

ENF Environmental Notification Form

For Office Use Only
Executive Office of Environmental Affairs
 EOE No.: 13050
 MEPA Analyst: Deirdre Buckley
 Phone: 617-626-1044

The information requested on this form must be completed to begin MEPA Review in accordance with the provisions of the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act, 301 CMR 11.00.

Project Name: Coastal Bank Restoration and Protection		
Street: Sconset Bluff (65, 67, 69, and 71 Baxter Road)		
Municipality: Nantucket	Watershed: Islands	
Universal Transverse Mercator Coordinates:	Latitude: 41:16:0.887N Longitude: 69:57:47.192W	
Estimated commencement date: Sept. '03	Estimated completion date: Sept. '03	
Approximate cost: \$75,000	Status of project design: 100 %complete	
Proponent: Stephen Meister		
Street: 708 Third Avenue, 24 th Floor		
Municipality: New York	State: NY	Zip Code: 10017
Name of Contact Person From Whom Copies of this ENF May Be Obtained: Christina Gill		
Firm/Agency: Ocean and Coastal Consultants	Street: 36 Cordage Park Circle, Suite 217	
Municipality: Plymouth	State: MA	Zip Code: 02360
Phone: 508-830-1110	Fax: 508-830-1202	E-mail: cgill@ocean-coastal.com

- Does this project meet or exceed a mandatory EIR threshold (see 301 CMR 11.03)?
 Yes No
- Has this project been filed with MEPA before?
 Yes (EOEA No. _____) No
- Has any project on this site been filed with MEPA before?
 Yes (EOEA No. _____) No
- Is this an Expanded ENF (see 301 CMR 11.05(7)) requesting:
- a Single EIR? (see 301 CMR 11.06(8)) Yes No
 - a Special Review Procedure? (see 301 CMR 11.09) Yes No
 - a Waiver of mandatory EIR? (see 301 CMR 11.11) Yes No
 - a Phase I Waiver? (see 301 CMR 11.11) Yes No

Identify any financial assistance or land transfer from an agency of the Commonwealth, including the agency name and the amount of funding or land area (in acres): NA

Are you requesting coordinated review with any other federal, state, regional, or local agency?
 Yes (Specify _____) No

List Local or Federal Permits and Approvals:
Nantucket Conservation Commission, Order of Conditions

Which ENF or EIR review threshold(s) does the project meet or exceed (see 301 CMR 11.03):

- | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land | <input type="checkbox"/> Rare Species | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wetlands, Waterways, & Tidelands |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Water | <input type="checkbox"/> Wastewater | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Energy | <input type="checkbox"/> Air | <input type="checkbox"/> Solid & Hazardous Waste |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ACEC | <input type="checkbox"/> Regulations | <input type="checkbox"/> Historical & Archaeological Resources |

Summary of Project Size & Environmental Impacts	Existing	Change	Total	State Permits & Approvals
LAND				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Order of Conditions <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Superseding Order of Conditions <input type="checkbox"/> Chapter 91 License <input type="checkbox"/> 401 Water Quality Certification <input type="checkbox"/> MHD or MDC Access Permit <input type="checkbox"/> Water Management Act Permit <input type="checkbox"/> New Source Approval <input type="checkbox"/> DEP or MWRA Sewer Connection/ Extension Permit <input type="checkbox"/> Other Permits <i>(including Legislative Approvals) – Specify:</i>
Total site acreage	5.5			
New acres of land altered		0		
Acres of impervious area	NA	NA	NA	
Square feet of new bordering vegetated wetlands alteration		NA		
Square feet of new other wetland alteration		13,200		
Acres of new non-water dependent use of tidelands or waterways		NA		
STRUCTURES				
Gross square footage	20,500	0	20,500	
Number of housing units	6	0	6	
Maximum height (in feet)	35	0	35	
TRANSPORTATION				
Vehicle trips per day	NA			
Parking spaces	NA			
WATER/WASTEWATER				
Gallons/day (GPD) of water use	NA			
GPD water withdrawal	NA			
GPD wastewater generation/ treatment	NA			
Length of water/sewer mains (in miles)	NA			

CONSERVATION LAND: Will the project involve the conversion of public parkland or other Article 97 public natural resources to any purpose not in accordance with Article 97?

- Yes (Specify _____) No

Will it involve the release of any conservation restriction, preservation restriction, agricultural preservation restriction, or watershed preservation restriction?

- Yes (Specify _____) No

RARE SPECIES: Does the project site include Estimated Habitat of Rare Species, Vernal Pools, Priority Sites of Rare Species, or Exemplary Natural Communities?

Yes (Specify Estimated Habitat of Rare Species) No

HISTORICAL /ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Does the project site include any structure, site or district listed in the State Register of Historic Place or the inventory of Historic and Archaeological Assets of the Commonwealth?

Yes (Specify _____) No

If yes, does the project involve any demolition or destruction of any listed or inventoried historic or archaeological resources?

Yes (Specify _____) No

AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN: Is the project in or adjacent to an Area of Critical Environmental Concern?

Yes (Specify _____) No

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project description should include (a) a description of the project site, (b) a description of both on-site and off-site alternatives and the impacts associated with each alternative, and (c) potential on-site and off-site mitigation measures for each alternative (*You may attach one additional page, if necessary.*)

The site for this coastal bank restoration and protection project is located along the southeast shoreline of Nantucket in Siasconset. Six dwellings lie within the buffer zone to an eroding coastal bank having a top elevation of 80' +/- MSL. Once protected by a low, vegetated coastal dune, the coastal bank has steepened and lost substantial areas of vegetation to this year's winter storms. The steep, devegetated scarp ranges from 60 feet in height at the north end of the project site to three feet in height at the south end. Without a project to restore and protect the coastal bank, the existing dwellings will be subject to future collapse.

The proposed project is a low cost combination of a single zig-zag row of a sturdy sand fence (Duneguard) and the stacking of coir logs covered with sand and vegetated with grasses and shrubs for a length of 660 feet. Mitigation of any adverse effects documented during monitoring and immediate cleanup of damaged and destroyed sections of fencing are conditions imposed by the Conservation Commission and accepted by the applicant.

Onsite alternatives are limited to the no build, and variations of soft-engineering and hard-engineering solutions. Large-scale filling, terracing and re-vegetation would extend the toe of the bank too far seaward to be successful. Terracing and revegetating the existing grades would relocate the top of the bank too far landward and threaten the existing dwellings. Large-scale beach nourishment would be ineffective and costly over the long-term. A stone revetment, geotubes or other toe reinforcement structures may obstruct the sediment being supplied to adjacent coastal beaches and dunes. A groin or series of groins may interfere with longshore sediment transport and adversely effect downdrift properties. The only offshore alternative that would address the restoration and protection of this section of coastal bank would be some form of an offshore breakwater that could impact offshore bottom topography and benthic habitat.

Potential mitigation of the impacts from the hard-engineering alternatives is the primary concern. This would be some form of beach nourishment which, even as a stand alone project, was ruled out.