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.:/2907 MEPA Analyst**B;** // GA9E Phone: 617-626-/025

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: Plympton Business Park				
Street: Off Spring Street at Route 44	4			
Municipality: Plympton		Watershed: Taunton River and Jones River		
Universal Tranverse Mercator Coordinates:		Latitude: N41° 57' 20"		
		Longitude: W70° 46' 10"		
Estimated commencement date: Nov. 2003		Estimated completion date: Nov. 2004		
Approximate cost: \$7 Million		Status of project	t design:	50 %complete
Proponent: SN Commercial, LLC				
Street: 3050 Westford Drive				
Municipality: Baton Rouge		State: LA	Zip Code:	70816
Name of Contact Person From Whom Copies of this ENF May Be Obtained:				
Patty Wenskevich				
Firm/Agency: Woodard & Curran Inc.		Street: 980 Wa	shington St.,	Suite 325N
Municipality: Dedham		State: MA	Zip Code:	02026
Phone: (781) 251-0200	Fax: (78	1) 251-0847	E-mail:	14 T
			pwenskevich(@woodardcurran.cor
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 w		before? Yes (EOEA No)	☑No
Is this an Expanded ENF (see 301 CMR 11.05(7)) reque a Single EIR? (see 301 CMR 11.06(8))		esting: ☑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): None				
Are you requesting coordinated review with any other federal, state, regional, or local agency?				
☐Yes(Specify) ☑No				

Commission, Plympton Building Department Which ENF or EIR review threshold(s) does the project meet or exceed (see 301 CMR 11.03): Rare Species ✓ Land ☐ Wetlands, Waterways, & Tidelands ☐ Water ✓ Wastewater ✓ Transportation Energy ☐ Air Solid & Hazardous Waste ☐ ACEC Regulations Historical & Archaeological Resources **Summary of Project Size** State Permits & Existing Change Total & Environmental Impacts **Approvals** LAND Order of Conditions Superseding Order of 130 Total site acreage Conditions 130 New acres of land altered Chapter 91 License 401 Water Quality Acres of impervious area Certification 0 Square feet of new bordering ✓ MHD or MDC Access vegetated wetlands alteration Permit 0 Square feet of new other ☑Water Management wetland alteration Act Permit Acres of new non-water ☑ New Source Approval 0 dependent use of tidelands or ☐ DEP or MWRA waterways Sewer Connection/ **STRUCTURES Extension Permit** ☑ Other Permits 1 million 1 million Gross square footage (including Legislative Number of housing units 0 0 0 Approvals) - Specify: 40 40 Maximum height (in feet) **DEP Groundwater Discharge TRANSPORTATION** Permit Vehicle trips per day 8,684 8,684 2,237 2,237 0 Parking spaces WATER/WASTEWATER 89,000 89,000 Gallons/day (GPD) of water use 401,000 401.000 0 GPD water withdrawal 89,000 89,000 0 GPD wastewater generation/ treatment 0 1.5 1.5 Length of water/sewer mains (in 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? **☑**No Yes (Specify

List Local or Federal Permits and Approvals: Plympton Planning Board, Plympton Conservation

Will it involve the release of any conservation restriction, preservestriction, or watershed preservation restriction?	vation restriction, agricultural preservation
☐Yes (Specify	_) 🗹 No
RARE SPECIES: Does the project site include Estimated Habita Rare Species, or Exemplary Natural Communities?	
HISTORICAL /ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES: Does the p listed in the State Register of Historic Place or the inventory of H Commonwealth?	project site include any structure, site or district Historic and Archaeological Assets of the
☐Yes (Specify	_) ☑No (See attached letter from MHC)
If yes, does the project involve any demolition or destruction of a archaeological resources?	any listed or inventoried historic or
☐Yes (Specify)
AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN: Is the p Environmental Concern?	project in or adjacent to an Area of Critical
☐Yes (Specify	_) 🗹 No
PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The project description sho site, (b) a description of both on-site and off-site alternation	ould include (a) a description of the project ives and the impacts associated with each

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 entails development of a new mixed-use office park on 130 acres of land located in Plympton, MA at the intersection of Interstate Route 44 and Spring Street. The current plan is to develop the office park with a mix of uses that will include office, warehouse, hotel, and restaurant activities. The site is presently an undeveloped parcel that was formerly a gravel pit operation. Abutting land uses include industrial, commercial and undeveloped parcels, plus state highway Route 44 that is being expanded by the state.

Development alternatives that were considered for this site were variations on the density and mix of uses to be built. In part, the development mix and size of the project is driven by the "projected" real estate market demand at the time of project completion and leasing, expected to be in 2004 to 2010. Three development scenarios were considered for development:

- 1. Option A Office use totaling 880,000 sf; warehousing totaling 400,000 sf; a 120-room hotel and 200 seat restaurant.
- 2. Option B Warehousing use totaling 1.2 million sf.
- 3. Option C Office use totaling 250,000 sf; warehousing totaling 1 million sf; a 120-room hotel and 200 seat restaurant.
- 4. No Build This option is not a viable use for the proponent seeking development of an office park.

At this early stage of the project planning, several design layouts were prepared and examined of the three development options being considered. The primary factor, however, in selection of a preferred development plan is the traffic generation of each alternative development option and its impact on roadway level of service and safety. A traffic engineer was retained to study the alternate plans and examine the respective impacts of each. The results of the traffic analysis are shown in the table below. A copy of the Traffic Study is included in Attachment A (Section 1).