

*For Office Use Only*  
*Executive Office of Environmental Affairs*  
EOEA No.: 13460  
MEPA Analyst: Aisling Englington  
Phone: 617-626-1024

# ENF Environmental Notification Form

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: Restoration of Chauncey Allen Park Lily Pond		
Street: 62 Smith Avenue		
Municipality: Westfield	Watershed: Westfield River	
Universal Transverse Mercator Coordinates: E 685,140 N 4,665,660	Latitude: N 42.12316	Longitude: W 072.75998
Estimated commencement date: Spring 2005	Estimated completion date: Fall 2005	
Approximate cost: \$55,000	Status of project design: 95	%complete
Proponent: Friends of Grandmothers' Garden Board of Directors		
Street: P.O. Box 1432		
Municipality: Westfield	State: MA	Zip Code: 01086-1432
Name of Contact Person From Whom Copies of this ENF May Be Obtained: Raymond C. Levesque		
Firm/Agency: FOGG Board of Directors	Street: 64 Blueberry Ridge	
Municipality: Westfield	State: MA	Zip Code: 01085
Phone: 413.568.0985	Fax: 413.568.0986	E-mail: rayleves@comcast.net

- 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:

Westfield Conservation Commission Order of Conditions	pending
Massachusetts DEP 401 WQC	pending
Army Corps of Engineers 404 permit	pending

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	State Permits & Approvals
<b>LAND</b>				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Order of Conditions <input type="checkbox"/> Superseding Order of Conditions <input type="checkbox"/> Chapter 91 License <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Permits <i>(including Legislative Approvals) – Specify:</i> Army Corps of Engineers 404 permit
Total site acreage (wetlands)	1.3 acres			
New acres of land altered		0		
Acres of impervious area	0	0	0	
Square feet of new bordering vegetated wetlands alteration		9,755		
Square feet of new other wetland alteration		0		
Acres of new non-water dependent use of tidelands or waterways		0		
<b>STRUCTURES</b>				
Gross square footage	0	0	0	
Number of housing units	0	0	0	
Maximum height (in feet)	0	0	0	
<b>TRANSPORTATION</b>				
Vehicle trips per day	0	0	0	
Parking spaces	0	0	0	
<b>WATER/WASTEWATER</b>				
Gallons/day (GPD) of water use	0	0	0	
GPD water withdrawal	0	0	0	
GPD wastewater generation/treatment	0	0	0	
Length of water/sewer mains (in miles)	0	0	0	

**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 \_\_\_\_\_)  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.)

**a. The Project Site**

The project site is located within Chauncey Allen Park which is approximately 8.0 acres in size and is on Smith Avenue in Westfield, MA. Within the Park there is an existing wetland that has developed over the last 30 to 40 years as a result of poor drainage. This existing vegetated wetland is approximately 1.28 acres in size. It appears to be the result of groundwater intersecting the ground surface due to damage to and lack of maintenance of an old subsurface tile drainage system in this area of the Park. The wetland formed by the altered drainage can be classified as emergent and scrub-shrub. This wetland has no streams entering or leaving it and has no natural outlet. It has developed in the low point at the approximate center of Chauncey Allen Park. Historically, the park had a small lily pond of approximately 0.14 to 0.25 acres at the north side of the existing vegetated wetland. Today this lily pond is in a highly eutrophic state and is mostly filled in with silt and organic debris. When the lily pond was created, an apparent high-level overflow was built to one of the old city drain lines. This city drain is assumed to flow approximately 3000 to 4000 feet before discharging to the Westfield River. The Friends of Grandmothers' Garden (FOGG) was formed about ten years ago to promote the restoration of the Park beginning with colonial garden, Grandmothers' Garden, in the northwestern sector of the Park. The garden has been restored to its original splendor, and FOGG is now actively working on the restoration of the other elements of the park, including the lily pond.

**b. On and Off-Site Alternatives**

The alternatives considered for this project were based on the long-term goal of restoring all aspects of the Chauncey Allen Park to their original or perhaps an improved condition. The over-riding themes of passive recreation, nature study, pastoral beauty, and education have guided the master planning for the restoration work. Because the lily pond is a central element of the park, and what is done there will affect the rest of the park, the Master Planning Subcommittee of FOGG has designated it as the next component of the park restoration work. Based on the context discussed above, the subcommittee looked at the following alternatives.

1. **Off-Site Alternative** – There is no real off-site alternative to the pond restoration work. Although as part of the planning process, the subcommittee did look at the logic of restoring the pond within the context of other such resources that might be found within the city or the region. It was decided that no similar resource existed within the city and that attempting to create the pond and adjacent wetland off-site would not be practical for many reasons. The presence of the pond within the park was decided as integral to the overall function of the park. Thus, off-site alternatives were not pursued.

2. **Do Nothing Alternative** – This alternative was rejected because it runs counter to the very reason that FOGG was formed and all of the actions taking by the group and their partners in the city and region to date. By doing nothing a vital part of the part would be left to further degrade into an unmanaged area that had no

real place in the intended functioning of the park. This would severely limit the functions of passive recreation, nature study, and education that the park, garden and pond were intended to serve. Moreover, by doing nothing, the eutrophic pond and incidental wetland would continue to foster the growth of non-native and invasive plant species that decrease natural diversity and habitat for native plants and animals.

**3. Large-Pond Alternative** – The subcommittee, during the master planning process, considered creating a larger pond on the order of one-half to one acre. This alternative was rejected for the following reasons. First, the original lily pond was estimated to be approximately one-quarter acre in size and the desire was to maintain the same approximate size in the restoration. Second, creating a larger pond would involve a higher degree of permitting involvement which the subcommittee did not wish to take on. Last, creating a larger pond would necessitate the conversion of the adjacent wetland from a scrub-shrub swamp and emergent wetland to open water. This would reduce the naturally diversity of the wetland system in the Park and thereby take away from the nature study and educational role of the overall park.

**4. Similar-Sized-Pond (Chosen) Alternative** – The chosen alternative is for the restoration of the former lily pond to a size and in a location that is similar to that of the original pond. This alternative allows for the preservation of a significant part of the existing vegetated wetland thereby maintaining habitat diversity around the open-water zone of the pond. The restored pond will be about 9,750 square feet in area and will be irregular in shape thereby increasing the “edge” between the open water and the adjacent vegetated wetland.

### c. Mitigation Measures

**1. Off-Site Alternative** – This alternative would require off and on-site mitigation in that the problem of the eutrophying vegetated wetland would still exist in the park. Thus, on-site corrective measures to control the non-native and invasive plant species in the park wetland would have to be implemented. These might include hand pulling, spraying and/or cutting of undesirable species. These efforts would have to be on-going as most invasives are not easily eradicated and require a multi-year effort to eliminate them. Off-site, if a location could be found to create the desired pond, a connection with the park would have to be made. This was not deemed possible since it did not maintain the integrity and function of the park as envisioned in the master plan. One form of mitigation considered and rejected was to attempt to connect an off-site resource (pond) with the park via public or private transportation.

**2. Do Nothing Alternative** – This alternative would require the on-site mitigation to control the non-native and invasive species noted above in the off-site alternative. No off-site mitigation would be necessary.

**3. Large-Pond Alternative** – Mitigation for this alternative would involve no off-site work other than the possible need to find an acceptable disposal site for excess soil dug from the larger pond area. On-site mitigation would include the control of the non-native and invasive plants as well as the establishment and maintenance of erosion controls during and after the excavation work. It would also include the stabilization and planting of the newly exposed “bank” and soils around the open-water zone.

**4. Similar-Sized-Pond (Chosen) Alternative** – For this alternative on-site mitigation would include the control of the non-native and invasive plants as well as the establishment and maintenance of erosion controls during and after the excavation work. It would also include the stabilization and planting of the newly exposed “bank” and soils around the open-water zone. No off-site mitigation would be required.