

June 13, 2016
Planning Board minutes
LRSHS Cafeteria
Page 1 of 2

Present: Peter Abair, Steve Garvin, Dan Carty, Chris Morely, Martin Long, Jody Kablack (Planning and Community Development Director), Sudbury Water District Commissioners Lisa Eggleston and Bob Sheldon, Becky McEnroe (SWD Superintendent)

The meeting was called to order at 6:40 pm.

Discussion re: Meadow Walk Sudbury Conformance Recommendation and SWD conditions.

Steve Garvin and Jody Kablack stated that they had attended a meeting of the SWD on June 7, 2016 where the SWD had concerns about the project, mainly from the perspective of impacts to the Raymond Road wellfield due to increased water usage and discharge at the property.

Ms. Kablack stated that the SWD, and their consultant, had prepared conditions which were reviewed by the Developer. The two sides were not in agreement yet, however a large issue of requiring treatment of the wastewater treatment plant effluent to a standard of 5 mg/l nitrogen had been resolved. It appears that the only issue outstanding is who will pay for monitoring wells to be installed and sampled.

Bob Sheldon noted that the nitrogen they are looking at is nitrate nitrogen, not total nitrogen.

Lisa Eggleston noted an additional consideration was what the impacts of additional water on this site would be on the mobilization of other contaminants downgradient. The SWD would like to establish a mechanism to monitor plumes as they approach the Raymond Rd wells. Currently they do not have the capability to do this.

Steve Garvin asked if this concern was obvious before this project was proposed? What wells exist and how are they monitored currently? What if this work doesn't get funded by this project?

Ms. Eggleston replied that they do not currently have an upgradient shield, and want to create a program. They are not sure what other wells exist in the area, and opined that there may be some DEP wells, but they want their own wells. SWD users would need to fund this thru their annual budget if it doesn't get funded by the developer. They have a concern due to the commercial nature of the surrounding areas. Their intent was not to ask developer to fund a large monitoring program, but more to make them have a level of comfort due to the expanded water usage at the site.

Mr. Garvin noted that the Development Agreement includes \$100,000 for ZBA conditions for the Avalon 40B. It may be possible that a portion of these funds could go towards this. Avalon will be a large discharger.

There was a brief discussion about using the connection fees that will be paid by the developer for this purpose. The SWD response was that connection fee revenue pays for upgrading lines, as much of the SWD infrastructure is aging. But it appears there is no reason why it could not be used for monitoring. When asked if the SWD has an estimate for the cost of the program they are proposing, the answer was no.

Mr. Morely opined that the already agreed upon condition to reduce the nitrogen limit seems like a large concession. He listed several other environmental benefits with the development as well. The SWD members agreed, but as an indicator chemical, it is important to them to monitor nitrogen levels.

Ms. Eggleston asked if the SWD could sample the developer's wells, the details of which can be worked out in a MOU. The Developer would not be held accountable, but the SWD does not have many wells in the area and there are several located on this property. This would be a good opportunity to collect samples to see what is moving towards the town's wells.

Jack O'Neill stated that they want to be cooperative, and pledged to continue to work with SWD on the monitoring issue.

Language for the condition was then proposed which was met with approval from all sides: The Developer shall reasonably cooperate with the Sudbury Water District to establish protocol to allow for additional monitoring on the site.

Ms. Kablack noted that conditions 48 and 49 were added to the document today, and are as proposed by GeoInsight and discussed at the June 8 meeting.

A motion was made and seconded, and it was unanimously voted to approve the Conformance Recommendation as amended this evening.

The chair will report the vote of the Board at the beginning of the presentation for Article 1.

Motion to adjourn at 7:15 pm