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

Staff: Suzanne Simone.

Not Present: Robert de Jongh.

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

I. CALL TO ORDER

Dr. Dimmick called the public hearing to order at 7:30 p.m.

II. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

All present receipted the pledge of allegiance.

III. ROLL CALL

Ms. Dunne called the roll.

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

IV. DETERMINATION OF QUORUM

Dr. Dimmick determined there were enough members present for a quorum.

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

V. BUSINESS

1. Permit Application
   APP #2010-017
   Jennifer & David Arcesi
   DOR 7/06/10
   Nob Hill Road
   FT 7/10/10
   Sewer Lateral Installation
   PH 7/20/10
   MAD 8/24/10
Chris Juliano, PE and land surveyor of Juliano Associates was present on behalf of the applicants Jennifer & David Arcesi. Dr. Dimmick stated the reason for the public hearing on this application was that the Commission had some concerns regarding the project that they did not see answers to in what had been submitted earlier.

Dr. Dimmick stated for the record that he and Bob de Jongh field trip the site as well as Mr. Bowman. He said at some point he or Mr. Bowman may indicate their observations from the field trip and make that part of the record.

Mr. Juliano addressed the Commission.

Mr. Juliano explained the proposed is for the installation of a sanitary lateral hook-up at 226 Nob Hill Road.

Mr. Juliano stated the reason for the application is that the Arcesi’s have been experiencing a failing septic system for the past few years; they normally have it pumped between three and four times per year and its getting to the point where its becoming a little burdensome for them and they are getting recommendations from their septic installer – the person who is pumping it that its not going to last much longer and they really need to replace it or hook-up to the sanitary sewer.

Mr. Juliano explained that both Jennifer and David Arcesi had been in contact Mr. Michaelangelo from the Department of Public Works. At the time they had started communication the town was just starting to go through a sewer upgrade and installing sewers up Riverside, but unfortunately they stopped short of this property; they had tried to discuss with the town what it would take to have them installed up to the intersection of Nob Hill and then come up even further but unfortunately with the budgets the way they are it was not within the town’s budget to extend the sewers and economically its not within a single homeowners financial means to be able to extend the sewer.

Mr. Juliano said Mr. Michaelangelo did point out thought that there was the sanitary trunk sewer that ran through the property down at the bottom of the wetlands and they would be able to or should be able to hook up there.

Mr. Juliano said for those who did go out on the field trip, they definitely did observed as they observed when they were out there and anyone who looked at the map that towards the rear of the property before you get to the wetlands there is a very, very sleep slope and that is the main concern
about the entire project is coming down that steep slope and then connecting to the sewer.

Mr. Juliano said unfortunately at the bottom of that steep slope they have the wetlands, they also have the floodplain and then the Quinnipiac River.

Mr. Juliano said that is why they are really in front of the Commission – they need a temporary disturbance to go through the wetlands to be able to put the sewer lateral in and basically the way construction would work on this they would come through there in one of two times of the year to work on this; even in the very dry season since they are there now or maybe another month or the other option is to do it in the dead of winter when the ground is frozen.

Mr. Juliano explained what they would do is come in and they would put the sewer lateral in, they would disturb the wetland soils, excavate and push them to the side put the sewer lateral in, put the soils back, re-vegetate and the contractor would be out of there.

Mr. Juliano said they are really just looking for a temporary disturbance to allow the sanitary sewer to be put in.

Mr. Juliano said they did receive comments from the Engineering Department; there was one little paragraph – Mr. Disbrow is checking with the WPCA so see whether they want the connection at the manhole versus at the pipe.

Mr. Juliano said generally when you connect to a sewer you don’t connect in at the manhole but because of the size and it is a trunk sewer they may want that. He said it doesn’t affect the design – it said he thought it would just move the lateral to the north about 5’ to 7’ so the basic premise will be about the same they will just be connecting to the manhole and they can work that out with Mr. Disbrow or the WPCA.

Mr. Juliano said he could go through and explain various things on the plan but he thought it was pretty much straight forward – they are going to re-route plumbing in the interior of the house, come out the back side of the house and then head towards the sanitary sewer.

Mr. Juliano said one of the questions he posed was and he hoped the Commission may have thought was why aren’t they doing another septic system – he explained that it is a good question it is a feasibility they looked into – the only problem that he has is that he can’t guarantee to his
clients that if they do put in another septic system that it won’t fail in the future.

Mr. Juliano said they can do everything they can but a septic system is not fail proof – he said they can do everything they can but a septic system is not fail proof but a sanitary sewer pretty much is; once they make the connection they should be done – there should be no problems in the future.

Mr. Juliano said cost wise just so the Commission is aware they have gotten prices on sanitary sewer in the range of $13,000 and septic system at $23,000, so right there it tells him the sanitary sewer is being a less cost to the homeowner, it means they don’t have to pump out there system anymore and basically they don’t have to worry about any future problems with a septic system – its definitely the most feasible way for the homeowner to go.

Dr. Dimmick said there were some field trip observations – he said obviously the first thing that strikes you is that slope; he said the thing that concerned him at the last meeting was the soils there which according to the soil maps that is a gravel terrace and so its Manchester sandy gravelly loam and when he went out there, there were places where soil was exposed and of course it was dry. He said the stuff is very powdery – it does not cohere very well – he said he was worried about erosion on that slope – of course their concern is the wetland – but once that starts eroding it immediately goes down in the wetland itself.

Dr. Dimmick said there are problems with stabilizing that kind of material, it’s also hard to re-vegetate that material; he said he did not see the detail he wanted in terms of the erosion controls that would be necessary to keep things from going wrong; the yard slopes towards the escarpment at about 3-4% and the escarpment goes down somewhere about 33% and he would love to see more evidence to keep water from getting caught in where you are putting that trench down ending up with that being a slue-sway of some sort.

Mr. Juliano said that when they got down to the wetlands they basically on all three-four sides there are erosion controls. He said getting up on the slope he said he sees it as being a difficult problem if it does rain and they have erosion controls down the side; he said it just going to shoot through but at two points and he could do more – basically at the bottom of the slope and mid-way what he would call silt fence going across the excavation to kind of hold the runoff at that point.
Mr. Juliano said they spoke with the soil scientist when they were out there and they did notice and they did provide the information about this area being a gravelly soil and the difficulties they were going to posses if they were going to try to do this.

Mr. Juliano said he would beef up the erosion controls for the Commission that is not a problem – a blanket since its not a very wide area – so they could do an erosion control blanket on the slope; something that actually has seed in it so it will re-vegetate itself – that is a possibility.

Mr. Bowman said the other thing that he saw out there and he would have also recommended blankets – but also the compaction – he said this is the type of job where in a lot of sewer jobs they back-fill – it settles they come back they regrade and that’s the end of it – he said he thought this really needs to be compacted in 12” lifts the same way you would work in a road or a highway and he though the last 12” to 18” instead of the power that’s there needs to be top soil brought in again compacted and the blankets put down. He said if that is taken care of he did not really see a problem but if they get someone in there that does not compact that that is going to settle and once it settles – you are going to get a riblet and its going to run for ever and you are going to be back in front of the Commission and then you are really not going to be happy.

Mr. Bowman said if they do get to the point where there is a recommendation that that part of it be put in as special - the compaction and lifts.

Ms. Simone said if the Commission decided to make a motion to approve the application could be approved at the August 3, 2010 meeting; the mandatory action date is August 24, 2010 and the applicant always has the right to ask for an extension.

Mr. Juliano said he would have time to add the additional details on the plan and get it back to staff so she can distribute it the Commission members and then if that doesn’t meet the Commission needs then they can continue it to the next meeting or make it a condition of approval for whatever else the Commission wants.

Mr. Bowman said that if the application is not able to more forward in the next four weeks on the project then the dead of winter is going to be a much better option or even bring it part way now, not getting anywhere near the wetlands or the slope and then in the winter completing it.
There was a discussion about the best time to complete the project – either now or in the dead of winter.

Ms. Simone said they are lacking the signature of soil scientist on the plan.

Mr. Juliano said he would get that signature – they were done by Tim Pietras of Soil Science and Environmental Services.

Ms. Simone stated for the record her main concern were the erosion controls but if revised plans were coming then that was a step in the right direction.

There were no other Commission questions or comments. There were no public questions or comments.

Dr. Dimmick closed the public hearing at 7:45 p.m.

VI. ADJOURNMENT

The public hearing was adjourned at 7:45 p.m. by the consensus of Commission members present.

Respectfully submitted:

Carla Mills, Recording Secretary
Cheshire Inland Wetland and Watercourse Commission