

## **Wetlands Protection Committee Meeting September 13, 2012**

Wellesley Police Station

**8:05 PM continued NOI MassDEP #324-647, Wellesley County Club, 294 Wellesley Avenue, Amended proposal to install utilities for comfort station and restoration and drainage improvement in the Riverfront Area**

Committee Members: J. Stanley Waugh, Jay C. Hammerness, Eric Seaborn, and Robert Collins; Diane Torres, NRC Assistant Director

Citizen: Can I ask a question?

Eric: You can try... laughter

Citizen: I know I can ask...

Eric: I'll try and give you an answer.

Citizen: (garbled) Why is this considered a continuation isn't this kind of closed down, it's very different, which is great, but shouldn't this be a new project after what, almost 2 years?

Eric: No, this project was continued, and kept open, and we never set any time limit, we did 2 months ago make a formal inquiry to the club about the status of some of the related projects, and conditions, items, and were told at that time it would be resolved very soon hopefully. It is still the same NOI filing.

(Diane: Am I ok here or am I in the way? If I'm in the way here let me know.)

Eric: Is that ok folks, (re: lights) we can go even darker... that's pretty dark... we may not need this, we'll see.

Eric: We're ready whenever you're ready.

Jay: Yes

Eric: However you wan to start...

(Computer set up)

Citizen: So Eric, is the whole committee able to participate? One of the issues that we had, that would have been one of the benefits of starting fresh, we had that issue come up a while ago.

Eric: No, it's just, well, we have a quorum, but we have Jay, Stan and myself who can vote or take action.

Mike Toohill: Good evening, all, I'm Mike Toohill, with Coneco Engineers and Scientists, Marty Ryan, General Manager of Wellesley Country Club with us, Paul DeYesso member of the committee for maintenance facilities, and Art Kreiger, Counsel to the Wellesley Country Club.

I have, Diane I've got yet more paper for you. We did do an abutters' notice again re-notifying because of the length of time in between so we did a complete abutters notice per the WPA.

It's been a long time since we got together and talked in detail about this project. The committee did send a letter to the club this summer asking that the Club come before this committee on September 13 to talk about this project. And the project... I wrote a letter on August 30th, which I can scroll down and show you parts of here, explaining the changes to the project. The primary changes to the project is that all of the elements except for the comfort station lightning shelter and utilities that serve the comfort station lightning shelter is actually - the comfort station lightning shelter are outside the jurisdiction, the utilities that serve them, all the other elements, the mf, fuel and wash facility, environmental management center was never within jurisdiction, all those other elements are now being taken off the table and are outside of the jurisdiction of the WPA and wetlands bylaw, So that the club right now is modifying the notice of intent, the request for the project NOI is to simply cover the utilities for the mf ? There are 5 different elements to the project, the 1st three.... are really the utilities, installation of 1 and a half inch dia. plastic force main to carry wastewater from the 2 bathrooms men's and women's bathroom at the comfort station to the Wellesley sanitary sewer hole which is right where Brookside and Oakland come together, second part of the project is the installation of 1 " dia. water main coming directly in from Brookside Road there's a water main right in BR to serve the Comfort Station and bringing in pvc ducts for electrical conduits again from a pole that's right outside Brookside Avenue that entrance area right outside into the area we are talking about, so those are the three utility elements that we're dealing with here. The other 2 elements we've talked about a number of times we've been on site, I think we've all been on site, Bob's been out there, too, looking at restoration of the area down by Brookside Road next to the Community Gardens so that's part of this project now, part of that area is the restoration which does occur within the 200' riverfront area.

Citizen: Quick Question, on that to clarify, so that becomes part of this project as opposed to the project that created this disturbance?

MT: Yes. Correct.

Citizen: The prior project hasn't been closed and the restoration hasn't been completed.

Eric: That is correct. So we're trying to deal with this issue in the most efficient way possible. If you want to close that and have them re-disturb the site we just closed, that is an opportunity to deal with all this.

MT: We're taking this opportunity to go ahead and do that restoration now. The last part of that is installation of additional storm water controls within that restoration area to help mitigate some of the issues that we've been having towards the end of that opening down by Brookside Road. So those are the 5 elements of the project

Citizen: May I ask a question? Is a 1.5 inch pipe large enough?

MT: The force main, yup, right now they have at the Paddle Tennis Courts which are across from the club house also have a grinder pump force main system and it's a 1.5 inch diameter pipe, it's a fairly small pipe, it's a wet well with a grinder pump in it, a sealed well with a grinder pump in it and when the float level gets up high enough it sends it up the force main. OK.

I should mention Allen Majors is the engineer on the project they engineered these systems as well as preparing the plans that we've submitted to the committee. ... I just want to scroll down to a table that I had in here ... this is a comparison of where the project was at several different steps in the process and where the project is now.

And so as I mentioned, the maintenance facility, the wash facilities, the bulk storage facility, which I forgot to mention before, have been pulled out so now there is no impact in any wetland resource areas or buffers due to those projects. So the only remaining project is the CS and originally the CS, was that area down there proposed to be the CS and BS until the numbers were all put together, so I parsed out the numbers just for the CS since we're not doing the BS down there so the impact numbers are approximately 800 sq.ft., of inner riparian zone, 150 sq.ft. of outer Riparian Zone, that's total of the project. There's no disturbance to buffer zone and no disturbance zone within, the 25' buffer zone falls within the street.

Diane: OK, so that's shown on the Plans?

MT: That's shown on the plans. And I have PDF'S on the computer I can put up here of plans, which show the buffers. So those are the elements of the project right now, if you want I can put the plans up and I'll just show you some of the areas we're talking about right now Love it when it (computer) does that... we'll see how that looks. .... I can zoom into areas...as we talk about it... This is the entirety of the site, so here's Brookside Road, here's the Wetland Line right here, this is the bank line for Rosemary Brook down over here, so this is the bank line which goes way up into here the wetlands, these lines were peer reviewed by the committee's peer reviewer Beals and Thomas they agreed with the flagging locations. This plan is a series of plans, this plan happens to be the utility plans which would be the most instructive, here's the CS, the proposed CS facility right here, this is the 200' riverfront area, so the river is here, this goes out 200' here's the 100' buffer zone, that's why the lines start to get overlapped here, Diane, the 25 foot way down here on the street, then there's the inner riparian zone right here so you've got the 25' which isn't affected at all, the inner riparian, your 100' buffer right outside of that, here and then the 200' RFA. So the project elements that are within the Riverfront Area, the main resource area that we're concerned about here, this line here, which snakes up and around, comes out then goes up and extends further out on the map, I can show you that, goes up along the shoulder of BR, then out to Brookside Road, then goes across right along here, gets into the manhole that's on Brookside/Oakland so that's the sewer force main, right there. The water main, here's the electric, coming in from the pole off Brookside, and the water main comes straight in, this is where the opening is along BR, there's a gate there now, the water comes straight in and back up again, so those, each of those elements, will be within RA. The restoration, which I'll show you on another, plan, encompasses this entire area here, and I've got a plan of the restoration. Do you want to ask questions as we go along? How would you like to do it?

14:20

Eric: Yes. Essentially for this part of it we are talking about trenching? To put in sewer lines and FM lines and that to the CS - the CS is outside of our jurisdiction, just so everybody's clear ...

The electric ...

Citizen: Except to the degree that the CS drives this project, which is within your jurisdiction. If they don't need a CS, (and I'm not making that argument) if they don't need a CS then they don't need pipes to go to the CS, so I'm not sure it's fully outside. The construction of it itself, yes, but if the sizing of it, the location of it would alter the location of these lines, then I believe it would be within your jurisdiction.

Eric: Well, OK, anyway, just so we're clear.

Bob: And just for clarification on electric, even though it's on a pole, it's going to be in a trench, so it's underground?

MT: Yeah, it's underground.

Great, great,

They're going to put two ducts in so ... while you're opening the trench you may as well put in two 4" pvc pipes as opposed to one.

Eric: Just a couple more questions then we'll have questions after he's through.

Citizen: How far is the CS from the border from the Community Garden, and are those new plantings that I see little circles there, are those new plantings? For screening?

MT: I have two other graphics that show the plantings. We can show those in a minute. Those line of arborvitae exist right now that's out there right now, these exist right now, there's some additional planting are going to be put around the CS itself. So how far is it from the CG? This is the appx. property line, there's a bit of hill, so the CG are probably right in here. K?

Citizen: I'm just concerned if you are planting trees that would impact our gardening.

MT: No. They're not going to ...

Citizen: I mean, we like to have some screening but...

MT: Yeah, there's screening. There are golf course greens, tee's back here and some greens and they don't want trees hanging over those, either.

Citizen: Ok, thank you.

MT: That's why we were in here two weeks ago, to take out arborvitae that were causing damage to tees because they were keeping the air and the light from getting to the grass.

Eric: Any more questions?

Patrick Garner: I have a quick one: The 1.5" sewer force main runs along Brookside, does it enter/run within the 25' no disturb zone anywhere along the roadway?

MT: No, the 25' is over here it's a little hard to see, Patrick, the 25' is way over here, we're across the street from it. So I'd say it's not within that zone. Yes, sir?

Citizen: The sanitary pumping system is there a check valve system to prevent backup, I'm assuming you having a pump up a slope, is there a check valve system to prevent backup?

MT: That's why I wish the engineer were here.... they always have them. OK, it' part of the code.

Citizen: Why not straight up to Oakland? Rather than going across the wetlands area riparian zone why not bring it up the hill and connect it to Oakland Street directly?

MT: I'm not sure I understand the routing of that?

Citizen: If you look the, just for size, the size of the footprint on the CS, this, yeah, that's how big?

MT: Have to scale it, honestly I forget... it's a pretty small bldg, 20 by 20 foot building at the most.

Citizen: ... If you look from there, even if it's only 20X20 you're still 60' from Oakland Street granted uphill, but if you're pumping, our pumping. Why wouldn't you go straight up to Oakland rather than cross through...

MT: We are pumping to Oakland... we are pumping to the manhole that's available...

Citizen: But you're pumping to up Brookside to Oakland,

MT: This is the Club's property, the Club owns halfway out along Brookside Road, so this is the club's property this is the only place where it enters into the town property, into the street, so we're staying completely on our property to get to the nearest available manhole that's ... you want to pump into the nearest available manhole, that's where it is.

Citizen: Then there's no manhole on Oakland closer to that location?

MT: That is the nearest manhole that is feasible for us to get to from this location.

Jay: You're suggesting that they negotiate with the town because the town owns the gardens, go through the gardens, and hit Oakland ...

Citizen: If it's better for our water...

MT: Why is it better for the water?

Citizen: Well, because you're not having to go into the riverfront area at all. If you cut out to Oakland, I'm not saying it's possible ...

MT: This is buried pipe in a completely restored area. This is going to be completely restored, this going to be completely repaved and no different than it is right now.

Eric: I'd like to move on, actually let's see the next plan for the restoration then we'll have some questions. There'll be plenty of time for questions.

20:08

MT: Let's see if I can blow this up for you a little bit. These are the plantings around the CS so basically they're going to retain the screening that exists right now on this side of the community gardens, that screens the community gardens completely, the plantings that are going to be down in this area here, that's where the CS part of the project which is actually outside the wetland protection jurisdiction so I've broken out a separate plan for the restoration.

Citizen: So the oval that's right above the CS, the oval, by the arborvitae, right up on Oakland, are those your arborvitae?

MT: Well, this isn't Oakland; this is the Community Garden ... (discussion of boundary lines... clarification... OK)

MT: I can slide this around as we need to... so what this graphic shows is the existing tree line, first of all, on the outside. This is tree'd all around here. ... So this is the opening area. Here's the entrance off Brookside Road, this is Brookside Road, here's the entrance off Brookside Road. Here's that gravel path that comes in right now this is the open area that actually slopes up a bit and then down to the CG's, then the low point is actually probably in the black locusts back here. That's the lowest point back here. So part of what we wanted to do was to pick up the drainage from the CS roof and from the paved area, here, and we're going to put in "cul-tech" infiltration chambers in front of the CS, again completely outside of the resource areas, so that all of the drainage from the hard surfaces here that exist now, and the CS roof get infiltrated into this chamber. In addition, we are proposing to put in an infiltration swale along here that ends in this terminated little basin, so it's terminated in this basin right here. We also submitted along with the letter a plan stormwater report that Allen Major prepared that gave all the calculations for you know sizing this and sizing the ditch and so this area here, there are three different types of planting zones here, they are all going to be planted with herbaceous vegetation.... slightly be different seed mixes because the characteristics might be different after we construct it, so this going to be presumably a wetter area down here so we're going to seed that area with wet mix, the areas on the outside here are drier more upland areas right now if you go in there these areas are actually fairly well vegetated with a real interesting assemblage of native wildflowers, primarily, and that's what we're doing is mimicking that mix, we're not going to just scrape up what's there we're going to augment that, and we're going to plant some blueberry bushes in there as well, augment that with some seed mix put some compost over just to retain water and get good growth back in that area. Same thing over here, this is a bit more open so we are going to do some grading down here, a little bit of loam or something just to get a good base in the mix. We're going to put the same seed mixes here and here. And then there's a third seed mix which varies just slightly actually from the upland wildflower seed mix, it's I think it's called a wildflower conservation mix, wildflower mix, couple of species that drop in and out, so we're going to seed alongside the path that comes in with that mix. Part of what in the process of looking at this memo August 30th Diane came up with some questions some of the questions had to do with putting the narrative together, which I did, in a letter on the 11th, I think your comments were Tuesday or something I think I sent them shortly after that, right, so there's a description of what we're doing here, and there's also spec sheets from NE Wetland Plants, we're going to use 3 different seed mixes from NE Wetland Plants. The Spec sheets for those seed mixes are also included in the submission to the committee. So that's kind of the long and short of it.

Jay: I saw your set of plans, I read your most recent letter, what I, could you give us a little more detail on that basin?

MT: Right here?

Jay: Yeah. You had detail in your plans of about everything else but you didn't have any explanation...

MT: There's details in the original plans, there's grading details in - Bill from Allen Majors actually did the design of this so there's grade details in here, there are also details in the Storm Water Report but in short what we're doing is we're coming down slope and you have to, you want to terminate that somehow into a slightly larger footprint so that you have more of an opportunity for filtration. If you remember in the original proposal...

Jay: So you're saying the details on that basin are in your previous ...

MT: They're in the plan set, and

Jay: In this plan set?

MT: In the current plan, (set in the...) plan set, the grading details.

Diane: The one you just gave me? On the...

MT: Total? I gave you 3 sheets to show you where the buffer is, the most important 3 sheets, the ones I'm showing.

Diane: Ok

27:05

MT: If you remember we were talking about putting a rain garden, that was down there originally, this is kind of the same concept, the water is going to flow downhill and we want to stop it before it comes out, you want to give it one last chance of filtration, we'll get infiltration along this trench, during a very heavy rain events the water will reach down to here, so you want to kind of terminate it onto something that kind of has a lip on it, a little lip on it.

Jay: Well I guess what I was kind of looking for was details on, if you're simply saying this is the low point and we're just going to keep it natural and going to make a swale down to it, or are you going to in a sense engineer a type of basin there... you know digging a hole, and then refilling it with soils.

MT: we're going to grade it... going to grade it...

Jay: so that it serves as a kind of a natural dry well. That' I'd like to see. I didn't see it.

MT: OK I'll check but I think those are on it.

Jay: I didn't see it.

?: Does this just catch the roof runoff? Or additional?

MT: No. The roof runoff actually goes into here, into this infiltration chamber. So the soils out here are relatively sandy. So this is where, where we're going to get infiltration.... for the roof and for the paving. What this does, is there's some, a little bit of sheet flow that's going to come down off of these restored slopes. What we want to do is catch that. There's been a problem at the entrance here. Been before with the committee a number of times to try and address that, with water collecting right at this entrance, it used to be physically higher than the road, so water coming down here would at one time you know go out into the road, and there was a concern about that, so what the Club did was graded that entrance down lower than the road, so now what we do is end up coming into a crowned road at a slightly lower elevation so we've created a small area by the edge of the road on the Country Club's property that's physically lower than the road and so the water wants to sit there

Citizen: That's because of action that was created prior to when that gravel driveway was put in.

29:37

Eric: It was also a discussion about mitigation to keep the water out of/sheeting into the road.

There was discussion about hopefully taking that puddle that's now there on the Country Club's property and somehow getting it dispersed to the side, we've had those discussions, sounds like what you're proposing here is your proposed resolution to that problem.

MT: What we're trying to do is, the water that potentially would have made it here and caused that puddle from this area here we want to capture before it gets there and infiltrate it in this in this swale. And infiltrate it in this terminal basin before it gets down here, so any water that's going to collect alongside the road quite honestly is coming from the road. And we can't do anything about that. There's no drainage in the road, as a matter of fact, the Town installed what's called a paved water-way on the other side of the road to deal with some of that.

30:29

Patrick Garner: I've got a general question. I've got a number of sort of broad comments I'd like to make, when would it be appropriate to do so?

Eric: I think, the way I had seen this in reviewing everything that was submitted, actually, I look at this project as this is the alternative to what was originally proposed, ok, and certainly from a wetlands perspective, wetlands protection perspective, and our concerns, this is a dramatic improvement, OK, so in my mind there was nothing here that couldn't be resolved tonight, in terms of hopefully being able to close and potentially issue at the next meeting. My suggestion is that we would leave the meeting open and use that 3-week period to collect questions and comments ...

31:39

.... From everybody and do our best to respond to them.

Garner: You can't close the hearing and then continue to collect questions.

Eric: That's what I'm saying, we wouldn't close tonight. So, but I don't, in my review and my understanding of this entire project, and the history of this project, I don't see anything here that raises a red flag in my mind.

Garner: That's not my question to you. When would it be appropriate for my comments?

Eric: I'm suggesting is we use the 3-week period that we have

Garner .....

Jay: I would like to hear his comments.

Eric: Ok, ok...

MT: But can I finish the presentation first?

Garner: I didn't mean to interrupt you -- talking over....

Jay: I have some questions, too.



Eric: I'm not saying... I thought you were saying... You have a lot of broad very conceptual questions and that would take up too much time.

Garner: Purely succinct and brief comments... When would the appropriate time be?

Eric to Toohill: How close?

Toohill: I'd like to go through the answers to Diane's questions because Patrick and I talked earlier this week and I think some of the questions he had might be answered by this, maybe not.

Eric: Let's do that and then we'll certainly have plenty of time for questions.

Toohill: Fairly short... First one is just to show the buffer zones.

Jay: We all understand that Patrick is here on behalf of the citizens, just so everybody knows.

MT: So we show buffer zones and erosion control zones, just so everybody knows, ... details of delineation was already accepted and peer reviewed by the Committee... so I think we're all set with that. Alternatives Analysis was a big question.

Jay: Let me make a point of that, I don't think we actually accepted, you assumed we had accepted, I don't think we officially accepted, I think we ought to do that

Toohill: It would be part of the OOC when we file.

Jay: When we vote we vote for actually 2 things, we vote to accept it, to state that this plan can (can't?) be conditioned, and 2, we accept the delineations. We haven't physically done that.

Eric: A big part of our determination...

Toohill: No I agree.

Jay: I think we just assume that we accepted, that we would accept.

Toohill: The AA Diane asked about alternatives to first of all to the comfort station itself which is outside Jurisdiction but some residents pointed out drives everything else we're talking about, there are really two primary alternatives to using a centralized waste water sewer system, force main, the first is using an on-site septic system, Title V septic system, and the TV septic system in a Water Resources District is not I don't know if specifically prohibited but it's not a great idea. And that was something actually that B&T reviewed during the early process and agreed that Title V septic system was not appropriate.

The second thing that came up the last meeting and come before was what about a composting toilet system. And composting toilet System, they're great, we actually have them at several Boy Scout camps that I'm a part of, but they have some operational mechanical difficulties and they also have some residual management difficulties, and under Title V they're treated essentially like septic systems. You have to have a separate system; they have separate systems for collecting the solid waste and composting it. Once you compost the solid waste you only got 2 things you can do with it. You can bury it on site, with 3 feet of cover, you can't do in a water shed protection district, or you can hire a septic hauler to take it away. Those are the two ways that

Title V lets you deal with that part of it. Second part is the liquid waste, liquid waste is not wash water and we're assuming that it would be the waterless system, although there are water using systems as well. The liquid waste actually has to be stored on site in a tight tank and has to be then pumped out and brought out for disposal. And it has to be stored for, excuse me, the compostable solids have to be stored for at least 2 years on site inside the chamber or in another chamber similar to somewhere on site before you take it out and bury it or bring it away by a septic hauler. Composting toilet systems have mechanical systems in them they rely upon constant airflow, so they have fans that run 24/7 so composting toilet systems actually use a fair amount of electrical energy in order to be able to minimize odors, cause if you don't do that you wind up with latrines and wind up with real odor problems. So the club actually queried several other clubs about their experiences with them, and they get mixed reviews, and so the club has opted not to go with the composting system because of all those issues. If you use a water composting system where you actually have hand washing water, although that's considered by the industry as being grey water, under Title V it's treated like black water and you have to have Title v septic system to deal with the wash water so now you're back to a septic system. So honestly the most environmentally friendly way to deal with waste coming out of here is to bring it to the centralized wastewater treatment system, which means bringing out a force main to the manhole out in Oakland Avenue.

37:50

I think those were the, oh the narrative which I also talked about before, the restoration narrative, that was something else that Diane asked about, and the last point Diane asked would the access road remain as an access road to the County Club and the answer is yes, the Club does not have any intention of closing the access from Brookside Road.

So that's the letter that I wrote back in response to Diane's questions to me and to the committee. So if you want to open up for further questions, I have other graphics, as well...

Eric: Well, ok, so for the restoration plan I had a question, the seed mixes you are using, you noted right now when you drive by there's a pretty interesting mix of wildflowers that have come up, so is your plan to basically reseed over what's there, and where necessary if there are bare spots, seed, that kind of thing, or talking about scarfing off the turf and

MT: No, I really don't think there's any need, other than the areas where, you have to remember the force main comes up through here, so we are going to have a trench cut that we're going to have to reseed, the remainder of it I would honestly over seed and put some compost on it at the most because it's specially this area in here, right here, is coming in really well, and the plants that are coming in now are actually a major component of the seed mix and that's why we chose those mixes.

39:30

Eric: Relative to the access point, I had a question and I know it's come up and I think at this point it's going to have to be the determination of the committee, about, it's certainly going to be a determination of the committee about maintaining that access point, but how much traffic do you see and what kind of traffic do you anticipate entering through that access point?

MT: it's primarily an emergency access egress point for the fire department primarily, we actually contacted the fire department and they confirmed that these access points are important to them we asked them to put that in writing to the committee, honestly and have not received anything back from them in writing but we talked to the lieutenant about that. There may be an occasional vehicle that has to come in to do some service on this area here but that would be relatively infrequent.

Citizen: Like once a week, once a month... once a year?

MT: During the height of the season, um, probably once a week to come in to make sure you know besides the cleaning which we can get to from inside but at most once a week to come in just to maintain it,

Citizen: In my view that's not infrequent

MT: ok.

Eric: Well, ok. Well.

Jay: I think this plan meets my objective in terms of handling the area. I don't want to deal with whether or not this access is permitted or not it's there now I don't want to deal with that and I don't think that in once sense that this committee has the right to make that determination on that.

Citizen: The access was put in in conjunction with....

Jay: Well, that's an assertion, it was not, I just don't want to deal with it. OK. I do, however, have a question about the gravel pathway. It appears to be very narrow on your drawing but when I was there the other day it's you know, wide enough for a truck. It's not in the early stages there's heavy gravel right here next to the road, but then it lightens up it kind of disappears by the time you get up here... in that this is now permanent, and there's no need for maintenance, which there would be with a composting thing, why and how can you justify the continued gravel path here. I would be happy if you just got rid of the gravel path including all this gravel here, come up with more detail on the basin and I think it's a great plan. That's how I would deal with it. I'd like to see that gravel out of there or I guess justification for continuing to have it.

Eric: The purpose of the gravel is to... is for vehicle access ...

MT: Yeah, I mean, If you recall, the gravel was originally put in when we were meeting with the committee on site under an enforcement issue

43:30

Committee: That's the gravel at the road. And you're going to solve that problem by this basin, and the re-grading and the swale, aren't' you?

MT: Yeah, but it was the gravel up in here, too, the gravel up in this area too that was put in for that reason, because there was a concern, that before this was fairly well vegetated, when we were still cleaning the area up, there was a concern that sediment was coming down, one of the ways to deal with that was to put this gravel in to trap sediment, that's why the gravel is here.

Jay: Ok, well...

MT: it's why you have a stable basin there, when I estimated the size of this, I said it was between 6 and 10' under existing conditions, we could make it narrower.

Jay: If you want this access, and an ability for infrequent maintenance of this whole area in some fashion, seems to me if it's infrequent you don't need that gravel to the extent you that have it now, and I'd just as soon take it out, then I think that addresses your concerns, ok. So I'm not denying you the possibility or ability to come in here, I'm not saying we'll close off this access you still have the access but you know by having no gravel here it's going to be infrequent. You still have an access from a safety point of view.

MT: Yeah

Jay: and I've talked to the fire department, too and I think their, they like these, but their feeling is they can't require a private citizen or private organization to open up a place for them. I think they appreciate it, and certainly I think from a practicable point of view, kind of nice - you're 70 years old and out playing golf and you have the big one you'd certainly like to have the police be able to get there. And some of us have ridden in that ambulance more than once, so, I can tell you it's pretty nice to have it there.

45:46

Eric: My concern though, is, with what once a week a vehicle coming in there for maintenance purposes if there's not some kind of a bedding there, you're going to be tracking.

Jay: You're saying, if they're going to do it, then maybe they can justify it. I'm saying, let them justify it to us, cause I'd just as soon have it go

Eric: I agree if there was some other way. I do see the benefit if the vehicle stays on the track.

MT: If there's any sediment that's down here you're going to trap that so that you want at least an apron by the entrance, by the road, and you can do that as a gravel apron, you can do it as a paved apron, there's a lot of different ways of dealing with it, whatever you, even temporary construction access points, when you have a construction site, they require that you put a gravel apron coming out...

Jay: That's to clean the wheels ...

MT: That's also to keep anything from coming down...

Jay: Well, yeah, ok...

MT: So you want to talk about doing something up in here and take some of the gravel out of there we could probably talk about that. I'd still like to keep something, I can talk to the engineer I'd like to keep something down by the road.

Eric: The apron does not bother me

Unknown: The Gravel is as you indicated, to check the sediment coming down to the up gradient area was stabilized, you previously indicated that it is now stabilized, if it's now stabilized you could probably get away with a foot wide gravel swale through there to catch any sediment in there, you don't need a 4, 6 8 10 foot wide section...

Citizen: I think the real question is there gravel driveway there, which I think it is what is there today, gravel driveway.

?: Yeah

Citizen: If that's removed because they can access it from elsewhere on the property, clearly it's not going to be heavily planted with trees to prevent emergency access if that needed to happen, but that's infrequent. Weekly maintenance is not infrequent. Do the maintenance from within the property allow this area to be appropriately restored, remove the gravel path, and I think that's far more environmentally sensitive response, I think it's a better response...

48:15

Garner: Can I comment, respond? I'm a little concerned listening to this dialogue, there's sort of an essential element that's not being focused on by everyone on all sides... we're talking about work within the Riverfront Area. That's a resource area, it's not a buffer zone, it's no different than a wetlands swamp or any other (DEP) protected equally under the WPA. ??

Jay: Yeah, however, there are within the Riverfront there are zones within the riverfront.

(garbled) There are two different zones - within... inner riparian...

48:50-ish

Jay: And then we have to be aware of the fact that there's a road.

Garner: Under the Wetlands Protection Act that doesn't lessen the quality...

Jay: Well there is a road, Let's make certain we keep that in mind.

Garner: That doesn't lessen the quality of that resource area.

Jay: Come on...

Garner: We've got a roadway, coming off of Brookside, through the Riverfront Area and that has not been explored through an Alternatives Analysis, it has not. Secondly, we have a swale that runs for 125' that's there for one purpose only, and that's to catch the runoff due to the roadway. .... If the roadway was not being put in we wouldn't have the need for the swale.

Thirdly, the swale terminates in a basin that's within the inner 100' riparian zone. It could easily be in the outer riparian zone, (be there?) but the entire design is incredibly insensitive in terms of trying to minimize the impacts to the resource area.... it's as this is an open field, we're going to lay some seed down, put some roadway in, gravel roadway which the committee members are showing some concern about, increases the imperviousness of the surfaces which increases runoff, which increases the ..... swale and the actual size of the drywell where it terminates. I did the early review, the hydrology ...? and the hydrology is well done, but the assumptions are that there's a roadway there, and the assumptions are that there's basically an open planted meadow ??? ... I'm just concerned that the general focus here is on trying, to one: now to preserve the roadway, two preserve the ability of the roadway to serve a facility that is outside of the 200' zone but does not justify piercing the zone itself with the roadway

particularly, we haven't explored whether there is an access for the necessary vehicles through any other location, if there is, if it can be located at access anywhere on the course, and that's where we should be heading with this, and not trying to simply access off Brookside.

WCC: The comments that you're making presume that we're talking about building a roadway into the riverfront area as opposed to already having an existing opening that was grandfathered because it predates the rivers act.

Garner: I'm saying that rather than memorializing and making this roadway permanent and in fact stabilizing it and adding all sorts of infrastructure for it, if the CS can be accessed from anywhere else, in the course, internal roadways, and alternate locations, then that's what we should be looking at. But we don't know because there's been no AA we have letters from the Club stating there's no need for an updated AA because they did one in 2010 and it was reviewed by a peer reviewer in fact what they reviewed was a different proposal and I'm not arguing that these aren't superior submissions... What I'm saying is it's the ... Commission's, the committees' role is to do everything it can to protect that RA.

Committee: Within the framework of the law.

Garner: Within the framework of the law which is very specific about AA's ....  
(interrupted)

53:00

Eric: I would like to ... I'm doing this as, a little differently, that, as I noted at the beginning, that this is still the same case, this is still open this is the Alternative that they are presenting.

Citizen: I think that, I understand that, but it's not

Eric: How can you say this is not the alternative?

Citizen: Because this is one subset of what was in a prior plan. Everything else has been removed.

Eric: Yeah, exactly, that's the Alternative.

Citizen: It's not an Alternative. Because when you submitted that first plan, your legal obligation was to have investigated all alternatives, and you said we've investigated every alternative, and this is the best plan we can come up with. You know what, it wasn't, so that's great. So now we've made some progress. Now we still have one facility, so now we have one facility that needs to be evaluated against all other alternatives for whether it belongs there. Whether it can be serviced in a different way.

Eric: I disagree entirely...

Citizen: Whether there needs to be ... ? This is not an alternative to the prior plan.

Eric: Of course it is, it's a completely different scope related to the same project, the same submission in the same NOI. It's an Alternative to what was proposed before. And it is far better.

Gardner: The Chair is correct, it is an alternative to the prior plan, but it triggers a different alternative analysis.

Jay: I don't think so, but I think the alternative analysis would be required if that building were in the riverfront. It's not in the RF. So the infrastructure is, come on... when you... their needs were 3 fold, this is, this makes sense I think, come on guys.

Eric: Let me ask representatives from the Club, how wedded are you to having that roadway that gravel.

DeYesso: I'm not sure it needs to be a gravel roadway, there needs to be access.

Jay: I don't think anybody is saying we're going to close off the access...

DeYesso: If there's something we can lay down that allows us to have in our estimation the occasional access that's fine, I just don't know what can you plant something that you can drive over occasionally that's still stable that...what we don't want to do is if I bring a small pickup truck in there once a week I don't want to disturb the area by driving

Jay: I would hope you wouldn't drive once a week. I'm talking, you know, once a month, maybe three months during the summer. You know, you don't need it because.

DY: Nobody's even going there in the winter.

Jay: Yeah, nobody's going in the winter, but the real reason for that was to service your temporary potty ports or potties, and you don't have that anymore, you don't have that need, so I just hope that you would say, Look, we don't need the gravel there. You've got a different way of dealing with this problem area by doing this basin, by creating a swale... get rid of the gravel. Then I'll vote for it.

Eric: I'd like to get an answer to that question.

DY: I don't know if there's something else you can put there ... maybe if you drive on it just once you disturb the area so much that you created more of a problem, Mike, I don't know...

Citizen: What's the nearest cart path to that building?

DY: I think we're going to build a cart path to the bldg. but I can't drive a pickup truck ....

Jay: I think they want their building to do more than simply service this building, I think other things. So, you know, does that...

?: May I make a suggestions? As an alternative to.... the entire path being gravel, why don't they just have 50 % of it gravel then the other 50% be a honeycomb style travel pads that they use around universities and medical facilities that they can drive on, whether it's an emergency vehicle or maintenance vehicle, it's occasional use, they can plant grass in between the honeycombs, still stable for a vehicle, one of the things situations everyone seems to overlook is that this is heavy gravel area that is extremely compacted over years of compaction and when it rains the sediment runs down that hill and you have to have some gravel to act as a buffer before it gets into that drainage system, or the drainage system will be eliminated in a period of a couple of years.

Jay: You mean the swale, the little dry well there?

?: I haven't seen the plan but I assume it's a swale with ric rac that goes down into a lower holding area that lets the water dissipate, just like we've done on other sites that has soil identical, in many other towns, we've set up a section of stone that slows the flow of water down so if it does have sediment in it if we have a torrential rainstorm, 50 year storm or something, it doesn't wipe out the entire drainage system this is a protective belt and suspenders but built so that the system lasts, we want it to last for 20, 30, 50 years. If you take that out, and we have one of those storms, all the sediment runs out god forbid down Brookside Road because it doesn't have any drainage the town's got to go out and sweep out all the stuff that came down the road CC has to pick it up, we haven't solved anything... this plan in my, from what I've seen with the topo that it has I think we can't put in a drainage system w/o some sort of buffer between the drainage system and the up gradient or it's just going to get wiped out. If you put grass in with a honeycombs at least it would slow down over the honeycombs, the sediment would build up over the honeycomb, you could still have infrequent access from the road to the facility and you wouldn't see it. And they wouldn't get stuck

Jay: You would think that honeycombs are preferable to the gravel?

?: Make some gravel, mix some honeycombs. At least you wouldn't see it and they could have access, this would slow the water down, they could get in and out, if you needed to have an ambulance get in there for some reason, he doesn't go in after a rainstorm and get stuck. There's a safety issue too, here, people need to get in and out of there in case there's an emergency.

59:26:

Citizen: There could be an emergency anywhere on the 160 acres.

?: So if somebody was in the bathroom, and god forbid they had a heart attack and they hit the buzzer that you have to have in commercial facilities now in case they have a situation, they're not going to run all the way down the cart path, they're going to go the closest road and try to get to that facility.

Citizen: Right, much like I could drive onto my yard, not over my driveway, it could be like that. It was vegetated. If I could, let me just take a minute, to say something? I'm somewhat disappointed because about this claim that the driveways were grandfathered prior to 1996 and we've had meetings before, and I've got the meetings minutes right here, and at the meetings the committee has told the club that the onus is on them to prove that they were there prior to 1996. Now why is this an issue?, Without getting into all of the nitty gritty he said she said, back to what we're saying as a community, it is a riverfront area, very close to the water, Wellesley's water supply, the well head protection district, it's just important, if ever there was an area to try to protect this is it, and if that's not necessary, then we should try not to have it there. But this issue, when one person says that it was there, and then the community has shown pictures of trucks devastating that area, devastating it, created the devastation...

Eric: There have been enforcement orders on that issue. There was restoration done there at our request. They are proposing further restoration to that site I think that's what we're trying to determine here.



Citizen: Can I ask for one thing here? I'll try and stay focused, OK? Could we just make and maybe the club would be open to this, too, could we make the decision that access roads from Brookside Road to the Club property are not grandfathered. This allows us, as an entire community, now, to say, that's ok. And we go from present day processes, which are in place for a reason, when, like we're doing now, as we discuss this gravel driveway. So not saying, ... I would love to see a continuous buffer separating the Club property, it could be a residential development, it could be one owner with 165 acres that wanted to do this, I would love to see a continuous buffer down the whole road. I think that's what we should do as a town, I think that's the best thing to do. But, if we're not going to do that, can we at least, since you put, in your own words, and in writing, I've got you asking them to prove that they predate the RF Act. We've sent in a lot of pictures, and tied these erosions to past DEP projects, in their own words, where they were coming in, what they were doing, we've got pictures of the trucks in there doing it, so then again, not to do the he said she said, but in the big picture, what does it harm any of us to say, and I say this more for future generations, instead of passing this buck, and having our grandchildren sit in this room and argue over these breeches again on Brookside Road, can't we just make the decision, since you put the onus on the club, several times, to prove this, and no proof has come in, yet the community has provided some level of testimony and pictures, can't we say, they're not grandfathered and go from there, move forward, all of us, and then anytime someone wants to enter through the Riparian Zone they go through a process that is correct because it's the present process. What's the harm in making the call? You guys, before, you've said, I'm putting the onus on you, club, to prove that these were grandfathered yet so far no proof has come.

Eric: well, I

Citizen: It's more progressive, it's more progressive, as a town, and as a people to say ok, if you want to put a road through there.... actually we're doing what I'm asking right now by discussing how we can solve this problem.

Eric: Ok, I understand the concern. And we did ask for some validation, or verification from the club but it has not come. But to be fair, the pictures that were provided to us from the residents, the neighbors, were inconclusive, we had that discussion, had a meeting, there was no way we could tell anything about the access points from the pictures provided. I'd also like to make the point that we don't have the authority, I don't believe, to make that kind of a call. That these are grandfathered or not. And to get into that kind of argument you could potentially go back and say the best thing here is to tear up Brookside Road because it was never grandfathered. Brookside Road has a major impact upon that wetland system. BR damages that system. The best thing to do would be to tear up the road and let it return to nature. But that's not going to happen.

1:05:10

Citizen: If we could just take full countenance here... it's illogical, the entire town could be ripped up. I would agree 100% with what Laura has said. I think what she's talking about is the general perspective that we all should have about what's going on here with respect to the club, I think reasonableness should be asked of the club to limit their use of external access, to maximize and optimize for accessing whatever they need to do to run their club internally. That's to me is the reasonable thing of where we should be. This gets out of hand very quickly, and I live there, I see the trucks, they go by, they make noise, they block traffic, all the stuff goes on, it should be internal to the club. And I would hope that the club would also share that as a reasonable goal, and I think we've talked about it, and if we think that way, we stop getting away from the

minutiae of what existed / preexisted, what dates and all that stuff and just use your acreage internally, to access your facility they way you need to and not throughout the neighborhood.

Jay: Let me add another aspect to this. I put this in the context of two other areas on B. One is the gardens and the fact that they constantly are moving out getting closer to the street definitely having bricks and all sorts of stuff I don't know what their sort of pesticides or fertilizer statements are there, but they are definitely moving out, the usage has moved out. There doesn't seem to be any concern by the citizens of that area, the neighbors about that activity...

1:07:03

Citizen: In all fairness, Jay, we're not ....

Jay: Wait a minute, I'm not done. And then the 2nd area is the, what I gather is a pumping station which is on the other side closer to the Brook there isn't any concern by "the citizens" Stan and I wrote a letter from the Committee to ask the Town what's the story here. What we got practically was that they locked it up so that we don't have UPS, Fed Ex guys driving their trucks in and creating oil down there. But we don't have an answer on why they continue to have that facility as a pumping station for septic tank trucks. And I've been told, I don't know if these numbers are right, but there are like 4 homes in the whole town of Wellesley that aren't connected, so.

Citizen: We actually brought that issue to you...

Jay: but what I'm telling you is there's the country club, this project, there's the gardens, there's the septic pumping station, 3 areas, I think this is a pretty good response to our requirements for you know maintaining a concern about the Riverfront Area. That's how I'm going to vote, I'm just telling you.

Stan: Well, the gentleman has a good point. If the comfort station could be serviced from within the club's property, then, why not?

Jay: Yeah, why not? I don't think it needs to be serviced.

Citizen: I have 3 bathrooms and I don't have a pickup truck coming to my house every week to service them.

Stan: Well, then, I'm not even making that judgment. I'm just asking, why not do it from within, is that impossible, or impractical? Or, a real burden? Why not?

Eric: In other words, would you be amenable to maintaining this site w/o that roadway, strictly as an emergency access?

DY: I think there are other Club needs that road needs to exist for. I can't speak to exactly what for, it's our point that we have an access point there. It's existed prior to the Riverfront Act and we are at this point unable unwilling to give that up. We think that we as a club have made, have spent, again, two years a lot of time, a lot of effort, listened to a lot of people, we've made what I think are, If Mike would put that chart back up, great changes to our proposal from where it was to where it is, and at this point I guess this is our proposal to the....

Eric: Ok, so you've ....

Citizen: I've watched you for 20 years dump crap there I would like you to be prevented from doing it again.

DY: I object to that accusing tone....

Eric: Let's not do that, all right? I will point out that we have jurisdiction in this area and if there are violations, we have an enforcement order action that we can take. So we're not saying that we would drop any of that responsibility if we were to approve this and something was to be going on that was damaging the resource area we still have an enforcement order that we have used very recently so...

Jay: The gentleman is right. There was a pile of stuff. We asked them to remove it, they removed it.

?: They cleaned it up?

Jay: And so let's, you've made a point, but I think we've moved on beyond that.

Citizen: They have other access points along Brookside ... why don't they meet the same standards as those access points.

Jay: Those are different; I think this is the one with gravel.

Eric: They just made a statement. This is their proposal and they are present it, and they are presenting it to us for determination. So. Mr. Kreiger...

AK: Arthur Kreiger, from Anderson and Kreiger for the Club... I think the practical issues before you are how wide or the minimum width the path needs to be, if it can be six feet or 7 feet vs. 10 feet whatever supports a pickup truck, and if it can be part permeable pavers or what is called honeycomb rather than gravel, if that works technically if it's a stable enough base. Now you've truly minimized impact, it's not visible, it's permeable, it still traps sediment, it's no wider than it needs to be as long as it meets the need for access by a pickup truck through the existing opening.

Jay: Would you be willing to come back with a modified plan that incorporates

Citizen: As a community we'd really like to understand why that access is needed beyond an emergency access. They've made an argument around emergency access...

1:12:15

Eric: I'm not sure that they are obligated to tell you that.

Jay: If they want to that's fine, but from my point of view they don't have to.

Citizen: But you did ask the question as to whether that gravel pathway that driveway could be removed. And I do think that goes a long way to alleviate the question was about putting it to the same standards as the other access points - there is no gravel there. And there doesn't need to be yet there's still access points. And the concern that the easier and smoother and better that access point is the more it will be used. I don't understand why, beyond the construction an access point there, I have not heard anything other than an emergency vehicle access. And if that's what it is in good faith we would accept that I think, I think anyone would. But we just heard "we have other uses for it." What does that mean? We don't know.

Eric: We don't know either.

Citizens: We need to know. Are trucks going to be washed down before they access it for other reasons? Really, it's going to the comfort station, I don't understand what needs to be done there. It was put there, as you said, to service the porto potties,

Eric: Are you willing and can you answer those questions?

DY: I don't have all the information I'd have to talk to our greens department, again, I don't run or maintain the golf course but I would not know my greens keeper's activities, you know, I know them broadly, but on Tuesday, on September 3rd he needs to remove logs or something. I have no idea.

1:13...

Citizen: There are big trucks that come through. Yellow front-end loader, goes chugging up Wellesley Ave, you know, the traffic, where are they all going with all this stuff? And that's where I come from. I think this is a great plan, but that's what I want to try and avoid, this use, this can be done internally. There's plenty of land to do it. We shouldn't shy away from it, because we should in good faith want both parties to do it. That's how I look at it. We live in Wellesley; Wellesley Country club has been there forever. It should be a good citizen. And it should internally service its needs.

1:14:26

WCC: the Club said before that aside from emergency access there would be occasional maintenance, reference to once a week during the season. Maybe some maintenance needs restocking the Comfort Station's cupboards?, that was already said, so people say you haven't told us anything, that's not the case. If the committee would like more detail on the path, about the composition of the path, more detail on the need for access to the comfort station, that's fine, but

Jay: I would like more detail on that basin area there, too. Cause I didn't really see a detail. I saw details of everything else but I didn't think I saw a detail on that page.

Garner: I would like to see the basin removed from the inner 100' riparian zone.....

Stan: But that's the logical place for the basin. You tell me where... where it should be

Gardner: Grade is nearly identical all the way to its location.

Everyone: the hill is... Flow is this way, flow is this way. It also flows away. To the south. Where does it flow away? To the south. It flows that way now. It flows down by my elbow? He's showing a watershed here. And that all goes down to here.

Garner: What we haven't seen tonight, and is available... Proposed grading that is built around the roadway itself and allows runoff to come from the northerly, the basin... Whether it's located as shown, or westerly, 30 or 40 feet, but the way it's designed now is located in the 100' riparian zone. The WPA tells us that we have to, if we can avoid, or simply unavoidable, then we have to, but this plan is not doing that. (Interrupted)

Jay: To me that's the natural location for that I was out there 2 days ago and boy I don't see, so, and then there's the road, to me that's....

Garner: But it's not, the topo...

Club: We could provide more information on that.

Eric: If we could have some more information on that.

Jay: He's talking about something slightly different that I am. He's talking about moving it out of that location and I don't see it.

DY: We'll ask our consultant. If moving it is a better alternative, great... if it's not I don't want to move it just for the sake of moving it.

Jay: that's fair enough.

AK: We'll address 4 things next time: Details of the basin. Whether it can be moved and if not, why not. The need for access, and the composition of the gravel path. Would the committee like any further information from the Club for next time?

Eric: As I said, this project does not raise any red flags in my mind. As it is... but if you could answer those questions satisfactorily.

AK: Would another member like to have the answers to those questions? What I'm seeing is one member would like...

Stan: I would like to have exploration of the minimized gravel. If you look at the old old photographs of when that was a farm, that opening was narrow, but it had two distinct tire tracks. And that's all it had. And lots of growing stuff everywhere. Wouldn't that work? Just have it natural? And if you needed something you'd drive a vehicle over it and have two little paths here? Or does that cause problems with water? I don't know the answer to that I don't know what happened back 50 years ago.

Eric: So maybe that would be another ....

Farm Tractor...

Stan: Again, I don't know. You can see the two tracks very distinctly. And it went up into the land.

1:19

Citizen: A comment to both the Country Club and the Committee, I think what you're hearing from the community, and I can only speak for myself, I think what you're hearing is that the disturbance in order to put in pipes, while there may or may not be a better approach, as long as that's done appropriately, that could be supported. The removal of the path for anything other than emergency access and the proper re-vegetation, replanting, reestablishment of that natural buffer area is important, and is something that should be more strongly considered, so I don't know why a weekly access or frankly even a monthly access can't be accomplished from within the course. There's a cart path, as I just heard, that goes right up to it, it really feels that that should be accomplished from within the course and I can't see why you need a pickup truck. I understand the point, but I don't see why you need a pickup truck, there's so much stuff done of golf courses through carts and carts with the trailer on the back I don't understand why you need a pickup truck. Maybe there is a reason, I don't get it. But I think removing that roadway for anything other than emergency, true emergency access, re-vegetating the area, if Patrick's point about moving the basin can be accomplished in a way that's a better outcome, that's what we should do. If it can't, then it needs to probably go where it is, but it sounds like we have two people here who have looked at it and have some expertise in this far more than I do, they are indicating in their belief that it can. I don't believe in any negative way impacts the club.

AK: I said that's one of the 4 things.

Eric: Sounded like a recap.

Jay: Let me also state that in talking with the fire folks and rescue people, they're not going to bring a vehicle, they're going to leave the vehicle on the road, what they need the access for is the stretcher and the people, so that's my other reason for I'm not so sure you've proved the need for the gravel. But if you prove that - Dean has talked about the gravel in terms of aiding the water, so looking at it from a different point of view, maybe it if you can justify its need then maybe you've also given them an opportunity to maintain that as supported for an occasional use by a truck.

WCC: It sounds like it can be addressed in one of those 4.... what's the minimum...

Eric: I suggest, sounds like we have some homework to do here... so we're going to have to continue this obviously, let's take one more question in the back.

Citizen: I'm Stanley Brooks. I'm an attorney in town, my practice involves real estate, and real estate development work. I was also a Planning Board Chairman. I've had the opportunity to present these things, look at these things, and I've looked over some of the materials that were submitted here, I didn't read everything, but I came here tonight expecting to hear - it may be in the materials - but I expected to hear some alternatives. And we heard alternatives about why we're not using composting toilets as opposed to this building, but we didn't hear alternative locations as has been pointed out. I expected to hear why this site is necessary as opposed to some other site on the property, that may not have these similar impacts that exist from the necessary infrastructure to service this thing. So I think it's incumbent for those alternatives to be explored and presented.

1:23:07

I think this required that they present those things.

I did read part of the storm water report and it day say with respect to this swale going down to the retention basin that the purpose of it is to retain the storm water and infiltrate it on site and minimize the runoff from the site, that may drain towards Brookside. So they are aware that there's runoff towards Brookside. That's fine. If the goal is to retain it on site, let's pull it out of a 100' area and bring it back to the southwest somewhere, I mean if it's got to be within the 200' zone it's got to be, but I don't see any reason why that retention basin can't be brought south off of the swale and if you look at the existing conditions plans and look at the topo on this plan, you see that the topo going to the east and the topo going to the south west are very similar, from that comfort station. So if we can direct the water not towards Brookside and towards the resource area, but away from the resource area, which is the stated goal in the storm water plan, it seems it would be a much more preferable way to deal with the water that's going in there. You really do need some sort of cross section of what this retention basin is going to look like, because they can be all over the place, as I'm sure you are aware. So they should have some, it may be in the original presentation.

Jay: But the location of that basin is at the edge of the very wooded area and I think he's going to explore other locations but to say that you want to move it here if that's what you're saying.

Attendees: No, no.... bring it west and south

Get it out of the 100'....

Jay: There's wood here... I don't want to cut down a lot of trees just to make another location.

Citizen: There's not woods to the south...

Jay: You're going to explore that issue...

Brooks: I know it's not attractive to have a swale/basin by your tee, by your greens, but you can make it attractive... I understand the desire to put it there.

Jay: This is on the other side of that hill, the green people, the people playing golf aren't going to see this basin.

Brooks: Great. Put it to the southwest and get it out of the 100' zone. There's no reason for it to be there unless they've got some geological or other reason...

Eric: That's one of the questions...

AK: That's one of the 4 things we'd said we'd address.

AK: When are we continuing to?

Eric: Three weeks from now, looks like October 4, October 4. (Do you need a calendar?)

Laura: Taking all the people out of it, we've been through, we've relied on B & T before, "provided in the August 17, 2010 NOI, September 2010 PP and additional description provided with Coneco letter of November 9, 2010 do not fully and adequately address potential alternatives to the proposed site 1 and Site 2 as required by the Act." At the time Site 2 was Bulk Material Storage.

Jay: Laura, Laura, those AA that they presented were not adequate. They were not. I told you, if you remember in the meeting, I asked them to do what I called a matrix analysis, where they took each site and then they evaluated it for the different factors, I think they were called, aren't they called factors? They didn't do that. If they had continued to ask for that maintenance facility, then I would have said they've got to do a better analysis, they've really got to do some. In this case, this is their choice where they want to put it, it's outside our area, it's not in the Riverfront, I don't think it requires an Alternative Analysis. That's my decision.

Gardner: from the Club's point of view, I know this is going to be my final comment, from the Club's point of view, Mr. Kreiger knows this, they are leaving themselves vulnerable to a legitimate appeal by not doing the full alternatives analysis of the changed plan. And that's egregious. And it's leaving them completely ...

Committee: Well that's their decision...

AK: I agree with the Chairman, and I agree it leaves the Club vulnerable to an appeal, I would not agree that such an appeal would be legitimate.

DY: The B&T report as we read it said that the way we were dealing with utilities for this facility were appropriate in the buffer zone. This facility, there is no other location other than maybe 100' away, but the utilities. This, the reason this facility is located here is it is the furthest point from our Clubhouse to provide comfort, to provide a bathroom and safety shelter for people on the golf course, that's why it's here. Putting

this halfway between here and the Clubhouse in our estimation it's not an alternative, so the location of this, this is the only alternative. We're relying on the B&T report that said we propose dealing with utilities; they said you've dealt with the utilities in the zone properly. So I don't, and we've just talked about how else we could deal with utilities, we could do a composting, we could do a Title V, septic, Mike, or we can go back to, build a lightning shelter and go back to having porta potties that need to be serviced. We don't think that's an alternative.

Stan: But this is all separate from the road.

DY: Correct.

Club: We're going to address the 4 issues, let's keep focused on what the to do list is, for next time. We would have done a matrix analysis, as counsel I would have looked forward to doing it, except the club went back and changed and it's not necessary, you're absolutely right, we absolutely would have complied with the Committee's wishes. I've identified several times the 4 things that I've heard that you want, is there anything else you want, I'm happy to consider it, if not, I understand we're off until October 4, if we can get you the information before that...

Eric: Yes, that's what we're asking. And we need to move on, folks. I'm sorry, Laura, we have full agenda...

Laura: Can the community send in questions?

Eric: You can always send in questions. Yes, absolutely.

Background talk. -- End of hearing -- 1:31:08 in length.