

Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Executive Office of Environmental Affairs ■ MEPA Office

ENF

Environmental Notification Form

<i>For Office Use Only</i> <i>Executive Office of Environmental Affairs</i>	
EOEA No.:	14116
MEPA Analyst:	ANNE CANADAY
Phone:	617-626- X 1035

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: King Philip Water Treatment Plant		
Street: Wampanoag Road		
Municipality: Raynham	Watershed: Taunton River Basin	
Universal Transverse Mercator Coordinates:	Latitude: 41.93	Longitude: -71.06
Estimated commencement date: May 2008	Estimated completion date: May 2009	
Approximate cost: 3.8 million	Status of project design: 50 %	
Proponent: North Raynham Water District		
Street: P.O BOX I		
Municipality: Raynham	State: MA	Zip Code: 02767
Name of Contact Person From Whom Copies of this ENF May Be Obtained: Nicole Sanford, Sr. Environmental Scientist		
Firm/Agency: Stantec Consulting Services	Street: 136 West Street, Suite 203	
Municipality: Northampton	State: MA	Zip Code: 01060
Phone: 413-584-4776	Fax: 413-584-3157	E-mail: nicole.sanford@stantec.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. 10978) 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): DEP SRF – DWSRF – 3.8 million dollars

Are you requesting coordinated review with any other federal, state, regional, or local agency?
 Yes (Specify: **MA DEP, Town Building Inspector, an Fire Chief**) No

List Local or Federal Permits and Approvals: **Water Management Act Permit Amendment, DEP SRF, DEP Permit to Construct (BRP WS 24), Sewer Discharge Permit, Local Site**

Plan Approval, and Order of Conditions, NPDES Stormwater Construction General Permit

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 checked="" 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 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water Management Act Permit <input type="checkbox"/> New Source Approval <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DEP or MWRA Sewer Connection/ Extension Permit <input type="checkbox"/> Other Permits <i>(including Legislative Approvals) – Specify:</i> Water Management Act Permit Amendment, DEP SRF, DEP Permit to Construct (BRP WS 24), Local Site Plan Approval, NPDES Stormwater Construction General Permit and Sewer Connection Permit
Total site acreage	29.97 acres			
New acres of land altered		2.80 acres		
Acres of impervious area	0.53 acres	0.75 acres	1.28 acres	
Square feet of new bordering vegetated wetlands alteration		0 acres		
Square feet of new other wetland alteration		0 acres		
Acres of new non-water dependent use of tidelands or waterways		N/A		
STRUCTURES				
Gross square footage	1,100 = existing pump station	King Philip WTP = 3,800	4,900	
Number of housing units	N/A	N/A	N/A	
Maximum height (in feet)	Existing pump station is 25 feet	Proposed WTP is 43 feet	Pump station = 25 ft. and WTP = 43 ft.	
TRANSPORTATION				
Vehicle trips per day	2 trips each site	0	2 trips each site	
Parking spaces	2	2 additional at WTP	4	
WATER/WASTEWATER				
Gallons/day (GPD) of water use	0	0	0	
GPD water withdrawal	763 GPM for combined wells to be treated by WTP	0 GPM	763 GPM for combined wells.	
GPD wastewater generation/ treatment	0	40	40	

Length of water/sewer mains (in miles)	1,130 LF water main 0 existing sewer main	3,200 LF water main 500 LF sewer main	4,330 LF water main 500 LF sewer main
---	--	--	--

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 _____) 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.)

Introduction

The North Raynham Water District (District) has been experiencing a decline in water quality from three existing drinking water wells: First Street Well and King Philip Well No. 3A and 3B. In order to correct the water quality issues, the District needs to build a water treatment facility (WTP) that will treat the raw water from the three existing wells and one new well referred to as the King Philip Rock Well (Figure 1). The project also involves upgrading the new King Philip Rock Well to a production well. This well is a DEP Approved Well that offers the District another withdrawal point. The new well will not result in an increase in the District's existing permitted withdrawal rate. This project exceeds the MEPA review thresholds at 310 CMR 11.03 (4) (b) (4) construction of a new drinking water treatment plant with the capacity of 1 MGD or more; and 310 CMR 11.03 (4) (b) (1) new withdrawal or expansion in withdrawal of 100,000 or more GPD from a water source that requires new construction for the withdrawal. Treatment of these supplies is needed to allow pumping of the wells without introducing elevated levels of iron and manganese into the water distribution system. Iron and manganese levels in water are considered secondary standards. Secondary drinking water standards are for parameters which have no adverse health effects but cause a nuisance or an aesthetic problem to the consumer. These symptoms may consist of hard, rusty or cloudy water, stains on household fixtures or metallic taste. The existing wells have had a history of producing water with elevated concentrations of iron and/or manganese that are above the DEP Secondary Maximum Contaminant Levels and have caused consumer complaints.

Project Description

The existing well sites are owned and operated by the North Raynham Water District and consist of access roads with well houses and/or pump stations. The proposed King Philip Water Treatment Facility (WTP) will be located adjacent to the existing King Philip Pump Station which pumps water from two existing onsite wells (King Philip Well 3A and 3B). The new King Philip Rock Well is also onsite and will be treated by the

new WTP. The proposed King Philip WTP will treat the raw water from these onsite wells as well as the First Street Well that is located off the property. Raw water from the First Street Well will be connected to the WTP for treatment via new water main installations.

As shown on the enclosed plans, the project will involve the construction of a 3,800 SF water treatment facility with associated infrastructure (e.g., stormwater structures and lagoons for backwash wastewater) and the installation of associated utilities to connect the wells to the WTP and the treated water to the existing distribution system. Specifically, 1,700 LF of water main will be installed in Pontiac Road, Wampanoag Road and the existing access road to the King Philip pump station and new WTP; 575 LF of water main will be installed on Chickering Road; and 925 LF of water main will be installed from the new Rock Well to the new WTP. Also, 500 LF of new sanitary force main will be installed from the WTP to the existing sewer manhole in the cul-de-sac on Wampanoag Road. Finally, a pitless adapter and submersible pump will be installed at the new rock well to upgrade it from a test well to a production well.

Project Alternatives

There are no practicable off-site alternatives for this project and it only makes logistical and economic sense to construct a facility near the wells it is designed to treat.

Project Impacts

The project will require the filing of a Notice of Intent with the Conservation Commission for the installation of water transmission mains that will connect the wells to the WTP and the WTP to the existing water distribution system, and for construction related to upgrading the King Philip Rock Well to a production well. There will be no impact to any resource areas. The upgrade of the King Philip Rock Well and portions of the water main installations will occur within the buffer zone of bordering vegetated wetlands. The majority of these impacts to the 100-foot buffer zone will be temporary and land that is altered will be returned to pre-existing conditions. The project will also require an Amendment to the existing Water Management Act Permit in order to get the rock well listed as an additional withdrawal point. Please note that the Water Management Act Permit Amendment does not increase the total permitted withdrawal.

In summary, only 2.80 acres of the 29.97 acres will be disturbed as it is the goal of public drinking water supplies to the leave areas surrounding wells as natural as possible. The project will not result in an increase in permitted water withdrawal and will only improve the quality and reliability of drinking water for the Town of Raynham.

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 **X** 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	0.03	0.09	0.12
Roadways, parking, and other paved areas	0.49	0.5	0.99
Other altered areas (describe)	0	0.47*	0.47
Undeveloped areas	29.26	-2.33**	26.93

*Infrastructure associated with the WTP construction (e.g., underground utilities, backwash water lagoons)

**Acreage of proposed new construction

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

C. Is any part of the project site currently or proposed to be in active forestry use?
 ___ Yes **X** No; if yes, please describe current and proposed forestry activities and indicate whether any part of the site is the subject of a DEM-approved forest management plan: