



Arlington Conservation Commission

Date: December 17, 2020

Time: 7:30pm

Location: Conducted through Remote Participation using Zoom

Minutes

Attendance: Commission Members Susan Chapnick (Chair), Mike Gildesgame, Pam Heidell, Dave Kaplan, Nathaniel Stevens, Chuck Tirone (Vice Chair), and David White; Associate Commissioners Cathy Garnett and Doug Kilgour; and Conservation Agent Emily Sullivan. Representatives for the Arlington Reservoir NOI hearing included: Joe Connelly (Recreation Department), Leslie Mayer (Park & Recreation Commission), Danielle Desilets (KZLA), Brad Mustain (Woodard & Curran), Denise Cameron (Woodard & Curran), and Mikey Marcus (SWCA). Members of the public included: Jeff Alberti, Ann LeRoyer, David Barlow, Johanna Meyer, Stephan Miller, and Susan Kendall.

Conservation Offset

The Commission reviewed the proposed \$7,192 offset for the Conservation Agent's salary. N. Stevens motioned to approve the offset from the Commission's Conservation Commission Fees account, D. White seconded, all were in favor, motion approved. A roll call vote was taken. S Chapnick voted yes, M. Gildesgame voted yes, P. Heidell voted yes, D. Kaplan voted yes, N. Stevens voted yes, C. Tirone voted yes, and D. White voted yes.

Water Bodies Working Group Update

D. White updated the Commission on the Water Bodies Working Group. The Working Group met on December 10, 2020 to review the Reservoir Report submitted by Solitude Lake Management. The Working Group is still waiting for the Spy Pond and Hill's Pond Reports to be submitted. Once all reports are received, the Working Group will meet again to discuss priorities for 2021.

Notice of Intent: 210 Lowell Street, Arlington Reservoir Master Plan Phase 2

MassDEP File #091-0327

Documents Reviewed:

- 1) *Arlington Reservoir Renovation Project Phase 2 NOI, prepared by SWCA, dated December 3, 2020*
- 2) *Arlington Reservoir Phase 2 NOI Plan Set, prepared Kyle Zick Landscape Architecture Inc, stamped by Kyle Zick RLA# 1163, dated November 13, 2020*

- 3) *Arlington Reservoir Phase 2 Stormwater Management Report, prepared by Woodard & Curran, stamped by Denis L Cameron PE# 56348, dated October 2020*

Resource Areas:

- 1) *100-ft Wetlands Buffer*
- 2) *Adjacent Upland Resource Area*
- 3) *Inland Bank*
- 4) *Arlington Reservoir*

This project consists of the second phase of implementation of the Arlington Reservoir Master Plan and includes the following activities: parking area and stormwater improvements; improvements to existing pathways to make them accessible under the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA); renovation and addition of new recreational facilities; shoreline bank stabilization; and upland habitat restoration and invasive species removal.

Mickey Marcus and Danielle Desilets presented the project proposal. The project includes elevating the parking lot 16 inches and installing porous pavement as a stormwater best management practice. The stormwater management system meets the water quality standards of the State Stormwater Handbook, but does not meet with water quantity standards because there is no place to store water onsite.

The project proposes to stabilize approximately 2,000 linear feet of bank in Arlington, and slightly more in Lexington using coir fascine and native plantings.

M. Gildesgame asked for more information on the proposed stabilized granite pathway. D. Desilets stated that the stabilized granite material is a material preferred by the Lexington Conservation Commission. It uses a binder and has a gravel sub-base. It is a porous material.

P. Heidell asked if the stabilize granite material had the same drainage characteristics as the porous pavement pilot path. D. Desilets stated that they have similar drainage characteristics.

C. Garnett stated that she was concerned with the stabilized granite material because of her experience with the Neponset River pathway. C. Garnett asked for more information on the material.

Leslie Mayer clarified that the stabilized granite material would mostly be installed in Lexington, and that the Arlington pathway would be touched up using its current surface material. The Arlington pathway was resurfaced when the Reservoir dam was reconstructed. The pathway is in great shape and needs minor touch ups.

S. Chapnick asked that the stormwater calculations be recalculated using NOAA Atlas 14+.

S. Chapnick reminded the Recreation Department and the Park & Recreation Commission that the Order of Conditions for Phase 1 was still open and would eventually need to be closed. Phase 2 permitting could proceed without requesting a Certificate of Compliance for Phase 1.

C. Tirone asked for clarification on the parking lot stormwater system. C. Tirone asked if every grate inlet was attached to a catch basin. B. Mustain clarified that overflow runoff will only occur at or above a 100-year storm, and that the porous pavement parking lot material will manage other storm events if maintained properly. No sheet flow will enter the grates, and water that falls into the grates will be conveyed straight to the Reservoir.

C. Tirone asked if the parking lot above the boat ramp is porous pavement. B. Mustain stated that the parking lot above the boat ramp was not porous, and that the porous pavement only extended from the Reservoir entrance to the sidewalk in the parking lot.

D. Kaplan recommended that a regenerative air sweeper replace the industrial vacuum in the porous pavement parking lot Operations & Maintenance Plan. D. Kaplan how the porosity of the parking lot would be monitored. B. Mustain stated that the parking lot would be visually inspected for porosity.

D. Kaplan asked for clarification on the various invasive treatments proposed as part of the project. M. Marcus clarified that both cut-and-dab and spray application was proposed. M. Marcus stated that Buckthorn is recommended for cut-and-dab treatment, but Japanese knotweed, Phragmites, and Multiflora rose are recommended for spray treatment. D. Kaplan stated that cut-and-dab was preferred over spray treatment. C. Garnett stated that cut-and-dab treatment was an effective method.

The hearing was opened for public comment.

John Verderese asked what was the capacity of the parking lot. The Applicant stated the capacity was essentially the same. John Verderese asked whether DPW would still use the parking lot as a snow storage area. The Applicant stated that snow storage was not recommended and that the Recreation Director would confirm with DPW that the parking lot wouldn't be used for snow storage.

The Commission requested the following supplemental information and materials:

- 1) Information on Lexington's stabilized granite requirements
- 2) Recalculate stormwater calculations using NOAA Atlas 14+
- 3) Review removal/replacement of trees
- 4) Add erosion controls (silt sack) around turf area in parking lot to prevent siltation
- 5) Propose alternatives to glyphosate invasive treatment
- 6) Coordinate with DPW to ensure parking lot is not a snow dump
- 7) Revise parking lot O&M Plan to include regenerative air sweeper
- 8) Revise invasive management to include as much cut-and-dab, not spray, as possible
- 9) Update plan set with changes (erosion controls, plan has erosion control matting near flared end but rip rap might be better)

N. Stevens motioned to continue the public hearing for the Reservoir Phase 2 NOI to the Commission's January 7, 2021 meeting, D. White seconded, all were in favor, motion approved. A roll call vote was taken. S Chapnick voted yes, P. Heidell voted yes, D. Kaplan voted yes, M. Gildesgame voted yes, N. Stevens voted yes, C. Tirone voted yes, and D. White voted yes.

Deliberation: Notice of Intent: 51 Grove Street, Arlington Department of Public Works

MassDEP File #091-0326

Documents Reviewed:

- 4) *DPW Facility 51Grove Street NOI, prepared by Weston & Sampson, dated October 22, 2020*
- 5) *Arlington Town Yard Facility 51 Grove Street NOI Plan Set, prepared by Weston & Sampson, dated October 21, 2020*
- 6) *Supplemental Materials for DPW Facility NOI, prepared by Weston & Sampson, dated 11242020*

Resource Areas:

- 5) *100-ft Wetlands Buffer*
- 6) *Adjacent Upland Resource Area*
- 7) *200-ft Riverfront Area*
- 8) *Floodplain and Floodway*
- 9) *Mill Brook*

This project proposes a new/renovated Municipal Facility to support the Department of Public Works (DPW), Inspectional Services Department (ISD), Facilities, and IT departments at 51 Grove Street. The proposed site includes the current 4.4-acre parcel, used by DPW / ISD, and an adjacent 1.4-acre portion of Town-owned land for a total of 5.8 acres. The site has Activity and Use Limitations (AUL) as defined by MassDEP due to site contamination, and therefore has contact barriers and engineered barriers (mostly pavement) per MassDEP requirements to prevent exposure to underlying contaminated soil. Sections of the site are within the 100-ft Wetlands Buffer, AURA, and 200-ft Riverfront Area of Mill Brook, as well as floodway and floodplain.

The Conservation Commission had a working session for this project proposal during its August 20, 2020 meeting. The public hearing for this NOI began at the Commission's November 5, 2020 meeting and was continued to the December 3, 2020 meeting. The public hearing was closed on December 3, 2020.

The Commission reviewed a draft Order of Conditions for the project. The Commission discussed edits to the draft. P. Heidell motioned to approve the project under the Wetlands Protection Act and Arlington Regulations for Wetlands Project with the discussed conditions, D. White seconded, all were in favor, motion approved. A roll call vote was taken. S Chapnick voted yes, M. Gildesgame voted yes, P. Heidell voted yes, D. Kaplan voted yes, C. Tirone voted yes, and D. White voted yes. N. Stevens missed a prior hearing on this project and was not eligible to vote.

Thorndike Place Update

D. White recused himself from the discussion.

S. Chapnick updated the Commission on the status of the Thorndike Place Comprehensive 40B Permit. During the December 3, 2020 working session, the Commission stated that it did not accept the wetlands delineation conducted by BSC Group. The Commission had requested additional soil assessment during the working session. S. Chapnick stated that the Town's Special Town Counsel recommended that the Commission assume the two isolated vegetated wetlands are jurisdictional.

S. Chapnick clarified that Comprehensive Permits cannot be assessed at higher standards than other projects.

The Commission reviewed a draft comment letter addressed to the ZBA.

N. Stevens motioned to close the Commission meeting, M. Gildesgame seconded, all were in favor, motioned approved.

Meeting adjourned at 10:15pm.

DR