



The City of Worcester

Conservation Commission

Meeting Minutes

July 13th, 2026

City Hall – Levi Lincoln Chamber,

with remote participation options available via Zoom online at
<https://worcesterma.zoomgov.com/j/1604682366> and
call-in number 1-669-254-5252 (Meeting ID: 160 468 2366).

Attendance:

Commissioners Present:

Diane Fratoni, Chair
Devin Canton, Vice Chair
Lindsay Nystrom, Commissioner
Stuart Kirshner, Commissioner

Staff Present:

Eric Flint, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services (DPRS)
Mattie VandenBoom, Division of Planning & Regulatory Services
(DPRS)

Call to Order

Chair Fratoni called the meeting to order at approximately 5:30 PM.

Requests for Continuances, Postponements and Withdrawals

Item 3 – 497 Granite Street – Notice of Intent (CC-2026-026 & DEP# 349-1452)

Request to postpone the public hearing to 08/03/2026 & extend the constructive grant deadline to 08/25/2026

Mr. Flint read the requests for postponements into the record.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Nystrom, seconded by Commissioner Kirshner, the Commission voted by roll call vote 4-0 to postpone the public hearings as discussed.

New Business – Request for Determination of Applicability

1) Providence and Worcester Railroad Right-of-Way - CC-2026-033

There was no representative present at the meeting for this item.



The City of Worcester

2) 166 Moreland Street (MBL 25-045-011-2) – CC-2026-038

Rich Kirby, LEC Environmental, on behalf of the applicant, Edrrysa and Jesula Jean, reviewed the proposed project. The project entails installation of a 16-by-32-foot above-ground pool and a 10-by-16-foot deck on the west side of the pool. Mr. Kirby explained that contractors would shave down elevated portions of the west side to create a level pad and push that material eastward to fill the lower area, thereby establishing a flat surface while avoiding any impact on the resource areas. Straw wattles would be installed along the downgradient edge to contain sediment during the brief grading operation.

The owners also proposed extending an existing polyvinyl fence to fully enclose the yard, connecting it to existing fencing near the garage. The proposal included removal of one hazard tree located near the property boundary. Mr. Kirby noted that the tree was smothered by Asiatic bittersweet vines and exhibited significant decline.

Mr. Kirby then described a previous 2020 enforcement order on the property relating to vegetation removal in the eastern portion of the yard. Restoration was conducted in accordance with the Commission's directives, including installation of several saplings and shrubs. Although only eight of twelve marked shrubs could be located due to dense natural regrowth, he explained that the area had become heavily vegetated with native species, effectively fulfilling the functional objectives of the restoration plan. The applicant submitted a restoration monitoring report, confirming that the area had been successfully vegetated.

Ms. VandenBoom confirmed that because the proposed pool and deck were located over fifty feet from the wetland, the project constituted a minor activity exempt from filing under the Wetlands Protection Act (WPA), though filing was required under the local Wetlands Ordinance. She reported that the fence extension would not increase impacts because it would be located farther away from the wetland than the current fence. Regarding the tree removal, staff noted that photographs showed the tree was in poor health and that bittersweet infestation contributed to its decline; therefore, staff had no objection to its removal.

Ms. VandenBoom also reported that the applicant had satisfied the conditions of the prior enforcement order, and restoration work completed the previous year had been successful. Based on monitoring reports demonstrating healthy regrowth and adequate native vegetation, staff recommended that the Commission lift the enforcement order.

Ms. VandenBoom recommended a condition requiring that any dewatering of the pool be directed away from the resource area to avoid erosion or migration of chemically treated water.

Commissioners engaged in a lengthy, detailed discussion concerning the appropriate standards for pool water discharge. Questions were raised regarding access for construction equipment, with Mr. Kirby confirming that smaller equipment would be sufficient to navigate the tight yard space without causing additional disturbance.



The City of Worcester

The bulk of the discussion concerned chlorine levels, pH thresholds, and methods to ensure safe discharge of water during seasonal pool draining. Several Commissioners raised concerns about potential impacts on the wetland should inadequately treated pool water be discharged, noting that the site slopes uniformly toward the wetland. Mr. Kirby advised that chlorine dissipates naturally when untreated for several days and that commonly available home test strips could reliably indicate chlorine concentrations.

Mr. Kirby researched thresholds during the meeting and cited guidance from the City of Edgerton, Kansas, which identifies 0.1 parts per million (ppm) as the maximum chlorine level compatible with discharge to vegetated areas. Additional discussion addressed pH, with Chair Fratonis referencing a Massachusetts DCR document stating that water should have a pH between 6.5 and 8.5 before discharge. The applicant confirmed that these values were typical for pool operations and that test strips measuring both pH and chlorine were readily available.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Nystrom, seconded by Commissioner Kirshner, the Commission voted by roll call vote 4-0 by to issue a negative determination of applicability as discussed.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Nystrom, seconded by Commissioner Kirshner, the Commission voted 4-0 by roll call vote to lift the Enforcement Order.

List of Exhibits:

Exhibit A: Request for Determination of Applicability; dated 06/24/2026; prepared by Rich Kirby, LEC Environmental

New Business – Notice of Intent

3) 2 Northboro Street (MBL 17-025-04+05) – CC-2026-041

Michael Andrade, Graves Engineering, Inc., on behalf of REMP Realty, LLC, the applicant, comprehensive description of the property and project proposal. The subject parcel is situated at the corner of Northboro, Peabody, and Plantation Streets, consisting of roughly one-quarter acre of land containing an existing one-story building. He explained the history of the property, noting that it previously served as a satellite dry cleaning establishment. The building has been vacant for a considerable period.

The proposed project intends to renovate and expand the structure into a two-story building and modernize the entire site. Improvements include reconfigured curb cuts, new parking layouts, updated lighting, landscaping, and fully redesigned stormwater management systems. The renovated building and site will house “Napoli Deli,” a business currently operating in Shrewsbury and seeking relocation to the family-owned property in Worcester.

Mr. Andrade stated that the Zoning Board of Appeals had already granted necessary approvals and that Planning Board review was scheduled for later that week. He emphasized that the Conservation Commission’s review was triggered not by the presence of wetlands—none exist on the parcel—but because the site lies within the local stormwater protection zone and within 100 feet of a catch basin on Peabody Street.



The City of Worcester

Ms. VandenBoom reviewed staff comments. She noted that staff had reviewed the stormwater management system in detail and had questioned the applicant about the presence of ledge on the site. A response letter was issued by the representative, explaining that the stormwater system had been designed with full knowledge of the subsurface conditions and would still meet recharge requirements. She indicated that staff concerns had been addressed.

Chair Fratoni asked about the existing and proposed grades on site. Mr. Andrade explained that the site was not flat, with the highest point located in the southeastern corner. The land slopes downward toward both Peabody Street and Northboro Street. The existing parking area along Northboro Street is relatively level, but grading elsewhere must be adjusted slightly to accommodate the proposed improvements.

Chair Fratoni inquired about stormwater flow under current and proposed conditions. Mr. Andrade illustrated the drainage patterns and the stormwater collection system, noting that runoff will enter either of two catch basins that lead to treatment units and then to underground infiltration structures before discharge. He also highlighted the need for a retaining wall and confirmed that the grading plan had been prepared to minimize ledge removal.

No comments from the public.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Nystrom, seconded by Commissioner Kirshner, the Commission voted 4-0 by roll call vote to close the public hearing.

In addition to the standard conditions, Ms. VandenBoom recommended revised plans, infiltration unit inspection, certification of stormwater infrastructure, dust control, dewatering, cement truck washing, spill prevention and ongoing condition for stormwater management system maintenance, and sand/salt.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Nystrom, seconded by Commissioner Kirshner, the Commission voted 4-0 by roll call vote to issue the Order of Conditions as discussed.

List of Exhibits:

- Exhibit A: Notice of Intent; dated 05/27/2026; prepared by Michael Andrade, Graves Engineering, Inc.
- Exhibit B: Site Plan; dated 05/19/2026; prepared by Michael Andrade, Graves Engineering, Inc.
- Exhibit C: Stormwater Report; dated 01/19/2026; prepared by Michael Andrade, Graves Engineering, Inc.
- Exhibit D: Division of Planning and Regulatory Comments; dated 06/12/2026; prepared by Eric Flint and Mattie VandenBoom
- Exhibit E: Response to Comments; dated 06/12/2026; prepared by Michael Andrade, Graves Engineering, Inc.



The City of Worcester

5) 283 Lake Avenue (Quinsigamond State Park) (MBL 41-047-00004)

Andrea Kendall, LEC Environmental Consultants, Inc. and Andrew Keel, Hatch Design Consultants, provided an extensive overview of the improvement project at Lake Quinsigamond State Park on behalf of the applicant, Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR).

Mr. Keel explained that it is part of a larger two-phase initiative to redesign a portion of Lake Quinsigamond State Park. The existing waterfront includes an inaccessible swimming beach that DCR seeks to permanently close due to safety and accessibility constraints. Phase 1 of the improvement project focuses on the area immediately surrounding the bath house and a portion of the existing lower parking lot. The plan proposes transforming that asphalt area into a spray deck, playground, and universally accessible recreational space.

Ms. Kendall then described the resource areas near the project site. She explained that an intermittent stream flows from an adjacent city property and meanders through the project area before broadening into a vegetated wetland system. The water then leaves the wetland via a raised culvert structure and enters Lake Quinsigamond through an underground pipe. She identified the Bank of the intermittent stream, Bordering Vegetated Wetland (BVW), and the 100-foot buffer zone, portions of which overlap with the limits of the proposed work. She noted that there is no mapped floodplain associated with the site.

Ms. Kendall described vegetation within the project area, noting a mix of native and non-native species, including a notable presence of Norway Maple and invasive understory species such as burning bush and bittersweet. The applicant is proposing removal of nine trees along the upper slope—eight of which are non-native Norway maple—as well as removal of invasive vegetation. She explained that the project would restore the area by planting twenty-six native trees and placing a woodland seed mix along portions of the slope to improve habitat diversity and restore ecological function.

Hillary Homes, Hatch Design Consultants, reviewed the proposed grading and drainage improvements. She explained that the current parking lot lacks any infiltration or significant stormwater treatment and that the existing outfall requires repair and replacement to meet contemporary design standards. She detailed the proposed stormwater system, which includes deep-sump catch basins, area drains, and an underground infiltration gallery composed of perforated pipe surrounded by crushed stone. She emphasized that this project falls within a DCR priority watershed and must therefore maximize pollution reduction, especially in relation to phosphorus. She did note that test pits had not been conducted yet but will be conducted prior to construction.



The City of Worcester

Mr. Flint reported that staff had visited the site with the project team and found the proposal beneficial in many respects. The project substantially reduces impervious surface area, improves stormwater treatment, removes invasive vegetation, and restores native habitat. He stated that staff had no concerns regarding the proposed scope. Because the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) had not yet issued a file number, the Commission cannot close the hearing or issue an Order of Conditions at this meeting. Mr. Flint also stated that staff were comfortable conditioning the infiltration test pits to occur later during the permitting process.

Chair Fratoni raised questions about the spray deck's water supply and drainage. Mr. Keel confirmed that the spray deck uses potable city water, not re-circulated water, and that all spray deck drainage would flow into the infiltration system.

Due to the absence of a DEP file number, the Chair Fratoni entertained a motion to continue the hearing until August 3.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Nystrom, seconded by Commissioner Kirshner, the Commission voted 4-0 by roll call vote to continue the public hearing to August 3rd, 2026.

List of Exhibits:

Exhibit A: Notice of Intent; dated 06/22/2026; prepared by Andrea Kendall

Exhibit B: Site Plan; dated 04/2026; prepared by Hilary A. Holmes, Hatch Design Consultants

Exhibit C: Stormwater Report; dated 06/10/2026; prepared by Hilary A. Holmes, Hatch Design Consultants

6) 35 State Road (MBL 32-019-00316) - CC-2026-045 & DEP#349- 14xx

Paul Lenkarski, the applicant, reviewed the proposal involving complete removal of the current structure and construction of a new residential building containing eight one-bedroom units. The redevelopment will include creation of sixteen parking spaces, which complies with Worcester's zoning requirements for a development of this size. He noted that approximately fourteen parking spaces currently exist on the site. He noted that the redevelopment will include installation of an underground stormwater retention area designed to manage runoff from both the parking lot and the building's roof drains. He added that accessory landscaping and related site improvements were also planned as part of the complete redevelopment of the parcel.

Mr. Flint began by noting that the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) had not yet issued a file number for this Notice of Intent. Therefore, the Commission could not close the hearing or vote on the matter that evening. He then provided detailed comments concerning the wetland resource areas associated with the project.



The City of Worcester

Mr. Flint explained that a bordering vegetated wetland (BVW) is located to the east of the property and that a stream flows near or through this portion of the site. The wetland line was depicted clearly on the submitted plans, and staff had visited the site to review the delineation. He reported that staff had no concerns with the accuracy of the flagging, although many of the flags had faded; new flags bearing legible identification numbers would be required so that staff and the Commission could verify locations during any future field visits.

Mr. Flint stated that stormwater considerations were particularly complex due to the site's location within Zone A of a public drinking water supply. Under the Massachusetts Stormwater Standards, specifically Standard 6, new discharges within Zone A are prohibited except for projects associated directly with public drinking water infrastructure. Staff explained that MassDEP maps Zone A differently from the watershed protection zones shown under DCR's jurisdiction and that, in this instance, the site fell within MassDEP's Zone A, even though it was not located within DCR's primary or secondary protection zones. He acknowledged that such mapping discrepancies were uncommon but nevertheless controlling under the state's stormwater standards. Because of the regulatory complexity, staff reported that they had initiated an inquiry with MassDEP seeking clarification. Specifically, staff asked whether, under the "maximum extent practicable" framework, MassDEP might allow a new discharge within Zone A if the alternative—sheet flow across the site—would be less protective of water quality.

Mr. Flint added that a small number of additional revisions would be needed, including updates to erosion-control details and potential installation of native buffer plantings between the parking lot and the wetland to enhance natural filtration. Staff also informed the Commission that the Commonwealth's watershed protection program had notified the City that the project would require a variance under the Watershed Protection Act. Staff had discussed the matter with representatives from the program, and although no major concerns were raised, both sides agreed to maintain communication as reviews progressed.

Finally, Mr. Flint indicated that, regardless of whether MassDEP ultimately allows a discharge in Zone A, modifications to the applicant's stormwater report would likely be necessary to address Standard 6 explicitly and to ensure that any discharge or infiltration method complies with state requirements.

Chair Fratoni asked whether the applicant understood the regulatory complexities and the significance of the property's location within a drinking water protection zone. Mr. Lenkarski responded that he and his engineer were aware of the issue, noting that they had already met with DCR and applied for the necessary variance. He explained that under DCR's mapping, the property lies within a "low-yield zone," rather than the more restrictive 200-foot or 400-foot protection zones. However, Mr. Flint clarified that MassDEP's mapping governs Standard 6 compliance, not DCR's mapping under the Watershed Protection Act.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Nystrom, seconded by Commissioner Kirshner, the Commission voted 4-0 by roll call vote to continue the public hearing to August 3rd, 2026.



The City of Worcester

List of Exhibits:

- Exhibit A: Notice of Intent; dated 06/22/2026; prepared by Vito Colonna, Connorstone Engineering, Inc.
- Exhibit B: Site Plan; dated 05/21/2026; revised 06/22/2026; prepared by Vito Colonna, Connorstone Engineering, Inc.
- Exhibit C: Stormwater Report; dated 05/20/2026; prepared by Vito Colonna, Connorstone Engineering, Inc.
- Exhibit D: Wetland Report; dated 10/24/2025; Doug Dillon, Goddard Consulting

New Business – Request Amended Order of Conditions

7) Lots 9, 10, 11, & 12 Chester Street (MBL 55-004-001C9, -01C10, -01C11, & -01C12) - CC-2026-043 (CC-2025-053 & DEP#349-1428

James Tetreault of Expedited Engineering appeared on behalf of the applicant, Modern Structures, Inc., whose principal, Mike Fam, was also present. Mr. Tetreault explained that the Commission originally issued an Order of Conditions in October of the previous year for the construction of four single-family homes on these lots. During subsequent Planning Board review, as well as review by the City's newly appointed Director of Engineering, several issues were identified that required modifications to the approved grading plan.

Mr. Tetreault stated that the new Director of Engineering had requested a geotechnical analysis of the hillside behind the proposed homes to determine slope stability. A geotechnical engineer conducted soil borings and evaluated stability in accordance with standard slope failure models. The analysis concluded that the slope would need to be graded to at least 2.66:1 to meet acceptable factors of safety. In response, the applicant redesigned the slopes to grade them at 2.8:1, slightly flatter than required. To accommodate the required slope, backyard depths were reduced on several lots. The applicant also prepared new stamped plans for a retaining wall located on Lot 9.

Mr. Flint stated that the primary wetland concern is related to the increased clearing necessary to implement the flatter slope design. He noted that the situation was somewhat unique because the wetland is located upgradient of the work area rather than downgradient. As a result, erosion concerns pertain primarily to runoff washing toward Chester Street rather than toward the wetland. Mr. Flint expressed no objection to the revised slope grading but recommended that the Commission consider requiring additional native plantings on the hillside to compensate for loss of tree canopy and to increase slope stabilization through long-rooted vegetation.

Chair Fratoni expressed concerns with runoff to the street during construction and clear cutting of the hillside. Mr. Tetreault explained how construction would proceed in phases to minimize erosion. For example, although trees would be cut early in the project, stumps would remain in place until grading occurred, thereby reducing soil disturbance. Temporary sediment basins would be created at strategic locations during each phase, eventually consolidating into a single basin at Lot 12 as construction progressed. A designated stockpile area and construction entrance were included in the plans.



The City of Worcester

Chair Fratoni questioned how trucks and construction equipment would access the site without destabilizing newly graded slopes. Mr. Tetreault stated that the initial access point would be located at Lot 12 and that equipment movements would be confined to designated work zones shown on the interim plans.

Chair Fratoni also inquired about seasonal stabilization. Mr. Tetreault explained that if some slopes could not be seeded due to winter conditions, the applicant would stabilize those areas with stump grindings—material preferred for its ability to adhere to soil and provide erosion resistance during freeze-thaw cycles.

Mr. Flint asked about the seed mix being used on the slope. Mr. Tetreault confirmed that a slope stabilization mix containing fescue, rye, and related species was included on the landscape sheet. However, upon further discussion, Commissioners and staff agreed that the hillside should be seeded with a conservation or no-mow native erosion control mix rather than a conventional lawn mix. The Commission emphasized that a native, unmowed mix would provide a stronger root systems for slope stability, allow natural succession of native species, and reduce long-term maintenance burdens.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Nystrom, seconded by Commissioner Kirshner, the Commission voted 4-0 by roll call vote to close the public hearing.

Mr. Flint recommended Replacing the prior plan reference with the May 26, 2026 revised plans; requiring the hillside to be seeded with a native, no-mow conservation erosion control mix; retaining the condition requiring submission of an Operation & Maintenance plan for the area drains; removing the outdated condition relating to infiltration trenches, which were removed from the revised design.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Nystrom, seconded by Commissioner Kirshner, the Commission voted 4-0 by roll call vote to issue the Order of Conditions as discussed.

List of Exhibits:

Exhibit A: Request for Amended Order of Conditions; dated 06/11/2026; prepared by James Tetreault, Expedited Engineering

Exhibit B: Site Plan; dated 06/25/2025; revised 08/08/2025; revised 08/25/2025; revised 09/23/2025; revised 10/10/2025; revised 10/31/2025; revised 12/10/2025; revised 03/13/2026; revised 04/27/2026; revised 05/26/2026; prepared by James L. Tetreault, Expedited Engineering, LLC

Exhibit C: Drainage Report; dated 08/08/2025; revised 03/13/2026; prepared by James L. Tetreault, Expedited Engineering, LLC

Other Business

10) Request for Certificate of Compliance a. 51 Oriol Drive (CC-2022-065)



The City of Worcester

Ms. VandenBoom reviewed the request for a Certificate of Compliance for 51 Oriel Drive, a large apartment complex previously permitted under a local Wetlands Ordinance filing. Staff reported that there are no wetlands associated with the property and that the Conservation Commission's jurisdiction was limited to ensuring compliance with the stormwater and erosion control conditions applicable to the original permit. A site visit conducted by staff on the preceding Friday confirmed that the site was fully stabilized. An as-built plan and a certification letter from the engineer of record were submitted, verifying compliance with the approved stormwater design.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Nystrom, seconded by Commissioner Kirshner, the Commission voted 4-0 by roll call vote to issue the Certificate of Compliance.

List of Exhibits:

- Exhibit A: Certificate of Compliance Request; dated 03/04/2026; prepared by Mark Borenstein, Prince Lobel
- Exhibit B: As-built Plan; dated 06/12/2026; prepared by Andrew J. Ruggles, Allen & Major

b. 2 Lodi Street (fka 50 Lafayette Street) (CC-2023-073 & DEP# 349-1403)

Ms. VandenBoom reviewed the request and noted the Commission had reviewed this at the previous meeting. She confirmed the requested modification had been made on the fence. She confirmed that staff have no concerns about this item moving forward for a Certificate of Compliance.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Nystrom, seconded by Commissioner Kirshner, the Commission voted 4-0 by roll call vote to issue the Certificate of Compliance.

List of Exhibits:

- Exhibit A: Certificate of Compliance Request; dated 06/04/2026; prepared by Carla Pires

c. 70 Webster Street (CC-2024-033 & DEP#349-1394)

Nick Kelling, Level Design Group, LLC, on behalf of the applicant, Gold Star Builders, Inc. explained that while the project had been largely constructed in accordance with the approved plans, several minor modifications were made during construction. the transformer pad had been relocated due to instructions from the electric utility. Additionally, the western parking aisle width had been reduced from 24 feet to 22 feet, a change permissible under the special permit issued for that portion of the project. Mr. Nick further explained that a guardrail previously proposed had instead been replaced with a two-foot-high concrete-retaining wall topped by a four-foot aluminum safety fence. Although this differed from the approved plan, he confirmed that the wall and fence served the same functional purpose as the guardrail and provided equal or better safety containment. He also reported extending riprap by approximately five feet along a section of slope to improve erosion control near a concrete retaining wall.



The City of Worcester

Ms. VandenBoom noted the Commission had previously requested installation of shrubs downgradient of the outfall, but the applicant determined that installation would require disturbance of well-established vegetation. She agreed that avoiding unnecessary disturbance was reasonable.

Upon a motion by Commissioner Nystrom, seconded by Commissioner Kirshner, the Commission voted 3-0 to issue a certificate of compliance.

List of Exhibits:

Exhibit A: Certificate of Compliance Request; dated 06/24/2026; prepared by Nicola Facendola, Level Design Group, LLC

Exhibit B: As-built Plan; dated 06/16/2026; prepared by Nicola Facendola, Level Design Group, LLC

9) Enforcement Order and Violation Updates

a. 133 Lake Avenue North (CC-2020-007)

b. 99 Wildwood Avenue (CC-EO-2020-009)

c. 166 Moreland Street (CC-EO-2020-011)

d. 269 James Street (CC-EO-2021-007)

e. 4 Tiffany Avenue (CC-EO-2023-001)

f. 570 Lincoln Street (CC-EO-2023-010)

g. 198 Granite Street (CC-EO-2024-001)

Glenn Krevosky of EBT Environmental Consultants appeared, accompanied by property owner representative Mr. Chris Dimarzio. Mr. Krevosky began by addressing the Commission's prior questions concerning the sediment removal plan and clarified discrepancies identified between the narrative and the plan sheets. Specifically, he noted that one plan sheet referenced 3–4-inch subangular rock while another referenced 6–10-inch rock, and he explained that the latter range—extending up to 10 inches—was the correct specification for the largest rock intended for channel stabilization. He further clarified that the channel reconstruction would utilize stone ranging from the larger 10-inch pieces down to smaller grades to replicate appropriate natural gradation.

Mr. Krevosky described the sedimentation and scour conditions within the channel. He noted that a photograph submitted as part of the record demonstrated severe scour below the existing culvert, attributable to the increased peak flows created by upstream impervious surfaces. He related these findings to NOAA analyses indicating trends of higher peak flow events. In support of the proposed remediation methods, Mr. Krevosky referenced a previous 260-foot channel reconstruction project conducted by EBT in Oxford, Massachusetts, where subangular rock and engineered grading withstood much greater flows from a one-square-mile watershed. He emphasized that EBT was well-experienced in designing and reconstructing channels to withstand high-intensity storm events.



The City of Worcester

He then reviewed the planned method of sediment removal. The work would be completed primarily using a mid-sized John Deere 75G excavator equipped with a cleanup bucket. He reiterated that the earlier augering performed by EBT had identified the A-horizon beneath the sediment, confirming that excavation could be performed to a known, stable soil layer. Mr. Krevosky emphasized that the excavation would be conducted carefully to prevent damage to the underlying mineral layer and to preserve the integrity of the wetland system.

Mr. Krevosky next explained the bypass strategy for maintaining flow during excavation. An 8-inch bypass pipe would be used to divert water from the culvert to a stable channel. He stated that during recent high-flow events—specifically during the storm that contributed to peak flows into the Blackstone River—he observed that water flowing from the Granite Street culvert had been effectively captured by National Grid’s newly installed crushed-stone driveway and supplemental subsurface drainage trench. These structures had prevented high flows from entering the sediment removal area, and Mr. Krevosky expressed confidence that similar capacity would prevent stormwater from interfering with the sediment removal during construction.

He then described the restoration plan, noting that existing elderberry and arrowwood shrubs located in the upper wet meadow would be salvaged and replanted. Additional upland and wetland plantings would be installed post-excavation, although he stated that hydric soils were not expected to remain once sediment was removed down to the A-horizon. This would allow planting of species appropriate to the underlying mineral substrate.

At this point, Mr. Dimarzio addressed the Commission regarding the disposition of the excavated sediment. He explained that negotiations were ongoing with National Grid, the underlying landowner of the adjacent transmission corridor. While initial discussions with National Grid suggested that the material could remain onsite or be relocated to another portion of National Grid property, updated internal guidance from the utility appeared to require disposal at a remote location. This would impose significant trucking and handling costs on the applicant. Mr. Dimarzio reported that he had spoken with National Grid representatives that morning and believed that internal discussions were continuing. He stated that the applicant had offered to indemnify National Grid to allow the sediment to be transported and stockpiled on a portion of land owned by the applicant beneath the transmission lines. He added that, at minimum, the applicant hoped National Grid would allow temporary stockpiling so that removal could proceed during the dry season, even if final disposal arrangements were not yet resolved.



The City of Worcester

The Commission and staff then discussed the remaining procedural requirements for authorizing the sediment removal work. Mr. Flint emphasized that because the property is subject to a conservation restriction held jointly by Greater Worcester Land Trust and Mass Audubon, the Commission must receive written confirmation from those organizations that the proposed work is permissible under the terms of the restriction. He also reported that the City Law Department was drafting a license agreement that would allow access to the city-owned portion of the site for excavation. Once the Commission received approvals from the conservation restriction holders and once the license agreement was in place, the Commission could formally amend the enforcement order to require implementation of the sediment removal plan.

Mr. Dimarzio anticipated having an update from National Grid by the Commission's next meeting on August 3. Mr. Flint stated that written responses from Mass Audubon and Greater Worcester Land Trust should also be received by the next meeting and that the license agreement should be ready at that time. Accordingly, staff indicated that the Commission would be in a position at the August 3 meeting to consider formally amending the Enforcement Order to authorize the work.

h. 86 Webster Street (CC-EO-2024-003)

i. Salisbury Hill (CC-EO-2024-005 & DEP#349-1253)

j. 262 Mill Street (CC-EO-2024-007)

k. 142-158 Wildwood Avenue (CC-EO-2024-010)

l. 1256 West Boylston Street (CC-EO-2025-001)

m. 13 Holden Street (CC-EO-2025-002 & DEP# 349-1409)

n. 270 Webster Street (CC-EO-2025-004)

o. 34 Eskow Road & 224 Southwest Cutoff (CC-EO-2025-006)

p. 148A Tory Fort Lane (CC-EO-2025-007, CC-2023-016, & DEP# 349-1356)

q. 1259 West Boylston Street (CC-EO-2025-008)

r. 145 Newton Ave North (CC-EO-2025-009)

s. 757 Salisbury Street (CC-EO-2025-010 & CC-2023-005)

t. 9 & 13 Elton Street (CC-EO-2025-011, CC-2024-083, & DEP#349-1407)

u. 612 Grove Street (CC-EO-2026-001)

v. 342 (aka 344, 346, & 348) Lake Avenue (CC-EO-2026-002 & DEP#349-1435)

w. 88 Webster Street (CC-2023-025 & DEP#349-1361)



The City of Worcester

Ms. VandenBoom explained while conducting the site visit for the 70 Webster Street Certificate of Compliance, she observed that riprap had been installed along the bank of Curtis Pond abutting 88 Webster Street without authorization. She presented photographic evidence showing that the bank appeared significantly degraded prior to the riprap placement, with signs of erosion, slumping, and progressive loss of asphalt at the property's edge. The newly placed riprap extended down the bank and into the water, modifying both Bank and the Bordering Land Subject to Flooding (BLSF), thereby falling under the Commission's jurisdiction.

Staff reported that a violation notice had been issued, and the property owner along with their engineer were instructed to appear before the Commission. However, the engineer was unavailable for this meeting due to travel, and staff requested that the Commission allow the matter to be heard at the next meeting on August 3.

There was no discussion of item 9a-9f & 9h-9v.

10) Open Space Discussion

a. Brooks Dairy Farm Ribbon Cutting Ceremony – July 14th at 5:30 PM

Mr. Flint reminded the Commission that a ribbon-cutting ceremony for the newly acquired Brooks Dairy Farm open space property was scheduled for the following day at 5:30 p.m. The ceremony would feature remarks by the City Manager, District Counselor, and Mayor, along with representatives from the Greater Worcester Land Trust.

11) Discussion of Active Projects

There was no discussion of item 11.

12) Communications

a. MassDEP – 4 Brandt Lane (CC-2026-024(CC-2024-087 & DEP# 349-1411) – Superseding Order of Conditions Withdrawn

Ms. VandenBoom reported that the Department of Environmental Protection had formally withdrawn its appeal of the Brandt Lane project. The original permit issued by the Commission had authorized rerouting of a small stream on the property, prompting DEP to file an appeal. After discussions with DEP, the applicant revised the project to abandon the stream-rerouting plan and instead restore the existing stream channel. With those changes submitted, DEP withdrew its appeal, clearing the way for the applicant to proceed with work.

Mr. Flint noted that while site work had not begun in earnest, the applicant had an active Determination of Applicability authorizing minor cleanup work, and full construction would not commence until after the Commission conducted a pre-construction meeting.

13) Approval of Minutes – June 22nd, 2026

Upon a motion by Commissioner Nystrom, seconded by Commissioner Kirshner, the Commission voted 4-0 by roll call vote to approve the minutes.



The City of Worcester

14) Update to Wetlands Protection Ordinance and Regulations

Ms. Flint provided an update on the Commission's ongoing effort to revise the Wetlands Protection Ordinance and associated regulations. Staff stated that drafting work continued steadily, with focus on refining performance standards, clarifying jurisdictional definitions, and potentially updating the fee schedule, which had not been revised for many years. He noted that the draft regulations, including all proposed edits, remained available in the Commission's shared Google Drive folder, and additional updates would be made throughout the summer.

15) Commission Liaison Update Lake Quinsigamond Commission

Ms. VandenBoom reported that the primary topic at that meeting was the growing use of wake boats on the lake. Several individuals addressed the Lake Commission both in favor of and in opposition to wake boats. Concerns raised included shoreline erosion caused by the large wakes generated by these boats, safety considerations for swimmers and other boaters, and environmental implications such as the potential spread of invasive aquatic species through ballast water intake and discharge. She noted that the Lake Commission had not made any regulatory decisions at that meeting but continued to explore options, including restrictions based on distance from shore or water depth. The matter remained under active discussion.

16) Policies and Procedures

There was no discussion of item 16.

Adjournment:

Upon a motion by Commissioner Nystrom, seconded by Commissioner Kirshner, the Commission voted by roll call vote to adjourn at approximately 7:16 PM.