

SOUTHINGTON INLAND WETLANDS AGENCY
 Regular Meeting
 Thursday, June 2, 2011
 7:00 pm - Town Hall Council Chambers
 75 Main Street, Southington, Connecticut

MINUTES

The Southington Inland Wetlands Agency held a public hearing & regular meeting on Thursday, June 2, 2011. Chairperson Theresa Albanese called the meeting to order at 7:00 o'clock, p.m.

The following Councilpersons were present, viz:

James Sullivan, Kevin Conroy and Dennis Palmieri

Alternates:

William Camp

Ex-officio members present were as follows, viz:

David Lavallee, Assistant Town Planner

Absent: Christopher Borowy, Commissioner
 John DeMello, Commissioner
 Ted Cabata, Commissioner
 Richard Post, Alternate
 Louis Martocchio, Ass't Town Attorney

The Chair seated William Camp for Christopher Borowy. A quorum was determined.

The Pledge of Allegiance to the American Flag was recited by everyone in attendance.

THERESA ALBANESE, Chair, presiding:

Approval of Minutes: Regular Meeting - May 5, 2011

Mr. Conroy made a motion to approve the Minutes as presented. Mr. Camp seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Treasurer's Report

Mr. Sullivan gave the Treasurer's Report to-date. Mr. Palmieri made a motion to approve the Treasurer's as read. Mr. Camp seconded. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

Reports from Public, Press and Ex-Officio members regarding items scheduled for action

None this evening.

Inland Wetland/Floodplain Filling Applications:

A. Information/Action - IW #1189, Application of Lovley Development Group seeking to construct a stormwater management area partially within the upland re view area and install an associated pipe outfall. Property located at 1115 West Street.

Sev Bovino, Planner with Kratzert, Jones & Associates presented the application. This property is located on the east side of West Street across from the insurance company buildings directly south of the existing medical buildings which Lovley Development operates in that area. This site was subject of a wetlands application previously for a hotel. That did not happen.

He showed from 2008 the detention area as proposed. It is basically the same as 2011 except we have a discharge point instead of being on the north side is centered. (Indicating)

Also, the buffer is proposed to be disturbed b 2881 sf (indicating) in this area.

Otherwise the design is the same in terms of the ability to take the runoff.

We have the proposal to use this detention area for a siltation basin during construction.

We have the pools. We have the storm check dams from both directions because in the future there'll be some development on the rest of the property. Explained.

We received comments from David Lavallee just now. We have no problem with the comments except the sloping, the benching of this area (indicating). If we are to place a bench, that slope is already a 2:1 slope there. This is 3:1 here (indicating). If we had to place a bench, that means we would have to put push into the buffer there, too. We're proposing to put blankets immediately on the slope as soon

as created and we will make sure there is no erosion coming down into the wetland area.

There is a natural low area along the bottom of this. Almost like a roadway. It used to be a farming roadway. So, we feel comfortable we are not going to have any erosion going into the wetland because of the way the land is shaped.

The Chair asked why the development is placed way back on the property, why we are deforesting this area and why we're not developing up front. Mr. Bovino said we have a building that takes advantage of the slope here, i.e.: walk out basement. There is an overall master plan for this property and in the front we have intention to have retail.

Mr. Bovino said there was going to be either a subdivision or we have a permit for multiple buildings on this site granted earlier.
Discussion.

Discussion regarding the master plan layout. The Commissioners indicated they would like to see the master plan.

Mr. Bovino said the site has about maybe 2000 yards of material to be imported. So, it is a pretty balanced site.

The grade of the main driveway was discussed. Mr. Conroy said it looks like this is going to be a heavily impervious site when all said and done. His concern is that because the whole watershed is going front to back, unless that new slope - which I don't have a problem with by itself - unless that's taken care of, I think we can get a lot of erosion and we can get a lot of water leading down into the river. Is there a way to abate that somehow? Maybe make the slope a little gentler?

The second question is regarding the basin, continued Mr. Conroy. Is the basin sized right now for the entire site to be developed? Mr. Conroy commented that just eye-balling it, it looked a little small for the whole site.

Discussion.

Mr. Bovino passed around colored copies of the plan.

Retaining wall locations were discussed.

Mitigations proposed were explained. The construction sequence was referenced.

Reforestation of the upland vegetation on the slope was discussed.

Mr. Sullivan made a motion to table IW 1189. Mr. Conroy seconded.

Roll call:

Mr. Sullivan:	Yes
Mr. Conroy:	Yes
Mr. Palmieri:	No
Mr. Camp:	No
Chair Albanese:	Yes

Motion passes 3 to 2.

Site walk set for Thursday, June 9, 2011

B. Information - IW #1190, Application of 45 Newell Street Associates seeking to disturb a portion of the 100' upland review area to the Quinnipiac River for the reconstruction of an existing bridge. Property located at 45 Newell Street.

Sev Bovino, Planner with Kratzert, Jones & Associates presented the application. This is the existing old building and the proposed addition is in the southwest corner of that building. The bridge is located right here (indicating) crossing the Quinnipiac River. It was used in the past by employees to come across to the parking area.
Explained.

He passed around some exhibits:

- schematic of the new bridge design
- profile of the existing bridge showing the elevation of the deck, the peers and the water elevation and the actual bottom of the brook elevation.

This is the replacing of the entire bridge structure. We're going to remove the deck because it's narrow. We're going to go from, I believe, 6' wide to 14' wide. A pedestrian bridge that is going to be used to possibly transport some material from one side to the other so they don't have to travel on Newell Street. Transfer the smaller loads between the two facilities.

Explained the process. Right now there are four peers at this location. We're going to leave the peers in place and we're going to propose to add one more peer to the left. The new peers are 36" diameter pipes and they're going to be drive into the ground and the dirt is going to be vacuumed out and the concrete will be poured in. Those pipes will become the new peers and they'll be at the same elevation as the existing peer. They're located in the shadow of the other peers so there will be bi effect on the flow of the water. Six peers, four original and two new ones.

Discussion.

That allows us to increase the width of the deck allowing backhoes to go across. In back of the piers, we are proposing concrete abutments to reinforce that area and strengthen the deck itself. Those abutments will be below grade. There will be excavation and the material will be removed off site and the forms will be put in place. There'll be a dewatering system ready to go if we encounter water problems. Then after the forms are put in place, they'll be concrete poured. Those elevations will maintain the current grade that's there now.

Discussion.

We are showing protection around the work area, i.e.: orange construction fence, silt fence, the mulch logs and we have a dewatering area indicated on either side of this operation.

The deck is one that can be either picked up with a big machine and lifted over or taken down by hand. It's a small deck.

We're working away from the water. We are not going to place any new structure in the water.

Discussion.

There is an existing sediment basin that we are using right now for the large construction taking place. So we can use the dewatering to be directed into that basin, too, if we have to.

The deck is going to be poured in place, concrete.

The final thing is stabilization of the area. We want to place some rip rap on the banks. Right now there is no rip rap on the banks of the river here. It's just plain dirt below the deck now.

Discussion.

Mr. Lavalley said it would be an interpretation issue. He is not against the project. But it's just going to be an interpretation by the Town Planner and the Town Engineer about the definition of encroachment into the floodway.

Mr. Conroy said his question is: Is the hydraulic bridge opening the same? Mr. Bovino said it is and referred to a letter submitted which is on file in the Town Planner's Office.

Discussion.

Mr. Bovino noted there is compensation for the floodplain filling on the other side. We have extra. And, even for the floodway, this detention area that is on the other side, this is totally in the floodway. We are providing quite a bit of an improvement there in terms of floodway.

Discussion.

Mr. Conroy said as long as the hydraulic reports show that everything is okay, then I'm fine with it. My real question is the bridge itself. You're taking a pedestrian bridge and you're going to run trucks over it and you're using the same foundation?

Mr. Bovino referred to the sketch showing the design and the beam size and all of that. That's going to be a full blown design. They tested the foundation and it is capable of handling the load.

Discussion of how the testing was done. He referred to a report from a professional engineer in the file.

Discussion of the past use of the bridge.

Discussion about a low flow channel for the 2 year flow? What is the depth of that water in a 2 year flow? Mr. Bovino will provide the information on a 2 year event.

The Chair added she would like to see something in writing from the Army Corp of Engineers regarding this project as the regulations have just changed.

Discussion.

Mr. Bovino added they do not have a hydraulic study and they don't expect to do that because we are not changing anything. The Chair pointed out you are putting in rip rap. Mr. Bovino explained he is not adding it; he will cut the banks and add the rip right by the abutments. Mr. Conroy said the floodway analysis just because you are filling in the floodway. That's a slightly different calculation than the normal hydraulic report. Mr. Conroy requested the applicant to provide a floodway analysis.

Extensive discussion.

Site walk set for Thursday, June 9, 2011

AND

C. Information - FF #227 - Application of 45 Newell Street Associates seeking to fill a portion of the new floodplain for work associated with the replacement of an existing footbridge with a vehicle bridge. Property located at 45 Newell Street.

Mr. Palmieri made a motion to table IW #1190 and FF #227. Mr. Conroy seconded. Motion passed 5 to 0 on a roll call vote.

Site walk set for Thursday, June 9, 2011

Communications

A. Reports from Public, Press and Ex-Officio members regarding items other than those scheduled for action.

None this evening.

9. Conservation Issues/Unfinished Business/Miscellaneous

- Discussion of the West Side Sewer Interceptor

Mr. Lavallee referred to the narrative previously submitted to the commission. There are three possible routes.

Mr. Conroy said this is a pretty major interceptor. It's going to service the west side of town, at least a good chunk of the west side of town.

Questions:

- Is it being sized to cover what I'll call full development?
- Do they never intend to expand this at any time in the future?
- Is this to avoid a pump station or multiple pump stations?
- What are the ramifications?
- What is the problem with going through Mount Vernon Road?

The three alternative routes were described by Mr. Lavallee and discussed by the commission.

Mr. Conroy asked for a copy of the Sewer Master Plan so the commission could review it. We definitely need more information. We need to see more alternatives.

Discussion.

This will immediately benefit Lincoln College and Lake Compounce but will also provide future service to the planned commercial land in the northwest corner of town, noted Mr. Lavallee.

Discussion.

Pipe sizes along West Queen were discussed as not being adequate.

Mr. Conroy again pointed out we are interested in what the alternatives analysis shows. He would also want to see the planning study done.

Discussion.

- **Appointments**

Mr. Palmieri asked about the appointments that were up in April and were not done. I'm questioning it because I talked to Dave earlier and he feels as long as the seat is occupied and they haven't made an appointment, its fine. My only concern is any decisions made by this commission knowing that we have two members sitting here and their position technically is up, could anything done be called into questions because the town has not reappointed those positions?

Discussion.

- **Site walk for the Griffin property is June 11th at 10:00 am.**

- **Saturday, June 4' 2011 is the opening of Phase II of the Rails to Trails.**

Mr. Palmieri made a motion to adjourn which was seconded by Mr. Sullivan. Motion passed unanimously on a voice vote.

(Whereupon, the meeting was adjourned at 8:05 o'clock, p.m.)