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.: 14138
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: Sengekontacket Pond Dredging, Beach Nourishment and Dune Restoration		
Street: Sengekontacket Pond, southern end of Sylvia State Beach, Bend in the Road Beach, Cow Bay Beach		
Municipality: Edgartown	Watershed: Sengekontacket Pond	
Universal Tranverse Mercator Coordinates:	Latitude: 041° 24' 43" N Longitude: 070° 32' 37" W	
Est. commencement date: Dec. 2008	Estimated completion date: Spring 2009	
Approximate cost: $1,200,000.00	Status of project design: 0 %complete	
Proponent: Town of Edgartown, Attn: Lynn Fraker, Dredge Administrator		
Street: Town Hall, 70 Main St.		
Municipality: Edgartown	State: MA	Zip Code: 02539
Name of Contact Person From Whom Copies of this ENF May Be Obtained: Beth Hays		
Firm/Agency: Woods Hole Group, Inc.	Street: 81 Technology Park Dr.	
Municipality: East Falmouth	State: MA	Zip Code: 02536
Phone:508-495-6240	Fax: 508-540-1001	E-mail: bhays@whgrp.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. 6386) ☐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): **N/A**

Are you requesting coordinated review with any other federal, state, regional, or local agency? ☒Yes: **We would like to coordinate a review with all the agencies to insure a complete scope is developed for the EIR with all agency's comments.** ☐No

List Local or Federal Permits and Approvals:

- **Order of Conditions from the Edgartown Conservation Commission**
- **Army Corps of Engineers Permit**
- **Massachusetts Coastal Zone Management Certification**

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	27.5± Dredge area and Barrier beach		
New acres of land altered		13.3± new Dune replenishment and beach nourishment	
Acres of impervious area			
Square feet of new bordering vegetated wetlands alteration		0	
Square feet of new other wetland alteration		13.9± acres dredging	
Acres of new non-water dependent use of tidelands or waterways		0	
STRUCTURES			
Gross square footage	N/A	N/A	N/A
Number of housing units	N/A	N/A	N/A
Maximum height (in feet)	N/A	N/A	N/A
TRANSPORTATION			
Vehicle trips per day	N/A	N/A	N/A
Parking spaces	N/A	N/A	N/A
WATER/WASTEWATER			
Gallons/day (GPD) of water use	N/A	N/A	N/A
GPD water withdrawal	N/A	N/A	N/A
GPD wastewater generation/ treatment	N/A	N/A	N/A
Length of water/sewer mains (in miles)	N/A	N/A	N/A

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 & Priority Site of Rare Species**) ☐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 proposed project calls for dredging approximately 85,000 cubic yards of sand from existing navigational channels within Sengekontacket Pond, which is located on the eastern shore of Martha's Vineyard. The project will include a combination of maintenance and improvement dredging and the dredged material will be reused as beach nourishment on adjacent coastal and barrier beaches. The dredging of Big Bridge entrance channel (navigational entrance to Sengekontacket Pond) and adjacent inlet shoals have been previously permitted for dredging, and therefore should be considered maintenance dredging. The remainder of the proposed channel has not been previously dredged and therefore considered improvement dredging.

The proposed channel is approximately 6,060 ft long, 100 ft wide, and approximately six (6) feet deep. The dredging project will generate approximately 85,000 cu yds of beach compatible sand that will be reused as beach nourishment on the adjacent barrier beaches, including Sylvia State Beach, Bend In The Road Beach and Cow Bay Beaches. Approximately one mile of the barrier beach extending from the southern end of Sylvia State Beach to the first groin east of Cow Bay Beach will be nourished. The properties include state, town and private beaches (see Figure 1 in attached Compliance Assessment, Appendix A). The dredging and subsequent beach nourishment will be completed with the Marathas Vineyard Hydraulic Dredge and the sand will be hydraulically pumped to the disposal sites through a combination of submerged and floating lines. The sand will be discharged on to the beach to nourish the beach and to build protective dunes. The dredging will directly impact approximately 13.9 acres of the Pond bottom while the beach nourishment and disposal will impact approximate 13.6 acres of coastal and barrier beach.

This project is consistent with the Local and Regional Master Plans, and the Town of Edgartown Master Dredging Plan (see Appendix A for Compliance Assessment). The completed project will enhance the navigational safety within the Edgartown Sengekontacket Pond Harbor, as well as improve the tidal flushing within the Sengekontacket Pond and the Upper and Lower sections of Trapps Pond. This project will make beneficial use of the dredge material for dune re-establishment and beach nourishment, for flood damage control. Additionally, the dredge material placement would be beneficial in the re-establishment of tern and plover nesting habitat in the area (see Appendix A for Compliance Assessment).

Project benefits include enhancing the coastal and barrier beaches by increasing their height and width and enhancing storm damage protection and flood control. The barrier beaches along this section of beach have been sediment starved because there is little sediment that reaches them naturally. Renourishing these beaches and barrier beaches will improve their health, increase there ability to provide storm damage prevention by acting as a barrier to flood waters, and provide increased sediment to the presently starved downdrift beaches. Additionally, the proposed dredging will enhance the shellfish habitat within the Pond. Presently the shellfish habitat within Sengekontacket Pond is degraded due to poor water quality and shoaling. Dredging the navigation channels will increase flushing and enhance water quality. This will improve the shellfish habitat and allow the Edgartown Shellfish Constable to pursue an aggressive seeding program within the Pond area to reestablish a healthy and viable shellfish population.

Alternative 1 – Do Nothing
Should the project not proceed, the navigation within Sengekontacket Pond will continue to be hazardous and tidally dependent because at low tide navigation is only possible for the smallest boats. If this alternative is implemented the beaches and barrier beaches will continue to degrade and the water quality and shellfish habitat will continue to decline.

Alternative 2 – Perform Dredging with offshore disposal
This Alternative would include the required dredging, but would not provide the much-needed benefit of beach nourishment on the adjacent coastal and barrier beaches. The dredge procedure would require barging the material out of the harbor and entrance channel to an offshore disposal site, where it would be dumped. This process would require dredging the entrance channel to the Pond at Big Bridge deeper that necessary to accommodate the draft of the sediment filled barge, or would require the use of a smaller barge, which would substantially increase the cost of the project. Additionally, running a large number of barges through the small entrance channel increases the possibility of the barge running a ground. If this occurs there is increased chance of damage to the barge and more importantly, the subsurface benthic habitat. Additionally, there is currently no approved offshore disposal site that is in proximity to the project site. Therefore, the costs to implement this alternative would require exhaustive research and would be cost prohibitive. Alternative 2 is not recommended.

Alternative 3 – Perform Dredging with Upland Disposal
This Alternative would include the required dredging, but again, would not provide the much-needed benefit of beach nourishment on the adjacent coastal and barrier beaches. Additionally, it would be necessary to establish a suitable location to dewater the 85,000 cu yds of material. At present there is no appropriate site within pumping distance that would accommodate a dewatering site of this size. Furthermore, transporting this quantity of material to an upland disposal site would require at least 5,000 truckloads of material be transported from the site. This has the possibility of creating public safety concerns as well as potential damage to local roadways. Alternative 3 is not recommended.

Alternative 4 – Preferred Alternative, Project as Proposed
This Alternative would provide benefits to navigation, and make available the dredge material for beneficial use as beach nourishment and dune enhancement. With appropriate coordination with Marine Fisheries and Natural Heritage, the proposed project can be properly designed, scheduled and monitored to ensure protection of habitat and spawning interests within the work area. The completion of this project would also greatly improve the tidal flushing and water quality within Sengekontacket Pond and Upper and Lower Trapps Pond. Additionally, implementing this alternative will improve shellfish habitat that will benefit commercial as well as recreational shell fishermen. It is recommended that this Alternative be implemented.