



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
SPECIAL MEETING
GRISWOLD TOWN HALL**

**UNAPPROVED MINUTES
SEPTEMBER 6, 2017**

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

1. Call to Order

Chairman Courtland Kinnie called this special meeting of the Griswold Inland Wetlands & Watercourses Conservation Commission to order on September 6, 2017 at 7:32 p.m.

2. Roll Call & Determination of Quorum

Present: Courtland Kinnie, Robert Parrette, Clarence (Pete) Merrill, Gary Serdechny, Lauren Churchill, Town Planner Mario Tristany, Recording Secretary Donna Szall

Absent: Lawrence Laidley, Glen Norman, WEO Peter Zvingilas,

There was a quorum for this special meeting.

3. Applications

A. CC 01-18 QUINN, EILEEN A., PROPERTY AT 1627 GLASGO ROAD, GRISWOLD, CT. Installation of a floating or wheel-in dock not to exceed 30 feet maximum extension into the pond; installation of a sand beach not to exceed 30 feet in width; and to clear brush, undergrowth and small trees in the beach area as well as selective clearing within the upland review area to provide access from existing trails. Plant shrubs and seed area around beach with approved grasses. Property is zoned R-60.

C. Kinnie stated that this application was before this commission at last month's meeting. He asked the applicant to make his presentation. Kevin Franklin, licensed land surveyor, was representing the applicant. He explained that the commission wanted to see the depth of the beach and also wanted to know the volume of sand to be installed. He submitted a revised plan with the information. He stated that the depth of the beach is 25 feet and the width is 30 feet and the volume of sand is approximately 10 cubic yards of sand.

P. Merrill asked how the sand would be brought in to the beach area. K. Franklin stated that he has a pickup truck and 4 ft. x 10 ft. dump trailer to haul in 3 or 4 loads of sand. P. Merrill asked if he will be cutting vegetation. K. Franklin stated yes, that they will cut the scrub growth especially along the beach area. He stated that trees 10 inches and larger they will try to leave. He wants to keep it as natural as possible, to clear a path, and have access.

C. Kinnie stated for the record that G. Serdechny is present. G. Serdechny arrived at 7:42 p.m.

L. Churchill asked where he will be trucking in the sand. K. Franklin stated that they will bring it in across lot 12 off Popple Bridge Road on an existing driveway that goes 900 feet into the woods and then use the existing woods roads and trails. He showed the area on the map. P. Merrill asked if there was a field there. K. Franklin stated that that was an overgrown corn field that has not been used for more than 20 years.

C. Kinnie appointed R. Parrette as Secretary Pro Tem. C. Kinnie asked if there were any other questions for the applicant. C. Kinnie asked if he had decided on a rolling dock or an anchor dock. K. Franklin stated that it will probably be an anchor dock, but they have not decided yet.

C. Kinnie asked for a motion.

MOTION: P. Merrill moved to approve CC 01-18. R. Parrette seconded the motion. All were in favor. The motion was carried.

K. Franklin thanked the commission.

B. CC 02-18 VERNOTT, ADAM, PROPERTY AT 118 KENWOOD ROAD, GRISWOLD, CT. For residential activity in a wetland/watercourse for excavation of the hillside, removal of all stumps and debris, placement of filter fabric along slope, chain large stones and rip rap as a base in order to create a revetment to prevent erosion of the pond waterfront. Property is zone R-60

C. Kinnie asked if there was someone to represent the applicant. Adam Vernott was present. C. Kinnie asked if he had correspondence from DEEP. A. Vernott stated that M. Tristany had received a letter from DEEP requesting a new survey. He explained that Kevin Franklin will be providing a new full survey of the applicant's entire property not just the shoreline. C. Kinnie asked what the time frame was for the survey to come before the commission with the new site plan. A. Vernott stated that K. Franklin has kept in contact with him and it will hopefully be done this week; and a copy of the survey will be sent to DEEP and a copy for the Commission.

C. Kinnie asked when the application was received and accepted. L. Churchill stated that it was received on July 17, 2017. C. Kinnie stated that it was accepted on July 20, 2017. C. Kinnie stated that the commission has 65 days to reach a decision. L. Churchill asked if the site walk had occurred and asked who was there. R. Parrette stated that he and P. Merrill were there. A. Vernott stated that it was raining heavily during the site walk. C. Kinnie stated that he wanted to nail down the time line. There was discussion of this matter. He stated that it is 59 days for the September 21st meeting which is still within the time frame. He asked A. Vernott if the full site plan survey will be ready for September 21st. A. Vernott stated that he will contact K. Franklin the surveyor to let him know. There was further discussion of this matter.

M. Tristany stated that he did not have the regulations with him, but that the applicant can request an extension of 65 days in writing, but he wanted to check the regulations to be sure and he will notify A. Vernott.

A. Vernott stated so for next meeting, I need to have 1) a copy of the survey, and 2) to send it to DEEP for their response. M. Tristany stated that if any work is to be done below the 159.42 ft. elevation, the project will be denied by DEEP. A. Vernott stated that he will look at the plan if any work is below the water line.

C. Kinnie asked for a report from the members for the site walk on August 5, 2017 at 9 a.m.

P. Merrill gave his report of the site walk: the house is about 50 feet edge of the water; and the front of the house is about 75 feet to the edge of the water. The bank is steep and shows undercutting from boat waves and storm waves. He stated that he divided the property into two parts and using the photograph that showed the bank on the photograph stating that portion of the bank were very steep and that there is a section where the lawn slopes from the paved driveway down to the water; but that it was not a continuous grade but it is steeper nearer the driveway. He showed the locations of where it was eroding and that there were wood chips that attempted to hold the bank. A. Vernott explained that those chips may be from when they removed trees a while ago. P. Merrill stated that there is a down spout from the house to the edge of the lawn, where there is a 4 or 5 inch open pipe that is dumping water uncontrolled down the bank.

C. Kinnie told A. Vernott that this drainage issue coming from the house should be addressed in the new site plan. P. Merrill stated that this water is washing away the bank. He stated that the area of the brush, that on Bing Maps showed large trees, but now has it big stumps and brush. He stated that there

is a walkway to cement steps to the water. He stated that the bank currently has nothing growing over 2 inches in diameter and are not taller than the bank and so it does not impede the view. He stated that there are big pine and oak tree stumps, 12 to 20 inches wide, with the roots exposed at the edge of the water.

C. Kinnie asked the applicant if he had any idea when the trees were cut. A. Vernott stated no. P. Merrill stated that the trees were cut after construction of the house. C. Kinnie asked if the concrete step will remain with the revetment. A. Vernott stated that the owner wants to keep the steps intact

P. Merrill stated that at the water line, there is the same undercut of the bank from the wave action of the water where the trees are located. R. Parrette stated that it was raining hard when we were out there and could see how the rain was eroding it; and how the boat wake is undercutting the bank. P. Merrill stated that, in his opinion, that it will not have any effect on the bank as long as the woody vegetation is maintained in the area. He stated that the lawn area is another issue. He stated that any fertilizer from the lawn is going right into the water. He stated that the brush area is heavy enough that he cannot walk through it. C. Kinnie asked if this area was being undercut. P. Merrill stated yes, it is being undercut. He stated that he did not see any trees tipped over into the water.

R. Parrette stated that under the final concrete step, it is washing away under the step. C. Kinnie stated that they are losing land. R. Parrette stated yes, it is going right into the pond. He stated that at the brush starts and the lawn starts there is substantial eroding, there is a pocket that you can see down into the ground when you are standing up on the lawn. M. Tristany showed an on-line Google Earth map of the area. C. Kinnie stated that if the roots weren't there, it would collapse. R. Parrette stated yes.

R. Parrette asked A. Vernott if there was a way to build up a wall to approximately 3' above the waterline and then layback it back into the hillside. It would decrease the amount of layback and have less impact to the hillside. A. Vernott explained that he would have get equipment into the water to access the first three feet; to try to reach down the hill would be too much, he would have to scrape back to place the stone and work back; he cannot cut back to build the wall; and he cannot build out toward the water. He stated that the whole idea of this revetment now is simply erosion control to retain the slope, hold it with natural stone and to have the least impact toward the water and the vegetation. He stated that the owner is elderly and has a lot of visitors and her nephew cannot get his pontoon boat close enough to the steps and so she wants safe access to the water and to retain the slope.

C. Kinnie stated that part of the problem is that the State has Pachaug Pond as a recreational pond and visitors to the pond use the state boat launch use the pond as well as residents; and there is a constant wave action from the boat from the boat launch. There was discussion of this matter of what material can be used for the wall. R. Parrette stated that the brush area is very high about 8 feet high. C. Kinnie state that the slope looked about 10 feet from the water. M. Tristany stated that a revetment would be better than gabion baskets.

C. Kinnie stated that the state wants to see natural vegetation. He stated that there really is not much of undeveloped land on the pond and it is hard to go back to vegetative water's edge when there are multiple uses for the pond; and the soils are sandy soil around the pond. C. Kinnie suggested looking at the property line where natural vegetation can be used along with the revetment. A. Vernott stated that he minored in horticulture and explained that vegetation requires maintenance and when it breaks down; it creates nitrogen that goes into the water and creates algae blooms and lily pad blooms.. He stated that with the natural stone revetment, the filter fabric allows for water containing nitrogen from the lawn fertilizer to go down through the filter fabric to the soils below before it can go into the water to pollute it.

M. Tristany suggested using a combination of natural vegetation and the stone revetment that would appease DEEP. A. Vernott stated possibly in the lower section where it is not so steep and then to use

the stone revetment in the steeper sections retaining the earth itself; we can try doing something like that. M. Tristany stated that if the work can stay out of the 150.42 ft elevation; it will take it out of DEEP and puts it here in Inland Wetlands.

P. Merrill asked if the stone revetment will be enough to control the fertilizer. A. Vernott stated yes because the filter fabric comes up to the top of the stone where the lawn meets so the water filters through to break down the fertilizer to become more soluble. P. Merrill stated that he was concerned because the lawn is quite sizable.

C. Kinnie asked M. Tristany about fertilizing. M. Tristany stated that years ago when Aleta was Chair, they would condition the approval that no fertilizer was to be used; but when you have an expensive home and spend thousands of dollars for sod, the fertilizer must be used correctly. P. Merrill stated that you have to fertilize the lawn so that the loam is not washed into the pond. There was discussion of this matter.

C. Kinnie asked for further questions for this application. L. Churchill stated that the map has demarcation for the elevations on it. M. Tristany asked the source of the map. A. Vernott stated that he drew that map. R. Parrette stated that this was the map that DEEP did not like. M. Tristany stated yes.

A. Vernott stated that for the next meeting on September 21st, he hopes to have a response from DEEP for the survey; and possibly request an extension. He thanked the members who came out the look at the site.

C. Kinnie asked for a motion to table this application.

MOTION: R. Parrette moved to table this application to the next regular meeting on September 21' 2017. G. Serdechny seconded the motion. All were in favor. The motion was carried.

4. Additional Business (new applications)

- A. CC 03-18 JEWETT CITY DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC UTILITIES, PROPERTY AT 51 & 51 WEDGWOOD DRIVE, 0 CHARLES ST. 47 OAK STREET, JEWETT CITY, CT.** Extension of the existing concrete wall to prevent flooding of the treatment plant facility during flooding events. The maximum height of the proposed wall is 4 feet above grade and will be constructed in two sections: one section 130 feet long and the other 240 feet long. The Headworks building will be flood-proofed and the entrance drive to the facility will be re-graded and repaved to create a berm to prevent flood water from entering the site.

C. Kinnie asked if the applicant was present. Kenneth Sullivan, Director of JC Public Utilities was present. He gave a brief introduction of this project. He submitted photographs of the March 2010 storm showing the flooding that occurred at that time where the treatment plant was nearly lost and showing the need for the proposed wall. He stated that the need for this flood prevention wall to protect this \$19.2 million facility. He explained that they had applied for grants since March 2010 and they were denied because of failure of a cost benefit ratio for not having enough customers. He introduced Bob Russo, Soil Scientist, CLA Engineering.

Bob. Russo explained that the work proposed will help to get the facility shovel ready to apply for future grants. He stated that this is an on-going process. He explained that the March 2010 storm had a lot of rainfall and because of the frozen ground, the flooding was greater than a 100 year flood. He explained that the areas of the plant that are closer to the river, particularly the Headworks Building, the water reached the second step of that building.

B. Russo showed, on the air photograph where the wall would start connecting to the existing wall across to the building and from the building along the driveway. He explained that where the driveway enters the site; it will be graded to raise the elevation. He showed the engineering plan of the driveway

that showed the 86 ft elevation and will be brought up to the 87 ft. elevation. He explained that the 100 year flood is 84.5 ft. elevation at the site. He stated that the top of the wall is 87 ft. elevation.

R. Parrette asked how that elevation relates to the 2010 storm. B. Russo stated that the elevation at the steps is at the 84.ft. elevation at the bottom of the steps; the flood reached about 85 ft elevation during the 2010 storm. He stated that the wall will be at the 87 ft. elevation.

M. Tristany asked if the Headworks Building had a basement. K. Sullivan stated that it has a slab foundation.

R. Parrette asked if the water ran into the site from around or did the water come in from the river when it flooded. B. Russo showed how the water came in from the river. B. Russo stated that to prevent that the wall will encircle the whole site. He stated that the wall will be run along the driveway and the driveway will be raised. C. Kinnie asked what the final grade of the berm will be. B. Russo stated that the peak of the berm will be at 86.5 ft which is higher than the 100 year storm and the March 2010 storm. C. Kinnie stated that that it would be the low point of the entire site. B. Russo stated yes that it would be the low point of the entire site.

R. Parrette asked what the elevations were for the tanks. B. Russo stated that the elevation at the base of the tank is 84 ft. elevation. B. Russo stated that the wall will be at 87 ft. elevation so the river water cannot get to the tank. M. Tristany asked if the water came in through the driveway. K. Sullivan explained that the water made its way around the wall and showed how it came in towards the solids handling tanks in the photograph.

C. Kinnie asked what the watershed area was upland above the site. B. Russo did not know about the watershed above it. He showed where the water was caught and came into the site. C. Kinnie stated that a pumping ability would be needed to remove the water coming in from above the site. B. Russo stated that the plant may have to pump the rain water out over the wall into the river, which the plant can do.

M. Tristany stated that there are weak links where the wall abuts the Headworks building which must be waterproofed; and there are also 18 inch PVC outlet pipes with back flow preventers. He asked if there was maintenance needed for the backflow preventers which are at 80 ft. elevation which is below the 7 ft. below the wall.

B. Russo stated on Page 2 that there is a detail for the backflow preventers. He explained the added security fixtures; the manufacturer states that the backflow preventers are maintenance free; and if debris gets caught in the backflow preventer, which will seal around the debris with a flexible plastic material to mold around the debris. B. Russo stated that the backflow preventers will be inspected routinely by the JCDPU. He stated that on the detail sheet, the structural engineer has proposed that there will be scour protection at the base of the wall, on the river side of the wall. B. Russo stated that M. Tristany and David Held, the Town consulting engineer, reviewed the plans and made comments on the plan; and they provided responses to those comments.

R. Parrette asked what the plan was to attach the wall to the existing building. B. Russo explained that it will be joined here and the structural engineer has provided notes on a second set of structural plans. B. Russo stated that the structural plans show how the joints will be accomplished and other details of the wall which can be supplied to the Commission if necessary.

B. Russo stated that there will be the typical erosion and sedimentation controls, inspection of the bank is necessary so that it is well maintained and stable. C. Kinnie asked if it will be a poured wall or a prefab wall. B. Russo stated that it will be a poured wall with rebar and that this detail is provided on the structural plan.

R. Parrette asked the size of the pipe. B. Russo stated that the pipes are 18 inches that drain and that the backflow preventers are made for any standard size pipe. R. Parrette asked the number of outflows. B. Russo stated that there are three. M. Tristany stated that there are actually five outflows to the river. R. Parrette was concerned that there were five points of potential failure hinging on a neoprene gasket that may or may not seal up around debris that may get caught. B. Russo stated that the backflow preventers have been installed at other sites at the shoreline had have seen them work. B. Russo stated that this drainage already exists bringing in surface water to the plant. There was discussion of this matter including that the backflow preventers must be added to the DPU maintenance program and a possible use of crank valves during a historic storm event.

P. Merrill suggested that to track by eye the potential inflow into the basin from uphill before it gets into the basin; to possibly build a ditch for high water. M. Tristany stated that this is a controlled site and not a large parking lot where there would be more debris to get into the pipes.

C. Kinnie asked for further questions for this project. R. Parrette asked when the project would start. K. Sullivan stated that they want this site to be shovel-ready so as to entice grant money so that when they do receive a grant, the work can start immediately. R. Parrette stated that it will be for next year.

R. Parrette asked why the wall was going straight across rather than follow the river. B. Russo stated that it would be a shorter run of wall to construct; he stated that this space is within the 100 year flooding area and is not used for anything.

C. Kinnie asked for any other questions or comments or concerns. C. Kinnie stated that this project is very timely considering what is happening right now. B. Russo thanked the commission for hearing their project. C. Kinnie explained that the commission will take action at their next regular meeting on September 21st. He asked if the application meets the time frame to act. M. Tristany stated yes. C. Kinnie stated that barring any unforeseen complications the commission can act on this at the regular meeting this month. B. Russo asked if the commission wanted copies of the structural plans. M. Tristany stated that he can email him the detail on where the wall connects to the building so it can be in the file.

L. Churchill notified the commission that she will be away on September 21st.

C. Kinnie asked for a motion to accept and table this application. R. Parrette moved to accept and table CC 03-18 until the regular meeting on September 21, 2017. L. Churchill seconded the motion. G. Serdechny asked about the fee for this application. M. Tristany stated that the BOS voted to waive the application fee. There was discussion of this matter and that the \$60 state fee will be required. All were in favor. The motion was carried.

5. Adjournment

R. Parrette moved to adjourn. G. Serdechny seconded the motion. All were in favor. The meeting adjourned at 8:45 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Secretary