

Brookline Conservation Commission Meeting
Tuesday, August 20, 2019, 7:00 PM
Room 111, Brookline Town Hall

Commissioners Present: Marcus Quigley (Chair), Roberta Schnoor, Deb Myers, Pallavi Kalia Mande

Commissioners Absent: Marian Lazar (Associate), Werner Lohe, Pamela Harvey, Benjamin Wish

Staff Present: Tom Brady (Conservation Administrator)

Staff Absent: Katie Weatherseed (Conservation Assistant)

Guests: See attached

AGENDA REVIEW/MINUTES

M. Quigley called the meeting to order. No amendments were made to the Agenda. The Commission decided to continue the review of the minutes until the next meeting.

CONTINUED REVIEW OF REQUEST FOR CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE FOR 69 PRINCETON ROAD, 17-10

R. Schnoor made a motion to close the hearing. P.K. Mande seconded. All in favor.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING FOR THE NOTICE OF INTENT FOR 69 PRINCETON RD

R. Kirby, of LEC Environmental, and B. Timm, of RJO'Connell and Associates, introduced themselves. R. Kirby briefly described what had been discussed at the previous meeting. He stated that the Commission had attended a site visit at 69 Princeton Road, and that B. Timm made some minor modifications to the plan. R. Kirby stated that he and B. Timm received a report from Stantec on behalf of the abutters of 69 Princeton Road and have not had a chance to formally review or respond to it.

B. Timm reviewed the minor changes to the proposed project. He stated that the new plan shows a slight shift in location of the gravel trench. T. Brady had voiced concerns about the proposed yard drain's effects on groundwater. B. Timm stated that the plan has been revised so that the yard drain will now consist of a solid pipe (no perforations), and concrete has been added to counteract any buoyancy. He stated that he reviewed the memo from Stantec and is able to respond to any questions that the Commission may have.

B. Timm clarified the history of the site for Commissioners who weren't present at the last meeting. M. Quigley inquired about the datum used for the proposed plan as compared to that of the plan retrieved from the engineering division's records. B. Timm stated that while the datum is different, the outlet of the proposed pipe is lower than the input. M. Quigley also inquired about the effects of the additional stone on the overall storage volume. B. Timm

replied that he does not think it will affect the overall storage volume. R. Schnoor asked whether the applicant had moved the Nyoplast yard drain, as discussed in the previous hearing. B. Timm replied that he had spoken with T. Brady about his concerns that the perforated pipes would affect the groundwater. He altered the design and proposed a solid pipe with a concrete collar, so that it will not affect groundwater.

M. Quigley stated that he received materials from Don Gentile and Stantec, and the Commission hasn't had a chance to review it. Don Gentile, representative of several abutters, stated that he asked M. Bartlett, of Stantec, to do a peer review of the proposed project. He stated that he submitted a letter to the Commission enclosing M. Bartlett's report. M. Bartlett introduced himself. He described his review process and his observance of the flooding first hand. M. Bartlett then voiced his concerns about whether the pipe the applicant is proposing to connect to is in satisfactory condition and what the size/capacity is. He continued that the use of different reference planes concerns him, as he is dubious whether the applicant is absolutely sure that the pipe they are proposing to connect to is downhill. He also inquired about issues including whether the applicant has a legal right to connect to the pipe, whether it is ever surcharged during major storm events, whether there is an existing pipe where the applicant is proposing a new pipe, etc. He stated that understanding the flooding characteristics of the watershed is important for any design to go forward.

T. Brady stated that the standard the Commission has to consider is whether a project will have an adverse impact on the resource. M. Bartlett began describing possible issues related to design details, such as the lack of identified cleanouts. He noted the elegance and simplicity of a pumping system. M. Quigley asked whether M. Bartlett had the most recent plan when drafting his peer review. M. Bartlett responded that he had the plan dated from July.

P. K. Mande inquired about the capacity of the existing infrastructure and whether it's functioning as it should. B. Timm suggested that he can video-scope the pipes. R. Kirby stated that the homeowner has had 3-4 pumps directing flow into the manhole, and the water isn't backflowing. T. Brady stated that in the past, the Commission has required a video inspection and a confirmation of invert and outlet elevations in the Order of Conditions.

M. Quigley mentioned the possibility of using check valves, however B. Timm responded that the introduction of check valves could result in mechanical issues. D. Gentile asked whether the Commission has an aversion to pump systems. R. Schnoor clarified that the standard for the Commission is whether it will negatively impact a wetland resource.

M. Quigley opened the hearing to public comments. S. Fisch, abutter, voiced his concerns about whether the water will drain using the proposed system. He described the swale that was constructed a number of years ago, and the fact that it is now flooded with water. He mentioned that work has been done to the property at 69 Princeton Road, including elevation changes. He concluded that he wants a collaborative approach to address the flooding.

S. Muthuswamy, abutter, stated that the remodeling of the property at 69 Princeton Road has changed the water table in his backyard. He stated that it is important to consider what the right choice is for the entire neighborhood.

J. Winkelman, abutter, introduced himself and his wife, R. Winkelman. He stated that he hired a hydrologist in 2004 to review the hydrology of the site. They found the inlet to the narrow pipe that connected with the culvert, and followed it down to the brook, but did not observe any effluent. He stated that he is concerned that the proposed project will not function as designed.

M. Quigley thanked the public for sharing their concerns. He said he would like time to review the submittals from Stantec and for the applicant's representatives to prepare a response to these concerns. B. Timm stated that he can connect offline with M. Bartlett.

R. Schnoor made motion to continue the hearing to September 17th, 2019 at 7:05 PM. D. Myers seconded. All in favor.

PERENNIAL STREAMS

T. Brady gave an overview of what was previously agreed upon. T. Brady stated that he will send section maps to people, and that the next step will be developing language for the bylaw.

MUDDY RIVER REVIEW

T. Brady stated that the project is currently out to bid.

STAFF UPDATE

T. Brady stated that the Open Space and Recreation Plan has been published. He thanked the Commission and staff for their work, particularly W. Lohe and P. K. Mande, who took on the task of being official representatives. T. Brady talked about the release. T. Brady also informed the Commission that the Department of Public Works was reaccredited with the APWA.

- 325 Heath Street Conservation Restriction
 - T. Brady showed the Commission the communication between Staff and A. Rossi. The Commission made the determination to lift the Cease and Desist.
- 69 Princeton Road Certificate of Compliance (BWB 17-10)

*R. Schnoor made a motion to issue the Certificate of Compliance for 69 Princeton Road.
P. K. Mande seconded. All in favor.*

D. Myers made a motion to adjourn. P.K. Mande seconded. All in favor.

ADJOURN

Minutes prepared by K. Weatherseed