



**Town of Reading**  
**16 Lowell Street**  
**Reading, MA 01867-2683**

**CONSERVATION COMMISSION**  
Phone (781) 942-9016 Fax (781) 942-9071  
ffink@ci.reading.ma.us

**Memorandum**

**To: Dr. Harry Harutunian, Superintendent, Reading Public Schools**

**cc: Larry Bronner, J & J Contractors, Inc.**  
**Gary Pease, Judith Nitsch Engineering**  
**Robert E. Peirce, Flansburgh Associates, Inc.**  
**Bob Corning, Geller Associates**  
**Peter Hechenbleikner, Town Manager**  
**Chris Reilly, Town Planner**  
**Glen Redmond, Commissioner of Buildings**  
**Joe Delaney, Town Engineer**  
**Greg Burns, Fire Chief**  
**Ted McIntire, Director of Public Works**  
**DEP, Northeast Regional Office, Wetlands Program**

**From: Fran Fink, Conservation Administrator**

**Date: June 20, 2003**

**RE: New Elementary School, Order of Conditions, DEP 270-341, RGB 2000-38**

On June 5, 2003, the Conservation Commission received the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) dated April 24, 2003, prepared by Shepco, Inc. and S.U.B. Contractors, for the new elementary school site, along with a site plan entitled "Civil Site Utility Plan, Sheet C1.0". I attended the Design Review Team (DRT) meeting with other Town staff on June 16, 2003. I reported to the Conservation Commission on the DRT discussion and the SWPPP during their meeting of June 18, and they asked that I send comments to the parties listed above. I met with Larry Bronner on the site on June 19 and reviewed most of these matters with him.

**FIRE LANE**

During the DRT meeting, the Fire Chief stated that the fire lane around the building should be 18 feet wide, paved, and a complete loop at the back of the building. The plan approved under the Order of Conditions calls for a 12-foot wide road with pervious surface (gravel).

The stormwater management system has not been designed to handle the additional runoff that would be created if the fire lane were paved instead of pervious. Such a change would require a revised drainage plan and possible amendment of the Orders of Conditions by both the Commission and DEP. Amended Orders might be subject to appeal. Also, the site is in the Aquifer Protection District, where groundwater recharge is important. Thus, the Commission would recommend that the surface of the fire lane remain pervious. The Fire Department has recently accepted pervious materials for fire lanes at Coolidge Middle School and at the Wingate nursing home.

If the fire lane is widened to 18 feet, it might be necessary to install a retaining wall to ease the side slopes adjacent to the fire lane.

### FRONT COURTYARD

The courtyard between the two wings at the front of the building appears on the plans approved by the Commission as a grassed area. The construction plans reviewed at the DRT meeting specify a concrete surface. This change is also a change from pervious to impervious materials and thus leads to the same problem as the proposed change in the fire lane surface.

### FES #5

The original approved site plans included an open forebay adjacent to the large detention basin in the northwestern corner of the site. During the DEP appeal process, the forebay was eliminated and Stormceptors were added to the plan. FES#4 was extended on the grading and utility plan to end at the upper edge of the detention basin, but FES#5 was not. Was this an oversight? If so, the plan should be revised and submitted for approval.

### LANDSCAPING

Some changes were proposed in the planting plan by Public Works during the DRT meeting to ease maintenance requirements. These changes would not appear to have any significant wetlands impacts, but should be submitted for Commission approval.

### SWPPP and CONSTRUCTION SEQUENCE

The construction sequence in the SWPPP is fairly general and does not address certain details that are important to consider. These include several items that need immediate attention:

1. During crusher operation on site, control stone dust so that it does not blow into adjacent wetlands or forest, or private property;
2. Apply grass seed to loam pile at this time to provide temporary stabilization until the final grading is done;
3. Sweep pavement on Sunset Rock Lane regularly. Also, install filter fabric under catch basin grates in the roadway to prevent excess sediments from entering the subdivision drainage

system. The latter should be inspected regularly, and accumulated sediments should be returned to the site above the erosion control barriers. (These provisions also apply to other adjacent roadways when work is underway there, and to catch basins within the site as they are installed.);

4. At present, only one of the two temporary sediment basins shown on the Site Preparation Plan approved by the Commission is in place. Because of the sandy soils and present grades, there are no major erosion gullies on site. However, as work proceeds, new measures may become necessary;
5. Have absorbent materials, plastic bags, and other equipment on site to use in case of spills of hazardous materials.

In addition, all of the drainage basins, infiltration beds, and other drainage system components need to be in place and ready to receive runoff before the roof goes onto the building and the roadways are paved. For the detention basins, this means that final grading, loaming, and seeding must be complete and the vegetation should be well-enough established to stabilize the soils in the basins before the runoff is conveyed to the basins. I asked Mr. Bronner to submit a more detailed plan showing how this goal will be met, including timing the planting during the growing season. It might be necessary to provide temporary detention basins in other parts of the site to handle runoff before the permanent basins are ready. It might be necessary to install additional erosion control barriers within the site to prevent sediments from washing off disturbed areas and entering the drainage system. (See Sedimentation and Erosion Control plan listed as Document #31 in the Order of Conditions.)

#### EXTENSION PERMIT

The Final Order of Conditions issued by DEP is dated March 28, 2002 and expires after 3 years. The Order of Conditions under the Reading General Bylaws was issued November 15, 2000 and stated that it expired after one year. Because of the appeal process, the one-year period probably did not begin until the Superior Court issued the decision in August, 2002. That decision has been appealed to the Appeals Court, which may further extend the expiration date. However, because work has commenced and is not scheduled for completion until August of 2004, the Commission would recommend that the School Department submit a written request for an Extension Permit under the bylaw. Because the State Order expires March 28, 2005, we would suggest that School Department request the extension to that date under the bylaw also.