Members present: Charles Dimmick, Matt Bowman, Kerrie Dunne, Earl Kurtz, Sheila Fiordelisi, and Peter Talbot.

Staff: Suzanne Simone.

Dr. Dimmick served as chairman pro-tem in Robert de Jongh’s absence.

I. CALL TO ORDER

Dr. Dimmick called the meeting to order at 7:31 p.m.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The pledge of allegiance was recited at the public hearing.

III. ROLL CALL

Ms. Dunne called the role. Members in attendance at the public hearing were Charles Dimmick, Matt Bowman, Kerrie Dunne, Earl Kurtz, Sheila Fiordelisi, and Peter Talbot.

IV. DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

A quorum was determined

V. BUSINESS

Ms. Dunne read the legal notice to open the public hearing on the following:

1. Permit Modification
   Town of Cheshire
   Schoolhouse Road
   Road Drainage/Endwall Reconstruction
   APP #2007-044A
   DOR 7/20/10
   PH 8/03/10
   MAD 9/07/10

At this point hearing, Earl Kurtz recused himself from the hearing at 7:32 p.m.
George Noewatne, Public Works Operation Manager and Tony Dornwood, PE from Cardinal Engineering were present.

Mr. Noewatne addressed the Commission. He stated he was here to discuss the project. He said he is also joined by Tony Dornwood, who is a professional engineering from Cardinal Engineering Associates; he will also give a presentation regarding the substance of the proposed design.

Mr. Noewatne said just to refresh the Commission’s memory, this is a design to improve the drainage on the central part of School House Road between a large hill and the stream crossing. He explained this was a matter taken up a couple of years ago – in January 2008 the Town received an approval for a similar design in this area and that is shown on the first set of plans.

Mr. Noewatne said the original design involved installing or reconfiguring about 13 catch basins and large section of 24” pipe to carry the storm water that amasses on the road in that section of road down to the stream crossing and in that particular design it showed an outlet on the southern side of the road.

Mr. Noewatne said in the interim since that work was approved and the project had not been started the endwall for the stream crossing has deteriorated and pretty came apart over the course of a couple of years.

Mr. Noewatne said a revised design was proposed and is now before the Commission for their review.

Mr. Noewatne stated that generally the upstream drainage of the drainage system is largely the same as what proposed on the original plan – the difference being this time the outlet is shown on the northern side of School House Road which would be incorporated in the new endwall that would have to be reconstructed so this project kind of combines the work to restore the endwall and to outlet the drainage to the north side of the road.

Mr. Noewatne said all work is being proposed in the Town right-of-way. He said the Town feels all the work can be done without encroaching on any adjacent property owners land or anything of that nature; all basins, sediment interceptors – everything will be on Town property.

Mr. Noewatne stated that was the crux of the design as they have shown it. He said he would ask that Tony Dornwood come up and talk through some of the options that were considered and how they came to propose this as the final design.
Tony Dorwood of Cardinal Engineering addressed the Commission.

Mr. Dornwood addressed the Commission. He said he wanted to point out the difference between the two designed from a technical point of view based on what they had proposed which is a different component they don’t have is what they refer to on the approved plan is a pre-formed modified rip-rap scarhole and basically what that is just to slow down the water that is coming out of the pipe; it’s a hole in the ground and the water in the hole helps to slow down the water that’s coming out of the pipe at a high velocity.

Mr. Dornwood explained that sometimes during slow flows when in the flow is not high, it also acts as an area for sediment to settle out but they really can’t count on the advantage of that because when you get a higher flow again it removes that sediment again – he stated he wanted to make sure Commission members understood that.

Mr. Dornwood explained under the current design they are proposing to outlet the flow to the downstream side of 66” pipe and when the existing endwall that is there collapsed, there were some emergency measures taken which was to place of big rip-rap there in order to keep the eroded bank from falling down; he said cars are still driving on the road.

Mr. Dornwood said there is already a lot of rip-rap placed in that area and that is why they wanted to take advantage of that and to outlet the system on that side so they don’t have to disturb that area that they would have on the upstream side and the rip-rap is there and they will probably have to remove a lot of it in order to reconstruct the endwall because they have to dig down below the ground and widen it slightly in order to allow the second pipe to also outlet there and to put the rip-rap back.

Mr. Dornwood said at the last meeting they were asked to see what alternatives there were aside from these two they have here and that would be to outlet this about 50’ to the east of this location shown on the other drawing. He explained that unfortunately the ground there is not low enough to except the storm sewer – he said they can’t raise the storm sewer enough or they won’t have enough cover over the pipes but they could construct a scarhole in a location and they would probably have to excavate an area downstream of that as well into another little stream that receives water from a culvert that goes across the railroad.

Mr. Dornwood said the area is very rough area that they would have to excavate and he believed a lot of the area is wetlands – although they haven’t flagged it, so they would be disturbing a pretty good size area and that is just the area that has to be excavated that is not showing the area that the equipment has to traverse in order to do this work – he said it
would be a pretty messy proposal as opposed to the current proposal the Commission has in front of them.

Mr. Dornwood said the it really is a lot cleaner, the proposed plan, he said the advantage of this plan is that you might have some settlement settle out but in the higher flows a lot of that sediment is just going to blow out of there again and he did not think Public Works was going to go there and remove it between storms – it just isn’t practical.

Mr. Dornwood said he wanted to point out again – they are incorporating a sediment removal chamber to remove the sediment that he is talking about.

Mr. Dornwood stated he believed this is the more practical plan – there are some other advantages – that when they go re-extend the 66” pipe and when they go to instruct the endwall they are going to be dealing with flows in that pipe constantly – there is always flow in that pipe – maybe a week in the year there is no flow in it or maybe a couple of weeks but it is very difficult to hit that time period so he said he did not think they can count on that. He said they have to maintain flows to allow the water to rise on the upstream side – within a day that would become high and they would have to release it; he said the contractor would have to do all this work within a day or every other day – it would be difficult so they think a bypass pipe would be a good way to go and all it would mean is a very short pipe to the upstream side that would be there to temporarily to take this flow while he is working on the bigger pipe.

This concluded Mr. Dornwood’s presentation.

Dr. Dimmick asked if there were any questions from Commission members.

Mr. Bowman said the question he had - he said it seems on the alternate plan is that normally you want to get some sort of slow down of flow to rip-rap corridor before you get into a stream and the applicant has that on their alternate plan; he asked if the applicant considered at any point think of putting the drainage on the other side of the road – running the main down the other side of the road where there are open ditches there especially down towards the canal – towards the railroad tracks where you could actually put a rip-rap chamber rather than on the south side. He asked if they gave any thought to running on the north side.

Mr. Dornwood said it just to happens there is a 16” water main that runs 1’ to 2’ from that edge the whole way on the north side of School House; it’s shown on the drawing. He showed on the plan the location he was talking about – he said it would have to be run it off the road not at the edge of the road.
Mr. Bowman said he understood that but there is a trench off the road now – east of the railroad tracks – there is an open trench or open swale that goes down between CK Greenhouses and Cheshire Tree.

Mr. Dornwood said Mr. Bowman meant further to the east – he explained as you get into that area he said he believe the area was like a marsh – it's very flat – he said they would have to do a considerable amount of excavation there; he asked if Mr Bowman was talking about a channel there.

Mr. Bowman said there is a channel there – al you would have to is to rip-rap the channel.

Mr. Dornwood said its way too high – he said they can't let the pipe out of the ground.

Mr. Bowman said they would have to pipe it up higher.

Mr. Dornwood said they wouldn’t have cover – it’s a 30” pipe.

Mr. Bowman said he understood the size of the pipe but if they have an open chamber – open trench maybe they wouldn’t need to pipe it maybe just leave it open.

Mr. Dornwood said the point he was trying to make is you would have a dig a channel 2’ to 3’ at least below the existing ground there; even if it’s only a 2’ wide channel at the bottom if you slope that up at 2:1 you are still talking 15’ wide proposition – he said there are all Cat Tails in that area – that's all wetlands.

Mr. Bowman said he had noticed. He said the sediment chamber they are proposing to put in – what size is that – will that handle the full flow – a 10 year flow.

Mr. Dornwood said no – that is not how they are sized they allow those higher flows to get through the chamber without disturbing the sediment that is there – he said this particular one has an overflow that goes over where the sediment is settling- the sediment is settling inside the manhole and then the flow has to go back up and out. He said this system only handles a 5.5 CFS; he said he thought the 10 year peak discharge is 26 CFS.

Mr. Bowman said not at peak just at 10 year; he talked about the design calculations.
Mr. Dornwood said the 5.4 CFS is like a 90 day peak not a 10 year peak – it’s a peak you can anticipate every quarter year or so; every time you get a good inch of rain fall that’s when the sediment from the roads gets washed off – you need a good amount of rainfall.

Mr. Bowman asked then where they are going to cross – there is a 66” pipe in there right now – how full is that pipe as they speak.

Mr. Dornwood said it varies – he said he has not seen it in a while – not since 2007 when they designed this but at that particular time when he saw it there was a good amount of flow – they had had a rain about a week or half a week prior to that and there was probably a good depth flowing in the pipe and flowing at a good velocity.

Mr. Bowman asked if the pipe was clear or full of sediment.

Mr. Dornwood said it was pretty clear – he said some of the rip-rap near the outlet might be slightly blocking it a little bit but for the most part it’s clear.

Mr. Bowman said he thought Mr. Dornwood should go out and take a look at it; he said it’s about 42” full; he said that is why asked about the pipe and the bypass options needed at the lower level.

Mr. Dornwood said so then things have changed. He asked Mr. Bowman about the 42” high deep water in the pipe.

Mr. Bowman said there was 42” high of deep sand and rock in the pipe.

Mr. Dornwood said so there is something that has entered the pipe and blocking the flow.

Dr. Dimmick asked what the difference between the endwall and a headwall.

Mr. Dornwood said that was a good question – he said he had been practicing for 31 years and there isn’t any.

There was a brief discussion regarding the terms endwall and headwall.

Ms. Simone said she did have a question – in looking at the revision – it does show there is a pipe that is going to be crossing School House Road and that is planning to be the bypass when the headwall/endwall/tailwall gets repaired – it that a possibility that can be a long term solution if they need to go back in and repair that area again or do something with the culvert – is this something that could serve as more of a long term goal for repair of that area.
Mr. Dornwood said they plan to leave the pipe but because they would be changing the discharge they plan to plug it; but they could remove the plug again to use it again; he said there is an advantage here that in the future if the 66” pipe gets full of 42” of sediment again and you need to do some work in there you could temporarily use that pipe to bypass the flow.

Mr. Bowman stated that was an excellent observation.

There were no other Commission or staff questions or comments.

Dr. Dimmick now opened the meeting to questions and comments from the public.

Mr. Earl Kurtz of 648 Wallingford Road stated he had a comment regarding the proposed project.

Mr. Kurtz said his family owns property immediately to the north of School House Road and naturally they have an interest in what’s going on.

Mr. Kurtz explained he commissioned an engineering company – he said he has one not seven copy of the report to submit to the Commission; he said he would like to say on the outset he is certainly not opposed to this project – the road, the area does need something to facilitate the drainage on School House Road.

Mr. Kurtz said the report he will present does not disagree with the idea but suggests that perhaps there is more runoff – more impervious area on School House Road then may have been considered by the present engineering company – the report shows pictures and discusses the road itself where the water running down the side of the road is actually caused erosion of the base of the road not just the asphalt but under it and suggests perhaps there should be some curbing on School House Road to both stop the erosion of the street and stop and to stop the debris from running down the side of the road into the potential catch basins which would cause problems every rain storm not just one a year or once every ten years.

Mr. Kurtz explained the report from his engineer also suggests an open running ditch the last 100’ before it enters the upstream area on the south side of School House Road – that might eliminate some sediment that gets through and it refers to, as Mr. Bowman mentioned, to the 66” pipe that goes under the road which by the way – that’s a stream that goes under that road – it’s not an intermittent stream – it’s a constant stream and it has a pond that feeds it and flows eventually into the Ten Mile River and that is a calculation that should probably be considered when they are talking
about the amount of water that’s going to have to be handled in this area; the stream also contributes to the volume of water.

Mr. Kurtz said as shown on the plan – the 66” and 30” pipe have the same level at the base. He said he would take exception – there is about 20” of sediment in the pipe which would be about 2/3’s of that 30” pipe so when the town presented this plan to the Commission two weeks ago they said they would not be altering the rip-rap and debris on the outlet side of that 66’ pipe and if they don’t they are already creating a situation where the 30” pipe is 2/3’s full and there needs to be some reconsideration of that; he said that is really all he is saying is that perhaps he would ask the Town to reconsider and reexamine some of their figures with the goal of doing a really great job – rather than a partial job in eliminating the water.

Dr. Dimmick asked if Mr. Kurtz was submitting this report to the Town.

Mr. Kurtz stated yes – he was. The report was prepared by Compass Road, LLC Engineering firm.

Dr. Dimmick said the report has a stamp of Victor Benny, PE.

Dr. Dimmick said to be fair – the applicant should have a copy of the report.

Mr. Kurtz provide the applicant with a copy of the report. He also stated that the engineer offered to be at the meeting to present the report himself as an expert; but Mr. Kurtz said no because he is not trying to create an adversary situation – he said he is trying to make something happen that will benefit the people in the area and in the long run the Town of Cheshire and that is why he said no – we are not going to court here – let’s just have some honest discussion and some good ideas.

Mr. Kurtz said he would personally present his copy of the report to the Town.

Mr. Noewatne accepted the copy of the report submitted by Mr. Kurtz.

Dr. Dimmick stated that he though under the circumstances – one they need to give the applicant time to go through the report and make an adequate response and the obviously they can’t do that this evening which means the public hearing would have to be continued.

Mr. Noewatne said the Town will need some time to digest the report; he said they were going to request that the Commission, if there were no major objections to act on this tonight to facilitate the bidding process and try to get the project done before the winter.
Dr. Dimmick stated the public hearing was going to have to be left open because of the new material submitted that the Commission has not had a chance to look at and the applicant has not had a chance to look at.

This portion of the public hearing was continued to the next meeting at 8:00 p.m.

The public hearing was continued to Tuesday, September 7, 2010.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The public hearing meeting was adjourned at 8:00 p.m. Approved by consensus of Commission members present.

Respectfully submitted:

Carla Mills, Recording Secretary
Cheshire Inland Wetland and Watercourse Commission