

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.: 13090
MEPA Analyst: Anne Canaday
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: Replacement of Massachusetts Army National Guard OMS #7		
Street: 522 Concord Street		
Municipality: Framingham	Watershed: Sudbury/Assabet/Concord	
Universal Transverse Mercator Coordinates:	Latitude: 42.17.26.9 Longitude: 71.24 35.9	
Estimated commencement date: Spring 2004	Estimated completion date: Spring 2005	
Approximate cost: \$8.2 million	Status of project design: 15% %complete	
Proponent: Massachusetts Army National Guard		
Street: 50 Maple Street		
Municipality: Milford	State: MA	Zip Code: 01757
Name of Contact Person From Whom Copies of this ENF May Be Obtained: David McCarley		
Firm/Agency: HRP Associates, Inc.	Street: 220 Forbes Road, Ste. 404	
Municipality: Braintree	State: MA	Zip Code: 02184
Phone: 781-356-2944	Fax: 781-356-2409	E-mail: david.mccarley@hrpassociates.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:

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 type="checkbox"/> Wetlands, Waterways, & Tidelands |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Water | <input type="checkbox"/> Wastewater | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Energy | <input type="checkbox"/> Air | <input type="checkbox"/> Solid & Hazardous Waste |
| <input type="checkbox"/> ACEC | <input type="checkbox"/> Regulations | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Historical & Archaeological Resources |

Summary of Project Size & Environmental Impacts	Existing	Change	Total	State Permits & Approvals
LAND				<input 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 <i>(including Legislative Approvals) – Specify:</i>
Total site acreage	10.84			
New acres of land altered		6.3		
Acres of impervious area	6.1	-0.02	5.9	
Square feet of new bordering vegetated wetlands alteration		0.0		
Square feet of new other wetland alteration		0.0		
Acres of new non-water dependent use of tidelands or waterways		0.0		
STRUCTURES				
Gross square footage	31,107	26,460	-4,647	
Number of housing units	0	0	0	
Maximum height (in feet)	15	17	32	
TRANSPORTATION				
Vehicle trips per day	64	0	64	
Parking spaces	105 (POV lined) ±3.0 acres unlined military parking	0	105 (POV lined) ±3.0 acres unlined military parking	
WATER/WASTEWATER				
Gallons/day (GPD) of water use	555 GPD	0.0	555 GPD	
GPD water withdrawal	0.0	0.0	0.0	
GPD wastewater generation/treatment	481 GPD	0.0	481 GPD	
Length of water/sewer mains (in miles)	0.1 miles	0.0	0.1 miles	

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 (Specify The State Historic Preservation Officer had determined that the structures on the property constitute a National Register-eligible district reflecting the changing approach to local and regional defense over more than half a century. The Armory building itself was erected in 1959 and would contribute to a district at the complex either as part of an extended period of significance through the Cold War period (to be determined by the National Park Service) or once it reaches fifty years of age.) No

If yes, does the project involve any demolition or destruction of any listed or inventoried historic or archaeological resources?

Yes (Specify: Two of the secondary structures on the project will be demolished, the OMS building and a Storage building, with the OMS replaced with a new structure. While the secondary structures on the site are older than the existing armory building, secondary support building usually do not qualify for individual listing in the National Register. However, they are included due to the SHPO determination stated above.) 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 site is located on the western portion of the Massachusetts Army National Guard (MAARNG) Framingham facility and is currently used as a maintenance facility for MAARNG vehicles. The Framingham site is listed in the Framingham Assessor's map as the Commonwealth of Massachusetts Armory Commission and is 11.35 acres in size. The site location is shown in Figure 1 and the site plan is included as Figure 2 (both attached at the end of the report). As can be seen in Figure 2, the facility site includes three buildings on the western two-thirds of the property and the Armory building (building #1) on the eastern third. The area of the proposed project is limited to the western two-thirds of the facility and involves demolition of the southern Storage Building, demolition and reconstruction of the OMS#7 building, renovations to the MVS building along the northwest border of the Armory facility, and changes to the associated paved and unpaved parking and driving areas at the facility.

The Organizational Maintenance Shop (OMS) #7, located in the eastern half of Building # 2, provides organizational level maintenance for assigned military vehicles and other equipment for MAARNG. Organizational maintenance consists of unit/general maintenance that includes fluid changes, brake repair, etc. and is also a location for vehicle refueling. The remainder of Building #2 is used for additional vehicle storage. Building #3 is the humidity controlled Motor Vehicle Storage (MVS) facility. Building #4 is a storage building that is currently not in use and has fallen into disrepair. Building #1 is the main Armory Building housing single story administrative wings flanking a central drill hall.

A new maintenance facility will be constructed to provide adequate organizational maintenance support for vehicles and equipment supported by the existing maintenance shop. The existing maintenance shop was

constructed in 1941 and is considered outdated and hazardous to work in. Building #2, which includes OMS #7, has 31,107 square feet of space and is considered to be inadequate to support the quantity and type of vehicles currently assigned to the OMS. The existing structure will be demolished and replaced by the new, smaller facility that will be approximately 26,460 feet in area. It will include an office area, personnel area, and work area in addition to work bays. The remainder of the project will include the changes and improvements to landscaping, drainage and paved and unpaved parking and driving areas associated with the facility.

Alternatives to the project are as follows:

- Locate new OMS #7 Facility at the Former USPFO Supply Depot in Natick, MA – An Environmental Alternatives Analysis (EAA) Study was conducted in August 1999 to identify the potential environmental requirements and liabilities associated with the two (2) proposed construction locations for the new OMS #7, the Framingham Armory and the Former USPFO Supply Depot in Natick, MA. HRP Associates concludes from the information provided in this report that the Framingham site would be the better environmental alternative for the replacement of OMS #7. The reasons for selecting Framingham include:
 1. *The Natick site is located in the Natick Aquifer Protection District, which indicates that Natick considers this location a valuable resource. The MAARNG may be required to obtain a variance from the town to construct and operate in this location and may be required to meet more stringent environmental requirements for the operation of the OMS. There are no such considerations relative to the Framingham site.*
 2. *Both locations have had historical site operations that indicate the potential for contamination of soil and groundwater to exist. It appears, however, that the concerns identified at the Framingham site have been investigated and that no significant contamination is present. Research relative to the Natick site indicated that documentation of the environmental history and conditions of that site are not as extensive as the information available for the Framingham site.*
- "No Build" Alternative. However, the "No Build" alternative would negatively impact the overall mission of the Guard. The lack of proper and adequate maintenance, training, storage and administrative areas will continue to impair the attainment of the units' required mobilization readiness levels.

Based on the nature of the facility and the project under consideration, in addition to the unchanged type, tempo and volume of usage at the facility, no on-site or off-site environmental mitigation measures will be necessary relative to the project if undertaken at the Framingham Armory. Based on the preliminary determination forwarded to the MAARNG the SHPO may recommend mitigation measures relative to the historic nature of the site under NHPA of 1966, Section 106. The Guard has coordinated, and will continue to coordinate, activities relative to the site with the Framingham Historical Society and SHPO.

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))
 ___ Yes No; if yes, specify each threshold:

II. Impacts and Permits

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

	<u>Existing</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Total</u>
Footprint of buildings	<u>2.3</u>	<u>-.01</u>	<u>2.2</u>
Roadways, parking, and other paved areas	<u>3.7</u>	<u>-0.1</u>	<u>3.6</u>
Other altered areas (describe)	<u>2.6</u>	<u>0.2</u>	<u>2.8</u>
Undeveloped areas	<u>0.8</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.8</u>

B. Has any part of the project site been in active agricultural use in the last three years?
 ___ Yes No; if yes, how many acres of land in agricultural use (with agricultural soils) will be