

Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Executive Office of Environmental Affairs ■ MEPA Office

Environmental
ENF Notification Form

For Office Use Only
Executive Office of Environmental Affairs
 EOE No.: 14429
 MEPA Analyst: Nick 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: Reconstruction of Athol Richmond Road (Route 32) in Royalston		
Street: Athol Richmond Road (Route 32)		
Municipality: Royalston	Watershed: Millers	
Universal Transverse Mercator Coordinates: 19 N15534844.4346 E 763968.9145 to 19 N15504458.2682 E 773058.6608 (NAD 83)	Latitude: 42° 43' 16" N to 42° 38' 20" N Longitude: 72° 15' 45" W to 72° 13' 28" W	
Estimated commencement date: Fall 2009	Estimated completion date: Fall 2011	
Approximate cost: \$3.88 Million	Status of project design: 75 %complete	
Proponent: MassHighway/Town of Royalston		
Street: 10 Park Plaza		
Municipality: Boston	State: MA	Zip Code: 02116
Name of Contact Person From Whom Copies of this ENF May Be Obtained: Jessie Wilson		
Firm/Agency: Massachusetts Highway Department	Street: 10 Park Plaza	
Municipality: Boston	State: MA	Zip Code: 02116
Phone: (617)973-8281	Fax: (617)973-8879	E-mail: Jessie.Wilson@mhd.state.ma.us

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): The Massachusetts Highway Department is funding 20% and the Federal Highway Administration is funding 80% of the construction costs.

Are you requesting coordinated review with any other federal, state, regional, or local agency?
 Yes (Specify _____) No

RECEIVED
 JUN 1 2009
MEPA

List Local or Federal Permits and Approvals: **National Environmental Policy Act Categorical Exclusion – Federal Highway Administration; Order of Conditions – Royalston Conservation Commission; Section 404 Programmatic General Permit – U.S. Army Corps of Engineers; National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Stormwater Discharges for Construction Activities – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency**

Which ENF or EIR review threshold(s) does the project meet or exceed (see 301 CMR 11.03):

- | | | |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Land | <input type="checkbox"/> Rare Species | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wetlands, Waterways, & Tidelands (301 11.03 (3)(b)1.f) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Water | <input type="checkbox"/> Wastewater | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Transportation (301 11.03(6)(b)2.b) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Energy | <input type="checkbox"/> Air | <input type="checkbox"/> Solid & Hazardous Waste |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ACEC | <input type="checkbox"/> Regulations | <input type="checkbox"/> Historical & Archaeological Resources |

Summary of Project Size & Environmental Impacts	Existing	Change	Total	State Permits & Approvals
LAND				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Order of Conditions <input type="checkbox"/> Superseding Order of Conditions <input type="checkbox"/> Chapter 91 License <input 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 type="checkbox"/> Other Permits (including Legislative Approvals) – Specify:
Total site acreage	18.6 acres			
New acres of land altered		1.7 acres		
Acres of impervious area	15.6 acres	1.0 acres	16.6 acres	
Square feet of new bordering vegetated wetlands alteration		4797 sf		
Square feet of new other wetland alteration		48,370 sf (Riverfront)		
Acres of new non-water dependent use of tidelands or waterways		0 sf		
STRUCTURES				
Gross square footage	N.A	N.A	N.A	
Number of housing units	N.A	N.A	N.A	
Maximum height (in feet)	N.A	N.A	N.A	
TRANSPORTATION				
Vehicle trips per day	810	0	810	
Parking spaces	N.A	N.A	N.A	
WASTEWATER				
Gallons/day (GPD) of water use	N.A	N.A	N.A	
GPD water withdrawal	N.A	N.A	N.A	
GPD wastewater generation/ treatment	N.A	N.A	N.A	

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 (77 Athol Richmond Road) No

The Royalston Historic District Commission has identified the property at 77 Athol Richmond Road as being individually eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. No roadway widening or stone wall relocation is proposed at this location. However, one 21" Maple Tree will be removed from the roadside within the existing highway layout in front of the property. According to MassHighway's Cultural Resource Section, it is considered unlikely that this project will have an adverse effect under Section 106 of the National Preservation Act on the NR-eligible property at 77 Athol Richmond Road.

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.)

The Massachusetts Highway Department is proposing to make improvements to Athol Richmond Road in the Town of Royalston from the New Hampshire state border to the Athol Town Line. The length of the roadway is approximately 6.5 miles.

Purpose and Need: The existing roadway is in extremely poor condition due to the lack of proper subgrade material, inadequate drainage and many years of heavy truck traffic. At the southerly end of the project, Tully Dam, owned and operated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, is lacking an adequate barrier system to prevent errant vehicles from leaving the elevated roadway and tumbling down the riprap slope.

Existing Conditions: Route 32 is a rural major collector which runs north/south from the New Hampshire state border to the Athol Town line. The roadway and surrounding infrastructure are in extremely poor condition. Route 32 is situated on top of Tully Dam which has formed Tully Lake at the southerly end of the project. The dam and adjacent recreational area and campground are owned and maintained by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. There is a 22 mile hiking/biking trail system named the Tully Trail which is a network of hiking trails affiliated with the Trustees of

Reservations and run a loop around Route 32. The Royalston State Forest abuts the Route 32 roadway in the middle portion of the project and there are several operating farms and residential properties abutting Route 32. The roadway width varies from approximately 20 to 22 feet throughout the length of the project. Numerous trees, wetland areas and culvert crossings are located throughout the project that create a very natural looking, wooded country road.

Proposed Improvements: The roadway is to be reconstructed within the footprint of the existing roadway with a 22 foot typical roadway section as appropriate for safety reasons. The roadway will be reconstructed with a reclaimed base course that is achieved by pulverizing the existing roadway asphalt surface and mixing it with the existing base course material to form a new base course. Additional quantities of crushed stone will be added to the reclaimed base course mixture as required in order to provide a stable base upon which to build the new roadway. A new hot mix asphalt pavement surface will then be paved on top of the reclaimed base course. Existing cross culverts along the entire project length will be replaced and the inlet and outlet channels will be cleared to ensure positive drainage. At two specific locations where adjacent beaver dams have caused roadway flooding, the profile will be raised and flow control devices will be installed through the beaver dams to maintain water levels beneath the road surface. At these areas new steel beam highway guard is proposed to prevent errant vehicles from rolling into the adjacent standing water. The slopes in these areas will be constructed with dumped riprap to stabilize the slope and minimize the extent of the wetland fill. In the section of Route 32 which runs parallel to Collar Brook, the alignment will be shifted easterly to provide a buffer to the Brook and stabilize the embankment adjacent to the brook as well as provide area for new guard rail to be installed.

At Tully Dam a new steel beam highway guard rail system will be installed to protect traffic on Route 32. This will not only provide a more standard railing system, it will be a system that the Town can maintain in the years to come as the existing concrete post and cable system is outdated.

Finally new pavement markings and signage will be installed to delineate travel on the new roadway.

Project Impacts: The project will result in approximately 4,797 sf of impacts (4,166 permanent, 631 temporary) to bordering vegetated wetlands. The project includes the installation of new culvert crossings with new headwalls and modified rock fill placed at the inlet and outlet locations and the raising the Route 32 roadway profile at two locations where beaver activity has restricted the flow of water and caused overtopping of the Route 32 roadway. The installation of guard rail necessitates the widening of the slope adjacent to the road and therefore results in a wider embankment. Approximately 48,370 sf of impacts to riverfront area will occur due to the proposed construction activities, the installation of new culvert crossings and the installation of riprap along Collar Brook, all of which occur within the 200 foot riverfront area buffer zone.

In order to mitigate the impacts to wetlands, a proposed wetland replication area has been designed and approved by the Town Conservation Commission. The replication area is located at the intersection of Stewart Street and Athol Richmond Road and is approximately 4,278 square feet.

There are no permanent Right of Way takings required as part of this project. 28 drainage easements and 2 highway easements will be formally established to provide the Town Department of Public Works the opportunity to maintain the infrastructure upon installation. An additional 18 temporary construction easements are also required to enable the construction work to properly blend into the existing adjacent topography.

Other Alternatives Considered: Alternatives to the proposed action that were considered include:

- No Build
- Pavement Overlay
- Full Depth Roadway Reconstruction

No Build: The condition of the existing roadway and cross culverts has deteriorated so severely that the roadway has become a serious safety hazard and the situation must be addressed. The no build option will ultimately lead to complete road closure. This is not a feasible option given the fact that there are several residences along the length of the project which must maintain access.

Pavement Overlay: The pavement overlay option represents a very short term less cost effective fix to the problem. Based on the severely deteriorated roadway conditions, the cost would be essentially the same as a full roadway reclamation and the overlay would shortly afterwards result in similar conditions to those which are being experienced at this time. Furthermore, unless the cross culverts are replaced and made functional, stormwater will be unable to drain away from the existing roadway which will continue the deterioration of the roadway being experienced at this time.

Full Depth Roadway Reconstruction: A full depth roadway reconstruction represents a more thorough and extensive solution to the problems which exist on the roadway. Reconstruction to current geometric standards and widths would result in far more wetland fill, stone wall removal, tree removals, landtakings and other impacts to the surrounding natural and cultural environment. In the early 1980's a similar design was proposed which was not chosen due to extensive public opposition. Furthermore, this option would cost an additional 3 million dollars than the preferred alternative.

Proposed Alternative: The proposed alternative involves the replacement of the deteriorated roadway cross culverts and reclamation of the existing roadway within the same general footprint. The preferred alternative has been selected because of its cost-effectiveness, minimized environmental impacts and its sensitivity to the context of this rural transportation corridor.