

For Office Use Only
 Executive Office of Environmental Affairs
 EOE No.: 13390
 MEPA Analyst: Bill Gagne
 Phone: 617-626-1025

ENF Environmental Notification Form

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: Quarry Stone Shore Protection-Humphrey & Donahue		
Street: 2 Massasoit Avenue		
Municipality: Plymouth	Watershed: Indian Brook	
Universal Transverse Mercator Coordinates: 379000, 861,000	Latitude: 41-53-45 Longitude: 70 32 30	
Estimated commencement date: 12-15-04	Estimated completion date: 01-01-05	
Approximate cost: \$50,000	Status of project design: 100% %complete	
Proponent: Jean Humphrey and John Donahue		
Street: 2 Massasoit Avenue		
Municipality: Plymouth	State: MA	Zip Code: 02360
Name of Contact Person From Whom Copies of this ENF May Be Obtained: Shelly McPhee		
Firm/Agency: O'Neill & Associates	Street: One Beacon Street, Suite 1500	
Municipality: Boston	State: MA	Zip Code: 02108
Phone: (617) 646-1016	Fax: (617) 646-1290	E-mail:

- 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 301 CMR 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: Superseding Order of Conditions

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	State Permits & Approvals
LAND				<input type="checkbox"/> Order of Conditions <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Water Management Act Permit <input type="checkbox"/> New Source Approval <input type="checkbox"/> DEP or MWRA Sewer Connection/ Extension Permit <input type="checkbox"/> Other Permits (including Legislative Approvals) – Specify:
Total site acreage	0.025			
New acres of land altered		0.005		
Acres of impervious area	0.0025	.0050	0.0075	
Square feet of new bordering vegetated wetlands alteration		0		
Square feet of new other wetland alteration		0		
Acres of new non-water dependent use of tidelands or waterways		0		
STRUCTURES				
Gross square footage				
Number of housing units				
Maximum height (in feet)				
TRANSPORTATION				
Vehicle trips per day				
Parking spaces				
WATER/WASTEWATER				
Gallons/day (GPD) of water use				
GPD water withdrawal				
GPD wastewater generation/ treatment				
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?

- 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.)

The proposed project is located within a residential shorefront area of Plymouth known as Manomet. The project consists of the construction of 100 lineal feet of quarry stone shore protection, which will match in height, width and depth the slope protection on the adjoining property. This wall is a continuation of a similar wall that runs to the South at least 2 miles and to the North for at least 2 miles. The proponent's house sits landward on top of the bank. The House was reconstructed in the mid 1980's, the original structure on the lot dates back to the early 1900's.

In the last two years, proponents have lost 2 feet off their backyard and the bank has changed from a moderately sloped vegetated surface to a vertical cut with no vegetation. In spite of beach nourishment at the toe of the bank and planting along the face, yearly storms have taken a heavy toll. Every attempt to vegetate the slope has failed.

The proponents are willing to monitor the beach and supply nourishment as needed. However, proponents believe that no nourishment will be necessary. There is currently no discernible difference between the beach in front of the proponent's property, with no vertical buffer, and the miles of beach to the North and South that sit in front of almost continuous vertical buffers. The beaches to the North and South of the premises are well nourished.

Discussion of Options:

Option 1 - Do Nothing

If nothing is done to the site, it is relatively certain that erosion will reach the house. The top of the bank has lost 2 feet in the last 2 years alone. Proponents believe that they are one or two severe storms away from disaster.

Option 2 - provide nourishment and plantings

The proponents have been providing nourishment at the toe of the bank and the previous owner provided nourishment and made multiple attempts to revegetate the slope, all to no avail. Several feet of the toe of the bank has been lost with each recent storm. For these reasons, nourishment and revegetation is not a reasonable strategy.