

**BOARD OF SELECTMEN
CWMP Public Hearing
Middle School Lecture Room
January 10, 2005
MINUTES**

Present: F. Eric Sonnett, Chairman Board of Selectmen; Paul J. Nelson; Leonard A. Holden; Ronald M. Clark; Mary C. Pratt.

Others Present: Theodore D. Kozak, Executive Secretary; Constance Craycroft, Westboro Resident; John Craycroft, Westboro Resident; Carol DeVeuve; Patricia Gellospio; Andre Griben; Alix Griben; Jacqueline Duffy Woodville Resident; Karen Webb; Tom Drechsler; Margaret Mighton; Karl Mighton; Philip and Carol Mecagni; John Daniels, Earth Tech; Thomas Parece, Earth Tech; Rosemary Blacquier, Earth Tech; Richard Jubinville, Earth Tech; Jessie Schwalbaum, Earth Tech; Eric Carty, DPW; Nancy Peters, Board of Health; Mark Furber; David Edson; Muriel Kramer; Kevin Kohrt; Jeff Doherty.

Public Hearing Opened

7:30 p.m. Mr. Sonnett opened the Public hearing and introduced the Earth Tech, Inc. Team - John Daniels, Dick Jubinville, Jesse Schwalbaum, Rosemary Blacquier and Tom Parece. Ms. Blacquier gave a 20-minute presentation (see attached). The Town Departments, Town residents and attendees (see attachment) gave public comments.

Public Hearing Closed:

8:30 p.m. Vote: Mr. Sonnett moved to close the Public Hearing. **Second Mr. Holden. Unanimously voted.**

Respectfully submitted,

Theodore D. Kozak
Executive Secretary

Date Approved: 2/15/05

ATTACHMENT:

1.0 RESPONSIVENESS SUMMARY TO PHASE III PUBLIC HEARING

A. GENERAL

The Town of Hopkinton submitted an Environmental Notification Form (ENF) to MEPA on November 30, 2001. The 30-day public comment period for the ENF was initiated by notice of the ENF's availability in the *Environmental Monitor* on December 8, 2001. The public comment period ended on January 25, 2002 and on February 1, 2002 the Executive Office of Environmental Affairs (EOEA) determined that the project required an Environmental Impact Report (EIR) and established a special procedure for review of the required EIR. The Scope of Work, contained in four phases, was included in the ENF.

The MEPA Certificate (EOEA No. 12654), issued by the Secretary of Environmental Affairs to the Town of Hopkinton, required the preparation of a Comprehensive Wastewater Management Plan/Environmental Impact Report (CWMP/EIR) for the Town and established a special procedure for review of this project. The special procedure is a phased review during which the scope for future phases is based in large part on the results of the preceding phase. The Phase I CWMP/EIR document scope is the "Need Analysis". The Phase II CWMP/EIR document scope is the "Screening of Alternatives". The Phase III is the "Draft Environmental Impact Report" and the Phase IV is the "Final Environmental Impact Report". Each phase was completed upon the completion of the phase preceding it. Each phase of this project was distributed for review according to MEPA regulations. Therefore, there was ample opportunity for the appropriate public comment period for all interested parties to contribute to the outcome of this project.

The Phase I, Needs Analysis, was filed on April 30, 2002. Following notice in the *Environmental Monitor* on May 8, 2002, and a public comment period, the Secretary of Environmental Affairs issued the MEPA Certificate on July 1, 2002. The Certificate states that "this project adequately and properly complies with the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (G.L., c.30, ss. 61-62H) and with its implementing regulations (301 CMR 11.00).

The Phase II CWMP/DEIR document Screening of Alternatives was filed on January 15, 2003. Following the public comment period, the Secretary of Environmental Affairs issued the MEPA Certificate on February 28, 2003 (revised March 11, 2003). The Certificate states that "this project adequately and properly complies with the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (G.L., c.30, ss. 61-62H) and with its implementing regulations (301 CMR 11.00).

The Phase II MEPA Certificate No. 12654 contained several items that were addressed in a letter from the Town to MEPA on July 10, 2003. At issue were the following items:

1. Hopkinton was urged to develop a regional stormwater strategy
2. Development of detailed proposals for I/I study.

A meeting was held on October 15, 2003, at MEPA with representatives from the Town, Earth Tech, Senator David Magnani and State Representative Paul Loscocco. Solutions were reached at the meeting and the Phase III CWMP/DEIR was initiated.

The Phase III CWMP/DEIR document was filed on June 30, 2004. Following a 45-day public comment period, the Secretary of Environmental Affairs issued the MEPA Certificate on August 30, 2004. The Certificate states that “this project adequately and properly complies with the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (G.L., c.30, ss. 61-62H) and with its implementing regulations (301 CMR 11.00).

The Phase IV CWMP/FEIR document was filed on December 15, 2004. Following a 30-day public comment period that ended on January 21, 2005, the Secretary of Environmental Affairs issued the MEPA Certificate on January 28, 2005. The Certificate states that “this project adequately and properly complies with the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (G.L., c.30, ss. 61-62H) and with its implementing regulations (301 CMR 11.00).

On January 10, 2005, a Public Hearing was held to present the results of the Final Environmental Impact Report and to solicit additional comments.

The following is a summary of the January 10, 2005 Public Hearing. See attendance list and copy of presentation attached.

7:00 p.m. - Public Hearing Opened.

Eric Sonnett, Chairman of the Board of Selectmen, opened the Hearing at 7:00 p.m. with a reading of the publication of the legal notice from the MetroWest Newspaper. Mr. Sonnett gave the opening remarks consisting of a recap of the CWMP/EIR and MEPA process as well as information on the approved MEPA Certificates to date.

Mr. Sonnett introduced the Earth Tech, Inc. Team – John Daniels, Dick Jubinville, Jesse Schwalbaum, Rosemary Blacquier and Tom Parece. Rosemary gave a 20-minute presentation (attached hereto).

At 7:30 p.m. Mr. Sonnett opened the Public Hearing for public comment, first to Town Departments, then Town residents and lastly to attendees.

COMMENT/QUESTION – TOWN DEPARTMENTS

Nancy Peters, Board of Health Chair

1. Commented on the cost analysis, I/A vs. system repair, particularly in Study Area 10.
2. Noted that there have been approximately 40 septic system repairs done in Study Area 10, with only one needing an I/A system. *

Response

1. Costs completed for the CWMP/EIR are in the Phase IV and are a worst-case scenario. The Town has multiple options to consider when assessing costs that need to be investigated.
2. Needs were based on a number of criteria in the Phase I Report, and considered for long-term sustainability. Criteria considered included impact to environment, water bodies, etc. The CWMP/EIR was not completed on a lot-by-lot basis, but through the delineation of study areas, with each study area consisting of similar parcels, age etc. See editorial footnote. *

COMMENT/QUESTION – RESIDENTS

Mark Furber, 232 Wood Street

1. Concerned about the quality of the Town's water. Board of Health should be more proactive in sustaining the water supply. Same aquifer so should have input to water supply as it relates to health.
2. Concerned with proposed location of WWTF and the Town's water supply wells.

Response

1. Board of Health has been involved and submitted written comments to MEPA on various issues.
2. Proposed WWTF is outside of the influence of the water supply wells.

Comment/Question

Margaret Mighton, 272 Wood Street

1. Interested in pipe location for Fruit Street WWTF.
2. Was Woodville the only area in Town slated for sewers?

Response

1. Proposed planning for pipe location not finalized. Could come in cross-country. Will be finalized in the Planning and Design phase of the project.
2. No. There are seven areas identified throughout the Town. (Map of the Study Areas was provided on the presentation screen).

Comment/Question

Andre Griber, Winter Street

1. Are there maps to show locations of Needs Areas, etc?

Response

1. Phases III and IV contain all the maps.

Comment/Question

Karl Mighton, 272 Wood Street

1. How are the costs covered?

Response

1. Eric Sonnet explained the previous betterment scenarios with the sewer phases 1 through six. If the Town waits to implement the recommendations, the costs will be higher due to inflation. Don't be alarmed by the numbers presented in the Phase IV, as they are a "guide".

Comment/Question

Carol DeVeuve, Chamberlain Street

1. What is the timing of the proposed sewers and wastewater treatment facility (WWTF)
2. Will the WWTF be built on the Fruit Street property?
3. How much wastewater gets sent to Westborough now?
4. If the Need Areas don't want sewers, does that mean there will be no need to build a WWTF at Fruit Street?

Response

1. Eric Sonnet explained that additional engineering studies need to be conducted before anything is built.
2. The WWTF is proposed to built on the Fruit Street property.
3. 400,000 gallons per day (350,000 wastewater flow, plus 50,000 for septage).
4. No, Phase VI (South Street) need capacity and the Fruit Street WWTF will handle this.

COMMENT/QUESTION –ATTENDEES

Muriel Kramer, Hopkinton Independent Newspaper

1. Do you have an estimate of the cost for the additional studies to be done at Fruit Street?
2. Are the costs included in the Phase IV Report?
3. Will the Fruit Street WWTF process sludge?

Response

1. Costs are associated with individual projects-water, wastewater etc. and will be completed in phases.
2. Cost estimates for the recommended plan are included in the Phase IV Report.
3. No. The sludge will be processed off-site.

Comment/Question

Kevin Kohrt, 35 Winter Street

1. Did you review any Innovative/Alternative (I/A) Systems and their associated costs?
2. Were there other parcels evaluated?

Response

1. The Phase II Report reviewed various I/A systems for possible solutions. These are well documented in the Phase II as well as the costs associated with them. The Phase III and Phase IV also compare costs.
2. We started with over 100 parcels and short-listed to 22. From the 22, all but 4 were eliminated from further evaluation based on the screening analysis completed in Phase II.

Comment/Question

Mary C. Pratt, Fruit Street (abutter)

1. If the treated effluent discharges to Whitehall Brook, how does that recharge the basin?
2. Can all pollutants be removed from the wastewater?
3. What is the \$2million from the Phase VI sewer project, South Street, being used at Fruit Street for?

Response

1. The discharge recharges the stressed Whitehall Brook to maintain the stream flow. The State's Watershed Initiative goals are not only to recharge basins, but also to maintain stream flows, recharge aquifer and preserve aquatic life. This plan proposes to meet those goals.
2. The Fruit Street WWTF will be designed to treat to a high degree-almost drinking water quality. Provisions have been added to the proposed design to reduce the levels of phosphorous based on comments received during the Phase III public comment period.
3. There has not been any official vote from the Board of Selectmen to spend this money as of yet.

Comment/Question

Frederika Gillespie, Sudbury River Watershed Organization

1. The SRWO is happy with this plan to recharge the Whitehall Brook.
2. What about the proposed water withdrawals, and areas of Need where recharge from on-site systems will not be replaced?
3. Was any groundwater modeling done in the Fruit Street Master Plan?
4. The consultant for the SRWO says that the hydrogeological study done is inadequate.
5. The SRWO is concerned with nitrates reaching the Town's wells.
6. Although the SRWO realizes that phosphorous levels have been reduced to .5, they will argue for .1.

Response

1. No response needed.
2. The recharge is being concentrated at a stressed basin at the point where it is stressed- Whitehall Brook. The aquifer is NOT stressed.
3. Do not know about the Fruit Street Master Plan-this Hearing is for the CWMP. Complete hydrogeological studies were completed for the proposed uses in the CWMP and are included in Appendix F of the Phase IV report.

4. Earth Tech would gladly review any work the SRWO consultant has completed-do you have any paperwork for this? (Answer was no).
5. This has been covered in the hydrogeological report-the wastewater flow travels easterly to the Brook and not the Town wells. See Appendix F of the Phase IV Report.
6. No response is needed.

Comment/Question

Paul Nelson, Board of Selectman

1. General comment: The benefit of the recharge is contained in the easterly portion of Fruit Street. The Town wells are protected, as they are located west of the proposed discharge.

Comment/Question

John Craycroft, Cedar Swamp Conservation Trust

1. What is the impact to Whitehall Brook?

Response

1. At full buildout, the levels in the Brook will be raised approximately 1.2 inches.

F. Eric Sonnett, Chairman Board of Selectmen

Are there any final comments before the Board closes the Public Hearing? Seeing as there are no comments, this Hearing is closed.

8:30 p.m. public Hearing closed.

*Editorial Footnote: The Phase I Needs Analysis was completed using a three-step approach. The first two steps being a review of the Study Areas based on; (1) a rating criteria matrix with community-provided data such as Assessor and Board of Health data, lot size, age, density, etc.; and (2) an evaluation of each Study Area based on soils classifications, groundwater levels and combination of lot size and age. The third step was a thorough review of the first two steps with the Board of Health Agent to confirm the results. As a result of this Board of Health review, the original results were approved and another Study Area was added to the original Needs results based on knowledge of on-site system repair, siting and operation. Basically, the Board of Health was the final evaluator in establishing the Needs Areas in Town.