



JANET T. MILLS
 GOVERNOR

MELANIE LOYZIM
 COMMISSIONER

Project Review Memorandum
 BUREAU OF WATER QUALITY, DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

To: Jami MacNeil, Project Manager *WJN* **Date:** 11-30-21
From: William T. Noble, Licensed Geologist **Land Div., Bureau of Land Resources**
Re: Sugarloaf -- West Mountain Expansion, Carrabassett Valley,
Project No. L-000217-26-JX-A.

An initial review of the site application for this project, dated 9-24-21, and its supporting information, received on 11-16-21, has been completed. The application indicates that the project will be served by public water and sewer utilities. Accordingly, the review was limited to the soils, groundwater, and blasting sections of the site application, and aspects of stormwater that may affect groundwater quality. Comments are as follows:

1. The soil survey narrative report should be dated. See Part II, Section 11.A of the site application.
2. Soil survey maps (*sheets E1.1 and E1.2*) should include the following: NOTE referencing the standards by which the soil survey was conducted, and a light underlay of the proposed development. See Part II, Section 11.A.2 of the site application. In addition, footprints of proposed stormwater basins (*underdrained soil filter basins and wetponds*) should be shown and labeled.
3. Subsurface explorations TB-1 and TPD-2 were not found on the soil survey maps. TBD-2 was found on sheet E1.1, however, no corresponding log for it was found. This information should be clarified.
4. The application states that geotechnical investigations will be performed for specific portions of the development, including lift foundations and multistory condominium buildings. Reports on these investigations should be provided when available.
5. Soil unit descriptions in the soil survey report indicate some soils are very limited for the proposed development (*Brayton, Colonel, and Tunbridge-Lyman Complex series*) due to a shallow water table, boulders, or bedrock, although a finding can be made that the soils present no limitations that cannot be overcome through standard engineering practices, provided the applicant follows the engineering and erosion control recommendations contained in the application.
6. The Section 7 exhibit of the site application presents a narrative on wetlands investigation and mapping, however, if a separate wetlands report was prepared in conjunction with delineation of wetlands as shown on project site plans, then this report should be provided, which is signed and dated by the wetlands investigator responsible for its preparation.
7. The stormwater management narrative states that underdrained soil filter (*UDSF*) basins are not anticipated to be lined, however the cross-section in sheet C1.06 specifies impermeable liners for the basins. UDSF basins need to be lined to keep stormwater separated from any seasonal high groundwater table, unless the conditions in Appendix E, Section 4.b of the Stormwater Management Rules can be met.

(continued)



DEP PROJECT REVIEW MEMORANDUM

Sugarloaf – West Mountain Expansion
Carrabassett Valley, Maine
Initial Review

Page 2 of 2
Project №. L-000217-26-JX-A
11-30-21

8. The 4 wetponds and 11 UDSFs shown on plan sheets CG-3.01 through CG-3.08 should be labeled as such and be numbered for identification and reference, perhaps by the "P" numbers used in the stormwater narrative. Note that CG-3.06 has no sheet number.
9. The stormwater management narrative indicates that soil data logs at wetpond and UDSF locations are in Appendix 12-2 of the report, but no soil data was found, and should be provided. In addition, locations of these subsurface explorations should be shown on a plan, perhaps on the plan-view diagrams on sheets CG-3.01 through CG-3.08. Plans showing locations of these subsurface explorations should identify the subsurface exploration symbol used and include a NOTE which identifies the responsible soil scientist, and also references the report where soil log data can be found.
10. The elevation table on plan sheet C1.06 for the UDSFs contains no elevation data, which should be provided. Note that elevation "C" (*top edge of impermeable liner*) should be at or above any seasonal high watertable.
11. Plan sheets SW-1, SW-1.1, and SW-2, which show soil mapping names and data, should include a NOTE referencing the source of this information.
12. The following should be provided in regard to the Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasures (*SPCC*) plan:
 - » Identification of where the plan will be kept for ease-of-reference.
 - » Management approval signature at beginning of plan and in Appendix 3 of the plan.
 - » Evidence of a subsequent required 5-year review. Plan provided is dated 2012.
13. If blasting for construction will occur within 500 feet of non-owned off-site structures (*buildings and wells*), then a map showing anticipated blast locations, and blasting plan, prepared and signed by a qualified blaster, must be provided to the Department. See Part II, Sections 20.A and 20.B.2 of the application. The blasting plan must include blasting standards in the statute: 38 MRS §490-Z (14). The blasting plan must be provided prior to any blasting, and include an anticipated blast design/shot pattern specifically tailored to the project site. Submittal of the blasting plan, and a map showing anticipated blast locations, could be required as a condition of site approval.
14. To conform to subsection G of the blasting statute, item 1 in the Performance Standards section of the blasting exhibit should read:

"Blasting may not occur in the period between sundown and sunrise the following day or in the period between 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m., whichever is greater. Routine production blasting is not allowed in the daytime on Sunday. Detonation of misfires may occur outside of these times but must be reported to the Department within 5 business days of the misfire detonation. Blasting may not occur more frequently than 4 times per day."