Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Executive Office of Environmental Affairs ■ MEPA Office

Environmental Notification Form

For Office Use Only
Executive Office of Environmental Affairs
EOEA No.: 13217 MEPA Analyst Ociadee Bookles Phone: 617-626-1044

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:					
OYSTER CREEK DREDGING P	ROJECT				
Street: Off Allen's Harbor Lane, We	equassett,	Dunes & Nons R	oads		
Municipality: Harwich		Watershed: Car			
Universal Tranverse Mercator Coord	dinates:	Latitude: 41.66			
Zone 12 416742.5E 4612510.5N		Longitude: -070.09			
Estimated commencement date: Se	pt. 2004	Estimated comp	etion date:	Dec. 2004	
Approximate cost: \$500,000±		Status of project design: ±95% complete			
Proponent: Oyster Creek Preservat	ion, Inc				
Street: 1 Rocky Ledge Terrace					
Municipality: Winchester		State: MA	Zip Code: (01890	
Name of Contact Person From Who	m Copies	of this ENF May	Be Obtaine	d:	
Arlene M. Wilson, PWS		<u> </u>			
Firm/Agency: A. M. Wilson Associa	tes, Inc.	Street: 20 Rasca	ally Rabbit R	d, Unit 3	
Municipality: Marstons Mills		State: MA	Zip Code:	02648	
Phone: 508-420-9792	Fax: 508	3-420-9795	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 b					
		es (EOEA No)	⊠No	
Has any project on this site been filed w				E	
		es (EOEA No)	⊠No	
Is this an Expanded ENF (see 301 CMR 11.	05(7)) requ e			5	
a Single EIR? (see 301 CMR 11.06(8)) a Special Review Procedure? (see 301C	MD 44 00\	∐Yes		⊠No	
a Waiver of mandatory EIR? (see 301 Ch		∐Yes ∏Yes		⊠No ⊠No	
a Phase I Waiver? (see 301 CMR 11.11)	viix 11.11)	□Yes		⊠No	
Identify any financial assistance or land	transfer fr	_	a Commonu		
the agency name and the amount of fur	nding or la	nd area (in acres):_	N/A	eaim, including	
Are you requesting coordinated review with any other federal, state, regional, or local agency? ☐Yes(Specify) ☒No					
List Local or Federal Permits and Appro	ovals:				
Order of Conditions – SE		Under Appeal)			
Chapter 01 Bermit					

Chapter 91 Permit

Corps of Engineering HO4 Permit MDWPC Permit

☐ Land ☐ Water ☐ Energy ☐ ACEC	☐ Wastewater ☐ Transports ☐ Air ☐ Solid & Ha ☐ Regulations ☐ Historical of the property		Wetlands, V Transportat Solid & Haz	Waterways, & Tidelands ition zardous Waste & Archaeological	
Summary of Project Size	Existing	Change	Total	State Permits &	
& Environmental Impacts				Approvals	
Total site acreage	±4 AC			☑ Order of Conditions☑ Superseding Order of Conditions	
New acres of land altered		0			
Acres of impervious area	0	0	0	⊠ 401 Water Quality Certification	
Square feet of new bordering vegetated wetlands alteration		0		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 Source Approval ☐ DEP or MWRA Sewer Connection/ Extension Permit	
STRU	JCTURES			Other Permits	
Gross square footage	4,530±	200	4,730±	(including Legislative Approvals) — Specify:	
Number of housing units	N/A	N/A	N/A	, pprovato, opcony.	
Maximum height (in feet)	±6' MLW	0	No Change		
TRANS	PORTATION	J			
Vehicle trips per day	0	0	0		
Parking spaces	0	0	0		
WATER/V	VASTEWATI	- ER			
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 pronatural resources to any purpose not	eject involve the	conversion of	public parklar	nd or other Article 97 public	

☐Yes (Specify	.) [⊴No
RARE SPECIES: Does the project site include Estimated F Sites of Rare Species, or Exemplary Natural Communities?	?	•
HISTORICAL /ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Does to listed in the State Register of Historic Place or the inventory Commonwealth?	the pro	ject site include any structure, site or district storic and Archaeological Assets of the
☐Yes (Specify)	⊠No
If yes, does the project involve any demolition or destruction archaeological resources?		
☐Yes (Specify)	□No
AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN: Is Environmental Concern? Yes (Specify		- ·
PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project description project site, (b) a description of both on-site and offswith each alternative, and (c) potential on-site and off (You may attach one additional page, if necessary.)	site al	ternatives and the impacts associated
Oyster Creek is a small inlet (±4 AC) located westerly off th Harwich. The inlet was created by dredging allowed under total dredge and fill footprint of ±6.6 AC. A total of 11 private easterly portion of the inlet and the margins around the pier available for public navigation. The inlet is not presently acothers at all tide stages.	Licens te piers s exhi	se #658 (Exhibit C). That License allowed a shave been constructed within the inlet. The bit significant sedimentation. The inlet is
The project proposes to dredge a channel within the limits of around existing piers where necessary to re-establish a deproject included utilization of clean dredge spoil to construct channel. These plots were to be constructed within existing walls with top elevations of varying between 1' to 3' MLW with the project, especially with regards to the two plots on the significant should marsh plots not be constructed, clean material will be Spoil from around the piers has a level of arsenic above the Bourne landfill or material needing to be more parking lot for the neighborhood association beach (Exhibit	oth of - t new g intert rere pr south s ce offe e Cate oved o	-4' MLW (Exhibit B). An ancillary portion of the salt marsh plots adjacent to the dredged idal and slightly supra-tidal beaches. Toe oposed to stabilize the spoil. This section of ide of the channel is now viewed as optional. red to the Town for beach nourishment gory I limit. It will likely be disposed of at the

The inlet is not restricted under the MDEM Coastal Wetlands Restriction Program; MGL Ch. 130 sec. 105. It is not mapped by MNHP as habitat for rare wetland related/dependent species. It is included within a FEMA mapped 100 yr. flood zone with a projected water elevation of 10' NGVD.

Impacts and Alternatives

A small section of the former and proposed dredge channel at the first southerly bend is the site of sandy sediment deposition eroding from the adjacent bank due to surface drainage flows and made-made changes to the inlet. It is used by the Town for its shellfish put and take program. The size of this area has increased in the last few years due to significant erosion of the adjacent coastal bank. Re-establishment of the navigation channel will eliminate some area used for the program. Several years of shellfish inventories show no reliable native set or population in the area (Exhibit I). The rapid sedimentation may be smothering seed. (Note that the Shellfish Warden stated both marked and unmarked shellfish are used for his planting program.) The two marsh plots proposed for the south side of the channel could be adjusted downward marginally in elevation and left unvegetated for shellfish habitat purposes. There is no public access to the inlet from any abutting upland location.

Other impacts are beneficial to benign: reestablishing channel depth will increase flushing of the southwest portion of the basin where anecdotal information shows water quality to be deteriorating.

The second alternative which proposes dredging without marsh construction salvages water quality benefits from flushing but not from vegetative uptake. It also would likely require more frequent maintenance dredging to ensure navigation benefits.

Non-build Alternative impacts are predominantly adverse. Should navigational access to the inlet be lost due to continued sedimentation, the Town will suffer loss of tax revenue as abutting properties become less valuable. The shellfish put and take program will suffer as interior sections of the inlet become non-tidal and the area now most intensely utilized becomes supra-tidal.

LAND

1D	SECTION – all proponents must fill out this section
l.	Thresholds / Permits A. Does the project meet or exceed any review thresholds related to land (see 301 CMR 11.03(1) X Yes No; if yes, specify each threshold: 301CMR 11.26(7)(a)(3)(c) – issuance of a Superceding Order of Conditions permitting dredging and marsh construction of more than ½ ac.
11.	Impacts and Permits A. Describe, in acres, the current and proposed character of the project site, as follows: Existing Change Total
	 B. Has any part of the project site been in active agricultural use in the last three years? Yes X No; if yes, how many acres of land in agricultural use (with agricultural soils) will be converted to nonagricultural use? C. Is any part of the project site currently or proposed to be in active forestry use? Yes X No; if yes, please describe current and proposed forestry activities and indicate whether appropriate of the cite is the cubicat of a DEM conveyed forest representation.
	any part of the site is the subject of a DEM-approved forest management plan: D. Does any part of the project involve conversion of land held for natural resources purposes in accordance with Article 97 of the Amendments to the Constitution of the Commonwealth to any purpose not in accordance with Article 97? Yes _X_ No; if yes, describe:
	E. Is any part of the project site currently subject to a conservation restriction, preservation restriction, agricultural preservation restriction or watershed preservation restriction? Yes _X_ No; if yes, does the project involve the release or modification of such restriction? Yes No; if yes, describe:
	F. Does the project require approval of a new urban redevelopment project or a fundamental change in an existing urban redevelopment project under M.G.L.c.121A? Yes _X_ No; if yes, describe:
	G. Does the project require approval of a new urban renewal plan or a major modification of an existing urban renewal plan under M.G.L.c.121B? Yes No _X ; if yes, describe:
	H. Describe the project's stormwater impacts and, if applicable, measures that the project will take to comply with the standards found in DEP's Stormwater Management Policy: N/A – no new impervious areas or discharges proposed and work requires Chapter 91 permitting.
	I. Is the project site currently being regulated under M.G.L.c.21E or the Massachusetts Contingency Plan? Yes No _X_; if yes, what is the Release Tracking Number (RTN)?