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.: 13007
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: **Proposed Ballard St, Worcester Retail Service Station**		
Street: 31 Ballard St		
Municipality: Worcester, MA	Watershed: Blackstone River	
Universal Tranverse Mercator Coordinates: 026948 4679 68	Latitude: 42:16:38N Longitude: 71:52:38W	
Estimated commencement date: June1 2003	Estimated completion date: Sept 1 2003	
Approximate cost: $ 800,000	Status of project design: 80 %complete	
Proponent: Hunter Development Company LLC		
Street: 1083 Frank Smith Road		
Municipality: Longmeadow	State: MA	Zip Code: 01106
Name of Contact Person From Whom Copies of this ENF May Be Obtained: John Christopher		
Firm/Agency: Hunter Development Company LLC	Street: 1083 Frank Smith Road	
Municipality: Longmeadow	State: MA	Zip Code: 01106
Phone: 413 565 2725	Fax: 413 565 2726	E-mail: hunterdev@attbi.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._____) ☒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): None

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

List Local or Federal Permits and Approvals:
Federal Permits/Approvals – ***None***
Local Permits/Approvals – ***Zoning Board of Appeals–Special Permit, Planning Board-Site Plan,***

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	3.5 +		
New acres of land altered		1.1	
Acres of impervious area	1.55	1.1	2.65
Square feet of new bordering vegetated wetlands alteration		N/a	
Square feet of new other wetland alteration		N/A	
Acres of new non-water dependent use of tidelands or waterways		N/A	
STRUCTURES			
Gross square footage	19,000	4000	23,000
Number of housing units	n/a	n/a	n/a
Maximum height (in feet)	25	35	35
TRANSPORTATION			
Vehicle trips per day	5	2555	2560
Parking spaces	50	29	79
WATER/WASTEWATER			
Gallons/day (GPD) of water use	50	3000	3050
GPD water withdrawal	N/A	N/A	N/A
GPD wastewater generation/ treatment	50	3000	3050
Length of water/sewer mains (in miles)	Existing	Existing	Existing

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_____) ☒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.*)

Site Description

31 Ballard St in Worcester, MA is a property located at the corner of Providence Street and Ballard Street, adjacent to the new Route 146. The corner lot was created by the MassHighway reconstruction of Route 146 and the upcoming construction of a new bridge connecting Providence Street to McKeon Road.

The existing parcel is more than 3.5 acres in size. The lot's natural topography divides the lot into two distinct areas. The first area (lower lot) is approximately 1.5 acres and consists of an existing 19,000 square foot trucking warehouse and a paved parking area. This area of the lot has most of its frontage on Ballard Street. The second area (upper lot) is a cleared area of land measuring approximately 2.0 acres. The area was used as storage for building materials and machinery related to the trucking business. This area of the lot has its entire frontage on Providence Street. The site is bounded to the north by land used for power transmission lines and to the west by business zoned private land.

Alternatives, Impacts, and Mitigation

Petitioner proposes to re-grade the upper lot and construct a 4060 Sq. Ft. convenience store with drive thru. Five fueling islands and a canopy will be installed to service automobiles. A one story carwash will also be installed at the site. The second phase of the proposal will be the construction of the lower lot. The current proposed use is a restaurant. This phase of the project is not expected to commence until 2004, but was included in the traffic generation numbers. The site plan does not reflect the proposed restaurant.

Currently, the existing untreated stormwater is allowed to flow into multiple catch basins, both onsite and offsite. This untreated storm water is then transferred and released at an unknown destination across route 146. The project proposes to collect all stormwater runoff on site. The

water will be treated upon entering the catch basins by an Abtech Ultra Urban Filter. It will then be transferred through a stormwater separation unit (Vortechnics) and then piped to an onsite detention pond and allowed to infiltrate back into the ground. The new stormwater treatment system will meet the current stormwater regulations and will be an improvement relative to existing conditions. The project proposes to utilize the Best Management Practices (BMP's) as outlined in the Stormwater Management Policy.

Offsite road improvements have already been completed during an extensive roadway reconstruction by MassHighway, in conjunction with the new Route 146 Project. No further offsite work is anticipated.

A complete traffic study was performed for the project and included for your review. The project will generate approximately 2,560 new vehicle trips per day to the site. It should be noted that the traffic study also included the impact of the future development of the lower lot. It is anticipated that a restaurant will occupy this site in the future. The applicant determined that the addition of this future development should be included in the overall traffic and MEPA review.

The proponents have taken care in the layout and design of the site to provide the smallest area of impact to the site's resources and keeping the project viable. A no-build alternative would not provide the services and resources desired by the community at this site; it would not meet the objectives of the project, and would eliminate the significant safety and environmental improvements proposed.