Commonwealth of Massachusetts Executive Office of Environmental Affairs ■ MEPA Office



Environmental Notification Form

For Office Use Only Executive Office of Environmental Affairs

EOEA No.: 13489

MEPA Analystnick Zavolas

Phone: 617-626- 1030

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:							
The Pines at Bousqu	et Mount	ain					
Street: Dan Fox Dr.	·						
Municipality: Pittsfield		Watershed: Housatonic					
Universal Tranverse Mercator Coord	dinates:	Latitude: 42°25'2.2N					
1806 41 873E 46 97 338N		Longitude: 73°16'32.9W					
Estimated commencement date: June, 2005		Estimated completion date: 2009					
Approximate cost: \$25,000,000		Status of project design: 25 %complete					
Proponent: LD Associates, Inc.							
Street: P.O. Box 1240							
Municipality: Hinsdale		State: MA	Zip Code: 01235				
Name of Contact Person From Who	m Copies	of this ENF May	Be Obtained:				
Robert G. Fournier							
Firm/Agency: SK Design Group, In	c.	Street: 2 Federico Dr.					
Municipality: Pittsfield		State: MA	Zip Code: 01201				
Phone: 413-443-3537	Fax: 41 3	3-445-5376	E-mail: rfournier@sk-				
			designgroup.com				
Does this project meet or exceed a mar	ndatory EIF	2 threshold (ass 204	CMT 44 00\7				
and project most of exceed a mai		es Short (see 301 CMR 11.03)?					
Has this project been filed with MEPA b		<u>~_</u> 35					
☐Yes (EOEA No.) ⊠No							
Has any project on this site been filed with MEPA before?							
Later E. Later C.		'es (EOEA No. <u>13</u>	<u>157</u>) No				
Is this an Expanded ENF (see 301 CMR 11.	05(7)) requ e						
a Single EIR? (see 301 CMR 11.06(8)) a Special Review Procedure? (see 301C	☐Yes □Yes	⊠No ⊠No					
a Waiver of mandatory EIR? (see 301 CA	MR 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):							
Are you requesting coordinated review with any other federal, state, regional, or local agency?							
☐Yes(Specify) ⊠No							
List Local or Federal Permits and Approvals: Special Permit; Order of Conditions; N.P.D.E.S.							
Construction General Permit							

 Land Water Energy ACEC	☐ Rare Species ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ ☐ Air ☐ ☐ ☐ Regulations ☐		Wetlands, Waterways, & Tidelands Transportation Solid & Hazardous Waste Historical & Archaeological Resources		
Summary of Project Size	Existing	Change	Total	State Permits &	
& Environmental Impacts				Approvals	
Total site acreage	LAND				
	70			Conditions	
New acres of land altered		22±		Chapter 91 License	
Acres of impervious area	0	7.5±		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 	
STR	JCTURES			Other Permits	
Gross square footage	0	210,000±	210,000±	(including Legislative	
Number of housing units	0	105	105	Approvals) - Specify:	
Maximum height (in feet)	0	35±	35±		
TRANS	ORTATION			•	
Vehicle trips per day	0	615			
Parking spaces	0	0			
WATER/W	ASTEWATE	R			
Gallons/day (GPD) of water use	0	31,500±			
GPD water withdrawal	0	0			
GPD wastewater generation/ reatment	0	34,650			
ength of water/sewer mains in miles)	0	12,900			
Dutside an exist. R.O.W. DNSERVATION LAND: Will the projections to any purpose not in according Yes (Specify	лапсе with Articli —————	997?) 区	JNo	•	
ill it involve the release of any conse striction, or watershed preservation r Yes (Specify	rvation restriction estriction?	n, preservation	n restriction, a	gricultural preservation	

RARE SPECIES: Does the project site include Estimated Habitat of Rare Species, or Exemplary Natural Communities? Yes (Specify) PH 1764	of Rare Species, Vernal Pools, Priority Sites of ☐No
MOTORIA	
HISTORICAL /ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Does the projet in the State Register of Historic Place or the inventory of Historic at Yes (Specify)	id Al Chaeological Assets of the Commonwealth?
If yes, does the project involve any demolition or destruction of any resources?	listed or inventoried historic or archaeological
☐Yes (Specify)	
	⊠No
AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCEDNATION	
AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN: Is the projection of the	ect in or adjacent to an Area of Critical
☐Yes (Specify)	
	⊠No
PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project description should (b) a description of both on-site and off-site alternatives and alternative, and (c) potential on-site and off-site mitigation meattach one additional page, if necessary.)	I include (a) a description of the project site, the impacts associated with each easures for each alternative (You may
(a) General Project Description:	
The project, as proposed, includes the construction of 105 rapproximately 3,100 linear feet of new "private" access robuildings will be all tri-plex buildings. The project will also services (and other utilities) to the site from nearby City or State full build-out the site will encompass 70 acres of the easy with frontage provided along Dan Fox Drive. An additional 5 and 15 an	include the extension of sewer and water ite roads.

physical ski area with the exception of a small portion of "Tube Town" which will be re-located to the (b) Alternatives:

1. An alternative access point was investigated that would have routed the main drive through the existing Bousquet parking lot rather than directly off Dan Fox Drive. This would in turn avoid the requirement for a Break in Access permit from Mass Highway. However, such a route would effectively reduce the number of parking spaces for the ski area, which are generally insufficient already. It would also create conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians.

with frontage provided along Dan Fox Drive. An additional 5 acres of land is under agreement at the time of this application and is expected to be annexed to the 70 acres. A majority of the proposed

For purposes of density requirements, a portion of the proposed tract area will extend into the actual ski area. However, construction of the roads and buildings is not expected to alter any portion of the

development area is wooded. The slopes across the site range from 5% to 40%.

- 2. An alternative siting of the middle portion of the access drive was investigated in the area near the Chamber of Commerce property (see Appendix B- Plans to Accompany ENF). This would have located the road through a steep section of the site and require re-location of a ski trail. Instead, the Applicant diligently pursued the purchase of this adjacent land. As such, the final alignment can now more closely follow the natural topography and thus reduce the amount of clearing and earthwork.
- 3. An alternative configuration of roads and buildings was also investigated (for the first phase only-see Appendix B- Plans to Accompany ENF). In fact, that alternative was approved by the Pittsfield Community Development Board in 2003 but has since been revised in favor of the current plan which allows for the placement of buildings on either side of a single access road, thus reducing the amount of road construction.

4. There are several alternatives to sewering the project and providing potable water service. One alternative would be on-site sub-surface sewage disposal system(s) and individual wells. To that end, percolation tests have been performed (in the vicinity of Tube Town) which revealed suitable soils for an on-site disposal system. For water supply, there are 2 high-yield wells on the Bousquet property that provide a considerable volume of water for snow making operations and potable use. Therefore it is believed that the underlying aquifer can easily supply water to the development. It is not clear at this time whether the area of "suitable soils" is large enough to accommodate the full build-out of the project.

The preferred alternative for sewage disposal is construction of a new collection and pumping system. This design, as shown in a general fashion on the accompanying plans, would extend existing municipal sewer service up Tamarack Rd. approximately 5500 ft. to the site. It would be designed as a low-pressure forcemain system, which would permit other properties along the route to tie in. At this time, it is expected that the sewer would be designed and constructed by the Applicant.

For water supply, the preferred alternative is construction of a new main down Dan Fox Drive approximately 4000 ft. to the site. This would provide adequate potable water supply and fire protection

The exact routing of these utilities has not been investigated. It is anticipated, however, that they will generally run down the shoulders of their respective roads. The impacts to surrounding Resource

(c) Mitigating measures:

The impacts from the development are expected to be minimal. Impacts to Wetland Resource Areas, if any, will fall within the limits of the regulations. The stormwater will be controlled within the limits of the site and designed to meet the strict requirements of the Massachusetts Stormwater Management Guidelines. Traffic from the development will have little or no impact to the adjacent public roadways. Erosion-controls will be carefully planned so as to prevent unlawful discharges of silt-laden runoff into receiving water bodies. Lighting from the project will be designed to prevent "night glow".

LAND SECTION – all proponents must fill out this section

I. 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: 11.03(1)(b)2. creation of 5 or more acres of impervious area

II. Impacts and Permits

A. Describe, in acres, the current and proposed character of the project site, as follows:

Footprint of buildings Roadways, parking, and other paved areas Other altered areas (describe)	Existing	Change 4.4 2.3 15.1	follows: Total 4.4 2.3 15.1 (clearing/grading)
Undeveloped areas	70	21.8	21.8

- 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 any part of the site is the subject of a DEM-approved forest management plan: