**Commonwealth of Massachusetts**
**Executive Office of Environmental Affairs ■ MEPA Office**

| For Office Use Only<br>Executive Office of Environmental Affairs |
|---|
| EOEA No.: 12890 |
| MEPA Analyst: Nick Zavolas |
| Phone: 617-626-1030 |

# ENF Environmental Notification Form

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: New Tyngsborough Bridge and Approaches | |
| Street: Route 113 and Route 3A | |
| Municipality: Tyngsborough | Watershed: Merrimack River Watershed |
| Universal Tranverse Mercator Coordinates<br>Alt. 14:<br>300101.9 E 4730068.4 N<br>301815.0 E 4729942.4 N<br>Alt. 5/6:<br>301362.6 E 4726157.5 N<br>301953.6 E 4726992.5 N<br>301671.7 E 4727440.6 N<br>Short Range Improvements<br>301428.9 E 4727480.9 N | Longitude/Latitude:<br>Alt. 14:<br>-71° 26′ 25.7″ W 42° 41′ 56.6″ N<br>-71° 25′ 10.3″ W 42° 41′ 54.1″ N<br>Alt. 5/6:<br>-71° 25′ 25.4″ W 42° 39′ 51.1″ N<br>-71° 25′ 0.5″ W 42° 40′ 18.6″ N<br>-71° 25′ 13.5″ W 42° 40′ 32.9″ N<br>Short Range Improvements:<br>-71° 25′ 24.2″ W 42° 40′ 32.0″ N |
| Estimated commencement date: 2006 | Estimated completion date: 2008 |
| Approximate cost:<br>Alternative 5/6: $20 - $26.5 Million<br>Alternative 14: $23 - $30 Million<br>Short Range Improvements: $4 – 4.5 Million | Status of project design: 5% complete<br>Project team is in the process of completing the conceptual design and the feasibility studies. Project design will not begin until the preferred alternative has been selected. |
| Proponent: Massachusetts Highway Department (Mass Highway) | |
| Street: 10 Park Plaza | |
| Municipality: Boston | State: MA / Zip Code: 02116 |
| Name of Contact Person From Whom Copies of this ENF May Be Obtained:<br>Thomas Hession | |
| Firm/Agency: Massachusetts Highway Department | Street: Ten Park Plaza |
| Municipality: Boston | State: MA / Zip Code: 02116 |
| Phone: 617-973-7498 / Fax: 617-973-8879 | E-mail: thomas.hession@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

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Number of housing units | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Maximum height (in feet) | 0 | To be calculated in future phases of the project. | To be calculated in future phases of the project. |
| **TRANSPORTATION** | | | |
| Vehicle trips per day (Modeled for 2020) | 0 | Alternative 5/6: 16,900 (ADT) Alternative 14: 24,350 (ADT) | Alternative 5/6: 16,900 (ADT) Alternative 14: 24,350 (ADT) |
| 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 |

**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

The current MassGIS data layer for natural communities and state-listed rare species habitats in Massachusetts shows that the entire length of the Merrimack River is mapped as estimated habitat due to the fact that large river systems, such as the Merrimack River, are typically associated with the migratory movements of rare, threatened, or endangered bird species. In this particular case, the Merrimack River is mapped for the bald eagle populations. Based on correspondence with NHESP, however, there are no known bald eagle nesting sites in Tyngsborough; rather, the Merrimack is mapped due to its association with the bald eagle's migratory movements. The correspondence is attached in Attachment 5. A figure showing the estimated habitat is included in Attachment 6.

**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

The study team contacted the Massachusetts Historical Commission (MHC) in order to identify state-listed archaeological/historical resources within the project's environmental focus area. A figure showing historic resources is included in Attachment 6 and the correspondence is included in Attachment 7.

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

☐Yes (Specify_____) ☒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 (See Attachment 11) ☐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): At this stage of the study, none have been identified.

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

List Local or Federal Permits and Approvals: Local conservation commission approval, 404 ACOE Certification, U.S. Coast Guard Bridge 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 | State Permits & Approvals |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **LAND** | | | | ☒ Order of Conditions<br>☐ Superseding Order of Conditions<br>☒ Chapter 91 License<br>☒ 401 Water Quality Certification<br>☐ MHD or MDC Access Permit<br>☐ Water Management Act Permit<br>☐ New Source Approval<br>☐ DEP or MWRA Sewer Connection/ Extension Permit<br>☒ Other Permits (*Including Legislative Approvals*) – Specify:<br>U. S. Coast Guard Bridge Permit |
| Total site acreage | To be calculated in future phases of the project. | | | |
| New acres of land altered | | To be calculated in future phases of the project. | | |
| Acres of impervious area (acres) | 0 | Short Range: 3.7<br>Alt. 5/6: 3<br>Alt 14: 3.1 | Short Range: 3.7<br>Alt. 5/6: 3<br>Alt 14: 3.1 | |
| Square feet of new bordering vegetated wetlands alteration | | Final wetland boundary delineation must be performed during future phases of the project to precisely quantify the wetland impacts of the bridge crossing alternatives and their approaches. Regardless of the final alignment, wetlands impacts are expected to be less than 5,000 square feet. | | |
| Square feet of new other wetland alteration | | | | |
| Acres of new non-water dependent use of tidelands or waterways | | | | |
| **STRUCTURES** | | | | |
| Gross square footage | 0 | Alternative 5/6 – 57,600<br>Alternative 14 – 43,500 | Alternative 5/6 – 57,600<br>Alternative 14 – 43,500 | |

**AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN:** Is the project in or adjacent to an 1Area 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.*)

(A more detailed description of the project alignment alternatives is included in Attachment 8)

In February 2002, the New Tyngsborough Bridge Transportation Study, Feasibility Study and Conceptual Design for a Second Bridge Crossing of the Merrimack River (the Study) was published by MassHighway. The purpose of the Study was to assess the need for and feasibility of a second bridge across the Merrimack River in the Town of Tyngsborough and to evaluate the local and regional implications of a new bridge. The impetus for this study came from continuing growth in both local and regional traffic and concerns about the ability of local public safety agencies to cross the river in emergencies. The first part of the study was to evaluate 14 different alternatives for bridge crossings. The Feasibility Study indicated that, out of the original fourteen (14) bridge alternatives that were identified, alternatives 5/6 and 14 show the most promise to best serve the overall study goals and the interests of the citizens of Tyngsborough with the least environmental impacts. Copies of the Study are available for public review at several locations; see Attachment 9.

The next step in the project development process is the filing of this Environmental Notification Form (ENF) with the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act office (MEPA Unit) of the Executive Office of Environmental Affairs. The project team, with the valuable assistance of the Public Working Group members, public agencies, the town administrators, and the citizens of Tyngsborough, identified the two alternatives to be developed to the conceptual design level and advanced through the MEPA process. In addition, two short-range improvements also were identified that help to alleviate some of the traffic congestion and safety concerns at the existing Tyngsborough Bridge.

The selection, design, permitting and construction of an additional bridge crossing of the Merrimack River will require several years to complete. Therefore, as part of the Study, certain short-range improvements were identified. These short-range improvements can be completed regardless of whether or not a second bridge is built. The proponent is requesting a Phase I waiver for the short-range improvements because they have independent utility and they do not exceed any of the MEPA thresholds. The short-range improvements are relatively low-cost and readily implemented improvements designed to alleviate traffic congestion in and around the existing bridge. The range of improvements examined included intersection geometries, signal re-timings and re-phasings, and complete roadway realignments. On the east side of the river the short-range improvements include the relocation of Pawtucket Boulevard such that the roadway departs from its current alignment along the riverbank about 2,000-feet south of the existing bridge, curving easterly in an arc that runs to an intersection with Sherburne Avenue, thence curving back to the west to first intersect Frost Road before approaching the existing bridge. On the west side of the river the short-range improvements include the widening of the westbound approach of the Middlesex Avenue/Kendall Road intersection. These improvements help to alleviate some of the major traffic and safety problems in and around the existing bridge. The existing Tyngsborough bridge is scheduled to undergo needed repairs beginning later this year. This work will include the installation of a temporary bridge adjacent to the south side of the existing span.