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
PUBLIC HEARING & REGULAR MEETING **APPROVED MINUTES**
GRISWOLD TOWN HALL **APRIL 16, 2015**

I. Public Hearing (7:00 P.M.)

1. Call to Order

Chairman Courtland Kinnie called this public hearing of the Griswold Inland Wetlands & Watercourses Conservation Commission to order on June 21, 2012 at 7:05 p.m.

2. Roll Call & Determination of Quorum

Present: Courtland Kinnie, Robert Parrette, Lawrence Laidley, Gary Serdechny, Alternates Clarence (Pete) Merrill, Town Planner Mario Tristany, WEO Peter Zvingilas, Recording Secretary Donna Szall

Also Present: Town Counsel Eliza Heins, CME Engineering P.E. Chuck Eaton and P.E. Peter Parent, George Logan, Sigrid Gadwa of REMA,

Absent: Stacie Stadnicki, Edward (Jay) Waitte, Glen Norman, Lauren Churchill, Kevin Franklin,

C. Kinnie appointed P. Merrill to sit for Jay Waitte. There was a quorum for this public hearing.

3. Matter Presented for Public Comment

A. CC 05-15 AMERICAN INDUSTRIES, 630 PLAINFIELD ROAD, GRISWOLD, CT Requesting approval for memorializing existing uses on the property located at 630 Plainfield Road, Griswold, CT for both industrial and residential uses, establishing a base line for activities which exist and/or are ongoing in regulated wetlands or watercourses and/or upland review areas adjacent to wetlands and watercourses; and to grant permits for those regulated activities which are deemed to have been instituted subsequent to the adoption of inland wetlands and watercourses regulations in the Town of Griswold and to institute erosion and sediment control measures in locations deemed warranted by the project engineer in order to prevent erosion and sedimentation into wetland and watercourses located on and adjacent to the property. Property is zoned C-2.

C. Kinnie stated this is a continuation of a prior public hearing that began in January and we will be receiving revised plans. He asked the representative of the applicant come forward. Attorney Harry Heller, 736 New London Turnpike, Uncasville, representing the applicant Pasquale Camputaro and American Industries. (Also present were John Faulise and David McKay, Boundaries, LLC and Pasquale Camputaro)

H. Heller stated that there are substantial revisions to the plan that was submitted in January. He stated that in addition to the revisions made, there is an increase in the height of the proposed berm on the north and north westerly sides of the site. He explained that their consultants have been working with the Town consultants to insure the methodology and implementation of the measures are consistent with the protection of the wetlands.

H. Heller outlined the changes of the high of the berm is increased to elevation 136 and the construction design has changed as a result to buffer the industrial activities from the neighbors in the north and northwest. . He explained that the area shaded in grey is the area the consultants agreed there should be remediation. He stated that in the due to the steeply sloped area, the sediment will remain so there is no damage. H. Heller explained the turbidity in the cove where the well that provides the well water for the plan, measures have been implemented to alleviate he turbidity such of which is paving of the access road to that area which now is gravel. He stated that the residential activity area, they propose to remove the lavatory and 1500 gallon holding tank with changes to the access road to the recreation area with the addition

of water bars to break the storm water runoff and allow infiltration; the structure at the bottom will accommodate the run off that reaches the watercourse. He stated that David McKay will explain the agreed upon methodology to the watercourse to alleviate the erosion that is there now.

H. Heller stated that have we have submitted the amended delineated activities that are proposed in conjunction with the application to be consistent with the revised plans submitted this evening. He explained that convert the gravel drive to bituminous concrete to alleviate one of the causes of the sedimentation to the cove.

H. Heller explained that in conjunction with the residential area, to restore 2,100 sq. ft. of beach area where sand was installed without a permit; it will be remediated to restore the wetland function. He stated that the application was amended to include the floating docks that are used in the recreation area not in the original application.

H. Heller stated that Dave McKay will explained the engineering details of the methodology proposed for this plan and complies with the permitting criteria.

C. Kinnie appointed R. Parrette as acting secretary pro tempore for this public hearing.

David McKay, P. E. Boundaries, LLC. He explained that they had met with the town consultants, CME Engineer and REMA Ecological Services on two occasions and on a site walk. He stated that these plans were prepared in conjunction with their recommendations. He stated official review letters from the Towns consultants and submitted the comment response letter for the record.

D. McKay reviewed the town engineers' review letter. He explained Sheet 1 for the commercial site that includes the wetland restoration area in grey, the slope stabilization area in dashed hatches, construction of the berm to elevation 136 as a buffer to the residences from the industrial use; and the formal stabilization of an access drive to the pump area. He explained that the access drive will be graded so that pitches towards the interior of the site where runoff will drain to a crushed stone shoulder into the slope that is proposed to be constructed of crushed stone; in the steeper portions runoff through a crushed stone shoulder and through a stone check dam for infiltration before it enters the pump area.

D. McKay explained CME's review comment #1: that crushed stone slope from the end of the berm to the crusher to be covered with an 8 inch thick layer compost area to retain water, allow for plants to grow and curb dust and other issues on the site be added to the plan set. He explained that the slope stabilization area has loose gravel that has entered into the wetland and due to the steepness, sediment will remain in the wetland to reduce impact to the wetland, based on recommendations by CME and REMA there will be a 6 inch layer of compost for stabilization of the slope and compost filter tubes parallel to the contours of the slope to break up runoff from the slope to prevent gravel runoff into the wetland area and promote growth of forest plants in this area.

D. McKay explained CME's review comment #2: removing 15 foot gap between the two mulch area and the slope stabilization area with placement of mulch over the entire area to allow uniform vegetation of the gap area. D. McKay stated that compost will be added for a uniform compost surface.

D. McKay explained CME review comment #3: proposed crushed stone slope to be keyed into proposed grade to prevent unraveling of the slope to prevent failure of the slope both sides of the slope, up against the paved driveway, and along the operation area. He showed the cross sectioned keyway areas on Sheet 4 stating that it will be 18 inches deep to prevent the stone from rolling off of the slope for a stable foundation.

D. McKay explained CME review comment #4: recommended revision of the construction sequence which he will discuss during REMAs recommendations for remediation of the wetland area.

D. McKay explained CME review comment #5: recommendation that erosion and sedimentation control measures are sufficient to protect the wetlands and recommended using less intrusive measures such as compost filter socks in place of silt fences where appropriate to minimize disturbance to in and around wetlands. D. McKay stated that silt fence was replaced in the wetland area down gradient of the remediation area to utilize compost filter sock staked directly to the ground. He stated that the silt fence and hay bales will be used in rest of the project area given the nature of the work constructing the berm to provide a better barrier.

D. McKay explained CME review comment #6: recommended additional data required for stabilization measures of the pump intake area addressing the turbidity of the water at the intake. He stated that the turbidity is runoff from existing gravel drive and loose gravel in that area. The turbidity color matches the color of the gravel drive impacts the water. This will be addressed by the paved access drive and with stabilizations to the berm and the composts treatments. He stated that an HDPE drainage discharge that discharges to the wetlands up gradient of the pump areas flows with silty water

during storm events; the inlet side of the pipe will be capped and the berm will be built over it to no longer receive silty discharge. He stated that the third source of turbidity can be from the gravel banks of the pump area and by suction from priming the pump where modified riprap is proposed to be added to slope of the pump, at the in the vicinity of the pump and within the pump chamber itself and 1 foot around that for inlet area bottom stability. L. Laidley asked about a stone check dam. D. McKay stated there will be a stone check at the bottom of the proposed paved access drive that will wrap around the whole paved access for runoff will be filtered before reaching the wetland. He stated that a turbidity curtain will be provided in the inlet to prevent the silt from getting in to Aspinook Pond inlet.

D. McKay explained CME review comment #7: recommendation for the use inverts in an installation detail of proposed casing pipe for pump discharge that acts as a drain for if drain set at the toe of the slope. D. McKay stated that there is an existing casing pipe that extends through the existing berm in that location from the pump discharging to the wash pump area. He stated that this existing casing will be protected during construction and will remain in use after construction and is pitched towards the wash pond and is 2 feet above the water elevation in the wash pond for which backflow through this pipe in not a concern.

Stacy Stadnicki arrived at 7:34 p.m.

D. McKay explained CME review comment #8: that a detail of a concrete retaining wall at the crusher will be provided. D. McKay explained the southern end of Sheet 2 that shows the main crusher area where the berm continues north toward asphalt plant and Johnson Cove Road. He stated that the berm will be moved into the wooded area adjacent to the site to obtain the 136 elevation height; and to protect the crusher, a 10 ft. tall concrete retaining wall will be installed which requires a building permit and a structural engineering design.

D. McKay explained CME review comment #9: that berm construction in the area of clearing and grubbing indicates plantings as noted and recommends REMAs comments for proposed plantings in that area. He stated that this area had to be cleared to install the berm and REMA suggestions to restore that area.

D. McKay explained CME review comment #10: recommendation of surface roughing technique promotes good moisture retention and seed contact to established vegetation to be added to the berm construction sequence prior to seeing and placement of erosion control measures. He explained that 8 inches of loam topsoil will be installed and the surface roughing using a rake to the contours of the berm and apply seed mix recommended by the manufacturer, and a erosion control blanket on slopes steeper than a 2:1 slope for good moist.

D. McKay explained CME review comment #11: recommendation that the staple pattern for erosion control blanket be added to the plan. He explained Sheet 5 showing the detail of the erosion control blanket and a perimeter staple pattern recommended by the manufacturer on slopes for 1:1 slopes.

D. McKay explained CME review comment #12: recommendation of mid slope silt fence provided with interval checks to prevent channelizing flow along the line of the silt fence to reduce erosion of the slope. D. McKay revised the plan to have a five foot sediment fence check every two hundred feet along the fence will have a hook to enter the site to break up the flow of water that runs along the fence.

D. McKay explained CME review comment #13: recommendation of dust control procedures to be provided due to proximity of wetlands during construction. D. McKay explained that dust control will be conducted as required based on site conditions using a tank with a pressure pump at a minimum of 20 psi utilizing non-brackish water free from oil, acid, injurious alkali or vegetable matter to be used at least once per day during berm construction.

D. McKay explained CME review comment #14: recommendation Erosion Control Operation and Maintenance notes that weekly inspections and inspections for 1 inch or greater rain fall to be provided and copies of inspectors reports are be provided to the town. He explained that the notes for the on sheet 5 were revised to show the check off list for the inspections and the best management practices installed on the site and a list of improvements. He stated that a note was added that the forms be submitted to the town.

D. McKay explained the recommendations from REMA review of the commercial site.

D. McKay explained REMA review comment #1: recommendation use of compost rather than wood mulch throughout for grown and colonization of species and ecological functions. He explained Sheet 1 of the plan was revised to use compost.

D. McKay explained REMA review comment #2: recommendation of 6 inch of compost layer and an 8 inch layer in areas where underlying subsoil is lacking to hold water and support growth. He explained that the plan was revised for the slope stabilization area using 6 inches compost layer and 8 inches compost on the crushed stone berm.

D. McKay explained REMA review comment #3: recommendation to add notes to the plan for removal and demarcation the Japanese knotweed infestation requiring excavation of soil and roots to the depth of permanent soil saturation. Bag and dispose all cut and excavated material in the landfill and to add a minimum of 4 inches of top soil; treat surviving shoots. He explained that the limits of the Japanese knotweed on the site. He read the notes that were added to the plan for removal of the Japanese knotweed.

D. McKay explained REMA review comment #4: recommendation that a maximum of 3 to 4 feet of material be excavated or to permanent soil saturation at the site since knotweed roots do not grow down to the water table. He stated that this recommendation was in the Japanese knotweed removal procedure notes on the plan.

D. McKay explained REMA review comment #5: recommendation that wetlands remediation area for sedimentation removal and adjacent upland area using hand tools and small tractor machine to uncover existing top soil and to minimize soil and root compaction. He explained that remediation sequence note 3 was revised to remove sedimentation within inland wetland with 10 feet up gradient of wetland limit use a tractor with non-toothed bucket with rubber tires down to the original topsoil working from the interior of the wetland to edge and beyond; hand tools will be utilized to remove remainder of sedimentation to limit disturbance to native wetland soil during excavation

D. McKay explained REMA review comment #6: recommendation to add note to plan labeled "Implementation of wetland remediation to be supervised by wetlands ecologist. He stated that this was added to the plan under remediation sequence.

D. McKay explained REMA review comment #7: recommendation that planting and seeding not proposed for shaded wetlands remediation site between wetland flags 115 and 120 because preexisting wetland seeds and rhizomes of wetland plants will sprout in the exposed wetland topsoil into the remediation area. He stated that this is addressed in Remediation Sequence Note 12 that the existing wetland plants are already sprouting up through the existing sedimentation.

D. McKay explained REMA review comment #8: recommendation that wetland plants be monitored for three growing seasons after the season of remedial work to allow for colonization from adjacent wetland and maturation of perennials and invasive species will be eradicated for 4 consecutive years. He stated that Remediation Sequence Note 12 was revised to the recommendations and samples the re-established area with reports to the Inland Wetlands Commission and removal of invasive species during the monitoring period.

D. McKay explained REMA review comment #9: recommendation to delay removal of silt fence part way up the slope until vegetation cover is at least 40 percent in the remediation area so that small seedlings and un-germinated seeds will not be buried from sedimentation washing down the slope. He explained that silt fence will be maintained for 6 months or until the slope is fully stabilized.

D. McKay explained REMA review comment #10: recommendation that northerly facing slopes in the remediation area and Section BB to preserve trees and saplings and to leave the irregular topography protect the wetlands from dust and air pollution of the crushing operation. He stated that a note was added to the plan that trees and saplings and to clear the mineral soils to native soils within 5 feet of the trees.

D. McKay explained REMA review comment #11: recommendation to adjust grading procedures to protect existing woody cover up gradient of the wetland remediation area and the adjacent slope sections and light slope grading in the tree line between Wetland flag 109 to 122. He stated that a note was added that proposed grading within tree line to be graded to original topsoil, protect existing trees and saplings. Trees and areas to be protected shall be marked with paint or flagging by the wetland scientist prior to grading.

D. McKay explained REMA review comment #12: recommendation that up gradient of Wetland Flags 103 to 109, grading of the slope can be irregular and patches of bare soil to be stabilized with hay mulch or for larger areas, erosion control blankets. Hand seed bare patched with roadside matrix upland mix where some shade –tolerant specials are located including shrubs. Protect saplings and other emerging woody vegetation including trees leaving boulders in place and other irregularities to minimize root damage. He stated that a note was added to plan that if density of vegetation prevents placement of erosion control blankets, straw mulch or compost may be applied at the direction of the wetland scientist.

D. McKay explained REMA review comment #13: recommendation to eradicate any invasive species prior to grading the northerly slopes between Wetland flags 103 and 126. Mugwort roots and soil are to be excavated and disposed of offsite. Woody invasive shrubs and vines control with cut and paint technique with herbicide to freshly cut surfaces. He stated that the note was added to the plan to eradicate invasive species identified by wetland scientist, excavate invasive species and dispose offsite prior to slope grading; and to treat woody invasive shrubs and vines painting herbicide on fresh cut surfaces of woody trunks.

D. McKay explained REMA review comment #14: recommendation to move the berm back to the south to maintain existing wooded wetland buffer where possible and for reforestation of the rear slope as needed; restore to dense woody vegetation, replace what is lost up to berm elevation 130.0 feet. D. McKay stated that the proposed wooded buffer restoration has been added to the plans.

D. McKay explained REMA review comment #15: recommendation prior to construction berm at wooded wetland buffer, restore, remove and stockpile existing topsoil with forest soil propagules only from areas free of infestations to be re-spread to a depth of 6 inches minimum on upper half of slope and 10 inches minimum in lower half of slope where more trees should be planted on the slope after placement of the berm material supplementing as needed with commercial topsoil. He stated that the note was added to the plans regarding the wooded buffer restoration area which he read for the record.

D. McKay explained REMA review comment #16: recommendation to plant species listed at the wooded wetland buffer restoration tolerant of thin soil over acidic rock. He explained the limit of the proposed wooded buffer restoration was added to the plans.

D. McKay explained REMA review comment #17: recommendation that shrub propagules for the wooded wetland buffer restoration are also introduced through roadside upland matrix seed mix. He stated that the limits of the wooded buffer restoration areas were added to the plans.

D. McKay explained REMA review comment #18: recommendation of using the listed sizes for smaller potted stock for list of woody materials for shrubs and trees to adjust more quickly to the site. He stated that the limit of the proposed wooded buffer restoration was added to the plan to use the recommended sizes for trees and shrubs.

D. McKay explained REMA review comment #19: recommendation to use compost-filled silt sock in addition to hay bales or silt fence at the base of the slope to filter fine sediment at the wetland buffer restoration. He stated that the plan shows silt fence backed by hay bales in the limit of the berm location since it provides a more stable barrier to the berm material during the berm construction process.

D. McKay explained REMA review comment #20: recommendation that NEWP roadside matrix upland seed mix to be used for the northerly facing area of the proposed berm to an elevation of 130.0 feet and to an elevation of 136.00 feet on the easterly section of D-D. He stated that the plans call for NEWP roadside matrix upland seed mix to be used on the northerly side of the berm.

D. McKay explained REMA review comment #21: recommendation that the section of the proposed berm on Sheet e close to the wooded swamp along Johnson Cove Road to reduce the grading can be achieved on the north slope with a shift of berm location to curve it to the couth into the site where it does not conflict with the existing operation. He stated that the plan has been revised accordingly in those areas. He stated that the berm will be moved from to be built up from the top of existing embankment and work into the site.

D. McKay explained REMA review comment #22: recommendation that the outer vegetated berm be covered with a minimum of 8 inches of topsoil except for the wetland buffer restoration prior to placement of the erosion control blanket and seeding. He stated that on Sheet 5 the construction sequence was revised to call for 8 inches of top soil on the berm.

D. McKay explained CME review comments for the residential site.

D. McKay explained that the work on Sheet 2 showing the proposed improvements to have water bars that will be paved on each side of the bituminous drive that breaks the watershed up into smaller pieces down the drive to the bottom to the beach. The modified rip rap at each of the water bars. He explained how the concrete grid pavers will be installed at the edge of the existing paved drive on a gavel base and filled with crushed stone. He stated that the lavatory and the tank will be removed.

D. McKay explained CME review comment #15: recommendation that area of disturbance for proposed swale does not appear to coincide with the depicted area of construction. He stated that the swale and rip rap was revised to 315 sq. feet of impact to the wetland.

D. McKay explained CME review comment #16: recommendation that the concrete grid swale must extend to the edge of the water the proposed riprap outlet particularly submerged to reduce potential under-cutting of the swale. He explained that the swale was shifted so that the swale ends at the water and the riprap is in the water to prevent scour.

D. McKay explained CME review comment #17: recommendation utilizing a less erodible material such as pea stone for the being of the concrete grid pavers since the sand may be washed out under certain flow conditions. He explained that the plan was revised accordingly to replace the 1 inch sand base with pea stone.

D. McKay explained CME review comment #18: recommendation that along the northwest edge of pavers adjacent to the paved driveway, the perimeter of all proposed concrete grid pavers should be bordered with curbing for a confined edge. He explained that the plan was revised accordingly in the details and on the plan to have the outside edge of the grid pavers will have a 12 inch concrete curb at grade to keep the beach sand segregated from the crushed stone and concrete grid pavers.

D. McKay explained CME review comment #19: recommendation erosion and sedimentation control narrative, operations and maintenance information to be provided. He explained that Sheet 3 shows the erosion and sedimentation control notes, the sediment fence detail and the turbidity curtain detail

D. McKay explained CME review comment #21: recommendation that the flowing docks require permits in order to remain. He stated that the docks are shown on the existing conditions plan and the proposed conditions.

D. McKay explained REMA Review – Residential Site

D. McKay explained REMA review comment #1: recommendation that aquatic plan communities the turbidity curtain should not remain more than a month after planting, unless there are excessive flows or wave action. He explained that a note was added to Beach Area Remediation Sequence Note 5 that turbidity curtain to be removed within one month of placement of wetland remediation area planting unless it is determined by wetland ecologist that there is excessive wave action or flows.

D. McKay explained REMA review comment #2: recommendation that vegetation dated of shoreline wetlands to be used to guide supplemental/substitute plantings beyond the specified list. He read the list of suggested plantings; and explained that Note 6 was added that Vegetation date from nearby shoreline wetlands shall be used to guide supplemental/ substitute as required by wetland ecologist.

D. McKay explained REMA review comment #3: recommendation for quart pots or plastic bags for aquatic plantings; not two inch peat pots; two-thirds of leaves and stems shall be above the water at the time of planting. He explained that Note 6 was revised to require quart pots or plastic bags and for two thirds of stems and leaves to be above water at the time of planting.

D. McKay explained REMA review comment #4: recommendation to add “but will be similar in density to the adjacent undisturbed emergent and scrub shrub wetland cover types to Note 5. He stated that this was revised accordingly.

D. McKay explained REMA review comment #5: recommendation to add “planting of shrubs can take place in late spring and early fall; however aquatic plants will be planted in late spring and early summer but not latter that August 1 to Note 6. He stated that Note 6 was revised accordingly.

D. McKay explained REMA review comment #6: recommendation to add buttonbush to the lists of Note 6. He stated that this was added to Note 6.

D. McKay explained REMA review comment #7: recommendation to add to Note 7 “at time of planning, shrubs will be a minimum of 3 feet in height and potted or in plastic bags, not peat pot propagules.” He stated that this was added to Note 7.

D. McKay explained REMA review comment #8: recommendation to Note 8 “Implementation of wetland remediation will be supervised by a wetlands ecologist who will also specify planting locations.” He stated that this was added to Note 8.

D. McKay explained REMA review comment #9: recommendation for monitoring of the remediation area for three growing seasons following plan implementation and reports to be provided to the Griswold Inland Wetlands Agency by December 15 of the year and eradication and control of invasive plant species monitored for 4 years within the restored wetland area and with 15 feet of its limits. He stated that REMAs recommendation was added to Note 9.

D. McKay explained REMA review comment #10: recommendation to add a Note 10 to the plan. He read the note for the record that additional aquatic and shrub species and a higher density would be necessary based on an evaluation of the restoration area to the undisturbed wetland cover in the first and second year of plan implementation. He stated that REMAs recommendation was added as Note 10 to the plan.

D. McKay stated that the proposed improvements to the residential area will have a 6 inch curb and paved access pad to the water slide to prevent runoff into slide during rain events.

D. McKay explained CME review – Miscellaneous Issues comment #20: He stated that there is the demonstration plan which he submitted for the record. He read comment 20 regarding the construction related material and equipment on the western boundary of the site within 150 feet of the pond and recommended removal and/or relocation of those items. He stated a note was added to the plan that all the materials will be moved outside of the 150 regulated areas to the upland review area opposite of the existing dirt road.

He stated that we worked closely with the consultants to meet the objective R. Parrette asked about the outlet that was to be capped. D. McKay stated that HDPE drain will have a watertight end cap and the berm would be constructed over it so that stormwater will not go in that pipe; if there is groundwater, it will move it to the wetland. C. Kinnie stated that previously you could not find the inlet. D. McKay stated that we have identified it.

C. Kinnie asked the town's consultants if they have responses to what they have heard this evening and the revised site plan.

Pete Parent, Professional Engineer, CME stated that they have addressed our comments well. He stated that they still had questions as for the pump inlet goes he asked if there was a back flow preventer on the pump line to keep turbid water going back to the inlet area when the pump is turned off. He stated that the remediation and stabilization proposed in that area is a good action to take. P. Parent asked that a note be added to the plan that the concrete retaining wall that this requires building official action prior to construction.

Pat Camputaro American Industries stated that it already has a check valve on it. C. Kinnie stated that it has a check valve. He asked for other comments from CME. He asked if REMA had comments.

George Logan, REMA Ecological, he stated that this is how things should work between consultants with the back and forth. He had a few things to address. 1) add a note to the plan that watering of the slopes will take place in case of drought so that the vegetation is established well. G. Logan stated that the paved access drive to the pump and asked whether CME is satisfied that the check dam and the crushed stone shoulder will take care of the flow going down.

G. Logan stated that the Japanese knotweed demarcation of where it is located to add a designation to the plan showing the location of the Japanese knotweed. He showed where there is some of this weed

Sigrun Gadwa stated that if it is going being low the water table you don't have to dig deep up in the upland area the roots can go down eight feet and deep digging is needed and she noticed the infestation near the pump. She stated that the paved access drive and what traffic will be using the drive since it will require regular sweeping. H. Heller stated that that paved area is used only for maintenance.

G. Logan stated on page 7 that language should be added to Note 3 for treating surviving shoots with the proposed herbicide in June and July and to add for 3 years following should anything come back up.

G. Logan stated on page 9 regarding protect existing trees; he stated to add to the note: a minimum of five feet of all trees as directed by an ecologist in the field. He stated that on page 10 regarding the wetland buffer restoration, he explained that the following species to add "more" trees and scratch the wording from shall to 130.

G. Logan stated that he was concerned because this is a critical area, he stated to keep the silt fence and to add the compost. He stated that this should be on the high spot and at least DOT spec compost to 18 inches will take out silt. S. Gadwa stated that to put aged compost directly behind the silt fence 2 ft wide and 1.5 feet tall. She stated that after two years, there is no silt at all. She stated that in may be more convenient tot put just compost behind the silt fence.

G. Logan stated that he was satisfied with the revision. C. Kinnie asked if these accommodations can be made. D. McKay stated yes, these will be added to the site plan. C. Kinnie asked for questions from commission members. He asked that on page 2 the area of the berm where you are going out into the wooded area and asked for clarification that the raising and extending of the berm is outside the jurisdiction of this commission and you are coming before us because it is in the regulated area. D. McKay stated yes. C. Kinnie stated that according to the plant tonight, vegetation is being taking away and being restore and this will be supervised at all time. D. McKay stated yes. C. Kinnie asked if the silt boom at the pump will remain in place. D. McKay stated yes that it is a permanent installation that will require maintenance or replacement after a winter but it is a backup safety measure.

H. Heller stated that you do not take into consideration of the reason for it being done; but the commission is charged by the Wetland Act and your regulations, with the balancing the economic development of the state of Connecticut with the

wetlands and watercourse resources. He stated that this is a complex matter and in order to protect an industrial activ8ty and to continue its viability we are trying to reach an accommodation for the continuation of this activity and to be good neighbors to the residents north of the site without having an adverse impact on the wetlands utilizing the modifications made to the plan.

P. Merrill asked on page 8 item 10 refers to the area of silt removal. D. McKay stated that comment 10 was stabilizing the destabilized areas above the sedimentation that will be removed from the wetlands. P. Merrill stated that he was concerned about the trees and shrubs growing in ht gravel and mineral soils; how the soils can be removed without disturbing it. D. McKay stated that the soil is not deep, less than a foot to clear to the native top soil and stabilize what is not choking the trees. There was discussion of this matter including explaining the gravel soil removal procedure with topsoil and seed mix placed.

G. Serdechny asked about the Japanese knotweed if after four years we don't see it, it is gone. Sigrun explained that there are new methods that have not been DEEP approved to inject herbicide into the hollow stem. She stated that this technique ay be available this year. G. Serdechny stated based on the method outlined here, it will be gone. S. Gadwa stated yes, the seed are infertile and will not spread and not to move it around with construction equipment. She asked if when removing knotweed to remove it prior to any construction. D. McKay stated that the construction sequence will be revised to remove the knotweed removal is the first step.

R. Parrette stated that near the water pump there are items that are not natural; he asked if those items will be removed. D. McKay stated that that note can be added to the plan. He asked about the lavatory being removed and when did that become a concern. D. McKay stated that the holding tanks violate the Public Health Code. S. Stadnicki asked what will be used in its place. D. McKay stated that portable toilets will be used.

R. Parrette asked about the floating docks and if they extend out and be mounted on the shore. P. Camputaro stated that they are floating rafts not docks. R. Parrette asked about the depressions in the pavement to divert the water down the hill, how far out from the pavement do the depressions go and to keep the water running down the pavement and creating a channel. D. McKay stated that it matches the existing edge of pavement which are pitched to a 30 degree angle down the slope and when it is off the low side it goes into a riprap pad.

S. Stadnicki asked what was going on with the beach. D. McKay stated that we are removing 2100 sq. ft. of sand to restore the wetland in that area to minimize impact to the wetlands which is about half the beach. D. McKay stated that it will be replanted to match the area. She was concerned that it would make things worse. D. McKay stated that the sand was placed on top of the area so when it is taken out, it will be replanted to match the existing area. R. Parrette asked how thick the sand was. D. McKay stated that it varies from 6 inches to a foot. L. Laidley asked if material will be brought it to replace the sand. D. McKay stated no, it will fill in with water and plants are going into the water with two thirds of the plants above the water.

G. Logan stated that we will find out if there is compaction there; there will be removal of the sand to the original topsoil and closer to the tree it grades down to the pond bottom.

P. Zvingilas asked if everything is being monitored by a wetland ecologist. D. McKay stated that it is a wetlands scientist on the plan. G. Logan explained that the qualifications for a wetlands ecologist would be listed and whoever was picked would supervise the actual work. He stated that the monitoring can be done by Boundaries and that the information can be reviewed by a wetlands ecologist. P. Zvingilas asked who pays for this cost of the wetland ecologist. H. Heller stated that the applicant would pay the cost. G. Logan explained that the ecologist would be there as necessary and then for the next growing season, the ecologist would make recommendations. It is the town's responsibility to do the monitoring for three years of the site for invasive species and how whether the remediation was effective; and the reports would go to the commission who will determine if an ecologist was needed. There was discussion of this matter including that the ecologist need not be there the whole time but schedule those things for review.

C. Kinnie asked G. Logan about the annual report during growing season. G. Logan stated that the growing season extends into early fall, if the monitoring is done in September at the end of the growing season, nothing will happen that season so December 15 is used for the next growing season.

R. Parrette asked about Clayville pond and asked the distance of Clayville Pond and if it is in the 150 foot buffer. D. McKay showed where the site is in relation to Clayville Pond. R. Parrette asked if where it brushes the pond, is there any airborne activities that have affected the pond. D. McKay stated that he could not answer that. R. Parrette asked if there was a berm in the front. D. McKay stated yes. C. Kinnie asked that there were comments raised about the catch basins on rout3 12 depositing sediment into Clayville pond. D. McKay stated that he can check it out and showed the closest drainage

structure. John Faulise stated that the runoff that would enter the roadway would be from the entrance of the paved driveway.

C. Kinnie asked if there were questions from the public concerning this application to state their name and address.

Beverly Cholewa, 16 Fairview Avenue, asked if there would be overhead maps to determine whether the site has been enlarged. C. Kinnie stated that we are dealing here just with the wetlands. H. Heller stated that it was before the Planning and Zoning Commission.

C. Kinnie asked for other questions from the public.

Jeff Ryan, 72 Johnson Cove, thanked all the parties involved and was excited for the finished product.

C. Kinnie stated that S. Stadnicki had a question about the statutory deadline for this public hearing. C. Kinnie stated that he did not have the exact date of when we are limited to. E. Heins stated that we have eight days past tomorrow. C. Kinnie explained that the public hearing can be closed if all questions are answer this evening and members can listen to recordings before the next meeting. There was discussion of this matter. P. Zvingilas stated that there should be staff review of the modifications to the site plan. H. Heller stated that you can accept comments from staff after closing the public hearing.

C. Kinnie asked for any other comments from commission members to the applicant or representatives or the town consultants.

G. Serdechny stated it looks very thorough and everyone got together to agree on the right things to do. S. Stadnicki asked about staff review and it would be from Peter. C. Kinnie stated that it would be comments from Peter.

C. Kinnie asked for any other questions or comments.

Bevin Sweet, Havey Lane, stated that H. Heller stated that they wanted to be good neighbors to the north but he stated not to forget the residents to the east. C. Kinnie asked where east was. Geer Road, Havey Lane, Lily Pond. C. Kinnie asked the height of the berm that parallel route 12. J. Faulise stated that it was about 20 to 25 feet tall. P. Camputaro stated that he can build that berm higher as well.

S. Gadwa stated that there is a direct benefit from the berm to that wetland wildlife that is sensitive to loud noise.

B. Cholewa, 16 Fairview, asked if the berm and vegetation will make it quieter. She asked about the weed and what it was and was it bamboo.

L. Laidley asked to show on the map the location of where the scrap will be moved to in the residential upland review area.

C. Kinnie stated that any revisions and notations to the plan will come to Peter for his review and he will report to the commission. P. Zvingilas stated that he will get the recommendations from CME that it has been done.
MOTION: R. Parrette moved to close the public hearing for CC 05-15. P. Merrill seconded the motion. All were in favor. The motion carried. The public hearing was closed at 9 pm. He thanked everyone.

II. REGULAR MEETING (7:30 P.M.)

1. Call to Order

Chairman C. Kinnie called this regular meeting of the Griswold Inland Wetlands & Watercourses Conservation Commission to order on April 16, 2015 at 9:08 p.m.

2. Roll Call & Determination of a Quorum

Present: Courtland Kinnie, Robert Parrette, Stacie Stadnicki, Lawrence Laidley, Gary Serdechny, Alternates Clarence (Pete) Merrill, Town Planner Mario Tristany, WEO Peter Zvingilas, Recording Secretary Donna Szall

Also Present: Town Counsel Eliza Heins

Absent: Edward (Jay) Waitte, Glen Norman, Lauren Churchill, Kevin Franklin,

C. Kinnie appointed P. Merrill to sit for Jay Waitte. There was a quorum for this regular meeting.

3. Written Complaints

There were no written complaints.

4. Approval of Minutes

A. Approval of Minutes of the Regular Meeting of March 19, 2015.

C. Kinnie asked for a motion to approve the minutes of March 19, 2015. L. Laidley stated that on page 7 there was a missing that is missing a word. H. Heller stated that it could be possible. D. Szall stated that she will check it and make the corrections.
MOTION: R. Parrette moved to approve the minutes noting the omission of March 19, 2015. G. Serdechny seconded the motion. All were in favor. The motion was carried.

5. Applications

A. CC 05-15 AMERICAN INDUSTRIES, 630 PLAINFIELD ROAD, GRISWOLD, CT Requesting approval for memorializing existing uses on the property located at 630 Plainfield Road, Griswold, CT for both industrial and residential uses, establishing a base line for activities which exist and/or are ongoing in regulated wetlands or watercourses and/or upland review areas adjacent to wetlands and watercourses; and to grant permits for those regulated activities which are deemed to have been instituted subsequent to the adoption of inland wetlands and watercourses regulations in the Town of Griswold and to institute erosion and sediment control measures in locations deemed warranted by the project engineer in order to prevent erosion and sedimentation into wetland and watercourses located on and adjacent to the property. Property is zoned C-2.

C. Kinnie stated that this was the matter presented for public comment at the public hearing and asked for a motion to table this application to the next regular meeting. He asked that members listen to all of the recordings and review the materials presented. S. Stadnicki asked what the time line was. E. Heins stated that the deadline for the public hearing was in 8 days. C. Kinnie asked for a motion to table this application.
MOTION: R. Parrette moved to table CC 05-15 to the next regular meeting of May 21, 2015 in this meeting room at 7:30 pm. S. Stadnicki seconded the motion. All were in favor. The motion was carried.

B. CC 08-15 CADDLE, JANET & WILLIAM, PROPERTY AT 125 MACKIN DRIVE, GRISWOLD. Requesting approval for residential activity within a wetlands/watercourse to cross the wetland spanning the entire lot frontage at its narrowest point, with a 12 ft. wide driveway by installing 12" RCP culvert pipe with two concrete flared ends to maintain existing hydrology; and filling 620 sq. of inland wetlands and establishing acceptable side slopes. Other regulated activities within the 75 ft. upland review area include land clearing, grading, and installation of the driveway, septic system and foot drain outlet pipe in order to construct a single family residence. Property is zoned R-60.

C. Kinnie stated that we did see this application last month and he asked if there was someone to represent the applicant.

John Faulise, Boundaries LLC, was present to represent the applicants. He submitted a revised plan to the Commission. He explained that there were comments from the town consulting engineers CME that have been addressed on this plan: 1) that they agreed with the design concept. 2) recommendation to change the bedding material for the culvert pipe from crushed stone to sand, this has been added to the plan; 3) to use a silt sock rather than silt fence down gradient of the pipe in the wetland area, this has been changed on the plan; 4) recommended to the time for construction to be from June 1 and September 30 that was added to the plan; 5) the comment for Uncas District Approval, this was submitted to the file.

C. Kinnie asked if the plans are submitted to the file. J. Faulise stated yes. C. Kinnie asked for questions concerning this application. He stated that the questions were asked last month. He asked for a motion.
MOTION: R. Parrette moved to approved CC-08-15 with the revised plan of April 15, 2015. P. Merrill seconded the motion. There were 4 aye votes, two abstentions by S. Stadnicki and L. Laidley The motion was carried.

C. Kinnie stated to let the record show that town planner M. Tristany has returned to the meeting.

C. **CC 09-15 TILCON CONNECTICUT, INC. 43 SIBICKY ROAD AND 176 RIXTOWN ROAD, GRISWOLD.** Requesting approval of Commercial/Industrial activities within a regulated area for an earth products excavation located within the commercial/industrial upland review area adjacent Billings Brook wetlands system on the northwesterly side of Sibicky Road. Property is in R-80 and I.

C. Kinnie stated for the record that he was listed as an abutter of the Tilcon processing plant and crusher. He asked if there was objection to his remaining on the board for this application. H. Heller had no objection. There were no objections from the commission.

C. Kinnie asked if there was someone to represent the applicant. Attorney Harry Heller, 736 New London Turnpike, Uncasville was present to represent the applicant and Frank Lane, Director of Environmental compliance for Tilcon, Connecticut, Inc. was also present. He stated that this property abuts Billings Brook but no activities are proposed within the 150 ft. upland review area of Billings Brook. He explained that activities are proposed within 150 ft of the upland review are for the property on Sibicky Road.

H. Heller stated that there were 2 questions from last month that the commission requested 1) regarding what the moni9toriy wells were. H. Heller explained that those were installed in the late 80's to monitor ground water.

2) A request to conduct a NBDB for endangered species or species of concern in the area. He submitted the survey report to the commission that was done by Tilcon. He submitted the report for the record. He explained that DEEP requested that a study was to be done to determine the potential for favorable habitat. Jody Chase ecologist did a study in 2011, for this property. He submitted a copy for the record for the record.

H. Heller explained that the report and field study showed that that there are areas of suitable habitat on the application property but that they are not within the limits of the proposed excavation areas. He explained the three species, the Eastern Box Turtle, the Wood Turtle and the white river crayfish. He stated that because the proposed excavation is heavily forested areas with steep slopes which the box turtle and wood turtle habitats are in flatter areas and there are not activities proposed in the Billings Brook area of the white river crayfish that is an aquatic species. He stated that the field survey did not find the turtle species present in the proposed site

H. Heller stated that the proposed excavation, on this site will maintain the buffer along Sibicky Road until the third phase where the site will be worked from the inside. C. Kinnie asked that during the last phase, will the culvert be protected. H. Heller stated yes, it will be covered to keep sediment out of the culvert.

C. Kinnie asked for questions from the commission.

G. Serdechny questioned the date of the report and survey since in the report it states that if the project is not implemented within 12 months, a new study should be done. C. Kinnie stated that the habitat has not changed from the 2011 report and so a report would not be required. There was discussion of this matter.

S. Stadnicki had questions regarding the site plan. H. Heller explained the proposed excavation plans where the processing will be done. He stated that this application was before the commission. Sibicky Road where there is a wetlands system that is within the 150 ft. upland review area. L. Laidley asked if any activity would occur in the area of Billings Brook. H. Heller state that no activity will be done in that area and he explained the proposed excavation to L. Laidley and S. Stadnicki.

C. Kinnie asked if there were any other questions. C. Kinnie stated that this was well presented last month.
MOTION: R. Parrette moved to approve CC 09-15 as presented on the existing site plan. P. Merrill seconded the motion. There were 4 aye votes and two abstentions. The motion was carried.

6. Additional Business (New Applications)

D. Szall stated there was a new application from Quiet Cove. C. Kinnie asked for a motion to put this on the agenda.
MOTION: R. Parrette moved to put CC 10-15 Quiet Cove Homeowners association on the agenda. L. Laidley seconded the motion. All were in favor. The motion was carried.

C. Kinnie asked if there was someone here to represent the applicant. D. Szall stated that she mentioned to Mrs. Laroux that someone should be here to present the application. There was discussion of this matter. C. Kinnie asked that a letter obtained appointing Mrs. Laroux or someone to represent the Home Owners Association in the matter.
MOTION: S. Stadnicki moved to table CC 10-15 to the next regular meeting. L. Laidley seconded the motion. All were in favor. The motion carried.

7. Reports from the Enforcement Officer

P. Zvingilas stated that the Pleasant View site is finished with blasting and are installing the sewer sanitary lines and are half way up the road before starting construction.

8. Old Business

A. Update and discussion of the Quiet Cove Homeowners' Association Open Space Declaration Modification.

C. Kinnie asked D. Szall if they adopted the language recommended by Attorney Branse. He stated that it is in the file. R. Parrette asked if anything needed to be done. C. Kinnie stated no.

9. New Business

There was no new business.

10. Communications

There were no communications.

11. Reports from Members

There were no reports from members.

12. Conservation Commission Matters

A. Discussion of activities for 2015 Earth Day

C. Kinnie asked if there were suggestions for Earth Day. R. Parrette stated that he was waiting for Lauren and the garden. There was discussion of this matter. C. Kinnie stated that Lauren will give an update next month.

13. Adjournment

C. Kinnie asked for a motion to adjourn.
MOTION: R. Parrette moved to adjourn at 9:46 pm. L. Laidley seconded the motion. All were in favor. The meeting adjourned at 9:46 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 16, 2015 at 9:47 p.m.

2. Roll Call & Determination of Quorum

Present: Courtland Kinnie, Robert Parrette, Lawrence Laidley, Gary Serdechny, Alternates Clarence (Pete) Merrill, Town Planner Mario Tristany, WEO Peter Zvingilas, Recording Secretary Donna Szall

Absent: Stacie Stadnicki, Edward (Jay) Waitte, Glen Norman, Lauren Churchill, Kevin Franklin,

C. Kinnie appointed P. Merrill to sit for J. Waite. There was a quorum for this regular meeting.

3. Approval of Minutes

A. Approval of Minutes of March 19, 2015 for the Regular Meeting of the APA

C. Kinnie asked for any corrections or omissions. R. Parrette moved to approve the minutes of March 19, 2015 as presented. G. Serdechny seconded the motion. C. Kinnie stated that this is the time to notice the omission that was mentioned in the prior minutes.

4. Matters Presented for Discussion

A. APA 01-15 Pasquale Camputaro/American Industries, Inc., 630 Plainfield Road, Griswold Municipal Registration for Regulated Activities in Aquifer Protection Areas.

C. Kinnie stated that this is a municipal registration for the aquifer protection area. Attorney Harry Heller was present to represent American Industries. He stated He submitted a second amended registration based on comments DEEP, he explained the list of deletions. 1) The underground storage tanks and transmission of petroleum products. These are now above ground. 2) The discharge of industrial waste waters to ground waters based on two activities: a) the wash ponds used for the water for the crushing and washing plant. These ponds have concrete bottoms so DEEP recommended eliminating that since the water has no interaction between the industrial waste water and the ground water; b) the truck washing activities are no longer occurring on site. He explained that the reports prepared by Boundaries, LLC are not affected by this elimination. So Box A and Box F have been eliminated. He stated that the prior amendment removed the double lettered items had been deleted.

P. Zvingilas stated that he had a note here that you have received the DEEP Industrial Stormwater Registration. H. Heller stated that we have filed but it has not been issued. P. Zvingilas stated that it says it has been issued. D. McKay, Boundaries, LLC stated that he spoke to a representative from DEEP when that approval appeared on their website; she stated to him that they have not reviewed the pollution prevention plan and will issue comments. He stated that we are waiting for those comments after it has been reviewed. P. Zvingilas submitted this note for the record. There was discussion of this matter.

C. Kinnie stated that a site walk is needed and asked for dates. C. Kinnie suggested May 9, 2015 in the morning. There was discussion of this matter. S. Stadnicki suggested 9 a.m. D. Szall stated that P. Zvingilas will be on vacation for a month and asked for another representative from staff to attend the site walk. C. Kinnie asked if someone from Attorney Branse's office attend. E. Heins stated that someone from Attorney Branse's office will be in attendance. She stated that the deadline for this registration is July 14 and there are no extensions for the registration. C. Kinnie asked for a motion.
MOTION: S. Stadnicki moved to set a site walk for Saturday, May 9, 2015 at 9 am at American Industries, 630 Plainfield Road. L. Laidley seconded the motion. R. Parrette asked if the coming Saturday was good. G. Serdechny asked if the paved driveway will be washed. P. Camputaro stated that it has not been approved yet. E. Heins stated that this is a permit questions; this can be discussed when a permit is requested for a regulated activity under the APA regulations. There was discussion of this matter. All were in favor. The motion was carried.

B. Discussion of and updates from DEEP regarding one outstanding registrant including complaints from neighbors received by DEEP Aquifer Protection Agency Program (APA Program) and any updates from Town attorney and/or registrant's attorney.

C. Kinnie asked if there were any updates from DEEP. P. Zvingilas stated that you have that permit. D. Szall stated that there has been no DEEP correspondence.

5. Adjournment

C. Kinnie asked for a motion to adjourn. L. Laidley moved to adjourn. S. Stadnicki seconded the motion. All were in favor. The meeting adjourned at 10:05 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Donna M. Szall
Recording Secretary