
Member(s) absent: Kerrie Dunne and Peter Talbot

Staff: Suzanne Simone.

Ms. Fiordelisi served as secretary pro-tem in Ms. Dunne’s absence.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman de Jongh called the meeting to order at 7:30 p.m.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All present recited the pledge of allegiance.

III. ROLL CALL

Ms. Fiordelisi called the roll.

Members in attendance were: Robert de Jongh, Charles Dimmick, Matt Bowman, Earl Kurtz, and Sheila Fiordelisi.

IV. DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Chairman de Jongh determined there were enough members present for a quorum.

V. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – Public Hearing – October 5, 2010
   Regular Meeting – October 5, 2010

The approval of the minutes was deferred to the end of the meeting by the consensus of Commission members present.

VI. COMMUNICATIONS

1. CACIWC 33rd Annual Meeting – 11/13/10
Handed out at tonight’s meeting were the following additional correspondences.

2. Notice re: 630 Cook Hill Road
   This item was reviewed.

3. Department of Environmental Protection Natural Resources review of Sandbank Road Project.
   This item was reviewed.

   Ms. Simone stated this item is also listed under unfinished business on tonight’s agenda.

4. Memo to Chris Juliano of Juliano Associates Re: Cornwall Properties
   This item was reviewed.

   Ms. Simone stated this item is also listed under new business on tonight’s agenda.

5. Engineering Department review of Cornwall Properties
   This item was reviewed.

   Ms. Simone stated this item is also listed under new business on tonight’s agenda.

6. Engineering Department’s review of Alexion – Knotter Drive
   This item was reviewed.

   Ms. Simone stated this item is also listed under new business on tonight’s agenda.

   This item was reviewed.

8. Copy of the Updated Regulations that reflect the changes that were adopted at the last meeting.
This item was reviewed.


VII. INSPECTION REPORTS

1. Written Inspections

Ms. Simone stated there were no written inspections.

2. Staff Inspections

a. Wiese Road

Ms. Simone informed the Commission there was a pre-construction meeting on the site at Weise Road having to do with the culvert crossing; it was discussed – the erosion controls that would be put in place.

b. Country Club Road

Ms. Simone said there was a staff inspection of Country Club Road for the bridge replacement that’s taking place. Erosion controls are in place and the site seems to be well stabilized.

c. Harvest Court – Complaint

Ms. Simone said staff received a complaint for Harvest Court. She said this is the property owned by Mr. Roscoe that was subject of a show cause hearing in 2007; she said there was a complaint of clearing in wetlands as well as ATV activities.

Ms. Simone informed the Commission that she is in the beginning stages of reviewing what happened in 2007.

Ms. Simone explained that she is going to meet the property owner that abuts this property and view it from their property and see what’s going on.

Ms. Simone stated that she would have information for the Commission at the next meeting.

d. Yankee Gas Project – Terrell Farms
Ms. Simone said that Yankee Gas Project on Terrell Farms Road – they have gone through and installed the gas line through there. She explained that Ken Stevens has identified that there was an area that they did not see immediately – it’s an area that water travels over land and then deposits into a wetland.

Ms. Simone said she did follow up with Yankee Gas and they went out there and within two days and had it seeded and stabilized with silt fence and all that.

VIII. ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS

1. Unauthorized Activities in a Regulated Wetland Area
   Ms. Karin Eichten
   630 Cook Hill Road

   Chairman de Jongh stated there was a communication on this item this evening.

   Ms. Simone said they were still awaiting word from the Attorney as to what the status is with this item.

2. Unauthorized Activities in a Regulated Wetland Area
   SC 1/06/09
   Mr. Chris Lambert
   SC 1/20/09
   Highland Avenue
   SC 2/03/09
   SC 2/17/09

   Chairman de Jongh stated this item is still status quo.

3. Unauthorized Activities in an Regulated Wetland Area
   SC 3/16/10
   Michael and Bonnie Donato
   SC 3/16/10
   35 Sudol Court

   Chairman de Jongh asked staff if there was any movement on this item.

   Ms. Simone explained that at the last meeting the property owner did submit information to staff that they were in the process of hiring someone to do the work and they planned on doing it – starting this fall to clear out some of those invasive species; she said the property said they were going to be acting on this item soon.

   Chairman de Jongh asked for staff to provide an update by the next meeting because the fall is running out rapidly and any time they have to do anything is going to be evaporating pretty soon.
Ms. Simone stated she would provide a report.

4. Unauthorized Activities in an Regulated Wetland Area SC 5/04/10
Dr. Robert Henry and Maria Passaro-Henry
12 Mountaincrest Drive

Ms. Simone said she sent a request for an update from them but she has not heard back from them.

Ms. Simone stated she would follow-up on this item.

SHOW CAUSE

Unauthorized Activities in an Regulated Wetland Area SC 10/05/10
Edward and Lisa Ellis SC 10/19/10
79 Dundee Drive

Ms. Simone said she believed Commission members received a staff report in their packet for Dundee Drive.

Ms. Simone stated the she, Dr. Dimmick, and Don Nolte from Public Works went out to the property and they were able to locate the pins then were able to find the property line. She said from that they were able to find where the conservation area was and where the property boundary was.

Ms. Simone explained that there is significant encroachment onto town property which will be handled separately then the proceedings tonight; town administration will take care of implementing a recommendation for that.

Ms. Simone said what remains is that there is clearing in the conservation area – in one area there is lawn that is now established as opposed to the native vegetation and in the other conservation area which is shown on the map there is a playscape that straddles the line so half of it is on town property, the remaining half is in the conservation area.

Mr. Bowman asked if the conservation area – is that the wetlands line or is there a non-encroachment line before wetlands.

Dr. Dimmick said there is a non-encroachment line before wetlands. He said facing towards the back of the property the wetlands on the left side – is actually the property line and the conservation area comes about 15’ into the property – he said it was supposed to be an addition buffer.
Mr. Bowman said is the wetlands line is the property line.

Dr. Dimmick said on the left side on the back; on the right side the wetlands line comes onto the property about 10’ – well actually if you go from the center of the back its right at the line and then it kind of comes on the site about 10’ and then the conservation easement is another roughly 15’ back from that.

Dr. Dimmick stated the left side – in back – the wetlands line is in front; the property line is a very sharp line – extremely sharp; he said you all of a sudden know your in wetlands; on the right its amore sort of gradually sort of a change. He said he poked around with his shovel - he said he could move the line 5’ or 6’ one way or the other depending on your opinion on things; he said the conservation provides additional protection on that side.

Ms. Simone said when the approval was given in 1992 for this subdivision it identified an non-encroachment line; it also identified language that was recorded on the deed for this property that basically said that “it’s a restrictive covenant that no development or excavation or any other alternation which would have an adverse affect upon or which would alter the user condition or the restricted parcel as open space shall occur upon or within the area bounded by the monumented non-encroachment line.”

Chairman de Jongh said the “monumented non-encroachment line.”

Ms. Simone said there are no monuments.

Dr. Dimmick said he wanted to add one other observation – the lawn on the back right side that covers the conservation easement looks like its been there quite some time so it could very well be from the 1990s. He said he could not say one way or another whether the present owner did that or whether that may have been as his statement was “it was lawn when he moved in.” It could be when they built the house in 1996 – he said at that time they did not have staff to check every single one of these to make sure that things were done the right way.

Ms. Fiordelisi said so you’re saying the monuments may not have ever been in place.

Dr. Dimmick said he suspected that they may never have been in place – he said they just don’t have the staff to check everything like that.

Mr. Bowman said they weren’t required on the site plans either and they are now.
Ms. Simone said now they required as-builts and they require when there’s a wetland permit associated with a development that those markers then be placed on the as-built.

Chairman de Jongh said it was clear from the testimony from the homeowner that he was willing to do whatever it took to make this right; so a suggestion he wanted to throw out to Commission members and they can talk about it is – really there are two things; one is to allow that one section on the right side of the property which is now grass to go back to a natural state and follow the original intent of what the application was and the other piece is to move that playscape off town property and out of the non-encroachment line and back into their own property.

Chairman de Jongh said he thought doing those two things would satisfy the concerns of the Commission.

Ms. Fiordelisi said she though they should put monuments in.

Chairman de Jongh said he did not disagree with Ms. Fiordelisi but the builder did not put those in he was not sure they could ask the property owner to do that – he said he did not know.

Dr. Dimmick said he would be satisfied with treated 4’ by 4” posts with their little plaques on it would do nicely.

Mr. Bowman asked if the Commission had their own plaques.

Ms. Simone stated – yes – they do.

Chairman de Jongh said he stated his suggestions – and they could talk about that unless someone else had some other ideas.

Mr. Kurtz said it might be a good idea for someone to locate the places for the posts to go in; he said since nothing is there and the property owner is oblivious to exactly where the line is as well as what’s required.

Dr. Dimmick said now that they have found the pins for the corners they can measure on the map roughly where they go; he said its not going to make a difference if its 1’ or 2’ off; he said this would follow the intent without the exact letter.

Chairman de Jongh said it would and it wouldn’t incur the cost of having a surveyor come out and formally depict where it is; he said they know where the pins are so they can measure it off.
Mr. Kurtz said he wanted to make sure in dealing with town – the town will make sure that everything is removed properly.

Ms. Simone said you because there’s the issue of what’s being stored on town property so the town will follow up with that to make sure that that’s removed and whatever the Commission decides tonight – if its decided that the playscape be removed and the markers that be markers be put up – the town would monitor all of that as well.

Dr. Dimmick said they discussed in the field with the owner a possibility of putting in the conservation area putting some conservation ornamental bushes – things like Silky Dogwood; he said the owner seemed amenable to something – something that makes it look nicer for him and serve the Commission’s purpose too.

Chairman de Jongh stated that the property was told he did not have to be present tonight.

Ms. Simone said staff met out in the field with the property and he did seem agreeable.

Motion:

That the show cause hearing has found that there has been encroachment into regulated wetland and wetland setback areas and the Commission has instructed staff to proceed with an agreement with the violator to resolve the problem as discussed at the Tuesday, October 19, 2010 CIWWC meeting. This would include allowing the area to the right side of the property to go back to its natural state and the left side would have the removal of the playscape and the installation of the non-encroachment markers.

Moved by Dr. Dimmick. Seconded by Mr. Kurtz. Motion approved unanimously by Commission members present.

Motion: To close the show cause hearing at 7:46 p.m.

Moved by Dr. Dimmick. Seconded by Mr. Kurtz. Motion approved unanimously by Commission members present.

XI. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. Permit Application 
   Town of Cheshire Public Works 
   APP #2010-023 
   DOR 9/21/10
Sandbank Road R.O.W.  
Site Plan – Drainage Improvements  
MAD  11/25/10

Don Nolte, Engineering Technician – Public Works & Engineering was present on behalf of the applicant.

The Commission reviewed the revised site plans for the proposed drainage improvements.

Mr. Nolte addressed the Commission. He stated he was here tonight to present the revised plan that has been developed in response to marking of utilities and field survey of edge of pavement, driveways and utility poles, etc.

Mr. Nolte stated that the box culvert has been physically located; elevations determined; a more accurate and defined profile has been developed.

Mr. Nolte stated that it is about 1,000 LF of drainage of a 1,250’ section of road to reconstructed in the same location, to the same elevations.

Mr. Nolte said there are nine structures – he said they did have to remove the tenth structure due to a conflict with the gas line down near the box culvert but they don’t feel it will impede the design – he said they may be doing a test pit for one structure – the one closest to the box culvert because of the marking of a waterline but that is not exact so perhaps they will do a test pit or install it at that same time in a place that works but it looks like all the other locations work with the 1.5’ of separation from the gas line minimum that is required.

Mr. Nolte said they are using the Environment 21 uni-storm gross particle separator. They have submitted the redesign to the designer engineer for shop drawings to be prepared; the engineer feels it will work as designed with this modified layout and it will removed 80% of the total suspended soils before discharge.

Mr. Nolte said this evening, he submitted his response to the Natural Diversity Database inquiry letter that they received from Julie Victoria, DEP Wildlife Biologist.

Copies of Mr. Nolte’s letter dated October 19, 2010 in response to DEP Wildlife Biologist Julie Victoria’s comments were handed out to Commission members.
Mr. Nolte read the letter into the record. He explained in his letter that; all of the proposed work within 750’ of the watercourse is located within an existing paved area; there will be no loss of wildlife habitat associated with this project the watercourse is contained within the banks of a relatively deep and steep banked channel with no wetland soils apparent; the likelihood of a listed species being run over by construction equipment is no greater than by daily traffic; the only discharge to the regulated area is proposed to be thorough an 18” diameter hole to be cored through the side of an existing 5’x10’ box culvert; the only activity necessary within the watercourse will be access by a mason on foot carrying a bucket of grout to seal around the pipe inside the culvert; from the letter it appears that both of these species are dormant between November 1 and April 1 – the work will take place in November; based on the limited scope of the project they do not believe that the work will negatively impact the habitat of the Eastern Box Turtle or Eastern Ribbon Snake and that a survey is therefore not necessary - if the Commission determines the work will negatively impact the listed species habitat, then they (the town) will commission a survey be done; in that case, they will retain the services of Ms. Sigrun Gadwa to perform a pre-construction survey of the stream several days in advance of the commencement of work to relocate any species of concern if found, and to issue a report of her findings.

Dr. Dimmick said he was satisfied with everything except one hanging question - among the recommendations they say that no heavy machinery or vehicles be parked in any habitat – he asked that that it be clarified where that sort of equipment would be.

Mr. Nolte explained that all of the vehicles would be parked within the town right-of-way or within parking lots where they have gained permission to stage and stockpile equipment and materials- they will be well away from the regulated area.

Chairman de Jongh said it appears the Commission has received the information that they need.

Ms. Simone said she has had a chance to review the revised plans – she said she is not prepared with any language tonight – she stated she does not have any concerns.

Further action deferred pending staff review and recommendation.
XII. NEW BUSINESS

1. Permit Application APP #2010-024
   Cornwall Properties, LLC DOR 10/19/10
   Cornwall Avenue
   Site Plan – Parking Lot Expansion MAD 12/23/10

Chris Juliano, PE of Juliano Associated was present on behalf of the applicant.

The Commission reviewed the plans.

Mr. Juliano addressed the Commission. He explained to the Commission the current location of the existing businesses at the location of the proposed activity.

Mr. Juliano explained the application and owner – 500 Cornwall Ave, LLC is Logo Sports Wear.

Mr. Juliano said the application is pretty straight forward with respect to the Wetlands Commission.

Mr. Juliano stated that he had a chance to sit down with Suzanne Simone prior to submitting the application. He said that he would briefly go through where the property is and run through what the activities are.

Mr. Juliano explained the property is located just to the west of the Linear Trail on Cornwall Avenue. He said it is a rear property and they have the access right that they share or have right to use over the Arisco building which is where the Karate Studio (on the back piece).

Mr. Juliano said the property is about 1 acre in size; existing building and existing parking. He explained they have a wetlands line that touches at the northwest border – comes off the property and then continues down towards Cornwall Avenue – it’s associated with the Willow Brook and there is a small flood plane boundary that touches the southwestern corner of the property.

Mr. Juliano said what the applicant is looking to overall is to put a small expansion – a 20’ by 58’ metal expansion off on the existing building - that is away from the regulated activities. He said after meeting with Ms. Simone they have decided to focus what the issues were.
Mr. Juliano said since they are building this addition for more storage and use inside the building they needed to replace the existing parking that they are losing so therefore they have a small parking lot expansion in the southwest corner of the property and in addition when he met with Bill Volker regarding the overall site plan he noticed that this existing garage is a zoning violation – it’s a pre-built garage so they need to relocate that to the western side of the building and at the same time they applicant would like to gain permission to put a in second pre-built garage.

Mr. Juliano said the garages store catalogs, some product and over-runs.

Mr. Juliano stated there is not a vehicle in the garage or anything like that – it’s for storage for Logo Sports Wear.

Mr. Juliano said so basically they have a slight disturbance within the regulated upland area for the parking lot expansion; for the two garages they encroach approximately 2.5’ on one corner and 4.5’ at one point and roughly 3.2’ on another; so it’s a very minor encroachment into the buffer.

Mr. Juliano said if Commission members have been out to the site or get a chance to go out to the site they will notice from the edge of the existing parking lot it is a grass area and then there is a well established tree line along the border of the property – he said they are not going anywhere near that wooded line and will not be disturbing any part of it.

Mr. Juliano said in his opinion the plan is pretty much straight forward with respect to what the applicant in wishing to do.

Mr. Juliano said he did hear that there were two memos that came through – one from staff and that problem was taken care of (re: signatures) and the Engineering memo and he said he has not seen that.

Ms. Simone stated the signature issue was all set.

Ms. Simone said that they received a fax at the end of the day that it failed to go through; she handed Mr. Juliano a copy of the Engineering memo.
Mr. Juliano had an opportunity to review the Engineering memo. He said he understood the comments regarding the drywell and the capacity of the drywell – he said the only real problem is – if you go out to the property you will see the property is dead flat; he said he thought there was only 2’ of elevation from one side to the other.

Mr. Juliano said there was no place to stick a pipe out or an overflow from the drywell until he went into the wetland and the brook and that is on someone else’s property and they are not going to be able to do that.

Dr. Dimmick said the other alternative of course is increase the drywell capacity by about 20% and that would take care of most situations.

Mr. Juliano stated that was correct. He said he believed from the drainage calculations he submitted there was about 600 gallons that were required and it’s about a 900 gallon drywell.

Mr. Juliano said he had no problem increasing the size if that would satisfy the Commission’s concern and Engineering’s concerns.

Dr. Dimmick said he was not sure – it might satisfy Engineering but this Commission did not have much concern themselves.

Mr. Juliano said he would work directly with Mr. Disbrow and get that settled.

Mr. Bowman asked if they did a perk out there.

Mr. Juliano stated no they hadn’t.

Dr. Dimmick said the site in pretty gravelly in that area.

Mr. Juliano said he thought it was something he could talk to Mr. Disbrow about and possible do during construction and if there is a problem they could increase the size or add galleys to it.

Mr. Juliano said there was a question about the signature on the plans – he said the plan was signed by Scott Steven’s signature – he reviewed it because Tom Pietras who works for Scott and Ken Stevens (he did the physical work) is working on some big pipeline job so he is not around.
Mr. Juliano said Scott Stevens did review the file; he did go through everything.

Dr. Dimmick said it looks like Ken Stevens signature on the plan he was reviewing.

Mr. Juliano said that he was told that Scott Stevens was the one reviewing it—maybe he got Ken Stevens to come in and review it.

Mr. Juliano said if the Commission had any other questions in respect to the plan he would be happy to address them.

There were no other questions from the Commission or staff.

Motion: To accept the application.

Moved by Dr. Dimmick. Seconded by Mr. Bowman. Motion approved unanimously by Commission members present.

Motion: To declare the proposed activity not significant within the context of the Commission’s regulations.

Moved by Dr. Dimmick. Seconded by Ms. Fiordelisi. Motion approved unanimously by Commission members present.

Further action on this item was deferred pending staff review and recommendation.

2. Permit Application
    Winstanley Property Management
    Knotter Drive
    Site Plan – Parking Lot Expansion

    APP         #2010-025
    DOR         10/19/10
    MAD         12/23/10

    David Carson, principal of the OCC Group was present on behalf of the applicant Winstanley Property Management.

    Mr. Carson addressed the Commission.

    The Commission reviewed the plans for the proposed activity.

    Mr. Carson explained that the application before the Commission this evening is for a parking lot expansion to serve Alexion Pharmaceutical at 350 Knotter Drive – Alexion is the principal tenant in that particular building located at that site.
Mr. Carson said he would briefly run through the plans to allow the Commission to see what they are doing.

Mr. Carson reviewed a copy of the town topography map where the field located wetlands are superimposed on to it; those wetland were field located by OCC Group; delineated by Soil Science and Environmental Services; also superimposed on this plan is a shaded area showing you where the proposed parking is to be placed.

Mr. Carson showed on the plans the location of the existing building, the existing parking lot running along the face of the building.

Mr. Carson stated the parcel is 75 aces in size and it contains approximately 44 acres of wetlands which extends around the perimeter of site.

Mr. Carson said over a period of several months they have been doing some master planning studies for Winstanley because Alexion Pharmaceuticals is planning an expansion.

Mr. Carson said the Commission may recall in 2006 or 2007 they actually put on a 40,000 SF addition to this building in the rear area; at that time, they were cramped for space but they did not really anticipate an increase need for parking – they had excess parking at the time so they met the Zoning requirements as far as parking.

Mr. Carson said what has happened over the two years since that building has been built they are now in a dire need for additional parking and they are planning on doing another building addition and this parking lot that is proposed on this plan is designed to accommodate their immediate needs plus the needs of their next building addition. He said this was going to be a single application for a building addition and parking but what has happened is the immediate need for parking is gotten so great and the time it takes to actually design a building addition – they are hopeful they can get through both the Wetland and Planning and Zoning process expeditiously enough to actually get the first half of this parking lot installed before winter – before the asphalt plants close down to meet their immediate needs.

Mr. Carson reviewed the 40 scale plan of the existing field conditions, the topographic and wetlands map, the demolition plan. He said this plan will go out to a site contractor for bidding. He said the only demolition is a few signs need to be relocated and a couple of pavement cuts need to made.
Mr. Carson reviewed the site plan; he said he highlighted in red the field located wetland limits in this area; the green line represents the limits of the 50’ upland review area.

Mr. Carson said all of the proposed work is outside the upland review limits, including the parking lot, the grading associated with it and even the proposed plantings.

Mr. Carson said there is a plan for planting and landscape plan which predominately calls for planting within the island and White Pines planted along the corners and in the areas closest to the 50’ upland review area but still outside that area.

Mr. Carson said for Planning and Zoning they did point illumination study of the proposed lighting.

Mr. Carson reviewed the grading and utilities plan.

Mr. Carson said what they are proposing as far as the drainage system is – the drainage system is highlighted in blue; this area of the site is virtually level – gently sloping toward the wetland.

Mr. Carson said what they have designed is a sheet flow collection system in the center of the parking lot; collected in four basins; the two end ones will be installed with oil traps – the outflow from those basins will go to an underground detention recharge system – its a storm-tech system which they have been utilizing over the last couple of years.

Mr. Carson explained the basic design of the storm-tech system is that this particular one they are actually feeding from both ends; typically you only feed from one end but the area is so level and they have such little gradient to deal with they are feeding it from both ends; it goes into a control structure manhole which has a center weir – that center weir directs the entire first flush to the first row called an isolator row which is designed to take out 80% of suspended solids; after it crest the weir it then feeds into the four additional rows which are there for detention and ground water recharge; it outflows at the center to manhole and its proposed to discharge into an existing drainage swale which is highlighted in green which runs down to the wetland line; he said they are proposing to discharge at that point approximately 80’ from the wetlands – there will be a riprap discharge on-grade with no disturbance past that point.
Mr. Carson said the next sheets of the plans are standard construction details. He said the parking lot phase if it’s done in phases is shown on CD-1.

Mr. Carson showed on the plan the portion of the parking lot he was referring to; he said that area of parking would be paved and the entire underground detention system would be put in; the detention system is actually under the second phase of parking. If it was to be done in that way that second phase area is called out to be loamed and temporarily seeded until such time they come back and built the rest.

Mr. Carson said if there is adequate time to do this prior to the asphalt plants shutting down – they may just go ahead and build it in one phase. He said if it’s not approved in time to do it this winter then it certainly would all be done in one phase.

Mr. Carson said the next sheet of the plans shows the detail of the underground detention system – all of the details in order actually build that system.

Mr. Carson said he did meet with the contractor that Winstanley intends to use for this project and they were familiar with the system and they did not have any problem with the design plan; pending approval they would be able to get going immediately.

Mr. Carson said the next plan is the erosion control plan which is detailed in terms of a narrative and what they are proposing to do. The actual construction sequence is spelled out on one of the detail sheets.

Mr. Carson said basically what they are proposing to here is to cut the trees; once the trees are cut, install perimeter silt fencing and haybales along the rear or down gradient portion – it would be a sandwich of haybales and silt fence; once the trees were out they would install a diversion berm – a 2’ high berm to trap anything that is flowing that way before they proceed with the grubbing; top soil in stunts would be stock piled with perimeter protection; one that was done – the area in yellow would be installed as a temporary sediment trap with a stone outlet filter at the point where the drainage ultimately would discharge within the existing grass swale that is out there.

Mr. Carson said once the parking lot is pitched to the center; prior to installing the drainage system they would have a temporary swale to
capture the fact that it’s grade to the center directed into the temporary sediment trap so that the underground drainage system could then be installed once that was installed and they could install the rest of the drainage system with perimeter protection – silt sacks in the catch basins.

Mr. Carson said the construction sequence is spelled out on the construction detail sheet – the final sheet being the erosion and sediment control details.

Mr. Carson said there was a memorandum from the Engineering Department which was faxed to his office at 3:35 p.m. this afternoon; he said he would formally answer those questions with the Engineering Department but the questions were how long will it take for the detention system to empty – it will take 16 to 18 hours depending on the storm even; the design infiltration rate is ten minutes per inch; the high ground water elevation in the area is 135 to 135.3; the bottom of the chambers have been designed 24” above the high ground water level – there are 6” of stone under the chambers; the entire bottom of the infiltration system is 18” above high ground water – typical to the way a septic system works only this isn’t clean water.

Mr. Carson said the other factor that plays a significant role in the design of this is the 100 year flood limit – they are totally outside the 100 year flood limit but it’s not the limit line that if of significance it’s the elevation; the 100 year flood elevation is 137; they have designed the entire system so that the outlet of this system is at elevation 137 and the design of the storage and infiltration capabilities of this system are designed to provide zero increase on a 100 year storm event because that is the only event where you couldn’t possible discharge from the system because the 100 acres of wetlands that you are discharging to are flooded to elevation – 137.

Mr. Carson said basically all of the other events – it kind of mirrors per-development flow; there might be insignificant decreases or increases but it was primarily designed to recharge the ground water to the extent viable but certainly make sure that it constrains the flows of a 100 year storm because there is no where for that storm to go to without actually raising the flood elevation within the flood plane area.

Mr. Carson said so that is the basics of the design. He said he would be happy to answer any questions the Commission may have.
Dr. Dimmick said he knew it was in the plans but if Mr. Carson could go over the maintenance schedule for this somewhat elaborate system.

Mr. Carson said there is a maintenance guideline for the entire drainage system; he said it seems fairly elaborate but it’s actually designed to user friendly as long as the maintenance schedule is followed. He said because they are trapping the oils – they are trapping them in catechu basins – its visible – if in fact there are oils floating and they can be vacuumed up prior to actually getting to formal system.

Tape change.

Mr. Carson discussed the maintenance schedule in general and the inspection of the traps will immediately show you of there are any sediments getting past the catch basin collection system. He said as a last resort of potential failure following the maintenance system and sediment build up – he said in a parking lot like this it seems like it would take more years then he could imagine. He said the final rows of the detention system are installed with inspection ports at the center if there is sediment there – it’s just a vacuum hose down the inspection ports that sucks the sediment out; but with the proper maintenance is followed basically the system is basically a septic system for storm water so basically the same thing applies – if you pump out your septic tank your system is going to last... if you don’t its going to clog and fail – the same thing could happen here but at least here the system doesn’t fail it is just a matter of pumping and sucking out the sediment if in fact there is build up.

Dr. Dimmick said he seemed to remember one or more vernal pools – he said in looking at the map he sees tow enclosed wetland areas and he was wondering of one of those might be the vernal pools that he remembered.

Mr. Carson said they weren’t delineated as vernal pools but you are correct there are two little isolated areas that actually three.

Dr. Dimmick said he did not know if anyone has checked those for that potential – he said obviously that is not something he could tell from the map – and his memory is not good enough to know exactly where he remembered seeing vernal pools – it might even be that property – it might be the next one over.
Mr. Carson stated he would certainly follow up with that because they had everybody out on this one – Tom Pietras, Ken and Scott Stevens because it was so extensive – when they started the project they started it as a building edition and they were using the entire other side of the property.

Dr. Dimmick said if there is a vernal pool there Tom Pietras would be able to spot it; he said he would like an insurance one way or the other on that. He said in looking at the design they are doing it so there is the last possible chance of water from the parking lots going into those particular directions.

Mr. Carson said he understood completely.

There were no other Commission members and staff questions or comments.

Motion: To accept the application.

Moved by Dr. Dimmick. Seconded by Mr. Kurtz. Motion approved unanimously by Commission members present.

There was discussion about the timeline for the possible approval of application.

Mr. Carson said if there isn’t a vernal pool there will not be a problem.

The declaration of significant was deferred pending additional information regarding the vernal pools.

Further discussed on this item was deferred to the next meeting.

3. Approval of the minutes from the Public Hearing and Regular Meeting – October 5, 2010

Motion: To accept the minutes of the October 5, 2010 Public Hearing with no corrections and the Regular Meeting with corrections.

Pg. 1 L46 “parch” to “porch”; pg. 2 L16 “Commission” to “Commissioner”; pg. 3 L13 “asked about” to “stated”, L43 delete “there is an issue”; pg. 7 L15 “their” to “they’re”, L47 “conversation” to “conservation”, L48 delete “but”; pg. 8 L35 “think” to “thing”; pg. 9 L6 “pursuit” to “pursue”; pg. 9 L47 “their après” to “there appears”; pg. 10 L13 add “know” after “don’t”; Pg. 13-14 L19 & 27 renumber after the first number 3; pg. 19 L47 “their” to “there”, L49 “Low Lands” to “Lowlands”.
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Moved by Mr. Bowman. Seconded by Mr. Kurtz. Motion approved unanimously by Commission members present.

3. Other

(a) Chairman de Jongh said before the meeting was closed tonight – for those of you who are not aware – he did want to mention a personal matter – Dr. Dimmick’s wife passed away recently and he was certainly thankful that Dr. Dimmick was at the meeting tonight and stated that “our prayers are with you” and whatever the Commission could do to lighten the burden – let Commission members know.

Commission members expressed their condolences.

(b) Chairman de Jongh informed the Commission that Peter Talbot will no longer serve on the Wetlands Commission; he has accepted an appointment on the Board of Education Commission.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:25 p.m. by the consensus of Commission members present.

Respectfully submitted:

Carla Mills, Recording Secretary
Cheshire Inland Wetland and Watercourse Commission