Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Environmental Affairs ■ MEPA Office

ENF Environmental Notification Form

For Office Use Only
Executive Office of Environmental Affairs
EOEA No.: 14257
MEPA Analyst: Briony Angus
Phone: 617-626- 1029

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: **Camp Eisner Pond Dredging**		
Street: **Brookside Drive**		
Municipality: **Great Barrington**	Watershed: **Housatonic River**	
Universal Tranverse Mercator Coordinates: Northing: **4670672** Easting: **635905**	Latitude: **42.176527** Longitude: **(-73.354065)**	
Estimated commencement date: **Fall 2008**	Estimated completion date: **Fall 2009**	
Approximate cost: **$200,000**	Status of project design: **75** %complete	
Proponent: **The Camp Institute for Living Judaism**		
Street: **Brookside Drive**		
Municipality: **Great Barrington**	State: **MA**	Zip Code: **01230**
Name of Contact Person From Whom Copies of this ENF May Be Obtained: **Michael S. Kulig**		
Firm/Agency: **Berkshire Engineering, Inc.**	Street: **157 Columbia Street**	
Municipality: **Lee**	State: **MA**	Zip Code: **01238**
Phone: **(413)243-3780**	Fax: **(413)243-3784**	E-mail: **mkulig@berkshireengineering.com**

Does this project meet or exceed a mandatory EIR threshold (see 301 CMR 11.03)?
☐ Yes **X** No

Has this project been filed with MEPA before?
☐ Yes (EOEA No._____) **X** No

Has any project on this site been filed with MEPA before?
☐ Yes (EOEA No._____) **X** 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 301CMR 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): N/A

Are you requesting coordinated review with any other federal, state, regional, or local agency?
X No

List Local or Federal Permits and Approvals: NPDES, 401 WQC, 404 Dredging Permit, MESA, Order of Conditions

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

- ☐ Land
- ☐ Water
- ☐ Energy
- ☐ ACEC
- ☒ Rare Species
- ☐ Wastewater
- ☐ Air
- ☐ Regulations
- ☒ Wetlands, Waterways, & Tidelands
- ☐ Transportation
- ☐ Solid & Hazardous Waste
- ☐ Historical & Archaeological Resources

Summary of Project Size & Environmental Impacts	Existing	Change	Total
LAND			
Total site acreage	252 AC +/-		
New acres of land altered		2.77 AC	
Acres of impervious area	0.038 AC	-0-	0.038 AC
Square feet of new bordering vegetated wetlands alteration		-0-	
Square feet of new other wetland alteration		184,584 SF (Dredging)	
Acres of new non-water dependent use of tidelands or waterways		-0-	
STRUCTURES			
Gross square footage			
Number of housing units			
Maximum height (in feet)			
TRANSPORTATION			
Vehicle trips per day	0	+/- 50 (temp.)	+/- 50(temp.)
Parking spaces	0	0	0
WATER/WASTEWATER			
Gallons/day (GPD) of water use			
GPD water withdrawal			
GPD wastewater generation/ treatment			
Length of water/sewer mains (in miles)			

State Permits & Approvals

- ☒ Order of Conditions
- ☐ Superseding Order of Conditions
- ☐ Chapter 91 License
- ☒ 401 Water Quality Certification
- ☐ MHD or MDC Access Permit
- ☐ Water Management Act Permit
- ☐ New Source Approval
- ☐ DEP or MWRA Sewer Connection/ Extension Permit
- ☒ Other Permits (*including Legislative Approvals*) – Specify: **MESA, NPDES, ACOE**

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 (**Estimated & Priority Habitat**) ☐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, **Pending Determination**

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.*)

(a) Project Site-Camp Eisner Pond is a man made impoundment formed by an earthen dam across Roaring Brook and is located entirely within the Camp Institute for Living Judaism's (CILJ) 297 AC parcel in Great Barrington, MA. (Figure 1-Vicinity Map) The pond water surface is approximately 3.3 AC in its existing state and is surrounded by miscellaneous camp buildings, open space, and associated utilities including an access road encompassing approximately one-half the circumference of the pond. The campus is used as a recreational camp for youth during summer months. The purpose of the pond is for fire protection and recreational use in association with camp activities and includes swimming, non-motorized boating and fishing. The CILJ maintains a small beach on the western edge of the pond and a large platform/dock structure on the eastern edge. There is also a gazebo structure located in the pond that may be accessed by "water only" means. Roaring Brook, a perennial stream, and an unnamed intermittent stream direct stormwater run off and base flows into the pond. The drainage has been calculated using the USGS "Stream Stats" program to be 1.95 square miles and is comprised of primarily undeveloped steeply sloping topography with relatively erosive soils. Storm events, providing flashy hydrologic conditions along the streams, have resulted in significant sediment transport and deposition over the approximately 70 year history of the pond. Historic information and field recovered data indieate that, due to the lack of maintenance dredging, the pond has lost approximately 2 to 4 FT in water depth and approximately 60,400 SF of Land Under Water has reverted to Bordering Vegetated Wetland and very shallow land under water. The applicant proposes to remove siltation from the pond in an effort to restore water depth and restore the pond's free surface to its' origimal 4.24 AC.

(b) Alternatives-The proposed dredging of Camp Eisner Pond is specific to the site. The on-site alternatives are limit to the following: 1) No Action 2) Hydraulically Dredge 3) Conventional Dry Dredge 4) Combination Dry and Hydraulic Dredge

The No Dredge Alternative would result in a long term impact of loss the pond as both a wetlands resouree area as well as a recreational water body.

The Hydraulic Dredge Method presents short term impacts to pond aquatic wildlife and turbidity to the pond water column and potential loss of wildlife species. This method alone is not sufficient to achieve the project purpose as existing water level located along southern portions of the pond are too shallow for the hydraulic dredge equipment to work effectively.

The Conventional Dry Dredge method presents both short term and potential long term impacts. Extended exposure of the pond bottom can impact shore line vegetation and land under water including areas of Bordering Vegetated Wetland and wildlife habitat. Downstream sedimentation may occur if proper methods are not incorporated during maintenance dredging activities.

A combination of dry and hydraulic dredge includes impacts as described above individually for each method. The hydraulic dredge method could be used in areas where elevations allow and the magnitude of impacts as described for solely using a dry dredge method would be deereased by combining both methods to achieve the project purpose.

(c) Mitigation Measures-Impacts of hydraulic dredging on the pond's aquatic wildlife would be largely mitigated naturally.

Many wildlife species are capable of avoiding the activity and it's impacts and may only be displaced temporarily. An unavoidable loss of benthic organisms would be anticipated. Turbidity generated by the cutterhead is typically minimized by the suction created by the pump line attached to the dredge that immediately removes the sediments once they are dislodged from the pond bottom. The dredged material will be pumped to a dewatering facility on shore which will be composed of grit chambers and sediment slurry conditioning followed by either geotexitile fabric tubes (geotubes) or belt filter presses for final dewatering. Dewatered sediments will be properly reused or disposed of in accordance with the pending 401 Water Quality Certification approval. This process provides for a rapid and effective separation of material from the water. A polymer flocculent, similar to those used in the drinking water treatment process, is introduced which will capture the fine-grain suspended particles. Clarified water will be monitored carefully for turbidity before it is eventually discharged to Roaring Brook.

Impacts of conventional dry dredging can be difficult to mitigate. Water fowl would have the ability to relocate during the drawdown and some fish species have the ability to migrate up or downstream during dry dredge efforts. There would likely be unavoidable fish kills under this scenario. Affects of the drawdown on benthic organisms and fringing wetlands are unavoidable, although similar dredging efforts have not reportedly permanently impacted these resources. The release of sediments upon initial opening of the low level outlet in the dam would be expected to be insignificant however once the pond is drained the flow of the stream through the exposed pond bottom area would result in significant downstream sedimentation. Culvert piping the stream(s) flow would help to mitigate downstream sedimentation.

A combination of hydraulic and dry dredge would serve to meet the project purpose while minimizing environmental impacts to the ecosystem. The project could be phased such that during the first dredging season a dry dredge of the southern shoreline area could be completed. Water levels could be reduced to expose approximately 1.3 AC of existing shallow land under water leaving a 2.0 AC pond for use by waterfowl species and also leaving an undisturbed stock of organisms which would repopulate the pond after dry dredging. Sand bagging, filter fabric and piping the incoming and outgoing streams during the dry dredge would reduce the potential for downstream sedimentation. The second phase of dredging could be completed during a second season using a hydraulic dredge to help minimize overall impacts of dredging the entire pond. Again organisms and fish species could escape dredging into areas previously dry dredged and have the ability to replenish populations within the entire pond upon completion of the work.