

BERKSHIRE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
1 FENN STREET, SUITE 201, PITTSFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS 01201
TELEPHONE (413) 442-1521 · FAX (413) 442-1523
www.berkshireplanning.org

SHEILA IRVIN, Chair
KYLE HANLON, Vice-Chair
MARILYN WILEY, Clerk
CHARLES P. OGDEN, Treasurer

NATHANIEL W. KARNS, A.I.C.P.
Executive Director

MEETING NOTICE

A meeting of the Berkshire Regional Planning Commission
will be held on:

Thursday, July 10, 2014 at **5:30 p.m.**

Berkshire Regional Planning Commission Offices
Pittsfield, Massachusetts

Meeting Material: All written materials for the meeting are posted on BRPC's website:
www.berkshireplanning.org. Click on the calendar date for the meeting and materials available
will be listed.

AGENDA

- I. Opening (5:30-5:35)**
- A. Call to Order
 - B. Roll Call
 - C. Approval of Minutes of May 15, 2014 Meeting
- II. Comments from the Public (5:35-5:40)**
- Members of the public may offer comments regarding topics which are on the agenda or other matters which they wish to bring to the Commission's attention. Comments are limited to no more than three minutes and are to be directed to the Commission.*
- III. Delegates' Issues (5:40-5:45)**
- Delegates and Alternates may bring up any issue not on the agenda.*
- IV. Election of BRPC Officers for FY 2015 (5:45-5:55)**
- The Nominating Committee proposed the following slate of officers for FY 2015:*
- Chair: Sheila Irvin, Pittsfield Delegate*
 - Vice Chair: Kyle Hanlon, North Adams Delegate*
 - Clerk: Marie Raftery, Stockbridge Alternate*
 - Treasurer: Charles Ogden, Egremont Alternate*
- Nominations will be taken from the floor.*
- V. Endorsement of Committee Chair and At-Large Executive Committee Member Appointments (5:55-6:00)**

VI. Consideration of Clearinghouse Review Committee Comments on Connecticut Expansion Project of the Tennessee Gas Pipeline (Sandisfield and Tyringham) Expanded Environmental Notification Form (6:00-6:20)

An EENF has been filed for expansion of the existing Tennessee Gas Pipeline in Sandisfield, with an associated pipeyard in Tyringham. The Clearinghouse Review Committee met on June 25th and endorsed proposed comments on this significant infrastructure project. Commission consideration of the comments is requested.

VII. Consideration of Comments on H.4065 – An Act Promoting the Planning and Development of Sustainable Communities (6:20-6:50)

The Regional Issues Committee has met on the most recent version of the land use reform legislation (now H.4065, previously H.1859). This bill has been reported favorably from the Joint Committee on Municipalities and Regional Government and is awaiting action in the House Ways & Means Committee. The BRPC Regional Issues Committee has recommended a proposed letter to be shared with our legislative delegation, the House and Senate Committee Chairs, the Speaker of the House and the Senate President. A copy of the draft letter is attached and further information is available on the BRPC website with Commission meeting materials.

VIII. Approval of Executive Committee Actions between May 16 and July 10, 2014 (6:50-6:55)

IX. Executive Director's Report (6:55-7:00)

- A. 2015 District Local Technical Assistance & Community Innovation Challenge Grant Funding
- B. Nominations for 2014 Charles Kusik Award for Outstanding Contributions to Planning in Berkshire County
- C. MassBroadband 123 – Get Connected – Monday, July 14th, Crowne Plaza Hotel, Pittsfield
- D. New Planning Board and Zoning Board of Appeals Member Training – Thursday, July 31st, BRPC
- E. New Pavement Management Assessments in Great Barrington and Lee
- F. Assistance to Sandisfield in Procuring Public Works Construction Services for Various Segments of New Hartford Road
- G. Other

X. Adjournment (7:00)

Other interested citizens and officials are invited to attend.

City and Town Clerks: Please post this notice pursuant to M.G.L. Chapter 39, Section 23B

BERKSHIRE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
1 FENN STREET, SUITE 201, PITTSFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS 01201
TELEPHONE (413) 442-1521 · FAX (413) 442-1523
Massachusetts Relay Service: TTY: 771 or 1-800-439-2370
www.berkshireplanning.org

SHEILA IRVIN, Chair
KYLE HANLON, Vice-Chair
MARILYN WILEY, Clerk
CHARLES P. OGDEN, Treasurer

NATHANIEL W. KARNS
Executive Director

DRAFT MINUTES OF THE BERKSHIRE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Thursday, May 15, 2014
At the Berkshire Regional Planning Commission Office
1 Fenn Street, Suite 201, Pittsfield, MA 01201

I. Call to Order

A. The meeting is called to order at: 7:00 PM

Chair Sheila Irvin reminded all per the open meeting law, BRPC records all meetings. Others may record the meeting after informing the chair. Any documents presented must be left with the chair at the meeting.

B. Introductions/Roll Call

The following Commission members are present:

Robert Ronzio – Becket Delegate
Beth Van Ness – Becket Alternate
Caleb Darby – Dalton Delegate
Mark Holmes – Egremont Delegate
Jack Hickey – Lanesborough Alternate
Wayne Burkhart – Monterey Alternate
James Lovejoy – Mount Washington Alternate
James Mullen – New Marlborough Delegate
Kyle Hanlon – North Adams Delegate
Sheila Irvin – Pittsfield Delegate
Marie Raftery – Stockbridge Alternate
Sarah Hudson – Tyringham Alternate
Roger Bolton – Williamstown Alternate

Staff Present:

Nat Karns - Executive Director
Tom Matuszko – Assistant Director
Marianne Sniezek - Office Manager
Melissa Provencher – Senior Planner
Clete Kus – Transportation Manager

Others Present:

Chris Ketchen – Lenox Town Manager

C. Approval of Minutes of Commission Committee Meeting of January 16, 2014 Meeting

Jamie Mullen moved to approve the minutes; seconded by Kyle Hanlon. Unanimously approved.

II. Public Comments – none

III. Delegate & Alternate Issues – none

IV. Consideration of Draft Transportation Improvement Program for FY 2015-2018

Clete Kus, Transportation Manager, gave an overview of the TIP for FY2015-2018. For FY2015 the funds have been allocated to the Lee Tyringham Road project and improvement to the intersections of West

Housatonic and Center Streets in Pittsfield. The remaining funds will be used to go out to bid on the Dalton Housatonic Street project. For FY2016 the Dalton Housatonic Street project will be the primary project, along with improvements to the intersections at Rte 20 and Walker Street in Lenox. For FY 2017 the funds will be used to complete the Dalton Housatonic Street Project and the extension of the Ashuwillticook Rail Trail from Lime Street in Adams to Hodges Cross Road in North Adams. The BMC area improvements in Pittsfield will be started.

The Commission should recommend to the Chair on how to vote at the MPO meeting on which of the three FY2018 options the Commission supports. The three scenarios are listed on the colored hand out.

The differences are:

- 1A - Lenox, Route 183/Walker St. - \$2.9 Million not covered to complete the project
- 1B - Williamstown, Route 43/Water St. – 100% of the cost covered
- 1C - Washington, Washington Mountain Rd - \$6.9 Million not covered to complete the project

Jack Hickey reported the Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC) unanimously supported Scenario 1C. The rationale for their decision was the condition of Washington Mountain Road which is in very dire need of repair.

Roger Bolton stated the improvements to the road and sidewalks will increase the attractiveness to the new affordable housing in the Cable Mills Complex. The project is very noteworthy project.

Jim Lovejoy stated Washington Mountain Road is heavily traveled road and goes by the Pittsfield water supply. The Washington Mountain Road project is at 100% design.

Robert Ronzio stated Washington Mountain Road serves Becket and the road is a thoroughfare to Chester and Otis.

Jamie Mullen made a motion to recommend the Chair to support Scenario 1C at the MPO meeting; seconded by Jack Hickey. Nine approved with one abstention.

V. Consideration of Draft Transportation Unified Planning Work Program for FY 2015

Clete explained the work activities identified in the Draft UPWP for the staff in FY 2015. Clete highlighted new work activities:

- Title VI/ADA – American Disabilities Act
- Bicycle Counts
- Monument Square Pedestrian Safety Study in North Adams
- Pedestrian Safety Study in Dalton
- Under Bicycle and Pedestrian Planning – Identifying improvements to widening, striping, signals, and signage, and best practices on different land use (urban, suburban, rural and open space)

Clete explained under the Safety Analysis task BRPC will conduct a Road Safety Audit. The location is chosen using accident data from the Registry of Motor Vehicles (RMV) on high crash locations including deaths reported by local police to the RMV.

Jamie Mullen moved to endorse the UPWP as presented at the MPO meeting; seconded by Wayne Burkhart. Unanimously approved.

VI. Kinder-Morgan Natural Gas Transmission Pipeline Projects

Melissa Provencher gave an overview of the two pipeline proposals that are in different stages.

1. Existing pipeline running southeast from Richmond thru Sandisfield, then to Connecticut. There will be the need for a MEPA review in the near future.
2. New pipeline running northeast from Richmond thru Windsor up to New Hampshire.

BRPC submitted a Federal Technical Assistance Grant application for educational training for Berkshire County and other areas affected in Massachusetts. BRPC received strong support from Senators Warren and Markey and U.S. Representatives Neal, McGovern, Tsongas and Capuano and four other regional planning agencies. If awarded the grant would also provide a small amount of money for meetings in each affected region.

BRPC has been requested to use District Local Technical Assistant funds to start the process.

VII. Report of the Regional Issues Committee – Utilization of the Rural-Urban Transect and Form-Based Codes

Jamie Mullen explained using form-based codes is more complex and communities and staff would need education in this Land Use Regulation tool that is an alternate tool to zoning. Form-Based Codes or Smart codes regulate development.

At the Regional Issues Committee last meeting, May 5th, the following motion was approved:

To recommend to the Commission that on the topics of form-based coding and design standards it direct the staff to seek funding for:

1. additional staff and Commission education; and
2. technical assistance grants to Berkshire towns and cities

Kyle Hanlon moved to approve; seconded by Roger Bolton. Unanimously approved.

VIII. Consideration of BRPC Budget for FY 2015

Nat explained the proposed FY15 Budget in total has an increase over FY14 due to an increase in subcontractors. The proposed budget shows \$191,797 in unsecured new projects. If the gap is not closed we will have to revisit. District Local Technical Assistance funding is two staff positions. BRPC has two less planners decreasing direct billable salaries. Benefits are decreasing due to fewer planners and lower health insurance cost. Once again BRPC plans to contribute \$45,000 into the Retiree Health Insurance Liability Trust. Non-personnel operating costs have decreased. We have budgeted to put \$15,000 into our reserve.

Kyle Hanlon moved to approve; seconded by Caleb Darby. Unanimously approved.

IX. Report of the Nominating Committee – Slate of Officer Candidates for FY 2015

Sarah Hudson announced the recommended slate of officers for FY2015:

SHEILA IRVIN, Chair
KYLE HANLON, Vice-Chair
MARIE RAFTERY, Clerk
CHARLES P. OGDEN, Treasurer

Nat explained there will be a summer meeting most likely in July to elect officers.

X. Approval of Executive Committee Actions between March 20 and May 15, 2014

Kyle Hanlon moved to approve; seconded by Jack Hickey. Unanimously approved.

XI. Executive Director's Report

- A. MassDOT Project Selection Advisory Council Public Hearing – Tuesday, May 20, 2014, BRPC**
MassDOT created the Council on how to fund projects. Jim has been pushing for Regional Equity as a criteria for decisions on how to fund projects. A certain amount of funding should go to each region. Use the MPO's to define the regions. By using different criteria other than lane miles and population as criteria will assist funding needed in Berkshire County. Jim Lovejoy explained he and Linda Dunlavy from FRCOG are on the committee. The chair is Richard Davey, Secretary of the Transportation.
- B. Release of Proposed Remedy for Rest of River Clean-Up by EPA – Tuesday, June 17, 2014, Lenox Middle/High School** – Nat explained we do not know what the remedy is at this time.
- C. Status of 2015 District Local Technical Assistance & Community Innovation Challenge Grant Funding in Budget** – This is a critical line item in BRPC's budget and our communities and the work BRPC does for those communities.
- D. H.1859 – “An Act promoting the planning and development of sustainable communities” (formerly the Comprehensive Land Use Reform Act)** Nat will review the new bill number H4065. The Regional Issues Committee will meet on June 2nd to review this legislation, formerly known as CLURPA. There appears to be support in the House to support the bill.
- E. 5th Thursday Dinner for Planning & Zoning Boards – Planning for the Impacts of Climate Change at the Local Level - May 29th, Cork & Hearth, Lee** – Nat urged all to sign up.
- F. Other**

Nat will follow up on money available from MEMA/FEMA. Jim Lovejoy stated mixed messages are being heard on availability of money. Any community that is part of a Hazard Mitigation Plan will receive cleanup money after a storm. Nat explained RPAs can no longer collect Admin cost for new MEMA/FEMA contracts. BRPC cannot be the applicant due to the change. A community would need to be the lead and hire BRPC as a subcontractor to cover administrative cost.

XII. Adjournment

Jamie Mullen made a motion to adjourn; seconded by Sarah Hudson. Unanimously approved.
Adjourned at 8:50 pm.

Materials distributed or presented during this meeting:

- Meeting Agenda
- Draft Meeting Minutes
- Approval of Executive Committee Actions Memo
- Executive Director's Report
- Consideration of Proposed TIP FY 2015-2018
- FFY 2018 Scenarios
- Consideration of Proposed UPWP for FY 2015
- Introduction to the Rural to Urban Transect
- What are Form-Based Codes?
- Defining a one-block parcel – by zoning, design guidelines, or form-based codes
- Consideration of BRPC FY 2015 Budget
- Proposed Expansion of Projects Tennessee Gas

BERKSHIRE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
1 FENN STREET, SUITE 201, PITTSFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS 01201
TELEPHONE (413) 442-1521 · FAX (413) 442-1523
www.berkshireplanning.org

SHEILA IRVIN, Chair
KYLE HANLON, Vice-Chair
MARILYN WILEY, Clerk
CHARLES P. OGDEN, Treasurer

NATHANIEL W. KARNS, A.I.C.P.
Executive Director

MEMORANDUM

TO: Delegates and Alternates, Berkshire Regional Planning Commission
FROM: Nathaniel W. Karns, AICP, Executive Director
DATE: July 7, 2014
SUBJ: Authorization for Executive Committee to Act on Behalf of the Commission

The bylaws for BRPC stipulate that the Delegates (or in the absence of a delegate, the Alternate) must vote annually whether to authorize the Executive Committee to act on the Commission's behalf. Such authorization requires approval by a two-thirds ballot vote of the delegates (22 affirmative votes must be received). The authorization for the Executive Committee to act on the Commission's behalf is limited to the following:

1. Disbursement of Commission funds based on a warrant;
2. Borrowing funds in anticipation of revenue;
3. Hearing and resolving personnel grievances;
4. Making applications for federal, state, and local aid;
5. Seeking contributions;
6. Entering into contracts;
7. Preparing reviews and comments on proposals of a regional or inter-community nature;
8. Establishing policy regarding requests for planning-related advice;
9. Authorization for planning services; and
10. Acting on routine transportation matters (excepting adoption of plans, programs, or endorsement of specific projects).

All actions of the Executive Committee are subject to review and endorsement, modification or change at the next Commission meeting and this authorization may be revoked at any Commission meeting by simple majority vote. The Commission retains sole authority to act on the following:

1. Adoption of regional plans or policies;
2. Adoption of BRPC annual assessment and budgets;
3. Election of officers and approval of At-Large Executive Committee members and all committee chairs;
4. Confirmation of appointments to all committees;
5. Approval of Transportation Improvement Program;
6. Endorsement of specific transportation projects;
7. Modification of the duties of the Executive Director; and
8. Adoption or amendment to the bylaws.

Please return a completed ballot at Thursday's Commission meeting or by mail. Alternatively, you can send me an email stating that you either vote in favor of or oppose authorizing the Executive Committee to act on behalf of the Commission.

Thank you.

The Executive Committee of the Berkshire Regional Planning Commission

_____ should be authorized

_____ should not be authorized

to act on behalf of the Commission for the remainder of Fiscal Year 2015.

Delegate's signature

Community represented

Berkshire Regional Planning Commission Clearinghouse Review Report

June 26, 2014

SUBJECT: Connecticut Expansion Project
EOEEA#: 15205
LOCATION: Tyringham and Sandisfield
ESTIMATED COST: Unknown
REVIEW TYPE: EENF
PROPONENT: Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C.
COMMENTS DUE: July 3, 2014

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The “Massachusetts Loop” is located in Sandisfield and consists of approximately 3.8 miles of new 36-inch outside diameter pipeline co-located within or adjacent to the existing Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, L.L.C. (“Tennessee”) 200 Line Mainline right-of-way (“ROW”). The loop segment commences near Tennessee’s existing Mainline Valve (“MLV”) 258 at MP 0.0 adjacent to Town Hill Road and extends southeast to approximately MP 3.8 southeast of South Beech Plain Road. Additional permanent ROW will be required along with temporary workspace (“TWS”) and additional temporary workspace (“ATWS”) to facilitate construction.

The “Connecticut Loop” commences in Agawam in the yard of Compressor Station 261 at MP 0.0 and extends southward approximately 8.1 miles to the terminus in Suffield Connecticut. The portion of the pipeline along this loop section in Massachusetts will consist of approximately 0.11 miles of 24-inch outside diameter pipeline co-located within or adjacent to Tennessee’s existing ROW, terminating at the Massachusetts and Connecticut state line.

Appurtenant facilities associated with the Project will include two pig launchers, one pig receiver and one relocated mainline valve to be constructed by Tennessee. One pig launcher will be constructed at the Agawam Compressor Station property and a second pig launcher will be constructed within the workspace at MP 0.0 in Sandisfield off of Town Hill Road at the beginning of the Massachusetts looping segment. A pig receiver and MLV will be located at the terminus of the Project at MP 3.8 in Sandisfield. Tennessee plans to relocate the existing valve site located off of Town Hill Road to the terminus at MP 3.8 to minimize impacts to state lands and place the valve site on private property at the terminus of the loop. All appurtenant facilities will be constructed within the proposed workspace in the pipeline ROW and will not require additional impacts.

The construction workspace (including TWS, ATWS, permanent ROW, access roads and contractor/pipeyards) will total approximately 58.8 acres. Operation of the Project facilities will require approximately 11.85 acres that will be maintained as new permanent ROW. The majority of the existing land use in the Project area consists of upland forests, open land, agricultural land and wetlands. Typically, pipeline construction will require between 100 to 125 feet of workspace depending on the size of the pipeline to be installed.

Berkshire Regional Planning Commission Clearinghouse Review Report

A 3 acre pipeyard will be located in Tyringham. Although maps are included within the EENF and the pipeyard is periodically referenced, there is no discussion within the EENF relative to the pipeyard.

Required Permits & MEPA Thresholds

The project requires an Order of Conditions from the Tyringham Conservation Commission and the Sandisfield Conservation Commission, MESA Review for Rare and Endangered Species, Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection (MassDEP) Section 401 Water Quality Certification, Massachusetts Historical Commission Project Notification Form, US Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 Permit, US Environmental Protection Agency NPDES Permit, and Federal Energy Regulatory Commission Certificate of Public Convenience and Necessity. The project has reached the MEPA review threshold for an ENF and Mandatory EIR for 58.8 acres of land disturbance and the alteration of 8.87 acres of bordering vegetated wetlands. The proponent is requesting a Single EIR.

CONSIDERATIONS AND POTENTIAL ISSUES:

Land Impacts

Article 97 Land

The construction and operation of the Project will result in impacts to approximately 30 acres of Article 97 Land within Otis State Forest in Sandisfield. Approximately 6 acres will be comprised of new permanent ROW adjacent to the existing ROW to accommodate the installation of the new 36-inch pipe. Approximately 7.2 acres will be workspace on the existing cleared ROW and the remaining 17 acres will be comprised of temporary workspace that will be allowed to re-vegetate following construction.

Blasting

According to the EENF, the USDA-NRCS Web Soil Survey does not identify any shallow depth to bedrock along any portions of the Project loops in Massachusetts. Therefore, the EENF indicates that no blasting is anticipated to be required for the Project. The EENF states that a complete list of blasting locations can only be accurately determined in the field during the construction process. If blasting is necessary, Tennessee will obtain state and municipal approvals associated with proposed blasting prior to the commencement of construction. Tennessee will develop a Blasting Plan for the Project that establishes procedures and safety measures that its contractor will adhere to while implementing blasting activities along the pipeline ROW during the Project. An independent contractor will inspect structures and wells within approximately 200 ft of the construction work area. During blasting, the contractor will monitor ground vibrations at the nearest structure or well within 200 ft of the construction

Berkshire Regional Planning Commission Clearinghouse Review Report

work area. Post-blast inspections of structures will be performed as warranted and wells will be inspected for water quality and flow with the owner's permission.

During the MEPA Consultation Session, it was brought to the proponent's attention that there are significant bedrock outcrops and that based on local knowledge, including previous pipeline construction, blasting should be anticipated. Bedrock outcrops were observed on DCR land during the site visit. The DEIR should include a description of the *anticipated* blasting plan. Based on historical records from previous pipeline construction and bedrock outcrops that are visible in the field, specific areas where blasting is anticipated/likely should be identified.

Environmental Impacts

Rare Species Habitat

Tennessee anticipates using water from Lower Spectacle Pond to conduct hydrostatic testing on all segments of the pipeline prior to placement in service. Tennessee will install a pump at the end of the boat ramp off of Cold Spring Road. A dissipation device (screen) will be used to avoid the entrainment of fish and other wildlife. The screen will be elevated off of the bottom of the pond to avoid the withdrawal of mud and sediment. Lower Spectacle Pond is Priority Habitat for an insect species. The proposed withdrawal process will avoid potential impacts to the state listed species by avoiding impacts to the bottom sediments where this insect would exist in its aquatic larval form. The timing of the withdrawal may also avoid additional impacts to the listed species. Upon completion of the hydrostatic test, the test water will be discharged through a filtration device to an upland area adjacent to the existing ROW. The discharge rate of the test water will be regulated using valves and energy dissipation devices to reduce the potential for erosion. The clean test water will only be discharged into areas where adequate vegetation is present.

During the MEPA Consultation Session, it was learned that the pipeyard in Tyringham includes Priority Habitat for the wood turtle (*Glyptemys insculpta*), American bittern (*Botaurus lentiginosus*), and a third (unidentified) species. The proponent explained that they have initiated correspondence with the Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program (NHESP). The proponent plans to utilize fencing to prevent the wood turtle from entering into the work area. In addition, a mat will be laid over the work area to prevent any American bittern from nesting on the site and prevent direct impacts to the species.

Wetlands

The Project will cross a total of 16 wetlands, representing approximately 5,392 linear feet. In addition to the 16 wetlands crossed by the pipeline, one wetland is impacted by an access road, but will not be crossed by the pipeline. One wetland is located in proximity to the Tyringham pipeyard. Approximately 9.85 acres of wetlands will be temporarily altered and impacted during construction. Approximately 2.19 acres of wetlands will be permanently maintained in a scrub-shrub or herbaceous vegetation community during operation of the pipeline.

Berkshire Regional Planning Commission Clearinghouse Review Report

Tennessee will implement wetland construction procedures to minimize impacts to wetlands. Workspace will be limited to 75ft in width unless topographic conditions or other safety concerns require additional workspace. Tennessee will minimize tree clearing to the maximum extent practicable while maintaining safe construction conditions. Tree clearing within wetlands during operation of the pipeline will be limited to selectively clearing trees within 15 feet of the pipeline that are greater than 15 feet in height. Upon completion of construction, topsoil, contour elevations and hydrologic patterns will be restored, and all disturbed areas will be reseeded or replanted to promote the re-establishment of native hydrophytic vegetation. All TWS and ATWS areas will be restored to pre-construction grades and contours, and reseeded and/or planted during restoration activities.

A 10-foot wide corridor centered over the pipeline will be permanently maintained in an herbaceous state in wetland areas and areas adjacent to perennial streams. The remaining temporary and permanent ROW will revert to its pre-construction land use/land cover once construction is complete. No permanent loss of wetlands will occur due to the construction or operation of the Project, and No Net Loss of Wetlands will be met.

Tennessee will develop a Project-specific wetland mitigation plan prior to construction. Mitigation for permanent wetland impacts will likely consist of off-site wetland restoration or conservation. Tennessee will develop a Project-specific Invasive Species Management Plan ("ISMP") to be implemented prior to construction and to continue for a minimum of five years post-construction.

Riverfront

Two surface waterbody crossings have been identified and three potential methods for crossing have been identified: conventional trenching, flumed crossing, and dam and pump.

Alternatives to sandbags, such as water diversion tubes, should be considered for temporary clean water diversion to reduce the potential for sand to leach out into the stream. *Massachusetts River and Stream Crossing Standards* should be met to the maximum extent practicable. During the MEPA Consultation Session, an existing stream crossing composed of corroding pipes laid across the stream was observed. This crossing does not meet the objectives of the stream crossing standards and does not allow for fish passage. Such crossing should not be included within the proposed project and a plan should be developed for the removal of such existing crossings.

Green House Gases

It is stated within the EENF that Tennessee is not required to quantify Greenhouse Gas emissions during construction of the Project.

Berkshire Regional Planning Commission Clearinghouse Review Report

Based on correspondence with the MEPA Office, the Project is subject to the Revised MEPA Greenhouse Gas Emissions Policy and Protocol (2010). Since the proponent is seeking a Single EIR pursuant to 301 CMR 11.06(8), the proponent should quantify emissions, analyze proposed mitigation, and submit this information in the Expanded Environmental Notification Form (EENF) in accordance with 301 CMR 11.05(7). This information must be submitted within a Draft Environmental Impact Report.

The proponent should quantify emissions, analyze proposed mitigation, and submit this information in accordance with the Revised MEPA Greenhouse Gas Emissions Policy and Protocol. Both carbon dioxide (CO₂) and methane (CH₄) emissions should be quantified for construction activities and ongoing maintenance and operation.

The proponent should consider the US EPA document titled Carbon Sequestration through Reforestation as an alternative mitigation measure for the long-term storage of carbon in trees and plants. CO₂ removed from the atmosphere is stored in growing plants in the form of biomass. Sequestering carbon helps to reduce or slow the buildup of CO₂ concentrations in the atmosphere. The proponent should investigate participation in Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI) CO₂ allowance auctions. RGGI is the first cap-and-trade program to distribute nearly all CO₂ allowances by auction. A RGGI CO₂ offset allowance represents a project-based greenhouse gas emission reduction outside of the capped electric power generation sector. Offset allowances have been designed to reduce or sequester emissions of carbon dioxide (CO₂), methane (CH₄), or sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆) within the nine-state region. Methane emissions may potentially be offset by equivalent CO₂.

Transportation Impacts

Road crossings will be required at five locations. Prior to construction, Tennessee will locate all existing underground utilities and make provisions for traffic management in work areas. Road crossings will be completed using standard open cut and conventional boring methods depending on the road.

In addition to road crossings, the Project calls for transporting heavy equipment, including pipe, from the Tyringham Pipeyard through Sandisfield. Such transport is expected to intensify damage to road surfaces and bases, bridges, and culverts. It is important to note that these roads were not designed with the intent to carry such loads. Main Road is the only road through Tyringham and is a feeder road to the Towns of Otis and Monterey as well as a connection to Town of Lee and City of Pittsfield. Based on the existing condition of the transportation infrastructure and the sheer amount of wear and tear projected from the construction, transportation infrastructure improvements may be needed prior to, during, or at the conclusion of construction. Tennessee shall ensure that roads utilized are in adequate condition and safe to travel during construction and in a good state of repair at the conclusion of construction. A Transportation Impacts Assessment Scope of Work has been developed for

Berkshire Regional Planning Commission Clearinghouse Review Report

the General Electric “Rest of River Cleanup” and is attached. The elements that shall be included within a Corrective Measures Study/Proposal document are described within the Transportation Impacts Assessment Scope of Work.

Alternatives Analysis

Tennessee undertook a needs and alternative routing analysis for the Project. Tennessee evaluated pipeline routing options based on regional topography, potential adverse environmental impacts, population density, existing land use, and construction safety and feasibility considerations. Tennessee also considered route alternatives in conjunction with Federal Energy Regulatory Commission guidelines.

No-Action Alternative

The “no-action” alternative would not fulfill the project purpose, to provide additional capacity to meet the existing demand for natural gas.

Energy Conservation/Energy Alternatives

Tennessee presently has programs in place that strongly encourage energy conservation. Even with these programs, there remains an existing need for additional natural gas capacity. Energy conservation, wind power, solar power, and geothermal power were evaluated independently and it was determined that each alternative would not be able to provide the energy to meet the projected need on its own. Coal, oil, nuclear, electric, fuel cells, Liquefied Natural Gas and propane/air storage were also independently evaluated and were not determined to be a preferable or viable alternatives.

System Alternatives

System alternatives would make use of other existing, modified or proposed natural gas pipeline systems or existing compression to meet the stated objectives of the proposed Project. The impacts were determined to be similar to or greater than that associated with the construction of the proposed Project. The Alternatives Analysis includes the analysis of one alternative Greenfield pipeline of 100 miles in length. Tennessee also evaluated an option of installing 42-inch OD pipeline looping which would reduce the pipeline mileage by 0.3 miles. This alternative was not selected for many reasons including the need for more above ground facilities.

Route Alternatives/Alternate Sites

Route variations evaluated consisted of evaluating which side of the ROW the new pipeline would be located and minimizing cross-overs. A discussion of alternative sites was limited to appurtenant facilities.

Berkshire Regional Planning Commission Clearinghouse Review Report

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

Primary Recommendation:

BRPC recommends that projects of this scope be required to submit both a Draft and Final EIR. **BRPC does not believe that the EENF meets the standards of a Draft EIR and recommends that the Secretary deny the request for a Single EIR.** This project exceeds thresholds for a Mandatory EIR for 58.8 acres of land disturbance and the alteration of 8.87 acres of bordering vegetated wetlands. The proponent submitted an Expanded ENF requesting a Single EIR. Projects of this scope should be reviewed very closely and particular attention paid to issues such as, but not limited to, the Alternatives Analysis and impacts resulting from Article 97 takings.

BRPC offers the following comments as the Secretary issues a scope for the Draft EIR.

Recommendations to MEPA for Scoping the Draft EIR:

1. The BRPC Sustainable Berkshires Plan should be sited, not the Comprehensive Economic Development Plan. The Sustainable Berkshires Plan is available at www.berkshireplanning.org.
2. The project should be described in its entirety. The entire route should be described starting from the point of entry in Massachusetts. The proponent should provide clarification as to how it was determined that the proposed Northeast Expansion Project is a separate project and does not pose an issue with regard to segmentation. The project description should include whether any excess capacity is included within the proposed Connecticut Expansion Project and whether an additional future expansion is anticipated to meet future demand. An analysis of the cumulative pipeline capacity, which includes other pipelines (i.e., Iroquois and Algonquin), should be included in order to better understand the cumulative impacts statewide and impacts to supply and demand.
3. The proponent should provide a more complete alternatives analysis in order to ascertain which alternative minimizes overall impacts to land, Article 97 and other conserved land, wetlands, and rare species. The EIR should fully explain any trade-offs inherent in the alternatives analysis, such as increased impacts on some resources to avoid impacts to other resources. A detailed alternatives analysis should include:
 - a. Low demand scenario.
 - b. Alternative routes within Connecticut in conjunction with the existing pipeline system.
 - c. Co-locating new pipeline loops within existing and/or proposed ROW in Connecticut.
 - d. Alternative routes within existing ROW in Massachusetts.
 - e. Replacement of existing line with larger, more efficient line.
 - f. Combination of conservation, efficiency, and renewable energy to reduce demand.

Berkshire Regional Planning Commission Clearinghouse Review Report

4. Significant detail is lacking with regard to the proposed pipeyard in Tyringham, which includes wetlands and rare species habitat. A detailed site plan and description of the proposed mitigation must be provided. Correspondence from the Natural Heritage and Endangered Species Program should be included.
5. Two archaeological sites are potentially impacted. Correspondence from the Massachusetts Historical Commission should be included.
6. A detailed site plan(s) should be required showing resource areas, buffer areas, rare species habitat, Article 97 lands, and wells with all access roads, appurtenant facilities, ROW (existing and new), construction limits, TWA and ATWA, wetland mitigation areas (if any), and stormwater and erosion controls clearly labeled. Site plan(s) should depict both the proposed work and the resource areas together and not on separate plans/maps in order to capture cumulative impacts and a greater understanding of the project.
7. The proponent should quantify emissions, analyze proposed mitigation, and submit this information in accordance with the Revised MEPA Greenhouse Gas Emissions Policy and Protocol. Both carbon dioxide (CO₂) and methane (CH₄) emissions should be quantified. The volume of methane should be quantified from wellhead to burner tip and not limited to construction activity.
8. Document and describe the anticipated impacts and proposed mitigation for Article 97 lands, which typically serve significant functions such as climate resiliency.
9. A Transportation Impact Assessment and the Corrective Measures Study/Proposal should be developed. A final transportation route that includes road crossing and access roads and operation plans to manage the anticipated impacts on each municipality that will be affected by the transportation and construction of this project. Such plans should deal with traffic, road closures, emergency services and compensation to each municipality for any costs incurred and damage caused. A copy of the proposed methodology is attached.
10. A description of the *anticipated* blasting plan including specific areas where blasting is anticipated/likely. Plans should be in place to inform local town officials, if it is determined that blasting will be necessary. Local town officials should be provided with copies and detailed Project-specific blasting plans as soon as they are developed and should be provided enough lead time to make comments and address issues and concerns. There should be a detailed public notification plan for any blasting.
11. A detailed description of the proposed water withdrawal and discharge of hydrostatic test water. The description should include the time of year when water withdrawal and discharge will be conducted, where the water will be discharged, the rate of discharge,

Berkshire Regional Planning Commission Clearinghouse Review Report

potential effects of water withdrawal to Lower Spectacle Pond, water quality of hydrostatic test water discharged, and alternative methodologies for hydrostatic testing (such as alternative locations for withdrawal and discharge).

12. A monitoring plan and contingency plan should be required to identify and mitigate any adverse impacts to rare species.
13. An erosion and sediment control plan which includes frequent monitoring during all phases of construction to insure that the erosion control devices function properly.
14. A detailed dewatering plan, including plans to address sediment and siltation, should be included for the dewatering of trenches which will be required.
15. A detailed plan outlining how the *Massachusetts River and Stream Crossing Standards* will be met to the maximum extent practicable.
16. A detailed plan to replicate impacted wetlands in accordance with the Wetlands Protection Act, which is consistent with the *Massachusetts Inland Wetland Replication Guidelines* (2002) and the *Massachusetts Wildlife Habitat Protection Guidance for Inland Wetlands* (2006). Alternatively, a detailed plan, including potential sites, for off-site wetland restoration or conservation.
17. A detailed plan to reestablish vegetated cover in the ROW, TWA and ATWA, including plant lists and a monitoring plan to determine the successful establishment of plants and a plan to address invasive species through monitoring and eradication (should invasive species become established).
18. The proponent should develop a detailed Project-specific Invasive Species Management Plan and take extreme care not to introduce/spread invasive species.
 - a. The proponent should consider using an alternative method of silt-fencing and straw-baling to reduce the risk of the inadvertent introduction of invasive species since hay bales frequently contain seed stock from invasive plants. Alternatives include straw bales in place of hay bales or double silt fences, silt socks, or coconut fiber material which can be staked like a silt fence and obviates the need for hay bales. These products are available from a variety of manufacturers.
 - b. Similarly, the proponent should carefully select all fill materials to protect against the introduction of invasive species.
 - c. The proponent should require vehicle cleaning before and after all work, both construction and routine operation and maintenance.
 - d. An independent monitor should be required in perpetuity.

Berkshire Regional Planning Commission Clearinghouse Review Report

Recommendations to Local Boards and Commissions for the Local Permitting Process:

1. The Towns should not close public hearings on pending permits for this project prior to the conclusion of the MEPA process.
2. The Towns should determine that they have the appropriate rules and regulations in place to hire outside consultants, at the proponent's expense, to review the project for wetlands, rare and endangered species, floodplain impacts, blasting, and road infrastructure projects.
3. The Conservation Commissions should include provisions for ongoing monitoring.
4. Given careful management of refueling and servicing of construction equipment should be conducted, particularly in wetland and riverfront areas. The use of biodegradable plant-based hydraulic fluids should be considered.
5. Tennessee should be required to provide periodic training of emergency responders in Sandisfield and all communities with whom the Sandisfield Volunteer Fire Department normally interacts for mutual aid situations. This should be an ongoing commitment for the life of the pipeline. Ambulance and police should also be included, as well as the towns' Emergency Managers.

BERKSHIRE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
1 FENN STREET, SUITE 201, PITTSFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS 01201
TELEPHONE (413) 442-1521 · FAX (413) 442-1523
Massachusetts Relay Service: TTY: 771 or 1-800-439-2370
www.berkshireplanning.org

SHEILA IRVIN, Chair
KYLE HANLON, Vice-Chair
MARILYN WILEY, Clerk
CHARLES P. OGDEN, Treasurer

NATHANIEL W. KARNIS, A.I.C.P.
Executive Director

July 7, 2014

The Honorable Robert A. DeLeo, Speaker
Massachusetts House of Representatives
State House, Room 356
Boston, MA 02133

The Honorable Therese Murray, President
Massachusetts Senate
State House, Suite 332
Boston, MA 02133

RE: H. 4065, An Act Promoting the Planning and Development of Sustainable Communities

Dear Speaker DeLeo and President Murray:

The Berkshire Regional Planning Commission (BRPC), which serves the 32 cities and town in Berkshire County, wishes to indicate its support for passage of H. 4065 which will modernize the zoning, planning and subdivision laws of the Commonwealth. These laws are currently a deterrent to development across most of the Commonwealth, do not serve the cities and towns in the state well, and are amongst the worst land use laws in the country. After in-depth consideration by the Joint Committee on Municipalities and Regional Government, this bill has come out of that committee with a favorable recommendation. We hope that the General Court will not allow this legislation to lapse but will push it through to final action before adjournment of formal session this month.

This bill or predecessors to it have been discussed at length over at least the past decade. The length of that discussion is testimony to the very real fundamental flaws in the existing land use legislation in the State. Lack of action during the legislative term which is wrapping up will only mean that some version of the same legislation will have to be dealt with in the next term. H.4065 is the result of a number of parties, with very different viewpoints, working together over the past two years to try to achieve a middle ground. The bill as proposed accomplishes that. BRPC had commented at length to the Committee as it considered the earlier version of this bill (H.1859). The Committee incorporated many of our thoughts involving the zoning aspects into the final version. They chose not to incorporate our recommendations concerning the master planning and subdivision sections. While BRPC is not entirely happy with the bill; we believe the changes to Chapter 40A (the Zoning Enabling Act) are generally good; the changes in Chapter 41 regarding community master planning are not particularly to our liking and will actually lead to less master planning by our communities, but the changes in that chapter regarding the Subdivision Control Act are a significant improvement. After consideration by our Commission, despite the issues we have with some aspects of the bill, we overall are in favor of its passage as recommended by the Committee.

We understand that some real estate interests are now, suddenly, opposed to passage of this legislation. It is important to note that these organizations were invited to work with the rest of the stakeholders involved with land use planning and regulation to try to mold the legislation. They apparently decided not to try to be involved in that process and only now are deciding to just try to block passage. We understand that a primary concern is the provision to allow, by local decision, use of a minor subdivision provision in place of the current "approval not required" (ANR) process to subdivide along existing road frontage. This opposition flies in the face of the strong tradition of local home rule in Massachusetts. To the extent that the argument is that by eliminating ANR housing will be more unaffordable, we only have to look at results of using ANR. Massachusetts is the only state with an ANR provision and yet our housing prices are among the most unaffordable in the country. There simply is no correlation between ANR and housing affordability. In fact, it may be that since ANR consumes existing road frontage inefficiently, and tends to lead to larger than required lots with back land remaining undeveloped, that it actually is leading to an increased cost of housing due to inefficient land development. ANR also consumes highway capacity by unnecessarily creating multiple driveways and as the General Court is abundantly aware, we do not have spare transportation dollars to continue to add capacity to roads across the Commonwealth.

We hope that the House Ways and Means Committee will immediately release this bill for favorable consideration by the full House and that the Senate will take this up in an expeditious fashion so this much needed legislation passes in final form before the end of this formal session.

Sincerely,

Nathaniel W. Karns, AICP
Executive Director

Cc: The Honorable Brian S. Dempsey, Chair, House Ways & Means Committee
The Honorable Stephen M. Brewer, Chair, Senate Ways & Means Committee
The Honorable Benjamin B. Downing, Senator, Berkshire, Hampshire, Franklin & Hampden District
The Honorable Gailann Cariddi, Representative, 1st Berkshire District
The Honorable Paul Mark, Representative, 2nd Berkshire District
The Honorable Tricia Farley-Bouvier, Representative, 3rd Berkshire District
The Honorable Smitty Pignatelli, Representative, 4th Berkshire District

BERKSHIRE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
1 FENN STREET, SUITE 201, PITTSFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS 01201
TELEPHONE (413) 442-1521 • FAX (413) 442-1523
www.berkshireplanning.org

SHEILA IRVIN, Chair
KYLE HANLON, Vice-Chair
MARILYN WILEY, Clerk
CHARLES P. OGDEN, Treasurer

NATHANIEL W. KARNS, A.I.C.P.
Executive Director

MEMORANDUM

TO: Delegates and Alternates, Berkshire Regional Planning Commission
FROM: Nathaniel W. Karns, AICP, Executive Director
DATE: July 7, 2014
SUBJ: Approval of Executive Committee Actions

In accordance with the bylaws, all actions taken by the Executive Committee on the Commission's behalf must be endorsed at the next Commission meeting.

The Executive Committee took the following actions at its June 12, 2014 meeting:

- Approved the Executive Director on behalf of the Commission to submit comments to MEPA regarding the ENF for Roundabout Construction at Route 8 and Friend St (Adams) (copy attached)
- Approved the Clearinghouse Review Committee on behalf of the Commission to prepare and submit comments on the EENF for Connecticut Expansion Project by Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company (Sandisfield and Tyringham).
- Approved the Executive Director on behalf of the Commission to Submit Grant Application to Toxic Use Reduction Institute to Reduce Use of Toxic Substances in Schools
- Approved the Executive Director on behalf of the Commission to prepare and submit comments on the H.4065, Land Use Reform legislation.

Berkshire Regional Planning Commission Clearinghouse Review Report

June 3, 2014

SUBJECT: Intersection Improvement Project, Columbia St. (Rte. 8),
Adams, MA
EOEA#: 15204
LOCATION: Adams
ESTIMATED COST: \$1.9 million
REVIEW TYPE: ENF
PROPONENT: MassDOT Highway Division and Town of Adams
COMMENTS DUE: June 10, 2014

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

The proposed project involves the construction of a modern roundabout at the intersection of Columbia Street (Rte. 8) and Friend and Renfrew Streets in the Town of Adams. The intersection currently experiences significant delays during peak hours from the side streets, which are expected to worsen under future no-build conditions. The proposed roundabout will improve access from and to Friend Street and Renfrew Street, as well as provide a traffic calming measure for this section of Route 8 where vehicle speeds have been observed to be operating over the posted speed limit of 35 miles per hour. Sidewalk construction is also proposed to improve pedestrian accommodations. In addition, two substandard commercial driveways which are located in very close proximity to the intersection will be eliminated.

The ENF states that the project is proceeding through the MEPA review process because it exceeds the following MEPA review threshold: Conversion of land held for natural resources purposes in accordance with Article 97. The Article 97 impacts are 1,849 sq ft of land at the extreme northeast corner of the Town's Renfrew Park in order to construct the roundabout. This corner of the park is currently maintained as lawn and is separated from the remainder of the park by a paved parking area and walkway.

COMMENTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Technical comments on designs/plans:
 - We are very pleased to see the elimination of two commercial driveways which are currently much too close to the intersection to be safe (the northern driveway on Rte. 8 at the 7-11 site; the eastern-most driveway on Friend St. at the auto dealership). One of the original intents of this project was to improve corridor access management along Route 8 and the elimination of these driveways helps accomplish that.
 - The driveway on Renfrew Street into the 7-11 also is moved about 11 feet further from the intersection, which is appreciated. However the driveway width is being increased from approximately 61 feet to 69 feet. Both widths are considerably greater than generally accepted commercial driveway widths. There may be reasons for this excessive width involving the internal flow on the existing site but generally wider driveways increase the chance for vehicle conflicts in the driveway due to the greater

Berkshire Regional Planning Commission Clearinghouse Review Report

- uncertainty on the part of drivers as to where they should be. It also makes pedestrian access across the driveway less safe.
- Having a utility pole in the roundabout would appear to create a traffic safety hazard and increase the risk of damage to the utility pole; the overhead wires running over the northbound travel lanes through the roundabout, as well as a pole in the middle of it lack any aesthetic sensitivity. We understand that MassDOT has a new policy which prohibits any state/federal highway funds to be expended in placing utilities underground; that is unfortunate as a broad public policy statement as there are certainly some instances where placing the utilities underground serves broader public policy goals than simply saving money.
 - A landscape plan is not provided with the ENF submission, however, the cover sheet indicates that a landscape plan is included in the 100% design submittal. A landscape treatment for the center island with a significant vertical dimension, such as trees or a sculpture with cross-view blockage would have a positive impact on roundabout operations, based on existing research. Blocking the view across the center islands will reduce speeds ahead of the pedestrian crossings, increasing safety for all roadway users. Although the speeds may slow, they will also become more uniform, causing drivers entering the roundabout to accept shorter gaps. The effective capacity of the roundabout will be boosted because more vehicles will occupy the circulatory roadway, thus accomplishing the project's principal goal of congestion mitigation. A significant vertical dimension should be strongly considered regardless of whether the utility pole is removed from the center island, although it may help obscure the visual impact of such an appurtenance.
 - We note that a photometric plan is not included in the 100% submittal. Lighting at crosswalks is essential for pedestrian safety at roundabouts. Adequate placement of lighting fixtures may also influence the final location of utility poles.
 - We believe the wetlands and Article 97 lands impacts to be very minor and mitigated to the extent possible. The public benefits from the project and its various enhancements for safety, congestion, and pedestrian access outweigh any of the small wetlands or park impacts.

2. Compliance with Regional Plans

- The Project is in accord, as the ENF states, with multiple goals of the 2012 Berkshire Regional Transportation Plan. It has been listed in the FFY 2014-2017 Transportation Improvement Program, adopted by the Berkshire Metropolitan Planning Organization in June 2013, for going to bid prior to September 30, 2014.
- The Project also supports a regional priority project in the 2012 Berkshire County Comprehensive Economic Development Strategy (adopted by BRPC in June 2012). The Greylock Glen project is served by Friend Street and part of the MEPA certification for that project required traffic mitigation at this intersection which the roundabout accomplishes.
- The Project also is supported by various goals and policies in the just adopted *Sustainable Berkshires* plan (regional plan adopted by BRPC, March 2014). Specific elements, policies and strategies which this project helps implement include:

Berkshire Regional Planning Commission Clearinghouse Review Report

Economy - Invest in Making Sites Developer-Ready

Work to make sites developer-ready by pro-actively addressing zoning, infrastructure, or brownfield concerns. [emphasis added]

Infrastructure & Services - Protect and improve the performance of the existing transportation facilities.

Identify operational and management strategies to protect and improve the performance of the existing transportation facilities to relieve vehicular congestion and maximize the safety and mobility of people and goods utilizing techniques such as corridor access management.

Infrastructure & Services - Monitor on an ongoing basis accident data and focus planning and funding on areas with higher than average rates of accidents.

Keep the region's highway safety analysis up-to-date, identifying the locations or corridors with the highest accident rates. , , ,Use high accident locations as criteria in establishing priorities for highway improvement funding. . . .

Infrastructure & Services - Encourage projects that promote a shared, safe transportation system.

Encourage projects, designs and initiatives that promote a shared, safe transportation system for bicyclists, motorists, transit users and pedestrians.

3. Appropriateness of Timing of MEPA Filing

BRPC has previously voiced its strong concern regarding the timing of filings with MEPA by MassDOT on projects (most recently regarding the Dalton-Housatonic Street Project in August 2013). MassDOT apparently always files these as a last punch-list item after plans are at the 100% design stage. This is too late in the process to allow meaningful input regarding the project and is apparently flagrantly intended to reduce the opportunities for input which may allow avoidance, minimization, or mitigation of impacts. We request that MassDOT submit all future transportation projects undergoing MEPA review in the Berkshires to MEPA at approximately the 75% design stage which will allow for meaningful public input at a stage of design which provides a reasonable level of knowledge of potential project impacts. It should also reduce the chances that a project will be unduly delayed by the MEPA process which would appear to be in the best interest of the project proponent. In this project's case, if there were impacts which required an EIR, the project would not be able to proceed in a timely fashion and the funding for it would impact projects in the subsequent years of the Transportation Improvement Program or this project would have no funding available.

These comments were approved by the BRPC Clearinghouse Review Committee on June 3, 2014.

BERKSHIRE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
1 FENN STREET, SUITE 201, PITTSFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS 01201
TELEPHONE (413) 442-1521 · FAX (413) 442-1523
Massachusetts Relay Service: TTY: 771 or 1-800-439-2370
www.berkshireplanning.org

SHEILA IRVIN, Chair
KYLE HANLON, Vice-Chair
MARILYN WILEY, Clerk
CHARLES P. OGDEN, Treasurer

NATHANIEL W. KARNS, A.I.C.P.
Executive Director

MEMORANDUM

TO: Berkshire Regional Planning Commission
FROM: Nathaniel W. Karns, AICP, Executive Director
DATE: July 7, 2014
SUBJ: Executive Director's Report

Various items warrant mention:

A. 2015 District Local Technical Assistance & Community Innovation Challenge Grant Funding

We are pleased to report that the final budget approved by the House and Senate last week includes \$2.8 million (level-funded) for District Local Technical Assistance and \$3.0 million for the Community Innovation Challenge Grant Program. Thanks to those who contacted Senator Downing, your State Representative, and the Budget Conference Committee members to press for this funding.

The next stage in the budget process is the Governor's approval, modification or veto of various line items. He has ten days to act; that will occur late this week. Over the past couple of years the Governor has not tried to modify or veto this funding so hopefully that will continue to be the case. If there is a modification or veto, we will inform the Commission and press for the General Court to override his action during its veto session. For further information, contact Executive Director Nat Karns at nkarns@berkshireplanning.org or 442-1521, ext. 26.

B. Nominations for 2014 Charles Kusik Award for Outstanding Contributions to Planning in Berkshire County

Attached is the nomination solicitation and form for this year's Kusik Award. The award will be made at our Annual Meeting which is scheduled for Thursday, October 16th. Please make nominations by September 1.

C. MassBroadband 123 – Get Connected – Monday, July 14th, Crowne Plaza Hotel, Pittsfield

Attached is an announcement of a presentation of the MassBroadband 123 network and how the region and entities in it can take advantage of this major leap forward in providing the region the best broadband infrastructure available. RSVPs are requested no later than Tuesday, July 8th so if you have an interest and the time, now is the time to sign-up.

D. New Planning Board and Zoning Board of Appeals Member Training – Thursday, July 31st, BRPC
The announcement for the annual training for new Planning & Zoning Board members is attached. This can also be very useful for incumbent board members to refresh their knowledge. For further information, contact Senior Planner Brian Domina (bdomina@berkshireplanning.org or 442-1521, ext. 14).

E. New Pavement Management Assessments in Great Barrington and Lee

Senior Planner Doug Plachcinski is providing pavement management assessments for Great Barrington and Lee. These include a complete inventory of the road surface conditions for all publically maintained roads and an analysis of the most cost beneficial approach to spending scarce road maintenance dollars to improve overall road surface conditions. Over the past three years, pavement management assessments have already been completed in nine communities (Adams, Cheshire, Egremont, Hinsdale, Lanesborough, New Marlborough, Otis, Richmond, and Sandisfield). For further information, contact Doug Plachcinski at 442-1521 ext. 16 or dplachcinski@berkshireplanning.org.

F. Assistance to Sandisfield in Procuring Public Works Construction Services for Various Segments of New Hartford Road

In a new endeavor for BRPC, Senior Planners Doug Plachcinski and Pat Mullins are assisting Sandisfield to procure public works construction services for some road reconstruction work on New Hartford Road. Our assistance consists of preparing the bid documents, advertising, analysis of bids, and follow-up leading to the pre-construction conference. For further information, contact Doug Plachcinski at 442-1521 ext. 16 or dplachcinski@berkshireplanning.org or Pat Mullins at ext. 17 or pmullins@berkshireplanning.org.

Attachments (3): Kusik Award Nomination Form
 MassBroadband 123 – Get Connected
 New Planning Board and Zoning Board of Appeals Member Training

BERKSHIRE REGIONAL PLANNING COMMISSION
1 FENN STREET, SUITE 201, PITTSFIELD, MASSACHUSETTS 01201
TELEPHONE (413) 442-1521 · FAX (413) 442-1523
www.berkshireplanning.org

SHEILA IRVIN, Chair
KYLE HANLON, Vice-Chair
MARILYN WILEY, Clerk
CHARLES P. OGDEN, Treasurer

NATHANIEL W. KARNS, A.I.C.P.
Executive Director

NOMINATION FORM

**Charles Kusik Award for Outstanding Contributions
to Planning in Berkshire County**

The Charles Kusik Award was instituted to recognize projects, groups, or individuals who have made outstanding contributions to planning in Berkshire County. Employees, Delegates and Alternates to the Berkshire Regional Planning Commission are not eligible for the award.

I nominate the following for the Charles Kusik Award:

I believe that this project, group, or individual deserves the award because:

Please return to: Executive Committee, BRPC, 1 Fenn Street, Ste. 201, Pittsfield, MA 01201
Fax Number: 413-442-1523
E-mail: nkarns@berkshireplanning.org

Nominations must be received no later than September 1, 2014.

Please Join Us!

**Senator Benjamin Downing,
The Massachusetts Broadband Institute
at the Massachusetts Technology Collaborative,
and the Berkshire Chamber of Commerce**

cordially invite you to:

MassBroadband 123 – Get Connected

DATE: Monday July 14, 2014

TIME: 10am – 12pm

LOCATION: Crowne Plaza Hotel – 1 West St – Pittsfield, MA 01201

Light Refreshments will be served

Agenda

- Welcome Address - Senator Benjamin B. Downing
- The Massachusetts Broadband Institute will provide an overview of the ***MassBroadband 123*** fiber- optic network, and discuss the benefits and capabilities this platform brings to the region
- AXIA, the MBI's network operator, will discuss its approach to the market, and explain necessary steps to connect to the network
- Q and A conversation regarding broadband and economic development in Berkshire County

Please RSVP to Elizabeth Wicks - Wicks@masstech.org
Seating is limited so please respond by July 8, 2014
Questions? 508-870-0312 ext 630

New Planning Board and Zoning Board of Appeals Member Training



July 31, 2014

6:00 –8:00 PM

Are you a recently elected Planning Board or ZBA member or an experienced member seeking to expand your knowledge about the intricacies of Massachusetts land use law?

If so, this is the training for you!

Experienced land use attorney Paul Bobrowski will review the duties of Board members, the required procedures and the relevant laws (Zoning Act, Subdivision Control Law). Paul will also have the answers to all your burning land use questions.

Light Dinner and Refreshments will be Provided

This FREE Training to be held at :

Berkshire Regional Planning Commission

1 Fenn Street, Suite 201

Pittsfield, MA 01201

Please RSVP to Brian Domina by July 28, 2014:

413-442-1521 ext. 14

bdomina@berkshireplanning.org

