

Minutes
Watertown Conservation Commission
Lower Hearing Room
Wednesday, December 1, 2010
7:30p.m.
Adopted January 5, 2011

Conservation Commission Members Present: Marylouise Pallotta McDermott, Louis Taverna, Leo Martin, Maria Rose, Patrick Fairbairn, Stan Sadkowski, Charles Bering

Staff Present: Hayward, Collins

Members of the Public Present: See Sign-In Form

Pallotta-McDermott chaired.

1. Public Hearing Continued- 118-140 Pleasant Street, NOI to build a 44-unit residential building with roadway, access drives, parking areas, stormwater management facilities, utilities, site grading and landscaping. Owner/Applicant: Coppolla Pleasant Street LLC/Cresset Development

The CC reviewed the requested materials from the previous meeting:

Alternatives Analysis – Pallotta McDermott was satisfied with the submission. She requested that “Dan’s Garage” be identified appropriately in the narrative.

12” Pipe Updated in Plans- Martin was satisfied that the 12” pipe was properly identified in the plans. He requested that the clean stone be wrapped in fabric for protection. Cresset agreed to the request.

Souhegan Valley Engineering Opinion Letter – Sadkowski was satisfied with the letter discussing the integrity of the wall system.

A copy of the AUL – CC was satisfied with the submission.

Narrative Discussing the Modifications to the AUL - Mike Duscheneau, LSP, reported that the true contamination cannot be determined until the demolition of the building. Once the building is down more bores are proposed to determine the extent of the contamination. Pallotta McDermott was concerned that the selected mitigation measures would occur after CC approval.

Rose was concerned that the plume identified in Figure 11 was not clear how much will be removed. She found that without vertical profiles the extent could not be determined. She felt that things were still unresolved which is unusual for a residential project.

Duchesneau asserted that both alternatives proposed will meet the AUL requirements. He hoped that no engineered barrier would be required. He could not make a commitment for excavation unless there was an approval.

Rose argued that they had done and can do test boring through the building. She also noted that in the narrative the three areas of note don't match the excavation areas.

Duchesneau responded that the RAM had been done in the three areas. The lower area and area under the building are the ones of most concern. Pallotta McDermott was concerned about what will be found.

Ed Nardi responded that they have to comply with DEP for the outcome. He asserted that it is reasonable to quantify. He noted it could cost \$100K to do the tests when it would be simpler and easier to determine the contamination when they have access to the area when the building is removed.

Rose observed that allowing construction on a contaminated area next to the riverfront with citizen concerns is a concern.

Nardi asserted they will comply with the requirements to providing a clean site. He will provide copies on the details to insure it meets or exceeds MCP.

Engineered Barrier Design and Maintenance Plan – Rose preferred concrete instead of asphalt as the concrete lasts longer and cracks less. Duchesneau responded that the monitoring and maintenance plan will respond to repairs quickly. The plan will maintain the contaminants immobile.

Sadkowski was concerned about the implementation schedule being too fast at 9 months. He'd prefer the RAM was placed first.

Contaminated Soil Handling and Removal - Duscheneau thought they would have to excavate less and have good results. He thought that what would remain would be of minimal risk.

Nardi assured that monthly reports would be submitted. Rose requested the RAM status report and RAM completion. She wanted to know the barrier material to be used – concrete or asphalt.

Duscheneau responded that daily logs and oversight could be provided, or reports could be produced.

Bering requested that specific reports to CC be submitted monthly with the results of the soil and pre-characterizations. Fairbairn also supported regular, monthly reports. Rose was open to monthly or quarterly report submissions, and that the applicant report back on the type of barrier and when.

Note: Taverna moved to close the public portion of the meeting and to approve the project as submitted with conditions. Bering seconded the motion. The motion was unanimously approved

Order of Conditions for 140 Pleasant Street:

Submit an annual Operations and Maintenance Report to insure maintenance requirements are met;

Submit a copy of the decision of the RAM status and completion and which mitigation measure was selected - an engineered barrier or soil removal;

Submit the backup information for the RAM to be submitted in reports as the information becomes available.

Conditions: 18a, b, c, d, e; 19; 22; 23; 24; 25; 26; 27; 28; 29; 30; 31; 32; 33; 35; 36; 37; 38; 39; 40; 41a, b, c, f, g; 42.

2. Public Hearing – 44 Hunt Street, NOI for drainage construction, excavation, retaining wall construction, and repaving. Owner/Applicant: Charles River Realty LLC.

Abutters' green cards were submitted.

Steve Poole, engineer for the applicant, informed that the proposal was to expand the parking, cut into the slope and add a retaining wall. The proposal, according to Poole, will decrease the sediment going into the ground water and that it would be better for the environment, client and the CC.

Poole noted that the property was a commercial facility.

Rose was concerned about the lack of erosion control to prevent migration of materials, especially with the 9' cut to create parking. Poole assured that he could add erosion controls. He also noted that there will be no stockpiling as there is no room on site. He informed that the material will be removed by truck.

Rose noted that there was no information on the size of dry wells. Poole responded that the information was on page 15 and that they had a capacity of 225 cubic feet.

Taverna requested information on the retaining wall. Poole noted that the wall was well designed.

Sadkowski requested that the erosion controls be called out in the plans. Rose requested that the capacity and model number of the drywells be called out in the plans.

Vote: Taverna moved to close the public portion of the meeting for the NOI for 44 Hunt Street and to approve the proposal as submitted with conditions. The motion was unanimously approved.

Order of Conditions for 44 Hunt Street:

- submit an annual report of the operation and maintenance implementation in perpetuity;
- revise the retaining wall plans identifying the top and bottom measurements;
- submit sediment and erosion control measures along Nonantum Road to be identified in the plans;
- highlight all new and proposed dry wells distinguishable from existing ones;
- identify the capacity and model number of dry wells.

Conditions: 18a, b, c, d, e, 19, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 31, 32, 36, 37, 38, 40, 41a, b, c, f, g.

3. November Minutes – to be reviewed and adopted in January.

4. Old Business

No discussion

5. New Business

Hayward reported that a site plan review is scheduled for the Haartz-Mason on Tuesday, December 7 at 9am.

Hayward reported that he had requested a cost from Everett Brooks for the installation of concrete and fino markers at Whitney Hill.

Meeting adjourned at 9pm.

