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.: 13971
MEPA Analyst: Holly Johnson
Phone: 617-626-1023

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: Long Pond Wastewater Management Project		
Street: 6 waterfront needs communities in Lakeville, MA		
Municipality: Lakeville	Watershed: Taunton, Buzzards Bay	
Universal Tranverse Mercator Coordinates:	Latitude: 41° 48' 20.31"N Longitude: 70° 57' 00.12"W	
Estimated commencement date: Feb. 2010	Estimated completion date: TBD	
Approximate cost: $25.7M	Status of project design: 0 %complete	
Proponent: Rita Garbitt, Town Administrator		
Street: Lakeville Town Offices, 346 Bedford St.		
Municipality: Lakeville	State: MA	Zip Code: 02347
Name of Contact Person From Whom Copies of this ENF May Be Obtained: Whit Davis		
Firm/Agency: Camp Dresser & McKee	Street: One Cambridge Place, 50 Hampshire St.	
Municipality: Cambridge	State: MA	Zip Code: 02139
Phone: 617-452-6000	Fax: 617-452-8000	E-mail: daviswhit@cdm.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 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): DEP- SRF (amount TBD)

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

List Local or Federal Permits and Approvals: TBD (Site Plan Review, Creating zoning overlay)

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	TBD		
New acres of land altered		20*	
Acres of impervious area	NA	Minimal**	NA
Square feet of new bordering vegetated wetlands alteration		TBD	
Square feet of new other wetland alteration		TBD	
Acres of new non-water dependent use of tidelands or waterways		0	
STRUCTURES			
Gross square footage	TBD	TBD	TBD
Number of housing units	NA	NA	NA
Maximum height (in feet)	NA	NA	NA
TRANSPORTATION			
Vehicle trips per day	NA	0	NA
Parking spaces	NA	0	NA
WASTEWATER			
Gallons/day (GPD) of water use	NA	NA	NA
GPD water withdrawal	NA	NA	NA
GPD wastewater generation/ treatment	122,000	28,000	150,000
Length of water/sewer mains (in miles)	0	16.43	16.43

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:
Interbasin Transfer Act Decision

* 20 Acres = 86,800 ft. (length of new pipes) x 10 ft. (approx. width of construction needed), pumping stations will add some area.

** Only impervious area will be associated with new pump stations.

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?

See NHESP correspondence in Attachment B.

☒Yes (Specify: The Bridle Shiner and the Eastern Box Turtle are located on or near the project area) ☐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?

See attached letter to the MHC

☐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 Executive Summary of the Long Pond Wastewater Management Alternatives Evaluation is attached to this ENF and supplements the project description provided below. An electronic copy (pdf on CD) of the complete report can be provided upon request to the CDM contact person listed on the first page of this document.

a) Project Description. The Lakeville Water Study Board (LWSB) initiated the planning of the Long Pond Wastewater Management Alternatives Evaluation starting in 2002. The project will be implemented in the Long Pond Service Area (LPSA), which includes the six waterfront communities of Huckleberry Shores, Clark Shores, Churchill Shores, Lakeview Heights, Hilltop Acres, and Langlois Pines. Lakeville's wastewater management plan for Long Pond involves constructing sewer collection systems in the six communities, conveying the waste via gravity and pressure sewers to pumping stations, and then pumping it to the central pumping station and on to the New Bedford treatment plant. The six communities currently dispose of their 122,000 gpd of wastewater via Title V septic systems. The Water Study Board supports this project as opposed to continued reliance upon on-site Sanitary Disposal Systems (SDSs) because these densely developed communities have caused unhealthy concentrations of nitrogen in Long Pond and in the well water on which most LPSA residents depend. After natural atmospheric nitrogen deposition, nitrogen from SDSs is the largest, and most controllable, source of nitrogen in the LPSA. The small lot size (many <10,000 sf), and widespread septic system inspection failure rate (36%) contribute to this problem.

Needs areas. Household survey data from the six study communities shows that on average, 70% of the respondents support installing a wastewater system. The six communities have been grouped into four service areas for evaluation and cost sharing purposes. Huckleberry Shores, Clark Shores, and Churchill Shores each make up an individual service area, and the three communities- combined- of Lakeview Heights, Hilltop Acres, and Langlois Pines make up the fourth service area. These last three communities are grouped into one service area because of their relative proximity to each other, shared roadways, and smaller populations.

Wastewater Management Approaches. Four approaches to improving the LPSA's wastewater treatment and disposal program have been identified: 1) No action (continued use of SDSs w/o municipal water), 2) SDSs with municipal water (continued SDS-use for waste disposal while adding a municipal water supply), 3) On or near-site decentralized treatment and disposal systems (both with and without a municipal water supply), and 4) Disposal via a regional connection to a wastewater treatment facility (sewer collection and conveyance to an existing treatment facility), both with and without a municipal water supply. After comparing all these alternatives, option four (without municipal water) was considered the most viable because of cost, feasibility, and local demand, and a particular regional plant was also identified as the best-suited plant to receive the LPSA's wastewater. These options are described in more detail below:

1) *No Action*

Under this alternative, clean water is not supplied, and only upgrades to failing SDSs to comply with Title 5 Regulations are sought. Based on historical SDS failure rates in the LPSA, it is estimated that over the next 20 years, approximately 54% of the properties in the LPSA could experience failure. This alternative does not address nitrogen loading or fecal coliform contamination, and is marginally in compliance with regulatory requirements. It does not meet the local or regional development and environmental goals, and only 30% of respondents in the six communities supported No Action when surveyed. The SDS repairs are projected to cost $7.5M over the planning period.

2) *Continued Use of Title 5 SDSs with Municipal Water*

In this option, SDSs are still used as the primary method of waste disposal, but water mains are constructed to bring clean drinking water to Long Pond residents. Even by eliminating the wastewater concern entirely, the groundwater contamination present within the LPSA will remain for many years. Therefore, a safe, sustainable water supply should also be considered for the residents of the area. Lakeville currently has inter-municipal agreements (IMAs) with both Taunton and New Bedford, but because of limited infrastructure, it is only utilizing 15% of the water currently allocated from outside communities. Thus, construction of new water mains is necessary to more fully utilize existing water allotments. Only 47% of year-round residents (who would bear most of the financial responsibility for the construction) support installing a water distribution system, however. Also, along with the $7.5M cost of SDS improvements, the new water system construction is projected to cost $17.5M, making the cost for continued use of SDSs with a municipal water supply $25M.

3) *Package (or Decentralized) Treatment and Disposal*

With package treatment and disposal, clusters of homes that exceed a waste flow threshold can install a small, local treatment and disposal facility. There are a variety of treatment types and systems, and their operation would no longer be regulated by Title 5, but rather by the DEP Groundwater Discharge Permit Program. The construction of these decentralized systems is projected to cost $20.0M-$20.5M without adding a municipal water supply, and $37.5M-$38.0M if municipal water is added.

4) *Regional Treatment and Disposal*

The last alternative identified, and the one preferred by the Lakeville Water Study Board, proposes constructing a sewer collection system in the LPSA communities, and conveying the wastewater to the New Bedford treatment plant via a central pumping station. The projected construction cost of the forcemain is $10.1M. Including the sewer collection system, the total projected construction cost is $21.5M (without provision of municipal water), and $37.5M (with municipal water). Pumping the wastewater out of Long Pond for disposal and treatment will gradually improve the water and soil quality of Long Pond and the well water in the LPSA. It is estimated that approximately 150,000 gpd of wastewater will be conveyed to the New Bedford plant from the LPSA. The environmental impact of installing sewers and a forcemain to the New Bedford plant will be minimized by constructing new sewers in rights-of-way along existing roads and highways, where feasible. Because it is the cheapest alternative, it is the one most likely to be approved by Long Pond residents, of whom 70% feel that a year-round wastewater system is needed. It would cost approximately $100,000 less to connect to the existing Taunton gravity system, but sufficient capacity to accept Long Pond's wastewater is unavailable. New Bedford has sufficient capacity, and has also proposed to waive the connection fee. The New Bedford regional disposal alternative is thus the most appropriate for meeting the needs and desires of Long Pond residents.

b) On-site and off-site alternatives and impacts. See Executive Summary.

c) Potential on-site and off-site mitigation measures for each alternative. Proposed on-site and off-site impacts will be temporary in nature, and all disturbed areas will be restored to their pre-construction condition upon completion of work. Sedimentation and erosion controls will be used to prevent transport of sediment, and any work adjacent to wetland areas will involve hay bales and silt fence to prevent sedimentation into wetland areas.