

Attachment D

Meeting Minutes

- **June 13, 2006 Meeting with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Maine DEP, MaineDOT, and MTA**
- **August 21, 2006 Meeting with Maine DEP and MTA**
- **October 5, 2006 Meeting with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and MTA**
- **October 18, 2006 Meeting with Maine DEP, MaineDOT, and MTA**

Subject: West Gardiner Service Plaza – Environmental
Documentation & Permits

Date: June 13, 2006
Time: 1:00 PM

Place: Maine Turnpike West Gardiner Maintenance Building

Attendees: MaineDOT Ralph Webster 624-3393 ralph.webster@maine.gov

MTA Steve Tartre 871-7771 x 144 STartre@maineturnpike.com
Conrad Welzel 871-7771 x 126 cwelzel@maineturnpike.com
Jonathan LaBonte 871-7771 x 111 JLaBonte@maineturnpike.com

Army Peter Tischbein 623-8206 peter.tischbein@usace.army.mil
Corps

Maine DEP Danielle Obery 287-7824 danielle.obery@maine.gov

HNTB Jeff McEwen 774-5155 x 234 jmcewen@hntb.com
Lauren Meek 774-5155 x 225 lmeek@hntb.com
Kevin Slattery 617-532-2243 kslattery@hntb.com

HNTB File No: 09009-XW-009-001

MEETING MINUTES (Any questions concerning these minutes should be directed to Kevin Slattery)

1. Introduction (Conrad Welzel, MTA)

a) Meeting Purpose, Overview of Project, History, Funding & Lead Agency

Discussion:

- Conrad opened the meeting with a quick introduction and everyone introduced themselves. Conrad explained the reason for the meeting was to serve as kick-off for the service plaza project and allow an opportunity to see the site alternatives and preferred site. He described the evolution of the project including the closure of Maine DOT rest areas in Augusta and Sidney, consolidation of Turnpike service plaza facilities, and recent regulations regarding commercial vehicle driving times. He also mentioned the studies conducted by Maine DOT demonstrated the need for additional commercial parking and rest areas.
- Conrad explained the service plaza is a joint Maine Turnpike/Maine DOT project and the Maine Turnpike (MTA) is assuming the lead for the project. The MTA and Maine DOT have entered in to a MOA for the development of this project. The MTA will be the lead for design, bid, advertisement and construction with the assistance of Maine DOT and FHWA. The Maine DOT will provide future

<p>reimbursement per the MOA based on FHWA matching funds for eligible portions of the project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conrad explained that the originally envisioned site was north of Route 126, and between the Turnpike and I-295. However, it was found that much of that area is wetland, and a service plaza in that location would be physically constrained due to the ramps and highways, and the location would not have any opportunity for future expansion. • Conrad explained that the MTA and Maine DOT realize that alternatives must be considered in site permitting and therefore a larger study corridor with multiple site alternatives was investigated. That investigation is presented in the Site Identification and Screening report. • The preferred site is in West Gardiner on Route 126 between the Turnpike and I-295. Conrad explained that one of the benefits of the site is that one facility could be built to serve both travel directions on both I-95 (Turnpike) and I-295 which will provide a cost-effective facility that will be economically viable. Another advantage of the site is that it occurs between two highways and will occupy a commercial property previously used for a trucking company. • He mentioned that discussions with the Town of West Gardiner were positive and the town is receptive to the project. • The project will occur in three phases over twenty years.
<p>Action Items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None.

2. Project Team & Purpose and Need (Jeffrey McEwen, HNTB)

a) Project Team

<p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maine Turnpike is the lead agency for the project and supported by Maine DOT. HNTB Corporation is working for the MTA doing design, coordination, and leading the permitting and environmental documentation. Scott Warchol (not present) is the MTA project liaison, Conrad Welzel is the government relations manager assisted by Jonathan LaBonte, Heath Cowan of Maine DOT is the DOT project manager, Mike Clark is the environmental coordinator, Jeff McEwen is the Turnpike service plaza program manager, Lauren Meek is the northern service plaza project manager, and Kevin Slattery is leading the environmental studies and permits. • On behalf of MTA, HNTB performed a Site Identification and Screening Report of the Interstate corridor between the confluence of I-95 and I-295 in West Gardiner and the City of Augusta. The study was modeled after the Corps Highway Methodology and eight sites were investigated in Phase I. A similar footprint was used for each site and land use, impacts to wetlands, construction costs, I-95 & I-295 access to site, utilities and other considerations were evaluated. From the analysis, the Route 126 West Gardiner site was identified as the preferred location.
<p>Action Items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None.

b) Purpose and Need

<p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The general project purpose is to provide a rest area with restaurants, fuel, and automobile and truck parking to improve motorist safety. The new facility is needed to fill a gap in rest areas between Portland and Bangor. Jeff referenced the earlier studies conducted by the Maine DOT. Note: the Corps “Basic Project Purpose” as described in the Corps Highway Methodology is not yet established for the project. Jeff discussed the March 14 interagency meeting where the project was introduced to the agencies, and what progress was made on the study since then. He provided hand-outs showing slides from the previous presentation.
<p>Action Items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None.

3. Site Identification and Screening (Kevin Slattery, HNTB)

a) Site Identification and Screening Report

<p>Discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Due to a shortage of time, Kevin Slattery highlighted the contents of the Site Identification and Screening Report. A copy of the draft report was provided to all the participants. Kevin described examples of the site identification criteria and screening criteria. Kevin mentioned the permits that are anticipated for the project including NRPA wetlands, Site Location of Development, Army Corps 404, as well as NEPA documentation (Checklist EA) The site identification and screening study was made using a GIS from readily available information such as aerials, hydric soils, farmland, aquifers, streams, floodplains etc. Site selection process included multiple site locations, assessed equally, using a phased study approach as described in the New England District Corps of Engineers Highway Methodology. The study used similarly-shaped and sized site footprints placed with the intent to avoid the resources. Comparisons were made between the alternatives using the same level of resource information for all sites. Based upon the conclusion in the Site ID and Screening study, the study team conducted a wetland delineation of the preferred site to better assess wetland impacts. Wetlands were generally found where hydric soils occurred however, the actual wetland was somewhat less extensive than the NRCS survey of hydric soils.
<p>Action Items:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None.

4. Corridor and Site Visit

- a) Participants walked across Route 126 to see the preferred site. After seeing Site 1B, the participants took a short ride from the Maintenance Garage up to Western Avenue in Augusta to review the general locations of the alternative sites.

Discussion:

- All eight Phase I sites were pointed out during the drive by on the Turnpike. Reasons for site elimination were discussed. Peter Tischbein asked which site would be the next in-line for a preferred alternative. Kevin mentioned probably Site 5B was the next best.
- Most sites have similar site development costs, but the addition of a new interchange and bridge over the Turnpike for access to a site will significantly increase costs. That infrastructure development cost is the primary contributor to the much higher costs for other alternative sites.
- It was mentioned that the preferred site would have 14 acres of wetland impact based upon the NRCS soil mapping (hydric soils). Peter Tischbein thought that 14 acres would not be permittable.
- The actual wetland impact will be much less than 14 acres, due in part to a refinement of the exact site location and layout, and because the actual wetland areas on the site are less extensive than the hydric soils indicate. Much of the preferred site is a graded gravel surface and some areas mapped as hydric soils were likely filled since the soil survey. Also, there is an inherent degree of mis-alignment and limited resolution of information when using large scale corridor mapping on a specific site. To better represent wetlands on-site, an adjustment was made to the hydric soils boundary at Site 1 to exclude areas of fill.

Action Items:

- None.

5. General Discussion Post-field Visit

- a) Highway Methodology
- b) Environmental Documents
- c) Mitigation Requirements
- d) Project Schedule

Discussion:

- The Army Corps and Maine DEP will review the draft Site Identification and Screening study and provide comments to HNTB.
- Due to the highly generalized Phase I site layout and coarse soil maps used in Phase I, the preferred site's (1B) wetland impacts are higher than the actual impact. To better represent the site layout, and to provide an alternative with a reasonable wetland impact to carry forward from the screening, it was recommended that the Phase I site layout in the Site ID and Screening report be revisited. It appeared that a shift to the east would avoid further impact and bring the Phase I wetland impacts closer to other alternatives.
- The study team is researching potential wetland mitigation sites for the project. It is unknown whether the initial site development impacts will warrant mitigation. Even so, the study team is identifying candidate sites and will provide a similar identification and screening report focused on wetland mitigation.
- The next meeting for the project to finalize the site selection and review more specific information about the project will take place in roughly one month.

Action Items:

- **Team** will update the layout of the Phase I Site 1B to more closely represent the conceptual layout of the site, re-evaluate impacts and update the report.
- **HNTB** will provide Peter Tischbein with two additional copies of the Site Identification and Screening report to share with the federal resource agencies.
- **HNTB** to update the draft site screening report and redistribute to the team.
- **HNTB** to schedule the next project meeting for 1:00 on July 11, 2006 at the same location.

[NOTE: Project meeting on July 11, 2006 will be rescheduled]

MEETING MINUTES

(Any questions concerning these minutes should be directed to Lauren Meek)

West Gardiner Service Plaza/Rest Area
Maine Department of Environmental Protection Pre-application Meeting
August 21, 2006, 1:30 PM, Augusta

Natural Resources Protection Act
Site Location of Development Law
Stormwater Management Law

Participants

Maine DEP

- Danielle Obery
- Art McGlaufflin

Maine Turnpike Authority

- Conrad Welzel
- Scott Warchol
- Jonathan LaBonte

HNTB

- Paul Bergquist
- Lauren Meek
- Kevin Slattery

INTRODUCTION

- Joint Project of Maine Turnpike Authority and Maine Dept. of Transportation
- Maine Turnpike responsible for design, permitting, and construction
- HNTB Corporation agent for the Maine Turnpike Authority
- Overview of Project
 - **Phase 1**, scheduled to be operational in 2008, 13.6 acres developed will include the service plaza/rest area, a gas station with gas and diesel fuel pumps, parking for cars, trucks, and buses, and minor turning lane modifications to Route 126/9;
 - **Phase 2**, projected to be operational in 2016, 3 additional acres of development will involve additional truck parking; and
 - **Phase 3**, is 20 years or more in the future, 9.4 acres of additional development and will involve construction of a 4,000 square foot tourist information center and trucker facility, additional car, truck, and bus parking, and an expanded park and ride lot.
- Applicable permits (NRPA, Site Law, Stormwater, 404)
- Progress since first meeting
 - Site Identification and Screening Report
 - Wetland Delineation, Evaluations
 - Site Design, Construction Phases, Preliminary Impacts
 - Next Steps in Design

Army Corps Section 404 application – Awaiting LEDPA Mitigation Site Search

Discussion:

- The Site Identification and Screening Report has been updated with the comments received from Army Corps. The preferred Site 1B was modified to reduce the wetland impacts from 14.0 acres to 6.5 acres.
- The wetlands were delineated by Normandeau Associates and field verified by Kevin Slattery. The Army Corps is comfortable with the delineations and does not want to do a formal JD. HNTB offered to meet the DEP at the site if wanted.

• Project Schedule

Discussion:

- The Site Location Permit will be submitted in the next couple of months with a desired Spring approval. The project is schedule to go out to bid in Spring 2007.
- Danielle O. noted that 4 copies of Site Law application are to be submitted. She also noted individuals at the DEP that could be of assistance for certain issues: John Holpack or John Noble - on-site septic; Carla Hawkins – blast plan for utility corridor; John Dunlap – underground fuel tanks

NRPA WETLAND PERMIT (TIER 3)

- Phases 1-3 and Permit Approach
- Application / Submission Requirements
- Notice of Intent to file
- Wetland Boundary/Jurisdiction Determination
- No Wetland of Special Significance at site, one WSS at intermittent stream along utility route on Route 126/9
- Functional Assessments (Corps Descriptive Approach)
- Wetland Compensation Plan – likely to be wetland restoration/enhancement

SITE LOCATION OF DEVELOPMENT

- Application / Submission Requirements / (All Sections 1-25)
- Public information meeting (pre-application submission)
- Public Notice
- High Intensity Soil Survey
- Traffic Movement Permit (Maine DOT)

Discussion:

- HNTB said that Site Law application will be for all 3 phases. There was a discussion about permit durations and the need to have a permitted project substantially complete within 5 years of approval. The Corps recommended permitting all 3 phases with the understanding that an amendment would be needed for subsequent construction phases after the 5 year approval. A similar approach will be used for the Site Law and NRPA. However, full details of the stormwater design for Phase 3 will not be available at the permit submission. Art cautioned that the regulations are likely to change between now and when Phase 3 is built. Permitting the site to meet current standards may protect against future requirements.
- Kevin S said that for the utilities (sewer and water), there are strong committments that they are

private, including sizing the utilities for the transportation uses only, and the FHWA requirement that any non-transportation entity wanting to connect to the utilities would be required to repay the federal share of the utility cost . These measures will control tie-ins and protect against secondary development impacts.

- Art M stated that each phase must meet regulations, meaning that the stormwater systems cannot be delayed and installed with Phase 3.

STORMWATER MANAGEMENT

- Stormwater Law: Chapter 500
For this project, Stormwater Management Law permitting is administered through the Site Location of Development permit. Stormwater permit sought for Phase 1 & 2 at this time. Phase 3 not considered.
 - Overall drainage concepts:
 - Proposed development located in NE corner of site to minimize wetland impacts and take advantage of natural grades.
 - Existing drainage. North-south drainage divide roughly bisects site, a consideration in proposed grading. Maintain existing general drainage patterns to extent practical.
 - Proposed grading being developed to minimize closed drainage systems where possible, resulting in less earthwork (fill) and minimizing fill slopes.
 - Limitations on length of sheet flow.
 - Design objective will be to drain smaller areas to BMP's located throughout site rather than using one large end-of-pipe BMP. (i.e. promoting Low Impact Development concepts)

Discussion:

- Art M stated that there is no requirement for LID to be utilized.
- Art M said there are no limitations on length of sheet flow across impervious areas. Depending upon the situation, it could even be as much as 300 feet provided flow depth was acceptable.
- Art M said he doesn't require a high-intensity soil survey for the "stormwater" aspect of the project. Use SCS soil mapping to establish CN values in HydroCad model.

○ Section 4: Stormwater Standards

The following is a summary of which Standards apply to the project:

- A. Basic Standards – Comply
- B. General Standards
 - BMP Standards – Comply
 - Phosphorous Standards – Not applicable
 - Discussion – Former truck parking area (pavement/compacted gravel)
- C. Urban Impaired Stream Standard – Not applicable
- D. Flooding Standard - Comply
 - Overall site approximately 88 acres.

- Existing impervious cover removed and replaced, additional impervious areas added
 - Peak control for 2, 10 & 25-year, 24-hour storm.
- E. Easements and Covenants – Highway ROW abuts easterly property line

Discussion:

- Art M had concerns with how spills at the gas station would be addressed. Options could include Absorbing socks or pads to absorb the hydrocarbons. This will be addressed through the SPPCC (Spill Pollution Prevention Controls & Countermeasures).
- Art M asked if the site drains into Pleasant Pond which would subject the project to phosphorus control standards. Paul B answered that it does not and Art M will follow-up with that answer upon researching the DEP-designated limits of Pleasant Pond on the river. (note: we should include a locus plan showing flow path from site to Cobosecontee (sp?) River).
- The existing runoff model can only count existing impervious areas if they existed pre-1975.
- A protective easement would have to be created if a stormwater structure were to be located off-site.
- Plans will need to identify nearby water supplies (wells) within 300 feet and where the run-off goes.
- Art M added that the underdrain filters were no longer limited to the 18” depth and and that they now allow the underdrain filter BMP to provide detention. Biofiltration remains limited to 6” deep and additional depth is not allowed in that BMP.

o Section 5: Other Applicable Standards

A. Management of stormwater discharges

- discharge to level spreader to match contours
- requirements if level spreader exceeds 25’ length limitation

B. Discharge to freshwater or coastal wetlands – Discussion

C. Threatened or endangered species – None

D. Additional controls – TBD with DEP

E. Authorization for discharges to public storm sewer- Not applicable

Discussion:

- Art M suggested that the maximum 25’ length be held for level spreaders and that additional level spreaders be installed if necessary. The issue with longer spreaders is the construction and long term maintenance of the “level” lip.
- HNTB raised the issue of the petwalk. Scott W added that plastic bags will be supplied for the removal of pet waste. Art M indicated that the runoff could be sent to the filtration systems.
- Art M stated that erosion control plans for all 3 phases would be required. He also added that who is responsible for maintenance during and after construction should be noted. Suggested maintenance intervals were sweeping twice a year and cleaning sumps annually.

o Proposed Stormwater Management BMPs

- Underdrained vegetated soil filters at various locations with pretreatment (grass strips vs. sediment forebays)
 - o Discuss applicability, geometric variations, etc.
- BMP’s for car/truck fueling area
 - o Provide dedicated drainage system and BMP
 - o Discuss BMP preferences for this application
 - o Discuss spill containment considerations
 - o Discuss water quality inlet w/ oil/water separation baffles

- Wet pond(s)
 - Discuss applicability, geometric variations
- Detention (as part or separate of wet pond)
 - Discuss applicability, geometric variations

Discussion:

- Art M said that most people use the sediment forebays and the grass strips have to be a minimum of 25'.
- Art M stated that for the oil/ water separation baffles, the oil is generally flushed out and that the preference is the absorbing pads.
- Art M mentioned that the only proprietary unit currently allowed is the Stormtreat system which has been used on much smaller sites, but probably not appropriate for a large site like this.
- Paul B asked about the requirements for dewatering a wet pond. Art M replied that a valve is not necessary, but could be used, and that pumps are suitable for use during maintenance.
- Art M stated that the safety of wet ponds was the responsibility of the owner and that if the public can be near, he recommends fencing.
- Art M talked about the mean depth calculation. He indicated that we should read that part of the BMP Manual carefully so that we provide what they're looking for in the application.
- Art M agreed with Paul B that Filtration and/or Buffers are probably not appropriate for this site.
- If we need clarification on stormwater BMP aspects, Art's phone is 207-287-7739. Email is: arthur.t.mcglauflin@maine.gov

JOINT APPLICATIONS/PUBLIC MEETINGS

Subject: West Gardiner Service Plaza – Environmental
Documentation & Permits

Date: October 5, 2006
Time: 2:00 PM

Place: Maine Turnpike West Gardiner Maintenance Building

Attendees: Army Rod Howe 207-623-8367 rodney.a.howe@usace.army.mil
Corps

US Fish & Wende Mahaney 207-827-5938 wende_mahaney@fws.gov
Wildlife

US EPA Trish Garrigan 617-918-1583 garrigan.trish@epa.gov

MTA Scott Warchol 207-871-7771 x 121 swarchol@maineturnpike.com

HNTB Jeff McEwen 207-774-5155 x 234 jmcewen@hntb.com
Kevin Slattery 617-816-1861 kslattery@hntb.com

HNTB File No: 09009-XW-009-001

MEETING MINUTES (Any questions concerning these minutes should be directed to Kevin Slattery)

1. Introduction (Kevin Slattery, HNTB)

a) Meeting Purpose

Discussion:

- Kevin opened the meeting with a brief description of the purpose for the meeting. The reason for the meeting was to provide an update of the project for the new Corps project manager and to have a site visit with the Corps and US Fish & Wildlife and US EPA. The Turnpike and Maine DOT seek a LEDPA determination to proceed with the permitting process. Wende and Trish recalled the first discussion of the project at the interagency meeting on March 14, 2006. There will be an update of the project at the October 10, 2006 interagency meeting at Maine DOT.

2. Project Overview (Jeffrey McEwen, HNTB)

a) Overview of Project, History

Discussion:

- Jeff described the history of the project, including the closure of Maine DOT rest areas, and the Maine Turnpike's Service Plaza program. The preferred site is in West Gardiner on Route 126 between the Turnpike and I-295. Jeff explained the benefits of the site is that one facility could be built to serve both travel directions on both I-95 (Turnpike) and I-295 which will provide a cost-effective facility that will be economically viable. Another advantage of the site is that it occurs between two highways and will occupy a commercial property previously used for a trucking company. Using this site will not cause a change in access to local roads from the interstate. The site will likely use public water and sewer, however, using federal highway funds will necessitate restrictions for private use. The water and sewer could be used for state transportation facilities only (the plaza/rest area, possibly the Maine Turnpike Toll Plaza, or Maine Turnpike Maintenance area and/or possibly the Maine DOT facility west of the Turnpike).
- A color plan showing the study corridor and alternative sites was discussed. From the analysis in the Site Identification and Screening study, the Route 126 West Gardiner site was identified as the preferred location based upon lower direct impacts and considerably lower costs to construct. One reason for this site having less cost and wetland impact is due to it utilizing existing interchanges on the highways. Other sites would require new or upgraded bridges, new interchanges and the associated impacts, including possibly changes in access to the interstate highways. An early candidate location north of Route 126/9 and between the highways (one of the first sites considered) was investigated but found to have considerable wetland impact and limited room for expansion and did not make the Phase I alternatives.

b) Site Layout, Phased Construction

Discussion:

- Black and white aerial plans showing the site with Phase 1 and 2 construction limits were reviewed. Jeff described the layout and traffic pattern, buildings, parking, and fueling areas. The timing of the phased development was discussed. Phase 1 and 2 are anticipated to be completed by 2008 and 2016 respectively, and Phase 3 is at least 20 years in the future. Jeff explained that Phase 3 would occur as facility demand merits and will depend upon a wide range of other factors such as private truck stops and traffic on the roadways. Phase 3 is not included in either the Turnpike or Maine DOT's 20-year plans.

3. Permits and Information Distributed to Date (Kevin Slattery, HNTB)

a) Site Identification and Screening Report & Permits

Discussion:

- The site identification and screening study was previously distributed to the federal agencies by Peter Tischbein. Additional copies were provided to the Corps, US FWS and US EPA.
- Kevin mentioned the permits that are anticipated for the project including NRPA wetlands, Site Location of Development, Army Corps 404, as well as NEPA documentation (Checklist EA).

b) Wetland Supplemental Information

Discussion:

- Based upon the conclusion in the Site ID and Screening study, the study team conducted a wetland delineation of the preferred site to better assess wetland impacts. Wetlands were generally found where hydric soils occurred however, the actual wetland was somewhat less extensive than the NRCS survey of hydric soils.
- Wetland Impacts for the project range from 2.2 acres for Phase 1 to 4.4 acres for Phase 3 (includes all phases).
- There are no streams or Maine Wetlands of Special Significance at the site. Two intermittent streams may be encountered with utility construction along Route 126/9. Utility impacts would be temporary.
- The timing of the construction phases was discussed. Since Phase 3 is not included in either the Turnpike or Maine DOT's 20-year plan, it appeared to the Corps and resource agencies that permitting should be limited to Phase 1 and 2. Kevin mentioned that the Phase 3 work has been included in discussions to date such that the permitting agencies and public are aware of possible future expansion and the likely location for the expansion.
- Kevin asked Rod whether a Corps public notice for the project was needed before a LEDPA determination can be made. Rod did not indicate that it was needed for a LEDPA, but mitigation may need to be advanced prior to a LEDPA decision.
- Kevin described the mitigation site investigations and referred to an 8.5 x 11 color aerial showing candidate sites. Preferred sites are disturbed land and agricultural sites with indications of prior land-draining activities. Landowners were recently contacted about discussing land purchases for such use. Kevin noted about 50% of the 12 landowners indicated an interest in selling their land. The mitigation site investigations will be advanced and a site identification and screening report will be prepared. It is anticipated that a candidate mitigation site inspection field visit will be made with the agencies before advancing concepts in the permit applications.
- The team's approach to mitigation is to identify land areas needed for the total wetland impact including Phase 3 to assure land is available in the future for subsequent construction phases. Mitigation areas will reflect the permitted impacts, which could also be built in phases, depending upon the location, and cost effectiveness of building the sites.

4. Site Visit

- a) Participants walked across Route 126 to see the preferred site.

Discussion:

- The open/barren areas of the site were walked. Remnant compacted gravel and pavement were evident. Kevin mentioned the site previously contained buried fuel tanks, but all were removed several years ago. The Environmental Assessment investigation found the site to be "controlled" relative to spills.
- The area of proposed development is approximately 18 acres, which would use mostly the open former trucking facility, and portions of the early successional forested growth. Kevin pointed out the wetlands along the access drive to the cell phone tower. Many of the wetlands near the former truck areas are disturbed from grading and filling. Wetland types include forested, wet meadow, scrub-shrub and a small area of emergent at an excavated pool.
- The participants will be at the interagency meeting at Maine DOT on October 10, 2006.



Subject: West Gardiner Service Plaza/Rest Area – Maine DEP Date: October 18, 2006
Permits Time: 2:00 PM

Place: Maine DEP 17 State House Station, Augusta

Attendees: Maine DEP Danielle Obery 207-287-7824 danielle.obery@maine.gov
Art McGlaulin 207-287-7739 arthur.t.mcglauflin@maine.gov
John Hopeck 207-287-7733 john.t.hopeck@maine.gov

Maine Dwight Doughty 207-624-3103 dwight.doughty@maine.gov
DOT

Maine Jonathan LaBonte 871-7771 x 111 JLaBonte@maineturnpike.com
Turnpike Scott Warchol 207-871-7771 x 121 swarchol@maineturnpike.com

Haley & Andy Blaisdell 207-482-4619 ablaisdell@haleyaldrich.com
Aldrich

HNTB Paul Bergquist 617-542-6900 pbergquist@hntb.com
Jeff McEwen 207-774-5155 x 234 jmcewen@hntb.com
Kevin Slattery 617-816-1861 kslattery@hntb.com

HNTB File No: 09009-XW-009-001

MEETING MINUTES (Any questions concerning these minutes should be directed to Kevin Slattery)

1. Introduction

a) Meeting Purpose and Discussion

Discussion:

- Kevin opened the meeting with a brief description of the purpose for the meeting. The focus of the meeting was to provide an update of the project and stormwater concepts to verify the design approach is consistent with the stormwater management guidelines before the design is advanced and permit applications submitted. In addition, the team had information about the environmental site assessment and geotechnical investigation for the DEP.
- Paul Bergquist provided a figure from the “Phosphorous Control Action Plan for Pleasant Pond” (2004) which indicated the proposed Service Plaza/Rest Area does not drain into Pleasant Pond. The Phosphorous Control Standards are not required to be met by the project. Art McGlaulin agreed with the interpretation.

- The site was developed after 1975, therefore, existing developed areas (paved, compacted gravel, buildings) are not exempted from the stormwater standards.
- Paul described the site layout and stormwater management concepts. The existing developed site has a split watershed and is roughly divided north/south. Existing water flows to the east to the I-295 drainage and beyond to Cobbosseecontee Stream, and water on the west side of the site flows southwest eventually to Cold Brook Stream, and eventually into Cobbosseecontee Stream. Proposed stormwater treatment includes maintaining a similar distribution of water.
- A series of under-drained soil filters (USF) are proposed at the site, with maximum drainage areas of one acre. The USF's will also serve to provide flood storage to meet the flooding standard. A discussion followed about using buffers for treatment areas, particularly for the southern end of the project. Wetland areas cannot be used for stormwater buffers, and if buffers are used, they would have to be located between the wetland lobes on the site. The stormwater concept included a USF partially on the I-295 ROW with a discharge to a ditch that ties into the I-295 drainage. Additional discussions with Maine DOT and FHWA are needed to verify the ROW can be used for the drainage system.
- Paul asked about using some type of groundwater interceptor up-slope of the USF to meet the one-foot above groundwater requirement in the BMP guidance. Art mentioned that the DEP now allows USF's to receive seasonal high groundwater up to the under-drains, but not into the soil filter media. The stormwater concept anticipated having to depress groundwater at least one foot below the under-drains, which was making the surface elevations potentially higher than desired. Art also mentioned that the BMP guidance required a 1% grade of the under-drain, but DEP is now allowing a 0% grade. The above two revised BMP criteria were not used in the conceptual stormwater management system. The design will be modified if appropriate to allow higher groundwater and 0 pitch in the under-drain, which will decrease the vertical clearance requirements.
- Art cautioned against placing the USF or other under-drains too close to existing wetlands and causing them to dry. He also mentioned that the form of the USF can include long linear ditches on the perimeter of a development, similar to what has been used by some developers. The end of the ditch has a berm and the under-drain underlies the ditch.
- Paul described the details of the basins using a conceptual basin cross section. The area of the fueling facility will have a separate treatment system including curbs, catch basins, an oil/water separator, and outlet to a USF. Discharge will be to the surface toward the I-295 drainage system. John Hopeck explained that the proposed concept for the fueling area will likely meet the treatment standards for a surface discharge, however, he cautioned that if sub-surface discharge is to be used, the treatment would be more stringent. Oil absorbent pads are more effective and should be used at the catch basins rather than hooded outlets in deep-sump catch basins.
- Paul summarized by stating that the concept attempts to maintain the current site discharges, and treat stormwater nearer the point of origin rather than providing one large basin with a single discharge point. Art mentioned that the USF sizes and drainage areas are no longer limited to one acre. The drainage area to bio-retention cells remains at one acre maximum. The stormwater standards requires 95% of impervious and 80% of the developed area must be treated by BMP's. Paul asked about the linear project standards and possibility of applying some of the project drive to that standard. Art explained that standard is more applicable to roads or subdivision roads and not a development such as this.
- Rain gardens are similar to bio-retention cells but limited to 1 acre drainage area and maximum of 6" of water storage. The reason for the limitation is the vulnerability of planted garden vegetation to drown. Roof runoff is suitable for the rain garden and does not require pre-treatment. Rain gardens should not have any salt or petroleum getting into them. USF's do not require pre-treatment of stormwater.
- DEP does not want the USF areas to be used for snow disposal. The objective is to keep them free-flowing, and areas around the site perimeter may be better for snow disposal. It is important to protect the USF's during construction, because the fines can get into the filter medium and block it. It is best to keep the USF's off-line until after the site is stable. No geotextile material should be used between the soil medium and the under-drain bedding, only the USF's side-slopes and bottom below the pipe

bedding should have the fabric. DEP has found the geotextile tends to become clogged with fines very quickly.

- Art reminded the team that a maintenance plan for the stormwater system is needed with the application. It should cover all BMP's and provide as much detail as possible, such as construction methods and protection, normal maintenance schedule, the person in charge/point of contact, methods etc.

2. Geotechnical and Environmental Site Assessment

a) Environmental Site Assessment

Discussion:

- The on-site fuel storage tanks may be near the groundwater elevation. Under-draining that area may be required. Should the tanks be in an area of the previous petroleum contamination, special treatment of the dewatering from construction may be necessary. General construction de-watering should be made to filter bags (dirt bags), hay bale and geotextile settling pools, or other similar sediment removing treatments.
- John asked about the fuel storage for the on-site generator and mentioned that the State Fire Marshall, Steve Dixon, may require additional controls for generator fuel storage. Jeff McEwen described the generator as self-contained with an integral fuel tank, similar to what was used at the Kennebunk Service Plaza.

b) On-Site Septic vs. Off-site Disposal

Discussion:

- Kevin mentioned that on-site septic disposal may be used for the site. The intent is to use off-site treatment by connecting to the Gardiner sanitary treatment system, however, the team is considering on-site septic as an alternative. The location would be roughly 1,200 feet to the southwest of the development site. That area was evaluated for wetlands and included in the properties for the jurisdictional determination. Preliminary soil information was also collected and the area is suitable for septic leaching. Kevin asked whether a high-intensity soil survey was needed for the on-site septic area. John said that for septic a high intensity soil survey is not needed. He would like our preliminary soil information to look at and possibly make a site inspection. Preliminary flow information and the proposed boundary of the on-site areas should be provided.

3. Permits and Schedule

a) Permits

Discussion:

- Kevin asked whether the NRPA and Site Law applications must be submitted concurrently. Dani said both should be submitted at the same time for joint review. Kevin described the status of the mitigation site identification and screening. Fourteen potential sites were found and contact with the landowners found seven are interested in potentially selling the property or a portion for use as a mitigation site. Kevin asked whether complete mitigation designs are required for the permit, or whether 30% concepts could be provided as the final mitigation design is developed. Dani said that a mitigation plan would be needed for the permit and that the final construction plans would not be needed. Kevin offered that the contract documents could be provided as they are completed.
- The permit applications will address only Phase 1 and Phase 2 and will not include Phase 3 which is projected to be at least 20 years in the future. Wetland impacts for Phase 1 and 2 are 2.84 acres, including 0.39 acres of temporary impact for the utility connections with Gardiner. Permanent wetland impacts will be approximately 2.45 acres, based upon the site layout and additional buffer for possible stormwater treatment at the perimeter. Once the stormwater design is settled, exact footprints will be used and updated wetland impacts will be determined.
- Dani would like three complete sets of the applications, and one loose set for making copies of sections for internal DEP distribution. Three ring notebooks can be used, but the NRPA and Site Law applications should be contained in separate notebooks. Full size plans should be signed and stamped, folded and placed in the notebooks.
- Kevin asked about the Public Notice of Intent requirements prior to submitting permit applications. One public informational meeting was held on October 5th. There will be one more public informational meeting and one public hearing for the project as a part of the NEPA document process. The permit application NOI's were not included for the previous public meeting. The team would like to include the site law public meeting notice for either the public information meeting or the public hearing. Dani mentioned the only timing requirement is that notice of the meeting be provided to the abutters and town officials at least 10 days prior to the meeting and that the public meeting be held prior to submitting the application. NRPA and Site Law requirements are that notice of intent to file the applications must be made to the abutters and in the local newspaper within 30 days of submitting the application. Ideally the next public meetings will be used to meet the pre-submission public meeting required for Site Law.

b) Schedule

Discussion:

- Anticipated DEP permit application dates are late November 2006. One of the critical elements affecting the submission date is finalizing the stormwater concepts. Jeff mentioned the project schedule and desire to have the facility open by May 2008. The team anticipates the full review period may be needed by DEP.

4. Action Items

- a) HNTB to provide John Hopeck with a map showing the potential on-site septic and preliminary soil investigation.

- b) Updated concepts of the stormwater management system to be mailed to Dani Obery and Art McGlaulin for another review prior to finalizing the designs and permit applications.