

CONSERVATION COMMISSION

Town of GREENFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS
114 Main Street, Greenfield MA 01301

413-772-1551
413-772-1309 (fax)



GREENFIELD CONSERVATION COMMISSION Minutes of November 9, 2010 7:00 p.m.

Greenfield Planning Department
114 Main Street

The meeting was called to order by Chair Alex Haro at 7:07 p.m. with the following members:

PRESENT: Alex Haro, Chair; Tim Mosher, Vice-chair; Dee Letourneau; Tom DeHoyos; Steve Walk; Associate Member Bill Griswold

ABSENT: None

Also present: Ralph Kunkel, Conservation Agent and members of the Public.

Approval of Minutes: Approval of Meeting Minutes from October 26, 2010.

MOTION: Moved by DeHoyos, seconded by Walk, and voted 4-0 (Mosher abstained), to approve the minutes of October 26, 2010 as submitted.

Public Meetings/Hearings: 7:08 p.m. Vassilios Arvanitis – Public Hearing to review a Notice of Intent for property located at 105 Mohawk Trail (Assessors Map 46 Lot 23) to add a 500 sq. ft. addition and for site improvements with portions of the work within the Buffer Zone to a Bordering Vegetated Wetland. Continued from October 26, 2010.

Mickey Marcus, Principal and Senior Scientist, New England Environmental, was present on behalf of the client. Sue Arvanitis and Effie Arvanitis, who arrived at 7:20 p.m., were also present. Marcus reviewed the history of the project. Marcus pointed out on the plan an area of erosion on the bank due to existing conditions; he said this was not addressed in the plans because it was within the 25-foot No Disturb Zone, but in designing the rain gardens their intent was to reduce the flow responsible for that erosion.

Haro read the concerns the commission had expressed at the previous meeting and had asked the consultant to address. Marcus said he would address each of them:

- Curbing in the back to channel water away from the wall and into the rain gardens; Marcus said the retaining wall was designed to be the curbing to channel water toward the rain gardens. Walk asked about a gap in the paved area referred to by Griffin at the previous meeting. Marcus said there would be weep holes in the wall. Marcus suggested that in the Order of conditions the Commission could ask for specifications for the drainage. Haro said Griffin had referred to a drain pipe at the base of the wall; Haro asked if there would be such a drain pipe that would be drained to daylight at some point. Marcus replied that there would not be a drain pipe; that contractors construct “weep holes” to drain moisture from the soil behind the wall to prevent frost heaves. Walk asked if the sheet flow would be directed to the rain gardens. Marcus replied that it would.
- Paving and fencing of the dumpster area; Marcus said that the client had agreed to pave the dumpster area and put a fence around the area. DeHoyos requested a retention area within the fenced area with a poured concrete wall a minimum of 12 inches high to store grease containers. Effie Arvanitis agreed to that condition.

- Relocation of the snow storage area or consideration of snow removal in lieu of snow storage; Effie Arvanitis said that snow would be removed from the property; that the client intended to hire a contractor for snow removal.
- A detailed narrative of the sedimentation and erosion control methodology during construction of the retaining wall specifically addressing the steep areas; Marcus said that the NOI has a plan and limit of work designated; however for a detailed plan the commission should request that such a plan be submitted by the contractor prior to the beginning of work. Haro said he wanted assurance that the contractor would not go beyond limit of work; Marcus said that should be part of the plan submitted by the contractor. Marcus said that the impact would be less as Fuss and O'Neill said the work would require a small machine. Mosher said that he agreed that the equipment used in the area would have to be small.
- The disposition of the water from the wall drain; Marcus reiterated that contractors address this differently and that a narrative of how this would be addressed should be submitted by the contractor prior to the start of construction; Letourneau said that this would be in the conditions; Walk said he was okay with a condition for this because if the Commission did not like the plan, they could demand another before construction would be allowed to begin.
- Calculations to assure the Commission that the proposed Rain Gardens are adequate; Marcus said, as this was a small project that did not trigger Storm Water Regulations, the calculations were not done due to cost. Haro replied that the Commission would like to know, in that case, how the rain gardens were sized. Marcus replied that the rain gardens were sized as large as the site would allow; that the design was to capture the run-off and improve the area from the existing conditions. Marcus went on to explain that these rain gardens would be over-excavated and filled with impervious material to allow infiltration of the run-off; he reiterated the concept was to improve existing conditions. Letourneau asked about the grading and how much water would be directed onto Route 2. Marcus replied that no water would drain onto Route 2 that it would be graded so that all run-off was directed to the rain gardens. Mosher asked if anything from route 2 would flow in to the paved area and be directed to the rain gardens. Marcus replied that there would be no drainage from Route 2. Haro asked about whether permeable pavement could be considered for the back area from the building to the wall. Marcus and Effie Arvanitis both responded that it would be agreeable to install permeable paving in that area. Marcus explained how it would be installed. Walk asked how much of the run-off onto the permeable pavement would infiltrate; Marcus said if it were constructed correctly 100% would infiltrate. Haro reiterated the concern of whether the rain gardens would be adequate and that permeable pavement would be a help. DeHoyos asked if there would be a gutter on the back of the roof. Marcus replied that if the Commission requested it, there would be. DeHoyos asked whether it would be directed to a drainage well. Marcus replied that it would be more effective to drain it directly on to the permeable pavement.

Haro asked if they had determined anything about the cistern-like structure in the wetland. Marcus said that SVE had determined that it was a "Dry Well – abandoned"; but it was not known where it came from. Effie Arvanitis gave a brief history of the structure which had been relayed to her by the former owner of the Howard Johnson.

Walk expressed concern about what would happen to the Japanese Knotweed with the additional sunlight which would be a result of the trees that were taken out. A discussion ensued about how to handle the knotweed. The consensus was to have the clump removed that is currently there and to monitor it and treat it during construction and for the two year growing season after completion of the construction.

DeHoyos asked Marcus to show again on the plan where the existing erosion was. Marcus did so. DeHoyos asked if that could be mitigated. Marcus suggested that the area be filled with soil and be reseeded.

DeHoyos asked why the wall stopped short of the Northern edge of the parking area. Marcus said it was due to the grade. DeHoyos asked if it could be continued to the edge. Marcus replied that due to the grade, curbing would be better. DeHoyos asked that curbing be added to that end.

There was no further discussion.

MOTION: Moved by Letourneau, seconded by DeHoyos, and voted 4-0 (Mosher abstained) to accept as revised and with additional revisions requested in the special conditions the Notice of Intent submitted by Vassilios Arvanitis, DEP File No. 168-0279, with the following Special Conditions:

- 1. Boiler Plate Conditions for Orders of Conditions;**
- 2. Boiler Plate Conditions for Tree Removal;**
- 3. The following plans to be submitted by the Contractor for Commission approval prior to construction:**
 - a. Specifications for the excavation and installation of the permeable pavement;**
 - b. Specifications for the design of the retaining wall and its drainage;**
 - c. Detailed sedimentation & erosion control plan during construction and post construction until the area is stabilized;**
 - d. A plan detailing the treatment and control of the existing Japanese Knotweed during construction and for two growing seasons after completion of construction.**
 - e. A plan detailing the mitigation of the erosion on the bank of the resource area – how the area shall be filled, seeded (a wetland mix required) and mulched.**
- 4. The dumpster shall be contained on a concrete paved surface with an adjoining walled containment area for storage of used cooking grease. The wall around the containment area shall be of poured concrete and a minimum of 12 inches high. The entire dumpster/containment area shall be fenced to prevent dispersement of trash into the resource area;**
- 5. There shall be no snow storage on site;**
- 6. The retaining wall shall be extended to the North end of the parking area; and to the South if needed. If grading does not allow construction of the extension, curbing is acceptable;**
- 7. The back edge of the roof shall have a rain gutter discharged to a dry well beneath the surface of the permeable pavement.**

8:00 p.m. DeHoyos called for a five minute recess.

8:04 p.m. Haro reconvened the meeting.

Other Business: Daniel deLesdernier, 1Lt CAP – request for use of Griswold/GTD Conservation Area for a Civil Air Patrol Land Navigation.

To explain the reason for the Land Navigation exercise, deLesdernier gave an overview of the mission of the Civil Air Patrol; he said in the Franklin County group there were 15 cadets and only a few would show up for this exercise. Haro asked when they planned to carry out this exercise. Early December was deLesdernier's response and he added that this would most likely be a one time event. Haro asked him to provide a map showing the courses that would be charted.

MOTION: Moved by Walk, seconded by Letourneau, and voted 5-0 to allow the Civil Air Patrol to use the Griswold/GTD Conservation Area for the purpose of a one time Land Navigation exercise. If the area is considered for future exercises, the Civil Air Patrol shall come before the Commission to request permission.

Griswold recommended a press release with reference to the Conservation Area. Kunkel told deLesdernier that he would put him in contact with someone from the Greenfield Recorder.

Griswold brought up the "Boy Scout Bridge at the Conservation Area and said he had contacted Irmari Jones of the Recorder to write an article about it to find out if anyone remembers who constructed it, but had received no response from her. He asked Peter Conway, in attendance, to research who constructed the Bridge.

Peter Conway was present to suggest improvements to the map pointing out several errors in the map. Conway suggested installing 4x4 posts with letters at each of the intersections. DeHoyos asked that the Commission to hire someone to create a new map. Bill mentioned updating the large map on the sign at the parking lot. Haro asked Conway to create a list of items relevant to a map that need to be addressed at the Conservation area.

Haro mentioned that a woman named Roberta Green had been seen in Highland Park pulling weeds. Kunkel said he had contacted Green and invited her to come before the Commission November 23, 2010 with a plan for her control of invasives in Highland Park.

Monitoring:

Correspondence:

Enforcement Updates:

Site Visits: Griswold/GTD Conservation Area. 7:30a.m. Friday, November 12, 2010

Next Meeting: November 23, 2010 at 7:00 p.m. Greenfield Planning Department, 114 Main Street.

Adjournment: **MOTION: Moved by Mosher, seconded by Walk, and voted 5 - 0 to adjourn the meeting at 8:40 p.m.**

Respectfully Submitted,

Ralph Kunkel
Conservation Agent

Alex Haro
Chair