

April 29, 2021

Via email Only

David Thorn, Chairman
Holliston Planning Board
Town Hall
703 Washington Street
Holliston MA 01746

Re: Responses to Questions asked in the April 15, 2021 Planning Board Meeting

Chairman Thorn and Members of the Holliston Planning Board:

At the beginning of the April 15, 2021 Planning Board Meeting, the Board directed Applicant and all public participants to follow a meeting structure that consisted of public comment only, without immediate response from the Applicant. The Board also requested that Applicant list all questions asked at such meeting and address same in advance of the next Planning Board meeting scheduled for May 6, 2021.

CRG and the Design Team attended the meeting and reviewed the meeting afterward to list the questions as posed. The following therefore includes the questions asked during the meeting and provides the Applicant's responses to said questions.

Questions

- The World Health Organization has listed diesel exhaust as carcinogenic to humans – can you comment on that and the appropriateness of this development in a residential community?

Response from Attorney Richard Nysten:

The use of diesel fuel to power motor vehicles, including trucks, has been extensively studied and is comprehensively regulated by the EPA and the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection. We firmly commit that the proposed facility will fully comply with all federal and state air quality regulations, including those relating specifically to the use of diesel fuel, and we will accept and abide by a special permit condition to that effect.

- Did the sound engineers actually record sounds from an existing 160 door, 800K SF, 52' tall building or did they use theoretical data?

Response from Gregg Tocci (Cavanaugh Tocci):

Yes. Sound levels produced by trucking activities similar to those at the proposed Warehouse were measured at a similar warehouse facility. These sound levels have been and continue to be used by Cavanaugh Tocci in evaluating sound from other proposed warehouses.

Sound power levels for truck and conveyor door sound emissions were collected at a warehouse that has 270 bay doors. However, the number of bay doors is immaterial to the sound emitted by individual sources. Measurements of individual events were at this facility, and events measured were unrelated to the number of bay doors at the facility.

Truck activity sound emissions are of short duration and have been treated individually as they would rarely if ever occur simultaneously in the same proximity, as has been previously discussed. Hence, the number of bay doors and the size of the facility where measurements were made is not a factor in Project analysis.

The frequency of occurrence of these events depends on the tenant's traffic in and out of the facility. Nevertheless, sound levels at nearest residences for each event are low and all conform to the design goals established for the project.

- What is the length of left turn lane heading west on Route 16? (Parents will get blocked from soccer field taking a left onto Route 16 and heading east)

Response from Scott Thornton (Vanasse & Associates):

The length of the Washington Street left turn lane is approximately 500 feet; however, the typical vehicle queue is 1 to 2 vehicles which would not block the soccer field driveway.

- CRG's traffic engineer said traffic on Hopping Brook Road is "irrelevant" ... rails to trails path might get impacted ... will this be a danger?

Response from Attorney Richard Nysten:

Mr. Thornton's position was that the traffic increase on Hopping Brook Road was not the measuring stick for traffic impacts from the Project. CRG has committed to adjusting the signalization at the Washington Street intersection to maintain the level of service of Route 16.

Response from Scott Thornton (Vanasse & Associates):

In terms of traffic volume increases, the traffic volume increase on Hopping Brook Road from the Project is not relevant to the general public as they do not use the roadway, rather it's the increases on Washington Street resulting from the Project that are pertinent to the general public. With regard to impacts to rail trail traffic, signage will be posted to control vehicle speeds on Hopping Brook Road and in the vicinity of the trail crossing.

- CRG not the owner of the land, correct? (answered "yes" by Board) Owner of land is John Deli Priscoli? When did board start dealing with CRG as its representative? (board answered 'CRG was applicant upfront') When did they apply? ... who owns the land? Did town counsel receive notarized copy of the PSA?

Response from Attorney Richard Nysten:

CRG is the Applicant and filed the Project application and has answered at each meeting as the Applicant. There is no need for the presentation of the P&S Agreement, which is not relevant to the findings of the Board and is not necessary to be a public document.

- CRG made references to an amended site plan – are you considering making a decision on the site plan in conjunction with the special permit? (asserts that amended site plan has not been posted to public ergo violation of open meeting law) – doesn't think that CRG applied for review of amended site plan – (Answered by Jay Talerman – "no open meeting law violation")

Response from Attorney Richard Nysten:

Yes, the Applicant has requested that Site Plan approval be amended by the Planning Board from the approval in March 2020 due to changes in the Site Plan.

- Relative to an email from Tori Kim of MEPA on 2/26/21 to Chip Nylan and Mike Milanoski – it was asked if an air quality study will be completed ... has this been done? (referenced NAAQS)

Response from Attorney Richard Nylan:

MEPA communicated with the Applicant recently with respect to the Notice of Project Change (NPC) with a copy of the 1992 Air Quality Guidance, which requires air quality analysis to be conducted based upon thresholds of average daily trips. The trips generated by the building do not trigger the thresholds for filing. My reply to Ms. Kim is below.

Attorney Richard Nylan's Response to Ms. Kim's question:

"Thank you for the email. I reviewed the Air Quality Guidance attachment to your email. With respect to the air quality thresholds, the change in use has reduced the traffic significantly. You may recall the original MEPA filing of an office complex with 3,000,000 sq. ft. had ADTs between 17k and 35k. With the change to warehouse and other uses, we are presently around 345 ADT under existing uses with another 1310 to be added with the 800,000 sq. ft. warehouse.

We have stated to the Planning Board that we will restrict the use to 1310 ADT for the warehouse which will be included in lease documents and can be enforced by the owner and monitored by the Planning Board. As a result, we are under the 10,000 ADT and even under the 6,000 ADT listed in the attached policy document. I am attaching the filing with DOT that was the basis for the Section 61 findings. Please note on page 9 the numbers that we have projected that are under the cited MEPA thresholds."

- I didn't see any documentation on the town website showing evidence that CRG notified residents – Were any Holliston residents notified? (Board answered yes)

Response from Attorney Richard Nylan:

The Planning Board stated it would post the list on its website.

- The sound study mentioned that noise was taken from two loading docks – but there's 170 – does the study include an extrapolation to include all dock doors?

Response from Gregg Tocci (Cavanaugh Tocci):

Loading docks were reduced from 170 to 160 total with 80 doors per side and dock doors are kept closed for security and ventilation reasons, and only open while trailers are positioned loading or unloading. Even if were to remain open, stationary source sound levels would continue to meet MassDEP sound limits day and night with up to 70 doors open on each side of the building.

- Studies never mention trucks – vehicle trips only – should use LUC 156 – board asked for this and CRG didn't do it

Response from Scott Thornton (Vanasse & Associates):

There is no need for the application of LUC at 155/156 with 1310 ADT agreed to as part of the permit. The truck traffic is addressed in Table 1 of the November 2020 VAI study and included in

all traffic analysis presented to the Board and to its peer reviewer. The auto/truck split is based on the ITE 10th Edition Supplement data which is the latest ITE data available for warehouse uses.

With the traffic signal proposed and paid for by the Applicant at the intersection of Hopping Brook Road, the intersection level-of-service (LOS) will be LOS C or better.

Washington Street currently carries between 300 and 600 trucks per day, based on MassDOT count records so trucks can and do use the road. The Applicant will improve approximately 1,700 feet of Washington Street as part of this project to enhance safety.

As described previously, the notice of project change (NPC) traffic study required as a condition of the MassDOT access permit will review the operations at the 12 intersections included in the previous MEPA traffic study from 2003.

- Various statements about MEPA NPC, endangered species, conservation easement, wastewater treatment plant

Response from Peter Bemis (Engineering Design Consultants):

MEPA has reaffirmed that upon completion of the local site plan and special permit review process the Project would then need to complete the requisite paperwork for completing the NPC process with MEPA.

The Applicant has completed formal review process with the Holliston Conservation Commission with a Negative Determination of Applicability issued that reaffirms the Project has been designed to be outside the jurisdictional limits of the Holliston Conservation Commission.

CRG is aware that New Hopping Brook Trust had been discussing a Conservation Restriction for land areas associated with Hopping Brook located to the west of the 555 Hopping Brook Site and with project approval CRG would remain actively involved in this process in order to assist with implementation of a suitably designated Conservation Restricted Area within the Park.

Compliance with Title 5 and/or MassDEP Water Pollution Control will take place as part of the Project before occupation of the facility.

- Have fire and safety divisions had input in this?

Per Michael Cassidy, Fire Chief / Emergency Management Director memo of 4/29/21:

The department has been involved in the review of this project from the outset. We were first notified of the project by the Town Planner on December 27, 2019, and along with other staff, met with the project engineer on January 3, 2020. Following feedback from town officials, the first set of revised plans were received on February 10, 2020.

- Will they have training for a facility of this size?

Per Michael Cassidy, Fire Chief / Emergency Management Director memo of 4/29/21:

Our personnel are trained to the same standard (NFPA 1001: Standard for Fire Fighter Professional Qualifications) as full-time firefighters staffing neighboring town fire departments.

This national consensus standard identifies the minimum job performance requirements for firefighters whose duties are primarily structural in nature.

- Are there any agreements with surrounding fire departments to aid in the event of an emergency?

Per Michael Cassidy, Fire Chief / Emergency Management Director memo of 4/29/21:

We have mutual aid agreements with nearby departments in accordance with MGL c. 48, section 59A. We are a member of Massachusetts Fire District 14, and have a run card denoting which departments would be requested for an incident up to 10 alarms. The Commonwealth also has a Statewide Fire and EMS Mobilization plan, which provides communities with easy access to resources located outside of their district in the event that district mutual aid has been exhausted or will soon be exhausted.

- Where will water come from in the event of a fire?

Per Michael Cassidy, Fire Chief / Emergency Management Director memo of 4/29/21:

There is a water storage tank, 95' in height, with 1 million gallon storage capacity, located in the industrial park. That tank is part of the municipal water distribution system, which has a combined storage capacity of 5.6 million gallons. Holliston's water is drawn from five groundwater supply wells located on properties throughout town. The DPW Water Department routinely pumps in excess of 1 million gallons per day back into the system from the aquifer.

- Will tenant have harmful materials in the building and who designs an emergency response for the building?

Response from CRG:

The proposed building will not house hazardous materials. All operations will be consistent with the zoning ordinance.

Per Michael Cassidy, Fire Chief / Emergency Management Director memo of 4/29/21:

According to our Zoning Bylaws, uses involving the storage or transportation of hazardous materials are allowed by Special Permit in an Industrial Zone, subject to a Special Permit. One of the conditions of the issuance of the Special Permit is a Hazardous Materials Management Plan to be prepared and filed with the Fire Chief for those activities using or storing hazardous materials. Since the building has not been permitted, the applicant has not secured a tenant. Since a tenant has not been identified, as the Authority Having Jurisdiction, I cannot yet evaluate a Hazardous Materials Management Plan specific to the commodities being stored. The cost of a response to a facility is borne by the department budget, as part of the town's Omnibus budget, which is funded primarily through the tax levy. If there is a specialized response required, we do have the ability to recoup some costs through MGL c. 21E.

- Are any endangered species impacted?

Response from Peter Bemis (Engineering Design Consultants):

All work limits for the proposed project are located outside of the 100-foot wetland buffer zone and the jurisdictional limits of the Holliston Conservation Commission. There are no designated endangered species that will be impacted by the planned site activities.

- Who's going to enforce conditions of the permit?

Response from Attorney Richard Nysten:

The enforcement will be through a variety of measures. First, we expect that the Special Permit will restrict the ADT to 1310 with periodic monitoring to ensure compliance. Second, the Special Permit will also require the signage on-site and way finding signage off-site. Monitoring will take place to restrict trucks from South Street. Third, the leases entered into with CRG will require that any tenants in the building acknowledge and comply with these measures.

- Will there be more noise studies to cover Route 16 from Hopping Brook to Milford and from Hopping Brook to town?

Response from Gregg Tocci (Cavanaugh Tocci):

Project traffic sound on Route 16 was not studied. Massachusetts, having authority over many aspects of Route 16, does not have authority or criteria for assessing or limiting sound produced by Project traffic. Its authority extends to building new roads, widening roads, or other physical improvements to roads and rights of way. These projects may consider traffic noise, but in so far as they are public ways, who uses them with compliant vehicles, operating within legal limits is not restricted, irrespective of existing traffic sound level conditions.

- Where are noise studies now on Washington Street?

Response from Gregg Tocci (Cavanaugh Tocci):

Traffic noise modeling has not been completed by this firm on any area streets. See response to previous question.

- CRG's engineer used LUC 155/156 when the project was first proposed ... why was the study changed to LUC 150?

Response from Attorney Richard Nysten:

The initial project contemplated a fulfillment center consistent with LUC 155/156; however, since that time the Project is now proposing a conventional warehouse use, consistent with LUC 150.

- On imposed conditions from 3/11/20 - Item 21 states that trip estimates and signal warrant analysis should be updated to LUC 156 – why was this not done?

Response from Attorney Richard Nysten:

The Site Plan approval requested the traffic analysis for a fulfillment center, which has a greater demand for parking and traffic. CRG has stated publicly that there will be lease provisions establishing the 1310 ADT and sanctions for failure to comply.

- Why do you need 160 loading docks for 300 trucks?

Response from CRG:

Based on the ITE data, we are projecting a maximum of 181 daily trucks, which results in 362 daily trips. A typical model for interior warehouse inventory movement includes accepting incoming inventory on one side of the building, which is very often homogenous in nature (ie. a truck load

of the same product) and subsequently mixing many different products for outgoing inventory deliveries on the other side of the building. Trailers often take 12-24 hours to load or unload and are therefore parked idle at dock doors during such processes. Commonly, dock doors are expected to handle a maximum of 1-2 inventory turns per day, which would consist of either 1-2 incoming deliveries or 1-2 outgoing deliveries. Additionally, the design of 160 dock doors alleviates the need for truck idling caused by drivers waiting for unused dock doors.

- Why aren't we talking about other buildings (proposed)?

Response from CRG:

We have only submitted application materials for the subject project. No permit or approval applications have been submitted for any additional buildings. Any future development will be required to go through the state and local permitting processes.

- Have you considered rail trail in the context of increased traffic on Hopping Brook?

Response from Peter Bemis (Engineering Design Consultants):

As part of CRG's mitigation package the Rail Trail Crossing at Hopping Brook Road will be enhanced to include ground-based traffic markings and emergency flasher beacons as have been implemented at other roadway crossings in Holliston.

- Air handlers on top of the building will be loud - What is the actual noise level that we'll be hearing in our neighborhood because the air handlers are higher than the berm?

Response from CRG:

CRG has decided not to utilize the right to build to a 52' height as such was afforded us via the Zoning Board of Appeals decision from June 24, 2020. Accordingly, we plan to construct the building in compliance with the current zoning regulations with a maximum height of 40'.

Response from Gregg Tocci (Cavanaugh Tocci):

Estimated sound levels from rooftop air handling equipment will be no greater than 32 dBA at any residence, well below the 40 dBA limit specified by MassDEP and the 45 dBA limit in the Medway zoning bylaw. Furthermore, with a measured background level of 30 dBA, the 32 dBA level would likely be imperceptible for this type of noise. Additionally, ventilation units will be outfitted with air intake and discharge silencers to minimize sound transmitted to the community.

- Where is all the water runoff from this building going?

Response from Peter Bemis (Engineering Design Consultants):

All storm water from Hopping Brook is contained within the Hopping Brook Watershed that generally flows south to Beaver Brook that also flows south to the Charles River.

- Diesel is a carcinogen – has CRG done a study?

Response from Attorney Richard Nysten:

The use of diesel fuel to power motor vehicles, including trucks, has been extensively studied and is comprehensively regulated by the EPA and the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection. We firmly commit that the proposed facility will fully comply with all federal and state

air quality regulations, including those relating specifically to the use of diesel fuel, and we will accept and abide by a special permit condition to that effect.

- Is water supply capable of handling fire without a tank?

Per Michael Cassidy, Fire Chief / Emergency Management Director memo of 4/29/21:

There is a water storage tank, 95' in height, with 1 million gallon storage capacity, located in the industrial park. That tank is part of the municipal water distribution system, which has a combined storage capacity of 5.6 million gallons. Holliston's water is drawn from five groundwater supply wells located on properties throughout town. The DPW Water Department routinely pumps in excess of 1 million gallons per day back into the system from the aquifer.

- Would CRG be willing to restrict truck traffic to and from the site at night?

Response from CRG:

Such a restriction would render the building unusable by a typical warehouse tenant and therefore not feasible.

- Would CRG be willing to stipulate use of battery electric drive train yard dog equipment?

Response from CRG:

If such a condition is imposed by the Board, CRG would operate the building accordingly.

- Does the Stormwater Management Plan meet Massachusetts Stormwater Management Standards?

Response from Peter Bemis (Engineering Design Consultants):

The peer review by CMG Environmental (the Board's consulting engineer) will corroborate our position that the Stormwater Management Plan for the 555 Hopping Brook Site does satisfy the MassDEP Stormwater Standards including: no new untreated discharges, peak rate attenuation, recharge, water quality, LUHPPL's, Critical Areas, Construction SWPPP, O&M Plan and Prohibition of Illicit Discharge. Accordingly, the stormwater management system has been reviewed by the Boards peer reviewer and must be approved or signed off by CMG as a condition of the special permit.

- Is there any plan for a guard shack?

Response from CRG:

The current site plan makes an accommodation for a guard shack on the northwest side of the building not by necessity, but more so as a possible site amenity that may or may not be utilized by any future tenants.

- Has noise study included idling trucks at guard shack?

Response from Gregg Tocci (Cavanaugh Tocci):

We have not included queued trucks idling at the guard station entry. However, we have included sound produced by trucks accelerating on entering and leaving the facility at the guard station.

Truck acceleration sound is equivalent to about 8 trucks queued with engines set to high-idle, many more at low engine speed idle. Hence, computer modeling has considered a sound level event at the guard station louder than sound produced by the number of trucks anticipated to queue at the guard station.

- Why would CRG consider this is you have no support?

Response from CRG:

As stated in numerous past meetings, we often encounter opposition parties that assume worst case operational scenarios. We believe however that there is support for this project and therefore remain enthusiastic about investing in the Town of Holliston.

- Why not relocate air handler units to ground level to mitigate noise?

Response from CRG:

The safest place to install mechanical equipment is on the roof, thus keeping mechanical piping and power lines away from human contact, machinery and vehicles. Additionally, ground installation would require longer duct runs and larger units required to pump air volume over a longer distance, which might increase the overall noise level. The current design was used in the sound study, the results of which determined that noise resulting from such would be compliant with all laws.

- Where are the trucks going to refuel and where are they going to hang out?

Response from CRG:

Our typical tenants use long haul carriers that do not spend long periods of time on property. Typically, trucks arrive at the building, drop off a delivery trailer and immediately take an outgoing trailer on an outbound trip. Therefore, truck drivers do not “hang out” locally. Refueling of trucks is typically done at facilities conducive to the filling capacity needed, such as truck stops or commercial fueling stations (not local gas stations). Trucks fill 200-300 gallons of fuel and therefore don’t have frequent needs for fueling.

- How many company owned trucks do you think you’ll have here?

Response from CRG:

As stated in previous meetings, we do not know how many company owned trucks would be on site, however our typical tenants own little to none of their own trucks.

- Nobody mentioned light pollution – have you looked at this?

Response from Attorney Richard Nysten:

The Bylaws on this issue are quite specific and CRG will be compliant with them in their building design. Additionally, a condition of the Site Plan approval of March 2020 stipulates that the subject project will be “dark sky” compliant.

- CRG said that they wouldn’t have a cafeteria – relative to TDM, they need to have facilities on site for employees.

Response from CRG:

TDM requirements stipulated by both the Town of Holliston and MADOT, are intended to reduce site trip generation. Specifically, MADOT made reference to providing “microwave and refrigerator” which we always include in our buildings in a break room or employee lounge. We never build cafeterias in our buildings due to the health codes relating to the operation of such and the typically large need for water supply and discharge.