Commonwealth of Massachusetts Executive Office of Environmental Affairs ■ MEPA Office



Environmental Notification Form

For Office Use Only				
Executive Office of Environmental Affairs				
EOEA No.: /3938 MEPA Analyst/fo//g John.som Phone: 617-626-/023				

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: A proposed parking lot, 100 Brookdale Drive, Springfield, MA							
Street: Brookdale Drive							
Municipality: Springfield	Watershed: Chicopee River						
Universal Tranverse Mercator Coordinates:	Latitude: 42°-08'-40"						
	Longitude: 72°	-31'51"					
Estimated commencement date: March 200							
Approximate cost: ₫ 600,000	Status of project	Status of project design: 100 %complete					
Proponent: Berkshire Development LLC							
Street: 41 Taylor Street		_					
Municipality: Springfield	State: MA	Zip Code:	01103				
Name of Contact Person From Whom Copies of this ENF May Be Obtained: Peter Levesque							
Firm/Agency: Pioneer Environmental, Inc.		Street: 25 Granby Street					
Municipality: East Longmeadow	State: MA	Zip Code:	01028				
Phone: (413) 731-9898 Fax: (4	113) 731-8686	E-mail:					
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?							
Is this an Expanded ENF (see 301 CMR 11.05(7)) requesting: a Single EIR? (see 301 CMR 11.06(8)) a Special Review Procedure? (see 301 CMR 11.09) a Waiver of mandatory EIR? (see 301 CMR 11.11) Tyes 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):							
Are you requesting coordinated review with any other federal, state, regional, or local agency? Xero Xero							
List Local or Federal Permits and Approvals: <u>Corp. of Engineers, Springfield Conservation</u> Commission, Springfield Department of Public Works							

Which ENF or EIR review threshold(s) does the project meet or exceed (see 301 CMR 11.03):							
☐ Land ☐ Water ☐ Energy ☐ ACEC	☐ Rare Speci ☐ Wastewate ☐ Air ☐ Regulation	ır 📋	Transportat Solid & Haz	Vaterways, & Tidelands ion ardous Waste Archaeological			
Summary of Project Size	Existing	Change	Total	State Permits &			
& Environmental Impacts				Approvals			
	LAND			Order of Conditions			
Total site acreage	2.9			Superseding Order of Conditions			
New acres of land altered		2.4		☐ Chapter 91 License			
Acres of impervious area	0	1.83	1.83	☐ 401 Water Quality Certification			
Square feet of new bordering vegetated wetlands alteration		32,600		MHD or MDC Access Permit			
Square feet of new other wetland alteration		0		☐ Water Management Act Permit			
Acres of new non-water dependent use of tidelands or waterways		0		New SourceApprovalDEP or MWRASewer Connection/			
STRI	UCTURES			Extension Permit			
Gross square footage				☐ Other Permits			
Number of housing units				(including Legislative Approvals) — Specify:			
Maximum height (in feet)				, ,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,,			
TRANS	PORTATION		,				
Vehicle trips per day	0	725	725				
Parking spaces	0	260	260				
WATER/V	VASTEWATER	2					
Gallons/day (GPD) of water use			_				
GPD water withdrawal	<u> </u>						
GPD wastewater generation/ treatment							
Length of water/sewer mains (in miles)							
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?							

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)	⊠No
HISTORICAL /ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Does	the proj	ect site include any structure, site or district
listed in the State Register of Historic Place or the invento		
Commonwealth?		•
)	⊠No
If yes, does the project involve any demolition or destruction archaeological resources?	on of any	y listed or inventoried historic or
☐Yes (Specify)	□No
AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN: Is	the proj	ect in or adjacent to an Area of Critical
Environmental Concern?		
☐Yes (Specify)	⊠No

<u>PROJECT DESCRIPTION</u>: 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.) The project site is an existing wet bottom detention basin established to control stormwater runoff from the Cottage Street and Carando Drive Watershed. The detention basin was constructed in the early 1980's as part of the Carando Industrial Park development. Over the years the basin, due to lack of maintenance, has progressed to a wetland. The project construction would result in the filling of the detention basin to allow for the construction of a parking lot to service the abutting U.S. Postal Service facility. Stormwater drainage would be controlled by utilizing large diameter pipe, infiltration and detention. The filled resource area would be replaced and replicated down-gradient and abutting the site.
- b.) There are no on-site alternatives available to provide the required parking. A number of off-site areas both in the watershed and outside the watershed were investigated for available parking and wetland replication. Existing parking sites within the industrial park are all slated for full site development including buildings & infrastructure and the sites could not be economically feasible for parking. Off-site replication was reviewed at three possible locations: 1. Poor Brook watershed @ Route 291; 2. Cottage Brook watershed at Worcester Street; and 3. S.A.D.C. pond at Page Boulevard. At all three alternative replication sites, the negative impacts on the environment, i.e. tree cutting, road construction for site access and loss of woodland habitat were overriding.
- c.) The project will provide for on-site wetland replication at a 1 for 1 replacement rate. The improved stormwater management system will provide for a cleaner stormwater discharge to the brook. The City has also received, as part of this project, additional wetland and upland within the City.

II. Wetland Impacts and Permits:

A. Description of the site and wetland resource area:

The subject site consists of three (3) contiguous parcels of land located on the westerly side of Brookdale Drive and southeast of Carando Drive in Springfield, MA. *Figure 1* shows the site as seen on the Springfield North U.S. Geological Survey Quadrangle. Abutting the site to the north is undeveloped property owned by the City of Springfield. This property contains a 48-inch sewer interceptor line, which runs parallel to Bircham Bend Brook and its associated wetland. Much of this property has been degraded through historical grading, utility work, filling and dumping. To the south is 100 Brookdale Drive, which is currently occupied by the United States Postal Service. To the east is 150 Brookdale Drive, which is owned by Berkshire Development LLC and improved with a commercial building and parking lot occupied by Spaudling Co. To the west of the site is undeveloped land and commercial properties along Carando Drive. The central and northerly portions of the site contain riverfront area and a narrow band of bordering vegetated wetland (BVW) associated with Bircham Bend Brook.

Description and Functions of BVW

The BVW falls within a pre-1980 stormwater detention basin, which discharges, to Bircham Bend Brook. Wetland species in the basin are indicative of a combined emergent wet meadow / scrub-shrub hillside wetland. Vegetation dominating the basin consists of cattails, sensitive fern, speckled alder, jewelweed and soft rush. Other species identified along the edge of the basin include roughleaf goldenrod, Japanese bamboo, common reed, boneset, purple loosestrife, poison sumac, catalpa, common grape, night shade, poplar, bittersweet, red maple, Virginia creeper, reed canary grass, black locus, sweet fern, pin oak and low bush blueberry. The soils in and around the basin are disturbed and are thus not a reliable indicator. Historical disturbances to the wetland system and adjacent land consist of commercial and industrial development and the installation of large sewer and stormwater lines. The BVW within the basin functions partially as a source of groundwater supply, storm damage prevention, prevention of pollution, and wildlife habitat. However, the basin does not meet the eight (8) standards cited in the MADEP Stormwater Management Policy.

Hydrology and Soil of the BVW

Hydrology to the BVW is provided by several stormwater outfalls, surficial runoff from surrounding land, direct precipitation, and groundwater. Hand borings conducted within the detention basin revealed a thick organic mat, which appeared to create a perched water table. Soils on the edge and adjacent to the basin are disturbed and thus not a reliable indicator. Hydrology within the existing basin is controlled by a concrete notched weir and appears to allow ponding of 3-6" of water. Observations of the existing basin over the past year indicated that the surface water / groundwater interface fluctuates approximately 14-inches from 8-inches below the ground surface to 6-inches above the ground surface.

B. Extent and type of Wetland Impacts

The construction of an U. S Postal Service parking area above an existing detention basin, which was determined to be jurisdictional, will alter 32,600 SF of BVW. Under 310 CMR 10.53 (4) Limited Project, the stormwater management improvements proposed are intended to "improve the natural capacity of the resource area to protect the interest of the Act". The total BVW impact for the project is 32,600 SF, which is proposed to be replicated at slightly more than a 1:1 ratio. In an effort to substantially meet the performance standards in 310 CMR 10.55 a wetland replication plan has been designed utilizing DEP's Massachusetts Inland Wetland Replication Guidelines.

Avoidance/Alternative Analysis

During the project design all on-site options to avoid wetland impacts were explored, however, the site does not afford the room to accommodate the parking area needed. Alternative sites were then examined on parcels near and adjacent to the site and an agreement was reached with the City of Springfield, which allowed the parking area to be constructed and provided room for replication. The applicant also agreed to purchase a large undisturbed wetland and upland parcel of land within the City for preservation. It was also agreed upon by the local City officials that the current stormwater systems and water quality would be significantly improved by conducting the proposed work.

Minimization of Wetland Impacts

Only BVW disturbance necessary to achieve the project purpose is proposed. The stormwater storage capacity of the existing detention basin will remain the same and the existing notched weir will remain intact.

Mitigation of Wetland Loss

The proposed project will result in a total of 32,600 SF of permanent BVW impact via the construction of a parking area above an existing detention basin. This impact is proposed to be mitigated by replicating 33,200 SF of emergent and hillside wetland in compliance with the *Massachusetts Inland Replication Guidelines*.

Land Section

II. Impacts and Permits

H. The project will provide positive enhancement of current stormwater discharges. The existing detention basin allow untreated stormwater discharges from surrounding streets, parking lots and industrial areas to pass through the basin. The proposed stormwater management system will provide sediment removal using stormceptor type manholes and infiltration before discharge to the down-gradient brook. A long term maintenance plan has been developed for the parking lot drainage structures.

III. Consistency

- A. The City of Springfield land use plan designates the surrounding area for industrial development. The detention basin area is not included in the City Open Space plan. The prior agreement between the City and the owner provided the City with additional open space at another location in the City.
- B. The Pioneer Valley Planning Commission designates this area for industrial growth and in consultation with the Agency, the project is consistent with their plan.