



Town of Ashland , Office of Conservation

MEETING MINUTES
ASHLAND CONSERVATION COMMISSION
February 2, 2026

1
2
3
4
5
6 Present: Gregory Wands (Chair)
7 Carl Hakansson (Vice Chair)
8 Owen Ackerman
9 Preston Crow (Attended Remotely)
10 Gene Crouch
11 William Moulton (Attended Remotely)
12
13

14 Agent: Becca Solomon
15 Assistant: Sofia Chrisafideis
16

17 **Meeting held in person in the Select Board Room and remotely via zoom**
18 **Call to order: 7:00 P.M.**
19

20 **Chair Gregory Wands read the Ashland Conservation Commission virtual meeting protocols, and meeting**
21 **recording announcement. Mr. Wands announced that the Conservation Commission was implementing a**
22 **three-minute limit for each resident comment per hearing.**
23

24 **Notice of Intent, 61 Waverly Street, Map 15 Parcel 12, The Gutierrez Company, DEP 95-1016**

25 Mr. Wands stated that the Commission is looking to discuss subsurface geology and the structural integrity
26 of the culvert. Mr. Lopez (The Gutierrez Company) summarized that the team did submit a full response
27 package to the initial peer review from GCG Associates (GCG) (Engineering Firm, Representing the
28 Conservation Commission in the stormwater design review) and Beals and Thomas (Environmental
29 Specialists, representing the Conservation Commission in the wetlands review), and have received the
30 second review from GCG today, which will need to be reviewed further by the team before they can
31 comment on that. Mr. Hakansson asked that Mr. Mike Carter and Mr. Gorman (Wetlands Specialist, Beals
32 and Thomas) discuss the issues they had identified in the secondary review.
33

34 Mr. Carter (Professional Engineer and Land Surveyor, GCG Associates) responded that the design still has
35 stormwater runoff leaving the site in the 100-year storm over 1 cubic foot per second (CFS) in certain areas,
36 GCG had asked for a ledge profile as a corner of an infiltration system was identified to be on top of ledge,
37 and had also asked for more information regarding ledge in proximity to catch basins (CBs) in the parking lot
38 adjacent to Waverly Street, as it appeared that ledge could be removed up to 6-feet down below the surface
39 of bedrock. Mr. Carter continued, that there is an increased risk in fracturing the ledge and potentially
40 allowing water to seep down onto Waverly Street. Mr. Carter added that GCG did review the hydrology of
41 the site and offered some suggestions to mitigate this, such as making their infiltration and detention basins

42 slightly larger. Mr. Carter added that the Applicant offered to replace the 12-inch drain line in Waverly
43 Street from the existing catch basin at the end of the proposed driveway to the cross culvert under Waverly
44 Street, and that the Applicant plans to submit those designs later on, which may not be agreeable with the
45 Commission, as they would be approving work within the 100-ft Buffer Zone without an engineered and
46 designed replacement plan. Mr. Hakansson asked Mr. Carter if those are the only unaddressed issues. Mr.
47 Carter responded that there are minor nuances that would be addressed with those larger issues he had
48 mentioned, and that if the Applicant chooses to not do that, they must prove that the excess runoff does
49 not impact downstream wetlands resource areas. Mr. Hakansson summarized that there are three main
50 issues with the current proposal; the presence of ledge, peak runoff summaries showing an increase of
51 runoff in proposed conditions, and structural integrity of the culvert.

52
53 Mr. Gorman summarized that Beals and Thomas were asked to review specific portions of the wetland
54 delineation, one being a portion of the northernmost stream as well as two additional areas of bordering
55 vegetated wetland (BVW), using the presence of hydrophytic vegetation. Mr. Gorman explained that these
56 changes resulted in the BVW and associated BZ growing slightly, and is under the impression that the
57 Applicant has agreed to all of the changes suggested in their initial review. Mr. Gorman added that the plan
58 has been revised to include erosion and sedimentation control blankets, and that there is one outstanding
59 comment regarding snow storage areas, but will defer to GCG as that comment is more relevant in the
60 stormwater design. Mr. Hakansson asked the Applicant to respond to Beals and Thomas' comments.

61 Mr. Park (Project Engineer, SMMA, Representing the Applicant) explained that the snow storage areas are
62 now shown on the revised plans and are proposed to be within the parking lot, and that the snow storage
63 areas do not cover catch basins (CBs). Mr. Lopez agreed with Mr. Gorman's assessment of the wetlands
64 review and SMMA's response.

65
66 Mr. Hakansson stated that one of their concerns is whether work in bedrock by blasting or other means of
67 removal, might result in a change of water retained by the wetlands resource areas, and that in GCG's
68 response to a similar question, the wetland was described as a losing system, and asked for clarification on
69 that that meant. Mr. Carter responded that the design points (DPs) are split up so that they can model what
70 currently drains to each DP, and how that may look once developed. Mr. Carter continued, that they want to
71 ensure that the wetlands are not losing water, and that the concern over the ledge is whether blasting may
72 cause fissures and an excess of water to flow on the site during construction. Mr. Hakansson asked what is
73 meant by a losing system. Mr. Norton (Geologist, Sanborn Head and Associates, representing the Applicant)
74 responded that there is a distinction between whether water is feeding into the system, or if water is leaving
75 the system. Mr. Norton explained that the wetland was described as being "perched", with an accumulation
76 of fines and organic material, and that a "perched system" will still lose water into the ground, but at a
77 slower rate. Mr. Crouch responded that most wetlands are both, where in the summer wetlands lose water,
78 and in the spring, they gain water, and a wetland system generally cannot be solely described as a losing or
79 gaining system. Mr. Hakansson asked if the proposed changes will raise or lower the water level in the
80 wetlands. Mr. Park responded that Mr. Norton explained at a previous hearing that the test pits taken on
81 site show a general lack of groundwater above bedrock, and that it is their combined professional opinion
82 that the removal of ledge will not cause an inflow of water onto the site or leaving the site. Mr. Park
83 continued that they have proposed a perimeter drain and have placed their infiltration basins on the
84 wetland side of the ledge ridge, so that the water infiltrating into the soil will naturally feed the wetland.
85 Mr. Park continued, that between these alterations, that they believe the wetland will remain replenished,
86 and that the water "budget" should remain unchanged. Mr. Crouch explained that, based on the bedrock
87 model, there is a ridge across the site (the ridge being the shallowest portion of bedrock) and that on either
88 side of that ridge, the bedrock dips downward in two directions; toward the wetlands and toward the
89 intersection of Waverly Street and East Union Street. Mr. Crouch continued, that subsurface infiltration

90 system (SIS)-1 (larger system behind the proposed building footprint) appears to be pitched towards
91 Waverly Street, and that any stormwater infiltrated from that system will follow the contours of the bedrock
92 surface. Mr. Crouch added that SIS-2 (smaller system adjacent to the wetland) does appear to be pitched
93 toward the wetland, and agreed that water infiltrated from this system would flow to the wetland, and
94 asked if both SISs emulate existing conditions. Mr. Park responded that the SISs are designed in such a way
95 that infiltrated water should mimic the drainage patterns of existing conditions, and that the bottom
96 elevation of SIS-1 is relatively low compared to the surface elevation of Waverly Street. Mr. Park further
97 explained that he does not expect water to infiltrate and flow horizontally out of SIS-1 and onto Waverly
98 Street. Mr. Park continued, that Sanborn and Head interpolated the surface of bedrock from what was seen
99 above soil on site and from test pit data. Mr. Park added, that on the C-131 Grading and Drainage Plan, they
100 have called out bedrock water migration prevention measures, which will either be a premanufactured anti-
101 seep collar (rubber diaphragm along the outside of a pipe to stop/slow water flow), or a bentonite clay dam
102 placed about 100-ft apart from each other along the length of utility trenches and along the berm of the
103 surface detention basin. Mr. Park added that, in response to Mr. Carter's previous comment regarding ledge
104 in close proximity or enveloping proposed CBs, the final grade can be modified to limit the amount of ledge
105 removal in that area (CB 2-2 and CB 2-3 on sheet C-131 Grading and Drainage, plan set dated 1/23/26).
106 Mr. Crouch suggested including a shallow sump CB that ties onto a deep sump drain manhole to mitigate
107 the need to remove ledge. Mr. Park responded that they can look into that. Mr. Crouch asked which
108 infiltration system has to be partially built into the bedrock as previously described by Mr. Carter. Mr. Carter
109 clarified that the bottom left corner of SIS-2 may have to be built into the ledge. Mr. Park responded that,
110 for a majority of the system, 4 feet of separation will be maintained, and that they do not dispute that a
111 corner of the system may be impacted by an area of shallow bedrock, and reiterated that their site design
112 limits the removal of ledge to the maximum extent practicable, and that in only small pockets would ledge
113 removal be required. Mr. Park added that GCG did recommend additional test pits in this area to fine-tune
114 bedrock elevation estimations under SIS-2, and would have test pits witnessed in front of the Town if
115 required. Mr. Crouch asked what the ramifications are in the case that this would require additional ledge
116 removal, and if a mounding analysis would be required. Mr. Park responded that chambers nearest to a
117 suspected area of shallow bedrock could be moved to an alternate side of the system, or alternatively, other
118 municipalities have allowed a small portion of bedrock to be removed to create the required 2-foot
119 separation with approval from the Town Engineer or Conservation Agent. Ms. Solomon added that the
120 minor modification policy that the Commission requires for such field changes has been waived with other
121 bylaws, and that any field revisions would have to be approved by the Commission through an amended
122 Order of Conditions (OOC). Mr. Crouch added that if the footprint of the system is modified, that could lead
123 to the modification of nearby utility layouts as well. Mr. Park responded that he is confident that the
124 applicant team will be able to accommodate any field modifications, if required. Mr. Moulton asked if
125 corrugated metal pipe (CMP) would be used and asked if the life expectancy of CMP is known. Mr. Park
126 responded that the life expectancy of CMP is roughly 75-100 years, and that they are requiring that each
127 pipe be draped with an impermeable membrane, especially drain lines located underneath the parking lots
128 due to the introduction of road salts. Mr. Moulton stated that in the Long-Term Operations and
129 Maintenance Plan, stormwater infrastructure inspections are required annually for the drainage systems,
130 and asked if this would be done with cameras. Mr. Park responded that subsurface systems typically have
131 inspection ports, and that inspections could also take place at the inlet and outlet points of each structure.
132 Mr. Moulton asked if each system only has two inspection ports. Mr. Park responded that if the detail for
133 the SIS does not specify the number of inspection ports, that can be added to the detail or the number of
134 inspection ports can be revised per the Commission's recommendation. Mr. Carter added that an inspection
135 port at every other row would be adequate, however, too many inspection ports could introduce structural
136 issues and increased risk of chamber jams. Mr. Crouch asked if the systems have isolator rows. Mr. Park
137 responded that all infiltration and detention systems on site use water quality units (WQUs) as pretreatment

138 rather than isolator rows. Mr. Crouch stated that the detail notes for the Contech™ CDS Cascade WQUs
139 included a general description of the unit, and asked what the TSS removal efficiency of the units are.
140 Mr. Park explained that in the review provided by GCG, there were questions regarding the TSS removal
141 treatment train calculations, and explained that “treatment train” refers to all of the best management
142 practices in which stormwater passes through to meet pollutant removal rates as set by the Massachusetts
143 Stormwater Standards. Mr. Crouch responded that the manufacturer’s TSS removal rates are inflated.
144 Mr. Park responded that they rely on third party testing for their TSS removal rates, such as the New Jersey
145 Corporation for Advanced Technology (NJCAT). The Commission continued to discuss the TSS removal rates.
146 Mr. Hakansson summarized that Mr. Park is confident that the infiltration and detention systems will not be
147 impacted by bedrock, and that those that are within close proximity to shallow bedrock will meet the
148 separation requirements. Mr. Park confirmed. Mr. Hakansson asked Mr. Carter if he agreed. Mr. Carter
149 confirmed.

150
151 Mr. Crouch stated that these infiltration structures have to be protected from compaction, and expressed
152 concern that construction machinery and equipment may compact soils and limit infiltrative potential of
153 soils. Mr. Park responded that Mr. Crouch may be referring to the MassDEP regulation protecting native soil,
154 and that the two larger systems will comprise of 48” CMP chambers and are rated for extreme weight.
155 Mr. Crouch reiterated that the compaction issue is not related to post-construction, but during construction.
156 Mr. Carter explained that the areas where the infiltration systems will be installed should be protected from
157 machinery during construction. Mr. Park agreed, and added that the systems will be the first thing installed
158 on site so that the soils are not compacted. Mr. Park responded that the contractor will be aware of that.

159
160 Ms. Walker (123 Waverly Street) asked who will monitor these conditions as construction is taking place.
161 Mr. Wands responded that the Building Inspector as well as the Conservation Agent will be inspecting the
162 site regularly. Mr. Hakansson asked if there was a regular inspector approved by the Zoning Board of
163 Appeals (ZBA). Mr. Lopez responded that as a part of the ZBA agreement, the Town can hire a peer reviewer
164 to ensure that all plans between all departments are the same and as permitted, there will be an on-site
165 meeting with Town staff and consultants, and ongoing reporting that the contractor will provide to the
166 Town periodically throughout construction. Mr. Hakansson asked if the conditions in the ZBA Decision were
167 finalized. Mr. Lopez confirmed. Mr. Hakansson asked that, if there will be a peer reviewer looking at
168 Conservation-related items, that Conservation Commission be included in that conversation. Mr. Lopez
169 agreed. Ms. Walker asked what would happen in the scenario that post-construction conditions do not
170 mimic what was proposed or modelled. Mr. Hakansson responded that the Commission cannot guarantee
171 outcomes, however, if a portion of the design does fail, it depends on what aspect fails (in regards to
172 jurisdiction). Mr. Park added that the Operations and Maintenance Plan will be recorded with the
173 Massachusetts Registry of Deeds and will require the owner to inspect and maintain the stormwater system
174 as needed. Mr. Wands asked if a robust dewatering plan will be submitted. Mr. Park responded that they do
175 not have definitive direction on a dewatering plan, however, they expect that the contractor will provide
176 such as a part of the preconstruction documentation and review. Mr. Lopez clarified that based on
177 information gathered, water has not been observed to a meaningful degree, and that prior to construction,
178 a subsequent geotechnical report will be completed which will be used to formulate a dewatering plan
179 appropriate for site conditions.

180
181 Mr. Johnson, 4 Roberts Road, asked if wells will be drilled for residential water use, and if there is a known
182 length along bedrock that will be removed for the foundation of the building. Mr. Park responded that
183 Town water will be used. Mr. Park continued, that based on the depth of utilities and foundations from the
184 design, Sanborn and Head has highlighted in blue on the site design plan where ledge is expected to be
185 removed, which is limited to the two interior corners of the building footprint and at portions along utility

186 trenches. Mr. Hakansson asked Mr. Park to clarify the location at which ledge outcropping is visible from
187 Waverly Street in relation to shallow bedrock at a proposed drain line. Mr. Park explained that the
188 highlighted portion parallel to Waverly Street shows that additional ledge may have to be removed for utility
189 trenching, and that the trenches are proposed to be 5 feet deep and would have bedrock water migration
190 mitigation measures included, as previously described. Mr. Carter responded that his largest concern
191 regarding ledge is the potential for shallow bedrock at CBs 2-2 and 2-3. Mr. Crouch and Mr. Carter continued
192 to discuss these CBs in relation to shallow bedrock.

193
194 Mr. Crouch stated that the bioretention system has been changed to a subsurface detention system, and
195 asked if Mr. Carter has had a chance to look at that revised design. Mr. Carter responded that the letter that
196 GCG submitted today discussed that revised design, and that he and Mr. Ma (GCG Associates, Professional
197 Engineer) have gone over a few recommendations that would help their design. Mr. Park agreed, and
198 explained that the bioretention system was abandoned and replaced with the subsurface detention system
199 to further decrease the proposed-conditions peak discharge rate (PDR) as much as possible.

200
201 Mr. Park explained that GCG has provided comments to the PDR summary, and that they do believe further
202 adjustments can be made and are confident that the proposed PDRs for the 2-year storm has been met, and
203 will work to further decrease the PDRs for the 10- and 100-year storms. Mr. Park added that Massachusetts
204 Stormwater Standard 2 requires that the proposed PDRs either meet or are less than the existing rates, and
205 that the 100-year PDRs do not impact downstream resource areas. Mr. Park added that there remains a
206 chance that one or two DPs may still have a negligible increase in proposed PDRs, and that a comment letter
207 received by Ms. Solomon discussed concerns regarding PDRs in relation to existing stormwater
208 infrastructure in Waverly Street, and that their proposed PDRs for the 100-year storm translates to
209 stormwater infrastructure working at 60% flow capacity. Mr. Park continued that similarly, for DP-2, the 1.36
210 CFS for the 100-year storm will raise the water level in the wetland by 2 inches, which may not even be
211 enough to discharge out of the PVC pipe at the northern end of the wetland, and if it does make it out of the
212 pipe, stormwater would have to travel an additional 380-feet through a densely vegetated swale and
213 through another 12" RCP pipe before entering the stone-box culvert going across Waverly Street. Mr. Park
214 continued, that they will continue to work with the model to decrease the PDRs, and reiterated that there
215 still may be a slight, negligible increase. Mr. Hakansson stated that during preconstruction, most stormwater
216 drains southwesterly, and that post construction, most stormwater flows northeasterly, and asked why this
217 is significant. Mr. Park responded that drainage patterns on-site are not dramatically changing. Mr. Carter
218 clarified that GCG is ensuring that runoff is balanced on site. Mr. Carter continued, that water exits the site
219 at two points; at the site entrance/exit at East Union Street flowing towards the public safety building, and
220 at the site entrance/exit onto Waverly Street. Mr. Crouch asked that the sheet flow exiting the site at the
221 Waverly Street egress would be part of DP-1. Mr. Park responded that their modelling shows that water
222 sheet-flows over the road, and is not part of DP-1. Mr. Carter added that the site is close to being balanced,
223 and that his largest concern is the proposed PDR for the 100-year storm at DP-1. Mr. Carter continued, that
224 a CB grate typically has a peak discharge allowance of 2 CFS, and that even during a 100-year storm, that CB
225 would be able to capture runoff for an 8.22-inch (over 24-hour period), 100-year storm.

226
227 Mr. Hakansson explained that at the last meeting, Mr. Park stated that, in order to meet PDR requirements,
228 much of the reserved greenspace would have to be cleared, and asked if other options were explored.
229 Mr. Park responded that they are confident that they can make the numbers work essentially as designed,
230 without having to go forward with the worst-case scenarios as previously discussed at the last hearing.
231 Mr. Crouch stated that the Commission requires further justification that downstream wetland resource
232 areas will not be impacted by even the smallest increase in peak discharge rates, and suggested that this be
233 submitted in writing in further detail. Mr. Park agreed, and added that the stone-box culvert has been

234 highlighted in a memo to the Conservation Agent dated 1/29/26, and that the capacity of that culvert was
235 calculated to be just over 71 CFS. Mr. Carter agreed that the stone-box culvert does have a large capacity,
236 and added that the culvert is reliant on a 12-in RCP pipe at the inlet, which restricts the capacity of the
237 culvert, and suggested holding all stormwater on site rather than relying on drainage to carry even a small
238 increase in post-condition flows. Mr. Carter explained the existing layout of the culvert in Waverly Street.
239 Mr. Crouch asked if there is a DP (Design Point) that includes the stream and downstream areas. Mr. Park
240 confirmed there is not, due to the unknowns in regards to stormwater infrastructure at surrounding
241 properties, and that the undeveloped portion of the site to the northwest of the wetland area was not
242 considered in their drainage calculations. Mr. Crouch asked if there is a potential that more water is flowing
243 through the culvert than anticipated, as that area was not considered. Mr. Carter responded that if that was
244 considered, the capacity of the 12-inch RCP may already be exceeded. Mr. Arnold reiterated that the 100-
245 year storm drops 8.22 inches of rain over a 24-hour period, and explained that the wetland is shaped as a
246 bowl and acts as a naturally-formed detention area, and that there would be more concern over stormwater
247 leaving the site if the water level in the wetland were to rise 6 inches or more.
248

249 Mr. Carter reiterated that the Applicant has offered to replace the 12-in, 150-linear-foot drain line in
250 Waverly Street, and asked that the Commission discuss whether that design should be reviewed alongside
251 the development proposal. Mr. Lopez agreed that they have offered to replace that RCP, however, are
252 under the impression that it is too early in the process to have those design plans reviewed by the
253 Commission. Mr. Lopez added that intense discussion with the DPW will have to take place and that the
254 DPW will have to review and approve the final plans, and are proposing that the design be done as a
255 condition to receiving an OOC. Mr. Hakansson asked if the pipe replacement was included as a condition in
256 the ZBA Decision. Mr. Lopez responded that it was not, and that they have heard the Commission's concerns
257 regarding the RCP pipe in the roadway and have volunteered to replace the drain line as a condition to the
258 OOC, and stated that the team does not believe that this replacement will be a critical part to their proposed
259 drainage system. Mr. Lopez added that they have observed that the pipe is impacted, though it is their
260 current understanding that its current condition does not compact the resiliency of the design.

261 Mr. Hakansson asked if Mr. Lopez would be willing to reinforce the stone culvert in addition to replacing
262 that drain line. Mr. Lopez responded that at this point, he cannot say, as that is an additional level of
263 infrastructure work than they are comfortable pursuing. Mr. Lopez continued, that there are many
264 contributing flows going to that culvert currently and that their proposed peak runoff amounts minimally
265 contribute to those existing flows. Mr. Small (DPW Director) responded that the replacement of that drain
266 line can be tied to the Road Opening Permit (ROP), which is already required as a part of the ZBA conditions.
267 Mr. Hakansson asked that Mr. Small is agreeing with Mr. Lopez, that the replacement of that drain line be
268 done through the ROP, subsequent to the issuance of an OOC. Mr. Small confirmed, and added that
269 insurance that the replacement is completed will be held to the applicant through the issuance of an
270 Occupancy Permit. Mr. Lopez agreed. Mr. Crouch responded that the Commission can handle the pipe
271 replacement as a condition to the OOC, and completion would also tie into the issuance of a Certificate of
272 Compliance. Mr. Lopez acknowledged that all improvements to the site would have to be completed before
273 an Occupancy Permit can be issued. Ms. Solomon added that, using MassMapper to estimate wetland
274 locations, that the replacement of the drain line may require the filing of a Request for Determination of
275 Applicability (RDA) at the least. Mr. Lopez responded that the drain line replacement, if it were to be
276 included as a condition to the OOC, would be permitted through the OOC. Mr. Carter explained that because
277 the drain line is within the Commission's jurisdiction, that they may want to include a condition for their
278 review of the design plans of the drain line. Mr. Park responded that they will expand the viewport of the
279 design plans to portray a conceptual drain line replacement with the associated buffer zones, other utility
280 lines, brief sequencing notes, and coordination with DPW and construction will occur prior to occupancy.
281 Mr. Crouch added that the Commission will not need to see much more than that conceptual layout and a

282 profile. Mr. Small added that the DPW would be doing a majority of the review for the drain line
283 replacement.

284
285 Mr. Park confirmed that the Commission would be amenable to receiving the dewatering plan from the
286 contractor subsequent to the issuance of an OOC. The Commission agreed. Ms. Solomon suggested that a
287 condition be included requiring that the Commission reviews the dewatering plan, once provided, before
288 construction may begin. The Commission and the applicant team scheduled the next hearing on March 2nd,
289 2026, and another hearing on March 16th, 2026.

290
291 **Motion:** Mr. Hakansson moved to continue the hearing for the Notice of Intent at 61 Waverly Street, Map
292 15 Parcel 12, DEP 95-1016 to March 2, 2026, at 7:05 PM. The motion was seconded by Mr. Crow.

293 **Vote:** The motion passed with a 6-0-0 vote. (Rollcall vote: OA, PC, GC, CH, WM, GW)

294

295 **Review Minutes from 1/12/2026:**

296 **1/12/2026 Meeting Minutes:**

297 The Commission reviewed and edited the January 12, 2026 meeting minutes.

298

299 **Motion:** Mr. Hakansson moved to approve the January 12, 2026 meeting minutes as discussed. The motion
300 was seconded by Mr. Crow.

301 **Vote:** The motion passed with a 6-0-0 vote. (Rollcall vote: OA, PC, GC, CH, WM, GW)

302

303 **Member Prerogative:**

304 Mr. Hakansson confirmed the next hearing dates with Ms. Solomon.

305

306 **Meeting Adjournment:**

307 **Motion:** Mr. Hakansson moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Crow.

308 **Vote:** The motion passed with a 6-0-0 vote. (Rollcall vote: OA, PC, GC, CH, WM, GW)

309

310 **The meeting was adjourned at 9:16 PM.**

311

312 **Documents Reviewed by the Commission:**

- 313 • Document entitled, Meeting Agenda, dated 2/2/2026
- 314 • Document entitled, Agent Report, dated 2/2/2026
- 315 • Document entitled, Meeting Minutes, dated 1/12/2026
- 316 • Document entitled, 61 Waverly Street NOI, dated 10/29/2025
- 317 • Plans entitled, 61 Waverly Street Drawings, dated 10/29/2025
- 318 • Document entitled, Signed ConCom Letter to ZBA, 61 Waverly Street, dated March 2025
- 319 • Document entitled, Town of Ashland, Mail – ConCom Letter Regarding 40B Waiver Requests 61
320 Waverly St, dated 10/23/2025
- 321 • Document entitled, Proposal for Peer Review Services, Beals and Thomas, 61 Waverly Street, dated
322 12/1/2025
- 323 • Document entitled, Proposal for Peer Review Services, GCG, 61 Waverly Street, dated 11/24/2025
- 324 • Document entitled, Peer Review Draft Scope, SW Management and Drainage Infrastructure, N.D.
- 325 • Document entitled, Applicant's Response to Agent's 1/27/26 letter, dated 1/28/26
- 326 • Document entitled, Agent's Response to Applicant's 1/22/26 Response, dated 1/27/26
- 327 • Document entitled, Applicant's Initial Response to Agent's Comments, dated 1/22/26
- 328 • Document entitled, Applicant's Response to GCG Peer Review Comments, dated 1/22/26

- 329 • Plan entitled, Revised Site Design Plans, dated 1/22/26
- 330 • Document entitled, 25 Year pipe sizing, dated 1/22/26
- 331 • Plan entitled, Bedrock contour plan, dated 1/22/26
- 332 • Document entitled, Contech water quality unit sizing calculations, dated 1/22/26
- 333 • Document entitled, Existing hydrology report, dated 1/22/26
- 334 • Document entitled, Existing Waverly Street 12-in RCP Capacity, dated 1/22/26
- 335 • Document entitled, Infiltration System WQV, dated 1/22/26
- 336 • Document entitled, Peak discharge rate summary, dated 1/22/26
- 337 • Document entitled, Proposed hydrology report, dated 1/22/26
- 338 • Document entitled, Recharge and drawdown, 1/22/26
- 339 • Document entitled, SDS-1 Buoyancy Calculations, 1/22/26
- 340 • Document entitled, TSS Removal, dated 1/22/26
- 341 • Plan entitled, Existing hydrology map, dated 1/23/26
- 342 • Document entitled, O&M Manual, dated 1/23/26
- 343 • Plan entitled, Proposed hydrology map, dated 1/23/26
- 344 • Document entitled, Applicant's Response to Beals and Thomas, dated 1/22/26
- 345 • Plan entitled, C-101 Revised Existing Conditions Plan, dated 1/22/26
- 346 • Document entitled, Revised Wetland Flags, dated 1/23/26
- 347 • Document entitled, Applicant's Response to Agent's 1/27/26 letter, dated 1/28/26
- 348 • Document entitled, Agent's Response to Applicant's 1/22/26 Response, dated 1/27/26
- 349 • Document entitled, Applicant's Initial Response to Agent's Comments, dated 1/22/26
- 350 • Document entitled, Applicant's Response to GCG Peer Review Comments, dated 1/22/26
- 351 • Plan entitled, Revised Site Design Plans, dated 1/22/26
- 352 • Document entitled, 25 Year pipe sizing, dated 1/22/26
- 353 • Plan entitled, Bedrock contour plan, dated 1/22/26
- 354 • Document entitled, Contech water quality unit sizing calculations, dated 1/22/26
- 355 • Document entitled, Existing hydrology report, dated 1/22/26
- 356 • Document entitled, Existing Waverly Street 12-in RCP Capacity, dated 1/22/26
- 357 • Document entitled, Infiltration System WQV, dated 1/22/26
- 358 • Document entitled, Peak discharge rate summary, dated 1/22/26
- 359 • Document entitled, Proposed hydrology report, dated 1/22/26
- 360 • Document entitled, Recharge and drawdown, 1/22/26
- 361 • Document entitled, SDS-1 Buoyancy Calculations, 1/22/26
- 362 • Document entitled, TSS Removal, dated 1/22/26
- 363 • Document entitled, Existing hydrology map, dated 1/23/26
- 364 • Document entitled, O&M Manual, dated 1/23/26
- 365 • Document entitled, Proposed hydrology map, dated 1/23/26
- 366 • Document entitled, Applicant's Response to Beals and Thomas, dated 1/22/26
- 367 • Plan entitled, C-101 Revised Existing Conditions Plan, dated 1/22/26
- 368 • Document entitled, Revised Wetland Flags, dated 1/23/26