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.: 13467 MEPA Analysis Ling Egling Told Phone: 617-626-

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: Michelle Lane						
Street: Cherry Street				·-·		
Municipality: Holyoke		Watershed: Connecticut River				
Universal Tranverse Mercator Coordinates:		Latitude: 4675176N				
		Longitude: 694121E				
Estimated commencement date: Spring 05		Estimated completion date: Fall 05				
Approximate cost: \$350,000.00		Status of project design: 95 %complete				
Proponent: J. N. Douquete and Sons	s Constru	ction, INC				
Street:						
Municipality: Feeding Hills		State: MA	Zip Code:			
Name of Contact Person From Who	m Copies	of this ENF May	Be Obtained:			
Terry Reynolds						
Firm/Agency: Huntley Associates, P	Firm/Agency: Huntley Associates, P.C.		Street: 30 Industrial Drive East			
Municipality: Northampton	·	State: MA	Zip Code: 01060			
Phone: 413 584-7444	Fax: 413	3 584-9159	E-mail:			
			reynoldst@huntleyassocia			
			com			
Does this project meet or exceed a mar		R threshold (see 301 Yes	i CMR 11.03)? ⊠No	o		
Has this project been filed with MEPA b						
		Yes (EOEA No) 🔲 N	0		
Has any project on this site been filed w		perore? Yes (EOEA No.)	^		
				U		
Is this an Expanded ENF (see 301 CMR 11. a Single EIR? (see 301 CMR 11.06(8)) a Special Review Procedure? (see 301 CM a Waiver of mandatory EIR? (see 301 CM a Phase I Waiver? (see 301 CMR 11.11)	MR 11.09)	esting:	⊠n ⊠n ⊠n	o o		
Identify any financial assistance or land the agency name and the amount of fu				including		
Are you requesting coordinated review Yes(Specify	-	ther federal, state	'	gency?		
List Local or Federal Permits and Appro General Permit, Subdivision Approval				Construction		

☐ Land ☐ Water ☐ Energy ☐ ACEC	□ Rare Speci □ Wastewate □ Air □ Regulation	er 📋	Transportat Solid & Haz	/aterways, & Tidelands ion ardous Waste Archaeological		
Summary of Project Size	Existing	Change	Total	State Permits &		
& Environmental Impacts				Approvals		
Total site acreage	LAND 92±			✓ Order of Conditions✓ Superseding Order of		
New acres of land altered		3.0 ±		Conditions Chapter 91 License		
Acres of impervious area	0	0.43	0.43	401 Water Quality		
Square feet of new bordering vegetated wetlands alteration		0		Certification 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		
STR	UCTURES			Other Permits		
Gross square footage		TBD		(including Legislative		
Number of housing units	0	8	8	Approvals) – Specify:		
Maximum height (in feet)	0	30	30			
TRANS	PORTATION					
Vehicle trips per day	0	6	6			
Parking spaces	0	0	0			
WATER/\	VASTEWAT	ER				
Gallons/day (GPD) of water use		NA				
GPD water withdrawal		NA				
GPD wastewater generation/ treatment	0	3200	3200			
Length of water/sewer mains (in miles)	0	0.14	0.14			

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 Estimated Habitat, Priority Sites 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)
PRO JECT DESCRIPTION. The project description should include (a) a description of the project with

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project description should include (a) a description of the project site, (b) a description of both on-site and off-site e 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. Site and Project Descriptions

Site: The study area is located within the City of Holyoke to the west of Interstate 91 behind two rows of single-family houses along Jarvis Avenue and Cherry Street. The parcel is entirely forested and abuts a large parcel of land owned by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. The project area occupies only a small portion of the entire property (~7 of ~92 acres), and is topographically complex, including a large ridge along the center and a number of smaller hills and apparent ledgy areas evident between the top of the ridge and the large wetland to the north of the proposed project site. Chicopee Shale and glacial erratics were frequently observed. A small intermittent stream drains the wetland, flowing around the east side of the project area behind a closely spaced row of houses and exiting through a culvert beneath Cherry Street at the southern boundary.

Project: J.N. Duquette & Sons Construction, Inc. proposes to construct eight single family homes together with an access road, utilities and a stormwater management system in a parcel of land located mostly behind existing houses along Cherry Street and Jarvis Avenue in the western part of Holyoke. The proposed 7.0± acre project site is part of a wooded 92.0± acre parcel extending to the top of the ridge between East Mountain and Mount Tom. The proposed development of the site includes the construction of a 500-foot road and cul-de-sac to service the eight (8) residential building lots. The access road is to enter the site from Cherry Street, since entry from Jarvis Avenue access points would cause considerably greater impact to a Bordering Vegetated Wetland located to the north of the proposed development. The site is currently wooded and is crossed by an intermittent stream flowing along its eastern boundary behind the houses along Jarvis Avenue. Most of the trees in the buffer zone to this intermittent stream would remain; only the trees in the proposed access road and stormwater management basin would be removed.

b. Alternatives Analysis

A number of potential alternatives exist to the currently proposed project approach. The first

alternative to be discussed is always the "No Project" alternative, which leaves everything as it was before. This is clearly not an economically feasible alternative, and given that the potential exists for a large and ecologically significant area of land is otherwise available for certain preservation, it is likely not the preferred alternative to any of the parties involved. Other alternatives have to do with effects of utilizing any one or more of the three access points to the parcel. The three access points are: the Cherry Street access – the currently proposed access point (Access 1), the southern access along Jarvis Street (Access 2) and the northern access along Jarvis Street (Access 3). The consequences of the use of each of these are discussed as follows:

<u>Utilize Access 2</u>: Although it would be possible to use this access point while complying with the performance standards for impacts to BVW and Bank, the impacts would be more severe with regard to any ecological consideration relative to Access 1. Access 1 proposes no impacts to BVW, and though the proposed impacts to Bank are higher than they would be at Access 2, the proposed impacts are to Bank in degraded condition, as opposed to the Bank that would be crossed at Access 2, which is in reasonably good condition. Further, the Access 2 crosses the wetland north of the project site, which is in excellent condition, and which may provide habitat for the Marbled Salamander, known to be in the area.

<u>Utilize Access 3</u>: Access 3 is considerably to the north of the project area and would require construction of an access road extending southward along very steep and rocky terrain for about 1,000 feet, much of which would be in the steep buffer zone to the BVW north of the proposed project area. This approach could also meet the performance standards for work in a buffer to a BVW, but the road would be perched directly above the BVW, would open up a large area of buildable land north of the proposed project area and would be so expensive as to require much more intensive development of the entire parcel to be economically feasible. Further, utilization of Access 3 would install a barrier to upland/wetland travel for the Marbled Salamander, perhaps limiting travel capability and certainly exposing the animals to vehicular traffic during migration periods.

Access 1 – Preferred Alternative: Utilization of Access 1 would install a minimum of barriers to migration for the Marbled Salamander because the proposed cul-de-sac would not be interposed between the BVW and upland habitat. It would, however, reduce available upland habitat for both the Marbled Salamander and the Sallow Tailed Moth. This alternative would not interpose any barriers between the BVW and the large area of upland habitat to the west, not would it impact BVW. Though it does impact Bank, it impacts a degraded section of Bank and proposes to clean up a greater amount of currently degraded Bank and adjacent upland.

c. Mitigation

The proposed mitigation of impacts to listed species habitat consists of both a conservation Restriction to be placed on 80.6 acres of strategically located land and clean-up of trash and debris along the intermittent stream flowing behind the houses along Jarvis Street. The CR will cover land adjacent to an existing Wildlife Management Area, the BVW north of the project area and the upland habitat upslope of the BVW. It consists of land located entirely within Priority Habitat and land within a part of a polygon identified as Rare Species habitat. The net effect will be to add to a large area of unbroken habitat in a form that is broad and unrestricted, versus protecting just a corridor between identified habitats or other types of undeveloped land. The stipulation of the applicant is that a 3 acre buildable estate lot with access will be retained, the access for which will be through Access 3.