

## Minutes from March 14, 2012 WRAC Meeting

Attending this meeting were the following: Ron Beck, Barry Rosen, Jeff Clymer, Helen Probst, Matt Mostoller, Janet Adachi, Kim Montella, and Rob Bukowski. Ron Beck opened the meeting at 6:55 PM.

The minutes for the meeting of February 15 were reviewed and two minor changes were made and with those changes the minutes were approved.

The two non-WRAC attendees introduced themselves and provided a quick summary of their background. Rob is a practicing civil engineer with considerable storm-water experience. Kim is also a civil engineer with over 15 years of experience, but is no longer active in that field. Ron provided a summary of the history of the WRAC and what we are trying to accomplish with our current project. This current work relates the two bylaws required for our M4 permit.

Since there are many different approaches to the second bylaw, we spent considerable time deciding on our approach. We discussed where the authority should be placed and the suggestion of the WRAC becoming a formal committee and being defined as the governing body. A second major area of discussion was the use of the Handbook and how we might modify the requirements for specific considerations:

- Severity of storm used as a benchmark
- Calculation of run-off/recharge
- Exclusion of residential (Rob pointed out that new requirements would apply if more than an acre is disturbed)

Charlton is an example and has adopted their bylaw. Precipitation is based on old models, so we may need to up the storm severity to adjust for these understatements. However, if the threshold gets too high may be counterproductive as it pushes developers towards 40B.

100<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the AWD is coming. AWD pamphlet circulated.

Inputs to the engineering model need to be controlled. Probably would want initial review from the Town's Engineering Department review. We have included the ability to require the proponent to pay for an outside consultant. One specific concern of the WRAC is that in the change in recharge calculation that the inclusion of septic recharge biases this calculation. Using an Engineering Firm should provide an unbiased view as they tend to compete (will not simply agree with what the proponent's Engineering Firm). Redevelopment definition needs work and we need to define in accordance with the MA handbook.

Other issues discussed were

- What are the concerns from an enforcement perspective?
- Slope. Sudbury is rethinking what they did including the use of slope.
- Avoid any change in recharge.
- Most sites are somewhat challenging that are left.
- Pervious payment concerns (used in Littleton).

Engineers only are asked to take a second look when there is a problem. Enforcement and monitoring is an issue which is in many cases, addressed with deed restrictions. Need to get enforcement funds in advance.

TRF55 model is used to evaluate run-off (storm event in inches). Bylaw could potentially define different thresholds for small and large properties rather than a single threshold. There is a case to be made to use a single engineering firm for all local developments. It will be important to check all of the particulars of the original engineer's work.

Rainfall events (rate of run-off). 2 year storm may be as difficult to plan around as a severe storm. New Jersey has a requirement to infiltrate a 2 year storm. Total suspended solids were also an issue for NJ requirements.

Roland meeting observations – definitions consistent, consistent process, amend with reference and Chapter W. Additional input for special permit for subdivisions and not a new process. Independent process for those not part of the PB process.

Issues to consider at next meeting: Infiltration focus; Review process; Coefficients for ground surface (TR55); Review handbook.

Meeting was adjourned at 8:50 PM.