Commonwealth of Massachusetts



Executive Office of Environmental Affairs

MEPA Office

Environmental Notification Form

12753 R	
Bill GAGE	
617-626-1025	

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: South River Dredging	3					
Street:						
Municipality: Scituate and Marshfield		Watershed: South Coastal				
Universal Tranverse Mercator Coordinates:		Latitude: 42°08'30" N				
N 4666750 E 359600	Longitude: 70°42'00" W					
Estimated commencement date: Nov. 2004		Estimated completion date: Feb. 2004				
Approximate cost: \$500,000	Status of project design: 75%complete					
Proponent: Town of Scituate Water	ways Con	nmission				
Street: 600 Chief Justice Cushing H	ighway					
Municipality: Scituate		State: Mass.	Zip Code: 02	2066		
Name of Contact Person From Who	m Copies	of this ENF May	Be Obtained:			
Burton B. Bryan	_					
Firm/Agency: Robert L. Fultz & Associates		Street: 74 Colonial Road				
Municipality: Marshfield		State: Mass.	Zip Code: 02	2050		
Phone: 781-659-2003	Fax: 78	1-659-2003	E-mail: bnayr	b@aol.com		
Does this project meet or exceed a mandatory EIR threshold (see 301 CMR 11.03)? Yes						
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)	,	☐Yes ☐Yes ⊠Yes ☐Yes		⊠No ⊠No ⊠No ⊠No		
Identify any financial assistance or land the agency name and the amount of fur Management,	transfer fr nding or la	om an agency of t nd area (in acres):	he Commonwea Department of	alth, including f Environmental		
Are you requesting coordinated review	with any o	ther federal, state,) ⊠r		al agency?		
List Local or Federal Permits and Appro	ovals: Or	der of Conditions	Scituate Conser	vation		

Commission; Order of Conditions, Marshfield Conservation Commission; U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Permit						
Which ENF or EIR review thres Land Water Energy ACEC	hold(s) does th Rare Spec Wastewate Air Regulation	ies 🛚	Wetlands, W Transportat Solid & Haz	Vaterways, & Tidelands		
Summary of Project Size	Existing	Change	Total	State Permits &		
& Environmental Impacts				Approvals		
	AND			Order of Conditions		
Total site acreage				Superseding Order of Conditions		
New acres of land altered		39.6				
Acres of impervious area	0	0	0			
Square feet of new bordering vegetated wetlands alteration		0		MHD or MDC Access Permit		
Square feet of new other wetland alteration		1,727,300		☐ Water Management_ Act Permit		
Acres of new non-water dependent use of tidelands or waterways		0		New Source Approval DEP or MWRA Sewer Connection/		
STRU	JCTURES			Extension Permit Other Permits		
Gross square footage	0	0	0	(including Legislative		
Number of housing units	0	0	0	Approvals) - Specify:		
Maximum height (in feet)	N/A			***		
TRANSI	PORTATION					
Vehicle trips per day	N/A					
Parking spaces	0	0	0			
WATER/W	VASTEWATE	R				
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 pro	piect involve the	conversion of	Foublic porkla	nd or other Article 07 - LL		
natural resources to any purpose not Yes (Specify	in accordance	with Article 97'	r public parkia ? ⊠No	TIG OF OTHER ARTICLE 97 PUBLIC		

Will it involve the release of any conservation restriction, preserva preservation restriction, or watershed preservation restriction?	ation restriction, agricultural
Yes (Specify)	⊠No
RARE SPECIES: Does the project site include Estimated Habitat of Sites of Rare Species, or Exemplary Natural Communities?	·
HISTORICAL /ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Does the project district listed in the State Register of Historic Place or the inventor the Commonwealth?	ry of Historic and Archaeological Assets of
If yes, does the project involve any demolition or destruction of an archaeological resources?	
☐Yes (Specify)	□No
AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN: Is the projection of the	
PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project description should project site, (b) a description of both on-site and off-site alter with each alternative, and (c) potential on-site and off-site mit (You may attach one additional page, if necessary.)	rnatives and the impacts associated

The project involves dredging a 10,000 foot (1.89 mile) stretch of the South River extending north from the Sea Street Bridge connecting the mainland in Marshfield to the barrier beach of Humarock, which is part of Scituate (see attached locus map). Of this length, only approximately 6,200 linear feet (1.17 mi.) is shallow enough to require dredging. The town line between Scituate and Marshfield goes approximately down the center of the channel in its southern half; the northern part is in Scituate. The area to be dredged will be 75 feet wide at the bottom. It is proposed to dredge the sediments mechanically and barge them to the nearshore area off Humarock, on the other side of the barrier beach, in approximately 15 to 20 feet of water. This will keep the material in the nearshore/beach system, in which sediments are washed into the beach and back out to the nearshore area depending on the intensity of wave action.

Alternatives

- 1. No Build-No dredging is conducted. Considerable shoaling in the proposed project area will continue to provide a risk to public safety, property and water quality due to vessels grounding and colliding with other vessels. The potential for collision is increased because vessels have no clear line of navigation. The shoaling represents a threat to public safety and public health by: restricting vessels from using the established course; potential vessel damages from avoiding and/or coming in contact with a hazard (such as shoaling, or another vessel) and jeopardizing safe turning. Any continued impairment to the ability of the United States Coast Guard and the Scituate Harbormaster Office to respond to emergencies puts commercial and recreational boaters at even greater risk.
- 2. Maintenance dredging is conducted, spoils are dewatered and trucked to upland disposal site, possibly a landfill. The project would not then provide the multiple benefits of storm

damage prevention and flood control that beach nourishment would. There is not a suitable site for dewatering in the vicinity of the project area. This alternative is more costly than the proposed alternative.

- 3. The entire channel is mechanically dredged and the sediment of disposed of at the Mass. Bay Disposal Site. Sediment samples from this entire stretch of the river have been approved for disposal at MBDS by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, but this option would prevent the suitable portion of the sediments from being used as beach nourishment. The Scituate Waterways Commission, The Conservation Commission, the Save Humarock Association, Humarock residents, and Mass. Coastal Zone Management are all interested in keeping as much of the material as possible in the Humarock barrier beach system.
- 4. Maintenance dredging is conducted with a hydraulic dredge and suitable spoil material is disposed of in a slurry through a pipeline onto Humarock Beach, with the remainder being mechanically dredged and disposed of at MBDS. This option would enhance the beach's functions of storm damage prevention and flood control. However, the material could go only to a relatively small area of the beach, not that in greatest need of nourishment, because of legal constraints. The majority of the material would be lost to the barrier beach system.
- 5. Mechanically dredge all material and transport it by barge to the nearshore area off Humarock, on the other side of the barrier beach, in approximately 15 to 20 feet of water. This alternative keeps all the material in the barrier beach system and is cost-effective, since only a single dredging method is used, no transfer of the material is needed, and the route of barge transportation is short. Since the area proposed as the disposal site is far larger than needed for this single project, the site once permitted, can be used as a disposal area for other regional projects. This is the preferred alternative.