

**Marlborough Conservation Commission  
Special Meeting  
Marlborough Senior Center  
February 25, 2004  
7:00 p.m.**

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Mr. Don Hautman called the meeting to at 7:14 p.m. in the meeting room of the Marlborough Senior Center, Marlborough, CT.

**2. ROLL CALL**

The following Commission members were seated and voting:

Don Hautman  
Jack Bray  
Jim Montstream  
Christine Miller  
Gale Busemeyer

Also in attendance:

Peter Hughes, Marlborough Town Planner  
Atty. Paul J. Aparo, O'Connell, Flaherty & Attmore, L.L.C.  
Dennis Goderre, BL Companies  
Bruce Hoben, Planimetrics  
Michael Klein, Environmental Planning Services  
Martin Malin, BL Companies  
Marshall Victor, the Roger Rulewich Group  
Dave Fleury  
Ray Bole  
William Roche  
Mark Moriarty  
Roger Rulewich  
Terry Gallagher, BL Companies  
Sam Haydock  
Dr. Martin Petrovic

**3. PUBLIC HEARING – MARLBOROUGH PARTNERS, LLC APPLICATION  
#03-15 COUNTRY CLUB/GOLF COURSE**

The public hearing was a joint public hearing of the Conservation Commission, the Zoning Commission and the Planning Commission.

Atty. Paul Aparo introduced the various people in attendance on behalf of the applicant. Atty. Aparo stated that he has presented to Peter Hughes four letters for the various boards: two letters to request each of the Zoning Commission public hearings be extended, one letter to the

Conservation Commission to extend the public hearing and one letter to clarify some issues with respect to water and wells testing.

Dr. Martin Petrovic gave a presentation on the integrated pest management system. Dr. Petrovic is a professor at Cornell University in the area of turf grass management. He also does research on fertilizers and pesticides applied to turf (both golf courses and lawns). He has been a consultant on projects such as the Marlborough Partners, LLC project for over fourteen years.

Dr. Petrovic explained that the purpose of the integrated pest management system is to provide an environmentally sound golf course and residential lawn maintenance program. The philosophy is to use fertilizers and pest control materials to produce a healthy plant/turf while not contaminating the surface or ground water. The philosophy will rely heavily on environmentally friendly practices, including slow release and naturally organic fertilizers, pest-resistant grasses and the careful application of fertilizers. Pesticides will be used as a last resort. No chemical that poses a high risk to humans or aquatic wildlife will be used on the golf course. Some materials that have a moderate risk to humans and aquatic wildlife will be used as a last alternative. These materials will be used in small areas under very controlled conditions. The integrated turf and pest management system conforms to the best management practices outlined for Connecticut golf courses. The same philosophy will be applied to residential lawns.

Dr. Petrovic explained that there were four environmental concerns that were addressed when developing the integrated turf and pest management system: nitrate, ammonium, phosphorus and pesticides. He gave a brief background on what is known about the environmental impacts of lawn and golf courses. He provided many examples of research that have shown the impact on water quality and wildlife to be minimal. He explained that the information he used for his report included review of site plans, vernal pool ecology research, a wetlands function value assessment plan, site-specific soil properties, an environmental risk assessment and site visits. He used a method that was developed by the USDA and the Natural Resource Conservation Service. The method takes site-specific soil information, looks at the properties of pesticides and estimates the potential impact to humans (over a lifetime) and wildlife. He stated the model was developed for crop agriculture, where pesticides are applied to bare soil. Under golf course settings, pesticides are applied to a heavy plant canopy that is very effective at filtering some of the pesticides. The method is therefore considered very conservative.

Dr. Petrovic stated that his team evaluated 46 pesticides on the five native soils that are on the site. 17 pesticides were found to be low-risk to humans and aquatic wildlife. 13 pesticides had an intermediate risk, four of which may need to be used to control certain pests on the site. He explained that these four pesticides will be used under very controlled conditions and only when there are not other options. 16 pesticides were found to have a high risk and none of them will be used. His team also evaluated various fertilizers and did calculations on water re-charge levels on the site. He laid out three different scenarios for fertilizer use and its effect on groundwater: best case, typical case and worst case and demonstrated that even under the worst case scenario, nitrate leeching into the water would still be in very low concentrations. A similar test was done for phosphorus and the results were similar.

In summarizing the environmental impacts, Dr. Petrovic stated that he estimated concentrations of nitrates in ground water directly in the greens, tees, fairways, roughs and lawns and all those were well below drinking water standard, even in the worst case scenario. With pesticides, the

primary ones to be used have a low risk to humans. Four pesticides have a moderate risk but, when applied very carefully, minimize the risk. He believes the risk to wells on the property and surrounding the golf course should be minimally impacted.

The components of the integrated pest management program are to use cultural practices, use pest-resistant grasses, develop thresholds for treatment courses, use biological controls first and to use low-risk pesticides as a last resort. Pest monitoring will be done daily, on a hole-by-hole basis. Pest thresholds were established and will be used to determine whether a treatment will be applied. Factors that are important in an environmentally sound fertilizer program will be the amount of fertilizer, using site-specific fertilizers, and the use of natural organic disease suppressant sources, where possible. The overall goal is to have a healthy plant without contaminating ground water. Storing and handling of pesticides and fertilizers will be done in a chemical storage and handling facility that is equipped with wash down areas and storage space. The pesticides area will be heated. It will be set up so the floor is sealed. In the mixing and storage area the drain will be in a place where the recycled water is safely retained and stored. Dr. Petrovic went through aspects of fertilizer application that can protect the environment and prevent leeching and runoff.

Atty. Aparo stated that the operator of the golf course will be required to adopt Dr. Petrovic's turf and pest management plan. The same plan will also be required under the DMR/townhouse association guidelines, so the professional lawn care people for the DMR will be required to use the same guidelines. The single-family homes are going to be owned by individual homeowners. Through the declaration of the planned community, homeowners will be required to use the same plan. Enforcement in the single-family home area will be harder to control. Atty. Aparo explained that one idea was to offer homeowners the opportunity to sign up with the same lawn care company that will be servicing the DMR portion of the site.

Roger Rulewich, the golf course architect, explained the golf course design and construction. Mr. Rulewich explained that this will be an 18-hole, regulation golf course. The golf course will be private but will be available for public play as well. Mr. Rulewich explained that the design is a "returning nine" layout, which means that each nine begins and ends at the club area. Mr. Rulewich designed the golf course around the terrain of the site. There is a practice fairway on the northeast side of the site. Most holes on the course are par 4. There are some par 3's and some par 5's, also. He stated that the greatest challenge in designing the golf course was going around the complex pattern of wetlands on the site. There are nine holes that play over wetlands. The location of the playovers on each of the nine holes were designed in an effort to minimize disturbance in these areas. Mr. Rulewich stated that many changes have been made to the initial plans to minimize disturbances. Tees have been moved away from boundary lines and undisturbed buffer areas at wetland crossings have been created. Stone walls will protect the buffer area, define the play area and provide a nice aesthetic to the course.

Marshall Victor, head of construction for the Roger Rulewich Group, went through the construction elements and the sequence of construction for the golf course. The construction sequence includes two scenarios, one with construction beginning in April and another with construction beginning in September. The first consideration is the installation of erosion control measures. Mr. Victor explained that the construction will start in the open areas. The initial phase of clearing will be near holes 13 and 14 where the septic field will be built. The driving range and the staging area on the northeast portion of the site will be constructed next. The goal

is start in an area that does not require a lot of clearing so that several operations can come on line within the first 30 days of construction. The next sequence will be working on holes 1-7. The construction of the septic field will take approximately 3-4 months. Access to the area will be across a meadowed wetlands where there currently exists a road. That road will be enhanced. The sequence will change as the golf course construction comes along. Mr. Victor explained that once seeding begins, it will start at the corners of the property and work its way out. Mr. Victor explained that the first thing to be done will be the construction of the erosion control measures: silt fence and wood chips around the open areas. He used hole 5 as an example and went through the construction process for hole 5. Access to the hole will be from the existing logging road into the green area. Temporary wetland crossings will be built in 2 areas around hole 5. The temporary crossings are planned in the same location as future golf course bridges. He explained the process of building the temporary wetland crossing. It involves the laying of a filter fabric, logs, pipes and swamp mats in the wetland area. When the temporary crossings are no longer needed, the materials will be taken out. Mr. Victor stated that the temporary wetland crossings will be down approx. 8-9 months. There will be four permanent wetland crossings on the course: one at hole 13/14, two on hole 5 and one on hole 3. Mr. Victor explained that erosion control measures will be installed before the clearing and stumping activities. A silt fence with wood chips will be built around the green area. Two temporary sedimentation basins will be built in the lower areas of the hole. Clearing in the wetlands will be done by hand. All equipment will be outside the wetland area.

In terms of the earthwork process on hole five, 25,000 cubic yards of earth will be moved. 4,000 yards will be hauled into the grain. The balance will be hauled into the fairway and the tee area. For the entire golf course, approx. 500,000 yards of dirt will be moved. All the dirt will be moved around within the site; no dirt will be imported to or exported from the site. After the earthwork is hauled into place, the rough shaping of the golf course takes place. This is done with bulldozers. The irrigation system is then installed. All irrigation crossings of wetlands are done at the bridges. The bridges are built so that the irrigation system can hang off the bottom of them. There is no excavating in the wetlands at all. The golf course bridges are done with equipment working on top of the bridge as they work their way out. The equipment does not get into the wetlands. Mr. Victor explained that the golf course will have rock walls outside the 25-foot buffer from 2-4 feet high with drainage rock behind it. This will create a definite barrier between the playable area and the non-playable area. These 25-foot buffers will also be enhanced with plantings. Mr. Victor then went through the grassing plan, showing the area for the cart path and the cart path bridges. Prior to the grassing of the golf course, the temporary erosion control measures will be converted into permanent erosion control measures, i.e. a leaky berm or a plunge pool or permanent retention basin. These holes will be engineered to calculate how much water is coming off it as to the size and location of the permanent erosion control measures. It will take 3-4 days per hole to seed. One of the most important aspects of the grassing in relation to erosion control is the application of a hydro mulch product on the steepest slopes to prevent erosion. The erosion control measures will stay in place after the grass is up (i.e. hay bales and silt fences).

Mr. Victor went through the route plan for the construction road. In the development of the plan, the architects took into consideration where the earth was going to be moved from and to. For each hole, the plan shows how much earthwork is done within the hole and how much is imported or exported to different holes. There is a chart listing quantities for each hole and area on the golf course. With respect to the temporary wetland bridges (especially the three that will be crossing

streams) the pipe sizes will be determined by the engineers based on their calculations at the time of construction.

Michael Klein walked through the proposed temporary wetland crossing construction. He reiterated that the pipe size will be determined by the engineers based on their calculations. He stated that before the pipes are installed, the area will be cleared but it will not be stumped so that it can be restored at a later date. A geo-textile fabric will be laid down to protect the soil and then a series of log will be laid down as a corduroy road crossing. Unlike a typical corduroy road crossing, with the geo-textile layer the logs won't sink into the soil and it is all easily removed. On top of the logs swamp mats are placed. These are portable, heavy timbers that are cabled together. At these locations the heavy trucks that are used for earth moving and grading and shaping can drive back and forth across these. The logs and geo-textile distribute the load well. Once the construction is done, the swamp mats and logs and pipes are taken out and the geo-textile can be rolled up and the area can be restored with vegetation. The temporary crossings have been co-located, to the maximum extent possible, with the proposed bridges for the golf course so the area where the timber bridges would go are the same areas where the golf bridges. In these instances, the area of timber bridges wouldn't need to be restored. The area on either side (because of differences in width) will be restored with native vegetation. The plan also shows silt fences with wood chip berms for erosion control. Using hole 5 as an example again, Mr. Klein showed the wetland carry over, the playover area. Wetland buffer areas will be established on either side along the entire perimeter of the wetlands. The number of plants proposed is substantial in order to re-vegetate the area and provide wildlife habitat along the wetlands. The plan also includes some plantings along the area where the storm water control berms are proposed. Mr. Klein stated that on a typical hole like hole 5, there are a variety of different shrub species (7 different shrubs) that are chosen because they are native to CT, they provide wildlife habitat and they provide soil stabilization and infiltration. In all, there will be approximately 650-700 plants along the entire area. As a result of the removal of logs in the area that needs to be cleared for the carry, there may be some damage to the wetland plant materials, so there is a schedule included to supplement the vegetation that is there.

There is a concentrated wetland mitigation plan in the southeastern part of the site. This area of the site is presently farmed meadow. There is not a lot of mature vegetation that needs to be removed. There is a large wetland system that will remain relatively intact, but still has some features that can be improved upon. The agricultural operations have resulted in a significant amount of invasive plant materials in these areas, including phragmites, multi-flora rose and Japanese barberry. These invasives will be removed to allow native vegetation to come back. In addition, three large shrub masses covering  $\frac{3}{4}$  acre will be planted along this area. This will include approx. 5500 shrubs. The shrubs will provide a habitat for wildlife and migratory birds, bats, owls and kestrels. The last element of the mitigation plan is for the small pond (vernal pool) near the golf course area. In order to mitigate any potential impact on that area, a basin will be created around the area to protect the area and create a breeding area for birds. These measures are considered to be significant enhancements for wildlife utilization on the site.

Atty. Aparo explained that the darkest green area on the plan represent areas of open space, either open space that will be deeded to the town or open space that will be retained by the various associations. The proposal has always been to deed a portion of the land directly to the town. Atty. Aparo explained that the most logical piece would be the 40-acre piece in the center of the site, together with the 50-foot strip that connects South Rd. to Ogden Lord Rd. The orange

pathway on the plan is the proposed path that will be constructed on the site as a walking path. There is also the possibility of building a 2-3 parking lot area for people to park. In addition to this open space that would be deeded to the town and the other open space that will be retained, the proposal is to set up a system that, upon closing the 84 single family homes and the 56 town homes, there would be an amount payable to a town fund for acquisition of additional open space.

With respect to the operation of the golf club, Atty. Aparo explained that it will be a semi-private club. This means that the club will be private, but hopefully will be user-friendly to the public. He stated that the plan is not set in concrete right now, but the current plan is to have three different memberships: a full membership, an intermediate social membership where people can use some aspects of the club and a health membership for use of the health club. Priorities of tee time would be given to full members and Marlborough residents would be given second priority. In addition, the restaurant facilities will be open to the public and the banquet hall will be available for rent by the public.

Sam Haydock from BL Companies went through the groundwater testing issues. He explained that his role has been to locate, develop, test and permit the water supply sources needed for the project. Mr. Haydock explained some of the water testing and monitoring that has been done and how he arrived at potential impacts on neighboring homeowners and surface groundwater resources on the site. Mr. Haydock thanked the neighbors who allowed BL to test and monitor their wells. He stated that the data collected during the tests will be very important to protect their water resources and to ensure that the project's use of water is fair and valid.

Mr. Haydock explained that the project includes two water use components: one for potable purposes for the residents and clubhouse and another for irrigation. The potable demands will be met through the development and construction of a community water system that will serve all the single family homes, the townhouses and the clubhouse through standard design calculations using figures for water use out of the state public health code. Mr. Haydock has calculated the demand for the potable water supply at approx. 59,000 gallons per day. This translates to 41 gallons per minute of groundwater that will be needed to provide the supply based on a 24-hour day. Using the various factors of safety required through the public health code as established by the CT Department of Public Health, the project actually needs to be able to provide approx. 69 gallons per minute. With respect to the golf course, there is an estimated irrigation demand of between 100,000-250,000 gallons per day, depending on the time of year. The highest demands are in July and August. Mr. Haydock went through the purpose of the testing, which is to meet various different regulatory requirements for different regulatory agencies. Three agencies are involved in the ultimate approval of the water systems: CT Department of Public Health, CT Department of Environmental Protection and CT Department of Public Utility Control. Mr. Haydock stated that the potable demands are more important than the irrigation demand and therefore showing the CT Department of Public Health that the planners can meet the project's demand for potable supply is most important.

Mr. Haydock showed an outline of the property without the proposed development plan, showing existing conditions. The bedrock aquifer was identified as the primary source to develop water supply wells from. Mr. Haydock went through the process used to locate the best areas on the site for the wells. A total of 13 test sites were identified: 11 were drilled and 9 were proven to be good yielding wells. There will be 3 wells on the northern portion of the property, test W 11, 7 and 13 which will be used for potable use. The other wells located on the central and southern

portion of the property (1, 2 and 9) will be used for irrigation purposes. Mr. Haydock explained that he developed a system to monitor existing wells offsite to make sure there will be no adverse impacts on other existing groundwater uses. He explained the two tests that he did – one for the potable wells and another for the irrigation wells. For the potable wells, Mr. Haydock tested within a 2,000 foot radius and monitored neighboring homeowner wells. For the irrigation testing, Mr. Haydock tested within a 3,000 foot radius. The same process was used for testing and monitoring neighboring wells. With respect to the potable water test, test wells 11, 7 and 13 were tested simultaneously for 120 hours over August 18<sup>th</sup>-23<sup>rd</sup>. The pump rates were 32 gallons/minute for test well 7, 32 gallons/minute for test well 13 and 32 gallons/minute for test well 11 for the first day then that was increased to just under 50 gallons/minute for the remainder of the test. In addition to the offsite wells that were tested, Mr. Haydock also monitored some points on site associated with the streams and wetlands. Mr. Haydock explained the offsite well monitoring process.

For the irrigation wells, test well 1, 2 and 9 were tested simultaneously for a total of 168 hours over the period of October 6<sup>th</sup>-13<sup>th</sup>. Test well 1 pumped at 35 gallons/minute, test well 2 pumped at 34 gallons/minute and test well 9 pumped at 34 gallons/minute. During the final 48 hours of testing, all three potable wells were turned on so that all six wells were pumped simultaneously in order to stress the aquifer and evaluate the capacity of the wells to produce water and the impacts on offsite wells and onsite water resources. Mr. Haydock reiterated that the testing was done to meet regulatory requirements. The group needs to demonstrate to the CT DEP in support of an application of a diversion permit for the withdrawal of water that there will not be significant adverse impacts to existing groundwater uses and the environment.

Mr. Haydock then went through the results of the water testing. He first explained some terms used in water testing. He showed a hydrograph depicting the response of a well during the testing period. The hydrograph showed depths of water at various times of the testing. Mr. Haydock explained that the well showed drawdown of 2-3 feet when the peak household demands are placed on the well. During the first 5-day test on the potable well, there was drawdown measured at 12-15 feet. At the end of the pumping period, the water levels were back up to general static. The greatest impact was observed when all six pumps were pumping together. Mr. Haydock then explained how the data was evaluated. He explained there are regulations in the Public Health Code that describe how the data must be analyzed to determine whether there is a significant impact on the ability of a household to meet its average and peak daily demands. He stated that the required analysis is extremely conservative because it assumes the pumping is continuous for 180 days, 24/7 with no recharge. It also assumes that drawdown continues at the same trend observed during the test and that there is no equilibrium reached. In reality, often times equilibrium is reached and drawdown stops. Mr. Haydock stated that when they do the pumping tests, they really try to stress the aquifer by pumping all the rates simultaneously and pumping them at rates higher than what would be recommended. In actuality, when the wells are utilized they will not be pumped 24/7 non-stop. They will most likely be run 12-15 hours a day. The water system will be designed to have adequate storage and the wells will pump in response to the water levels in the storage tanks.

Mr. Haydock stated that when evaluating the impact of the wells tested, there were three designations: 1) no impact (a lot of the wells showed no observed drawdown as a result of the pumping); 2) minimal impact where drawdown was observed but, based on the conservative analysis, the small drawdown has no impact on the ability of the well to meet the household

demands and 3) significant impact. For these wells, there was significant drawdown that extended out 180 days with no recharge. This raised a question that the well may not be able to meet its demand. Mr. Haydock stated, however, that in reality the analysis is so conservative that the impact will most likely not be as severe as calculated. Mr. Haydock went through the factors that are looked at to determine the severity of the impact. These include the observed drawdown during testing, the depth of the well, the projected drawdown over a 180-day period, the projected available drawdown remaining in the well, the daily fluctuations in the well as a result of typical household use and the well's yields based on drilling records. Every well that was monitored had to be looked at individually. Four wells were found to have a potential significant impact. The regulatory agencies will review the data as it relates to the pumping wells themselves and the offsite impacts before granting approval for the wells. The CT DEP and the CT DPH will make the final determination on the proposed usage for the wells. Mr. Haydock stated that, with respect to the wells that may have a potential severe impact, the planners have already proposed mitigating measures. Atty. Aparo has submitted a letter from the project owners indicating their commitment to make sure that any adverse impacts on a homeowner's ability to meet their daily water demands, if clearly attributable to the project's pumping, will be addressed by the project owners. Additional conditions could be imposed by the regulatory agencies, including long term monitoring of certain neighboring wells. Mr. Haydock stated again that the analysis undertaken was extremely conservative in all aspects. Factors of safety were built into the analysis. Because of this, Mr. Haydock stated that it is very likely that the wells that experienced the most drawdown may never experience the worst-case scenario.

Mr. Haydock stated that Marlborough Partners is committed to being a good, responsible neighbor. The planners have met with four homeowners where they feel there is the potential for an adverse impact, in most cases shallow wells. Options to remedy the situation include deepening the wells to provide more available drawdown or drilling new wells.

With respect to on-site monitoring as it relates to the streams and the wetlands, Mr. Haydock set up 31 monitoring points on the site. Mr. Haydock showed a map of all the monitoring sites. These were installed to evaluate the potential impact on the wetlands and watercourses. Mr. Haydock stated that the wells are installed in bedrock aquifer. While the streams and wetlands play a role in recharge to bedrock aquifer, the bedrock aquifer also receives recharge from large areas that extend well beyond the boundaries of the site. It is much less typical to see significant direct impacts to wetlands and watercourses from bedrock wells than stratified drift wells, which are usually closer to the surface and in the sand and gravel. The 31 points were monitored throughout the course of all the testing and there was no direct connection or reduction in stream flows or water levels in the wetlands as a result of the pumping. Mr. Haydock showed hydrographs depicting the data on both the streams and the wetlands.

There is a community septic field proposed for the site. Mr. Haydock talked about the well monitoring that was done in this area. In general, the data suggests no direct connection between the pumping wells and the area of the proposed septic leaching fields. Mr. Haydock stated that hydrographs and individual data reports have been sent to all the neighboring homeowners who participated in the well tests.

At this point in the public hearing, the members of the three commissions were given an opportunity to ask their questions. Denis Soucy (Planning Commission) asked for some clarification on the water tests. He also asked a question about increased water turbidity in

neighboring wells during the testing. Mr. Haydock stated that it is possible to get a short-term disruption in turbidity as more water is pulled through the aquifer, but this generally does not persist. When asked if there would be an odor from the community waste water system, Mr. Haydock answered that there would be no odor because the system is very advanced.

Jack Bray asked where the water was pumped from during the drawdown tests that showed there was no impact on the wetlands. Mr. Haydock stated that the northern wells were selected for the potable tests and the southern wells for irrigation. Within a certain radius from those wells, they discharged the water from the tests down gradient.

Don Hautman asked when the applicant would be obtaining Health Department approval for the water system. Mr. Haydock responded that the Phase 1B review (a review of water quantity and quality) in approximately two months. The final component will be the Stage 2 process. The diversion permit aspect takes several months to complete. Don Hautman also asked whether the town's experts would be reviewing the data from the water tests, particularly the impact on the wetlands and watercourses. Peter Hughes stated that the data will be reviewed and Mr. Hughes also reiterated that the testing is very conservative. He used the school project as an example.

Jim Montstream asked how deep the project wells will be. He also asked how deep the four offsite, neighboring wells with high levels of potential impact are. Mr. Haydock stated that the depth of the project wells vary in range from 400 ft. to 750 ft. The depths of the two of the four identified wells range from 168 ft. to 225 feet. These wells are located on Williamsburg Rd. The other two identified wells actually fell outside the monitoring radius on South Main St. One of these wells is 150 ft. The problem with this well is an insufficient pump. The last well is an artesian well that overflows that is set up to overflow into a below ground cistern. There is no pump in the well itself. Mr. Haydock stated that he has had discussions with both homeowners on South Main St. and they have reached agreements to mitigate the problems with either new wells or deeper wells. Mr. Haydock stated that the well that is causing the problem is test well 11. This is a huge well that has a potential stand-alone stake yield of 500 gallons/minute.

A member of the public asked how the water management system will be monitored. Peter Hughes stated that the commissions can require monitoring as part of any permit that is issued. The state will definitely require monitoring through the DEP and the Dept. of Health and the town has to monitor the wells quarterly for chemical analysis. Mr. Haydock stated that they will develop a groundwater and surface water monitoring program that will evaluate groundwater in the aquifer as well as surface water. Because it will be a public water system and there is a golf course on the site, the regulatory agencies will also monitor the system.

Bill Proscia, 32 Williamsburg Rd. asked whether the 180-day projections on the lot plots will be made available to the public. Mr. Haydock stated they will be in the report.

Jeff Jacobson, town consultant and engineer, asked what types of mechanisms would be proposed to ensure that the mitigating measures happen so that individual homeowners don't need to argue if their wells are impacted. Atty. Aparo stated that anyone who has a complaint (whether they fall within the testing area or outside the testing area) will be investigated. He stated that if anyone's well is affected by the project's community water system, corrective measures will be taken. He also stated that Birmingham Utilities will take over the system and there will likely be some kind of indemnification language between the project owners and Birmingham Utilities.

Don Hautman stated that the applicant's representatives have been saying often that things will be forthcoming. He stated that he is assuming the information will be received prior to the closing of the public hearing. If not, the applicant's representatives need to indicate that.

Tom Ryder, LandTech consultant for the town, asked if there were any calculations that show the pre-development water budget vs. post-development for individual wetlands drainage to show whether the post-development water budget will be affected. Terry Gallagher replied that they did not have those figures. He did state that there is no diversion of watershed areas within the site, with the exception of some minor adjustments near South Rd. and Williamsburg Rd. Mr. Gallagher stated that these were minor and they don't impact the overall tributary areas.

Don Hautman stated that in a previous meeting he had asked for the applicant to provide a table showing pre and post water discharge exiting through the nine exit locations on the site.

Ray Bole, 52 Williamsburg Rd. stated that he felt the process for the homeowners who have been affected by the water or who may be affected by the water in the future needs to be better. He stated that there should be a clearly documented procedure for residents to follow when there is a problem with their well as a result of the project, i.e. who is responsible for doing what, etc. Mr. Bole also stated that his house is very close to where pesticides and chemicals will be applied on the site. He doesn't think abutters should have to pay to test their water. Instead, homeowners that are within a certain area of the site should be included on the same tests that are being done on the golf course. Peter Hughes told Mr. Bole that anyone who wants that should write a letter to the commission and go on record.

Peter Hughes asked a couple questions relating to the integrated turf and pest management system. He noted that there is a change in the soil type in the drainage report from well drained to poorly drained soil on 2/3 of the site. He asked what effect the change will have on the model and the calculations that were done. Martin Petrovic explained that there was no affect. The analysis is good. Mr. Petrovic explained when the four pesticides considered an intermediate threat would be used. He also walked through how the fertilizer would be applied. Peter Hughes asked Dr. Petrovic what other golf courses he has worked on that were located near water sources. Dr. Petrovic provided some names and stated that none of them have any issues with contaminated water. Dr. Petrovic also explained the responsibilities of the golf superintendent, who will be responsible for determining when and how fertilizers and pesticides are applied.

Paul Slot (Zoning Commission) asked how the neighboring homeowners, especially the ones along the northern end of the golf course, would feel comfortable that a few years from now the pest and turf management system is being followed. Dr. Petrovic stated that it depends on what kinds of conditions are placed on the golf course by the various commissions, such as annual reporting to the town on fertilizer and pesticide applications. Don Hautman asked whether the applicant is providing a monitoring process on the lawn management plant or whether the applicant is waiting for the town's commissions to tell them what they want. Atty. Aparo stated that Martin Malin from BL Companies will develop a monitoring plan that will lay out the reporting requirements. The town will then have an opportunity to review the plan.

Kathy O'Neil (Zoning Commission) asked whether the applicant had looked into a concern that had been raised earlier about the drainage from the golf course going into the 4-H owned pond.

Sam Haydock stated that the monitoring plan will include monitoring the flow offsite at the various exit points. This will include an evaluation of potential impact to stream water downgraded as well as the 4-H pond.

H. Scott Miller (Zoning Commission) asked whether an effective pest management plan ever creates an enhanced level of pests on neighboring properties. Dr. Petrovic stated that this has never happened to his knowledge.

Bill Dest (consultant to the town) asked whether the applicant could do a risk assessment for phosphorus to measure concentrations of phosphorus within each watershed. The applicant stated that it is possible to do a risk assessment for phosphorus if requested.

Norma-Jean Proscia asked where the sifter would be located during the construction phase of holes 1 and 2 (given the close proximity to Williamsburg Rd.). She is concerned that the sifter will be very loud and wants the sifter away from the abutting properties. The applicant replied that the sifter would not be close to the abutters' properties.

There was a brief discussion amongst the members of all three commissions to decide whether the next public hearing should be another joint hearing or whether the commissions should meet individually. It was decided that the different commissions would meet independently and that perhaps later in the process one more joint public hearing will be scheduled.

**Motion by Jim Montstream to continue the public hearing for application #03-15 – Marlborough Partners, LLC Country Club/Golf Course on March 1<sup>st</sup> at 7:00. The motion was seconded by Gale Montstream and it was carried by a unanimous vote.**

**Motion by Jim Montstream to table application #03-15 – Marlborough Partners, LLC Country Club/Golf Course until March 1<sup>st</sup>. The motion was seconded by Gale Montstream and the motion was carried by a unanimous vote.**

**Motion by Gale Busemeyer to grant a 45-day extension for the public hearing for application #03-15 – Marlborough Partners, LLC Country Club/Golf Course. The motion was seconded by Jim Montstream. Don Hautman voted in favor of the motion and Jack Bray opposed the motion. The motion was carried by a majority vote.**

#### **4. OLD BUSINESS**

There was no old business.

#### **5. ADJOURNMENT**

**Motion by Jack Bray to adjourn the meeting at 11:31 p.m. The motion was seconded by Christine Miller and it was carried by a unanimous vote.**

Respectfully submitted,  
Mary Sciano