

**HOLDEN CONSERVATION COMMISSION
1130 MAIN STREET, HOLDEN SENIOR CENTER
MINUTES
December 4, 2019**

Members Present: Robert Lowell, Anthony Costello, David Nyman, Michael Scott, Cathy Doherty.

Not Present: Luke Boucher, Kenneth Strom

Others Present: Glenda Williamson, Conservation Agent; Alisha Pollinger, Recording Secretary; Jeff Alberti, Elena Comptez and Tony Wespier; Weston & Sampson, Ruth Bull and William Musterl; 473 Worcester Road an abutter, Gary Kaczmarek, OPM.

R Lowell called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM

NOTICE OF INTENT - 18 Industrial Drive, Assessing Map 186, Parcel 43. DEP File#: 183-0665. Construction of a new DPW facility within the 100-foot buffer of a bordering vegetated wetland. Town of Holden. Rep. Alexandra Gaspar, Jeff Alberti, Weston & Sampson.

G. Williamson read the legal ad into record. Jeff Alberti with Weston & Sampson was present to discuss the project. This is for the new DPW Facility at 18 Industrial Drive. This is an aerial view, the site was a former industrial facility that the town purchased. Former Rico site that is 120,000 sq ft plus of building and additional 160,000 sq ft paved area. As part of the project the town is to demolish the building that is the overall view of the existing plan.

The resources areas are identified are the north of the site, Industrial Drive is located on the right side. You see the isolated wetland located in the top of the presentation, the 25ft no disturb shown in the darker green, along with the 100ft wetland buffer associated with resource areas. There are also an intermittent stream that is associated with the wetlands that runs across the northern portion of the site. Some of these photos were taken prior to the initial demolition that took place. There is a lot of broken up pavement, there is no curbing and there is a lot of sheet flow of storm water that is exiting the site. There us pavement running off the end and the storm water running off that site. In the back of the site you can see more of the broken up pavement, no curbing, run off exiting the site. Some of the storm water on that site is untreated. One of the benefits of this project was to collect that storm water, treat it and have it 80% total suspended solids (TSS) removal prior to discharge. Taking a look at the overall plan this darker area represents the impervious area as we went through and develop concepts and we were able to improve and reduced the overall pavement area to the south and the north. The whole reduction is about 56, 000sq ft, of which 8,000 sq ft in the 100ft buffer, we will bring back those pavement areas from the wetlands.

This is a rendering of proposed facility as you are referring to it on the presentation, it's about a 42,000sq ft facility with 6,000 sq ft canopy. It will house all the operations, which includes offices, shops, maintenance, vehicle wash facility and a vehicle equipment storage area. Also we have salt storage structure and a new fueling facility.

The stormwater system consists of the western and eastern system. Western system consists of deep catch basin and connected to hydro dynamic separators to underground filtration chambers all of it is connected to a piping system. We are catching things through the catch basins through the hydro dynamic separator, we had some infiltration after it has been treated and we do have an overflow to an existing out fall. To the east we have similar systems, catch basins and the hydro dynamic separator, in this case here we provided some infiltration swales along the foot of the property. Through the treatment chains we are able to move 93% of the total suspended solids. We took a close look at the predevelopment and post development conditions. We compared both and our post development are less. Summary of improvements, the new facility will collect the storm water and will eliminate the untreated sheet flow storm water that runs off the site, this provides a new storm water system meeting the minimum 80% TSS removal and decreases the impervious area on the entire site by 60,000 sq ft, also decreases the impervious area and restores to an impervious surface about 8,000 sq ft within the buffer zone.

R. Lowell stated that this is a labor yard that has a high potential of pollution and more than 80% TSS removal is required. Is there a street sweeping sequence to go through? Jeff Alberti stated that the street sweeping was included in the chain. Elena Comptev stated that the street sweeping will bring it up to 93 % TSS removal, sites with higher potential load pollution, the requirement is that you have 44% pretreatment before you infiltrate storm water, that's why we have included the hydro dynamic separators upstream of the basins. Jeff stated that in regard to the sweeping, because the equipment is on site and we are able to store in a minimally heated garage, it won't have to be winterized it will be used to conduct periodic sweeping.

R Lowell asked if there was any other management practice to keep the salt from getting into the ground water. Jeff stated that it is done in the management of the product and salt is a very expensive product the DWP is very careful about ensuring that it is going on the roads and not being left on the site. There are a couple procedures to have this done, keeping it under a cover and having a door opening that allows them to dump directly inside the building. The older structures they dumped outside and a front end loader moving it, we are going to be designing it to dump on the inside and we will be providing a salt loading ramp it allows the front end loader to dump at 2 to 4 ft above the vehicle that is being loaded. As they are dumping they won't over shoot or overload the vehicle, there are standard operating procedures if any product does get spilled they can get that material back inside.

R. Lowell asked about the fueling center. Jeff stated that it is for town vehicle fueling, double wall leak protected and they go on a concrete pad slate. R Lowell asked if it provides any containment? Jeff Alberti stated yes, in the range of 5 gallon per dispense and there will be a shut off valve for an emergency situation. Jeff Alberti said the tanks are double walled and well protected.

D. Nyman stated that a portion of the roof is being directly discharged to the wetlands. There is nothing in Standard 4 that exempts roof runoff from treatment. Standard 3 allows the runoff to be infiltrated without pre-treatment because it is somewhat cleaner. You still need to count the impervious area of the rooftop and send the water for treatment. Jeff Alberti stated that they will look into that and see if they can make some adjustments. D Nyman stated they can still justify the improvement under redevelopment. D. Nyman asked if the wash system was connected to the drainage system. Jeff Alberti stated that it is connected to the sump inside and then connects to the

sewer system. All washing is done with detergents and high pressure system is all done under cover and flows does not get into the storm water system. Jeff Alberti said that the wash water goes through a series of separators inside and is treated to discharge.

A. Costello asked where the DPW would be storing their sand/salt mixture. Jeff Alberti said that he would confirm with the DPW how this would be managed. He stated that it would have to go in a small shed to keep the weather off of it.

D Nyman asked about the depth to ground water where there is infiltration. Jeff Alberti stated that they are greater than 4-ft in most areas and where they are not, they did a mounding analysis to ensure there are no detrimental impacts. D. Nyman stated that Standard 5 was not checked and that it should be if there is exposure. D. Nyman asked if the project area drains to water supply. Jeff Alberti stated that it is in a Zone A and they would be adding the Zone A to the plan. D. Nyman stated that Standard 6 would apply as well.

D. Nyman asked if there are procedures for shut down and containment. Jeff Alberti said that he would confirm that. He said typically we do with a system like this there is spill prevention control that is associated just with the fueling and the general procedures for any type of spill containment. Jeff stated that they would look into this further and discuss it further in the narrative.

D. Nyman asked about the watershed assessment and how the 100-year floodplain was determined. Jeff Alberti stated that this was determined by Eco-Tec that did a stream stats analysis and determined that the stream is intermittent. They found that the overall drainage area was less than .5 square miles. Jeff stated that he would reach out to Eco-Tec for additional information on this. Ruth Bull, a resident in attendance said she would like this information as well.

D. Nyman asked if all of the fleet storage would be kept under cover. Jeff stated yes, they designed it so all vehicles could be parked indoors. D. Nyman asked if there were any metal roofs. Jeff Alberti stated that they would double check on this and provide more information on the products that would be used. R. Lowell asked for any input from the public.

Ruth Bull asked if treated water would be discharged to the intermittent stream and if that water would flow into the adjoining wetlands. Jeff Alberti stated yes. Ruth asked if there would be any monitoring of the water quality and if that would be provided to the abutters. Jeff Alberti stated that there are two things that are taken into consideration, number one we provided systems that are going to mitigate through the treatment trains, catch basin and the hydro dynamic separators through onsite infiltration. The flow rate and the volume of water that currently exits the side of that location will be significantly less. R. Lowell stated that they are required to put in a number of treatment systems before the stormwater leaves the site. There is a treatment and infiltration, when you have a big rain storm, the system will be maxed out and will be the cleanest water. That is the case requirements we are subject to, and or advocate for and work within the Commonwealth of Mass. Ruth Bull asked when you dig and build these water treatment structures, what's the assurance that it is not going to be releasing hazardous waste that are currently on the site back into the water treatment area.

Jeff Alberti stated that when the town purchased the area there was extensive testing and there is an filtration room that the town has already remediated and got out and removed the contamination and using a licensed site professional, which is governed through DEP. Jeff stated that there is no contamination in the areas we are developing and the town has completed the remediation in the filtration room. R Lowell stated that there was a previous land fill on site. Jeff Alberti stated that there was a previous disposal area by the former owner. There are still two other contaminated areas outside of the development that are stabilized and are under a temporary solution, which means they are stable and they need to be monitored on a bi-annual basis, that is being done by the town. Jeff stated that the greatest benefit that he saw was the oil filtration room, which was remediated and it is in the middle of this.

G Williamson asked Ruth Bull where her property is located. She indicated the location and the plan and stated assessing map 173, Parcel 56. She stated that it is three quarters of an acre and the entire parcel is wetlands. G. Williamson stated that she would get less volume and less pollution due to the stormwater improvements. Jeff stated that the stormwater plan was designed by professional engineers and submitted to the local conservation commission and the DEP. There are no current treatments on the site, it's essentially sheet flow. As you look through treatment trains, you see a decrease in the flows and volumes and you will have less. Ruth Bull stated that less doesn't mean it's good. Jeff stated that its much less and meets all the current standards.

Ruth asked if they would be checking for hazardous materials when they are digging. Jeff stated absolutely, for any work that is done we have representatives on site and they are obligated to address this. R. Lowell asked if the site was being monitored. Ruth stated that there were several pockets of contamination that could not permanently be dealt with. R. Lowell asked if there would be any reuse of site soil. Jeff stated that they are keeping a balanced site, if there are any excess material that is generated we will look at it from a geo technical prospective whether it can be reused from a structural fill prospective and if it can't it will be shipped off site. Any material that leaves the site will have an EMEP material management plan, which requires all materials to be tested for disposal. Ruth asked if they would be issuing reports during construction. Jeff stated that the town has a full time representative that will be onsite during construction. R. Lowell stated that any monitoring of the hazardous waste goes to DEP that is also public record. Ruth Bull asked if the construction committee has meetings. Gary Kaczmarek said that they have weekly site meeting and monthly meetings on the first Monday with the DPW facility committee. Meetings are posted through the town clerks office.

M. Scott asked if everything is flowing to the south and east, from the northern existing outfall does that run to the west. Jeff said that they don't have a survey down that low. R. Lowell asked if the vegetated swales also tie into that. Jeff stated yes, they are interconnected and do have an outfall connected to the drainage system into the street. M. Scott asked if it would require a new connection. Jeff stated yes. They we will provide resubmission package and documents to you for the next hearing on January 8th, 2020.

PROJECT UPDATES:**Greenwood Estates - Construction/Stabilization Update**

G Williamson stated that Tom Larson could not make it to the meeting and she would provide the update. She stated that there was a heavy rain and water was diverted around the hay bale line and did not flow to the temporary diversion pipe. An enforcement order was issued as sediments were discharged into the stream below the crossing. She stated that all of the sediments were removed with shovels and buckets and erosion controls have been replaced. They are still installing gravity sewer on Deanna Drive, they are constructing the lateral service into individual lots for the sewer in the phase one area. They added a discharge pit for basin 2-3, added an outlet for basin 3-1 and an outlet for 3-3. They recently added water service to the pump station and still installing sewer and drain manholes. Next they will be doing the geo grids on the slopes adjacent to crossing #2. They are waiting for final approval from Weston & Sampson to install the geo grid, it will be 12in rip rap. D Nyman asked if they could install geo-grid on frozen ground. G. Williamson stated that she would ask Weston & Sampson about this. D. Nyman asked how feasible is it when we are into freezing conditions and what level they are at and what material they are working with. He stated that he would like to hear from the geo-technical engineering person how this will be done and if this is an appropriate time to construct the geo-grid slopes.

D. Nyman stated that on this project we have had several erosion control and sediment management failures, we should have more information up front from new applicants, on how they attend to manage all the bigger storms. The management plans have to be much more aggressive and we should not accept more applications that are lacking in the calculations and timing as with Greenwood Estates. Going forward we should be much more diligent in getting information. D Nyman stated that it is a lot of development in a small amount of space and resulted in severe erosion sediment issues. R. Lowell stated that this site has been challenging. D Nyman stated that the erosion control plan should be developed by the contractor. We have to have something that the contractor works with and modifies for it to be a complete application, it shouldn't be issued without the documents being filed. The documents should meet our bylaw and the DEP regulations, it should be one that suffices for NPDES permit. C. Doherty asked is there anything we have to do to ask for that. R. Lowell said we can ask before the order is issued. D. Nyman stated that this is something we found in recent experience and need to have management plans in place.

M. Scott asked if Pine Tree Estates in front of the planning board. G. Williamson stated that they had a public meeting not to long ago. M. Scott asked if this would be a Blair development and how large it is. G. Williamson said that it is not a Blair project, its all of the land between the upper part of Bailey Road and Salisbury Street. G. Williamson said that we are going to get a submittal for this project soon.

M. Scott stated that we can demand regulations and require that a SWIPP be provided if they are not requiring enough information in projects. D. Nyman stated that many of the sites are in Watershed Protection Act areas and they require a permit from the DEP for the erosion control. D Nyman stated that the Pine Tree Estates submittal is months away we should let them know we are concerned stormwater management.

M. Scott asked if the Graves review of the construction at Greenwood is being done through our order or is that the Planning Board. G Williamson stated that it is through Conservation, Weston & Sampson was brought in through DPW and they require inspections on 2-1 slopes of the road way and stabilization. No retaining walls are allowed in the right away.

REQUEST FOR CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE - DEP File # 183-0637

Lot 3, 129 Quinapoxet Street, Assessing Map 102, Parcel 1. Construction of a single-family home in the 100-foot buffer. Jim Harrity.

R. Lowell asked if the lot was satisfactory? G. Williamson stated no, he didn't put bigger boulders behind the home yet. We will let him know again that larger boulders are required and once complete, we will add this item to a future agenda. The final COC for this lot was not issued.

REQUEST FOR CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE - DEP File # 183-0651

1 Brentwood Drive, Eric Veien. Assessing Map 225, Parcel 54. Construction of an attached garage, driveway realignment and retaining wall in the 100-foot buffer of a stream.

G. Williamson showed the Commission photos of the home and lot. There is a intermittent stream and slope next to his house and they constructed an attached garage with a room over. The order called for shrubs to be planted by the foot bridge and his lawn was already located in the no disturb zone. Eric requested a final COC since the wall construction is complete. The lawn adjacent to the stairs and a portion of the front yard was not fully stabilized. The Commission agreed that more time was needed for the lawn to stabilize. The final COC for this lot was not issued.

REQUEST FOR CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE - DEP File # 183-0307

792 Princeton Street, Assessing Map 50, Parcel 5. Jeffrey Copeland, Single family home and driveway in the 100-foot buffer.

G. Williamson stated that the 409 Elmwood Ave parcel was subdivided out of 792 Princeton Street and this is why there is an outstanding Order of Conditions showing on the deed. G. Williamson stated that the home at 409 Elmwood Ave. was constructed years ago and the yard is fully stabilized. R Lowell asked for a recommendation from the Commission.

Motion by M. Scott, seconded by C. Doherty, it was **UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO ISSUE THE CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE FOR 792 PRINCETON STREET, CONSTRUCTION OF A SINGLE FAMILY HOME IN THE 100-FOOT, DEP FILE # 183-0307.**

FOREST CUTTING PLAN - CH. 132 - 11 Acres off Highland Ave. Property Owner Wolfe Farms, LLC. Forester Joe Hyland, Access is thru Greenwood Estates property.

G. Williamson stated that the Commission received a DCR forest cutting plan for 11 acres off Highland Ave. She walked the site with Joe Hyland and John Clark. The Commission has 10 days to provide any comments back. There is one stream crossing that they will protect with a timber bridge. R. Lowell stated that it looks like they are coming in from Meadwood Drive. G Williamson stated that there was a landing area at that location but this would not be used to access

the site. Joe Hyland, the forester, said they have permission from Clea Blair to enter through the sewer easement at Highland Ave. R Lowell asked what we need to do. G. Williamson stated that a vote is not needed. Joe just wanted the Commission to be aware that they will be cutting this site. A. Costello stated that they are taking 8-inch trees out but leaving the 10 to 16-inch trees. This is typical for a selective cut, they retain some of the larger trees.

Minutes

Motion by D. Nyman, seconded by A. Costello, it was **VOTED TO APPROVE THE JUNE 5TH, 2019 CONSERVATION COMMISSION MEETING MINUTES BY A VOTE OF 4-0-1.** (Lowell, abstain).

The August 7, 2019 minutes need more review and edits.

Motion by R. Lowell, it was **UNANIMOUSLY VOTED TO ADJOURN THE DECEMBER 4, 2019 CONSERVATION COMMISSION MEETING AT 8:10 PM.**