Commonwealth of Massachusetts



Executive Office of Environmental Affairs ■ MEPA Office

Environmental Notification Form

		ffice Use		
Execut	ive Office	of Envir	onmental Aj	ffairs
EOEA N	lo.:	34	30_	
MEPA A	nalyst:	3,11	GAGE 5	
Phone: 6	17-626-	102	5	
	•			

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.

Desired Nove				
Project Name:				
Bear Meadow Wellfield, Whitman	ivia			
Street: Oak Street				
Municipality: Whitman	.1* 4	Watershed: Taunton		
Universal Tranverse Mercator Coord X: 341356 Y: 4659097	dinates:	Latitude: N 42		
X: 341356 Y: 4659097 Estimated commencement date: 20	0.5	Longitude: W 70		
		Estimated completion date: 2006		
Approximate cost: \$ 500,000		Status of project design: 30-50%		
Proponent: Town of Whitman, c/o Jo	ohn Pettir	nelli		
Street: P.O. Box 454				
Municipality: Whitman		State: MA	Zip Code: 02382	
Name of Contact Person From Who	m Copies	of this ENF May	Be Obtained:	
David Johnson				
Firm/Agency: P.M.P. Associates, LL	C	Street: 200 North Bedford Street		
Municipality: East Bridgewater		State: MA	Zip Code: 02333	
Phone: 508-378-3421	Fax: 508	3-378-8382	E-mail:dave@pmpassoc.com	
Does this project meet or exceed a man Has this project been filed with MEPA by Yes (EOEA No Has any project on this site been filed with MEPA by Yes (EOEA No Yes (EOEA No	□Y pefore? with MEPA	es ⊠No) ⊠No before?	CMR 11.03)?	
Is this an Expanded ENF (see 301 CMR 11.0 a Single EIR? (see 301 CMR 11.06(8)) a Special Review Procedure? (see 301 CMR a Waiver of mandatory EIR? (see 301 CMR 11.11)	☐Y R 11.09)☐Y R 11.11)	es ⊠No es ⊠No		
Identify any financial assistance or land the agency name and the amount of fu	transfer fr nding or la	rom an agency of nd area (in acres)	the Commonwealth, including Not Applicable	
Are you requesting coordinated review Yes (Source Final, List Local or Federal Permits and Appro	WMA) L]No		
Lood of Fodoral Folimic and Apple	/vais. <u> </u>	tie received to gai	LE	

Which ENF or EIR review thres	hold(s) does t	he project me	eet or excee	d (see 301 CMR 11.03):
☐ Land ☑ Water ☐ Energy ☐ ACEC	⊠ Rare Spec □ Wastewate □ Air □ Regulation	er 🗍	Transportati Solid & Haz	zardous Waste Archaeological
Summary of Project Size	Existing	Change	Total	State Permits &
& Environmental Impacts			<u></u>	Approvals
	AND			Order of Conditions
Total site acreage	466 entire golf course			Superseding Order of Conditions
New acres of land altered		< 1		☐ Chapter 91 License
Acres of impervious area	N.A.	0.1	N.A.	401 Water Quality Certification
Square feet of new bordering vegetated wetlands alteration		Up to 15,000 (est)		☐ MHD or MDC Access Permit☑ Water Management Act Permit
Square feet of new other wetland alteration		0		
Acres of new non-water dependent use of tidelands or waterways	· .	0		⊠ New Source Approval
STRUCTURES				DEP or MWRA Sewer Connection/ Extension Permit
Gross square footage	N.A.	1,500	N.A.	Other Permits (including Legislative Approvals) — Specify:
Number of housing units	N.A.	0	N.A.	ripprovidely opposity.
Maximum height (in feet)	N.A.	20	N.A.	
TRANSI	PORTATION			
Vehicle trips per day	N.A.	1	N.A.	
Parking spaces	N.A.	2	N.A.	
WAST	EWATER			
Gallons/day (GPD) of water use	N.A.	0	N.A.	
GPD water withdrawal	N.A.	405,000	N.A.	
GPD wastewater generation/ treatment	N.A	0	N.A.	
Length of water/sewer mains (in miles)	N.A.	.34	N.A	

d.

1.1

Mainteorige cognic care

CONSERVATION LAND: Will the project involve the conversion of public parkland or other Article 97
public haldran resources to any purpose not in accordance with Article 072
□Yes (Specify) No
Will it involve the release of any conservation restriction, preservation restriction, paricultural
preservation restriction, or watershed preservation restriction?
☐Yes (Specify)
RARE SPECIES: Does the project site include Estimated Habitat of Rare Species, Vernal Pools, Priority
ones of Nate Species, of Exemplary Natural Communities?
⊠Yes (Estimated Habitat, 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
alo Commonweartt
☐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
The formal contents
☐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 according
with each alternative, and (c) potential on-site and off-site mitigation measures for each
atternative (You may attach one additional page, if necessary)
The Town of Whitman is seeking approval of a 405,000 GPD municipal well on property of
John Ridder located between the Ridder Country Club Golf Course and Rear Meadow in Whitman
rieviously installed test wells have demonstrated an unusually high yield for bedrock walls in
Massachusetts. Close to the most productive test well, a 12-inch diameter production well (PW-1)
was installed with a steel casing sealed into the bedrock. PW-1 is the subject of this filing.
and the subject of this ning.

A Site Exam was successful and led to the approval of a Pumping Test Plan in 2002. Pumping tests were completed in 2004. New source approval for this well is being requested so that water can be pumped from the well into the adjacent public water system of Whitman. The water is of high quality, with one exception. Manganese, a common constituent of groundwater throughout Massachusetts, is present at concentrations about 6 times higher than the Federal Secondary Maximum Contaminant Level (SMCL). This water will require treatment to remove the manganese before it can be introduced into the Whitman distribution system. Therefore, a small water treatment plant is also proposed.

The water systems serving Whitman and Brockton are connected through the pipeline from Brockton's Silver Lake treatment plant. Both Brockton and Whitman have experienced water shortages and have been very much involved in demand management over at least the last two decades. The additional water that can flow from the proposed Bear Meadow wellfield will be a most welcome, albeit small, addition to the sources that already serve Brockton and Whitman. Furthermore, because use of this water by Whitman will reduce water demand on the current Brockton/Whitman supply from Silver Lake, in Pembroke it will have the effect of decreasing withdrawals from Silver Lake (a grandfathered inter-basin transfer) by 405,000 gallons per day.