

**MEETING NOTES OF
BARNES AQUIFER PROTECTION ADVISORY COMMITTEE**

DATE: 9/5/17 LOCATION: Easthampton Municipal Offices, Easthampton, MA

MEMBERS AND DESIGNEES PRESENT:

<u>X</u> M. Czerwiec, Easthampton	<u>X</u> C. Seklecki, Easthampton	
D. Conti, Holyoke	J. Burkott, Holyoke	<u>X</u> A. Smith, Holyoke
<u>X</u> T. Gaughan, Southampton	<u>X</u> M. Hanc, Southampton	James Labrie, Southampton
<u>X</u> Heather Miller, Westfield	K. Leigh, Westfield	Jay Vinskey, Westfield
<u>X</u> R. Newton, Smith College	<u>X</u> P. Gambarini, PVPC	<u>X</u> L. Sullivan, PVPC

Others present: Mary Ann Babinski, Westfield City Council; Matthew Roman, Westfield resident; Chris Carey, Comcast; Rob Lévesque, R. Lévesque Associates, representing Comcast; Keith Terry, Sherman and Frydryk; and Kristen Mello, Westfield resident

TIME OF CALL TO ORDER: 3:31 p.m. TIME OF ADJOURNMENT: 4:58 p.m.

Action Items from Meeting:

PVPC

- Write up and distribute 9-5-17 meeting notes
- Prepare comments letter for Westfield Planning on 110 East Mountain Road
- Prepare comments letter for Westfield Planning on 0 Progress Avenue
- Draft one-pager delineating BAPAC status and needs (once receive ideas from BAPAC members)
- Prepare agenda for 10/3/17 meeting

BAPAC members

- Send ideas to Patty for one-pager document on BAPAC needs
-

1. Adoption of June 6 meeting notes

Adoption of the June meeting notes was recommended by Tom Gaughan, seconded by Bob Newton, and unanimously approved.

- 2. Citizen Speak:** Mary Ann Babinski welcomed everyone back, saying she hoped everyone had a great summer.

3. Developments of Regional Impact

Diesel fuel tanks at 1110 East Mountain Road (Comcast) Westfield – Westfield Planning Board looking for follow-up correspondence from BAPAC

Rob Lévesque, of R. Lévesque Associates, representing Comcast, introduced Chris Carey as the architect for Comcast. Mr. Lévesque reported that they are working in concert with Comcast representatives to permit some fuel tanks and generators for a proposed facility located on East Mountain Road in Westfield. Mr. Lévesque stated that on May 2, 2017, project plans for the proposed facility were presented to the Barnes Aquifer Protection Advisory Board (BAPAC) and a Special Permit Application was submitted to the Westfield Planning Board on May 16, 2017. The Special Permit Application had to be withdrawn because one of the Westfield Planning Board members was on vacation. In the interim, the

applicant had prepared a Memorandum responding to questions from both BAPAC members and members of the Westfield Planning. This memorandum was forwarded to BAPAC on August 16th. Patty requested Mr. Lévesque go through the questions in the Memorandum for the benefit of members and he replied that he would address them item by item along with the responses prepared by R. Lévesque Associates.

Mr. Lévesque began by addressing the first question about the fuel tank that will be used. He explained that the tank is topped off periodically throughout the year as needed; *Clean Harbors* provides tank cleaning services and maintenance; and spill protection is provided by ARCADIS, an engineering firm in Springfield. Mr. Lévesque added that the proponent Comcast is willing to replace the existing fuel tank if necessary.

Next, there were questions pertaining to the tertiary containment structure and the refueling hookups as related to the containment of diesel fuel. Mr. Lévesque stated that the refueling hookups are accessed via a hinged panel located directly over the containment structure. Mr. Lévesque explained that the curbing at the refueling location in the front parking lot won't provide containment. Instead, a drive-over containment structure is proposed to be installed to provide protection against spills. Fuel tanker trucks park on this drive-over containment structure and deliver fuel through the special containment hookups. During refueling, holes that allow for the passage of stormwater are blocked. If there is a leak that cannot be stopped by using approved absorbent materials, emergency personnel would be called and MassDEP would be notified if a spill is greater than 10 gallons. Mr. Lévesque indicated that no connections will penetrate the walls of the concrete, tertiary containment structure. The tank itself is double-walled with an alarm and has tertiary containment around it with a rain guard on the top.

Mr. Lévesque responded to the last two BAPAC questions regarding treatment of diesel fuel and the testing of the generators by saying that the diesel fuel will be tested annually for bacteria and contaminants, and if found to be contaminated, the fuel will be replaced at that time. He explained that the generator is maintained and tested by *Clean Harbors* and runs automatically for an hour each week while performing testing exercises. He did not respond to a request to provide testing results.

Mr. Lévesque then addressed the questions submitted by the Westfield Planning Board beginning with the age of the existing tank and why there is so much additional fuel capacity. Mr. Lévesque stated that the existing tank is approximately 20 years old and Comcast has agreed to replace it. Responding to a question about the capacity of the fuel tank, Mr. Lévesque said he needs to confirm that the replacement tank will have the same capacity as the 20-year old tank. To the question of "Why so much additional fuel capacity?" he explained that because the City of Westfield is classified as an "A," there can be dual (fully redundant) generators that will run a minimum of 48 hours on full load of the generators.

Mr. Lévesque said that Comcast's need to submit for a permit to upgrade at the East Mountain site is based on a required, electrical service upgrade. He then responded to questions about the construction of the fuel tanks and refilling and replacement.

- The construction of the fuel tanks is dual wall steel.

- There's an alarm system that is triggered if there's any moisture found between the two walls of the tank.
- The fuel tank is topped off periodically throughout the year as needed based on the amount of runtime and utility power outages.
- The plan for this project will need the approval of the Fire Department.
- Diesel is the preferred fuel because it's reliable and because Comcast doesn't want to rely on any utility company.
- The fuel spill containment basins will be completely covered by an aluminum rain-guard protective cover.

Bob asked why two fuel tanks were necessary. Mr. Lévesque replied that the two tanks are independent of each other. If there's a problem with one, the other serves as a backup.

Mr. Lévesque indicated that the Westfield Planning Board meeting will be held on September 19th and he requested a positive recommendation on the project from the BAPAC members based on the information provided. Mr. Lévesque said the expectation is that the Planning Board will take a vote on the project at that meeting. Bob asked about the depth of ground-level to groundwater at the site and Mr. Lévesque replied that a test wasn't conducted, but he doesn't expect the ground water to be within 12 feet of the surface based on his knowledge of the area.

Patty asked the BAPAC members their thoughts on making the recommendation requested to the Westfield Planning Board. Tom said he was fine as did other members.

Mr. Lévesque stated that the first Westfield Planning Board meeting of the month is held on the same day as BAPAC's meetings and if the timing isn't right, it can be a month and a half before a submittal is presented to the Planning Board. Mr. Lévesque stated that he will request that the Westfield City Council ask BAPAC to shift its meeting by a week.

0 Progress Avenue, Westfield

Keith Terry, Project Engineer at Sherman and Frydryk Land Surveying, stated that a site plan for Progress Avenue has been submitted for approval to the Westfield Planning Board. He described the site as a wooded parcel that was divided as a commercial subdivision and has Barnes Airport as an abutting parcel. He further stated that Progress Avenue has a stormwater retention basin that currently manages street run-off. Mr. Terry explained that Sherman and Frydryk's proposal is to build a 37,000 square foot commercial building. Employee parking is proposed for the front of the building facing Progress Avenue and loading docks for commercial trucking in the rear of the building. Storm flow from the roof, he said, will be delivered directly to the infiltration basin. Storm flow from the front parking lot will enter catch basins that direct flow to a Stormceptor unit, and then into the infiltration basin. Rear parking lot run-off will also enter catch basins that lead to the Stormceptor unit and then the infiltration basin.

Patty asked Mr. Terry for the number of catch basins and he replied two in the front of the proposed building and two in the rear. Marla Hanc asked if the paving would reach from Falcon Drive to the end of the cul-de-sac. Mr. Terry replied that the proposed commercial

building measures 370' x 100' and a good part of the frontage will be paved for employee parking; there will be three lanes for large trucks, loading docks with pavement space allowed for maneuverability and there will be three small grassy areas for snow storage. Patty asked about the stormwater facility along Progress Avenue. Mr. Terry replied that there is a swale that won't be disturbed.

Mr. Terry was asked what percent of the site would be impervious. He replied maximum building coverage is 20%, but he stated that the maximum impervious surface hasn't been determined yet. Mary Ann Babinski noted that the actual permit sets it at 15%.

Patty noted that the entire site is priority habitat and she asked about endangered species. Mr. Terry replied that Natural Heritage has already reviewed a previous development proposal for this site. Marla interjected that she couldn't understand how this site could be approved with there being endangered species and so much paving with only three small areas for snow storage. Andrew Smith said there must have been a letter from Natural Heritage and Marla agreed that someone would have committed to a yea or a nay on a certain date. Andrew noted that 10 years is a long time in the regulatory world and the site was recently remapped to August 1st. Mr. Terry reported that proposed development of this site was approved around the year 2000. Marla said she wonders how something approved 17 years ago compares to the map now since some remapping has been done. Marla said that she was putting on her conservation commission hat and wanted to know exactly what Natural Heritage said. Mr. Terry indicated that he hasn't spoken directly with Natural Heritage to find out why this site is within their mapping.

Heather Miller inquired of the actual use of the site in terms of the kind of activities to be conducted on the site. Mr. Terry replied warehouse and light manufacturing will occur inside the proposed commercial building. He explained that there will be one primary occupant and there will be light manufacturing and storage, but that he knows nothing about the specific use of the building or what will be stored there. Heather underscored that she's concerned about the types of materials and compounds being used that might adversely affect the Barnes Aquifer. Patty noted that there are explicit prohibitions in the Aquifer Protection District.

Patty asked where Mr. Terry is in his process of review with the City of Westfield. Mr. Terry replied that he hasn't had a meeting with the City yet but a hearing has been scheduled with the Westfield Planning Board to review the site plan on September 19th. Mr. Terry stated that he is the engineer on this project and that One Development Construction, LLC is the applicant.

Because there are several unanswered questions regarding the amount of impervious cover and use of the building, Patty noted that BAPAC members cannot recommend the Progress Avenue Project in Westfield at this stage. Heather commented that the BAPAC members don't know what will be stored on this site.

In response to Andrew Smith's comments, Mr. Terry replied that because of required, pre-imposed flows, the system for this proposed project is designed to infiltrate everything that comes into contact with the building and the pavement. He explained that there will be

leaching basins underneath the infiltration basin. Heather asked for the depth of the groundwater and Mr. Terry replied that the depth is over 12 feet and it meets the required three feet of separation to groundwater. Bob asked what the depth is below the surface of the bottom of the infiltration system. Mr. Terry said the estimation of the seasonal high groundwater elevation is 256'. Then Mr. Terry stated that the bottom of these structures is 261' and the structures consist of perforated concrete surrounded by stone with infiltration fabric. He added that the storm structures will deliver to the Stormceptors which deliver to leaching basins. Heather inquired about the roof material and Mr. Terry said it will be rubberized sheeting with stone on the top.

Patty stated that BAPAC members have not in the past recommended leaching basins within a retention facility because these are dry wells and a direct connection isn't recommended. Mr. Terry said, "Then this board would rather I make a deeper basin." Heather explained that assuming the infiltration rates are appropriate for an infiltration basin, the dry wells shouldn't add anything appreciable in terms of the rate of infiltration. It just provides a more direct connection into subsurface water. Heather added that when the whole surface of the basin is being used for infiltration, and assuming the basin is maintained properly and graded appropriately, the dry wells shouldn't be needed. Mr. Terry replied that presently, the dry wells are needed because of the flatness of the site. He said the Stormceptor invert is below the bottom of the open basin so in order to have an open discharge from the Stormceptor, the basin needs to be excavated deeper than it is presently. Heather interjected that she misunderstood what Mr. Terry was saying earlier. Mr. Terry explained that the issue is that the loading docks are a four foot drop from the site's elevation so that there can be movement directly from the building into the trailers. If this requires an open pipe discharge, he underscored, the basin will have to be excavated deeper because the four-foot drop at 266 feet is below the bottom of the basin which is at 264 feet. Mr. Terry stated that additional depth is needed in order to have a structure that has an oil separation mechanism. Mr. Terry explained that if this basin is further excavated, the bottom of the basin will be closer to the groundwater. Mr. Terry added that it's necessary to go through the Stormceptor in order to do the required 80% TSS removal before reaching the infiltration basin. Bob suggested raising the building. Mr. Terry replied that the building is two feet above Progress Avenue so that's a possibility.

Bob commented that he doesn't like having those leaching chamber in the bottom of the basin connecting directly to the groundwater and he has a problem with that. Heather added that she has a major concern with the water quality storage and the recharge with those structures in the bottom, also. Heather indicated that if the only way the basin receives water is to surcharge those infiltrating chambers, then the area of the basin is not being effectively used and there's no opportunity for uptake of any of the potential stormwater nutrients by vegetation in basin or through soil in the basin. Heather added that it's just a direct connection to the sand in the Barnes Aquifer.

Mike Czerwicz stated that there are obviously quite a few of questions that need answers. Mike said to Mr. Terry that BAPAC will list provide their questions and concerns to the applicant and City of Westfield Planning Board. Mike asked if there is a project time line. Mr. Terry replied that he didn't know.

77 Pequot Road, Southampton

Patty said the applicant for this project did not make contact with her to be placed on the agenda, but that she had received several calls and correspondences relative to the project and wanted to update BAPAC members. 77 Pequot Road is located in the Town of Southampton over the Zone II near Hampden Ponds and involves proposed storage of trucks and other vehicles that are to be repaired. Based on Southampton's By-Laws it appears this use is prohibited in the Zone II. Patty explained that she has been contacted by abutting property owners and an attorney who is representing one of the nearby property owners. The developer has presented the project to the Southampton Zoning Board and the board recommended that BAPAC be consulted. Patty reported that she has not yet heard from the developer. Marla Hanc commented that one of the neighbors has been sending out photos of the number of trucks parked on the site and there have been a lot of trees cut down already.

Relative to Developments of Regional Impact projects generally, Patty noted that project proposals as of late have been incomplete and lacking in needed information. Patty said that developers ought to be consulting the BAPAC website and become familiar with the *Developments of Regional Impact Review (DRI) Guidance and Procedure*, especially the review process questions so that they know what is required to enable BAPAC members to write a letter recommending their projects. Mike suggested putting this on an upcoming agenda and sending out an email addressing the issue. Heather asked for a check list and Patty replied that she's in process on creating a form for developers based on the DRI Guidance so that they can come better prepared.

3. BAPAC Memorandum of Agreement revisions

Patty stated that as a follow up on an agenda item from the June meeting, she wanted to take the opportunity to talk about process. She noted that before the board gets to revisions on the MOA, she is making first steps to help address BAPAC concerns about funding and the idea that came up in June about charging developers for review so that annual dues from municipalities could cover other BAPAC functions. Patty reported that she has learned that one way to do this is through augmenting development fees that are already being charged by planning boards to help cover third party review. PVPC is using this approach in its planning board assistance program.

Patty reported that she sent out a draft agreement to planning boards in each of the BAPAC communities. For Westfield, Jay Vinskey is checking to see if there is a way to get this on the September 19th planning board agenda. Patty requested that a BAPAC member attend any meetings at a municipal level with her to discuss the agreement. Heather replied that she could attend the September 19th Westfield meeting with Patty. Patty reported that Jessica Allan, Easthampton City Planner, thought that this agreement would essentially change the existing BAPAC MOU and that is a topic better taken up with Mayor Cadieux. Patty will continue following up with communities.

Bob stressed that Patty's plan to speak with planning boards and mayors is the right thing to do and he applauded the idea of doing a better job of protecting drinking water. He suggested writing a one-page document delineating what the BAPAC Advisory Committee needs to continue doing and what BAPAC needs to address that it can't because of inadequate funding. Patty added that she would like to hear from community water

departments about what they feel is important. Bob and Heather added that feedback regarding their concerns about the new MS4 regulations would also be helpful. Mike asked if there should be a motion, but Bob said composing a document like this should be an agenda item task. He suggested that Patty prepare a draft document before the next meeting and send it out to the BAPAC members with a request for their feedback. Patty asked the BAPAC members to send her some bulleted points.

4. Other business

Mike asked if there was any other business. Bob replied that he heard on the radio that Albany and Bennington are petitioning the EPA or Public Health to do health studies on the PFOAs and he suggested that the BAPAC members might want to get involved in the petition.

Mike asked again if there were any more questions. Kristin Mello indicated that the Aquifer is not being protected in Westfield and a discussion ensued regarding protecting the water we use versus protecting the whole aquifer. Bob said it was appalling that only Zone IIs are protected and Mike said zoning and property line adjustments are contentious. Bob added that we should be thinking about our secondary recharge areas as well as our primary recharge areas. Patty asked if the secondary recharge area is equivalent to Zone III. Bob said he didn't know but water protection might be a topic to be discussed.

5. Next meeting date

The next BAPAC meeting is scheduled for 3:30 p.m. on Tuesday, October 3, 2017.

Tom Gaughan made a motion to adjourn this September 5th BAPAC meeting at 4:58 p.m., seconded by Bob Newton, and approved unanimously.