

# Memo

From: Scituate Water Resources Committee

Jeffrey Rosen, Chairman 

To: Scituate Board of Selectmen  
Community Preservation Committee

Subject: Evaluation of priority for purchase of property based on Water Resource Considerations – Mirarchi Property

Date: January 14, 2009

Attached is an evaluation of the Mirarchi property from the perspective of water resources. The Scituate Water Resources Committee has reviewed this property according to the attached criteria. The scores represent the combined opinions of the Water Resources Committee members listed. The evaluation was performed at an open public meeting on December 10, 2009. We have included the score and the basis upon which the score was selected.

The WRC considers this property to be a **High** priority with a score of 41 out of a possible 47.

	Name of property	Priority Score
1.	Mirarchi	41 out of 47
2.	Hennessey property	17 out of 47

We would be happy to discuss these priorities and our approach with you further if that would be helpful.

Scituate Water Resources Committee  
Land Acquisition Prioritization Worksheet

Property name:    Mirarchi Property development   

Date of Review:    December 10, 2009   

Reviewers :    Mark Curran, Daniel Martin, Jeff Rosen, Hart Peterson, Elise Kline , Gene Babin   

Property Relationship to Water Resources Used for Drinking water

Viable candidate for New Water Resources (new surface water or ground water source) 10

<b>Possible candidate for new ground water source</b>	<b>7</b>
Not a candidate for new drinking water resource	0

Explanation of Decision     While the property is immediately adjacent to the main surface water source it is not expected that it is a new source but might be an option for future consideration as a possible ground water source based its designation and proximity to the reservoir. It is not however in an area designated as a high yield aquifer

Property relationship to protecting existing or planned Drinking water resource

<b>Property directly related either hydrologically or geographically to existing or likely Drinking water source</b>	<b>10</b>
--	-----------

Property directly related either hydrologically or geographically to a possible drinking water source	7
Property directly related to existing water resource or likely drinking water source Which is already protected by other regulation or existing Uses.	3
Property remotely related to protecting an existing or planned drinking water source	1
Property not even remotely connected to Town water resource	0

Explanation of Decision Property is directly adjacent to the town's main Surface water source.

Property relationship to Drinking or Waste Water Infrastructure

Property needed to maintain, repair or enhance existing infrastructure 10

<b>Property possibly supportive of infrastructure maintenance, repair or enhancements</b>	<b>7</b>
Property has no relationship to infrastructure	0

Explanation of Decision - Property is supportive functionally of the reservoir and its environment. It was not scored a 10 because in its current state it is already protective due to existing wetland rules.

Property Relationship to Habitat of Primary interest for Water Resource protection

<b>Property is important in protecting critical habitat</b>	<b>10</b>
---	-----------

Property could be helpful in protecting critical habitat	7
Property peripherally related to protecting critical habitat	3
Property not related to Habitat protection or restoration	0

Explanation of Decision - Wetland is supportive of the reservoir's habitat. It is forested land as well that supports natural habitat.

Property relationship to Recreational Water Use (bathing, fishing, boating)

<b>Property would be a new recreational water resource for the town or increased recreational access to an existing water resource</b>	<b>7</b>
--	----------

Property would reduce impacts to existing

Recreational waters

5

Property has little recreational water value

0

Explanation of Decision – Property would potentially increase access for fishing from the shore of the reservoir.

=====

**Total Points 41 out of 47**

Other notes and considerations:

Possible liabilities to the town and water resources: eg. Underground tanks, historical soil or ground water pollution

Unknown - the committee has no information on potential liabilities.