Commonwealth of Massachusetts

Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs
Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) Office

Environmental Notification Form

For Office Use Only
EEA#: 15848
MEPA Analyst: Erin Flaherty

The information requested on this form must be completed in order to submit a document electronically for review under the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act, 301 CMR 11.00.

Project Name: 90 Barber Ave Storage			
Street Address: 90 Barber Ave			
Municipality: Worcester		Watershed: Blackstone	
Universal Transverse Mercator Coordinates: **19T 269197, 4686846**		Latitude: 42.299633 Longitude: -71.799893	
Estimated commencement date:		Estimated completion date:	
Project Type: Commercial Construction		Status of project design: 0 %complete	
Proponent: Banner Worcester Storage, LLC			
Street Address: 500 Skokie Blvd., Suite 600			
Municipality: Northbrook		State: IL	Zip Code:60062
Name of Contact Person: Scott Goddard			
Firm/Agency: Goddard Consulting, LLC		Street Address: 291 Main St., Suite 8	
Municipality: Northborough		State: MA	Zip Code: 01532
Phone: (508)393-3784	Fax:		E-mail: scott@goddardconsultingllc.com

Does this project meet or exceed a mandatory EIR threshold (see 301 CMR 11.03)?
☐Yes ☒No

If this is an Expanded Environmental Notification Form (ENF) (see 301 CMR 11.05(7)) or a Notice of Project Change (NPC), are you 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
(Note: Greenhouse Gas Emissions analysis must be included in the Expanded ENF.)

Which MEPA review threshold(s) does the project meet or exceed (see 301 CMR 11.03)?: 301 CMR 11.03(3)(b)1.d.: alteration of 5,000 or more sf of BVW or isolated vegetated wetlands

Which State Agency Permits will the project require?: 401 Water Quality Certification

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

1578
Ex Libris

Summary of Project Size & Environmental Impacts	Existing	Change	Total
LAND			
Total site acreage	2.01		
New acres of land altered		±1.5	
Acres of impervious area	0	±1.0	±1.0
Square feet of new bordering vegetated wetlands alteration		6,973	
Square feet of new other wetland alteration		0	
Acres of new non-water dependent use of tidelands or waterways		0	
STRUCTURES			
Gross square footage	0	±127,000(GFA)/4 stories = ±31,750 s.f. (footrprint)	±31,750
Number of housing units	0	0	0
Maximum height (feet)	0	52.83ft from grade	52.83ft from grade
TRANSPORTATION			
Vehicle trips per day	0	15	15
Parking spaces	0	9	9
WASTEWATER			
Water Use (Gallons per day)	0	291 (120 Domestic, 39 Building Maintenance, 132 Irrigation)	291
Water withdrawal (GPD)	0	0	0
Wastewater generation/treatment (GPD)	0	120	120
Length of water mains (miles)	0	0	0
Length of sewer mains (miles)	0	0	0

Has this project been filed with MEPA before?
☐ Yes (EEA #_____) ☒No

Has any project on this site been filed with MEPA before?
☐ Yes (EEA #_____) ☐No

GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION – all proponents must fill out this section

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

Describe the existing conditions and land uses on the project site:

90 Barber Ave. (Map:22, Block:1, Lot:1) is a ±4.53 acre lot currently zoned for BG-3.0 (General Business). Accordingly, the parcel is primarily surrounded by mixed commercial use structures including a USPS facility to the north, Barber Ave. to the east, Randolph Rd. to the south and train tracks and businesses to the west and a ±70,000s.f. parking lot to the south.

The lot was subdivided creating a ±2.01acre lot located to the north of the existing parking lot. This parcel is currently undeveloped. Land cover within this area consists of an herbaceous dominant upland which slopes into a forest/shrub wetland complex to the west. A wet meadow feature runs down the slope in a north west direction, from the southern parcel boundary, and connects with the primary wetland feature to the west. Because of its location on the slope, this wet meadow area provides little capacity for storm water infiltration or retention.

Describe the proposed project and its programmatic and physical elements:

The proponent is proposing the construction of a storage facility and associated parking area. The 4-story storage facility will total ± 127,000 GFA, equating to a footprint of ±37,150s.f. The parking area will be located to the east of the structure and total ±9,550 s.f.

A subsurface infiltration basin, designed in accordance with MassDEP and City of Worcester storm water Management standards has been proposed to handle storm water run-off from the roofline and proposed catch basins within the parking area.

The project will result in the filling of ±6,930s.f. of jurisdictional wetland. Mitigation for this filling will be provided through replication and an in-lieu fee paid to the Army Corps of Engineers.

Current design was created in consideration of existing site topography, economic constraints and the goal of minimizing and reducing the amount of disturbance to jurisdictional resource areas.

Wetland disturbance has been limited to steeply sloped areas which possess an inherently lower ecological value to more gradually sloped wetlands, displaying reduction in capacity for storm water retention and infiltration. Additionally, features of the project have been scaled back to reduce the need for additional wetland impact. Current Worcester Zoning Ordinance requires buildings of the proposed type have a minimum of 43 parking spaces. Due to the existing site constraints and desire to reduce wetland impacts, this project was put before the Zoning Board of Appeals in request of a variance from the parking space requirement. This variance was granted, allowing the parking to be reduced to 9 spaces, significantly reducing the need for additional impact to resource areas.

The building will tie into existing city utilities for water, sewer and electricity. The proposed impacts on these systems have been reviewed by the appropriate city departments and been deemed to be in compliance with current and future infrastructure capacity. Daily water use and generation will fall within the range prescribed to a single-family home.

Total land disturbance associated with the project (including the construction of the replication area)

will total ±1.5 acres.

NOTE: The project description should summarize both the project's direct and indirect impacts (including construction period impacts) in terms of their magnitude, geographic extent, duration and frequency, and reversibility, as applicable. It should also discuss the infrastructure requirements of the project and the capacity of the municipal and/or regional infrastructure to sustain these requirements into the future.

Describe the on-site project alternatives (and alternative off-site locations, if applicable), considered by the proponent, including at least one feasible alternative that is allowed under current zoning, and the reasons(s) that they were not selected as the preferred alternative:

Due to the existing topographical characteristics and distribution of resources areas on site, few alternatives exist for the development of this parcel. Additionally, the high costs associated with property and development require that certain rates of return be reached for development projects to be economically feasible. These factors dictate the size requirements for nearly all allowable structures within zoning district BG 3.0, meaning that any development of this parcel, regardless of intended use, would result in similar wetland impacts.

One alternative to current design that was considered proposed a structure with similar GFA but reduced footprint achieved by increased building height. This option was not pursued due to untenable costs associated with the construction of a taller structure.

NOTE: *The purpose of the alternatives analysis is to consider what effect changing the parameters and/or siting of a project, or components thereof, will have on the environment, keeping in mind that the objective of the MEPA review process is to avoid or minimize damage to the environment to the greatest extent feasible. Examples of alternative projects include alternative site locations, alternative site uses, and alternative site configurations.*

Summarize the mitigation measures proposed to offset the impacts of the preferred alternative:

To mitigate the impacts to BVW, a wetland replication area totaling ±7,400s.f. is proposed along the west Side of the proposed building. This replication area will be constructed on-site and immediately adjacent to existing BVW. This replication area will fulfill state and local requirements for the replication of filled wetlands and will provide mitigation at ratio greater than 1:1.

In addition to this an in-lieu fee will be paid to the Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) to meet federal Replication requirements. Additional replication is unable to be constructed on-site the approved project design.

Construction supervision and replication monitoring will be conducted in accordance with the standards established by the Worcester Conservation Commission and the ACOE.

If the project is proposed to be constructed in phases, please describe each phase:
N/A

AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN:
Is the project within or adjacent to an Area of Critical Environmental Concern?
☐Yes (Specify_____)
☒No
if yes, does the ACEC have an approved Resource Management Plan? ☐Yes ☐No;