

**TOWN OF TRURO
ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS**

Meeting Minutes
December 12, 2019 – 5:30 pm
Truro Town Hall

Quorum Present: Arthur Hultin (Chair); Fred Todd (Vice Chair); Chris Lucy (Clerk); John Dundas; John Thornley; Darrell Shedd (Alternate); Heidi Townsend (Alternate)

Other Participants: Jeffrey Ribeiro, AICP – Truro Town Planner; Emily Beebe – Truro Health and Conservation Agent; Barbara Huggins Carboni, Esq. and Jessica D. Bardi, Esq. – Town Counsel, KP Law; Ted Malone – Community Housing Resource; John O'Reilly – Project Engineer

Members of the Public Addressing the Board: Jan Worthington, Hank Keenan, Jon Slater, Susan Howe, Steve Tarantal

Meeting convened at 5:30 pm by Chair Hultin

Public Hearing – Continued

2019-008 ZBA – Community Housing Resource, Inc. seeks approval for a Comprehensive Permit pursuant to G.L. c. 40B, §§20-23 to create 40 residential rental units, of which not less than 25% or 10 units shall be restricted as affordable for low or moderate income persons or families, to be constructed on property located at 22 Highland Road, as shown on Assessor's Map 36 and Parcel 238-0 containing 3.91 acres of land area.

Jeffrey Ribeiro gave a brief overview of events to date and stated that they are moving forward to find a qualified consultant to do a peer review on the septic issues. Town Counsel is leading that in finding firms that have significant experience with groundwater modeling and sewerage and nutrient issues. They will continue to delve into these issues tonight. Emily Beebe will give an overview of Board of Health comments, and Planning Board submitted copy of their written comments which will be discussed as well. The Site Plan Review Checklist will be reviewed for the smaller issues. Hearings for in-depth review of the different aspects of the project to continue next week and into the new year once have updated materials that respond to all concerns.

Chair Hultin reviewed sequence of events for this meeting and stated that public comments will be heard at the end with additional time for Board questions as a result of public comments.

Ms. Beebe stated that the Board of Health met on December 3, 2019 and discussed the proposal submitted for the Cloverleaf development. Plans had been reviewed, and they went through a multi-page checklist on review of the septic design. Ms. Beebe had an opportunity to meet with the engineer to review prior to this meeting. The Board of Health meeting was well attended and there were numerous comments mostly around the septic system design, size of the development, and concerns about groundwater quality. Ms. Beebe explained that the protection of groundwater is top priority for the Board of Health and went on to explain that it was something that was reflected in their local regulations. We have local regulations that amplify some of the State

standards. Title 5 has its own set of rules, and we have a set above that. Title 5 rules apply and there is a waiver requested from Board of Health regulations. The plan is compliant with Title 5 and is well-designed with pressure distribution for both systems. Want to underscore that Title 5 does not require the nitrogen loading standards of our local regulations on properties that are served by municipal water as this one would be. Town water can be next to well water and because of that there is a regulation that says the nitrogen loading standards that applies to wells with septic on same lot would apply uniformly across town whether or not you are on town water.

Pursuant to these concerns, looking at the wastewater design plan, the Board of Health did hear comments about additional treatment in order to reduce the overall nutrient and nitrogen load to the groundwater. It is not required under Title 5, but it would be required under local regulation. Board of Health has asked applicant to provide them with overall cost for adding the I/A treatment which would reduce concentrations of nitrogen and other contaminants prior to disposal. Board of Health also asked applicant to explore costs for larger pump chambers to increase the amount of available storage of wastewater during electrical outages. We also had some concerns about stormwater. Discussion mainly focused on design based on 50-year storm which is standard. Board of Health looked at comments forwarded from the Cape Cod Commission, and Board of Health wanted to amplify some of those comments regarding the treatment of stormwater (wherever possible use rain guardian and vegetative swales which would reduce the nutrient load from pavement and roof runoff). Board of Health looking forward to further discussion with the applicant.

Chair Hultin asked ZBA Board members for questions or comments on Ms. Beebe's summary.

Member Chris Lucy stated he had missed the last meeting but watched that meeting, Planning Board, and Board of Health on video. Nitrates in the water main topic. Asked Ms. Beebe if anyone in Town had issue with a poisonous nitrate problem in their well. Ms. Beebe responded that periodically happens when nitrate level exceeds 10 parts per million. Homeowner then looking at needing to drill new well. If Board of Health is aware of an elevated reading, such as if someone is north of 3, they will notify via letter; will also be done with other elevations such as sodium, etc. Mr. Lucy reiterated that generally the way of fixing this issue is to drill a new well on the same property but somewhere in the same location – still away from their septic, still away from other people's septic, a safe place, and generally the water comes back cleaner. Ms. Beebe responded yes. Mr. Lucy stated that the numbers before the Board were supplied by the Water Resources Oversight Committee from 2010, so 9½ years old. One area pinpointed with high nitrates. Ms. Beebe responded that nothing in that area was over 10, but further testing in that area has not been done to her knowledge.

Member Darrell Shedd asked applicant, Ted Malone, if he had any information on I/A. Mr. Malone responded that John did some work on costs. Mr. O'Reilly's Memorandum of I/A Technology Treatment Costs was viewed on screen. Mr. O'Reilly stated that one manufacturer that was permitted for on-site I/A treatment facility, called F.A.S.T. (Fixed Activated Sludge Treatment), was provided approximate flow of each system of about 4,200 gallons per day (it varies) for a nitrogen reduction into 19 ppm (permitted treatment level from DEP). Total estimated budget for the two (2) units, installation and hookup, would be \$119,000. Operation and

maintenance costs additional \$6,200 estimated per year. Mr. O'Reilly stated that with regard to pump tank size and accommodation of a generator, they are looking into that.

Mr. Shedd asked Chair Hultin if the Zoning Board was waiting for the peer review, or independent advisor – who determines whether an I/A system is needed. Chair Hultin responded that all aspects are being investigated.

Member Fred Todd asked Ms. Beebe, typically, if a system has high nitrate levels, what was the cause – failed septic system or old cesspool or something. Ms. Beebe responded not usually. Unknown when putting in a well if it will be intercepting a signal from another system – increasing lateral separation helps, but it depends on direction of groundwater flow and what is upstream. Mr. Todd asked if using the rest of the Cloverleaf interchange 16+ acres as part of the 10,000 sq. ft. per bedroom, did Board of Health consider that option. Ms. Beebe responded that since it wasn't a formal proposal, they have not considered that. Is the 10,000 sq. ft. per bedroom considered an adequate standard. Ms. Beebe responded yes.

Chair Hultin asked Ms. Beebe if evidence of outflow from improved I/A system is 19 ppm, is the limit for safely drinking well water 3 ppm. Ms. Beebe responded that no, it is 10, the ceiling. Chair Hultin asked if put in an I/A system at 19 ppm, how would it affect surrounding areas, what are the parameters regarding nitrates since high nitrates found in Pond Village area. Can this be tracked especially since adding 70 more units. Ms. Beebe responded that the peer review process could better answer this in detail.

Member Heidi Townsend asked Ms. Beebe for more detail regarding procedures on well testing and what triggers a test. Ms. Beebe responded and expanded on the triggers: homeowner can randomly obtain test kit, a transfer of property, septic inspection, some form of building on site. Ms. Beebe responded to Chair Hultin's question about ongoing water testing stating that there is none by the Town. Ms. Beebe also responded and expanded on Chair Hultin's question regarding dilution.

Mr. Lucy asked Mr. O'Reilly to respond to Board of Health septic total for the project showing 8,290 total gallons but project looking to treat 4,200. Mr. O'Reilly stated times 2; it is per system; therefore, 8,400. Mr. O'Reilly gave overview of the guidelines and permit from the DEP rating the system at a permitted level of 19 ppm and also expanded on the process including leaching and groundwater.

Planning Board comments were read by Planning Board Chair Steve Sollog explaining basis for comments from Site Plan Review process using their Checklist and Bylaws. Mr. Sollog read through their comments with explanation and/or expansion. No questions at this time from the Zoning Board; however, Chair Hultin did state, in agreement with the Planning Board, that it needs to be clear whether this is residential or commercial.

Chair Hultin asked Mr. Malone if he would like to respond to any of the Planning Board's comments. Mr. Malone stated that he believes the question of whether this is residential or commercial, and is Seashore District involved, needs to be clarified. Mr. Malone also thanked the Planning Board for pointing out additional areas in the Bylaw that may need to be addressed,

possibly through additional waivers. He discussed them briefly. Mr. O'Reilly stated that regarding the snow removal concern, he believes that Truro's DPW Director had reviewed and commented on this. There is a memo from the Director regarding the entrance to the site which was explained on a plan provided by Mr. Malone, viewed on screen, showing a tweak from last meeting. Mr. O'Reilly explained the enhancements to the entrance and intersection, catch basins, etc., and changes for emergency vehicles per Fire Chief's request.

Mr. Malone stated that they are presenting a lot of this information addressing specific issues raised, but they will not be issuing a new dated plan for each one of those things. They felt it would be more understandable to have sketch plans and then move them all into a final plan with a new date. Question to Chair Hultin if he would like it done differently? Chair Hultin stated that it didn't make sense to issue a new plan every time there was a slight change.

Mr. O'Reilly stated that after review of this information by the Board and the Fire Chief to make sure that it is what the Fire Chief is expecting, he would be happy to answer any questions. He stated that this is a vast improvement over the single lane that was originally designed. It allows traffic to come off of Highland and get on the site without crossing over the double yellow line or running over landscape beds or what have you.

Mr. Malone stated that they do have some additional information calculations on the drainage flow that John prepared which he submitted to the Board. Mr. O'Reilly explained that what was being handed out was the drainage design analysis for a 50-year storm, and it does comply with the 50-year storm. If asked to go to a 100-year storm, considerations will need to be made.

Mr. Malone stated that some of the other areas that they have been looking at are that they had requested a waiver from the Subdivision Rules and Regulations because this is not a subdivision of land. The Planning Board report had suggested that there are certain guidelines that are informative. Mr. Malone stated they have gotten more specific with the Subdivision Rules and Regulations in the form of a formal Waiver request that will be submitted at a later meeting. Their response to the Planning Board was submitted to the Board.

Mr. Ribeiro stated that all this information would be up on the website on a more regular basis. Chair Hultin asked Mr. Ribeiro to explain where all this information could be found. Mr. Ribeiro stated that it could be accessed under the Zoning Board of Appeals page, but it is also kept on the home page showing the illustrated site plan and Cloverleaf 40B.

Chair Hultin suggested that Mr. O'Reilly explain the handout. Mr. O'Reilly stated that they had taken a look at the Subdivision Rules and Regulations starting with roadway standards under Section 3.6. The Bylaw has a separation of roadways to abutting properties to be 25', and we would be seeking a waiver for this particular section of roadway where it is 13' from the pavement to the easterly property line, which is the National Seashore. Design Standards under Appendix 2, Table 2, Type C Road, the Bylaw calls for a 20' wide roadway which is being provided on entrance road, will be provided on southern and northern side of island, and already have it at top. Remaining roads are one-way looped road and they are 14' travel ways with 1' berms, so that would be a waiver. Radius at center line of street is called out at 290' in Regulations and we would be looking for waivers of that. We are providing 35'-40' of center line depending on where you

are on the site. Chair Hultin asked for an explanation of that. Mr. O'Reilly explained that a curb with a radius of 290' is a very gentle curve. He doesn't believe that the 290' center line Bylaw is meant for this type of application. What it is trying to avoid is subdivision roads that turn on very quick angles.

Next one is maximum grade. 8 percent is identified, and we are looking for 10 percent on the entrance road. Chair Hultin explained that while Subdivision Regulations say 8 percent, State fire code says 10 percent is acceptable. Mr. O'Reilly stated that the entrance radiuses Bylaw calls out 30', and we are holding at 30' with the exception of the interior island which is at 15' on the west of the island and 25' on the east of the island. Dead end street limitation is 1,000'. If start at Highland Road and go all the way around the site and stop at bottom of center island it is about 1,200'.

Under Section 4 – Specifications for construction, the Bylaw calls out 18" berms, and we are doing a modified Cape Cod berm which is an angled berm of 12" wide. The Rules and Regulations also call out trees outside the roadway shall remain, and they are looking for a waiver because we have a limit of work that encompasses the entire site and would be looking at disturbing any vegetation within that area as was previously mentioned. Under Section 4.2.4 – Drainage treatment, this is where they talk about vegetative swales incorporated for drainage. We are not providing any vegetative swales because of the topography and limited space and because they take up a tremendous amount of room. Drainage is being handled by solid catch basins. Mr. O'Reilly then explained how the catch basin works.

Mr. Lucy asked to go back to the drainage calculations. Drainage numbers are designed based on a 24-hour, 50-year rainfall, that was calculated at 6¼" of rainfall within a 24-hour period. Mr. Lucy asked when was the last time we had that? Mr. O'Reilly stated that the rainfall amounts are taken from the Mass Highway Stillwater Handbook, that every storm is rated 10, 25, 50 per 24-hour period, that it is anticipated Truro will get 6.23 inches of rain. Design is based on numbers from that manual. Chair Hultin asked Mr. O'Reilly if he knew what the 100-year rainfall numbers would be. Mr. O'Reilly responded that he did not have that information with him as they just started looking at it; however, it is not a function of 2 times (not 12 inches). He will get that number for Ted.

Mr. Malone would like to speak to some of the things on the running list of additional waivers, areas of compliance with the General Bylaws that they had not specifically addressed in the original presentation. General Bylaws, Section 3, Handicapped Parking – we do comply with the handicapped parking provisions with the exception of an accessible van location that requires that the space be 12' wide by 20' long with crosshatched aisle of 8' wide allowing a van to operate a lift. Not designed this into the plan but will by working with the spaces they have to achieve that.

Mr. Malone addressed the outdoor lighting which had been mentioned by the Planning Board report, and they will comply fully with Section 6 Outdoor Lighting in the General Bylaws.

Regarding the soil removal that had been brought up at a previous meeting, General Bylaws Section 8 Soil Removal requires that the Building Commissioner issue a permit based on information provided as to what the cut and fill and any removal of earth from the site would be.

Our only waiver request is that the Zoning Board of Appeals issue that soil removal permit in lieu of the Building Commissioner. Mr. Lucy asked if they knew how much fill might be in the site. Mr. Malone shared a printout of calculations based on their engineered site plans and Williams Building Company who had done the cost estimating. There are four different categories: Cut & Stockpile – 1,270 Cubic Yards (cut groundcover and “duff layer” for reuse); Cut & Fill – 7,990 cubic yards (cut from elevation 55’ to 62’ at center (east) of site and fill at rear (northeast) of site elevation 36’ to 46’; Excavate & Backfill – 5,122 cubic yards for building foundations; and Cut & Remove – 7,212 cubic yards (cut from access roadway and cut from elevation 55’ to 62’ and remove/export from site).

Attorney Barbara Huggins Carboni asked to offer comment on that. She agrees with the applicant that it is appropriate to ask for a waiver from a requirement that the Building Inspector issue a separate permit, but this would be another area for the Board to get the advice of the Building Commissioner regarding the numbers or have the peer review address this as well.

Regarding the Site Plan Review requirements of the Zoning Bylaws, Mr. Malone stated that he had submitted to the Town Planner the Checklist the Planning Board uses to determine compliance with all the provisions but that is to be reviewed by the Town Planner and perhaps the Planning Board as well. They are in the process of determining Section 50.2 of the Zoning Bylaws regarding building gross floor area and if they will need a waiver from that as well as the general dimensional requirements.

John Thornley had a question referencing the Planning Board stating that this may include measures such as white noise, back-up chimes on vehicles, sound barriers, etc. Will any of that be done? Mr. Malone stated that he believes that there are provisions under the building code that recognize construction noise; there are safety reasons for the back-up bells for the protection of people working on the site. Dust mitigation and erosion mitigation are definitely part of their plan and they are in the process of drafting the stormwater pollution protection plan. Have a draft that needs review by one of their environmental consultants. Mr. Malone stated that they will address the dust, but he is not sure how to protect immediate abutters from construction noise. There are significant untouched buffer areas between the two immediate abutters to the north and to the east. Believes the Town sets a limit to between 7:00 am and 7:00 pm – this is to be confirmed. Ms. Townsend asked Mr. Malone if there would be something available for abutters to reference as to when the big machines will be working and for how many days, etc. Mr. Malone stated that the Zoning Board could put that as a condition of permitting.

Chair Hultin stated that the next Agenda item is the review of the Planning Board criteria list. Chair Hultin asked the Board if they had a chance to review the criteria. Chair Hultin and Vice Chair Todd believe that this item should be continued and asked Mr. Ribeiro his thoughts. Mr. Ribeiro replied that he thought it was a good idea and that they could revisit that next week and go through it. Thinks it would be very useful to start going through what kind of mitigation measures they want the applicant to explore for each of those areas as a group next week. Mr. Malone stated that Mr. O’Reilly would not be at the next meeting and invited comment directed to Mr. O’Reilly to address now. Chair Hultin asked a question regarding the T at the top of the solid catch basin. Mr. O’Reilly responded that the catch basin is solid, has a bottom, doesn’t leach. There is a T that extends down below the liquid level of the catch basin that remains full at all times, or it should.

It acts very much like a septic tank. It prevents solids from getting out into the leaching facility. It is a 12" pipe that flows into the leaching facility for the drainage. Chair Hultin asked that it doesn't connect to any storm water pipe that is under Highland Road. Mr. O'Reilly responded that they own and control all their site drainage. Mr. Malone showed a Highland Road storm drain, viewed on screen, that is part of the Highland Road right-of-way, that connects to a pipe that goes all the way down to Pilgrim Pond. However, there will be a berm at the end to retain water so that these catch basins on our site are gathering that water and will not be utilizing that. These leach chambers for road drainage will be shuffled around because of the new design. It will be on the next version of the site plan.

Mr. Lucy asked Mr. O'Reilly to go back to the schematic of the septic plan. Mr. Lucy inquired about the trunk line that takes all the sewerage from the units into the initial tank – 6"? Mr. O'Reilly replied that it will be a 6" main trunk. The drawing being viewed is not a construction level drawing. The pipe from the building to the first primary tank is a 6" line. As was discussed with Ms. Beebe, once they get to a construction permit set, would be location of clean-outs along the trunk line, where they would be located, how they would be accessed. Mr. O'Reilly stated that there are two main trunk lines that will be 6" and everything else will be 4" coming out of the buildings. Mr. O'Reilly explained, using the plan on-screen, which lines would be 4" and which would be 6" and how that pertained to the 10 houses, and should be "beefed up". Mr. Lucy stated that he believed code requires them to be 6" minimum.

Mr. Lucy asked Mr. O'Reilly to go back to the schematic again for pump dosing calculations. Mr. O'Reilly stated that these pump dosing calculations are pretty standard when doing a pressure dose system and explained in detail how that would work. Mr. Lucy asked about the two liberty pumps, 1 hp. Mr. O'Reilly stated that it was an error and should be two liberty pumps, 2 hp.

Chair Hultin asked if it was known what the total amperage for this project would be and do you need to get any engineering done by Eversource to make that happen? Mr. Malone responded by stating that those calculations have not been done by any of his engineers. Mr. Lucy asked if the roof and structure were solar ready. Mr. Malone responded that certain sections of roof are considered solar ready.

Public Comment Period

Chair Hultin asked Jan Worthington if she would like to be first. Ms. Worthington identified herself. Ms. Worthington stated that, as a former firefighter/EMT on our Truro Department, she knows they do not have a ladder truck and does not believe there is a building as high as this in town with this many people in it. She thanked the Planning Board for bringing that up. It is a concern to her as to how a fire rescue could take place in that building without a ladder truck. Ms. Worthington spoke about the mutual aid system and noted that there is a ladder truck in both Wellfleet and Provincetown; however, consider time taken to get to people for rescue. Ms. Worthington directed a question to Mr. O'Reilly: when talking about the fire trucks going up the driveway, were you saying that part of the truck is not on the pavement? Did I hear you correctly? Mr. O'Reilly responded yes but explained the wheels are on the pavement but the gap between the side of the wheels and the front bumper and the side of the truck are not. They will get over the side of the berm, but the tires actually remain on the pavement. Ms. Worthington thanked Mr.

O'Reilly but restated that the whole thing concerns her regarding getting large equipment to that big building to rescue people.

Hank Keenan, Highland Road, identified himself. Mr. Keenan was wondering if something had been worked out with the State to improve the quality of Highland Road itself. Poor condition and worried about all this traffic and what its going to do to the condition of the road. Chair Hultin responded that he was guessing the answer was no. Mr. Keenan stated that he thought it was worth mentioning, and Chair Hultin agreed, and reiterated about the current poor condition. Chair Hultin asked Town Planner, Mr. Ribeiro, if there was any coordination with the State and what the State's priorities were regarding their pavements in town. Mr. Ribeiro stated that he felt the DPW Director could answer these questions and would get back to the Board with an answer at their next meeting.

Jon Slater, 13 Tryworks Road, identified himself. Mr. Slater referenced a summary by the Cape Cod Commission that was read at the last meeting. Mr. Slater read that letter on the website today and would like feedback where Cape Cod Commission pointed out that there were some five properties that would likely be affected by the problem of sewerage and the runoff from the site as well as some other properties to the north. One of their suggestions was providing municipal water to those properties as a way of alleviating the problem, and it seems to me that with Cape Cod Commission's suggestion and recommendation that there should be some discussion of that point. Chair Hultin believes that Emily Beebe had an opinion of that and stated the difficulty of picking and choosing which houses get municipal water. It has to be coordinated with the Town of Provincetown Water Department, but it is worthy to investigate further. He believes there is no current provision for this but maybe there should be. Mr. Slater stated that the point would be, as referenced by drilling of alternative wells, that's probably not going to be an option for those people being so close to the actual pollution site, so having town water might be the way around it for them if you are going to go ahead as planned. Chair Hultin stated don't want to refer to it as a pollution site as they are making sure they don't have to. Mr. Slater responded good to hear.

Mr. Ribeiro asked Chair Hultin if he thought reading those paragraphs would be helpful. Mr. Ribeiro stated that he believes what Mr. Slater was referencing were the following paragraphs from Cape Cod Commission's comments, which Mr. Ribeiro read:

The site is not located in a Wellhead Protection Area or Potential Public Water Supply Area relative to public water supply wells. However, non-community public water supply wells are located to the west, south, and northeast of the project site; and private residential wells are located to the southwest and northeast. The southern corner of the project site does extend into the Interim Wellhead Protection Area for the Mamarazzi Restaurant non-community supply well.

The project is proposed to be served by a Title V compliant septic system. Based on a preliminary calculation performed by Commissions staff, the project's sitewide nitrogen loading concentration (based on a proposed design flow for 70 bedrooms and 7700 gallons per day) would be nearly 19 mg/L. Groundwater flow at the site appears to be generally to the west/southwest, but without local water table measurements it is not possible to more precisely determine the direction of groundwater flow or likely path of septic system effluent.

Mr. Ribeiro thinks that this is one of the key things as to why we are doing the peer review.

Susan Howe, 12 Houser Way, identified herself. Ms. Howe asked how much longer the public hearings will go on for people to ask questions and express their feelings. Chair Hultin responded by stating that minimally there would be two more hearings, but there is no limit to the number that may be necessary, therefore there is plenty of opportunity ahead. Chair Hultin stated that there would be a meeting next Thursday at 5:30 and that there would be at least a two-week break before any further hearings. Ms. Howe responded by stating that there would be hearings in January as well. Chair Hultin responded yes. Ms. Howe stated that was great; she thinks it important to take your time and think this through very carefully as there is so much at stake here and she feels that is important. Ms. Howe thanked the Board for their due diligence.

Mr. Slater took the podium again. He inquired if the timeframe was 180 days from November 21 and within that timeframe a decision has to be made. Chair Hultin stated extensions can be requested and granted and an extension can go beyond 180 days. Mr. Slater stated that he thought it should be looked into as his understanding was that it could not and would default automatically to the developer. Attorney Carboni stated that the Board has 180 days to have the Public Hearing open, and it can be extended by agreement with the applicant, and then an additional 40 days to render a decision and file it with the Town Clerk.

Steve Tarantal, 6 Tryworks Road, identified himself. Mr. Tarantal questioned whether there was any way a pedestrian could enter as he did not believe there was a sidewalk to be used. Mr. O'Reilly explained, using the colored plan viewed on screen, that there is a sidewalk planned from Highland running up the eastern side of the way.

A Zoning Board Member stated that the Planning Board brought this up in their concerns – are you planning on a sidewalk over to the bus stop? Chair Hultin stated that it might be explored. Mr. Malone stated that he believes that was suggested in one of the reports, by the Cape Cod Commission, so we don't have any ability to construct on the State-owned land, but as part of the Town's application for MassWorks funding for the water line that could be explored.

Public comment was made by a gentleman who did not identify himself. He asked if the Board was satisfied with what they have so far on the septic system, where it goes, the flow of it. All of these things that have come up on the screen. Chair Hultin responded by stating that they are seeking a peer review consultant, and they are going to come up with their opinion as to it. The Board Members are not septic or hydrologic experts so... The gentleman again asked, so you are satisfied? Chair Hultin stated we are taking the information and processing it. The gentleman asked, so we will know when and who has been hired. Chair Hultin responded yes, you will.

Chair Hultin stated that the next Hearing date is next week at 5:30 pm and asked Town Planner, Jeffrey Ribeiro, to comment on the planned topics of coverage next week. Mr. Ribeiro stated that he believed they had received a lot of good input during the discussions, so he will put them together in a Staff Report where we can go through all of those issues and also respond to Ted's comments that he has provided, and start talking about some of the conditions that could be imposed, e.g., a time of day restriction on construction, provision of an operating and management

plan for the stormwater system to make sure that operates the way it is supposed to, and go from there. In advance of next week, maybe think about when in January would make sense to pick up the Hearings just to have your schedules in mind because we will have to continue to a day/time/place certain. Chair Hultin suggested they have some of the discussion now. We have a meeting scheduled next week and then none scheduled until January. Chair Hultin discussed the Board's availability for meeting in January, and January 16 was agreed on but to be reviewed further at the next meeting.

Chair Hultin asked if there were any further comments; there were none.

Chair Hultin made a motion to continue the Public Hearing to December 19, 2019 at 5:30 pm in this room, Truro Town Hall, in Truro. Chris Lucy seconded the motion. No further discussion on that motion. Chair Hultin called this meeting to be continued next week, Thursday, 5:30 pm. So voted: 7-0, unanimous. Meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,



Elizabeth Sturdy

