

**Town of Bellingham  
Conservation Commission  
Municipal Center  
Bellingham, MA 02019  
Minutes of the meeting of March 23, 2016**

---

**Project: 105-776 & BWP-128**  
CNOI

**Project Description:**  
316 Hartford Ave. – ground mounted solar array

**Applicant:**  
Joey Pellegrino  
385 Solar, LLC  
265 State Street  
Springfield, MA

**Representative:**  
David Cowell  
Hancock Associates  
315 Elm St.  
Marlborough, MA

**Plans:**  
**Continuation time: 7:30 PM**

Brian Goodrow stated that the applicant has submitted four revisions to the plans and have covered all of the Conservation Commission concerns. They worked out the comments from Tom Houston on 3/9/16. They're working on the cost of decommissioning. Requests for temporary and permanent access are being prepared for the town meeting. Cliff Matthews brought up the need for improvements on the access road. The access to the site is the only issue that remains, according to Brian Goodrow. That is because it is within the buffer zone. The work involved does not require cutting of trees. They are showing all the work being proposed. On the plans, sheets #7 & 8 show the details of the access road. It's outside the buffer zone. Brian Norton asked about snow removal. The Planning Board would set the conditions – no snow removal will take place on the array itself. Mike O'Herron asked about the clearance from the ground to the array – 2 and half feet is the minimum. Cutting the grass twice each year is in the conditions. A motion to issue an order of conditions was moved by Neal Standley and seconded by Shawn Wade. After a brief additional discussion about microclimate changes, the motion was passed on a unanimous vote.

---

**Project: 105-779 & BWP-131**  
NOI

**Project Description:**  
160 High St. – 600,000 sf. & 300,000 sf. Distribution facility,  
septic, storm water management

**Applicant:**  
Mark Pillote  
Campanelli Bell. LLC  
10 Campbell Dr.  
Braintree, MA

**Representative:**  
Brandon Li  
Kelly Engineering Group Inc.  
0 Campanelli Drive  
Braintree, MA

**Plans: Site Development Plans for 160 High Street, 21 Sheets**  
**Hearing time: 7:50 PM**

David Kelly from Kelly Engineering Group with Mark Pillote and John Rockwood provided an update. They stated that a lot of discussions have been ongoing, and that's why there's been a delay in their providing presentations. David Kelly reviewed the project before the presentation began. Run off is oriented east and west on the site with a break point in grade centrally located. Most the property is vegetated.

**Conservation Commission**  
**Minutes of the meeting of March 23, 2016**  
**Page #2**

The proposal is for a 600,000 ft.<sup>2</sup> building and a 300,000 ft.<sup>2</sup> building, parking, and future parking. Loading areas are on the west sides of each building. Employee and reserve parking is to the north and south of building #1 and the east of building #2 (smaller proposed building). There are 4 isolated wetland systems. There is also an intermittent stream on the north and the floodplain line on the west edge of the property. Since our last meeting on 1/16/16, they have had one more meeting with the Planning Board. They received letters from both the Conservation Commission and the Planning Board consultants. They put their replies in one letter. DEP has issued a file number with several comments. The state has sent a certificate from the MEPA office –notice of project change (NPC). The 2<sup>nd</sup> peer review letter was received on 3/18/16 from the Conservation Commission's consultant. The 37 points made by our consultant have been narrowed down to what in the applicant's engineer's opinion are the 6 most critical issues which they would like to discuss tonight. The storm water system proposed, is typical and has additional features. The first challenge is to match the watershed areas east and west. Stormwater gathered at the 3 locations to the west for storm water management would find its way back to the Charles River. On the easterly watershed of the site, stormwater is gathered through a subsurface infiltration system in an attempt to mimic current conditions. Stormwater velocity must be mitigated. Clean roof run off is channeled directly into the western stormwater management system. Deep sump catch basins and sediment forebays serve as pretreatment in the proposed stormwater management train.

Cliff Matthews pointed out there was no mechanical means (Stormceptor, downstream defenders, etc.) for pretreatment. He stated that this is a significant issue and must be addressed to assure long term functioning of the stormwater management system. The end use will include heavy truck traffic which, in winter weather, can contribute to silt deposition and potential pipe scouring limiting functionality of the entire system.

The Conservation Commission then reviewed the comment letter responses from Tom Houston of PSC, dated March 10, 2016.

1. The 200 foot buffer line originally shown was on the old plans. This was rechecked with the USGS and GIS and the current plan shows the agreed-upon correct line along the Charles River.
2. We agreed that we made the boundary of the resource area, Bordering Land Subject to Flooding, correctly and no change is required.
- 3 & 4. This speaks to methodology – Mike O'Herron brought up possible vernal pools in the south – central portion of the site. Cliff Matthews said those were not vernal pools. John Rockwood concurred and stated that in the western portion of the site there could be a potential vernal pool.
5. (SC) A replication bond must be posted Mr. Matthew stated. PSC stated that the replication areas should be marked with signage for no disturbance. Snow fence is proposed during the construction around the replication site to demarcate the area. A wetland scientist must be on site to ensure no additional disturbance to resource area or the buffer zone occurs during construction and to assure that the approved replication methodology is followed.
6. Cutting of trees – Cliff Matthews stated that the replacement number should be higher. John Rockwood stated 12 trees of Red Maples and Swamp White Oak would be planted to replace the 4 trees cut.
7. Sheet #3 on the revised plans – notes are sufficiently detailed (10 step protocol) – The process was described in which the replicated wetland area would be constructed and protected from the development. During construction impacts and alterations to the buffer zone are to be minimized. Minimize the ulceration area. The soils in the replication area were not hydric. Supervision by a qualified wetland scientist is the most important step in the replication process. This person must be on-site to ensure proper protocols are employed. Next step is placing erosion control wattles. Area is then cleared and grubbed.

**Conservation Commission**  
**Minutes of the meeting of March 23, 2016**  
**Page #3**

Then the site is excavated 10 to 14 inches below grade and slightly sloped. Material is graded appropriately – lumpy/bumpy. After that the plantings are put in place. Only then are details such as the logs of wood for habitat added. Saplings, 50 shrubs & 54 in clumps are allowed for 4 or 5 species are put together and placed appropriately in the field. The area is mulched with saltmarsh hay. Stone piles are added to mimic the existing area. Three years of monitoring is proposed (Planting in the fall is best). This would be in the southeast corner of the project.

8. This section is okay.
9. A mounding analysis is important according to Cliff Matthews. There is one large infiltration structure to the east of the larger building and each of the three stormwater basins relies on overflow infiltration. Therefore, to assure no increase in stormwater volume post-construction, a mounding analysis must take place to assure that during peak infiltration rates, groundwater maintains the minimum two foot separation required. This could make or break the storm water management system. Neal Standley briefly discussed the previous application for this site, and their proposal to utilize each of the large turf fields for recharge. David Kelly stated they been thinking about pervious pavement areas. This will require further review.
10. Sheet #11 – three test pits were done for each storm water basin. However, basin #1 has test pits where the berms will be. They don't meet the standards according to Cliff Matthews. Sheet #12 – shows three test pits in storm water basin #2, according to David Kelly. Neal Standley asked about the linings for these storm water basins. David Kelly stated they would be back with a better design. There is a major challenge in separation to groundwater level.

Mike O'Herron asked Dave Sanderson (from Tom Houston's office) about the cover letter and receiving a plan that captures the entire area, with all the important boundaries and resource area delineations marked, including an overlay of the buffer zone, flood plain and riparian zone (perhaps something color-coded). Additionally, he requested that test pit data be included on the same sheet as the test pit locations in order to facilitate interpretation of data. Mr. Kelly stated that could be provided. Mike also questioned what direction the groundwater flow is (because there is a well not too far off site). Cliff Matthews pointed out with a break point in the groundwater flow to the west, the Charles River is between the town well and the site. David Kelly informed Conservation Commission members that the applicant was going to the Planning Board in two weeks. The applicant is filing both under the DEP and local bylaws wetlands regulations.

Neal Standley moved to continue the hearing to 7:30 PM on 4/13/16, was seconded by Brian Norton and passed on the unanimous vote.

---

**Updates:**

**Countryside Road – Pine Hollow Condos** – The Order of Conditions (which had been sent via email to all Commission members for their review) was signed tonight.

**Pine Acres** – Mr. Dalpe put in more markers. The certificate of compliance was based on discussion and inspections – sign the deed – 15 acres (3/24/16)

**Conservation Commission**  
**Minutes of the meeting of March 23, 2016**  
**Page #4**

**23 Fox Run Rd.** – changes proposed by the homeowner were reviewed – they included a new plant bed against the foundation of the home, a flower bed, a 6' x 8' size shed, crushed stone and pavers at the rear of the house walkout basement entrance. There is no proposed alteration of fence line or grading. The Conservation Commission will notify the homeowner they need to file a request for determination.

**Open space plan survey** – The draft questionnaire about the town Open Space Plan was reviewed in the following changes were made:

#2 – Conservation Commission added solar

#3 – Conservation Commission added non-motorized trails & canoe launch sites

#6 – Conservation Commission went through the open space list of locations

#7 – The former Clara Macy school playground and the SNET Trail were added

- A brief description was added of the CPA

Mike O'Herron and Brian Norton will be the contact to Gino Carlucci to continue to move the survey forward.

**26 Pearl St.** – Order of Conditions was signed

**119 South Maple St.** – Determination of Applicability was signed

Minutes for March 9 were reviewed and approved. Approved minutes will be forwarded to the Conservation Commission administrator for posting.

Brian Norton moved to adjourn, seconded by Shawn Wade and passed unanimously at 9:44 PM

Attending the meeting was: Cliff Matthews, Brian Norton, Shawn Wade, Neal Standley, Lori Fafard and Michael O'Herron.