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.: 12822
MEPA Analyst: Bill Gage
Phone: 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: Katama Bay Navigation and Tidal Exchange Channels		
Street:		
Municipality: Edgartown	Watershed: Islands	
Universal Tranverse Mercator Coordinates: N 4579000 E 375500	Latitude: 41°21.2' Longitude: 70°29.3'	
Estimated commencement date:	Estimated completion date:	
Approximate cost:	Status of project design: 85%complete	
Proponent: Town of Edgartown		
Street: Attn: Harbormaster, P.O. Box 739		
Municipality: Edgartown	State: Mass.	Zip Code: 02539
Name of Contact Person From Whom Copies of this ENF May Be Obtained: Robert L. Fultz		
Firm/Agency: Robert L. Fultz & Associates	Street: 74 Colonial Rd.	
Municipality: Marshfield	State: MA	Zip Code: 02050
Phone: 781-837-4842	Fax: 781-837-1902	E-mail: rlfultz@msn.com

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 301CMR 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): _____

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

List Local or Federal Permits and Approvals: Order of Conditions, Edgartown Conservation Commission; U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Permit

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

- ☐ Land
- ☐ Water
- ☐ Energy
- ☐ ACEC
- ☒ Rare Species
- ☐ Wastewater
- ☐ Air
- ☐ Regulations
- ☒ Wetlands, Waterways, & Tidelands
- ☐ Transportation
- ☐ Solid & Hazardous Waste
- ☐ Historical & Archaeological Resources

Summary of Project Size & Environmental Impacts	Existing	Change	Total
LAND			
Total site acreage			
New acres of land altered		13.2	
Acres of impervious area	0	0	0
Square feet of new bordering vegetated wetlands alteration		0	
Square feet of new other wetland alteration		574,992	
Acres of new non-water dependent use of tidelands or waterways		0	
STRUCTURES			
Gross square footage	0	0	0
Number of housing units	0	0	0
Maximum height (in feet)	N/A		
TRANSPORTATION			
Vehicle trips per day	N/A		
Parking spaces	0	0	0
WATER/WASTEWATER			
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

State Permits & Approvals

- ☒ Order of Conditions
- ☐ Superseding Order of Conditions
- ☒ Chapter 91 License
- ☒ 401 Water Quality Certification
- ☐ MHD or MDC Access Permit
- ☐ Water Management Act Permit
- ☐ New Source Approval
- ☐ DEP or MWRA Sewer Connection/ Extension Permit
- ☐ Other Permits (*including Legislative Approvals*) – Specify:

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: Estimated Habitat and Priority Site) ☐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_____) ☒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 project consists of dredging two channels through the shallow southern part of Katama Bay in order to improve navigation for shellfishermen and circulation, water quality, and fisheries habitat. As shown on the enclosed plans, the channels would be 30 feet wide at the bottom and 2400 feet long (west channel) and 2125 feet long (central channel). Dredging will be by hydraulic dredge, and sediments will be deposited on South Beach. Total area to be dredged is 258,214 sq. ft. (5.9 acres), and the disposal area covers 317,988 sq. ft. (7.3 acres). Eelgrass has all but vanished in Katama Bay according to DEP 2001 survey. This project will help improve circulation and help restore eelgrass and shellfish habitat.

The disposal area is within Estimated Habitat of Rare Wildlife and Priority Habitat of Rare Species. The Naural Hereitage and Endangered Species Program will be notified of this project and all necessary precautions will be taken to avoid disturbance of listed species, including timing of disposal to avoid critical breeding and nesting seasons and 10 to 1 slope of disposal site(13 to 1 back slope). Adjacent projects have provided piping plover habitat. Channels have been kept to a minimum size necessary for small shellfishing vessels.

Alternatives

1. ***The preferred alternative is to dredge the sediments with a hydraulic dredge and pump them to a previously approved disposal area on South Beach, adjacent to Katama Bay. The sediments have been analyzed and found to be acceptable for beach nourishment, and grain size analysis has shown them to be compatible with sand presently on the beach. The sand would perform an important function of protecting and enhancing a beach enjoyed by thousands of visitors annually, as well as enhancing the beach's function of storm damage and flood control and providing piping plover habitat. This use has been approved by the Mass. DEP and the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers for previous projects in this area.***
2. ***Since the Town owns a hydraulic dredge, the sediments are suitable for hydraulic dredging, and hydraulic dredging has far less turbidity impacts than mechanical dredging, no other means of dredging was considered practical for this project. Similarly, since a nearby beach area has been approved for disposal, and beach nourishment on a public beach is the disposal method preferred by the DEP, no other disposal method is considered practical.***
3. ***The only other alternative is no action. This would allow the current condition of inaccessibility and less than ideal growing conditions for shellfish to continue, resulting in lost opportunities for employment and recreation.***