

**Pelham Planning Board
Public Hearing to review site plan for Centennial Treatment Plant**

Minutes

Date: October 26, 2021

Location: Ramsdell Room at Pelham Free Library and Zoom

Members Present in person: Lexi Dewey, Pete Wilson, Anne Stoddard (recording)

Members present via zoom: Judy Eiseman, Matteo Ramos-Mucci

Others present in person: Dana McDonald, Conservation Commission

Others Present via zoom: David Waskiewicz, Building Inspector; Ken Comia, PVPC; Matt Morganelli, Ryan Neyland, consulting engineers for Town of Amherst; Elisha Musgraves, consulting engineer CEI; James Lowenthal, lighting consultant, Guilford Mooring, Amherst DPW Superintendent.

Called to order at 7:08.

Ryan Neyland summarized the plan for the new Treatment Plant. The new plant will meet today's surface water treatment regulations. It will deliver 1.5 million gallons per day. The old facility will be completely demolished including the below grade structures. The old plant discharged treatment residual into lagoons that will be removed. The new treatment will use below grade tanks that are inside the building. 95% of the treatment residual will be recycled with 5% of the residual being periodically pumped into the sewer system. The new process for residuals will not require catch basins.

Judy asked if there were any questions from the Board members. Pete asked for clarification about how storm water and waste water from the treatment process are handled. Treatment residual goes into a holding tank which is periodically pumped into the Amherst town sewer. The finished drinking water is discharged into the water main which is separate from the sewer. Storm water is handled separately. The storm water system is designed for a "100 year storm" and includes catch basins to manage the flow. The treatment tanks have emergency overflow protection.

James Lowenthal summarized his review of the lighting plan. He said that most of the plan is in compliance with the lighting bylaw in terms of both color and lumens. His remaining concern is the pole lights. If all the pole lights are on at the same time they will exceed the caps on lumens. They also need better shielding to avoid glare. Two of the three pole lights are on manual switches. He recommends timers on the switches.

Judy asked if the glare and lumen problems were features of the bulbs or the fixtures. James said it was an issue of the fixtures in the spec sheets.

Ryan said that the engineers are open to making the changes recommended. There followed discussion of the best way to get lighting coverage of the area in an emergency at night. David said that the outside lights are not meant to be on except in an emergency and that they must

meet the OSHA requirements for visibility. James explained that reducing glare can improve visibility. James recommends four lights with lower lumens and better shielding.

Elisha then reviewed the report prepared by CEI. She shared some observations from her walkthrough. 1. She observed an intermittent channel. 2. The existing gravel driveway is seriously deteriorated. She recommends restabilization as there is a water main running beneath the driveway. 3. The settling and residual lagoons will need to be removed. Details on removal should be provided. 4. There is no significant wetland habitat but wetland flagging is incomplete.

Her main concern is that detailed construction erosion control is not provided.

There was discussion of the storm water management. The Conservation Commission thought that the additional storm water run-off would be captured by the emergency catch basin. Elisha recommends a bio-swale. Dana should be included in the discussions of the plan revisions.

Judy asked if there were any questions from the PB members. Lexi asked about the protections for accidental release of the chemicals stored and used on site. The existing protocols for managing spills will remain in place. Mass. Law requires a plan for sheet flow control of a spill.

Matteo asked about the recreation trails that cross the property and whether they will remain open. A security fence is required because the site is for the drinking water supply but there will be no change in the current access to recreation trails.

Judy asked why there is to be a paved walkway around the building and whether all of the pavement is needed, particularly the wide parking area in front of the building. Matt said it was included for emergency access to the doors and he will check with the fire department about how much walkway is needed.

Judy asked if there will be a sign. There will probably be a sign on the gate. Judy asked that it be as small as possible and in conformance with our sign bylaw.

The color of the building is yet to be determined and Judy indicated the Planning Board will want to weigh in on this.

Is “100 year storm” protection adequate? This exceeds legal requirements according to Morganelli. The calculations need to be confirmed.

Is there a basement? The treatment tanks are below grade and within the building.

Dave Waskiewicz asked whether this government building is required to meet the set-back limits. Judy said we could waive the set-back requirements if necessary although there is a question about whether or not the plan meets them.

There was a motion to allow Elisha, Dana, James, Matt and Ryan to meet to work out the design details. The motion passed unanimously.

There was a motion to continue the hearing until November 9 at 7:00PM via zoom. The motion passed unanimously.

Next Meetings.

The Public Hearing for the Water Treatment Plant site approval will continue to November 9 at 7:00PM via zoom.

The next regular meeting of the PB will be December 7 at 7:00PM.

Meeting adjourned at 8:54 PM

Respectfully submitted,
Anne Stoddard