

RICHARD T. ROOK
Attorney at Law

1170 West Street
P.O. Box 277
Sheldonville, MA 02070

Tel. 508.523.8356 (direct)
Office 508.384.8623 (voicemail)
Email: rooklaw@gmail.com
Fax: 508.463.4619

September 19, 2022

Conservation Commission by e-mail to concom@wrentham.gov
79 South Street
Wrentham, MA 02093

RE: Sheldon Meadow Senior Living Community (SLC) (20 Hancock Street)
Sheldon West Senior Living Community (SLC) (1139 West Street)

Dear Chair Immonen, Members of the Commission and Agent Luce:

As the Commission proceeds with its review of the referenced applications, I ask that you give careful consideration to the following three issues, among others:

* In order to begin implementing the Wrentham 2021 Water System Master Plan (WSMP), the Town's consultant Environmental Partners (EP) has been conducting a site feasibility analysis for a new Town Well in West Wrentham. The WSMP identified getting that well on-line as a high priority for public health and safety. EP presented its findings to the Select Board on September 6, 2022 at a meeting which can be viewed on Cable 8.

After analyzing multiple sites in West Wrentham, EP has preliminarily identified four sites as the most promising locations: (1) 1498 West Street (Joe's Rock), which is owned by the Town but presents access issues; (2) 200 Burnt Swamp Road (north), which is owned by the Pawtucket Water Supply Board (PWSB); (3) 200 Burnt Swamp Road (south), also owned by the PWSB; and (4) 180 Burnt Swamp Road, owned by the Marszalkowski family. **The last three of these four locations are on the 100-foot abutters list for 20 Hancock Street and 1139 West Street.** EP will now work with the Town to conduct field testing on at least three of the "finalist" sites to identify the most suitable location. EP stated also that PWSB has no objection to Wrentham using any of the three Burnt Swamp Road locations as long as PWSB's source water supply for its 130,000 retail customers is adequately protected.

If one of the three Burnt Swamp Road locations is determined to be the preferred site, then any major development of 1139 West Street/20 Hancock Street could adversely affect the quality not only of drinking water supplied by PWSB, but also the drinking

water supply of the residents of Wrentham. From the information presented by EP, there do not appear to be other suitable sites for a West Wrentham Well. If we should lose three promising sites to inappropriate development and use on abutting properties, there may be no acceptable alternatives. The abutters and neighbors have stated to the Commission (and other reviewing Boards) many times that 1139 West Street and 20 Hancock Street are unique sites with respect to flooding and drainage issues. Now, in light of the EP presentation, the Commission and reviewing Boards also should consider whether the potential risk to public water supply in two states if (or when) something goes wrong is a risk that should be taken. I do not believe so.

* The amount of fill (now estimated to be roughly 68,000 cubic yards) that will need to be trucked in remains a serious concern. I will not repeat the contents of my letter to the Commission dated August 22, 2022, or the letter from PWSB to the Commission dated July 18, 2022. I do ask the Commission to consider those letters again and consult with PWSB, in light of the new information presented to the Select Board on September 6, 2022. How can this or any Commission possibly ensure the purity and integrity of approximately 4,500 truckloads of fill from unknown sources? Will every truck be tested? The structural fill used to raise grades and support slab on grade houses and roadways will become essentially impervious when it is compacted. How can this be done in the middle of an underground river without unforeseen consequences? For all practical purposes, it is like building a large dam without being able to predict with confidence the effect on groundwater levels and direction of flow, or surface water flow on-site and affecting abutting properties. Once again, is this a prudent risk to take?

* The most recent filings by the applicant still do not appear to address the climate change resilience requirements of Article 8.1 of the Commission's Regulations. In the past few months, we have seen the future we face — droughts followed by flash flooding, extreme weather events now becoming the rule rather than the exception. I personally experienced the recent shutdown of parts of Route 95 in Providence because the drainage infrastructure was overwhelmed by torrential rain. And we all know the story of Norwood Hospital, destroyed in 2020 by less than six inches of rain in a few hours. This Commission should approve no major projects that do not demonstrate climate change resilience.

Thank you,

/s/

Richard T. Rook
1170 West Street
Sheldonville, MA
rooklaw@gmail.com

