

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

RECEIVED

FEB 28 2018

MEPA

Environmental Notification Form

For Office Use Only

EEA#: 15822

MEPA Analyst: Purvi Patel

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: Meadow View Commons		
Street Address: 310 Turnpike Street (Route 138)		
Municipality: Easton	Watershed: Taunton River	
Universal Transverse Mercator Coordinates: 465,410 328,900	Latitude: 42-01-19	Longitude: 71-03-56
Estimated commencement date: spring 2018	Estimated completion date: 2018/2019 2020	
Project Type: Residential Development	Status of project design: 90 100 %complete	
Proponent: Meadow View Commons, LLC		
Street Address: P O Box 522		
Municipality: Easton	State: MA	Zip Code: 02356
Name of Contact Person: Mark Perron		
Firm/Agency: Meadow View Commons, LLC	Street Address: P.O. Box 522	
Municipality: North Easton	State: MA	Zip Code: 02356
Phone: (508)-509-2888	Fax:	E-mail: mark@tmrealty.comcastbiz.net>

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)?
 Work in an ACEC and over 5,000 square feet of isolated wetland alteration.

Which State Agency Permits will the project require? Superseding Order of Conditions, MassDOT Permit

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:

1988
P. Patel

Summary of Project Size & Environmental Impacts	Existing	Change	Total
LAND			
Total site acreage	13.3		
New acres of land altered		1.1	
Acres of impervious area	1.75	0.94	2.69
Square feet of new bordering vegetated wetlands alteration		0	
Square feet of new other wetland alteration		7,035 sf (isolated wetland)	
Acres of new non-water dependent use of tidelands or waterways		0	
STRUCTURES			
Gross square footage	3,000	90,300	93,300
Number of housing units	0	36	36
Maximum height (feet)	35	0	35
TRANSPORTATION			
Vehicle trips per day	10	350	360
Parking spaces	10	62	72
WASTEWATER			
Water Use (Gallons per day)	500	9,000	9,500
Water withdrawal (GPD)	0	0	0
Wastewater generation/treatment (GPD)	330	8,030	8,360
Length of water mains (miles)	0	1,940	1,940
Length of sewer mains (miles)	0	1,300	1,300
Has this project been filed with MEPA before? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (EEA # <u>13302</u>) <input type="checkbox"/> No			
Has any project on this site been filed with MEPA before? <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes (EEA # <u>13302</u>) <input type="checkbox"/> No			

GENERAL PROJECT INFORMATION – all proponents must fill out this section

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

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

The 13.39± acre project site is located within Easton, immediately south of the Turnpike Street and Washington Street (Rt. 138) split. The site affords frontage off Turnpike Street (Route 138) to the west, while a mix of residential and commercial development occurs to the north and south and west across Turnpike Street. The easterly portion of site extends into West Bridgewater, abutting the United Drive Industrial Park. Open field, wet meadow, and emergent marsh habitat abut to the south/southeast. The project site itself contains a small building (former single-family dwelling), garage, former concrete foundations, and accessory storage trailers. As referenced above, the site has been continuously utilized as a contractor's yard with varying stockpiles of rock, debris, soil material, etc. Remnant pavement exists within the northwestern portion of the site associated with the former restaurant building demolished in 2012.

The eastern portion of the site is occupied by Bordering Vegetated Wetlands (BVW), associated with an open Pond abutting United Drive and surrounding cattail (*Typha sp.*) emergent marsh, transitioning to a wet meadow and ultimately a fringing forested wetland system occupied by red maple (*Acer rubrum*) trees in close proximity to the site. A small, isolated vegetated wetland occurs within the northern/northeastern portion of the site.

Upland vegetation on the project site is primarily limited to small pockets and narrow bands of invasive species, most notably autumn olive (*Eleaegnus umbellata*), glossy buckthorn (*Rhamnus frangula*), multiflora rose (*Rosa multiflora*), Japanese knotweed (*Fallopia japonica*), and Asiatic bittersweet (*Celastrus orbiculata*) entanglements, along with ragweed (*Ambrosia sp.*). Mature eastern white pine (*Pinus strobus*) trees also occur sporadically.

Describe the proposed project and its programmatic and physical elements:

The Applicant is proposing to construct 36 single-family homes accessed off a subdivision roadway containing three cul-de-sacs, as depicted on the Comprehensive Permit Plan of Land. Stormwater management has been designed and approved in compliance with DEP Stormwater Management standards. The project will include a shared on-site Title V septic system owned and maintained by the homeowner's association. The project will tie into other utility lines in Turnpike Street.

Wetland Replication and Buffer Zone Enhancement is also proposed. The degraded isolated vegetated wetland is proposed to be filled. The Wetland Replication Areas, identified as "Wetland Creation Area A & B" on the site (15,300 sf) on the site plans, will be created by removing existing invasive vegetation, solid waste, and historic fill utilizing Best Management Practices (BMP's); excavating to sub-grades; spreading a wetland soil; and planting with a diverse mixture of saplings, shrubs, and a seed mix. A 7,000 sf Wetland Restoration will also be similarly enhanced, in addition to 15,790 sf Buffer Zone Enhancement Area, both occupied by historic fill, solid waste, and invasive species. The Wetland Replication and Buffer Zone Enhancement will provide a significant improvement over existing conditions.

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:

The project was previously slated for development of 72 condominium units as detailed in the ENF filed with MEPA in 2004. Since then, economic and real estate market changes have prompted revising the project to a less intensive 36 unit single family home project. The project is consolidated in previously disturbed areas and involves significant mitigation as described above. Other alternatives were not considered.

X

NOTE: The purpose of the alternatives analysis is to consider what effect changing the parameter 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:

The project has been designed to avoid encroachment into the adjacent wetland area at the rear of the site. The existing wetland limits were delineated and used as a project limit line at the very beginning of site layout planning. By identifying environmental constraints prior to site planning, the need for mitigation measures were eliminated. The project will be constructed on the upland portion of the site that is presently a degraded commercial area. The rear portion of the property, containing wetlands, will be protected from development and will remain in its natural state.

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

The project will not be constructed in phases.

AREAS OF CRITICAL ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN:

Is the project within or adjacent to an Area of Critical Environmental Concern?

Yes (Hockomock Swamp ACEC)

No

if yes, does the ACEC have an approved Resource Management Plan? ___ Yes ___X No;

If yes, describe how the project complies with this plan.

Will there be stormwater runoff or discharge to the designated ACEC? ___x Yes ___ No;

If yes, describe and assess the potential impacts of such stormwater runoff/discharge to the designated ACEC.

The stormwater management system has been designed in accordance with DEP's Stormwater Handbook.

RARE SPECIES:

Does the project site include Estimated and/or Priority Habitat of State-Listed Rare Species? (see http://www.mass.gov/dfwele/dfw/nhosp/regulatory_review/priority_habitat/priority_habitat_home.htm)

Yes (Specify- Blanding's Turtle (*Emydoidea blandingii*)) No

The Applicant has filed for MESA Project Review on February 9, 2018

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