



# 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  
APRIL 21, 2016

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

1. **Call to Order**

Chairman Courtland Kinnie called this regular meeting of the Griswold Inland Wetlands & Watercourses Conservation Commission to order on May 21, 2016 at 7:38 p.m.

2. **Roll Call & Determination of Quorum**

**Present:** Courtland Kinnie, Robert Parrette, Glen Norman, Clarence (Pete) Merrill, Alternate Lauren Churchill, Town Planner Mario Tristany, WEO Peter Zvingilas, Recording Secretary Donna Szall

**Absent:** Edward (Jay) Waitte, Lawrence Laidley, Gary Serdechny, Kevin Franklin, Alex Grzelak

C. Kinnie appointed L. Churchill to sit for L. Laidley. There was a quorum for this regular meeting.

3. **Written Comments**

There were no written complaints.

4. **Approval of the Minutes**

A. **Approval of Minutes for the March 17, 2016 meeting.**

C. Kinnie asked for a motion to approve the minutes. R. Parrette moved to approve the minutes of March 17, 2016 as corrected. L. Churchill seconded the motion. C. Kinnie stated that in the call to order it should read regular meeting, not public hearing; and on page 2 Theresa Wooten should read Melissa Wooten. All were in favor. The motion was carried.

5. **Matter Presented for Consideration**

A. **CC 07-16, GRISWOLD, TOWN OF, PROPERTY AT 54 MYRTLE ROAD, GRISWOLD, CT. Requesting review and approval of the proposed repair to Town drainage easement to remove 15"-18" RCP pipe from basin in front of 54 Myrtle Road to the discharge point near Pachaug Pond. Replacement Pipe will be ADS pipe with gaskets. Property is zoned R-60.**

Todd Babbitt explained that the residents from that section from Myrtle Road took the town to court and we were ordered take the road and to maintain it. He stated that the resident at 54 Myrtle Road complained about the drain pipe running through her property; the pipe was inspected and found that the seams pipe was installed flush cut butted together. He stated that there was flooding from Jennifer Lane, Boundaries engineered the pipe that starts at 18 inches in the catch basin and ends up at 15 inches at the pond. He explained that the homeowner expressed concerns for removing the pipe next to the trees in that yard area and we may abandon that section in that area.

T. Babbitt stated that they have not received any court documents for the road or the easement that have made this transfer to the town so we cannot start the project until they are received.

R. Parrette asked if it could be slipped with another pipe. T. Babbitt stated that he didn't think so because of the changes in the pipe size from 15 inch to 18 inch; the plan is calculated for 18 inch pipe. C. Kinnie stated that the water comes down from Route 201 and from Jennifer Lane; it is a big watershed.

He stated that the owners were cited for discharging directing into the pond. He stated that this will be corrected by installing a riprap retention area before it discharges into the pond. C. Kinnie asked if the homeowner understood that his perimeter drain was tied into that drainage since that was part of the issue when their basement flood a couple of times.

T. Babbitt stated that they sent a camera through the pipe and it was not completed obstructed because there still was flow. He stated but if that is the case, then they will have to make other provisions for the perimeter drains because the Town does not allow this. C. Kinnie stated that that is what we were told. T. Babbitt stated that the perimeter drains were tied into the catch basin involved in the flooding on the pond side when the basin was filled with mud. D. McKay, Boundaries, LLC, stated that there is enough relief going down to the pond.

C. Kinnie asked how many feet overland does it spill out before it hits the riprap scour hole and then into the pond. T. Babbitt stated that the basin is 9 feet; so there is a 9 foot retention area. D. McKay stated that the retention basin is right next to the water.

R. Parrette stated that you are waiting to get the documents. T. Babbitt stated that insurance attorney representing their case stated that he will provide what the town attorney needs and the town attorney must go through the selectman's office. T. Babbitt stated that he will keep tabs on this. M. Tristany asked if it should be outletted further inland to provide more riprap area for the 18 inch pipe; in a major storm that is a lot of energy. D. McKay stated that it is sized in accordance with DEEP standards. M. Tristany asked if it was an energy dissipater. D. McKay stated yes.

P. Merrill asked how big the retention basin will be. D. McKay stated that it is half the diameter of the pipe. T. Babbitt stated that the only thing that they could do to break the velocity would be to put a hood in the basin so the water can come up and then go into the pipe.

C. Kinnie stated that this commission can still render a decision and have it be contingent upon the approved easement; until there is an easement; it is a private property issue.

**MOTION:** R. Parrette moved to approve CC 07-16 as presented contingent upon an approved easement approved by the town attorney and the landowner's attorney to the Town of Griswold. P. Merrill seconded the motion.

C. Kinnie asked how the velocity could be diminished at the scour hole. D. McKay stated that it is sized for the 25 year storm event designed to DEEP standards so the intent is to dissipate the energy from the flow before it enters the pond to eliminate erosion concerns. P. Merrill stated that that you could change the end of the pipe so the water would have to come up. T. Babbitt stated that he can put a hood in the basin that will stop direct flow by building up under the hood and going out the pipe. C. Kinnie asked if it would cause other issues. D. McKay stated that it is standard in new construction.

C. Kinnie asked M. Tristany if he had any comment. M. Tristany stated that if T. Babbitt feels that it has worked in the past and D. McKay has no issues. D. McKay stated no. M. Tristany stated that it will keep debris out of the pond to a degree. C. Kinnie asked if the applicant was willing to modify his site plan to indicate this change. T. Babbitt stated that he was willing to show this change to the plan. C. Kinnie asked that the motion be amended.

**MOTION:** R. Parrette amended his motion to approve CC 07-16 to include the addition to the site plan of a hood to the catch basin and also to be contingent upon an approved easement approved by the town attorney and the landowner's attorney to the Town of Griswold. P. Merrill seconded the motion as amended. All were in favor. The motion was carried. C. Kinnie asked if he wanted to amend the site plan now. T. Babbitt stated that he will submit an amended site plan.

## **6. Additional Business (new applications)**

### **A. Presentation by Todd Babbitt of upcoming Public Works projects**

T. Babbitt stated that he has the as-built for Roode Road which he submitted to the commission. C. Kinnie stated that the edgings need to be done. T. Babbitt stated that they are doing the edging now.

T. Babbitt stated that you are aware of the Sheldon Road Bridge closure. He stated that he will be working with the contractor and DOT will be coming in for permits. He explained that the DOT is offering a pilot program that does bridge design in house which save the towns money for outside bridge design.. The will be designing Sheldon Road bridge and Norman Road Bridge. T. Babbitt explained that the surveying has begun for the two bridges and DOT will be in for permits shortly. R. Parrette asked what was wrong with the bridges. T. Babbitt stated that Sheldon Road has been undermined because of draining the pond for the dam repair project and 30 years ago when these bridges were repaved, the abutments were not touched. He stated that the south abutment is cantilevered out and are not pinned to rock; there are two 12 foot galvanized rods holding the structure to the soil; the Norman Road Bridge abutments are in poor condition.

T. Babbitt stated that he was asking the Commission for an opinion for repairing the Ashland Street Bridge and some of that involves rip rap in the water and he is asking what he needs from this commission and DEEP. M. Tristany asked if the design was done by the State. T. Babbitt stated that the State gave us the details of what they wanted for the riprap; the bridge was damaged from the 2010 flooding where the center pier was damaged on the upstream side and the abutment closest to Hill Street. He stated that there are voids in the rip rap that is 12 inches deep; fabric will be placed and 12"-18" rip rap

will be placed with 6" rip rap to lock it in; the work will be done by hand off of a dock. He stated that this work will be done in the summer time when it is dryer through there. P. Merrill asked if he would have to stop the dam for the project. T. Babbitt stated that it is not too deep there; there are minor concrete repairs underneath that will be done from a floating dock; no equipment will be in the water. He stated that the rip rap is less than 4 cubic yards.

C. Kinnie stated that he cannot speak for what DEEP may require; but for what T. Babbitt is proposing there, the commission would like to see a narrative. T. Babbitt will provide a map when the application with the narrative is submitted. C. Kinnie asked when is the work proposed for Sheldon Road and Norman Road bridges. T. Babbitt stated that the work on the bridges will be done concurrently with the design starting now and design will be done by next year. C. Kinnie asked if there was a way to work on Sheldon Road while the pond is down. T. Babbitt stated that we have a tentative agreement with DEEP; the dam is finished for Labor Day; raise the pond for the winter; leave the pond up for next Labor Day, and DEEP is willing to significantly drain the pond for this bridgework which should be completed by next winter. He stated that both projects will bid together.

C. Kinnie asked about the keystone bridge underneath. T. Babbitt stated that he researched the bridge and it is not on the historic register. He stated that the bridge will have to go because the hydrology requirements cannot be met with it in place. He stated that the span for the new bridge must be lengthened and raised as well; the keystone bridge will be a big hydrology issue. M. Tristany stated that we could get the stones to build something in Veterans Park. C. Kinnie stated we could at least keep the stones.

C. Kinnie stated to let the record show that G. Norman arrived at 8 pm.

T. Babbitt stated that he can put in a request on the application that the town wants to keep stones for salvage. There was discussion of this matter including that the keystone bridge was the original roadway. C. Kinnie asked for questions. There were no other questions. T. Babbitt stated that he had no further items coming up.

**B. CC 08-16 UNITED COMMUNITY & FAMILY SERVICES, 266 EAST MAIN STREET, GRISWOLD, CT. Requesting approval of commercial activity within a wetland/watercourse and regulated area in order to eliminate 1,656 SF of regulated wetlands; this area is a topographic depression located between the bottom of an adjacent embankment and the back of the former factory building. The soils meet definitive criteria as "poorly drained". Said wetland is not a significant resource for wetland functions and values. (see Wetland Delineation Report) Successful redevelopment for a proposed health center requires elimination of the entire wetland for parking areas, circulation drive, stormwater management improvements and associated site grading. Property is zoned Industrial,**

C. Kinnie asked if there was someone to present this application. David McKay, Boundaries, LLC, was representing United Community Services. D. McKay stated that this is the former PWC property currently owned by the Town of Griswold; the original factory building was demolished in 2014; and Brownfields Remediation was done on the site. He explained that United Community and Family Services has an agreement to purchase this property from the town for a regional health center. He showed the wetland area that was delineated by Demian Sorrentino, Soil Scientist, Boundaries, LLC that backed up against the former building.

D. McKay explained the site layout for the UCFS facility with the circulation drives and parking; and required fill for the wetland. D. McKay explained that to mitigate the impact of the wetland fill, a stormwater management water quality basin will be installed in front of the site using wetland plantings such as bull rush, cat tails, wild blueberry bushes, and a New England plants wet mix. He stated that the stockpiled wetland soil will be used to form the basin and it will be sized for the water quality volume to make up for the loss of the minimal groundwater recharge based on Army Corp of Engineer values. D. McKay stated that he and town staff walked the property.

R. Parrette asked what the total fill value was. D. McKay stated that it was 1,656 square feet. He stated that the water quality basin is 1,680 square feet. He stated that the area was disturbed during the demolition phase and now consists of crushed stone to aide in drainage. M. Tristany asked if the water feature would have a wet bottom or dry. D. McKay stated that hopefully, the basin to have a wet bottom; but because the property is a Brownfield project, a clay liner will probably be installed. There was discussion of this matter that the basin is for the stormwater quality basin for storm drainage.

L. Churchill asked if any surface water from the parking lots will drain into the basin. D. McKay stated yes. He explained that the impervious coverage before was 58 percent and the proposed impervious surface will be 58 percent so it stayed about the same. He stated that the roof and footing drains will go into the basin and possibly two catch basins at the driveway entrance and the outlet will connect to the existing drainage system. P. Zvingilas stated that it will over flow when it rains. D. McKay stated that it is sized for the water quality volume and the parking lot will drain to an underground

storage system. D. McKay stated that the catch basins will have hoods. C. Kinnie stated that this is mitigation so there is no net loss.

M. Tristany asked D. McKay to explain about the underground storage. D. McKay explained that the parking lot has a significant amount of impervious area and the existing flow rate leaving the site must be met; large diameter pipes will be buried under the parking lot to hold the excess runoff and slowly release; the catch basin systems will discharge through a stormwater treatment system to collect sediment and trash before it gets to the underground storage. P. Zvingilas asked where the water goes when it gets to the road. T. Babbitt explained that it goes down Route 201 and discharges through the Triangle PWC mill site across the road. He stated that he does not know what was on that site.

M. Tristany asked if the underground system has been designed. D. McKay stated no, not yet. M. Tristany asked if it was for a 25 year or 50 year storm. D. McKay explained that it is sized for the 25 year storm but the peak flow rate off the site will match existing conditions for the 2 year through 100 year storm events because the site disturbance is over an acre so it has to meet the DEEP general permit requirement to meet the stormwater quality manual requirement. P. Zvingilas asked if he knew the impervious surface amount for the parking lot. D. McKay stated that the impervious surface was 58 percent of the property which is about 2.5 acres; so 1.25 acres will consist of building and pavement. P. Zvingilas asked so that the design would be for 0.75 acres and a 4 inch rainfall and it can handle that. D. McKay stated that it will be designed to meet the 100 year, 24 hour storm event. D. McKay stated that the amount of impervious surface has not changed for the site and it will be treated before it goes into the pond.

R. Parrette asked when the pipes fill up with sediment, how would they be cleaned out. D. McKay stated that there is treatment system upstream from the pipe storage which collects most of the sediment; and on each row of pipes, there are access ports to flush them.

M. Tristany explained that one of the requirements of Brownfields, is that when the design is near completion, several monitoring wells must be installed for groundwater for an approximately 12 to 18 month period; so the monitoring wells would not be put in before the construction is nearly done; and they will be installed in the traffic island so they would not be damaged.

C. Kinnie stated that larger pipes are to attenuate the flow; to slow down; they are not actually storage. D. McKay stated that they are for detention. R. Parrette asked about the diameter of the pipes under the pavement. D. McKay stated that they are typically 36 inch or 48 inch pipe. R. Parrette asked if the pipe tapers to a 30 inch pipe and if the bottom of the 30 inch pipe is being tapered into it or will they cone together; or will the bottom of the 36 inch pipe have a strip that never empties. D. McKay stated that the storage system will be elevated so that it will empty.

M. Tristany asked if any of the underground piping will be in the water table. D. McKay stated that we have to do more investigation; but that they will be filling in the back so it will be lifted above the groundwater. M. Tristany stated that he was concerned because the pipes would have to be anchored with concrete to stop flotation.

D. McKay stated that that was his presentation. C. Kinnie stated that this commission must consider the elimination of the 1,656 square feet of wetland. M. Tristany stated that he and Peter walked the site a couple weeks ago with Dave and Demian Sorrentino; and that there is no wetland value to that which was created when the factory building was built. There was discussion of this matter that there is no habitat or wetland value.

C. Kinnie asked if the commission had any other questions for Mr. McKay.

**MOTION:** R. Parrette moved to accept CC 08-16 and table it to the next month's regularly scheduled meeting. G. Norman seconded the motion. All were in favor. The motion was carried.

## **7. Reports from the Enforcement Officer**

P. Zvingilas stated that he did not have any other reports than what has been discussed. P. Zvingilas apologized for missing the Earth Day Clean up on Saturday. There was discussion of this matter.

## **8. Old Business**

There was no old business.

## **9. New Business**

### **A. Discussion regarding Connecticut Siting Council Documents for 1219 and 1240 Voluntown Road for a proposed Solar Facility, ECOS Energy (d.b.a.) Windham Solar LLC.**

C. Kinnie stated that there was a site visit of the Siting Council yesterday to which M. Tristany, Lauren Churchill and Alex Grzelak attended. M. Tristany explained that there were two people from the Siting Council; namely, Mike Perrone, Siting Council Staff, Jerry Murphy, Norwich attorney.

M. Tristany stated that 6 or 7 people from the Latham Drive neighborhood attended and who were concerned with the removal of vegetation along the easterly side of Latham Drive from the road portion to the few houses that abut the site from Lee Avenue. He stated that he had drafted a letter to Melanie Bachman that he had received several calls from the neighbors in that area and asked the Siting Council to consider the addition of 20 to 30 foot buffer where there is a service road coming in down Latham Drive. He explained that the plans show the 150 ft upland review area and a few of the panel just into this 150 area. He stated that there is no impact to the wetland from the solar farm, that they consider leaving the buffer along Latham Drive and move the development closer to the upland review area to within 100 feet so that fewer trees would have to be cleared from Latham Drive area. He stated that the neighbors were in agreement with that approach.

M. Tristany stated that in regard to Culver Road to the north, on the southerly side of Culver Road that the Siting Council consider the addition of arbor vitae to screen the development from the residents on Culver Road. He stated that Steve Broyer of ECOS Energy had no issues with our suggestions for improvements to the project. He stated that Mike Perrone will prepare a report with our suggestions for the Siting Council who will listen to concerns and who will come up with solutions to those concerns raised. The Siting Council has 60 days to render a decision which ends on May 12 or 13. C. Kinnie asked if this was for the hearing or for a final decision. M. Tristany stated that he has not received any correspondence regarding a hearing date for the solar farm.

L. Churchill stated that near Culver Road, they would be removing up to three rows of panels that would stick out into the upland review area. She stated that it was about 18 inches. She stated that it would give a little more room to put plantings there for the buffer. R. Parrette asked what would have to be cleared to move the 3 rows to the left. L. Churchill stated that nothing must be cleared because the field goes all the way to the edge of wetlands. R. Parrette stated that the disturbance is minimal because they are putting steel poles into the ground about 6-8 ft. so he did not have a problem if that is all they are doing to be running into the review area.

P. Merrill stated that he thought that all of those panels would create a considerable impact to the wetlands; all of that impervious surface like a parking lot; those panels won't absorb that water. R. Parrette stated that the water would runoff to the ground underneath the panels.

C. Kinnie asked of the area adjacent to Latham Drive, how much of the upland review areas goes into clear cut; is it all of it to the wetland edge. M. Tristany stated that he was not sure; he stated that the plan shows the limits of the panels. G. Norman stated that it looks like nothing is going closer than 75 feet. C. Kinnie stated that if they moved it over then it would be closer to the wetland boundary; He was curious about the limit of the clearing because you wouldn't want trees to shade the panels. He stated that this area will have to be maintained; cutting it back to keep it clean. L. Churchill stated that there is a drop off about 50 feet past where the 150 ft. review area is. R. Parrette stated that they should not be any closer than 75 feet into the upland review area.

C. Kinnie stated that where the slope is minimal, it is not much of an impact; but where the slope is significant, shifting things over can be problematic. G. Norman stated that the slope seems steep at the 75 foot mark. C. Kinnie stated that we can make comments about this to forward to the Siting Council.

R. Parrette asked if the driveway would be crushed stone or paved. M. Tristany stated that he assumed it will be paved so they can get in to do winter maintenance. P. Zvingilas stated that they would grade up to one acre. C. Kinnie stated that it is probably for the roadway. L. Churchill stated that the roadway will follow the topography.

M. Tristany stated that we can make a list of concerns and suggestions and forward it to the Siting Council. C. Kinnie stated that the parcel on the north side of Route 138 near Culver Road is an open field so that if they move it over one or two rows, it would not be an issue. C. Kinnie stated that his only concern was that if the people of Latham Drive want a buffer there, and if this gets shifted over in the more southerly sections, it will be right into that slope. M. Tristany stated that if it cannot shift over, then they can eliminate one or two rows. There was discussion of this matter including that the neighbors at Latham Drive did not want any of the trees cut in the area of Lee Avenue.

R. Parrette stated that we should suggest the residents' area that we do not want them to keep going to the west on; to reconfigure the area towards the east.

C. Kinnie asked what the commission how they wanted to address that.

**MOTION:** L. Churchill moved to write a letter to the Siting Council for the western most arrays that abut Latham Drive to maintain 75 feet of upland review area due to the steepness of the slope directly into the wetland.

R. Parrette read from the petition regarding the solar farm will reduce pollution from out of state. L. Churchill stated that the more solar farms there are the less pollution. R. Parrette read from the petition about service length and capacity factor, what happens when the panels are exhausted in 45 years. L. Churchill stated that they can re-sign up and do another array, or sell the land. R. Parrette stated that the capacity factor is 13 percent. P. Zvingilas stated that you run it for the year and you get 13 percent. M. Tristany stated that K. Sullivan has stated in his application that this area gets 17 percent efficiency. R. Parrette read that the grading is associated with the access driveway. R. Parrette read that no endangered species were found. M. Tristany explained that the state has an endangered species map. There was discussion of this matter.

M. Tristany read through the suggestions: 1) The westerly array of the southerly cluster that abuts Latham Drive, maintain 75 feet of the upland review area to the due to steepness of the slope into the wetlands. 2) no herbicides are to be used in the upland review area

2) Accommodates the concerns of the Latham Drive residents to maintain the tree buffer

L. Churchill stated that we should suggest using goats to maintain the area. C. Kinnie stated that they are proposing a seed mix; and they are cutting trees flush with the ground and it will be mowed.

P. Zvingilas asked how the panels are cleaned when grime and pollen builds up on the panels. C. Kinnie stated that the rain washes the panels off. R. Parrette stated that they have come out with a self cleaning glass. There was discussion of this matter. R. Parrette stated that if they will be cleaning the panels as part of the maintenance, what they clean it with should be looked at.

4) Cleaning agents/ chemicals used; and how the panels and the land underneath are maintained.

R. Parrette stated at Culver Road, the north cluster, that the 3 rows to the west can be moved, there is no issue as long as they stay away from the 75 foot buffer

R. Parrette seconded the motion. P. Merrill asked to have the list read back. M. Tristany read the list for the record.

1) The westerly array of the southerly cluster that abuts Latham Drive, to maintain 75 feet of the upland review area due to steepness of the slope down to the wetlands. 2) Address the concerns of the Latham Drive residents to maintain the tree buffer. 3) No Herbicides are to be used in the upland review area. 4) Cleaning agents/chemicals used to periodically clean the panels 5) Culver Road, northerly cluster, relocate panels to the west and stay out of 75 foot upland review area.

C. Kinnie asked for other recommendations. He asked for the vote. All were in favor. The motion was carried.

## **10. Communications**

### **A. Army Corp of Engineers Public Notice of Proposed Replacement and Revision of the Department of the Army Connecticut General Permit (GP)**

M. Tristany explained that the Army Corp of Engineers was making changes to their permit process.

### **B. Letter from Steve Broyer of Ecos Energy dated March 15, 2016 regarding Windham Solar LLC, Petition for Declaratory Ruling for a solar project located at 1219 and 1249 Voluntown Road**

C. Kinnie asked if a declaratory ruling was being asked of this Commission. M. Tristany stated that this declaratory ruling was to be from the Siting Council.

## **11. Reports from Members**

R. Parrette stated at the last meeting, we discussed reciting the pledge of allegiance before the meeting and that M. Tristany will look into the matter. M. Tristany stated that it would go on the agenda. D. Szall stated that she forgot to add it to this agenda; it has been added to the subsequent agendas.. C. Kinnie stated that this can be done before calling the meeting to order. There was discussion of this matter.

## **12. Conservation Commission Matters**

**A.** Discussion of the Earth Day Clean-Up of Glasgo Pond that occurred on Sunday, April 10, 2016 at 10 a.m.

C. Kinnie stated that he and Lauren were the only members who were present. R. Parrette stated that he had been looking for the site but had gone to the marina. C. Kinnie stated that was a second date set. L. Churchill stated that it was set for Sunday, May 1<sup>st</sup> to have the clean up and mentioned that T. Babbitt said the dumpsters were available the first and third Saturdays. There was discussion of this matter.

C. Kinnie stated that there really won't be many bags of trash from both sides of the pond. R. Parrette offered to put the trash bags in his pickup and he will dispose of them during the week. C. Kinnie asked D. Szall to send a reminder to the members about the clean up on May 2, 2106. She will do so. C. Kinnie told members that there is access to the pond on Hill Street in Glasgo Center on Route 201 if it is open. Members can park adjacent to the opening at the boat launch; park in front of the old church on Route 201, or on Jarvis Road on the other side of the bridge. C. Kinnie stated that this is at 10 AM, Sunday, May 1.

### **13. Adjournment**

C. Kinnie asked for a motion to adjourn. G. Norman moved to adjourn. P. Merrill seconded the motion. All were in favor. The meeting adjourned at 9:13 p.m.

## **III. Aquifer Protection Agency**

### **1. Call to Order**

Chairman Courtland Kinnie called this regular meeting of the Aquifer Protection Agency to order on April 21, 2016 at 9:13 p.m.

### **2. Roll Call & Determination of Quorum**

**Present:** Courtland Kinnie, Robert Parrette, Glen Norman, Clarence (Pete) Merrill, Alternate Lauren Churchill, Town Planner Mario Tristany, WEO Peter Zvingilas, Recording Secretary Donna Szall

**Absent:** Edward (Jay) Waitte, Lawrence Laidley, Gary Serdechny, Kevin Franklin, Alex Grzelak

C. Kinnie appointed L. Churchill to sit for L. Laidley. There was a quorum for this regular meeting.

### **3. Approval of the Minutes**

**A.** Approval of Minutes for APA meeting the March 17, 2016 meeting.

C. Kinnie asked for a motion for the minutes.

**MOTION:** R. Parrette moved to approve the minutes as submitted. L. Churchill seconded the motion. All were in favor. The motion was carried.

### **4. Matters Presented for Discussion**

**A. APA 03-16 CAMPUTARO, PASQUALE, 522 PLAINFIELD ROAD, GRISWOLD, CT. Registration for activities for Skyline Recovery Service.**

C. Kinnie stated that it was his understanding that John Faulise was going to be here for this registration. M. Tristany stated that Donna has sent him the emails received from the State. C. Kinnie stated that it seems that this can be attended to rather easily. C. Kinnie stated that the application needs to be amended. D. Szall stated Kim Czapl mentioned that this particular use does not need a registration. R. Parrette stated that the regulated activity must have been conducted at this site. D. Szall stated that from the 50's or 60's there has always been a auto repair garage. D. Szall stated that the activity for the automotive repair garage must be registered if they want to ever be that use again.

C. Kinnie reviewed the items in Part IV Facilities Information that had been checked off by Stilly's based on the K. Czapl's email of April 5, 2016.

Item 2 (A) Underground storage or transmission of oil or petroleum. C. Kinnie asked if there was underground storage. (B) Oil or petroleum dispensing for the purposes of retail, wholesale, or fleet use. (D) Repair or maintenance of vehicles or internal combustion engines of vehicles. C. Kinnie stated that this was the service garage. (E) C. Kinnie stated that the DEEP has a different definition of what salvage operations that what an auto repair garage would consider salvage. He stated that (E) should not have been checked for Stilly's. (F) Waste water discharge and (G) car or truck washing. C. Kinnie stated that they were washing cars at different times. M. Tristany stated degreasing engines. (K) generation of electrical power. C. Kinnie stated that they must have had a generator when the power went out. (T) Production or fabrication of metal products. C. Kinnie stated that they did welding. (V) Accumulation or storage of waste oil, anti-freeze or spent lead-acid batteries (recycling facility under a state DEEP General Permit) C. Kinnie stated that working on vehicles, they had to store

that. (X) Storage of de-icing chemicals (salt storage facility, fleet, state or municipal garage) C. Kinnie stated that this should not have been checked. M. Tristany stated that it was not a storage facility. R. Parrette stated that on Skyline Recover registration everything was checked but (K) and (X); they must have just copied it. D. Szall stated that was what she had told K. Czaplá.

C. Kinnie asked if the property has underground storage tanks. R. Parrette stated that the DEEP does not have it on record. There was discussion of this matter. C. Kinnie stated we must have Mr. Camputaro and John Faulise present at the next meeting so that we can review this registration side by side and go through K. Czaplá's comments. There was discussion of this matter.

M. Tristany asked about the inspection that DEEP was to do. C. Kinnie stated that DEEP was to go out to inspect that site the next day after her email. D. Szall stated that she has not heard anything more from DEEP.

C. Kinnie asked D. Szall to send a letter to Mr. Camputaro and Boundaries to be at the meeting to get these registrations done. He asked D. Szall to email K. Czaplá to get a report from DEEP regarding the inspection. C. Kinnie stated that we can set a site walk if this is not resolved next month.

## **5. Adjournment**

C. Kinnie asked for a motion to adjourn. R. Parrette moved to adjourn. G. Norman seconded the motion. All were in favor. The meeting adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna M. Szall  
Recording Secretary