

Committee: Conservation Commission

Date: May 16, 2019

Time: 7:00pm

Location: 3rd Floor Town Hall

Commissioners present: Carl Shreder, Laura Repplier, Rachel Bancroft, Rebecca Chane, Chris Candia, and Elisabeth Clark.

Staff members present: Steve Przyjemski, and Julie Cantara.

The meeting was called to order at: 7:05pm

Conservation Commission
5/16/2019

DISCUSSIONS

North Shore Nature Programs

Andrew Prazar (owner of the company and program) introduces himself and updates the Commission on last year.

Laura: Makes a motion to approve the contract.

Rebecca: Seconds motion.

Motion carries unanimously.

Enforcement Order: 388 North Street

Tree cutting and grading within 100' of a BVW without permission.

Laura: Makes a motion to ratify the Enforcement Order dated 5/16/19, and make it clear that it's a cease and desist order.

Rebecca: Seconds motion.

Motion carries unanimously.

HEARINGS

203 East Main Street (DEP#161-0857; GCC 2018-05) NOI – (cont.)

Construction of a Residential Recycling Drop off Area within Buffer Zone to Wetland Area.

Present: **Nancy McCann (Attorney)**
 Mary Rimmer (Wetland Consultant)
 Jason Mello (Applicant)

Carl: There were some outstanding things we were looking at, and you were dropping off new/revised plans to us today.

Nancy: The engineer intended to bring them tonight, but was advised that it wasn't the procedure; that he was supposed give them in advance. Changes in the plan Mary has with her tonight. Minor; stamping a plan already submitted and removing a note that this was not for construction purposes. Peer review consultant Jillian had noted in her comments that we needed to submit that plan, and the engineer just didn't get it to you in time. Where are on the project: We've gone through three rounds of comments with BSC and Mary Rimmer starting September through April 22nd – will review responses. The most recent comments from BSC was dated 4/22/19 via email indicating that we satisfied all of her comments, with the exception of submitting this plan with the note removed with regard to construction, and stamping the plan. I believe that's where we are at this point. I did see, however, in an email that came out from Steve this afternoon stating that the Commission was waiting on Jillian to clarify one of the concerns brought up by the Commission, and we would like clarification ourselves, because we're not aware of any outstanding issues.

Steve: BSC's review is not the end all of the project and now we can vote; it's the end of our technical review. Typically, what happens when that's done, is, that's when the Commission starts discussing the project and their concerns and other aspects. It's not that Jillian signed off on it, ok now let's vote. I talked to Jillian; I still have concerns, and a couple of Commissioners have expressed some concerns over the stormwater. This is when the Commission gets their opportunity to start asking questions – both to Jillian and to the Applicant.

Carl: Did we talk about doing a site walk out there?

Steve: We did. We typically wait till after the 3rd party review is done. As far as I see this; it has been a while, it's a very technical project, but the project is kind of just getting started as far as the Commission is concerned.

Carl: It's a good idea to properly review those issues that our 3rd party discussed.

Steve: And have been resolved, according to the 3rd party reviewer. But that doesn't mean that there aren't some concerns that the Commission has that are legitimate and need to be discussed. I have a few things – discussions and emails, that I'm concerned with that still need to be hashed out. We need to do a site walk.

Carl: Definitely.

Steve: I still don't have the plan. I got the plan two days ago; when I pulled it out of the box for tonight's meeting, it wasn't the right plan. I contacted them and they apologized for sending the wrong plan. I believe I saw an email in my inbox from an hour ago where they PDF'd it to me, and they were supposed to bring copies to the meeting. We have an *everything has to be in five days before the meeting* policy, so we can't close the meeting. We can't do anything tonight – this is just a discussion.

Carl: I think they're acknowledging that. I think they realize that it's not fair to any Board to drop a plan off and say 'here approve this, you haven't read it yet.'

Steve: There are no huge changes, but a lot of Commissioners haven't looked at that plan. We were waiting for the 3rd party review, to then do our review. Why would we look at it before? Because things change.

Carl: So why don't we discuss those issues that Jillian talked about? Discuss those, we can schedule a site walk and any other issues. I know there was a discussion about stormwater and also whether this actually is the final plan, in terms of there's no future anticipated modifications once this is approved.

Nancy: Yes, let me address that. What is encompassed in the NOI and in the plan that you have before you is the project that we're presenting to you. I believe there was some question on whether this project was to be expanded for purposes of dealing with some road work and increasing street layout. That has not been officially presented to any Board. This project is still with the Board of Appeals.

Carl: I guess what we would be opposed to, is if we're trying to get an approval, and then kind of come back to us knowing that we're going to need to modify.

Rebecca: Hold on. I thought that the 1st meeting you proposed a residential drop-off facility, correct?

Nancy: Correct.

Rebecca: And that you had to go expand that roadway to do that.

Nancy: No. The work that we need for the residential drop-off area is what's shown in the NOI, and is what's shown on the plan.

Rebecca: And that's what we're addressing tonight, that same thing?

Nancy: Correct. There was a question whether the actual street, Main Street, had to be expanded to accommodate truck turning movements and things like that. That has not been presented to anyone, nor is that part of this project, and we don't anticipate that that's going to be part of the project. So, the question is: 'Is this the project? Is this what we're asking for approval? Do we think that there's going to be anything more?' The answer is: 'This is the project – we don't anticipate anything.'

Carl: Definitely, the answer is yes? That this is the project?

Nancy: This is the project.

Steve: The traffic engineer in a ZBA meeting did make reference to the need to widen the driveway. Again, I'm confused by that.

Rebecca: I'm confused also, because I thought that we asked for the site walk to delineate the driveway that they had proposed that was within 100' or 75'. We couldn't do that without those markers, so it was definitely for something a driveway, came up very close.

Steve: The driveway accessing the property comes within feet.

Rebecca: It was up and around. It was to access the new residential, proposed residential – it was not where it is now. It was up and around, and that's why we asked Jillian to look at the plans.

Steve: Correct. And she looked at the residential drop-off area, that's different than my concern, which is the concept of bifurcating of the project where to me it appears...

Rebecca: Right, but what happened with Jillian? Where does that stand?

Steve: She did that review based on that little road going to the residential drop-off up by the site. I'm talking back by the main road.

Rebecca: Right, so where do we stand with Jillian? What her discoveries were with that previous project?

Nancy: That is the project. We can go through with you what the project is, what Jillian has reviewed, and that's what we're anticipating. There is no intent to do anything beyond that. This is the project that we have before you.

Laura: This is the residential drop-off area; is it also intended to be expanded? Is there going to be another project to do some other kind of drop-off area which would require the road to be changed? Is that potentially what's going to happen?

Nancy: No. This project that you have before you encompasses the whole upgrading of the site that's being required by DEP, and what is before you is the portion of that project that falls within your jurisdiction.

Laura: So, am I to assume that if it's just for residential drop-off, that we probably won't need to be messing with the road?

Steve: The only part that's jurisdictional is the residential drop-off. There are other things going on that they're showing on the plan that they acknowledged are going to happen – they're enclosing it. It's not being required; it's also been mis-spoken a lot on this project. The DEP is requiring them to enclose the building. They're choosing to build a bigger building, and expand it in certain ways. The residential drop-off is not required, the enclosing is. This project as shown is not required by the DEP. It's just to enclose the existing building. So, it is above and beyond; but the only aspect that's in the Commissions' jurisdiction is the residential drop-off, and paying attention to the stormwater, because this is a very sensitive, critical area. That's why the concerns are being brought up about the stormwater.

Carl: That's the basic premise with stormwater, is to try and prevent run-off.

Steve: And I come back to the ZBA minutes which capture a reference to the road needing to be improved to allow large trucks to pass and re-pass as far as, not the residential drop-off, but the expansion of the other area. So, I keep hearing that we don't need big trucking, but the traffic person mentioned they need to make improvements to the road, in the minutes.

Laura: Is that for the construction phase, or is that going to be on-going?

Steve: On-going.

Laura: Because they have to take the refuse out of there?

Steve: They're bringing in more materials, they need bigger trucks.

Carl: Just to re-group: from a civil engineering standpoint - the existing design can accommodate the size trucks that are going to go in there?

Nancy: What we have proposed on the plan will accommodate it, that's why it was designed that way. Were there discussions during the Board of Appeals hearing process about 'could you do takings along 133?' There were all sorts of different things that were discussed. Absolutely, those were discussed. But the project plans are these.

Carl: Ok. Why don't you just go through those discussions with Jillian so we can bring everyone up to speed with those.

Mary shows plans to the Commission.

Mary: This is route 133 and the access road. We filed an ANRAD back in 2017, and that delineation was approved; although I think the ANRAD is still outstanding. The wetland boundary was approved by BSC. This is the bordering vegetated wetlands shown in green; here, here, and here, along the project site. And Penn Brook out here. So, there's a 200' riverfront area of Penn Brook that doesn't include any of the proposed work area, and there's 100' buffer zone which I indicated here, which does include a portion of the work area. This plan here is existing conditions, this is what the site looks like right now. This spring, a question came up about whether or not there might be a vernal pool associated with Penn Brook. Steve had sent me some information about a location that he had heard about or knew about.

Steve: An abutter brought up the concern.

Mary: We did go and investigate that during the vernal pool season this year, myself, my colleague, and we couldn't find anything resembling a vernal pool. Except for a painted turtle, we couldn't find any other species. There wasn't as much water as I expected there to be, just the one area that you had pointed out, and the water quality was fairly poor. Like I said, there were painted turtles, but that was it.

Mary flips to the Proposed Conditions.

Mary: This is a blow up of the plan here. And this yellow line is the 100' setback, and the orange line is the 75', your *no impervious* area setback from the wetlands. This is the area of the residential drop-off, a portion of which is within jurisdiction. The backside of the container storage and some of the pavement from the drop-off area. All of that is within atop of existing capped landfill. So, the vegetation would be removed on top of the landfill, gravel base put in, and pavement installed on top of that. And new stormwater management to accommodate the additional run-off. There's not a lot of difference in pre and post rates because there's not a lot of difference in the infiltration, because it's capped landfill. So, you're going from a capped situation that, by design, does not allow infiltration to impervious conditions. Nonetheless, the stormwater management plan complies fully with the new development standards for DEP stormwater standards. They're not proposing it under the re-development provisions, which are less stringent.

Rebecca: So, it meets MS4?

Mary: Separate issue. The MS4 wouldn't be federal.

Carl: This is a municipal meeting.

Rebecca: That went into effect July 1, 2018.

Mary: Right, but that's different from the State stormwater management standards, so that has to do with town infrastructure and maintenance of town drainage systems, which isn't relevant to this project. DEP has their own stormwater regulations which are incorporated by/ referenced in the Massachusetts Wetland Protection Act, which are above and beyond what you'd need for this.

Carl: This is kind of a unique situation because you have a private entity on town property. In a private situation you'd still have to comply with stormwater, but here you have private on town property, which would have to comply with the State regulations, and municipal would be the MS4.

Mary: All of it, all of the standards are all elevated in this case because it's new development and they're improving the stormwater management system that's there now. So, even with the additional impervious area, there's more additional treatment being provided. All of that has been reviewed by BSC, and I think they've provided their comments and have signed off on that. I guess you'll have more instruction on that.

Carl: Refresh my memory as far as who's maintaining in terms of stormwater.

Mary: That would be a question for the engineers who are not here, and did this operation maintenance plan for it. I don't know who would be the responsible party.

Jason: We will be.

Carl: We need to be clear; if it's one of those things if no one's quite sure who's going to be doing it two years from now, we all look back and say 'oh I thought you were doing it.'

Jason: No, we will be. We met with the State to get it all back to where it used to be to maintain it. The town originally maintained it at first, and I told them in the spring, as soon as it dries out a little bit, the contractor's going to come in and fix it all. Then we will maintain it.

Carl: I just want to be clear on that, and that's fine. Just so we don't forget about it and everyone just ignores it.

Mary: That's a general re-cap of where we're at. The Peer Review of the plans has been completed as far as we understand, and I guess Steve, you'll have to let us know if you think that that's not the case, and if it needs to go back to them for any reason. I don't think they need to review the plan to see that the stamp is on it and the note is taken off, but if there's anything.

Steve: Just a PDF. Just so they get it, so they can have a final say and say yes, this is the plan to review, and they're ok with it.

Mary: I think the wetland boundaries are very obvious, there wasn't really any issue with that. So, really we're talking about a buffer zone project that's in between 75-100' on a capped landfill. That's what we're dealing with, so the stormwater management is the primary issue. You're far

away from the wetland, and you've still got mowed, maintained, capped landfill between this work area and the wetlands. There's not really viable buffer zone habitat in that area.

Carl: Stormwater is especially important because this isn't just parking lot run-off, so it's very critical.

Mary: They have to meet a higher standard. It's a higher pollutant load site, so that's a part of the stormwater standards.

Carl: Right.

Laura: But at the moment it's not covered.

Mary: Right.

Laura: And that is a proposal for a covered site. Will all off the material that's being brought in be covered, or will there will be uncovered materials on that site after this project?

Jason: No, they'll be covered.

Laura: They'll all be covered?

Jason: And on that paved area that we're proposing for the drop-off, that's recyclables.

Laura: What sorts of things?

Jason: Paper, cardboard, plastic, tin, aluminum. Not actual household trash or MSW.

Rebecca: In that building, recyclables will be covered?

Jason: The building?

Rebecca: The three bays.

Jason: The three bays are compaction units, so yes, they are covered, fully enclosed.

Rebecca: And that will have run-off within that green border, correct? Because you're putting a roof on that.

Mary: Yep, and all the run-off is generated. I can't really describe the stormwater management because I wasn't really prepared to do that for you, but anything that's got a hard surface has to be captured within the stormwater management overall plan.

Rebecca: Who came up with that plan?

Mary: Cornerstone Engineering.

Jason: Just to clarify, there's not going to be a roof over the recyclables. Those are fully enclosed, water tight compaction units.

Nancy: They're not in a building.

Jason: They're not in a building, they're free-standing, but there are doors that open and they have water tight seals on them.

Carl: In terms of what gets dropped off – how do you deal with it if someone tries to sneak in a hazardous material into refuse, which obviously occurs? You need to be able to respond to that or deal with it so it doesn't contaminate or cause major impact to the site and your operation.

Jason: As people are off-loading, there's always two to three people on the ground visually inspecting what's being thrown away. Obviously, I don't know what's in the bags.

Carl: People do know that they're not supposed to throw away compact fluorescent lights with mercury; let's face it, they do. Stuff gets thrown away, it's human nature, but again do you have as part of the stormwater, a response capability? Like you said that you're not opening the bags but you have people kind of scanning materials. Even someone they're supposed to send out lead acid batteries for recycling, they probably don't always do that. Or other kinds of nicad batteries, anything like that.

Jason: Anything that is seen by our personnel that is unacceptable material, the customers have to re-load it and take it back with them. Unless it's a material that we can separate and can handle; things like tires and televisions, and things like that.

Rebecca: Mary, that would fall under Standard 10 Pollution Prevention Plan, correct?

Mary: Yes. In addition, I think that DEP has standards that they have to comply with.

Jason: For load inspection. We have to do visual inspections.

Rebecca: Under #10, do you have that Pollution Prevention Plan?

Mary: Has the plan been prepared yet?

Jason: The O&M Plan?

Mary: There is an O&M Plan, I can tell you that I'm looking at it right now. Maintenance of the lease area will be the responsibility of the DMV, Mello, post-closure monitoring and maintenance of the remaining area of the site.

Rebecca: But 10 specifically addresses our Chairman's concern. It's a Pollution Prevention Plan, it's a specific plan.

Mary: Yes, it's a site that there's also soil disturbance that exceeds one acre, which automatically requires a stormwater prevention plan. So, I don't know whether or not this exceeds, I think it's on .6 acres on the material that the engineer provided, so I don't think they triggered that, but it's erosion control.

Carl: But whether it triggers it or not you still have to be able to readily address it in case a bag breaks open and someone's got a jug gallon of oil in there, and it starts leaking all over the place.

Mary: As part of the O&M Plan, and you can see, I can provide you with the O&M Plan or direct you to it, if it hasn't already been submitted.

Steve: And also, the 1st page of it says that the stormwater system shall be maintained by the Town of Georgetown, so I'm not sure what version you're looking at here, but this is what you guys submitted to us.

Carl: We want to clarify that, as Mr. Mello said, I think he's stated differently from what you have. So, we need to clarify.

Jason: I think after that was written I met with the State, and I agreed with the State that I would fix the stormwater, and I will maintain it.

Steve: Then this has to be modified.

Jason: My apologies.

Carl: Yeah, we definitely want to clarify that, so that'll be good.

Mary: And inspection reports still have to be provided to the DEP on a regular basis anyway.

Carl: I did want to schedule a site walk. Actually, I think it'll give it a little bit of flavor. I mean, it's not huge from a wetland perspective. Size wise, acreage wise, but I think it would give a better perspective of what they're proposing to actually go out there, since we have the 3rd party review.

Laura: Penn Brook is connected to where?

Rebecca: Parker River. Mary, I have a question regarding that. Under 314 cmr 4.0, so this whole area is a critical area to the Parker River. I thought under that regulation...

Mary: 4.0, which is the water quality standards?

Rebecca: Yes.

Mary: Yep.

Rebecca: That that extended the feet to 400', and Parker River is that watershed, is specifically listed on that 314 cmr 4.0.

Mary: For?

Rebecca: The Water Protection Act.

Mary: Right, so that would have to do with the installation of new wells and things like that, which isn't being proposed. It doesn't have to do with...

Rebecca: It's referenced in all the stormwater protection laws.

Mary: Right, different law; that's water quality. You can't fill wetlands that are in an ORW, which would be an area that should be (inaudible) to a public water supply. This doesn't propose to fill any, directly fill, any wetlands.

Rebecca: But they have to raise to a higher standard because they're in a critical area.

Mary: If they're filling wetlands, then 310 cmr 4.0 would apply.

Rebecca: And it's a notice to only filling wetlands. When I'm looking at the stormwater, it constantly refers to 314 cmr 4.0, and to note your areas of critical concern, and it's the Parker River watershed.

Mary: I think the 4.0 is just the water quality standards.

Rebecca: It's referenced all throughout the entire stormwater MS4.

Mary: Again, because we're actually proposing a new development, we have an entirely different set of standards that are more than what the MS4 requires. So, the MS4 is something that the Town is responsible for – this is a private development. They have to comply with the DEP stormwater standards.

Steve: How does it work when it's town property? It's a strange hybrid.

Carl: It's a unique situation.

Mary: It may be part of the Town's MS4 plan already, because it's a town facility.

Rebecca: Actually, no. I verified with the state, and the applicant is responsible for the stormwater and the MS4.

Mary: Right – which we're doing. That's why we're proposing that. I'm not sure if I'm clarifying your question.

Laura: Did you just say that what you're proposing exceeds the requirements of the MS4?

Mary: They're two different animals, so we're in a Notice of Intent right now. That's where we're focusing on now are the stormwater standards for a Notice of Intent. I would have to defer to the project engineers definitively, but my understanding is that the MS4 standards have to do with the Town's compliance with the Federal Clean Water Act.

Carl: Well, the Federal Clean Water Act pushes it on the State, which then pushes it on the Municipalities.

Mary: Exactly, so ultimately, it's a Federal standard.

Carl: Of course.

Mary: The State can enact their own standards as long as they're more stringent.

Carl: Correct.

Mary: We're acting on a standard that is already stricter than those MS4 standards.

Carl: Because industry has been under stormwater for 20+ years from EPA - municipalities are just coming up to speed now.

Mary: There are certain things they're required to do, as a private development.

Rebecca: I thought MS4 was designed that they'd be doing the stormwater regulations to come up to MS4 standards. That was my understanding, that MS4 is above and beyond some of the State requirements.

Mary: No, it's the other way around. You can't have it that way.

Carl: We can pose that you can check with your engineers just to verify that.

Steve: I already asked Jillian.

Rebecca: Something else that we need to find out: under the Parker River watershed is that it extends under 314 cmr 4.0 to 400 feet to either stormwater or MS4. Especially resource waters.

Mary: If you're discharging directly to an ORW, then you have a higher treatment standard. That would mean that instead of a ½" of run-off that has to be pre-treated prior to discharge, it would be a full inch of run-off.

Rebecca: Right, so you're treating 80% of your TSS removal.

Mary: Because I wasn't privy to the back and forth between Cornerstone Engineering and BSC, I would assume that that has been worked out. It's already at a higher standard because it's a higher pollutant load project. I'm assuming that that's going to be incorporated into the final design.

Carl: We just need to verify that.

Rebecca: Where the wetlands on that residential drop-off affect the wetlands, we should be able to see the plans as it relates to the stormwater and that 80%.

Mary: It's on the plans. Those stormwater facilities are on the plan.

Steve: Can you have the engineering team just provide a memo addressing this? Just to clarify what the difference is between the stormwater standards and the MS4, and how they relate? And maybe an opinion on what their opinion is on the hybrid aspect of this? Because this doesn't fit into the typical box, and I think that we're going to go around on that. Because we're looking at different standards for different options.

Rebecca: And then how it meets the (*inaudible*). The Parker River watershed is a huge environmental impact. Just the nature of this business – you're not putting up a typical house, you're going to have waste. Who knows what's coming in there?

Carl: Hence my questions about waste and response, and how to deal with it in terms of contaminants; metals and materials that go in the refuse. This could be a unique situation, a true hybrid. There are parts of the site that absolutely have to fall under MS4, but the private part of the project they have to meet the conditional, industrial side of the stormwater.

Nancy: We'll provide that. I think it's important to note however, that this is a transfer station; which means that everything that comes in, goes out within 48hrs. This isn't a landfill; this isn't anything where materials are going to stay. It comes in, gets separated, and shipped out with in 48hrs, maximum 72hrs.

Rachel: That doesn't mean that there can't be spilling.

Nancy: Absolutely.

Carl: Let's do a site walk.

Steve: If Commissioners have specific questions or concerns, they can email me and I can forward them along.

Laura: Can I just ask Mr. Mello – how long, when do you anticipate that this project will be undertaken or completed?

Jason: The residential drop-off area, if it gets approved, I would start immediately. It's not a large project to do, it wouldn't take long. And that would help the traffic flow and the bottleneck congestion; trying to get the cars in, the pick up trucks in, dump trucks onto the scale, and that way it'll help the traffic flow entirely.

Laura: Is it an enclosed building, or just a roofed area?

Jason: An enclosed building.

Laura: Ok.

Carl: Does it have any kind of drainage system in the building, and a collection point; the floor drains and things like that?

Jason: There are floor drains with a tank that will get pumped out.

Carl: As part of the stormwater plan?

Jason: The DEP; once it gets in the building, it can't make its way out of the building.

Carl: Good. We've got the 3rd party review done, so we can do a site walk.

Rebecca: Can I ask Mary another question? It says that the portion of the property that's not yet impervious must meet stormwater standards fully.

Mary: I'm not sure where this is from.

Rebecca: It's just some notes. Property that's not yet impervious – what does that mean?

Carl: It's dirt or not; does it have concrete down, or...

Mary: Essentially, the entire limit of the work that they're proposing is impervious, so they're capturing all of that. Beyond the limit of work is curving, around your pavement, so it's all being treated as impervious (inaudible). The rest of the landfill cap will continue to drain as it's coming in.

Laura: Is the current cap marked on your plan?

Mary: Yes, it is.

Carl: Does anyone have a preference for a site walk date?

Laura: No preference.

Carl: You're looking to get this done as soon as possible, so we can do it as soon as this coming week, if possible. What's the availability this coming week?

Laura: Any day.

Carl: Tuesday?

Laura: Sure. Any objections?

Rachel: What's the date?

Steve: The 21st.

Nancy: Mary is not available for that date.

Carl: Throw some dates that you are around.

Mary: This Monday or Wednesday.

Carl: How about Wednesday?

Steve: The 22nd.

Mary: What time did you say, 6?

Steve/Nancy: I didn't hear a time yet.

Laura: I could do 5:30.

Carl: It's a little early for me. I could do 6 – that's the earliest that I can do.

Laura: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion to do a site walk at 203 East Main Street on Wednesday, May 22nd at 6:00 PM.

Carl: Is there a 2nd?

Rachel: Seconds motion.

Motion carries unanimously.

Carl: We have a motion and it's been seconded to conduct a site walk at 203 East Main Street on 22 of May at 6PM. Is there any further discussion?

No one has further discussion.

Carl: And we need a continuation.

Nancy: I've been taking diligent notes to pass on to our engineer. Are there any other outstanding issues? Was there any issue that has been passed on to Jillian that we don't know about, that you referenced in your email?

- Steve:** It's just the stormwater. It was a conversation in regards to stormwater.
- Carl:** You clarified for me who is going to do the PM.
- Steve:** That just needs to be changed on the paperwork because it doesn't show that. There was another question. One of the aspects: typically, when there are waivers being requested, it's an alternative design or alternative locations. You guys are looking into Carleton; is that something that's appropriate too be discussed, because it's an alternative site? Or is your intention to keep that 100% separate? I'm getting questions about it all the time, and I'm just curious if it's something relevant to be brought up in this meeting, so there's no mis-understanding.
- Nancy:** There's been a public hearing going on with regard to an alternative location on Carleton Drive. That has more permitting to do, including before this Commission and the Planning Board. However, what we have before you is dealing with DEP requirements for this particular site.
- Carl:** As part of our requirements, we're required to look at alternatives; that's really why he asked that question. That's why we're bringing this in. Not for holding back this, this, or this; but it's valid to bring that up as a term of discussion.
- Nancy:** Absolutely, and it's certainly been in the public record. There have been public hearings on it, but there's a ways to go on that.
- Carl:** But your intent is to pursue this to completion vs. the other project at this point?
- Nancy:** Yes, we have an existing operation and an existing facility. We have requirements from DEP that we have to do certain things on this site. We want to upgrade this site to address not only DEP concerns, but concerns of residents that we've heard as we've been going through this whole process with regard to traffic and residential drop-off. As Jason said, if this gets approved with regard to the residential drop-off, he's going to do that right away. The other site is under permitting. We'll have to go through that entire permitting process, construction, and all of that, so this project is going forward.
- Rebecca:** Potentially, there will be both?
- Nancy:** There will not be two transfer stations operating at the same time, if that's what you're asking.
- Carl:** Before we continue – are there any abutters to 203 East Main Street? I see none. I'll entertain a motion to continue this. We have June 20th.
- Steve:** At 7:20 please.
- Laura:** Makes a motion to continue the hearing to June 20, 2019 at 7:20 PM.
- Rebecca:** Seconds motion.

Motion carries unanimously.

51 West Main Street (DEP#161-0877; GCC 2019-05) NOI– (cont.)

Construction of a commercial building and seven townhouses.

Applicant not present; requested continuation.

Rebecca: Makes a motion to continue the hearing to June 20, 2019 at 7:10 PM.

Rachel: Seconds motion.

Motion carries unanimously.

182 Pond Street (DEP#161-0878; GCC 2019-06) NOI– (NEW)

Septic system replacement.

Bob Grasso of Engineering Land Services gives an overview of the project, and shows a plan dated 04/04/2019 (approved by the Board of Health). He wrote on the plan that the wetland line was not approved by the Conservation Commission.

Laura: Makes a motion to approve the NOI with the condition of not accepting the wetland line.

Rebecca: Seconds motion.

Motion carries unanimously.

Rebecca: Makes a motion to close the hearing.

Laura: Seconds motion.

Motion carries unanimously.

103-109 Thurlow Street (DEP#161-0879; GCC 2019-07) ANRAD – (NEW)

Wetland Delineation.

Bob Grasso of Engineering Land Services gives an overview of where the project stands. Carl recommends to have a 3rd party review conducted.

Rebecca: Makes a motion for a 3rd party review.

Rachel: Seconds motion.

Motion carries unanimously.

Rebecca: Makes a motion to continue the hearing to June 20, 2019 at 7:05 PM.

Rachel: Seconds motion.

Motion carries unanimously.

27 Pillsbury Lane (DEP#161-0880; GCC 2019-08) NOI – (NEW)

Replace and expand existing deck and add grading within the 100' buffer.

An overview of the project was given by the homeowners with a plan dated 05/02/2019.

Rebecca: Makes a motion to approve the NOI with the conditions of not accepting the wetland line, and for the applicant to submit a final plan prior to starting any work.

Liz: Seconds motion.

Motion carries unanimously.

Rachel: Makes a motion to close the hearing.

Rebecca: Seconds motion.

Motion carries unanimously.

BUSINESS

Rachel: Makes a motion to pay bills as read by Steve.

Rebecca: Seconds motion.

Motion carries unanimously and the bills are signed.

Rebecca: Makes a motion to approve meeting minutes dated 4/18/2019.

Rachel: Seconds motion.

Motion carries with Carl and Laura abstaining, and the minutes are signed.

Rebecca: Makes a motion to close the meeting.

Rachel: Seconds motion.

Motion carries unanimously and the meeting is closed at 9:00 PM.

Documents and other exhibits used at the meeting will be available for review at The Conservation Office.

Meeting was adjourned at: 9:00 PM

NEXT MEETING

Date: June 20, 2019

Time: 7:00pm

Place: Third Floor Meeting Room

Minutes approved by Committee on: July 18, 2019.
(Date)

Respectfully submitted,

Chairman: Carl Shady
(Signature)