



Town of Griswold



28 Main Street
Griswold, CT 06351
Phone (860) 376-7060, Fax (860) 376-7070

**GRISWOLD INLAND WETLANDS & WATERCOURSES
CONSERVATION COMMISSION & AQUIFER PROTECTION AGENCY
REGULAR MEETING
GRISWOLD TOWN HALL**

**APPROVED MINUTES
JUNE 15, 2017**

I. Regular Meeting (7:30 P.M.)

1. Call to Order

Vice Chairman Robert Parrette called this regular meeting of the Griswold Inland Wetlands & Watercourses Conservation Commission to order on June 15, 2017 at 7:32 p.m.

2. Roll Call & Determination of Quorum

Present: Robert Parrette, Lawrence Laidley, Gary Serdechny, Lauren Churchill, Clarence (Pete) Merrill, Town Planner Mario Tristany, WEO Peter Zvingilas

Absent: Courtland Kinnie, Glen Norman, Recording Secretary D. Szall

There was a quorum for this regular meeting.

3. Written Comments

There were no written comments.

4. Approval of the Minutes

A. Approval of Minutes for the May 18, 2017 meeting.

L. Churchill stated that on page 2, third paragraph, it should read L. Churchill asked if the client is the builder.

R. Parrette asked for a motion.

MOTION: L. Laidley moved to approve the minutes as amended. G. Serdechny seconded the motion. All were in favor. The motion was carried.

5. Matter Presented for Consideration

A. CC 17-17 GLASGO ROAD INVESTMENTS, LLC, 1844 GLASGO ROAD, GRISWOLD, CT. Requesting approval for residential activity with a regulated area in order to install a crossing across wetlands that run the entire frontage of the property to access a single family property. Approximately 40 ft. of the driveway will cross the wetland swale and the first 150 ft. will be constructed with the 75 ft. upland review area. The property is zoned R-60.

R. Parrette stated that the commission did a site walk on Saturday and that he had made general notes at the site walk. He read his notes into the record of for the site walk on June 11, 2017 at 12 pm stating that R. Parrette, P. Merrill, G. Serdechny, L. Churchill and G. Glaude, surveyor, were present. P. Merrill stated that the depth of the muck not the wetlands was 12 inches.

R. Parrette asked if there was someone to represent the applicant.

Greg Glaude of Killingly Engineering Associates represented the applicant, Glasgo Road Investments. He submitted revised plans dated June 15, 2017 to the commission. He stated the revised plans are based on the CTDOT's comments and the soil scientist's comments. He stated that he had the report from the

soil scientist. He stated that the property is 2.68 acres on the Glasgow Road which is a state road. CTDOT comments were that at the pipe for the crossing rip rap was to be added at the outlet protection on the incoming and outgoing sides; and this has been added to the plan.

G. Glaude stated that a wetland replacement area which is south of the driveway crossing was added to the site plan. He stated that the riprap water quality basin will discharge into the wetland replacement area which is a 1:1 replacing the wetlands at the driveway crossing which is 825 sq. ft.; he stated that this is a flat area and works well with the design of the driveway. He stated that the soil scientist recommended that silt fence be placed where the wetlands will be disturbed uphill and downhill of the wetlands during construction. He stated that approvals were received from Uncas Health District for the onsite septic system which is outside of the review area.

G. Glaude stated that Joseph Theroux, Connecticut certified soil scientist, visited the site. He submitted the June 13, 2017 soil scientist report to the commission for the record.

M. Tristany asked if CTDOT wanted flared ends at the rip rap. G. Glaude stated yes, that is correct and CTDOT pointed out to him that they have drainage rights all along the drainage ditch on Glasgow Road.

L. Churchill stated the water bubbles up from the spring and asked if the silt fence is strong enough to direct water coming up from the spring into the pipe. G. Glaude stated that the pipe is 15 feet from the spring. She was concerned if the pipe could accommodate water flow during a 100 year storm. G. Glaude stated that Norm Thibeault submitted drainage calculations that address stormwater to Mario and CTDOT.

G. Glaude read the soil scientist's report for the record regarding 1) recommending that the silt fence should be backed by hay bales which are to be placed on the slope; 2) the description of the wetlands as herbaceous vegetation and scrub shrubs along Glasgow Road; 3) that ground water recharge from uphill and traps sediments and surface flows; 4) that there was limited wildlife habitat in the channel and stream; 5) there were no unique values or endangered or threatened species; 6) that there are no significant impacts to the wetlands and their functions for development provided that erosion and sedimentation control measures are implemented and maintained; 6) that disturbed areas are to be seeded and mulched to establish vegetation and stabilize the site; and 7) the wetland functions and habitats will be maintained.

R. Parrette asked what happens when it dries up. G. Glaude explained that the spring will be mushy. L. Churchill asked if the soil scientist make recommendations for the type of seed mix for the lawn at the driveway. G. Glaude stated that the soil scientist recommended a New England wet mix which is an herbaceous mix of wetland grasses plants and wildflowers and will be located where the wetlands transition from scrub shrubs to the emergent wetlands. L. Churchill asked what seed will be used further up the driveway. G. Glaude stated that it will be normal grass seed and rip rap where there is a large shady areas on the steep slope of the driveway. She asked if there was a particular type of grass that will be used to control erosion; she suggested using grasses such as sedge grasses for erosion control there. There was discussion of this matter. M. Tristany stated that as a condition, Joe Theroux, the soil scientist, can take a look at those steeper slopes as well. G. Glaude stated that he had no problem with that recommendation.

L. Laidley stated that when the work in the wetland starts to contact the Wetlands Enforcement Officer be contacted to be on site at that time.

MOTION: L. Laidley moved to approve CC 17-17 with the following stipulations: 1) to make sure that the grass planted along the driveway be such as to provide erosion control; 2) that staff shall be notified before work is begun in the wetland; and 3) all proper erosion and sedimentation control measures shall be installed. L. Churchill seconded the motion. R. Parrette asked for discussion; hearing none asked for the vote. All were in favor. The motion was carried.

6. Additional Business (New Applications)

- A. **CC 19-17 DEAN, EARL, 238 STONE HILL ROAD, GRISWOLD, CT.** Requesting approval for residential activity within a wetland or watercourse for restoration and maintenance of a pond. The property is zoned R-60.

R. Parrette stated that the commission did a site walk on June 11, 2017 at 1 pm. He read his notes of the site walk for the record stating that R. Parrette, P. Merrill, G. Serdechny, L. Churchill, Mr. Dean, and contractor Mr. Snide were present. L. Churchill stated that some fill will go next to the wetlands on the westerly side where there was a depression between the trees. P. Merrill stated that this should be looked at by a wetlands scientist.

R. Parrette asked if there was someone to represent the applicant.

Jason Snide was present to represent the applicant Earl Dean. He submitted diagrams to the commission. R. Parrette stated that sediment was to be removed. He stated that you did soundings through the muck determine the depth; the measurement of the muck looks to be about 5 ft. to 5.5 feet on average.

J. Snide explained that he used rebar to measure down to the hard pan by hand for the measurements. He stated that he was out about ten feet from shore. P. Merrill asked if the measurements were taken from the waterline down. J. Snide stated yes.

R. Parrette asked how J. Snide was to get to the middle of the pond. J. Snide explained that Mr. Dean wanted to take out the dam to make it a brook so the material could be removed. R. Parrette asked what the width of the brook was. J. Snide stated that he did not know. He stated that underneath the road; it is about four or five feet. M. Tristany stated that taking out the dam is now requires a hydraulic design if they go that route. J. Snide suggested that if they wait until August to do the work; he will remove what he can reach. L. Churchill asked from where he would be removing the material. J. Snide stated from the land. L. Churchill asked if it was from Mr. Dean's yard or from the road since the silt is coming in to the brook from the road. J. Snide stated from the yard. She asked if most of the silt was on the south side of the pond. J. Snide stated that it is coming in from the brook and that there are catch basins that run into the beginning of the pond and some silt is coming from the road. L. Churchill stated that most of the silt is coming in from the south. There was discussion of this matter including that there were some invasive grasses such as phragmites and cattail reeds.

R. Parrette asked what happens to the wildlife if you drain the pond. J. Snide explained that he would clean what he could from land and save that for the turtles, fish and frogs to stay in while he worked on the rest of the pond. He stated the machine can reach out about 23 feet to make a hole for them and then remove the dam; or build a road for the machine to go out further.

P. Zvingilas asked L. Churchill if the pond dries out. L. Churchill stated that during the drought years, it was quite low, and it was grown in, and there is a meandering channel. J. Snide stated that Mr. Dean can take the tile out to lower the pond about two feet but that was it. There was discussion of this matter.

M. Tristany stated that there is an area to put the silt material and asked if it is within the flood plain. R. Parrette showed him where the material would be placed on the photograph. There was discussion of this matter including placement of material in the flood plain not being feasible.

G. Serdechny asked what the plan is for getting this area as dry as possible to work in. J. Snide stated there are two plans; 1) wait until August when it is dry; or 2) to lower the dam. M. Tristany stated that if you lower the dam, DEEP becomes involved. J. Snide stated that he will tell Mr. Dean that if the dam is lowered, DEEP will be involved.

G. Serdechny stated that the only location to place the material where it would not be a problem is near the peach tree. G. Serdechny stated that he would like to see the pond go back to a pond again.

M. Tristany suggested Mr. Snide could use a drag line or to get a machine with a longer arm. P. Merrill stated that he was concerned because he could not reach very far with the boom; and the muck, because it is semi-liquid, would fall back into the pond. J. Snide stated that he would reach in to grab

what he can or he can use the drag line. There was discussion of this matter including rental of a machine with a longer arm.

P. Zvingilas stated that he has only seen a drag line used on commercial projects because it removes a lot of material. L. Laidley stated that the location of the fill would have to be delineated; some of it will have to be trucked out. J. Snide stated that he would do whatever the commission wanted.

G. Serdechny suggested making the pond very deep at the location where the culverts from the road drain into the pond; and then every few years clean out that area.

L. Laidley stated that on the application, the check marks needed to be filled out on the two pages by next month's meeting. There was discussion of this matter.

G. Serdechny suggested removing all the material from the site. He state to put it on the site, the area would need to be delineated since there are a lot of wetlands in the area. L. Laidley stated that the material will smell and upset the neighbors. J. Snide stated that he can bring it up to the farm.

J. Snide will tell Mr. Dean the commission's recommendations for a longer boom, a detailed plan of showing the dewatering; and removal of the material off site, and to complete the application check boxes and to have a more detailed plan.

MOTION: L. Laidley moved to accept and table this CC 19-17 to the next regular meeting. G. Serdechny seconded the motion. R. Parrette asked for further discussion; hearing none, he asked for the vote. All were in favor. The motion carried.

L. Laidley moved to add the application to be presented by John Faulise to the agenda. L. Churchill seconded the motion. All were in favor. The motion was carried.

John Faulise, Boundaries, LLC presented an application and payment to the Commission and asked to be added to the agenda for John Osga on Sam Chikan Road who wants to create a 1-lot subdivision on Sam Chikan Road for his grandson to build a house. J. Faulise explained that there are no wetlands on the proposed lot or the adjacent agricultural lands. J. Faulise explained that we are here for a jurisdictional ruling by the commission pursuant to the statutes.

L. Laidley rescinded his original motion; L. Churchill rescinded her original seconded.

MOTION: L. Laidley moved to add the application for John Osga, property located at 46 Sam Chikan Road, Griswold for a 1 lot subdivision. L. Churchill seconded the motion. All were in favor. The motion was carried.

J. Faulise explained sheet 1 for the proposed lot 1 which is 1.84 acres in an R-80 zone. He stated that the remaining land is about 74 acres of agricultural land. He stated that the closest wetland is 180 feet south of the proposed lot; he explained where the location of existing wetlands and watercourses were and that the remaining lands are hay fields. He stated that the nearest wetland to is 170 ft south of the property line of the proposed lot.

J. Faulise explained sheet 2 that showing the remainder of the property which is cultivated in corn and showing the location of an intermittent watercourse that crosses Sam Chikan Road. L. Laidley asked if all new building lots had to be 3 acres. J. Faulise explained that it is in an R-80 zone so lots are at least 80,000 square feet.

He explained sheet 3 showing the conceptual dwelling, well and septic system details, design standards, and soil test data. He stated that sheet 4 shows the erosion control drawings, details and notes. He stated that sheet 4 shows the operation and maintenance of the erosion and sedimentation controls, erosion and sedimentation control details and notes.

J. Faulise submitted a letter dated June 15, 2017 from Demian Sorrentino, ACIP, and Soil Scientist, that stated that after reviewing the property, that there are no wetlands or regulated areas on or adjacent to the property being developed and no construction activity proposed within 75 feet of any upland review areas.

J. Faulise stated that he is asking for a jurisdictional ruling by the Inland Wetland Commission pursuant to the statutes stating that Inland Wetlands must review a subdivision application to determine whether there are wetlands or watercourses. G. Serdechny asked why there are all the erosion drawings, notes

and details if the commission is not doing any of that. J. Faulise explained that DEEP requires that all the notes and details must be in place on the site plan if more than a 1/2 acre of land is disturbed. There was discussion of this matter.

L. Laidley moved to have the application handled administratively. He explained that if we agree that there are no wetlands on the property. J. Faulise explained that Mr. Osga was eager to get started. P. Zvingilas explained that we should agree the commission reviewed it and that there are no wetlands on the property. L. Laidley rescinded is first motion.

MOTION: L. Laidley moved that the commission reviewed the application and agrees that there are no wetlands on lot 1. G. Serdechny seconded the motion. He asked for further discussion R. Parrette stated that this application does not have a number and that the next application number will be assigned to this application number by staff. (CC 20-17 issued by staff on 6-26-17). R. Parrette asked for the vote. All were in favor. The motion was carried

7. Reports from the Enforcement Officer

P. Zvingilas stated that he had some calls on Stone Hill that there are possible ponds being done; he will look at these issues and will have a report for next month's meeting.

8. Old Business

There was no old business.

9. New Business

There was no new business.

10. Communications

- A. Connecticut Wildlife Magazine, March/April 2017, Connecticut Dept. of Energy and Environmental Protection, Bureau of Natural Resources, Divisions of Wildlife, Fisheries, and Forestry.

The above matter was reviewed by the Commission.

11. Reports from Members

R. Parrette asked for reports from members.

L. Churchill stated that she went to the Floating Workshop at and there were demonstrations to mitigate agricultural properties that use machines that use no-till planting. She stated that they have a system where a dairy farmer is putting in this system for containing manure.

12. Conservation Commission Matters

13. Adjournment

R. Parrette asked for a motion to adjourn. L. Laidley moved to adjourn. G. Serdechny seconded the motion. All were in favor. The meeting adjourned at 8:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna M. Szall
Recording Secretary