



COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF ENERGY & ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS
DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
WESTERN REGIONAL OFFICE

436 Dwight Street • Springfield, Massachusetts 01103 • (413) 784-1100

DEVAL L. PATRICK
Governor

TIMOTHY P. MURRAY
Lieutenant Governor

IAN A. BOWLES
Secretary

LAURIE BURT
Commissioner

Mark Germanowski, Airport Manager
City of Pittsfield Airport Commission
Pittsfield Municipal Airport
832 Tamarack Road
Pittsfield, Massachusetts 01201

March 28, 2008

Re: STATEMENT OF TECHNICAL DEFICIENCY
WATER QUALITY CERTIFICATION
Application for: BRP WW 10
MAJOR FILL AND EXCAVATION PROJECT
Pittsfield Municipal Airport Improvements Project
Pittsfield Municipal Airport, 832 Tamarack Road
Unnamed tributaries to Southwest Branch Housatonic River
Pittsfield, Massachusetts

USACOE Application Number: none to date
DEP Wetlands File Number: 263-901

Transmittal Number: W159622

AND

INFORMATION REQUEST
MASSACHUSETTS WETLANDS PROTECTION ACT
DEP Wetlands File #263-901
Request for Superseding Order of Conditions
Pittsfield Municipal Airport, 832 Tamarack Road
Pittsfield, Massachusetts

Dear Mr. Germanowski:

NOTE: Due to multiple permit requests required for the above-referenced project proposal, the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection is issuing this combined letter, in which both a Statement of Technical Deficiency under the Massachusetts Clean Waters Act Regulations (314 CMR 9.00) (SECTION I) and an information request letter under the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act Regulations (310 CMR 10.00) (SECTION II) are included.

SECTION 1: Massachusetts Clean Waters Act Regulations

The Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (hereinafter the Department) has completed its Technical Review of the permit application for the project listed above and determined that, based on information presently in the record, the permit will either be denied or conditions imposed that would significantly modify or restrict operation of the project or activity as proposed.

The additional information required by the Department is listed below. In accordance with 310 CMR 4.00, you have 180 days from the receipt of this letter to submit the additional information. However the Department requests that you submit the information as quickly as possible to insure completion of the review in a timely manner. If you fail to submit the additional information within the timeframe above, your application will be deemed withdrawn, and you must reapply if you still wish to seek a permit. You will not receive a refund as a result of this action.

The Department may, at its option, agree to a written request for an extension of the time allowed to submit the additional information, if the request is received within the time specified above. Should the application, based on submittal of the additional information still be deemed inadequate, the Department may request additional information during the course of the supplemental Technical Review in accordance with 310 CMR 4.04 (3)(b).

Further, you may within 45 days elect in writing to proceed on the application and supporting materials as they presently stand. If you elect to proceed in this manner you may not modify the application and supporting materials in any way. Following the Department's receipt of the request, a decision will be issued to grant or deny the permit within 45 days, subject to any adjustment in the schedule according to 310 CMR 4.04(2)(d)2. or 310 CMR 4.04(2)(d)3.a.

Please provide the following additional information:

1. Please submit proof that public notice in a newspaper of general circulation within the area of the proposed activity has been published per the requirement at 314 CMR 9.05(3);
2. Based upon information provided to date, the Department considers this proposal to be a single and complete project per 314 CMR 9.02 (Activity). As a result, any future proposals for additional activities at the site locus may be considered an artificial segmentation per 314 CMR 9.02 (Activity). If there are future planned or proposed activities beyond that which is presently before the Department, please provide information as to the scope and nature of these activities;
3. Per the Department's authority at 314 CMR 9.06(2), a written alternatives analysis exploring on-site means of avoiding and/or minimizing discharge of dredged and/or fill material within "Waters of the United States within the Commonwealth". This analysis shall, at a minimum, consider alternatives that:
 - a. Maintain a "usable runway length" of 5,000 feet, but does not include any extension; and then provides Runway Safety Areas (RSAs) which comply with Federal Aviation Administration Advisory Circular Number 150/5300-13, Change 8, or describes why this is not practicable;

- b. Extend the “usable runway length” to 5,300 feet, per Table 3 on page 2.18, Section 2 of the Notice of Intent;
 - c. Per Federal Aviation Administration Advisory Circular Number 150/5300-13, Change 8, analyzes use of an Engineered Materials Arresting System (EMAS) to reduce the necessary length of RSAs, or describes why this is not practicable;
 - d. Maintain the present non-precision approach without installation of the proposed Medium Intensity Approach Lighting System (MALS) and Runway Alignment Indicator Lights (RAIL), while still treating the existing 1,000 foot-wide primary surface under the Vegetation Management Plan for vegetative penetrations;
 - e. Any combination of the above, or any other viable alternative which would reduce the proposed 1,600 foot expansion of the “usable runway length” of Runway 26 to the east, including alternative components that reduce the proposed 650 feet of “usable runway length” runway surface removal on Runway 08, provided any such reduction of removal causes a similar reduction of expansion to Runway 26. No such analysis shall be required for any alternative that would reduce the “usable runway length” below 5,000 feet, nor shall any such analysis be required for any alternative that would demonstrably fail any requirement of the Federal Aviation Administration. Any elimination of such alternative shall be sufficiently justified;
 - f. Additional documentation and justification must be made for any alternative proposed to date which entails expansion of the existing “usable runway length” greater than 5,300 feet. Other means of increasing safety, aside from expansion, including additional emergency planning, pilot notification of adverse weather conditions, installation of additional airport safety devices, changes or improvements in snow removal, etc., must be fully screened. Any such alternative must justify the proposed length of expansion based upon industry standards, or aviation agency requirements or directives;
 - g. Successfully screened alternatives shall be presented with adequate cross-sectional and/or site plans. All practicable existing technologies and methodologies shall be addressed in this manner, and those alternatives identified as impracticable shall be supported by sufficient and specific evidence;
4. A revised site plan or plans that clearly and accurately reflect the boundaries of all jurisdictional resource areas (see 314 CMR 9.02 for definitions) within 100 feet of any proposed discharge of dredged or fill material in “Waters of the United States within the Commonwealth”, including distinct cartographic symbols and/or colors (preferred by the Department) for Bordering Vegetated Wetland (BVW), Isolated Vegetated Wetland (IVW), and Land Under Water (LUW), all as defined at 314 CMR 9.02. The site plans submitted with the application do not adequately identify jurisdictional areas and appear to include areas not subject to jurisdiction under 314 CMR 9.00;
5. On the revised site plan(s) required at #4, above, all proposed “discharge of dredged or fill material” within jurisdictional resource areas (whether temporary or permanent) should be individually color-coded (or demarcated by some other cartographic symbol acceptable to the Department) by resource area type as defined at 314 CMR 9.02. Each distinct area or polygon of loss should be individually numbered on said plan(s). A table should be created listing each numbered polygon of proposed alteration and its classification (BVW, IVW, or LUW) and areal extent, as expressed in square feet. At the

- time of this writing, areas of reported proposed alteration range from 172,708 square feet to 726,356 square feet (172,708 square feet plus 553,648 square feet). A clear distinction between “alter”, as defined at 310 CMR 10.04 of the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act Regulations and “discharge of dredged or fill material per 314 CMR 9.02 must be made. Prior to issuance of a Water Quality Certification, the Department will require presentation of actual areal extent of “discharge of dredged or fill material” (temporary and permanent) to “Waters of the United States within the Commonwealth”;
6. Fully completed “DEP Bordering Vegetated Wetland [310 CMR 10.55] Delineation Field Data Forms” (Appendix G), Sections 1 and 2, for transects of a sufficient number to fully describe the boundary of Bordering Vegetated Wetland per 314 CMR 9.02 Bordering Vegetated Wetlands, unless 310 CMR 10.55(2)(c)1. applies, which must be documented by the applicant’s consultant. Forms shall be completed per the methods detailed within *Delineating Bordering Vegetated Wetlands Under the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act* (MADEP 1995). Plants shall be identified to the species level and scientific nomenclature should follow *The Vascular Plants of Massachusetts: A County Checklist* (Sorrie & Somers 1999) or an equivalent acceptable to the Department. Soil profiles shall be prepared using *Field Indicators for Identifying Hydric Soils in New England, Version 3* (NEIWPC 2004) or an equivalent acceptable to the Department. Color photographs or color reproductions of photographs for each transect, both for plant community composition and hydric soil characteristics, shall be submitted as part of this information. This information shall be collected by a wetland scientist with at least two (2) years experience in interpreting hydric soil profiles and characteristics, as allowed per the Department’s authority at 310 CMR 10.05(4)(h). In specific, please note the requirements for *previously disturbed areas* at 310 CMR 10.55(2)(c)3., which may apply to some Bordering Vegetated Wetland upon the Site;
 7. A written Bordering Vegetated Wetland replacement area plan prepared per the attached “Addendum to Information Request Letter”. It is intended that this attachment be used in conjunction with “Massachusetts Inland Wetland Replication Guidelines” (DEP 2002). The attachment enumerates specific information the Department will require for this project, while the “Guidelines” explain and elaborate upon the information. When responding to the Department, please insure that all information within the “Addendum” is provided or addressed. Please note that the Department will typically not approve proposed “replacement areas” that either serve as stormwater management structures or receive a significant portion of their water budget from stormwater management trains. As previously discussed with the applicant’s consultant, the Department is concerned that some BVW proposed to be “replaced” may be calcareous fen, or other unusual or distinct wetland types, and that any “replacement area” plan must thoroughly describe how the functions of these wetland types can be successfully replaced, including water chemistry, soil structure, and other physical characteristics associated with these kinds of wetlands;
 8. Color photographs of each proposed crossing of all streams [as defined at 314 CMR 9.02 Land Under Water and 310 CMR 10.04 Stream]. Said photographs shall clearly depict the substrate composition of the stream channel in the immediate vicinity of the proposed crossing;
 9. Describe in detail how this proposal achieves minimization of adverse impact to Land Under Water [see 314 CMR 9.02 and 314 CMR 9.06(2)];

10. A map or other schematic, and any supporting documentation, identifying streams that support salmonid populations, especially native populations of brook trout (*Salvelinus fontinalis*). No activity shall take place within or adjacent to any “trout streams” prior to May 1st;
11. A description of any long-term anticipated affects of the project on the hydrology of jurisdictional resource areas. Will the proposed activity create ponding, re-directed flow patterns, flow impediments or changes due to surrounding artificial/disturbed substrates, etc.? If any impacts to wetland and subsurface hydrology are anticipated in jurisdictional resource areas not proposed to be filled, how does the applicant propose to avoid and then minimize any adverse impact?

GENERAL STORMWATER REQUIREMENTS

12. A Registered Professional Engineer (RPE) licensed to do business in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts pursuant to MGL Chapter 112, Section 81R shall be retained by the applicant, and shall prepare or review the preparation of all documents related to compliance with 314 CMR 9.06(6)(a) through (f), inclusive. Said RPE shall affix her or his stamp on all plans and documents submitted under this regulatory citation;
13. The appointed RPE shall provide a calculation of the areal extent, as expressed in square feet, or fractions thereof, of impervious area associated with the “single and complete” project, regardless of the boundaries of jurisdictional resource areas or there buffer zones. Impervious area shall include pavement, rooftops, and any other surfaces covered with structural stone, brick, cement, asphalt, ceramic, plastic, or other similar manufactured product. Said RPE shall document the method used to arrive at the reported areal extent;
14. Some of the proposed structural Best Management Practices (BMPs) are not listed in the *Massachusetts Stormwater Handbook* (MassDEP 2008) (it is a “proprietary BMP”). The appointed RPE shall verify that the proposed proprietary BMP is appropriately documented in Volume 2, Chapter 4 of the *Massachusetts Stormwater Handbook*. Additionally, the aforementioned RPE shall submit a copy of the TARP Report and/or STEP Report;
15. The appointed RPE shall specifically report that each proposed structural best management practice (BMP) meets each “Special Feature”, “Design Consideration”, “Site Criteria”, “Construction Criteria”, and “Maintenance Criteria” specified within the *Massachusetts Stormwater Handbook* for each proposed structural BMP. Any deviation from any criterion may disqualify this project from presumed Total Suspended Solids (TSS) removal rates specified in the *Massachusetts Stormwater Handbook*;
16. The appointed RPE shall stamp a scaled site plan showing parcel bounds and existing and proposed sub-watersheds (catchments), as determined through topographic mapping, for each “design point”, superimposed over the appropriate scaled Sheet from the county soil survey (Natural Resources Conservation Service), and clearly displaying each soil map unit intersected by said boundaries. Off-site portions (land beyond parcel boundaries) of any mapped sub-watershed **shall** be included, per Step 3, page 4-11 of *Hydrology Handbook for Conservation Commissioners, A Guide to Understanding Hydrologic and Hydraulic Data and Calculations Under the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act* (MassDEP March 2002);

17. The appointed RPE shall submit a fully completed "Worksheet 2: Runoff Curve Number and Runoff" (210-VI-TR-55, Second Edition, June 1986), or more modern equivalent;
18. The appointed RPE shall identify each "design point" ("analysis point") proposed for the project on a site plan. Said "design point" shall be located "...at the property line of the proposed development", for each place where stormwater leaves the property, and justify the selection of each design point accordingly;

STANDARD 3

19. The appointed RPE shall demonstrate that no infiltration is proposed in Hydrologic Group Type C or D soils at the Site;
20. The Department considers the NRCS county soil surveys for the Western region to be consistent with proper identification of Hydrologic Soil Groups at the Site, conditioned upon the limitations of the cartographic process, minimum mapping unit, and other characteristics inherent in remotely sensed data. Upon additional analysis of the information requested herein, if the appointed RPE concludes that specific limitations are evident in the soil survey, the appointed RPE shall use best professional judgment to identify Hydrologic Soil Groups per the *Massachusetts Stormwater Handbook*;
21. The appointed RPE shall specify the "Required Recharge Volume";
22. The appointed RPE shall confirm that calculation of "impervious" area "on-site" is appropriately quantified within each proposed "catchment";
23. The appointed RPE shall not include *existing* impervious surfaces in any calculation of "Required Recharge Volume", unless specifically required to do so under Standard #7;

STANDARD 4

24. The appointed RPE shall provide a "TSS Removal Calculation Worksheet" (using the Excel Spreadsheet made available by the Department) for each "stormwater management train" with a "point source of discharge" to a Buffer Zone and /or jurisdictional resource area (each as defined at 310 CMR 10.04);
25. The appointed RPE shall provide a "Long-Term Pollution Prevention Plan" for the entirety of the project area, both within and external of the Department's limits of geographic jurisdiction;
26. The appointed RPE shall calculate the Required Water Quality Volume for each "stormwater management train" with a "point source of discharge" to a Buffer Zone and /or jurisdictional resource area (each as defined at 310 CMR 10.04);

STANDARD 5

27. The Department has determined that the facility has a high probability of being classified as a "Land Use with Potential Higher Pollutant Load" (LUHPPL). Therefore, the appointed RPE shall formally determine whether the facility, or any portion thereof, meets the definition of a LUPPHL at 314 CMR 9.02; and design the project so that it meets Standard 5.

STANDARD 8

28. The appointed RPE shall provide a calculation of the areal extent, as expressed in acres or fractions thereof, of soil disturbance associated with the "single and complete" project, regardless of the boundaries of jurisdictional resource areas or there buffer zones. Said RPE shall document the method used to arrive at the reported areal extent;
29. The appointed RPE shall prepare and provide a "*Construction Period Pollution Prevention and Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan*" (CPPPESCP), which shall include a "*Construction Period Operation and Maintenance Plan*" (CPOMP). At the

discretion of the Department, an adequately prepared "*Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan*" (SWPPP) may be substituted for the CPPPESCP.

Following receipt of the information above, the Department has 96 days to complete a supplemental Technical Review and issue a determination to grant or deny the permit. The Department reserves the right to raise additional questions in response to those above. Please submit the additional information requested to the attention of David Foulis of the Department's Western Region Wetlands Program.

As part of the Department's review of this project proposal and per its authority at 314 CMR 9.05(4), a representative of this office will conduct an informal on-site meeting. All interested parties are invited to attend, subject to any safety and/or security limitations appropriate to the Site.

This informal meeting will be held at the site after submittal of the above information, but in any event prior to **September 1, 2008**. All parties will be notified in writing of the scheduled date and time at least two (2) weeks in advance. All parties are requested to make electronic mail addresses available to the Department for ease of rapid notification.

Please be advised that no work may proceed until the Department issues a final decision on this matter. Correspondence to the Department should be sent to the attention of David Foulis of the Wetlands Program. All correspondence must be copied to all parties in this matter.

If you have any questions regarding this on-site meeting notification and "Statement of Technical Deficiency", please feel free to contact David Foulis at 1-413-755-2154.

SECTION II: Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act Regulations

The Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (hereinafter the Department) is in receipt of your appeal of the Pittsfield Conservation Commission's Denial Order of Conditions, issued under the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act, MGL c. 131, § 40 (hereinafter the Act) and postmark-dated November 11, 2007, for the project referenced above. The Department has determined that the appeal, received November 29, 2007, is valid under the regulatory requirements of 310 CMR 10.05(7), and is filed pursuant to the procedure at 310 CMR 10.05(10) Variance.

Per the authority granted it at 310 CMR 10.05(7)(g), the Department hereby requests that the following requisite information be submitted in order to facilitate its review:

30. Per the Department's authority at 310 CMR 10.53(3) and 310 CMR 10.05(10)(b), a written alternatives analysis as listed in 3 (a-g) of the Statement of Technical Deficiency, above, for Bank, Bordering Vegetated Wetland (BVW), Land Under Water Bodies and Waterways (LUWW), and those portions of Bordering Land Subject to Flooding (BLSF) found to be significant to the protection of wildlife habitat, i.e., the Lower Floodplain as referenced at 310 CMR 10.60(2)(d).

31. A revised site plan or plans that clearly and accurately reflect the boundaries of all jurisdictional resource areas (see 310 CMR 10.02 for definitions) within 100 feet of any proposed activities subject to regulation. This can be the same plan as requested in item 4 of the Statement of Technical Deficiency referenced above, provided that it depicts Bank, Bordering Vegetated Wetland (BVW), Land Under Water Bodies and Waterways (LUWW), Bordering Land Subject to Flooding (BLSF) and Riverfront Area (RFA). In order to determine the boundary of Riverfront Area, it will be necessary to delineate the Mean Annual High-Water Line (MAHWL) on the site, including field located and surveyed flagging, referenced by specific number, with sufficient detail to accurately cast Riverfront Area [as defined at 310 CMR 10.58(2)]. For the purpose of identifying the portion of BLSF that is significant to protection of wildlife habitat (the Lower Floodplain), the boundary of Lower Floodplain, as described 310 CMR 10.57(1)(a)3., will need to be depicted on these plans.
32. A separate site plan based on the plan required at #2, above, depicting all proposed impacts within jurisdictional resource areas (Bank, BVW, IVW, LUWW, BLSF and RFA) as defined at 310 CMR 10.04. Each distinct area or polygon of loss should be individually numbered on said plan(s). A table should be created listing each numbered polygon of proposed alteration and its classification (BANK, BVW, IVW, LUW, BLSF or RFA) and areal extent, as expressed in square feet (save for Bank alteration, which shall be expressed in linear feet, though shown cartographically as a polygon). This plan shall depict areas that will be "altered", as defined at 310 CMR 10.04 of the Massachusetts Wetlands Protection Act Regulations. Prior to issuance of a Denial Superseding Order of Conditions, the Department will require presentation of actual areal extent impacts (temporary and permanent) to "areas subject to protection under the Act";
33. Fully completed "DEP Bordering Vegetated Wetland [310 CMR 10.55] Delineation Field Data Forms" (Appendix G), Sections 1 **and** 2, as requested in item 6 of the aforementioned Statement of Technical Deficiency.
34. A written Bordering Vegetated Wetland replacement area plan prepared per the attached "Addendum to Information Request Letter", as required in item 7 of the aforementioned Statement of Technical Deficiency.
35. Color photographs of the locations and characteristics each proposed crossing of all streams [as defined at 314 CMR 9.02 Land Under Water and 310 CMR 10.04 Stream]. Said photographs shall clearly depict the substrate composition of the stream channel in the immediate vicinity of the proposed crossing.
36. A description of any long-term anticipated affects of the project on the hydrology of jurisdictional resource areas as required in item 11 of the aforementioned Statement of Technical Deficiency.

GENERAL STORMWATER REQUIREMENTS

37. Please provide all information requested in Items 12 through and including 29 of the Statement of Technical Deficiency.

STREAM CROSSING STANDARDS

38. A description of compliance with the “Massachusetts River and Stream Crossing Standards”, including a narrative and detail drawings demonstrating that the standards will be met to the maximum extent feasible.

BORDERING LAND SUBJECT TO FLOODING

39. Documentation that the boundary of Bordering Land Subject to Flooding (BLSF), as shown on the site plan(s), if subject to the Flood Insurance Study presumption at 310 CMR 10.57(2)(a)3., is accurately based upon a bench mark or reference mark that corresponds to US Geological Survey datum of known elevation above mean sea level.
40. Calculations clearly demonstrating the extent to which incremental compensatory storage will meet the General Performance Standards at 310 CMR 10.57(4)(a)1. and 2., and a concise description of the methodology used to generate the calculations. Please provide a table of calculations of flood storage volume loss and gain for each incremental elevation in each watershed area, as well as totals for the site.
41. Compensatory flood storage is proposed within proposed BVW replacement areas. It is not clear how the performance standards associated with both resource areas will be met within these combination compensatory storage/BVW replacement areas. Please elaborate with specific reference to General Performance Standards and Department Guidance.

RIVERFRONT AREA

42. This project is eligible to be reviewed under 310 CMR 10.58(5) as redevelopment within previously developed Riverfront Areas (RFA). Please provide an “existing conditions site plan showing the footprint of “degraded” areas per 310 CMR 10.58(5) that are within the RFA on the subject parcel or parcels. Please provide a proposed conditions site plan, showing the footprint of areas within which work will take place within the RFA.
43. Table(s) showing the square footage of the Riverfront Areas on the parcel(s) in question, the square footage of the “limit of work” within Riverfront Areas, and the square footage of restoration and mitigation, respectively. Please include the calculations for each separate Riverfront Area (Mud Pond, Wild Acres Brook) as well as totals for the site.
44. Discussion of how the project will meet the redevelopment provisions at 310 CMR 10.58(5)(a) through (e) and the provision of restoration and/or mitigation under 310 CMR 10.58(f) and/or (g) and (h). Prior to issuance of a Denial Superseding Order of Conditions, the Department will require full design details for restoration and /or mitigation areas.

WILDLIFE HABITAT EVALUATION

45. This project, as proposed within the Notice of Intent, exceeds the threshold for alteration of “significant wildlife habitat” according to the General Performance Standards at 310 CMR 10.54(4)(a)5. for Bank, and 310 CMR 10.57(4)(a)3. for BLSF. The Department has determined that the Bank and BLSF proposed to be altered is “significant to the protection of wildlife habitat” per 310 CMR 10.54(4)(a)5. and 310 CMR 10.57(2)(a)2.

Therefore, you are required to submit wildlife habitat evaluations, including fully completed Appendix Bs, prepared by an individual with the requisite qualifications described at 310 CMR 10.60(1)(b), and prepared by reference to 310 CMR 10.60(2)(a) and (d), and the Department's *Massachusetts Wildlife Habitat Protection Guidance for Inland Wetlands* (MassDEP March 2006); **and** wildlife habitat restoration/replication plans prepared by that same individual per the General Performance Standard at 310 CMR 10.60(3).


VEGETATION MANAGEMENT PLAN (VMP)

46. The Department does not currently have adequate information to determine the applicability of the VMP and the limited project provision at 310 CMR 10.53(3)(n) for airport vegetation removal projects. The limited project provision excludes the expansion or relocation of existing airport uses. Please discuss and quantify the aspects of this project that are associated with the increase in use, and therefore not included in the limited project. Additionally, ALL proposed alteration, temporary or permanent, of all jurisdictional "resource areas", as defined at 310 CMR 10.04, must be tallied and presented in a revised Notice of Intent (NOI) form (WPA Form 3). These totals **MUST** include all proposed alteration from the VMP project component, the airfield safety component, and the runway and facilities expansion component. Due to the complexity of the project proposal, subtotals for each component should also be provided as an attachment to the revised NOI.

Please be advised that no work may proceed until the Department issues a final decision on this matter. Correspondence to the Department should be sent to the attention of Karen Hirschberg of the Wetlands Program. All correspondence must be copied to all parties in this matter. If you have any questions regarding this on-site meeting notification and information request, please feel free to contact Karen Hirschberg at (413) 755-2240.

Sincerely,

Robert J. McCollum
for



Robert J. McCollum
Wetlands Program Chief

W:\...PAC W159662 WQC TD\263-901 SOC-FI.doc

Certified Mail #7005 3110 0001 3150 7820

cc Pittsfield Conservation Commission (electronically)

Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection
Wetlands Program-Boston (electronically)

United States Department of the Army
New England District, Corps of Engineers
Regulatory Division
696 Virginia Road
Concord, MA 01742-2751
Attention: Karen K. Adams (electronically)

Randall Christensen
Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.
136 West Street, Suite 203
Northampton, MA 01060-3711 (electronically)

Thomas W. French, PhD., Assistant Director
Massachusetts Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program
Massachusetts Division of Fisheries and Wildlife
1 Rabbit Hill Road
Westborough, MA 01581 (electronically)

Federal Aviation Administration
Richard Doucette - Environmental Specialist
12 New England Executive Park
Burlington, MA 01803 (electronically)

Massachusetts Aeronautics Commission
Rachel Schohn - Environmental Planner
10 Park Plaza - Room 3190
Boston, MA 02116 (electronically)

Astrid Hagenguth, Chairman
United South Neighbors Association
20 Boylston Street
Pittsfield, MA 01201 (electronically)

Cecilia Rock and Judy Harris
107 Howard Street
Pittsfield, MA 01201 (electronically)

Thomas J. Sakshaug, DDS
Citizens for a Sensible Airport Plan
50 Vista Street
Pittsfield, MA 01201

Theresa Clary
732 Barker Road
Pittsfield, MA 01201

Jane Winn, Executive Director
Berkshire Environmental Action Team
27 Highland Avenue
Pittsfield, MA 01201

(electronically)

Rene Wendell, Jr.
66 Sheffield Street
Pittsfield, MA 01201

Carolyn W. Sibner, Water Protection Manager
Housatonic Valley Association
1383 Pleasant Street, Box 251
South Lee, MA 01260

(electronically)

Jamie Cooney
50 Richmond Avenue
Pittsfield, MA 01201

Wand J. Boeke
50 Richmond Avenue
Pittsfield, MA 01201

(electronically)

Kenneth E. Duncan

(electronically)