 Water Resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Groundwater</li> <li>▪ Surface Water</li> <li>▪ Construction Impacts</li> </ul> </li> <li>7.3 Living Resources <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Upland Vegetation</li> <li>▪ Fish and Wildlife</li> <li>▪ Threatened and Endangered Species</li> <li>▪ Construction Impacts</li> </ul> </li> <li>7.4 Wetlands</li> <li>7.5 Historical and Archaeological Resources</li> <li>7.6 Socioeconomics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Tribal Conditions</li> <li>▪ Project Area Conditions</li> <li>▪ Environmental Justice</li> <li>▪ No Action Alternative</li> </ul> </li> <li>7.7 Community Infrastructure <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Criminal Justice System</li> <li>▪ Fire Protection</li> <li>▪ Emergency Services</li> <li>▪ Schools</li> <li>▪ Recreation/Open Space</li> </ul> </li> <li>7.8 Utilities <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Water Supply</li> <li>▪ Wastewater Treatment</li> <li>▪ Electrical Service</li> <li>▪ Gas and Fuel Oil</li> <li>▪ Telephone and Cable</li> <li>▪ Solid Waste</li> <li>▪ Construction Impacts</li> </ul> </li> <li>7.9 Resource Use Patterns <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Hunting, Fishing and Gathering</li> <li>▪ Timber Harvesting</li> <li>▪ Agriculture</li> <li>▪ Mining</li> <li>▪ Recreation</li> <li>▪ Land Use Plans</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
---	--

Table 2

<p>7.10 Transportation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Future No-Build Traffic Volumes</li> <li>▪ Proposed MassHighway Route 44 Improvements</li> <li>▪ Proposed Improvements</li> <li>▪ Project Generated Traffic</li> <li>▪ Future Build Traffic Volumes</li> <li>▪ Future Build Intersection Operating Conditions</li> <li>▪ Regional Impact</li> <li>▪ Public Transportation</li> <li>▪ Construction Impacts</li> </ul> <p>7.11 Air Quality</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Microscale Analysis</li> <li>▪ Regional Mesoscale Analysis</li> <li>▪ Stationary Source Emissions</li> <li>▪ Greenhouse Gas Emissions</li> <li>▪ Construction Impacts</li> </ul> <p>7.12 Other Values</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Wilderness</li> <li>▪ Noise</li> <li>▪ Visual</li> <li>▪ Public Health and Safety</li> </ul> <p>7.13 Low Impact Development and Sustainable Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Site Planning</li> <li>▪ Mechanical Systems</li> <li>▪ Electrical Systems</li> <li>▪ Water Recovery and Conservation</li> <li>▪ Architectural Design of Building Envelope</li> <li>▪ Landscape</li> <li>▪ Construction</li> <li>▪ Recycling</li> <li>▪ LEED</li> </ul> <p>8.0 Environmental Consequences (Alternative A Option 2) Repeat Section 7 outline</p> <p>9.0 Environmental Consequences (Alternative A Option 3) Repeat Section 7 outline</p>	<p>10.0 Environmental Consequences (Alternative B) Repeat Section 7 outline</p> <p>11.0 Environmental Consequences (Alternative C) Repeat Section 7 outline</p> <p>12.0 Cumulative Impacts (Casino Site)</p> <p>13.0 Induced Growth</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Socioeconomic Growth Induced Impacts</li> <li>▪ Employee-Related Induced Effects</li> <li>▪ Operation-Related Induced Effects</li> <li>▪ Visitor-Related Induced Effects</li> <li>▪ Environmental Growth Induced Impacts</li> <li>▪ Planning for Induced Growth</li> </ul> <p>14.0 Mitigation Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Land Resources</li> <li>▪ Water Resources</li> <li>▪ Groundwater Recharge</li> <li>▪ Floodplain Compensatory Storage</li> <li>▪ Stormwater Quantity Controls</li> </ul> <p>15.0 Abbreviations</p> <p>16.0 References</p> <p>17.0 Consultation and Coordination</p> <p>18.0 List of Preparers</p>
---	--

Table 2  
- 3 -

Table 2

- 4 -

**Table 3. Summary of Verbal Comment – March 25, 2008<sup>1</sup>**

<b>ID</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Identification Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response Section<sup>2</sup></b>
B-C	Judith Ann Bigelow-Costa	B-C-1	Comment of support – economic improvements	x.6
Qu	Michael Quish	Qu-1	Comment of support – economic improvements	x.6
P-B	Ann Peters-Brown	P-B-1	Comment of support	--
ShA	Angela Shwoma	ShA-1	Comment of support – need and history	1.0 and 2.0
YeN	Nancy Yeatts	YeN-1	Regional needs have not been addressed	x.2, x.3, x.4 x.5, x.6, x.7, x.8, x.9, x.10, and x.11
		YeN-2	Primary concern is water supply	5.8, x.8
		YeN-3	Will there be a detailed traffic analysis	5.10, x.10
SS	Susan Speers	SS-1	Requests to be “interested party”	BIA does not have an “interested party” status. Commenter will be notified of issuance of public documents
		SS-2	Issues will be addressed in their written comment and include impacts to Taunton River; water supply; wetlands; wildlife habitat; stormwater runoff; wastewater management; traffic and induced growth	5.0, x.0, and 11.0
PC	Priscilla Chapman	PC-1	Request that EIS include analysis of smaller scale projects and alternative sites	3.0
		PC-2	Concern on Nemasket	x.3

<sup>1</sup> Transcript is provided in Appendix G with identification numbers

<sup>2</sup> X.6 – the “x” refers to all impact sections (ie, Section 7.6 for Alternative A-1; Section 8.6 for Alternative A-2; Section 9.6 for Alternative A-3 and Section 10.6 for Alternative B)

Table 3

			River herring run	
		PC-3	Concern on wildlife habitat including rare species	x.3
LaM	Carolyn LaMarre	LaM-1	Focused on avoidance of adverse effects	3.0, and x.0,
MaB-1	Bill Marzelli	MaB-1	Comment of support – historic ties in Middleborough	1.0
BoV	Virginia Bowman	BoV-1	Comment of support – economic benefits	x.6
MaJ	John Marcellino	MaJ-1	Comment of support	--
TuM	Mary Tufts	TuM-1	Concern about local traffic	x.10
		TuM-2	Concern about impacts on rail service	x.10
		TuM-3	Concern about negative social impacts	x.6 and x.7
PeC	Carl Peirce	PeC-1	Mashpee have no historic ties to Middleborough	1.0
DuM	Muriel Duphily	DuM-1	Comment of support – welcome Tribe back; use green construction	1.0 and x.13
CoR	Ryan Colter	CoR-1	Representative of Senator Pacheco	--
FrA	Allin Frawley	FrA-1	Nemasket River will not survive this project	x.2 and x.3
		FrA-2	Light and noise and air and water pollution will be rampant	x.2, x.11, and x.12,
		FrA-3	Automobile and proposed commuter rail traffic will increase	x.10
		FrA-4	Project plans destroy wetlands	x.3 and x.4
		FrA-5	Wildlife and habitat will be destroyed	x.3 and x.4
		FrA-6	Herring run in Nemasket will be impacted	x.3
		FrA-7	Stormwater runoff impacts	x.2
YoR	Richard Young	YoR-1	IGA process was inadequate and flawed	N/A – agreement has been signed and this is a Town, not NEPA issue
		YoR-2	Mashpee have no historic ties to Middleborough	1.0
BrH	Hal Brown	BrH-1	Comment of support –	x.6 and x.7

Table 3

			social impacts can be mitigated	
BoA	Adam Bond	BoA-1	Comment of support - IGA is adequate and mitigation should be stressed.	14.0
BeM	Mark Belanger	BeM-1	IGA is not adequate	N/A – agreement has been signed and this is a Town, not NEPA issue
		BeM-2	Mashpee have no historic ties to Middleborough	1.0
DuF	Franl Dunphy	DuF-1	Impacts to wildlife and fisheries	x.3
KnJ	James Knox	KnJ-1	IGA process was inadequate	N/A – agreement has been signed and this is a Town, not NEPA issue
PeW	Wayne Perkins	PeW-1	Town has capacity to provide water and sewer	5.8 and x.8
KeC	Carol Kelley	KeC-1	BIA does not have authority to place lands into trust	This comment is incorrect. The U.S. Court of Appeals for the First Circuit in Boston has upheld the Department's right to bring land into trust within the 13 colonies and the Supreme Court decided to not grant cert on rehearing that issue. They are only considering the applicability of a tribe's recognition date and applicability of their settlement

Table 3

				agreement. The BIA has previously brought land into trust in Massachusetts for the Aquinnah Wampanoag under the 25 CFR 151 procedures.
FIJ	Jerome Fletcher	FIJ-1	Visual impacts	x.12
		FIJ-2	Project site contains environmentally sensitive wetlands and water supplies	5.4, 5.8, x.4 and x.8
		FIJ-3	Area supports many species of wildlife and rare species	5.3 and x.3
		FIJ-4	Impact of traffic, light and air pollution	x.10, x.11, and x.12,
		FIJ-5	What will the project include	3.0
DeA	Eleanor DeAngelis	DeA-1	Comment of support – historic ties and economic development	1.0 and x.6
HaM-1	Mark Harding	HaM-1	Comment of support – historic ties	1.0
BaD	Diane Bassett	BaD-1	Comment of support – historic ties and relative size of project	1.0 and 2.0
MeP	Paul Meleedy	MeP-1	Comment of support – real estate values	x.6
HeW	Sarah Hewins	HeS-1	Casino will impact region's surface waters, wetlands are species, character, and groundwater	x.0
		HeS-2	Unregulated wetlands and surface waters will impact flood control, groundwater recharge and groundwater quality	x.1, x.2, x.3 and x.4
		HeS-3	Will cause the death of rare species	x.3
		HeS-4	Will impact aquifer	x.2 and x.8

Table 3

			recharge and health, especially Plymouth Carver aquifer	
SoG	Gill Solomon	SoG-1	Mashpee have no historic ties to Middleborough	1.0
GrF	Faries Gray	GrF-1	Mashpee have no historic ties to Middleborough	1.0
WyP	Penny Wyatt	WyP-1	NEPA laws do not apply to Massachusetts and there can be no federal public domain land	This comment is incorrect. NEPA applies to all discretionary Federal Executive Branch decisions unless statutorily excluded, and is a law that provides procedures on how Federal decisions are to be made, regardless of the location, not just to the fee-to-trust decision itself. The Federal government holds land in trust for the Aquinnah Wampanoag, both through settlement and the 25 CFR 151 process.
ChS	Stefanie Chiappetta	ChS-1	Concern on impacts to wildlife	5.3 and x.3
		ChS-2	Another concern is road noise	x.12
		ChS-3	Casino will not benefit the Tribe	2.0; x.6
StM	Mary Thomas	StM-1	BIA cannot create federal	This comment

Table 3

	Stone		land in Massachusetts	is incorrect. The Federal government already holds land in trust in Massachusetts for the Aquinnah Wampanoag
FrB	Barbara Frappier	FrB-1	Site has so many wetlands	5.4 and x.4
		FrB-2	Institute state of the art building and land use techniques	x.13
		FrB-3	Need better plans	3.0 and graphics
BrL	Leeann Bradley	BrL-1	Need better plans	3.0 and graphics
		BrL-2	Route 44 entrance is impossible	x.10
BrS	Scott Bradley	BrS-1	Lower value of properties	x.6
		BrS-2	Concern of safety	x.7
SaW	Wes Sanford	SaW-1	Middleborough aquifer is inadequate and impacts will affect Carver	5.8 and x.8
KeR	Richard Kerver	KeR-1	Much of the comment was inaudible; appears to be comment of support requesting consideration of sustainable issues	x.13
MiC	Chris Mickiewicz	MiC-1	Concerns of impacts to property value	x.6
CaD	David Cassady	CaD-1	Plans missing Everett Street extension	3.0 and x.10
		CaD-2	Sustainable design should be talked about	x.13
		CaD-3	Light pollution is one of the big issues	x.12
ShK	Kim Shea	ShK-1	Casino could have significant impact to Route 44 and adjoining communities	x.10
ShC	Connie Shea	ScC-1	Water demand will impact wildlife and water supply	x.3 and x.8
CaT	Tim Cayton	CaT-1	Comment of support – economic benefit	7.5 and 8.5
MoJ	John Morrissey	MoJ-1	Comment of support – jobs and school benefits	x.6 and x.7
SoM	Michael	SoM-1	Air quality must be	x.11

Table 3

	Solimini		addressed in detail	
BoVi	Victoria Bond	BoVi-1	Comment of support – benefits from traffic improvements	x.10
RaI	Ida Raduc	RaI-1	Traffic will make it impossible to commute on Route 44	x.10
		RaI-2	Road widening will impact Oliver Mill	5.10 and x.10 and x.12
		RaI-3	Impacts to box turtle and other wildlife	5.3 and x.3
		RaI-4	Casino will impact property values	x.6
JoR	Robb Johnson	JoR-1	Interested in impacts to rare species, wildlife, water quality, surface water, groundwater	x.2, x.3 and x.4
			Applaud that EIS includes a section on induced growth and mitigation	13.0 and 14.0
BrM	Marsha Brunelle	BrM-1	Comment of support – economic stimulus	x.6
ToJ	Jacque Tolosko	ToJ-1	Mashpee have no historic ties to Middleborough	1.0
ToT	Terry Tolosko	ToT-1	One of my concerns is the collection of rainwater	x.1 and x.2
		ToT-2	If basins are constructed wrong they become breeding grounds for mosquitoes	x.2
MoG	George Mosley	MoG-1	Comment of support	--
FuP	Peter Fuller	FuP-1	IGA process was inadequate	N/A – agreement has been signed and this is a Town, not NEPA issue
SpS	Steven Spataro	SpS-1	Comment of support – will provide revenues for town improvements	x.7
BrJ	John Bruno	BrJ-1	Casino has to be looked at for regional impacts	x.2, x.3, x.4, x.6, x.7, x.8, x.10 and x.11
		BrJ-2	Casino will have direct impact on local roads	x.10
MiD	Dino Mitrokostas	MiD-1	Comment of support	--

Table 3

KnJ2	Jim Knox (2)	KnJ2-1	Crime issues	x.7
IIF	Fred Illingworth	IIF-1	Increased noise and air pollution and safety concerns	x.11 and x.12
StL	Laura Stevens	StL-1	Casino proposed threat to bald eagles, particularly through impacts to Nemasket River herring run and lighting	x.3
		StL-2	Site is mapped by NHESP and there will be traffic impacts to box turtle	x.3
		StL-3	Another concern is wetlands	5.4 and x.4
PeC2	Carl Peirce (2)	PeC2-1	Current plans differ from what was in Public Notice	3.0
		PeC2-2	Major concern is chemicals and pesticides going into water	x.1, x.2, x.3 and x.13
BeM2	Mark Belanger (2)	BeM2-1	IGA is inadequate	N/A – agreement has been signed and this is a Town, not NEPA issue
ShK2	Kim Shea (2)	ShK2-1	Traffic will spillover into secondary roads and threaten health and safety	x.10
		ShK2-2	Traffic will cause air quality impacts	x.11
		ShK2-3	Route 44 is an emergency evacuation route	x.10
FuP2	Peter Fuller (2)	FuP2-1	IGA never should have been agreed to	x.7
BoA2	Adam Bond (2)	BoA2-1	Comment of support – economic revenue stream	x.6 and x.7

**Table 4. Summary of Verbal Comment – March 26, 2008<sup>i</sup>**

<b>ID</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Identification Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response Section</b>
CM	Coreen Moore	CM-1	Comment on need for Tribe to have land to build affordable housing	1.0, 3.0 and 6.0
PSW	Princess Smiling Wind	PSW-1	Comment on need for Tribe for the land to trust	1.0
MTR	Michelle Toby-Russell	MTR-1	Comment that more land should be taken into trust	3.0
JLDB	Jessie “Little Doe” Baird	JLDB-1	Comment of support to put land into trust and how long it took; territory	1.0
PP	Paula Peters	PP-1	Comment of support to put land into trust and how long it took; territory	1.0
MQ	Michael Quish	MQ-1	Comment of support	

---

<sup>i</sup> Transcript is provided in Appendix H with identification numbers

**Table 5. Summary of Written Comment<sup>1</sup>**

<b>ID</b>	<b>Commenter</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Identification Number</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Response Section<sup>2</sup></b>
DOA	Department of the Army	April 7, 2008	DOA-1	Request to be Cooperating Agency	1.0
			DOA-2	Provide complete wetland delineation	4.0 and 5.4
			DOA-3	Disclose permanent filling, culverted road crossings, temporary construction impacts	6.0, x.4
			DOA-4	Analyze potential for overland runoff of sediment and chemical components	6.0, x.1 and x.2
			DOA-5	Describe biological habitats – breeding, nursery, feeding, hibernation and migration	4.0, 5.3, 6.0, and x.3
			DOA-6	Alternatives analysis using EPA Guidelines to establish LEDPA, including minimization	3.0
			DOA-7	Describe wetland functions and values	5.4,
			DOA-8	Public Interest Review: Water quality	4.0, 5.2, 6.0, x.2
			DOA-9	Public Interest Review: Benthic flora and fauna	4.0, 5.3, 6.0, x.3 and x.4
			DOA-10	Public Interest Review: Land use classification	4.0, 5.3, 6.0, and x.3
			DOA-11	Public Interest Review: Water supply and conservation	4.0, 5.8, 6.0, and x.8
			DOA-12	Public Interest Review: Wetlands	4.0, 5.4, 6.0, and x.4

<sup>1</sup> Comment letters are provided in Appendix H with identification numbers

<sup>2</sup> X.6 – the “x” refers to all impact sections (ie, Section 7.6 for Alternative A-1; Section 8.6 for Alternative A-2; Section 9.6 for Alternative A-3 and Section 10.6 for Alternative B

Table 5

			DOA-13	Public Interest Review: Historic properties	4.0, 5.4, 6.0, and x.5
			DOA-14	Public Interest Review: Flooding	4.0, 5.2, 6.0, x.2,
			DOA-15	Public Interest Review: Drainage	4.0, 5.2, 6.0, x.2
			DOA-16	Public Interest Review: Energy needs	4.0, 5.8, 6.0, and x.8
			DOA-17	Public Interest Review: Economics	4.0, 5.6 and x.6
			DOA-18	Public Interest Review: Circulation patterns	4.0, 5.2, 6.0 and x.2
			DOA-19	Public Interest Review: Finfish/plankton	4.0, 5.3, 6.0, and x.3
			DOA-20	Public Interest Review: Air quality	4.0, 5.11, 6.0, x.11
			DOA-21	Public Interest Review: Esthetics	4.0, 5.12, 6.0, x.12,
			DOA-22	Public Interest Review: Erosion/accretions	4.0, 5.2, 6.0, x.2
			DOA-23	Public Interest Review: Noise	4.0, 5.12, 6.0, x.12,
			DOA-24	Public Interest Review: Wildlife	4.0, 5.3, 6.0, and x.3
			DOA-25	Public Interest Review: Food and fiber production	4.0, 5.8, 6.0. and x.9
			DOA-26	Public Interest Review: Floodplain values	4.0, 5.2, 6.0, x.2
			DOA-27	Public Interest Review: General environmental concerns	4.0, 5.0, 6.0, and x.0
			DOA-28	Public Interest Review: Safety	4.0, 5.7, 6.0, and x.7
			DOA-29	Public Interest Review: Property ownership	1.0, 3.0, 4.0, 5.0
			DOA-30	Public Interest Review: Needs and welfare of the people	2.0, 4.0, 5.6
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency	April 9, 2008	EPA-1	Requests interagency coordination meeting with BIA	1.0
			EPA-2	Assess range of alternative sites as well as a smaller scale project, alternative sites with smart growth principles such as an	3.0

Table 5

				urban site like New Bedford	
			EPA-3	Evaluate growth-inducing changes and cumulative impacts	12.0 and 13.0
			EPA-4	Provide baseline wetland mapping and assessment, including potentially affected offsite wetlands	4.0 and 5.4
			EPA-5	Document vernal pools as well as threatened and endangered species	4.0 and 5.3 and 5.4
			EPA-6	Describe placement of fill in waters of the United States as per Section 404 and EPA's Section 404(b)(1) regulations; include onsite and offsite impacts as well as indirect impacts	6.0 and x.4
			EPA-7	Document avoidance, minimization and mitigation efforts to protect wetlands	3.0, 6.0, and x.4
			EPA-8	Demonstrate compliance with Executive Order 11990 and 11988	6.0, x.2, and x.4
			EPA-9	Describe existing water quality and potential impacts	4.0, 5.2, 6.0, x.2
			EPA-10	Address potential impacts to Cape Cod Sole Source Aquifer from Mashpee sites; address potential indirect impacts to nearby Plymouth/Carver Sole Source Aquifer for Middleborough site	4.0, 5.2, 6.0, x.2
			EPA-11	Design project for water efficiency	4.0, 5.8, 6.0 and x.8
			EPA-12	Water supply: Enter into a water management agreement with the Commonwealth	Issues such as this will be part of the Compact with the Commonwealth

Table 5

			EPA-13	Wastewater: Describe potential changes to Middleborough POTW and wastewater discharge issues	4.0, 5.8, 6.0 and x.8
			EPA-14	Air quality: Determine if project triggers a general conformity regulation under the Clean Air Act. Implement measures for construction related emissions; VMT	4.0, 5.11, 6.0 and x.11
			EPA-15	Provide quantification and discussion of greenhouse gas emissions and energy efficiency	5.11, x.11 and x.13
			EPA-16	Energy use	4.0, 5.11, x.11 and x.13
Am	Ambrozaitas	undated	Am-1	Study rare species on the Middleboro site	5.3, and x.3
An	Anderson	undated	An-1	What are runoff effects from casino on Plympton water supply	5.2, x.2
			An-2	What is effect of 60-story casino on ambient light	3.0, x.12
			An-3	What are effects of casino on Plympton police and fire departments	x.7
			An-4	Who are the Wampanoags and will they give back to their Native American brothers	2.0
Ar	Armanetti	March 26, 2008	Ar-1	Letter of Support	--
Bab	Babbowich	April 2, 2008	Bab-1	Why is the land being considered to be taken out of local state and federal control	1.0 and 2.0
BalDan1	Baldwin, Danelle #1	March 25, 2008	BalDan1-1	Provide soil reports for Middleborough site	5.1
			BalDan1-2	Concerned about blasting in Middleborough	x.1

Table 5

BalDan2	Baldwin, Danelle #2	March 25, 2008	BalDan2-1	What will effects be on vernal pools at the casino site	x.3 and x.4
BalDan3	Baldwin, Danelle #3	March 25, 2008	BalDan3-1	Concerned about stormwater quantities entering Nemasket River and effect on herring run	x.2 and x.3
			BalDan3-2	Low Impact Development standards need to be used	x.13
BalDon1	Baldwin, Donald #1	March 25, 2008	BalDon1-1	Impervious surfaces of casino development cause contaminated stormwater	x.2
			BalDon1-2	Meet and improve on EPA and MADEP standards	x.2
BalDon2	Baldwin, Donald #2	March 25, 2008	BalDon2-1	Concern on Middleborough project impacts on endangered species	5.3 and x3
Bar1	Barry-Belanger #1	undated	Bar1-1	Comments that casino will not provide as much revenue as a commercial casino	N/A – this is a moot point since the commercial casino legislation was not passed
Bar2	Barry-Belanger #2	undated	Bar2-1	Comments on basis for Inter-Government Agreement (IGA)	N/A – agreement has been signed and this is a Town, not NEPA issue
Be	Beatty	undated	Be-1	Letter of support	--
BelaM1	Belanger, M. #1	undated	BelaM1-1	States that the Mashpee have no claim to land in Middleborough	2.0
			BelaM1-2	Mashpee should pursue small scale gaming	3.0
BelaM2	Belanger, M. #2	undated	BelaM2-1	There must be another meeting to review the project	1.0

Table 5

			BelaM2-2	The Middleboro/Mashpee Inter-Governmental Agreement provides insufficient payments	x.7
			BelaM2-3	States that the Mashpee have no claim to land in Middleborough	2.0
			BelaM2-4	Increases in Middleborough school enrollment	x.7
			BelaM2-5	The IGA only provides for increases due to national inflation	x.6 and x.7
			BelaM2-6	The IGA does not provide as much revenue as a commercial license would	N/A – this is a moot point since the commercial casino legislation was not passed
			BelaM2-7	The IGA is insufficient for school growth	x.7
			BelaM2-8	The IGA is insufficient for Fire/Police/EMS	x.7
			BelaM2-9	The IGA was signed with the expectation that the town would receive more money via a Tribal/State compact	x.6
			BelaM2-10	The IGA has no provisions for negative effects to real estate values	x.6
			BelaM2-11	Loss of jobs	x.6
			BelaM2-12	Taxpayer costs will go up	x.6
			BelaM2-13	Casino will result in reduction of local government revenues	x.6 and x.7
			BelaM2-14	Casino will cause pathological gambler costs	x.6 and x.7
			BelaM2-15	School costs	x.7
			BelaM2-16	Small business will have disproportionate	x.6

Table 5

				negative impacts from pathological gambling	
			BelaM2-17	Casino will have regional socioeconomic costs	x.6
BelaM3	Belanger, M. #3	undated	BelaM3-1	School costs	x.7
			BelaM3-2	New housing will be built with associated costs	x.6, 12.0 and 13.0
BelaM4	Belanger, M. #4	undated	BelaM4-1	The Tribe has no connections to Middleborough	1.0
BelaM5	Belanger, M. #5	undated	BelaM5-1	Casino will cause additional police costs	x.7
			BelaM5-2	Casino will cause additional fire/EMS costs	x.7
			BelaM5-3	Casino will cause additional school costs	x.7
			BelaM5-4	Town will have to pursue affordable housing to accommodate casino employees	x.6
BelaM6	Belanger, M. #6	undated	BelaM6-1	Casino will cause additional ambulance/EMS costs	x.7
BelaZ	Belanger, Z.	undated	BelaZ-1	IGA is insufficient to cover town's costs	x.6 and x.7
Belm	Belmont	undated	Belm-1	Letter of support	--
Ber	Bergstrom	undated	Ber-1	Letter of support	--
Bi	Bingham	undated	Bin-1	Additional Mashpee site alternatives	3.0
Bo	Boutin	undated	Bo-1	Proposed infrastructure modifications will not be adequate for traffic	x.10
			Bo-2	Casino will be visible	x.12
			Bo-3	Casino will hurt local businesses	x.6
Bra	Bradley	April 2, 2008	Bra-1	Provide fully engineered plans for Middleboro	3.0
			Bra-2	Comply with new stormwater regs for Middleboro	x.2

Table 5

			Bra-3	Provide drainage calculations	x.2
			Bra-4	Provide water and sewer treatment areas	x.8
			Bra-5	Provide well information	x.8
			Bra-6	Look at alternative sites within 50 miles of Mashpee	3.0
			Bra-7	Provide wetland mitigation plans	x.4
			Bra-8	Provide wildlife habitat evaluations for endangered and threatened species	x.3 and x.4
			Bra-9	Provide information on vernal pools	5.3, 5.4, x.3 and x.4
			Bra-10	Provide documents six months before next scoping session	There will not be another Scoping Session. The DEIS will be released with the required public comment period, during which there will be another public hearing
			Bra-11	Casino entrance will not work and will require land takings	3.0 and x.10
Bro	Brown	March 12, 2008	Bro-1	Letter of support	--
Bru	Bruno	March 31, 2008	Bru-1	Casino traffic will impact local roads in Halifax	x.10
			Bru-2	Casino will impact Halifax water supply	5.2, 5.8, x.2 and x.8,
			Bru-3	Impacts on rare turtles	5.3, x.3
Cara	Caradimos	March 17, 2008	Cara-1	Letter of support	--
Carr	Carrington	March 25, 2008	Carr-1	Letter of support	--
Carv	Carver Conservation Commission	March 24, 2008	Carv-1	Tribe will no longer be subject to any state or local regulations governing wetlands and there will be no protective	1.0, 5.4 and x.4

Table 5

				regulations	
			Carv-2	Tribe will no longer be subject to any state or local regulations governing rare and endangered species and there will be no protective regulations	1.0, 5.3, and x.3
			Carv-3	There will be serious impacts on region's effort to preserve open space	5.7 and x.7
			Carv-4	Casino will impact Plymouth/Carver aquifer	5.2, x.2 and x.8
			Carv-5	Tribe will no longer be subject to any state or local regulations governing water withdrawal and interbasin transfer and there will be no protective regulations	5.2, x.2 and x.8
			Carv-6	Wastewater discharge will impact Plymouth/Carver aquifer	5.2, x.2 and x.8
Cav	Cavanaugh	March 15, 2008	Cav-1	Middleborough cannot support a 34 story building	3.0
			Cav-2	34 story building will dominate views and add garish lighting	3.0, x.12
			Cav-3	Water use will draw down aquifer and will be pumped away from aquifer	5.2, x.2
			Cav-4	Runoff will be faster, warmer and dirtier	5.2, x.2
			Cav-5	Sewage will be discharged to the Nemasket and cause impacts	5.2, x.2
			Cav-6	Herring run in Nemasket will be impacted	5.2, 5.3, x.2, and x.3
			Cav-7	Increased traffic will bring increased air quality issues	x.10 and x.11
			Cav-8	Increased traffic will bring increased litter	Litter is outside of NEPA purview
			Cav-9	Increased traffic will bring increased	x.7

Table 5

				traffic accidents and demand on emergency services	
			Cav-10	Casino will impact ambient noise	x.12
			Cav-11	Crime will increase	x.7
			Cav-12	Increase in gambling addiction, alcohol abuse and possible drug abuse	x.7
Ch	Chase	March 30, 2008	Ch-1	Hotel-casino complex will bring irrevocable change to community	x.9 and x.12
Ci	Cinami DeCristofano	March 31, 2008	Ci-1	How will scoping comments be addressed	This Scoping Report addresses that
			Ci-2	Will EIS disclose who prepared the documents	18.0
			Ci-3	EIS should disclose all technical work	See all sections and appendices of EIS
			Ci-4	Will a systems analysis be conducted to address specific changes of ecosystem, political, economic and social systems	5.0 and x.0
			Ci-5	Surely there will be cumulative impacts	12.0
			Ci-6	How will sustainability be addressed	x.13
			Ci-7	How will EIS address impacts on Plympton sites such as Town Green, Town Cemetery and Town Buildings	x.5 and x.12
			Ci-8	How will socioeconomic issues be addressed regionally?	x.6 and x.7
			Ci-9	How will study address water drainage, water quality, water quantity, water location and local wells	x.2 and x.8
			Ci-10	Will study address changes to topography and soil profiles	x.1
			Ci-11	Will study address changes to flora and	x.3

Table 5

				fauna	
			Ci-12	What will be the daily and yearly volume of septic waste	x.8
			Ci-13	Will the study assess airport capacity	5.10 and x.10
			Ci-14	Will the study assess lighting and noise	5.12 and x.12
			Ci-15	What energy and power usage will be required	x.8
			Ci-16	How will study determine economic costs	x.6 and x.7
			Ci-17	Will the study consider open and undeveloped land impacts	x.9 and x.12
			Ci-18	What will the effects of the casino be on related diseases	This is outside the NEPA scope for a casino
			Ci-19	Will the EIS address population growth	x.6, x.7 and 13.0
CommMA	Commonwealth of Massachusetts	April 8, 2008	CommMA-1	Compare Proposed Action with no action alternative	Section 3.0
			CommMA-2	Compare Proposed Action with only taking Mashpee lands or only taking Middleborough lands	This comment is contrary to Congressional intent documented in the 25 USC 465 law and 25 CRR 151 regulations in supporting tribal self-determination, economic development and housing and will not be analyzed.
			CommMA-3	Compare Proposed Action with a Class II alternative	A Class II only alternative will not be

					<p>analyzed. The Department recognizes tribal rights to Class III gaming as “equal treatment under the law” and a Class II only alternative violates that “equal treatment under the law” principles of the constitution. However, a Class II <u>Option</u> is considered as a possible precursor to a Class III casino in the event that a Tribal-State Compact negotiation is not timely.</p>
			CommMA-4	Compare Proposed Action with action that complies with state laws	<p>Consideration of this alternative would undermine congressionally required support of Tribal self-determination. Tribal sovereignty over their land and government operations is an inherent and integral</p>

Table 5

					part in the function of tribal self-determination.
			CommMA-5	Compare Proposed Action with a lower density alternative	3.0, 8.0 and 9.0
			CommMA-6	Compare Proposed Action with an urban site	The Federal decision must be based on the Tribal application, so while an analysis of other locations may be somewhat relevant under NEPA, the Department does not have the authority to direct the Tribe to acquire a different property than proposed. Additionally, the Department has promulgated rules governing whether lands may qualify as the “initial reservation” of the Tribe on which gaming may be conducted, 25 CFR sec. 292.6, 73 Federal Register 29354 (May 20, 2008). To qualify

Table 5

					under these rules, the Tribe must have significant historical connections to the land, and a modern connection to the land, through a significant number of tribal members living nearby or otherwise. Analyzing other locations that would not meet these requirements would not be reasonable.
			CommMA-7	Describe mitigation measures	x.0 and 14.0
			CommMA-8	Request concurrent NEPA and MEPA review	1.0
			CommMA-9	List of analyses Commonwealth would typically require: issues related to land alteration, wetlands, tidelands, water quality, rare species, wildlife habitat, historic impacts, wastewater generation, contaminated soils and construction period impacts	4.0, 5.0 and x.0
			CommMA-10	Address construction phasing and impacts	6.0 and x.0
			CommMA-11	Examine potential greenhouse gas impact	x.11
			CommMA-12	Delineate wetlands	4.0 and 5.4

Table 5

			CommMA-13	Describe wetland and stream impacts; comply with MA River and Stream Crossing Standards as applicable and mitigation	6.0 and x.2
			CommMA-14	Analyze sources, volumes and quality of stormwater flow and address management	4.0, 5.2, 6.0, x.2
			CommMA-15	Identify structures within, over or beneath navigable streams, waterways and Great Ponds	1.0, 5.2 and 5.3
			CommMA-16	Examine alternatives for water supply and effects on Taunton River Basin; propose a water resource management plan; incorporate water conservation measures and reuse	3.0, and x.8
			CommMA-17	Discuss how town wastewater treatment plant will meet regulatory performance standards; confirm flows; discuss groundwater discharge alternative	3.0, 5.8 and x.8
			CommMA-18	Describe on-site sources of air pollutants; construction equipment retrofit; noise effects; service station controls; mesoscale analysis; TDM	5.10, 5.11, 5.12, x.10, x.11 and x.12
			CommMA-19	Describe generation and management of oil and hazardous waste and solid waste; construction and operational phase recycling and composting	x.8 and x.12
			CommMA-20	Conduct site assessments	4.0, 5.12, x.12
			CommMA-21	Provide information and analysis of potential impact to 4 state listed species	5.3 and x.3
			CommMA-22	Discuss effects to fisheries in Nemasket	5.3 and x.3

Table 5

				River and Raven Brook	
			CommMA-23	Discuss effects on Meetinghouse Swamp Wildlife Management Area access and recreational use	5.7, 5.12, x.7 and x.12
			CommMA-24	Discuss priority habitats on Mashpee lands	4.0 and 6.0
			CommMA-25	Tribe should enter into an agreement with the Commonwealth with respect to the regulatory jurisdiction of the Division of Fish and Game	Issues such as this will be part of the Compact with the Commonwealth
			CommMA-26	DCR holds a conservation restriction on Parcel 9 in Mashpee. EIS should address benefits of maintaining this and Tribe should enter into an agreement with the Commonwealth with respect to the regulatory jurisdiction of DCR	4.0 and 6.0
			CommMA-27	EIS should discuss plans for housing on Mashpee parcels	3.0 and 6.0
			CommMA-28	EIS should address any zoning and land use changes in Middleborough and Mashpee	4.0, 5.9, 6.0 and x.9
			CommMA-29	EIS should discuss how trust lands will impact affordable housing requirement calculations as well as demand	x.6
			CommMA-30	Transportation study area definition	5.10
			CommMA-31	EIS should include a MEPA /NEPA review of the entire Route 44 improvement project	1.0
			CommMA-32	FHWA Consultation	1.0
			CommMA-33	MassHighway and FHWA policy	5.10, x.10

Table 5

				preclude direct access to developments from an expressway	
			CommMA-34	Tribe should enter into an agreement with the Commonwealth with respect to improvements to the Commonwealth's transportation infrastructure	Issues such as this will be part of the Compact with the Commonwealth
			CommMA-35	There should be an updated study done for Route 44 which can be based on MassHighway's original work	1.0
			CommMA-36	Examine alternative modes of access to site	3.0, 5.10 and x.10
			CommMA-37	Include and define assumed background growth; update traffic counts; seasonal counts	x.10
			CommMA-38	Use a planning horizon of 20 years	x.10
			CommMA-39	Environmental impacts arising from Route 44 improvements should be addressed, most specifically wetlands	x.4
			CommMA-40	As for cost implications, the cost estimate should be updated, and outside funding analysis provided, if necessary,	Tribal contributions for road costs are subject to local agreements and the Tribal-State compact. While the analysis must include the traffic counts and potential impacts from the casino operation on the roads, any Tribal

					contribution for roads is subject to negotiation beyond the scope of this NEPA document.
			CommMA-41	Adding traffic to 495 may force MassHighway to bear the cost of improvements to 495 and the EIS should analyze these potential improvements and funding sources.	x.10
			CommMA-42	Proposed Action should be analyzed in terms of the Tribe's ability to operate a workplace subject only to federal and tribal enforcement of labor and employment conditions.	Issues such as this will be part of the Compact with the Commonwealth
			CommMA-43	EIS should address public safety needs of construction and operation of casino; impact on neighboring communities, State Police and other aspects of the criminal justice system including the local District Attorney's office and the courts.	x.6, x.7, x.9 and x.12
			CommMA-44	Tribe should enter into an agreement with the Commonwealth with respect to State police jurisdiction	Issues such as this will be part of the Compact with the Commonwealth
			CommMA-45	EIS should address fire services including tribal fire department and fire code and operation of the service station	5.7 and x.7
			CommMA-46	Tribe should enter into an agreement with the Commonwealth with respect to the MA Fire Code	Issues such as this will be part of the Compact with the

Table 5

					Commonwealth
			CommMA-47	How will Tribe adopt and enforce a code that is no less stringent than the state building code, including disability access, elevator inspections, boilers, air tanks and refrigeration unit operation	Issues such as this will be part of the Compact with the Commonwealth
			CommMA-48	Tribe should enter into an agreement with the Commonwealth with respect to building codes etc	Issues such as this will be part of the Compact with the Commonwealth
			CommMA-49	EIS should address public health concerns such as increased demand for social services, gambling prevention and addiction services, substance abuse, mental health services and child and public welfare	x.6 and x.7
			CommMA-50	Tribe should enter into an agreement with the Commonwealth with respect to operating casino with highest level of oversight	Issues such as this will be part of the Compact with the Commonwealth
			CommMA-51	EIS should address consumer protection and Tribe should enter into an agreement with the Commonwealth in this regard	Issues such as this will be part of the Compact with the Commonwealth
			CommMA-52	Evaluate increased demands on school systems	x.7
			CommMA-53	Analyze fiscal consequences, including loss of tax revenues in Middleborough and surrounding towns	x.6
CLF	Conservation	April 8, 2008	CLF-1	DEIS should include analysis of gaming	3.0

Table 5

	Law Foundation			options that may be allowed in the future	
			CLF-2	Climate change impacts and alternatives to mitigate climate impacts should be included.	x.11
			CLF-3	Stresses importance of analysis of alternative locations	3.0
			CLF-4	Include analysis of traffic	x.10
			CLF-5	Include analysis of air quality	x.11
			CLF-6	Include analysis of stormwater	x.1 and x.2
			CLF-7	Include analysis of water resources	x.1 and x.2
			CLF-8	Include analysis of wetlands	x.4
			CLF-9	Include analysis of land use	x.9
			CLF-10	Include analysis of cumulative impacts and secondary development	12.0 and 13.0
Cou	Council of Seven	April 7, 2008	Cou-1	Mashpee do not have ties to Middleborough	1.0
Cow	Cowan	March 20, 2008	Cow-1	Neighbors have private wells which will be affected	x.1, x.2 and x.8
			Cow-2	Most of the area is wetlands	5.4
			Cow-3	Gas station, hotel, restaurant and golf course will affect existing businesses	x.6
			Cow-4	Social impacts	x.6 and x.7
			Cow-5	IGA vote was no good	N/A – agreement has been signed and this is a Town, not NEPA issue
Cr	Crockett	April 2, 2008	Cr-1	More information on environmental impact	x.0
			Cr-2	More information on impact to services	x.7
			Cr-3	More information on impact to schools	x.7

Table 5

			Cr-4	More information on impact to socioeconomics	x.6
Da	Dargelis	March 27, 2008	Da-1	Traffic will have staggering impacts, especially to secondary roads and safety	x.10
De	DeCristofano	April 6, 2008	De-1	What are lighting impacts	x.12
Dub	Dube	undated	Dub-1	Letter of support	
Dum	Dumont	undated	Dum-1	Casino will destroy historic character of the town	5.5 and x.5, x.9 and x.12
Dun	Dunphy	March 24, 2008	Dun-1	Casino will impact wildlife habitat	5.3 and x.3
			Dun-2	Casino sewage will impact fisheries in Nemasket	5.3 and x.3
Dup	Dupuis	March 27, 2008	Dup-1	Mashpee do not have ties to Middleborough	1.0
Fl	Fletcher	March 17, 2008	Fl-1	Casino will have visual impacts	x.12
			Fl-2	Casino will impact local water supply, especially the nearby Plympton well	5.2, x.2
			Fl-3	Wildlife will be impacted	5.3 and x.3
			Fl-4	Casino will impact traffic	5.9, x.10
			Fl-5	Casino will impact light	x.12
			Fl-6	Casino will impact air quality	x.11
Fran	Frank	February 1, 2008	Fran-1	Request that Town of Halifax be an “interested party”	BIA does not have an “interested party” status. Commenter will be notified of issuance of public documents
FrawA	Frawley, A.	March 17, 2008	FrawA-1	Mashpee do not have ties to Middleborough	1.0
			FrawA-2	Nemasket River will not fare well and herring run will be impacted by	5.2, 5.3, x.2 and x.3

Table 5

				wastewater treatment	
			FrawA-3	Wildlife in adjacent wildlife management area will not fare well	5.3 and x.3
FrawL1	Frawley, L. #1	March 10, 2008	FrawL1-1	A casino will bring noise	x.12
				A casino will bring lights	x.12
				A casino will bring traffic	x.10
				A casino will bring increase in local services	x.7
				A casino will endanger wildlife	x.3
				A casino will endanger stream and water	x.2
				A casino will endanger air	x.11
FrawL2	Frawley, L. #2	March 28, 2008	FrawL2-1	Concerns include traffic and how roads will handle the traffic	x.10
			FrawL2-2	Another concern is how water will be disposed in the Nemasket River	x.2
			FrawL2-3	Another concern is how much water will be taken out of the aquifer	x.8
			FrawL2-4	Another concern is habitat destruction	x.3
			FrawL2-5	Where will the tons of trash go	x.8
Fri	Frisbie	March 17, 2008	Fri-1	Traffic presents a logistical nightmare	x.10
			Fri-2	I don't recall reading anything on the environmental impact	x.0
			Fri-3	There must be better suited regions for the casino	3.0
Ga	Gates	undated	Ga-1	Letter of support	--
Ge	Gendron	undated	Ge-1	Letter of support	--
GiJ	Gibbs, J.	March 27, 2008	GiJ-1	The Mashpee have no ties to Middleborough	3.0
GiR	Gibbs, R.	March 27, 2008	GiR-1	The Mashpee have no ties to Middleborough	3.0

Table 5

Gio	Giovanni	March 11, 2008	Gio-1	Letter of support	--
GID	Glaspey, D.	March 25, 2008	GID-1	Concern of lighting impacts	x.12
GIE	Glaspey, E.	March 25, 2008	GIE-1	Address noise impacts on homes near roads and casino	x.12
GIK1	Glaspey, K. #1	undated	GIK1-1	My concern is putting an 18-hole golf course over the aquifer that supplies most of Middleboro's water	5.2, x.2,
			GIK1-2	Wetlands will be unprotected and put at risk	1.0, x.4
GIK2	Glapsey, K. #2	March 25, 2008	GIK2-1	Casino will impact the federally listed red-bellied cooter	5.3
Gle	Glendye	March 28, 2008	Gle-1	Letter of support	--
Grah	Graham	March 26, 2008	Grah-1	Letter of support	--
Gran	Granger	April 4, 2008	Gran-1	Mashpee do not have ties to Middleborough	1.0
Hag	Hager	undated	Hag-1	EIS must evaluate environmental impacts to the Nemasket River	x.2 and x.3
			Hag-2	Nemasket River has one of the state's largest alewife fish runs	5.3 and x.3
			Hag-3	Nemasket River supports endangered and threatened species	5.3 and x.3
			Hag-4	Nemasket River is a tributary to the Taunton River which is classified as Wild and Scenic	5.2
			Hag-5	Nemasket River is historically significant	5.5 and x.5
			Hag-6	Nemasket River is an important recreational resource	x.7 and x.12
			Hag-7	EIS must ensure the Nemasket is protected	x.1, x.2, x.3 and x.4
			Hag-8	EIS must establish a baseline for the	5.2 and 5.8

Table 5

				Nemasket water quality	
			Hag-9	Development impacts must look at stormwater pollution	x.2
			Hag-10	Development impacts must look at wastewater pollution	x.8
			Hag-11	Development impacts must look at golf course impacts	7.0 and 10.0
			Hag-12	Development impacts must look at pollution from linked developments	12.0
			Hag-13	Development impacts must look at loss of wildlife habitat	x.3
			Hag-14	Project should include Low Impact Development	x.13
			Hag-15	Use scaled down wastewater treatment plants and re-use	x.8
			Hag-16	EIS should consider detention of stormwater flows	
Hal1	Halifax Executive Administrator #1	January 30, 2008	Hal1-1	Requests to be “interested party”	BIA does not have an “interested party” status. Commenter will be notified of issuance of public documents
Hal2	Halifax Executive Administrator #1	April 3, 2008	Hal2-1	How will the impacts on the residents of Halifax and other communities be studied	x.6, x.7, x.8, 12.0 and 13.0
			Hal2-2	Will municipal officials, regional planning agencies and residents be consulted	1.0, 17.0 and public comment period
			Hal2-3	Will those who write the study walk the ground of site and surrounding	5.0

Table 5

				communities	
			Hal2-4	How will the EIS determine changes in noise	x.12
			Hal2-5	How will the EIS determine changes in soil	x.1
			Hal2-6	How will the EIS determine changes in air	x.11
			Hal2-7	How will the EIS determine changes in water	x.2
			Hal2-8	How will the EIS determine changes in property values	x.6
			Hal2-9	How will the EIS determine changes in taxes	x.6
			Hal2-10	How will the EIS determine changes in traffic	x.10
			Hal2-11	How will the EIS determine changes in secondary effects	13.0
			Hal2-12	How will the EIS determine changes in housing	x.6
			Hal2-13	How will the EIS determine changes in services	x.7
			Hal2-14	How will the need for a casino be determined	2.0
Has	Haselmann	January 28, 2008	Has-1	Wetland concerns	5.4 and x.4
			Has-2	Water quality and quantity; surface water and groundwater concerns	5.2, 5.8, x.2 and x.8
			Has-3	Wildlife and endangered species concerns	5.3 and x.3
Hay	Haynes	March 25, 2008	Hay-1	Letter of support	--
He	Henry	April 3, 2008	He-1	Land to trust process should be put on hold until detailed full build plans are made available to the public and an	The EIS is the process by which the plans are developed

Table 5

				additional comment period granted	with public comment; additional public comment period will occur after the DEIS is issued
			He-2	The EIS should incorporate studies from other casinos	5.0 and x.0
			He-3	Assess potential effects on surrounding communities	x.0
			He-4	A website should be established	This is not a requirement of NEPA
			He-5	National studies should be used to determine social, economic and environmental consequence	5.0 and x.0
			He-6	The public need should be determined	2.0
			He-7	Include a study of the nature of the contract between the tribe and the investors and background investigations	The NEPA EIS is not used for this purpose
			He-8	Determine vehicle trips, levels of service, construction traffic	5.10 and x.10
			He-9	Calculate ongoing road maintenance costs	Tribal contributions for road maintenance costs are subject to local agreements and the Tribal-State compact. While the analysis must include the traffic counts and potential impacts from the casino

					operation on the roads, any Tribal contribution for road maintenance is subject to negotiation beyond the scope of this NEPA document.
			He-10	Study should indicate difference between state and local laws and regulations and federal laws and regulations	A comparison of State and Tribal laws is contrary to the congressionally required Department support of tribal self determination, and would be detrimental to the constitutionally derived government-to-government relationship with the Tribe. All Federal laws in areas that are not inherent to Tribal government operations apply to Tribal trust lands. This information will not be analyzed.
			He-11	Study should look at full build	3.0 and x.0
			He-12	Study area should include Routes 3, 27, 44, 58, 104, 105, 106 and local roads in Plympton	5.10

Table 5

			He-13	All other developments that are already on the drawing board need to included	5.10 and x.10
			He-14	Evaluate ability of highway capacity for emergency evacuation routes	x.10
			He-15	A comprehensive economic analysis should be undertaken, including regional impacts, tax base, jobs, property values, property taxes tourism facilities etc in Plympton	5.6 and x.6
			He-16	Effects on public essential commercial services	5.7 and x.7
			He-17	Address gambling related social problems	x.6 and x.7
			He-18	Address community character	5.9, 5.12, x.9 and x.12
			He-19	Address environmental justice	5.6 and x.6
			He-20	Address impact to schools in Plympton	x.7
			He-21	Review plans for sewage and solid waste disposal	x.8
			He-22	Determine water needs	x.8
			He-23	Determine energy needs	x.8
			He-24	Determine housing needs	x.6
			He-25	What will the scope of analysis be for lighting	x.12
			He-26	EIS should address visual impact	x.12
			He-27	EIS should address air pollution	x.11
			He-28	EIS should identify endangered, threatened and candidate species	5.3 and x.3
			He-29	EIS should determine quality of fish and wildlife habitat	5.3 and x.3
			He-30	Impact of new impervious area must be	5.2 and x.2

Table 5

				determined	
			He-31	Impact on vernal pools	5.3, 5.4, x.3 and x.4
			He-32	Tribe should have an environmental regulatory agency reporting to EPA	1.0 and 6.0
			He-33	Scope should identify all historic properties or cultural resources	5.5
			He-34	EIS should evaluate noise	x.12
			He-35	How will casino be monitored	Issues such as this will be part of the Compact with the Commonwealth
			He-36	EIS should address thermal effects	x.2
			He-37	How will the Tribe dispose of trash	x.8
Hu	Hutchison	March 18, 2008	Hu-1	Concerns over social impacts	x.6 and x.7
IBEW	International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers	April 3, 2008	IBEW-1	80 letters of support	--
Je	Jenkins	March 25, 2008	Je-1	Raises general socioeconomic concerns	x.6
Ke1	Kelley #1	March 13, 2008	Ke1-1	BIA must address their authority	The First Circuit Court of Appeals has upheld the ability of the Department to take lands in trust within the original 13 colonies. This will not be analyzed.
Ke2	Kelley #2	March 26, 2008	Kel2-1	Mashpee have no historic ties to Middleborough	1.0
Ke3	Kelley #3	April 3, 2008	Kel3-1	BIA must address their authority	See Ke1-1

Table 5

Ker	Kerzner	April 2, 2008	Ker-1	How will impacts in Duxbury be addressed	5.6, 5.7, 5.10, x.6, x.7 and x.10
			Ker-2	What is public need	1.0
			Ker-3	Will the EIS examine threatened and endangered species and general wildlife impacts?	5.3 and x.3
			Ker-4	Will the EIS examine waste effluent during floods	x.8
			Ker-5	Will the study examine population shifts	x.6 and x.7
			Ker-6	Will the study project changes in traffic patterns in Duxbury	x.10
			Ker-7	Will the study examine effects on air quality	x.11
			Ker-8	Will the study look at combined effects due to Cape Cod travel peaks	x.10
			Ker-9	Will the study include consideration of evacuation routes	x.10
			Ker-10	Will the study examine the potential need for increased salting	x.2 and 8.2
Ki	Kinney	March 25, 2008	Ki-1	Concern over gambling addictions and its costs	x.6 and x.7
			Ki-2	What will effect be on school costs	x.7
			Ki-3	How long will construction last	1.0
			Ki-4	How many phases will there be	3.0
			Ki-5	What will the effect be from radio and cell phone towers	None are proposed
			Ki-6	How will they mitigate effects on Nemasket River	x.2
			Ki-7	How will they control dust	x.1 and x.11
			Ki-8	What will the noise levels be during	x.12

Table 5

				construction	
			Ki-9	How will the wildlife be kept safe from road kill?	x.3
			Ki-10	How does the tribe plan to mitigate for light	x.12
Kn1	Knox #1	undated	Kn1-1	No adequate mitigation for increased 911 calls	x.7
Kn2	Knox #2	undated	Kn2-1	Intergovernmental Agreement was not legitimate	N/A – agreement has been signed and this is a Town, not NEPA issue
La	LaCoulture	April 5, 2008	La-1	Request another public meeting	This will occur after public notice of the DEIS
			La-2	There could be significant impacts from traffic to communities along Route 44	x.10
Le	Leschen	April 9, 2008	Le-1	Mashpee have no historical ties to Middleborough	1.0
			Le-2	Any archaeological, historical or Section 106 concerns must be handled by an objective third party	5.5 and x.5
			Le-3	Traffic will impact Route 44 evacuation route	5.10 and x.10
Lo	Lobban	undated	Lo-1	Letter of support	--
MaG	MacPherson, G	April 6, 2008	MaG-1	Provide estimates for any increase in school population	x.7
			MaG-2	Provide estimate for replacing police station and increased payroll	x.7
			MaG-3	Provide estimate for sufficiency of paramedic firefighter mitigation	x.7

Table 5

			MaG-4	Will town receive share of revenues from state	x.6 and x.7
MaL1	MacPherson, L #1	undated	MaL1-1	Safety on local roads	x.10
			MaL1-2	Noise	x.12
			MaL1-3	Light impacts	x.12
			MaL1-4	Increased litter	Litter is not a NEPA issue
			MaL1-5	Visual effects	x.12
			MaL1-6	Who will monitor new wildlife habitat areas	x.3 and x.4
			MaL1-7	How will traffic be kept off local roads	x.10
			MaL1-8	What kind of signage will be used on local roads	This will be under the purview of local authorities during final plans
			MaL1-9	How will traffic be routed during large scale events	x.10
			MaL1-10	How will Route 44 be patrolled and how will the increased cost be mitigated?	x.7 and x.10
			MaL1-11	How will construction traffic be controlled; safety; effects on school buses	x.10
			MaL1-12	How will rodents be controlled and pesticides managed	x.12
			MaL1-13	How will runoff be directed and what de-icing measures will be used	x.1 and x.2
			MaL1-14	How will fertilizers be applied and what are impacts	x.3
			MaL1-15	What will impacts and mitigation be for house values	x.6

Table 5

			MaL1-16	What will impacts of traffic be on shaking adjacent cemeteries?	x.10 discusses changes in traffic and x.1 discusses blasting. The effect of traffic changes on shaking of nearby cemeteries is subject to too much error to be considered reasonable to accurately calculate
			MaL1-17	How will mitigation be enforced	1.0 and 14.0
			MaL1-18	Will there be busing to train stations or offsite parking locations?	3.0, x.10
			MaL1-19	Will elderly, retired or semi-retired part time employees be protected	Issues such as this will be part of the Compact with the Commonwealth
			MaL1-20	What mitigation is proposed for the Oliver Home and Oliver Mill Park	x.5 and x.12
			MaL1-21	How will KOA access be maintained	x.10
			MaL1-22	How will the proposed gas station effect existing gas stations	x.6
			MaL1-23	How will closing the Everett Street intersection affect businesses	3.0, x.10
MaL2	MacPherson, L #2	undated	MaL2-1	The Mashpee do not have historic ties to Middleborough	1.0
			MaL2-2	How will casino impact historic structures and graveyards	5.5 and x.5
			MaL2-3	Will the casino negatively affect the tribe	3.0

Table 5

				by splitting it into two parts (Mashpee and Middleborough)	
MaL3	MacPherson, L #3	undated	MaL3-1	The Mashpee do not have historic ties to Middleborough	1.0
			MaL3-2	A clear set of plans is needed	See DEIS graphics
			MaL3-3	No off-ramp is shown at Everett Street	3.0, x.10
			MaL3-4	How will the gas station be regulated and potential spills managed	1.0 and x.12
			MaL3-5	How will gas station affect other local gas stations?	x.6
			MaL3-6	How will deliveries come in to the casino	3.0, x.10
			MaL3-7	How will trash be handled and stored	x.8
			MaL3-8	Will the casino be smoke free	x.12 and x.13
			MaL3-9	What will impacts to local roads be at Route 105, including to early childhood center and fire station	x.10
			MaL3-10	Will intersection of North Street/Montello Street/East Main Street and South Main Street be reorganized	5.10 and x.10
Mag	Magazu	undated	Mag-1	Letter of support	--
Mal1	Maloney #1	undated	Mal1-1	Concern about quality and quantity of well water and groundwater impacts	5.2, 5.8, x.2 and x.8
Mal2	Maloney #2	undated	Mal2-1	How will increase in traffic affect farm access and use of roads	x.10
Mal3	Maloney #3	undated	Mal3-1	What will be the negative effect of lighting on livestock	x.12
MarP	Marzelli, P.	March 17, 2008	MarP-1	Letter of support	--
MarT	Marzelli, T	undated	MarT-1	Class III gambling is illegal in Massachusetts and no reservations can be established in the 13 original colonies	This comment is incorrect and will not be analyzed.

Table 5

					Massachusetts has a State lottery and already allows charity casino nights, which may be considered equivalent to Class III gaming, and reservations already exist within the original 13 colonies, including Massachusetts.
MPTC	Massachusetts Ponkapoag Tribal Council	April 6, 2008	MPTC-1	The Mashpee do not have historic ties to Middleborough and cannot claim these lands	1.0
MAAud	MassAudubon	April 8, 2008	MAAud-1	EIS should consider alternative sites	3.0
			MAAud-2	On-site biological studies should be conducted by qualified biologists	5.3
			MAAud-3	Demonstrate that there are no practicable alternatives that would result in less adverse impact to the environment	x.3 and x.4
			MAAud-4	Document commitments by Tribe to protect resources	14.0
			MAAud-5	Any offsite impacts must be documented	x.0
			MAAud-6	We understand that a site on the Taunton River is being considered for wetland mitigation	x.4
			MAAud-7	Address stormwater management issues	5.1, 5.2, x.1 and x.2
			MAAud-8	Address water supply impacts and regional effects	5.8 and x.8

Table 5

			MAAud-9	Address wastewater treatment impacts and regional effects	5.8 and x.8
			MAAud-10	Added traffic would increase greenhouse gas emissions	x.11
			MAAud-11	No mechanism to provide mitigation to surrounding towns	Issues such as this will be part of the Compact with the Commonwealth
			MAAud-12	Provide detailed site plans	See DEIS graphics
			MAAud-13	Delineate all wetlands	5.4
			MAAud-14	Provide soil analysis	5.1
			MAAud-15	Demand for potable and non-potable water	5.8 and x.8
			MAAud-16	Stormwater volumes and management system	5.2 and x.2
			MAAud-17	Wastewater volumes and treatment; re-use	5.8 and x.8
			MAAud-18	Identify all new discharges	x.2
			MAAud-19	Projected traffic increase and mitigation	x.10
			MAAud-20	Project induced growth	x.6, x.7, x.10 and 13.0
			MAAud-21	Incorporate LID and LEED	x.13
			MAAud-22	Disclose impacts to Nemasket River	x.2 and x.3
			MAAud-23	Identify wetland alterations, alternatives, and mitigation	3. and x.4
			MAAud-24	Describe wildlife habitat impacts including impacts to federally listed species	x.3
			MAAud-25	Describe water conservation measures	x.8 and x.13
			MAAud-26	Analyze combined impacts of groundwater recharge loss, stormwater	x.2

Table 5

				discharges, wastewater discharge or reuse and water withdrawal	
			MAAud-27	Address construction impacts on-site and off-site	x.0
			MAAud-28	Address cumulative impacts	x.6, x.10, x.11 and 12.0
			MAAud-29	Alternatives should consider scaled-down development and brownfield sites.	3.0
Me	Mello	undated	Me-1	Letter of support	--
Mic	Mickiewicz	March 25, 2008	Mic-1	Direct impact of casino on property value	x.6
MPD	Middleborough Police Department	March 27, 2008	MPD-1	Police departments in Ledyard and Montville, Connecticut have indicated no increase in crime due to casinos and that law enforcement has been enhanced by tribal agreements	x.7
Mu	Murphy	March 20, 2008	Mu-1	Letter of support	--
NW	Name Withheld	April 2, 2008	NW-1	Federal sovereign immunity status enables Tribes' exemption from federal, state and local regulations	1.0
			NW-2	Lists several assistance programs available to Tribe	1.0
TNC	The Nature Conservancy	April 7, 2008	TNC-1	EIS should address Nemasket River impacts	x.1, x.2 and x.3
Ne	Neves	March 12, 2008	Ne-1	Letter of support	--
OL	O'Leary	March 31, 2008	OL-1	To what extent will the EIS include regional impacts	x.0
			OL-2	What population growth projections will be ascertained	x.6
			OL-3	What will be the likely impacts on traffic, travel times, duration, train service,	x.10

Table 5

				congestion and accident rates	
			OL-4	What will be the need for increased law enforcement	x.7
			OL-5	How will traffic affect safety, pedestrian and bike facilities	x.10
			OL-6	How will economic growth be studies	5.6, 5.7, x.6 and x.7
			OL-7	What specific impacts on human health and culture	x.12
			OL-8	What specific impacts on animal migration	x.3
			OL-9	What specific impacts on noise and light pollution	x.12
			OL-10	How will project effect Plympton's open space plan	x.7 and x.12
			OL-11	How will project effect regional groundwater supplies	5.2, 5.8, x.2 and x.8
			OL-12	How will waste management be impacted	x.8
			OL-13	What recourse will neighboring towns have	Issues such as this will be part of the Compact with the Commonwealth
ON	O'Neill	February 11, 2008	ON-1	Submitted copies of news articles	--
Or	Ortelt	March 25, 2008	Or-1	A drawback to the casino is air quality	x.11
			Or-2	A drawback to the casino is energy	x.8 and x.13
			Or-3	A drawback to the casino is noise pollution	x.12
			Or-4	A drawback to the casino is water quantity and quality	x.2
			Or-5	A drawback to the casino is wastewater	x.8

Table 5

				treatment and disposal	
			Or-6	A drawback to the casino is natural forests cut down	x.3
			Or-7	A drawback to the casino is wetlands affected	x.4
			Or-8	A drawback to the casino is increased traffic	x.10
			Or-9	A drawback to the casino is increase crime	x.7
			Or-10	A drawback to the casino is increased housing needs	x.6
Pa	Parker	April 2, 2008	Pa-1	Concern of wetlands	x.4
			Pa-2	Concern of tributary to Nemasket River	x.2
			Pa-3	Concern of endangered species	x.3
			Pa-4	Concern of water consumption	x.8
			Pa-5	Concern of wastewater discharge	x.8
			Pa-6	Concern of addiction and gambling	x.7
Pe	Perkins	March 24, 2008	Pe-1	Letter of support	--
Pin	Pina	April 2, 2008	Pin-1	Letter of support	--
Pit	Pittsley	April 3, 2008	Pit-1	School impact	x.7
			Pit-2	Impact on Nemasket	x.2 and x.3
			Pit-3	Amount of water consumption	x.8
PCC	Plympton Conservation Commission	March 31, 2008	PCC-1	Will EIS include survey of species	5.3
			PCC-2	Regional aquifer impacts	x.2 and x.8
			PCC-3	Water use	x.8
			PCC-4	How will project control invasive species	x.3 and x.4
			PCC-5	How will project impact health of wetland areas	x.4

Table 5

			PCC-6	How will regional water quality be affected	x.1 and x.2
			PCC-7	How will increased development pressure affect farming	x.9
			PCC-8	How will project affect authorities ability to plan	12.0 and 13.0
			PCC-9	What are risks of human illnesses	x.12
			PCC-10	Air quality issues	x.11
			PCC-11	How will casino affect micro climate	x.11
			PCC-12	Will EIS address landscape management practices for golf course	x.3 and x.4
			PCC-13	To what extent will the soil structure be impacted and what will vibration impacts be	x.1
PCOA	Plympton Council on Aging	April 9, 2008	PCOA-1	Concern on gambling addictions	x.7
			PCOA-2	Concern on water supply and aquifer effects	x.2 and x.8
			PCOA-3	Concern of increased crime	x.7
PBS1	Plympton Office of the Board of Selectman #1	undated	PBS1-1	Requesting “interested party” status	BIA does not have an “interested party” status. Commenter will be notified of issuance of public documents
PBS2	Plympton Office of the Board of Selectman #2	March 31, 2008	PBS2-1	What are regional effects	x.0

Table 5

			PBS2-2	Will there be a website established	No; this is not required under NEPA
			PBS2-3	What national studies will be used and analyses conducted, who will undertake the studies and how will their expertise be ensured?	x.0, 18.0
			PBS2-4	What is the public need for the project	2.0
			PBS2-5	Will the EIS use results from other casinos	x.6, x.7, x.8, x.10
			PBS2-6	Will EIS incorporate a study on the nature of the contract between the tribe and investors, how much each tribe member stands to make, what sort of funding will be used, and will there be background investigations?	The agreement between the Tribe and investors is subject to review by the National Indian Gaming Commission (NIGC) and not subject to NEPA review.
			PBS2-7	How will applicability of BIA oversight be determined given recent decision in <i>Carcieri v Kempthorne</i> ?	The Department has the right to take land into trust within the original 13 colonies, which is not subject to NEPA review.
			PBS2-8	Will the BIA publish rules for how persons contributing to study interact with outside entities?	The BIA follows the BIA NEPA Handbook guidelines in the preparation of NEPA documents including all studies, which is already

Table 5

					available to the public. Contractors are allowed to subcontract analyses, but all data is subject to BIA review and approval.
			PBS2-9	Will EIS describe trip generation info and provide all assumptions etc; travel times; seasonal traffic; wait time at intersections; study area; level of service; pedestrians; emergency evacuation	5.10 and x.10
			PBS2-10	Will the study look at greenhouse gas emissions	x.11
			PBS2-11	Will EIS look at estimated stress-related morbidity due to increased commuting times and effects on businesses; road rage, etc  There are a number of similar comments that are outside the normal scope of NEPA; these are not further marked	This is outside NEPA purview
			PBS2-12	Will EIS assess environmental impacts of new roads	x.0 and x.13
			PBS2-13	Will EIS evaluate noise increases	x.12
			PBS2-14	Will the study base its recommendations on the full build out	3.0
			PBS2-15	Will the EIS evaluate transportation options such as bus or light rail	x.10
			PBS2-16	Will the EIS address water quality and	x.2

Table 5

				quantity	
			PBS2-17	What will be the impact on air quality	x.12
			PBS2-18	What will be the impact of traffic and new roads be on wildlife migration and biodiversity	x.3
			PBS2-19	What will be the increased risk of spills	x.12
			PBS2-20	What will be the impacts on local and regional economics and taxation	x.6 and x.7 and 13.0
			PBS2-21	Will the EIS address social concerns including public services and schools	x.6 and x.7
			PBS2-22	What will be the impact on community character and quality of life	x.6, x.7, x.9 and x.12
			PBS2-23	What are the plans for sewage and solid waste disposal	x.8
			PBS2-24	What water usage is projected	x.8
			PBS2-25	Can the demand for power be met	x.8
			PBS2-26	How will housing needs be met	x.6
			PBS2-27	What will the scope of analysis be for lighting and visual impacts	x.12
			PBS2-28	How will air quality impacts be assessed	x.11
			PBS2-29	How will noise impacts be assessed	x.12
			PBS2-30	Will the EIS identify rare species	5.3 and x.3
			PBS2-31	Will the EIS describe fish and wildlife habitat and impacts	5.3 and x.3
			PBS2-32	What will be the impacts of non-source pollution in the Taunton River Watershed and impacts of new impervious area	5.2, x.2
			PBS2-33	What will be the impacts on vernal pools	5.3, 5.4, x.3 and x.4
			PBS2-34	What will be the effects of increased population	13.0

Table 5

			PBS2-35	What is the scope of the water quality analysis	5.2, x.2
			PBS2-36	How will casino be evaluated and monitored	1.0 and x.0
			PBS2-37	What impacts will tribal sovereignty have, what are the ties to Middleborough	1.0
			PBS2-38	How will trash be disposed	x.8
			PBS2-29	How will hazardous waste be handled	x.12
Pod	Podesta	undated	Pod-1	The amount of water needed to sustain growing population needs to be addressed	x.8
			Pod-2	Wastewater needs to be addressed	x.8
			Pod-3	Destruction of fields, woods and bogs needs to be addressed	x.3 and x.4
			Pod-4	Lighting needs to be addressed	x.12
			Pod-5	Traffic needs to be addressed	x.10
			Pod-6	Crime needs to be addressed	x.7
			Pod-7	Noise needs to be addressed	x.12
			Pod-8	Payment for police, fire, education and social needs must to be addressed	x.7
PowE	Powell, E.	undated	PowE-1	Concern over traffic	x.10
			PowE-2	Concern over pollution	x.2, x.11
			PowE-3	Concern over noise	x.12
PowJ1	Powell, J. #1	February 8, 2008	PowJ1-1	Comment on IGA process	N/A – agreement has been signed and this is a Town, not NEPA issue
PowJ2	Powell, J. #2	February 15, 2008	PowJ2-1	Comment on IGA process	N/A – agreement has been signed and this is a Town, not NEPA issue

Table 5

PowJ3	Powell, J. #3	February 15, 2008	PowJ3-1	Comment on IGA process	N/A – agreement has been signed and this is a Town, not NEPA issue
			PowJ3-2	A traffic study done last fall by the town should be thrown out	5.10 and x.10
			PowJ3-3	Proposed relocated train station	These impacts are not part of this project
PowJ4	Powell, J. #4	February 15, 2008	PowJ4-1	Concern on early IGA process	N/A – agreement has been signed and this is a Town, not NEPA issue
			PowJ4-2	Wastewater figures are erroneous	x.8
			PowJ4-3	Middleboro and surrounding communities share a single aquifer and casino consumption is greater than recharge	5.2, 5.8, x.2 and x.8
			PowJ4-4	Middleboro will lose control over water consumption and waste water discharge if land is put into trust	1.0 and x.8
			PowJ4-5	Nemasket River is a herring run	5.2, 5.3, x.2 and x.3
			PowJ4-6	Middleboro's storm drains discharge to the Nemasket	Fixes for Middleboro's town storm drain system is outside the scope of this EIS
PowJ5	Powell, J. #5	February 15, 2008	PowJ5-1	Concern over early IGA process	N/A – agreement has been signed and this is a Town, not NEPA issue
PowJ6	Powell, J. #6	March 16, 2008	PowJ6-1	Mashpee have no historic ties to	1.0

Table 5

				Middleborough	
			PowJ6-2	Portion of Middleboro land is MGL Ch 61A and that has been ignored	The proposed land to trust areas are not Section 61A lands
			PowJ6-3	Concern that land would no longer be subject to local or state control	1.0
			PowJ6-4	Aquifer is near recharge limit	5.2, 5.8, x.2 and x.8
			PowJ6-5	Water usage figures are vague and misleading	x.8
			PowJ6-6	No serious consideration offered to wastewater treatment and discharge	x.8
PowJ7	Powell, J. #7	March 16, 2008	PowJ7-1	No project plans exist	See DEIS figures
			PowJ7-2	Middleboro is on a significant aquifer abutting the Nemasket River	5.2
			PowJ7-3	Middleboro site is a sensitive ecosystem with the presence of rare, threatened and endangered species	5.3
			PowJ7-4	Major highway expansion is required	1.0, 5.10 and x.10
PowJ8	Powell, J. #8	April 6, 2008	PowJ8-1	Mashpee have no historic ties to Middleboro	1.0
			PowJ8-2	Concern on early IGA process	N/A – agreement has been signed and this is a Town, not NEPA issue
			PowJ8-3	Traffic counts should include weekends and holiday as well as secondary roads	5.10 and x.10
			PowJ8-4	Parking lots appear inadequate for the proposed 10,000 to 12,000 employees	3.0
			PowJ8-5	Air quality concerns	5.11 and x.11
			PowJ8-6	Emergency responders will be unable to	x.7

Table 5

				perform	
			PowJ8-7	School cost impacts	x.7
			PowJ8-8	On-site wells will threaten aquifer	x.8
			PowJ8-9	Plans require correction of overpasses and intersections ad should be resubmitted consistent with MHD	5.10 and x.10
QuM	Quish, M.	March 28, 2008	QuM-1	Letter of support	--
QuS	Qusih, S.	March 25, 2008	QuS-1	Letter of support	--
Ra	Ramsay	undated	Ra-1	Issues of air quality	x.11
			Ra-2	Issues of historical and cultural	5.5, 5.12, x.5 and x.12
			Ra-3	Issues of biota and threatened and endangered species	x.3
			Ra-4	Issues of construction, demolition, landscaping and reclamation	x.0
			Ra-5	Issues of crime potential, protection and prevention	x.7
			Ra-6	Issues of current, past and future cumulative impacts	x.0 and 12.0
			Ra-7	Issues of demographic trends	x.6 and x.7
			Ra-8	Issues of energy	x.8 and x.13
			Ra-9	Issues of resource uses and change	x.8
			Ra-10	Issues of fire potential, protection and prevention	x.7
			Ra-11	Issues of forests	x.3
			Ra-12	Issues of flood plain	x.2
			Ra-13	Issues of river, lake, wetland and riparian areas	x.2
			Ra-14	Issues of forestry	x.3 and x.9
			Ra-15	Issues of geology	x.1

Table 5

			Ra-16	Issues of seismic and mining	x.1
			Ra-17	Issues of health and safety, land use plans	x.12
			Ra-18	Issues of noise	x.12
			Ra-19	Issues of non hazardous waste	x.8
RTFCI	Regional Task Force on Casino Impacts	December 31, 2007	RTFCI-1	Requests to be an “interested party”	BIA does not have an “interested party” status. Commenter will be notified of issuance of public documents
RM	Residents of the Muttock	March 20, 2008	RM-1	Will the proposed casino affect the safety of abutters from increased traffic and crime	x.7 and x.10
			RM-2	Will the proposed casino entrance affect our physical and mental health through air pollution	x.11
			RM-3	How will the casino affect the Nemasket River herring	x.2 and x.3
			RM-4	Mashpee have no historic ties to Middleborough	1.0
RAC	Resort Advisory Committee	April 4, 2008	RAC-1	Describe operation of North/East Main Streets	x.10
			RAC-2	Will traffic models account for any planned future expansion	x.10
			RAC-3	How will stadium events be forecasted	x.10
			RAC-4	How will construction traffic be handled	x.10
			RAC-5	How will construction traffic access the site	x.10
			RAC-6	Who will maintain environmental mitigation	x.3 and 14.0

Table 5

			RAC-7	Will landscaping consist of native plants	x.3 and x.4
			RAC-8	How will rodents and other pests be dealt with	x.12
			RAC-9	Will part time jobs attract elderly who will require more services	x.6 and x.7
			RAC-10	What effect will casino have on local stores that sell lottery tickets and cigarettes	x.6
			RAC-11	Can we expect an influx of new pawn shops, check cashing facilities and massage parlors	x.6
			RAC-12	What effect will the facility have on local/regional inflation	x.6
			RAC-13	What means of public transportation are being considered	x.10
			RAC-14	To what extent will private bus service be used	x.10
			RAC-15	What effect will casino have on local farms, live stock and agriculture	x.9 and x.12
			RAC-16	How will access to Oliver Mill park and the Oliver House be affected	x.5 and x.10
			RAC-17	What actions will be taken to fulfill the promises made to Middleboro	These are part of the signed IGA
Re1	Reynolds, R. #1	March 31, 2008	Re1-1	How will effects to Plympton be assessed	x.2, x.3, x.5, x.6, x.10, x.11 and x.12
Re2	Reynolds, R. #2	April 3, 2008	Re2-1	The water table of the area will be exposed to pollutants	x.2
			Re2-2	What will happen to property values	x.6
Ri	Ricco	April 4, 2008	Ri-1	Public should be given another opportunity to address concerns after	1.0

Table 5

				plans are made	
			Ri-2	Area includes wetlands and forests that are home to listed species	x.3 and x.4
			Ri-3	Surrounding area will be subject to increased noise	x.12
			Ri-4	Surrounding area will be subject to increased light pollution	x.12
			Ri-5	Surrounding area will be subject to visual impacts	x.12
			Ri-6	Increase in traffic will put strain on roadways of Middleboro	x.10
			Ri-7	Initial reservation should be just in Mashpee	The BIA is obligated to respond to the Tribe's application as submitted and evaluate that according to pertinent statutes and regulations, which is part of the 25 CFR 151 review, and not the NEPA analysis.
			Ri-8	Casino will change character of area	x.9 and x.12
Ro	Royal	April 3, 2008	Ro-1	Casino will have detrimental effect on wetlands	x.4
			Ro-2	Casino will have detrimental effect on clean water supply	x.2
			Ro-3	Air pollution is an issue of concern	x.11
			Ro-4	Traffic is an issue of concern	x.10
			Ro-5	There will be significant impact on	x.3

Table 5

				threatened and endangered species	
Ru	Russell	March 27, 2008	Ru-1	Letter of support	--
Ry	Ryder	March 12, 2008	Ry-1	Letter of support	--
Sa	Sanford	undated	Sa-1	Casino's water demand will impact withdrawal and Carver supplies	x.2 and x.8
Sc	Schulze	undated	Sc-1	What national studies will be used	5.0, x.0 and 16.0
			Sc-2	Will the nature of Tribe's funding be made public	The agreement between Tribes and financial backers are subject to NIGC review and not NEPA
			Sc-3	Will the background of the investors be considered	The agreement between Tribes and financial backers are subject to NIGC review and not NEPA
			Sc-4	Will affordable housing needs be addressed	x.6
			Sc-5	Will EIS determine demand on water supply in future	x.8, 12.0 and 13.0
			Sc-6	Will EIS determine impacts on Plympton's well water quality taking into account increased traffic and pollution	Well water depression must be calculated as part of the impact analysis if there are onsite wells, and the impact determined, if the projected depression extends beyond the Tribal property

Table 5

					border. Impact on Plympton will be calculated only if the well depression extends into Plympton. Well water impacts due to traffic and pollution are subject to too much error to be considered reasonable to accurately calculate.
			Sc-7	Will the study indicate the differences between state local and federal regulations	1.0
			Sc-8	Will population shifts increase needs for town services and schools	x.7
			Sc-9	Will EIS address impacts on open space and recreation	x.9 and x.12
			Sc-10	Will EIS address historic preservation	x.5
			Sc-11	Will EIS address traffic levels and congestion	x.10
			Sc-12	Will EIS consider social impacts	x.5 and x.6
			Sc-13	Will EIS consider impacts to farming	x.9
ShC	Shea, C.	April 5, 2008	ShC-1	Concern on early IGA process	N/A – agreement has been signed and this is a Town, not NEPA issue
			ShC-2	I'd like to have known limits to what is proposed	3.0
ShK1	Shea, K. #1	March 17, 2008	ShK1-1	Requests another hearing	1.0

Table 5

			ShK1-2	There could be significant impacts to communities along Route 44	x.10
			ShK1-3	Concern of Route 44 east of Route 105	5.10 and x.10
			ShK1-4	Casino will double traffic on Route 44	5.10 and x.10
			ShK1-5	Casino traffic on secondary roads will have safety impacts	x.10
			ShK1-6	Route 44 is an emergency evacuation route	5.10 and x.10
			ShK1-7	Large increases in traffic on secondary roads will increase pollution	x.10
ShK2	Shea, K. #2	April 8, 2008	ShK2-1	Mashpee do not have historic ties to Middleboro	1.0
			ShK2-2	Need opportunity to review detailed plans	x.0
			ShK2-3	What are future plans and phases or land acquisitions	3.0
			ShK2-4	How many wells will be drilled onsite and how will they be regulated	3.0, x.2 and x.8
			ShK2-5	How many wetlands will be destroyed	x.4
			ShK2-6	How much stormwater will there be and how impervious are affect recharge	x.2
			ShK2-7	Will land need to be taken for roadway improvements	x.10
			ShK2-8	How many vehicles will there be	x.10
			ShK2-9	What will impacts on air quality be	x.11
			ShK2-10	How will hazardous materials be handled	x.12
			ShK2-11	What are evacuation plans	x.10
			ShK2-12	How will trash be disposed	x.8
			ShK2-13	Concerns on threatened habitat and especially box turtle	5.3 and x.3
			ShK2-14	Detail where wetlands are	5.4

Table 5

			ShK2-15	Effects of light pollution	x.12
			ShK2-16	How much energy will be needed	x.8
ShL	Shea, L	April 5, 2008	ShL-1	Casino will change country feel	x.9 and x.12
			ShL-2	Will have negative effect on noise	x.12
Si1	Silva #1	undated	Si1-1	Letter of support	--
Si2	Silva #2	March 20, 2008	Si2-1	Letter of support	--
Sma	Small	undated	Sma-1	BIA does not have authority to establish reservation in original 13 colonies	The First Circuit Court of Appeals has upheld the ability of the Department to take lands in trust within the original 13 colonies.
SmiD	Smith, D.	undated	SmiD-1	Concerns on adequacy of IGA	N/A – agreement has been signed and this is a Town, not NEPA issue
			SmiD-2	Effects on water supply	x.8
			SmiD-3	Treatment and dumping of wastewater	x.8
			SmiD-4	Quality of life	x.6, x.7, x.9 and x.12
			SmiD-5	Lighting and visual impacts	x.12
SmiR	Smith, R.	April 4, 2008	SmiR-1	Effects on water supply	x.8
Sol	Solimini	undated	Sol-1	What will the air quality impacts be?	x.11
SouM	Sousa, M.	March 24, 2008	SouM-1	Letter of support	--
SouW	Sousa, W.	March 24, 2008	SouW-1	Letter of support	--
SRPEDD	Southeastern Regional Planning and Economic Development	March 26, 2008	SRPEDD-1	Surrounding cities and towns must be included in revenue sharing	Issues such as this will be part of the Compact with the Commonwealth

Table 5

	District				
			SRPEDD-2	Estimates must be verified with further traffic studies	x.10
			SRPEDD-3	Describe proposed funding for Route 44 improvements	Tribal contributions for road costs are subject to local agreements and the Tribal-State compact. While the analysis must include the traffic counts and potential impacts from the casino operation on the roads, any Tribal contribution for road costs is subject to negotiation beyond the scope of this NEPA document.
			SRPEDD-4	Traffic study area and background projects	x.10
			SRPEDD-5	Tribe should comply with all Massachusetts and local bylaws and regulations	See response to Comment He-10. Subjecting tribal property to State laws is contrary to the law within 25 USC 465 and contrary to congressionally required support of

Table 5

					tribal self-determination. This will not be analyzed.
			SRPEDD-6	Effects on local/regional water supply	x.2 and x.8
			SRPEDD-7	Impact on Taunton River from wastewater discharge	x.8
			SRPEDD-8	Solid waste disposal	x.8
			SRPEDD-9	Energy demand and ability of grid to provide it	x.8
			SRPEDD-10	Contribute to public safety costs in region	Issues such as this will be part of the Compact with the Commonwealth
			SRPEDD-11	Impact on public transportation	x.10
			SRPEDD-12	Impact on regional housing stock	x.6
			SRPEDD-13	School impacts in region	x.7
			SRPEDD-14	Economic impacts; local businesses; property value assessment etc	x.6
			SRPEDD-15	Impacts associated with social costs	x.6 and x.7
Sta	Standfeld	March 30, 2008	Sta-1	Concerns of aquifer impacts	x.2 and x.8
			Sta-2	Traffic safety on Route 44, including evacuation route	x.10
			Sta-3	Concern of economic impact and community services	x.6 and x.7
Ste1	Stevens #1	March 28, 2008	Ste1-1	Middleborough's treatment plant needs to consider nitrogen-related issues	5..8 and x.8
			Ste1-2	Middleborough's treatment plant is not capable of treating water for re-use	5.8 and x.8
Ste2	Stevens #2	March 31, 2008	Ste2-1	Comment letter lists casino concerns, as summarized below	x.11

Table 5

				Air quality	
			Ste2-2	Archaeology, historical and cultural	x.5
			Ste2-3	Biota and threatened and endangered species	x.3
			Ste2-4	Coastal zone issues	N/A – site is not in a coastal zone
			Ste2-5	Construction, demolition, landscaping and reclamation	x.0
			Ste2-6	Crime potential, protection and prevention	x.6 and x.7
			Ste2-7	Current, post and future cumulative impacts	x.6, x.7, x.10, x.11, x.12 and 12.0
			Ste2-8	Demographic trends	5.6 and x.6
			Ste2-9	Energy resource uses and changes	5.8, x.8 and x.13
			Ste2-10	Fire potential, protection and prevention	5.7 and x.7
			Ste2-11	Floodplain, river, lake, wetland and riparian areas	5.2, 5.3, 5.4, x.2, x.3 and x.4
			Ste2-12	Forests, forestry resources and logging	5.3, 5.9, x.3 and x.9
			Ste2-13	Geology, seismic and mining	5.1, 5.9, x.1 and x.9
			Ste2-14	Hazardous substances and wastes	x.12
			Ste2-15	Health and safety	x.12
			Ste2-16	Indian religious issues	4.0, x.5
			Ste2-17	Land use plans	5.9 and x.9
			Ste2-18	Noise	x.12
			Ste2-19	Socioeconomic issues	x.6
			Ste2-20	Non hazardous waste	x.8
			Ste2-21	Paleontological resources	x.5
			Ste2-22	Prime and unique farmlands	5.1,
			Ste2-23	Protected, sensitive and special management areas	x.9 and x.12

Table 5

			Ste2-24	Rangeland, range resources and range activities	NA
			Ste2-25	Recreation/subsistence hunting, fishing, gathering	x.9
			Ste2-26	Releases	5.12 and x.12
			Ste2-27	Stormwater discharges	5.1, 5.2, x.1 and x.2,
			Ste2-28	Utilities issues and changes	5.8 and x.8
			Ste2-29	Vehicular and pedestrian traffic issues and changes	x.10
			Ste2-30	Vital resources (light pollution, views, aesthetics)	x.12
			Ste2-31	Wastewater treatment and discharge	x.8
			Ste2-32	Water quality	x.2
			Ste2-33	Water quantities	x.2
			Ste2-34	Alternatives site analysis	3.0; see comment CommMA-6
			Ste2-35	Local self determination	See comment SRPEDD-5
Sto	Stone	March 15, 2008	Sto-1	Mashpee do not have historic ties to Middleboro	1.0
			Sto-2	Comment on early IG process	N/A – agreement has been signed and this is a Town, not NEPA issue
			Sto-3	Local businesses will suffer	x.6
			Sto-4	Employees will require low income housing and schooling	x.6 and x.7
SvJef1	Svirtunas, Jeffrey #1	undated	SvJef1-1	Mashpee have no historic ties to Middleboro	1.0
			SvJef1-2	Concern on early IGA process	N/A – agreement has

Table 5

					been signed and this is a Town, not NEPA issue
SvJef2	Svirtunas, Jeffrey #2	undated	SvJef2-1	Casino will kill the fragile ecosystem including rivers and streams, vernal pools, wildlife habitat and human health	x.2, x.3 and x.4
			SvJef2-2	Casino will impact the eastern box turtle	5.3 and x.3
			SvJef2-3	Casino runoff will impact Nemasket River	5.2, x.2
SvJen	Svirtunas, Jennifer	undated	SvJen-1	Site is home to threatened and endangered species	5.3 and x.3
			SvJen-2	Concern on early IGA process	N/A – agreement has been signed and this is a Town, not NEPA issue
Swa	Swanson	March 20, 2008	Swa-1	Letter of support	--
SweL	Sweet, L.	April 2, 2008	SweL-1	Mashpee have no historic ties to Middleboro	1.0
			SweL-2	Factors such as trash removal, water usage, crime proliferation and infrastructure impacts have not been identified	x.6, x.7 and x.8
SweS	Sweet, S.	April 2, 2008	SweS-1	See SweL-1 and SweL-2	--
TR	Taunton River	April 8, 2008	TR-1	Provide detailed plans	3.0 and figures
			TR-2	Delineate wetlands	5.4
			TR-3	Provide USAD soil analysis	5.1
			TR-4	On-site biological studies	5.3
			TR-5	Demand for potable and non-potable water supply	x.8
			TR-6	Stormwater volumes to be generated; discharges and management	x.2

Table 5

			TR-7	Wastewater volume to be generated; discharge; re-use	x.8
			TR-8	Traffic increases	x.10
			TR-9	Induced growth effects	13.0
			TR-10	LID and LEED standards	x.13
			TR-11	Impacts of discharges on Nemasket River	x.2
			TR-12	Impacts of removal of vegetation from Nemasket buffer	x.3
			TR-13	Impacts of altering groundwater	x.2
			TR-14	Wetland alterations and mitigation	x.4
			TR-15	Alternatives analysis	3.0, x.0
			TR-16	Wildlife habitat and federally listed species details	5.3 and x.3
			TR-17	Impacts to Middleboro water supply; water conservation	5.8 and x.8
			TR-18	Describe modifications to treatment plant	x.8
			TR-19	Analysis of combined impacts of loss on groundwater	x.2 and 8.2
			TR-20	Impacts on off-site wetlands	x.4
			TR-21	Greenhouse gas emissions	x.11
			TR-22	Construction impacts	x.0
			TR-23	Cumulative impacts	x.10, x.11, x.12 and 12.0
To1	Tolosko #1	March 23, 2008	To1-1	Casino will destroy cultural history of Muttock area; Oliver Mill	x.5 and x.12
			To1-2	Traffic safety and capacity	x.10
			To1-3	Traffic noise and pollution	x.12
			To1-4	Social impacts	x.6 and x.7
			To1-5	Aquifer is not adequate to provide water supply	x.8

Table 5

To2	Tolosko #2	March 23, 2008	To2-1	Mashpee have no historic ties to Middleboro	1.0
To3	Tolosko #3	March 28, 2008	To3-1	Stormwater must be addressed	x.2
			To3-2	Mosquitos will breed in detention basins	x.2
To4	Tolosko #4	undated	To4-1	Roadway capacity and safety	x.10
Tr	Traynor	March 31, 2008	Tr-1	Concerns on historic preservation	x.5 and x.12
Tu	Tufts	April 2, 2008	Tu-1	Concerned about traffic impacts on local roads; safety; public transportation	x.10
			Tu-2	Effects on Bridgewater services	x.7
			Tu-3	Air quality impacts in Bridgewater	x.11
			Tu-4	Social issues	x.6 and x.7
			Tu-5	Employment	x.6
			Tu-6	Effects on Bridgewater water supply	x.8
			Tu-7	Effects on cultural resources (cemetery; Oliver Mill)	x.5 and x.12
			Tu-8	Mashpee have no historical ties to Middleboro	1.0
			Tu-9	See no need for tribe to build casino	2.0
Un	Unsigned	March 31, 2008	Un-1	Letter of support	--
Wa	Walsh	April 1, 2008	Wa-1	Effects on town character	x.9
			Wa-2	School impacts	x.7
			Wa-3	People are concerned about traffic impacts on local roads	x.10
			Wa-4	The real estate market will go down	x.6
We	West	April 2, 2008	We-1	What will be effects on aquifer in Plympton	x.2 and x.8
			We-2	How much sewage will flow from the site	x.8
			We-3	What are the impacts on school services	x.7
			We-4	What will effects be on Plympton town services and funding	x.7

Table 5

			We-5	How will EIS determine impacts of population increases	13.0
			We-6	How many vehicle trips will be generated	x.10
			We-7	What will the effects of increased traffic be on cultural sites	x.5 and x.12
			We-8	What will effects be on crime	x.7
			We-9	What are effects on local businesses	x.6
Yon	Yon	April 3, 2008	Yon-1	What will effects be on Plympton water supply	x.2 and x.8
			Yon-2	What will lighting effects be	x.12
			Yon-3	What will traffic impacts be on Plympton	x.10
			Yon-4	Plympton will lose its rural benefit from growth	13.0
You1	Young #1	undated	You1-1	Comment on IGA process	N/A – agreement has been signed and this is a Town, not NEPA issue
			You1-2	Mashpee have no historic ties to Middleboro	1.0
You2	Young #2	undated	You2-1	Traffic issues; improvements required; traffic volumes; safety; construction; maintenance; delivery hours; emergency vehicles	x.10
			You2-2	What are aquifer effects and will there be onsite wells	5.2, 5.8, x.2 and x.8
			You2-3	How will stormwater be handled	x.2
			You2-4	How and where will wastewater be treated	x.8
			You2-5	What would be done to protect wetlands	x.4
			You2-6	Will nuisance animals be affected	x.3
			You2-7	How would trash be disposed	x.8

Table 5

			You2-8	How would protected species be affected	x.3
			You2-9	How would aquatic life be impacted	x.3 and x.4
			You2-10	Would traffic increase pollution	x.10, x.11 and x.12
			You2-11	How would light pollution be affected	x.12
			You2-12	How would town seek new commercial growth; what areas are suitable for development; has the town begun comprehensive review of zoning; how would we address negative business	These are Town issues
			You2-13	How would casino affect local business	x.6
			You2-14	What types of housing would be created	x.6
			You2-15	How do new developments impact town services	12.0
			You2-16	How would schools be affected	x.7
			You2-17	How account for other developments	12.0
			You2-18	What are town's plans for social services and what are impacts	x.7
			You2-19	Comment on issues with IGA	N/A – agreement has been signed and this is a Town, not NEPA issue
			You2-20	Are future plans addressed	3.0
			You2-21	What happens to the site of no gambling is allowed and what are the tribe's other options on the site	3.0
You3	Young #3	undated	You3-1	Article on red bellied cooter	5.3
You4	Young #4	undated	You4-1	Mashpee have no historic ties to Middleboro	1.0
You5	Young #5	undated	You5-1	Refers to Resort Advisory Committee draft list; see comments RAC-1 thru -17	--

