

**Inland Wetlands & Watercourses Commission
(Remote) Regular Meeting
Wednesday, April 7, 2021, 7:00 p.m.
Town Hall, 45 South Main Street
Wallingford, CT**

MINUTES

Chair James Vitali called this (Remote) Regular Meeting of the Wallingford Inland Wetlands & Watercourses Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. This meeting was publicly noticed and held entirely remotely. [A YouTube recording was produced and posted on the Wallingford Town Website by Government Access Television.]

A. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited.

B. ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Chair James Vitali, Secretary Nick Kern, Commissioner Deborah Phillips and Alternates Aili McKeen, Robert Simon and Jennifer Passaretti and Environmental Planner Erin O'Hare.

ABSENT: Commissioner Michael Caruso.

There were 17 callers in the remote audience plus all the speakers named below.

C. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

1. Regular Meeting (Remote), Feb. 3, 2021

MS. PHILLIPS: MOTION THAT THE MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF FEBRUARY 3, 2021 BE ACCEPTED AS SUBMITTED.

MR. SIMON: SECOND

VOTE: MS. PHILLIPS – YES; MR. KERN – YES; MR. SIMON – YES; MS. MCKEEN – YES; MS. PASSARETTI; CHAIR VITALI – YES

Chair Vitali stated that the March Regular Meeting had been cancelled.

D. PUBLIC HEARING

1. Significant Impact #A20-10.3 / 5 Research Parkway / Muddy River – Montante Construction, LLC – (industrial development)

Chair Vitali announced that he was reopening and continuing the public hearing on this application by Montante Construction from the November 10, 2020, Special Meeting.

Chair Vitali stated that this is a public hearing in regard to an Application being designated a Significant Activity. He indicated that Ms. O'Hare had asked him to go over the Criteria for Decision on a Significant Activity and then read the IWWC Regulations, Section 10. Considerations for Decision into the record, as follows:

- “10.2 Criteria for Decision. In carrying out the purposes and policies of sections 22a-36 to 221-45, inclusive, of the Connecticut General Statutes, including matters relating to regulating, licensing and enforcing of the provisions thereof, the Commission shall take into consideration all relevant facts and circumstances including but not limited to:
- a. the environmental impact of the proposed regulated activity on wetlands and watercourses;
 - b. the applicant's purposes for, and any feasible and prudent alternatives to, the proposed regulated activity which alternatives would cause less or no environmental impact to wetlands or watercourses;
 - c. the relationship between the short-term and long term impacts of the proposed regulated activity on wetlands and watercourses and the maintenance and enhancement of long-term productivity of such wetlands and watercourses;
 - d. irreversible and irretrievable loss of wetland or watercourse resources which would be caused by the proposed activity, including the extent to which such activity would foreclose a future ability to protect, enhance or restore such resources, and any mitigation measures which may be considered as a condition of issuing a permit for such activity including, but not limited to, measures to (1) prevent or minimize pollution or other environmental damage, (2) maintain or enhance existing environmental quality, or (3) in the following order of priority: restore, enhance and create productive wetland or watercourse resources;
 - f. the character and degree of injury to, or interference with, safety, health, or the reasonable use of property, which is caused or threatened by the proposed regulated activity; and
 - g. impacts of the proposed activity on wetlands and watercourses outside the area for which the activity is proposed and future activities associated with or reasonably related to, the proposed regulated activity which are made inevitable by the proposed regulated activity and which may have an impact on wetlands and watercourses.
- 10.3 In the case of any application which received a public hearing pursuant to a finding by the Commission that the proposed activity may have a significant impact on wetlands or watercourses, a permit shall not be issued unless the Commission finds on the basis of the record that a feasible and prudent alternative does not exist. In making this finding, the Commission shall consider the facts and circumstances set forth in subsection 10.2 of this section. This finding and the reasons therefore shall be stated on the record in writing.”

Chair Vitali continued, Commissioners, that's what we're charged to protect in the process tonight. This application is probably the most detailed, most thorough in my 30-plus years. I thoroughly believe that the Town of Wallingford and all the departments have dedicated a tremendous amount of time to this application. Peer Reviewers were brought in, and they added to the importance of the project and what's involved. We have a lot of faith in our peer review. And we hope that they have incorporated everything from the Peer Review into their application. If it becomes a difference between Peer Review and the Applicant, I think that's where we intend to focus tonight. I hope the Peer Review and the Applicant can summarize a lot of the activities because I know what work has gone in with Erin and the rest of the Town.

Ms. O'Hare addressed two housekeeping matters: The legal notice was posted in the Meriden Record-Journal on March 26 and April 2, with copies in the record. A copy of the Public Hearing notice was posted In Town Hall and on the Town website on March 23; and the Applicant took the extra measure to send the legal notice to all the abutters within 100 feet of the property, and they turned the certificates of mailing in with a map last week as required. I want to mention that some material—there's still a lot of back-and-forth with the Applicant and the offices—some of that I e-mailed to the Applicant, Commissioners, and Town offices this afternoon to bring them up to date on last-minute changes.

During this Public Hearing the participants were: the Applicant's representatives named below and identified members of the public.

Chair Vitali asked to hear from the Applicant.

Attorney Tom Cody of Robinson & Cole in Hartford noted that Applicant, Montante Construction, and its representatives are here for the prospective tenant Amazon: from Montante are Mr. Byron Deluke and Mr. Rob Peters. From Amazon.com, who will be the anticipated tenant of the facility, are Mr. Michael Keleher and Ms. Jessica Shumer; For BL Companies were Jeffrey Dewey, P.E., and Chris Gagnon,

P.E.; and Carl Thunberg, P.E., Terracon. and Michael Klein, P.W.S., of Davison Environmental. We have PowerPoint presentations. The Public Hearing began November 10, 2020, and the Town then hired two Peer Review consultants: George Cotter, P.E., for the erosion control measures; and SLR (formerly Milone and MacBroom) to review hydrology and geology portions of the application. We received responses from Erik Krueger, Water Division Senior Engineer, and detailed staff reports and memos, even today at 4:30, and the Town Environmental Planner's staff reports. Chair Vitali, we applaud all the Town staff's efforts to work with us to improve the application and to address the Town's questions. We responded in two comprehensive revisions to reflect the changes from the Peer Review comments. In summary, all of the material issues raised have been addressed. The Suggested Conditions of Approval were provided by Ms. O'Hare on April 2 (later noted as corrected to April 1).

Mr. Jeff Dewey of BL Companies, Senior Engineer for Project Design, spoke: Through staff and Peer Reviewers and revising of plans, the substantial revisions have made the project much better. We incorporated Geo-grid for slope stabilizing in upland areas and to maintain more habitat. Also, we incorporated sand filter basins separate from stormwater management basins to improve water quality, plus infiltration trenches. We assessed sediment traps for up to a 25-year storm. We did hydroanalyses of temporary sediment traps; included diversion swales and directed sediment outflows to secondary settling basins; we expanded the construction and erosion control sequence to include pond draw-downs in the case of a catastrophic event. And we provided intermediate erosion control measures plus final contingency planning. There's an overall reduction in stormwater runoff volume and peak rate and not any increase.

Mr. Dewey continued: This slide shows Geogrid 1:1 slope stabilization and vegetated final slope used at three areas: south central; along the access road to allow more habitat; and the northeast corner slope to grade farther away from Wetland 1A. We worked extensively with Erin O'Hare and Mr. Krueger at the Water Division as well as Town Engineer Alison Kapushinski. Mr. Cotter did the Erosion and Sedimentation Peer Review, and Mr. Matt Sanford of SLR did the Stormwater and Wetlands Peer Review. For Existing Conditions, we responded to public comments from the previous public hearing regarding the north central wetland area, Wetland 1B, to assess it and protect it and to provide development areas appropriate for the site and a viable and safe approach to the protection of wildlife habitat and wetlands. We worked with Carl Thunberg on protecting this sensitive wetland.

Mr. Carl Thunberg of Terracon described existing site conditions. The proposed building site is a parking lot right now. We don't know a lot about how the parking lot was designed. Now, it's untreated stormwater going to Wetland 1B without significant treatment. I'd talk about the hydrology of Wetlands 1A and 1B. 1A is the smaller of the two wetlands. It's disconnected from the groundwater discharge—a 'perched wetland', where the groundwater was significantly below the bottom of this particular wetland. There's no net change in the water budget to Wetland 1A. About the hydrology of Wetland 1B, that is a discharge wetland, fed by groundwater and surface water. It's where the groundwater intersects the ground surface as a discharge wetland, with a perennial stream that runs down the middle of it. But at the hillside we did borings and found no groundwater in any of the borings there—the hillside is dense and not a significant water-bearing formation. In Jeff Dewey's proposed conditions, we incorporated enhanced stormwater treatment measures with sand filters and infiltration trenches to infiltrate stormwater directly to groundwater so it can gradually percolate into Wetland 1B. So the water balance to Wetland 1B is unchanged, where the water released to 1B is unchanged from the existing condition to the constructed condition. And it will be released much more slowly because of the groundwater infiltration measures and the sand filters. There is a net reduction of volume and peak into under Wetland 1B, but we will not divert any water away from Wetland 1B. All the water going to 1B is still going there. And there will be drains from the sand filter and the stormwater treatment.

Chair Vitali said, I think it's better if we ask questions now.

Ms. O'Hare said, Mr. Thunberg, You say there's to be a reduction in volume and percolation to Wetland 1B, but we don't want a reduction.

Mr. Thunberg said, In any given storm, there is no net change in the water going to Wetland 1B. All the water that used to go there will still go there, but the peak will come down. It's getting there much slower, and it will be cleaner. But there's no net loss of water to Wetland 1B.

Ms. O'Hare said, O.K. On Wetland 1A at the northeast corner, you said there was no net change to the water budget of that wetland. From the materials handed in, I see it's to be a reduction of 2.41 acres of contributory drainage area to that wetland. So how would that change the water budget?

Mr. Thunberg said, I'll have Jeff Dewey, who performed the drainage counts, speak on that.

Mr. Dewey said, This is the Watershed for Wetland 1A here. We will decrease some of the meadow area here out of the watershed. And this small meadow has little watershed associated with it. The majority of the watershed is actually from impervious area on the other side of Carpenter. So, in the runoff calculation, there's no appreciable change in the runoff from this meadow going to this wetland. And there's still impervious area contributing to runoff. There is no net change to the water budget. When you have a surface coefficient of meadow, there is a lot of infiltration and exfiltration going into the ground on mild slopes. With impervious, most of the water runs off. So where the amount of rainfall gets soaked into the ground and the plant life, there's insignificant change.

Chair Vitali asked for Commissioners' questions. There were none.

Mr. Michael Klein, Biologist and Soils Scientist from Davison Environmental, spoke about wetland impact analysis. During our last Public Hearing (reference is to Nov.10, 2020, first night of the Public Hearing), I talked about the proposed conditions at the site, generally a wooded wetlands, with the Muddy River entering on the east side and flowing to the southwest corner to large stormwater ponds that were constructed for Bristol-Myers Squibb. A smaller stormwater outlet is at the dam that supports the large pond. I had talked about recommendations to be incorporated into the plan. Primarily, we work to avoid wetland impacts. There's no loss of wetlands or watercourses or streams to be drained or flooded or dredging or grading in the wetlands. On potential changes: This shows activities that are "proposed regulated activities" in the URA, some near existing disturbed area, particularly in the southwest portion near the access road. Most work occurs along Carpenter Lane where changes are minimal. After our wetland avoidance work, next we looked at changes in hydrology and we saw that the perched wetland is not supported by the regional water table. There's a minor change in the watershed and no reduction in the volume of runoff going to this wetland. So the actual budget will remain unchanged. Wetland 1B, the large north central wetland, has hydrology that is driven by surface runoff and upwelling groundwater. The hillside watershed cannot support that hydrology, so it's all surface water and groundwelling, a negligible watershed change. Discharge from glacial till is not significant. All discharges are to be treated for quality, rate and volume. Per DEEP, we plan for groundwater recharge to put eight times more groundwater back into the ground than the DEEP requires. The next slide shows the southern Wetland 1E with two smaller stormwater ponds and a wooded wetland, supported by surface runoff and groundwater discharges. It was altered by prior development at the east and with minimal treatment to these small ponds in the prior use. Our plan has a higher level of water treatment and a number of habitat enhancements.

Mr. Klein continued about habitat restoration. In the south end is the Muddy River corridor, and our object is to restore woody vegetation adjacent to the river where it had been cleared. On the eastern limit of Wetland 1B is a large portion (the southern two-thirds) that is native woodland habitat for box turtles. We propose that to remain undisturbed, so we pulled the slopes back. We did invasive species control and eliminated impacts on water quality per the Water Division. Southern habitat restoration has more activity. See Wetland 1E in the center and the existing stormwater ponds (smaller and larger). Here, we would put a native meadow mix and hundreds of shrubs with deer fencing. We're converting areas of stormwater basins and by the ponds from turf to wildlife habitat and conservation mix. The goal is to have peak flow of no increase in volume and no increase to the ponds. Water quality treatment is for erosion and infiltration trenches. Erosion and sedimentation control is multi-layered with silt fence, hay bales, and Geo-grids slope stabilization as well as sediment traps and independent construction monitor, and pond drawdowns, contingency plan, and flok logs and turbidity curtains if your staff requires those. Our wetlands loss is none. Here our mitigation/restoration is up to 15% of the wetland with 262,000 square feet of habitat restoration. There is a 13,137-square-foot Box Turtle Habitat Protection Area. We reduced the managed turf and did about ½ acre of Muddy River corridor restoration. Invasive removal, per the Water Department's restrictions, will be added to the plan. To sum up, there are no significant impacts on wetlands or watercourses. We have a detailed Contingency Plan, plus a Habitat and Restoration Plan. The Independent Construction Monitor is still in the plans.

Ms. O'Hare asked the Applicant team, When do you want to discuss the Invasive Species Management Plan?

Chair Vitali asked, Do you want to eliminate the chemical use on the invasive species, as per the Water & Sewer Department?

Mr. Dewey said, We discussed habitat restoration and the native species planting plan and how to manage invasive species with Erik Krueger from the Water Division. It benefits species to not apply herbicide here because of its location near the watershed. Mr. Krueger's memo said that Imazapyr, glyphosate and two others should not be used on this for invasive removal. We agree to that. We think our proposed plan improves the habitat.

Chair Vitali said, This is direct water flow to Wallingford's drinking water supply.

Ms. O'Hare concurred with Mr. Klein: I do agree that there's a benefit to the eradication of invasive species and in line with the Water Division's purposes. This habitat plan was very well done by Davison Environmental. However, the Invasive Species Management portion of the proposal was not nuanced enough. I studied the plan and different approaches. You don't have to use chemicals in certain areas, or you'd have different treatments around the pond and other areas. The Water Division has been communicating with other water companies. Here we find invasive populations of Trees of Heaven and other invasives. Chemicals would be good there—but not to spray Trees of Heaven, but to girdle them back and treat the lower trunk with sticky chemicals which don't wash away. Also, water companies cut them and treat the stump. In discussion with the Water Division they are considering a more nuanced plan with site-specific, species-specific methods—and maybe forego treatment of the northern area. Also, there are 300 trees proposed to create a reforestation of the Muddy River corridor, so there has to be a way to control the weeds that come along. My Environmental Planner's Report of 4/1 was posted, but today (4/7) I prepared a more nuanced approach with new Suggested Conditions of Approval.

Chair Vitali told Attorney Cody that their original plan had more extensive chemical use to eliminate invasive species. Today, it's recommended for no chemicals. What about the Trees of Heaven, which was included in the chemical plan?

Mr. Cody asked Mr. Klein to respond.

Mr. Klein said Ms. O'Hare is correct. Either we cut and paint herbicide on Tree of Heaven trunks or girdle the trunks. If it were to be a mass spraying of the foliage, it's a finite area, so I'd ask for the Water Department's opinion. The diameter of a Tree of Heaven trunk is from 1" to 10".

Chair Vitali said, So your client would be able to address that particular species?

Mr. Klein said, Yes.

Chair Vitali stated, Probably we can work in the Conditions of Approval to deal with Tree of Heaven in conformance with the Water Department. They don't want to use chemicals.

Ms. O'Hare said, But I have a Condition that allows for that discussion to take place.

Mr. Cody pointed out their reading of the Decision Criteria in Section 10.2 (as above) was to check first for environmental impact on wetlands and watercourses. He found no impact. Mr. Cody continued: The second part in the Applicant's Concerns for Invasives, Mr. Klein's chart showed three alternatives: 1) For the last conditions and redevelopment; 2) Concerning simultaneous application, which we ignored; more features of filling impact is zero here; 3) And we included a Water Management Plan. You responded about maintenance and long-term directives. We agreed to pay for a Site Erosion Control Monitor during the project. A 4th criterion to look at is whether there is irretrievable loss and about environmental quality. But we have multiple steps, and Mr. Cotter will speak to those. And we proposed a Habitat Restoration Plan to enhance environmental quality long term. Fourth, or fifth, would be other criteria: That this application is neutral to any onsite or offsite property interests that would be created. Finally at 10.2.g is to look at the Stormwater Management Plan, which creates a long-term viable system to protect the environment because we're protecting water resources including what happens downstream. So we think the application more than satisfies the criteria and you should look favorably toward it. He addressed the staff's Conditions of Approval, saying that they had asked for some Conditions to be revised.

Chair Vitali asked when Mr. Cody decided that he didn't approve of all the Conditions of Approval? You received your Conditions of Approval a week ago, but we haven't had a chance to look at your "improved" conditions.

Mr. Cody said, We received your Proposed Conditions of Approval on Friday (4/2), which was a holiday. We did discuss them with Erin O'Hare, and I responded in writing about those. There's not many. This is the end of our presentation.

Chair Vitali said, We received e-mails tonight. I would have liked to have a bit of a warning on what you proposed for conditions. Is Ms. O'Hare ready to hear from the Peer Reviewers?

Ms. O'Hare said Yes, tonight, and perhaps to add comments on it.

Chair Vitali asked, Do you have a set with the proposed Changes of Conditions?

Mr. Cody replied that he does.

Ms. O'Hare asked to hear from Mr. Cotter as Peer Reviewer about Erosion Control.

Mr. George Cotter of CW International said he was requested to do a Peer Review of existing documents and additional submissions presented in the December 21, 2020, submission by the Applicant. I went through the plans. In my January 28 memo to BL Companies, I proposed that they would modify the Erosion & Sedimentation Control plans. We met on site on December 15 and discussed issues. There's a path to the day care facility with a footbridge where wetlands are constricted an 8" or 9" opening. There's a place to add an additional settling basin. They want to add stop logs at the footbridge opening and to add at a second location in the large pond. I did a draft report dated 2/9/21 to Erin O'Hare reviewing the four phases of the Erosion & Sedimentation Control Plan: Demolition of existing utilities; and Phases 1, 2, 3 with cuts or fills up to final grade, plus a final Site Plan. Also, I reviewed documents submitted on the Construction Site Contingency Plans for erosion control and emergency spills. So Applied Polymer Systems and I looked at the geotechnical report and the Town report of the temporary sediment traps and basins. That had notes on the plan as to how the Erosion and Sedimentation controls would be implemented. We also reviewed additional documents, and I came up with modifications in the different sheets, some very minor. The main discharge point from the north is a settling basin, and I felt there was a need for a level spreader out of that. They agreed. I also recommended installing a large-diameter pipe in the brook that flok logs could be placed in. They looked at that, and felt the surrounding wetlands do not justify that pipe. I reviewed that and agreed. At the footbridge they agreed to install stop logs at the large bottom. So I felt that the two larger ponds give you a chance because they're the connection points to install turbidity curtains, if needed, preconstruction. I reviewed an on-site Sedimentation & Erosion Control Plan. Regarding stop-logs as deflection points, my recommendation is concerning a major storm event. So Applied Polymer Systems would have to be consulted on site for that. So those recommendations could be added to the plan. Also I had a detailed breakdown of more specific Erosion & Sedimentation construction methods before contractors enter into the settling ponds. My only other recommendation was for a detailed breakdown to the contractor of how the Erosion & Sedimentation methods would be done, before work.

Mr. Cotter continued: On Stormwater Management discharge, there are places on site for recharge with 36"-diameter pipes and stone around them to allow it to go back into the ground on discharge from the basin. However, I feel because of topography, there's a possibility for more runoff to go down Old Barnes Road. So in my last letter this week, I recommended if they're not going to have water go down there, and then if they're not going to discharge to the north to the Muddy River Brook, then they would provide a detailed plan showing that the water will discharge to the brook and not to the service road. Those are the two points could be in the Conditions of Approval.

Chair Vitali asked for Commissioner questions. There were none. He said, Having experienced the red soil coming off Bristol-Myers and at another location, the red hangs in suspension. Flok logs would work. Those flok logs were more successful with Public Works in keeping the red soil out.

Mr. Cotter said in the borings, the northern portion is sandy; the southern portion is the red soil. They could use the flok logs in the small pond, and I'd recommend that they add them in the discharge of the small pond to the large pond. I think it's a more robust system in place. They could use flok logs onsite. Can those go in the watershed area? I think they need someone familiar with Applied Polymer Systems to determine how much to apply prior to getting into the small pond, where I believe the red soil will be discharging.

Chair Vitali said, That makes some sense.

Mr. Cody said that Mr. Cotter summarized those two conditions in a memorandum dated April 6. We've agreed to both of those as Conditions, about turbidity curtains and about the moving of the trench locations. We've agreed to those and put them into our plans. And flok logs can be used.

Chair Vitali said, That's an important point. Ms. O'Hare?

Ms. O'Hare said, A bond estimate will be later.

Mr. Matt J. Sanford, Professional Wetlands Scientist from SLR, described their independent technical review on stormwater course and wetland impacts. We provided two assessment letters and an additional comment letter to the Commission. Austin Dowd, P.E., and Mr. Ted Hart from SLR are here with me.

Mr. Ted Hart, P.E., of SLR, said, We reviewed the Stormwater Management Plan and commented. We feel this plan is excellent. They have stormwater quality measures including water quality sediment traps, sand filters, infiltration measures, drainage which exceed the Connecticut Stormwater Quality Guidelines. We commented on getting to their deep infiltration trenches. They raised the bottoms of some deep structures, and the Applicant can address those in final plans. The pipe is underground, with discharge below grade into an infiltration trench. It could be difficult to maintain if it gets full of sediment. But they said they can handle that in final plans and in the Operation and Maintenance Report about monitoring the infiltration trenches and level spreaders. They added a concrete curb to the top of their infiltration system to provide a sheet flow. Still, we had one concern to address in preconstruction. There's a 48-inch infiltration pipe all along the east side of the building which will be into bedrock. They said they will raise that if they had to. Their overall stormwater quality measures are very good because it's in a drinking water supply watershed.

Mr. Sanford resumed: From the wetlands perspective, we looked at the reports from the Applicant's team, Davison Environmental and Terracon's reports and BL Companies' stormwater reports on the wetlands. Overall, we're looking for direct wetland impacts, and that's not the case in this project. The other URA impacts are in the north central area by Wetland 1B in the Box Turtle Protection Plan and the Invasive Species Plan. So we saw the vernal pool by the prior day care facility. They're not proposing any project activities within a 100-foot envelope of the vernal pool or the Critical Terrestrial Habitat around it. Also, additional information was submitted to the Town this afternoon relating to another vernal pool that's immediately off site from northeastern Wetland 1A. Could the Applicant describe what that inventory found and what species were found there? And what protection measures are to be appropriate?

Mr. Michael Klein, Wetlands Scientist and Biologist, Davison Environmental, said, The area Matt is referring to is off site. It was noted in our reports from the 2018 hearing, when we were asked to identify wetlands on the northeastern boundary by Northeast Utilities/Eversource property. We could not enter there legally. Both Carpenter Lane and the water tower touch that site. There's no work set for that 100-foot area. Our associate walked along with someone from the utility, and he sketched approximate wetland limits on an old plan. Just east of the water tower there is an off-site area of standing water, but it's off site. He heard wood frogs, common to vernal pools. Half of the terrestrial area is on the other side of Carpenter Lane. He saw some standing water. There's a 750-foot potential Critical Terrestrial Habitat Area on our site which was already disturbed. That is on the sketch that we sent to Matt and Erin today. We feel that there is no significant biological element there that would be adversely affected. Regarding the Box Turtle Protection Area, that area was originally proposed to be cleared and regraded as a 2:1 slope. That's probably one of the best habitat, oak-beech forests, sandy and good habitat for box turtles. So we wanted to modify the plan to use 1:1 slopes with the Geo-grids. It's an area that we

might protect by signage. I think no easement is proposed, but we did protect it by modifying the slope here.

Mr. Sanford said, There's sensitive area identified to be protected by the Eastern Box Turtles Protection Zone and the 100-foot Vernal Pool Envelope on this parcel and the woodland habitat. The Commission may want those protected by signage and a conservation easement.

Next, Mr. Sanford discussed the Invasive Species Management. There's mechanical and herbicide approaches. A targeted approach is positive and uses herbicide on Trees of Heaven, multiflora rose and Autumn olive. So to eradicate or manage these species, I believe it can be done and with respect to the Muddy River and Mackenzie Reservoir. I believe it can be done efficiently and effectively. Last, we have responded to the Peer Review on Invasive Species Management and Stormwater.

Chair Vitali asked for Commissioner questions. There were none.

Ms. O'Hare asked Matt Sanford about the herbicide and to address all the areas that the Applicant proposes for Invasive Species Management, or is it just Trees of Heaven?

Mr. Sanford said he believes that all three species could be treated in an herbicide program.

Ms. O'Hare said, Have you heard about a multi-phase mechanical approach?

Mr. Klein said mechanical methods would be cutting and painting with herbicide or a girdling of the more robust trees. All meadow areas will get mowed regularly, so those are not in the Invasive Species Management Plan. In the dense area, we can access the root crowns and apply it (the chemical).

Mr. Sanford said, I agree with Mr. Klein.

Mr. Klein said, This control should be used on a case-by-case basis by an experienced contractor. You may have roots underground on the site, So I think the preliminary measures will be cutting and painting or girdling/spray. That is up to the contractor who does that on a daily basis. We'd be happy to address those with staff and with the On-Site Monitor during that portion of the plans.

Chair Vitali said, I'm not in favor of ripping stumps out, which would lead to erosion over open ground. I'm in favor of cutting and/or painting or girdling them. I don't see why they would have any objection to a conservation easement along the border of Pond 1A.

Ms. O'Hare said, I hadn't heard yet of conservation easements. I think it was for more near the day care center. There's two vernal pools.

Chair Vitali said, But that's where they couldn't go, along the Eversource Right-Of-Way?

Ms. O'Hare asked Mr. Sanford to clarify.

Mr. Sanford said, I'd recommend looking at the sensitive areas based on the existing habitat and then per Michael's documentation. I'd recommend a conservation easement in the area of the northeast wetland, as stated by the Chairman; as well as along the eastern portion of Wetland 1B, the north central wetland where we have the Eastern Box Turtle Protection Zone; as well as an Invasive Species Management zone located along that wetland as well.

Ms. O'Hare asked, But not for the other vernal pool?

Mr. Sanford said, The other vernal pool is sandwiched and protected by a few wetland systems in that general area. That could be considered. But, as I have seen, based on the proposed development and the encroachment close to, or within, the Critical Terrestrial Habitat of the northeast wetland vernal pool and the proximity to the north central wetland and the activities proposed adjacent to or within, those two would be the most critical areas for conservation.

Chair Vitali said, Mr. Cody, are you in agreement?

Mr. Cody said, Mr. Chairman, We would agree to a conservation easement in the specific areas that Mr. Sanford just described. But, to be clear, it's not a conservation easement for public access. It's just to protect against development.

Chair Vitali asked for comments from the public.

Ms. Adelheid Koepfer of 35 Whiffletree Road said, I'm overwhelmed with all the details as a lay person. I want to thank the Environmental Planner and the Water Division for all their work as to water quality. The Commission and the staff have shown diligence on this issue and the willingness of the Applicant to accommodate the concerns. I'd hope that the measures would exceed regulations and standards beyond what those on well water expect. I hope that the Water Division finds out by monitoring the water quality of the Muddy River when the total exceeds this site. Is there a water well monitor between this site and Mackenzie Reservoir?

Chair Vitali said, There's nobody here to give you a positive answer. I think the water gets metered at Mackenzie Reservoir, but there are other controls to the water in this system.

Ms. O'Hare said, Maybe Mr. Dewey can answer. I know the Water and Sewer Division will monitor water on site during construction, and it's in the Site Management Plan that they come on site yearly.

Mr. Dewey said, Yes during construction we will meet their turbidity and other standards, and after.

Ms. O'Hare asked, Are Water Division personnel supposed to monitor the site?

Mr. Dewey said, Correct, they would come on site during construction.

Ms. Koepfer said, The Invasive Species information mentioned glyphosate. I'd recommend extreme caution with pesticides and the risk to well water sources.

Mr. William Stuckey, 54 High Hill Road, asked, How much paved area is in this plan compared to Bristol-Myers as to the amount of parking and snow removal? I got the impression to allow a paved area in the watershed wasn't desirable. It seems there's more parking space compared to the building.

Chair Vitali said, It was covered in November. It's for parking of the delivery vans. Vans were to be moved in waves; when the vans move out, employee parking goes there for the day.

Mr. Jack Arrigoni, 18 Martin Trail, said he lives on Muddy River at Spring Lake. My well is 30 feet from the Muddy River. I feel I'm not going to get flooded. But I am concerned about the quality of the water, having to do with sodium and chlorides. Did you see the Water Division presentation on 12/14/20?

They had six graphs. They test the Muddy River and Mackenzie Reservoir. Both levels have more than doubled since the 1990s. My chlorides doubled since 1985, and I've told people about this. The chloride and sodium spiked in 2018, and then they went down. I think it was maybe coming from Bristol-Myers. It's only five to ten minutes, water-flow time, to Spring Lake. This impervious area, how does this compare to Bristol-Myers site? I don't think you can filter that stuff out of the water. Also, you're changing to calcium chloride and magnesium chloride. I noticed a rise in both in the last couple of years. Is that being looked at?

Chair Vitali said, I know that Bristol-Myers, with their employees and their building, they had a lot of impervious surface.

Ms. Jen Crochette, 21 Valley View Drive, asked, Did we talk about snow removal and where the actual snow is going to go with all the parking spaces and what chemicals are in the snow?

Chair Vitali said, I think it was addressed on the staff side. It's on the plan, per Jeff Dewey. Probably the Water Division was looking at that.

Commissioner Kern noted, Back in November I asked where the snow was going to be put. But I think there's not going to be any salts or de-icing. It's going to be natural because the sun comes up there.

Mr. Dewey said, You are correct. As per the Water Division, there will be no chemicals or similar used for de-icing.

Ms. O'Hare asked, Would you clarify that? I thought it was just sodium chloride could not be used. I'll check.

Mr. Dewey said, Or any other de-icing materials. I believe they could only use sand. I believe it was in the O&M per Erik Krueger's comments.

Mr. Bill Stuckey asked, What is the amount of impervious surface?

Mr. Dewey said, There is approximately an 800,000 square-foot increase in impervious surfaces. However, the stormwater management system far exceeds standards versus what was existing for Bristol-Myers with regard to stormwater quality and quantity treatment. We have exceeded Connecticut DEEP standards and DOT as well.

Ms. O'Hare said, I did find in the Site Operation and Maintenance Plan (she showed this document) dated March 5th that it says "no sodium chloride". It does not prohibit any other kind of salt. I can look through the Water Division's comments and see what the Department of Public Works told me.

Chair Vitali noted, The Town puts salt mixture on the roads.

Ms. O'Hare said, I think the Department of Public Works told me they use calcium chloride.

Commissioner Kern said, Calcium chloride breaks down fast. I think they're using a salt, granular.

Chair Vitali asked for additional questions from the public. There were none. Then he asked to talk about Conditions of Approval. Mr. Cody, you also wrote on that. So you are in agreement with all the conditions that Erin has, except which ones?

Mr. Cody said, I summarized our comments in an e-mail to Erin, based on Erin O'Hare's April 2 Environmental Planner's Report with her first Conditions of Approval. There are four that I'd raise for discussion. I believe everything else we already discussed and agreed to. Three of my questions are in Section 6, which is Conditions Relative to Ponds, from p. 8 to the top of page 9. It's in the fourth bullet, which is the Plan for Possible Unfavorable Aquatic Conditions. And what we talked about and agreed to was that in this Condition the second and third sentences would be deleted; and the first sentence would be revised as "A plan to be submitted within 60 days to address the possible need for improvement of water quality conditions and salvage/rescue of aquatic animals, should low water levels create distress/unfavorable conditions for viability."

Ms. O'Hare said, Yes, O.K. But, for the record, it was April 1, not Good Friday. Please correct that.

Mr. Cody said, Our second comment was, also in Condition 6, at the fifth bullet. We have no concerns about the first paragraph or subparagraph a). But we have concerns about subparagraph b) and ask that it be deleted. The distinction between a) and b) is that in this condition a) the question really is about "should restoration by sediment removal be determined to be necessary, the Permittee shall provide a proposal for such activity." Yes, we agree to that. But this subparagraph b) attempts to describe a scenario where sediment removal is not even needed because it's not necessary due to such a minimal depth of the sediment layer in the pond bottom. And we've been asked here to agree to provide remedies for the treatment of ponds for algal blooms post-construction phase erosion control measures in the event sediment is stirred up in the water column. Our concern is that the pond is already compromised, already has algal blooms, it already has some of the conditions in subparagraph b). And I think it would be impossible to measure such a depth in the pond bottom and implement such a condition. I don't think it's necessary because we've agreed under a) to remove any sediment that needs to be removed.

Chair Vitali asked, Let me ask you in paragraph b) there's no time frame associated with that. It's post construction; it could be five years from now. Erin, do you have any trouble eliminating b)?

Ms. O'Hare said, Yes. To explain: Let's say 2" of sediment is on the pond bottom. Maybe let it lie and let it be there, because it's going to create havoc. But my concern is that potassium, phosphorous and nitrogen attach to the soil particles. It's going to make nutrient loading during the construction phase. I'm concerned it will bloom plant life. Then it blooms and dies and it degrades and uses up oxygen in the pond. Possible extreme algal.

Chair Vitali said, But, Erin, they're supposed to clean the pond in paragraph a). Bristol-Myers used filter bags to clean the pond. I know your plantings around the pond contribute and make it more expensive to go in. Have you given that any thought? I think It could be addressed at that moment. Erin, are you still on board with b)? I think it's covered under a) to clean the pond out.

Ms. O'Hare said, I'm sure the Water Division will step in if it's a problem.

Chair Vitali said, Take out b).

Mr. Cody said, The third condition is next, in number 7 about chemicals that would be used in the eradication of invasive plants.

Chair Vitali said, To have it read--I think this whole eradication of invasive plants is still an open subject between you, Erin, Mike Klein and Erik Krueger. We want you to do some work on eradication/cleanup of the bases, but we don't want to impair the quality of the water Wallingford has, and we want to try to

satisfy everybody's concerns. I think could be an open condition of approval that says you, Erin, and the Water Department should work to come up with the best possible plan.

Mr. Cody, I agree. I think Erin has taken that step in the last condition in her memorandum today: "That we would together come up with an Invasive Species Management Plan and that the Water Division would have a role in the review and approval of any plan and in the use of any chemicals." So I think that is a better condition to replace #7 on p. 9.

Chair Vitali said, We seldom leave an open Condition. Usually, it's cast in concrete. But I'm having faith because this Applicant has done so much working with the Town and all departments that you will honor it. So that's #3. Do you have a #4?

Mr. Cody said, The last one is minor. At the end of the 4/1 memo there's an attachment which speaks to the role of the Independent Site S&E Control Plan Implementation Monitor. I'd point out in #6 under Scope of Work, there's a reference to "Storm Event" defined as a precipitation event of over 1/4" inch of rain as per the DEEP General Stormwater Permitting requirement. I believe that general permit references not 1/4" but .5 inch, 1/2" of rain (Section 5b.4b.1). So I think the current Stormwater permit has "1/2", not "1/4".

Chair Vitali said, O.K. You'll agree to whatever the DEEP General Stormwater Permit Requirement is.

Mr. Cody said, Yes, we will. That's the end of my comments.

Chair Vitali said, in Erin's memo of 4/1, Conditions of Approval start on p. 5 and go through to p.12, and you're in agreement with all of them?

Mr. Cody said, Yes, we agree.

Chair Vitali asked, Bonding? Mr. Cotter was assigned to look at bonding.

Mr. Cotter said, I had asked BL to come up with quantities and estimates for the E&S bond, and I think we should review. It was to be \$1.375 million, which they're prepared to bond for all the Erosion and Sedimentation work in four phases of the project. My comment would be that this bond covers all E&S work in all four phases. They should not be proposing two bonds for the same work, in my estimation.

Chair Vitali said, I think this total situation bond I think Erin O'Hare was to with Planning and Zoning on bonds and coverages.

Commissioner Kern asked, Does this \$1.3 million bond last through construction to post-construction?

Ms. O'Hare said, IWWC permit terms are five years. We're open to partial release o bonds after phases as usual.

Commissioner Kern said, I don't want to hold them hostage for \$1.3 million if they're done with S&E. Who's going to be releasing the monies in phases?

Ms. O'Hare said, I think it should be the Site Monitor's scope of work. On smaller application permits, I go out and inspect based on their letter request—but it would not be me here.

Chair Vitali asked, Is this bond strictly for Wetlands?

Commissioner Kern asked, Is it for everything or just S&E?

Mr. Cotter clarified, Just S&E in Phases I, II and Phase III. If the demolition phase is done and reviewed, it's done. It's actually in four phases because there's a Demolition Phase when they start the site. If you get to the final phase, some of the earlier E&S you might want to retain if there's more work in that final phase. But I think E&S is covered by the \$1.37 million.

Ms. O'Hare said, I think that it would be a good condition to add another work item for the Independent Site Monitor to give the recommendation that this phase is complete and he would recommend that this phase is complete and he would ask for partial release to the IWWC.

Mr. Cody, The Applicant would agree with that.

Chair Vitali asked, Ms. O'Hare, so you would have to agree with the Monitor?

Ms. O'Hare said, Yes. It should be worded that one of the Site Monitor's tasks is to look at the status and recommend partial bond release with approval of the Town—if the Water Division is agreeable on that. Do you agree with that, Mr. Cody?

Mr. Cody said, We do.

Chair Vitali said, So they agree to the bond covering all the S&E work.

Ms. O'Hare said, It's an E&S bond. Then to name the conservation easement areas.

Chair Vitali said, As mentioned by Matt Sanford, one would be along Wetland 1A and one along the east side of 1B, as long as they are provided not for public use but strictly for wetland protection.

Ms. O'Hare said, And on p. 9 of my EPR of today, in the first bullet on that page I'd cross out the last sentence in my Condition #3, which refers back to the previous EPR that went out on April 1 (even though I had marked it April 2). But it was at #3 "Conditions to Be Met on the Site Before Any Alteration Occurs" on p. 6 and onto p. 7 of that EPR, at the second bullet regarding "Implementation Monitor", I want to cross out that last sentence on "Terms of the Monitor" in Condition #3. The Law Department asked me to cross out that last sentence.

Chair Vitali said, O.K.

Ms. Koepfer said, To add one more thing about escrow: to remove road sediment in the wells close to the Muddy River. That man's sodium and magnesium or calcium levels went up. If the levels went up, how could the water quality be remediated? I think those levels could be associated with the closing of Bristol-Myers. And the increase in parking spaces and increased treatment with salt? I trust that the Water Division will monitor it.

Chair Vitali said, I'd ask, Where did the increased chemicals come from? That would have to be adjusted from there. A person's well water could come from farther away rather than 100 feet away. The Town drinking water, they monitor it and keep chemicals at bay. The Water Department and Planning and Zoning won't let chemicals for pools to be stored in drinking watershed areas.

Ms. O'Hare said, In the Zoning Regulations sodium chloride use is prohibited and the use of de-icing in the watershed. How do you find what they're using in five years?

Chair Vitali said, It's their request and regulations. The Water Division is going to be monitoring it.

Mr. Bill Stuckey said, There were 750 parking spaces proposed. It's a lot of vehicles coming back to that facility, taking whatever chemicals while they drove and chemicals back to that parking lot.

Mr. Cody said, Do we calculate runoff from the drains?

Chair Vitali said, I am not going to count that volume as Significant Activity.

Ms. O'Hare said, I'd remind everyone, the Applicant's team and the Commission, that Condition #1 in my EPR of April 1st is a catch-all. It folds in all the recommendations, the Peer Reviews, my recommendations in reports up to today and all that came in this week, that the Applicant has agreed to from mine and the Peer Reviewers. So I hope we don't have to call out every change that was requested and agreed to by the Applicant. They are going to honor all of them—that they all go into Condition #1?

Mr. Cody said, Yes. Chairman, we tried to pull together with the little notes, put them on these two sheets, that get back into the revised final plans to be submitted within 60 days of approval, and that (final set) becomes the set of record.

Chair Vitali said, I think if something comes up tomorrow that you haven't seen, that goes into it, too. But we eliminated four conditions tonight. Does that go into your catch-all #1, to take care of all the things that aren't in the plan tonight? Does the catch-all take care of all these things coming in and not what we're eliminating?

Ms. O'Hare said, We tailored them. The catch-all takes care of everything, but we still need to keep the rest of the conditions below it including the new #11.

Chair Vitali said, You're going to keep all the conditions. Everybody's in agreement to that?

Ms. O'Hare said, Yes.

Chair Vitali asked, You're in agreement to that, Mr. Cody?

Mr. Cody, Yes, we are.

Chair Vitali asked for any other questions from the Commission. Seeing none, I don't need a vote on Significant Activity because we already determined this was a Significant Activity before, right Erin?

Ms. O'Hare said, Right.

Chair Vitali asked, Are there any other questions from the Commission? None. And now I'm going to close the public hearing before a vote?

Attorney Cody said, Right.

Chair Vitali said, I am now going to close the public hearing at 9:53 p.m.

E. CONSIDERATION OF PUBLIC HEARING ITEM

1. Significant Impact #A20-10.3 / 5 Research Parkway / Muddy River – Montante Construction, LLC – (industrial development)

Chair Vitali said, If the Commission would make a Motion, we can act on this application now.

Commissioner Kern said, I'd want to clarify that this public hearing has had some conditions that could be added on tomorrow. I don't think that's fair to the Applicant. I think we should have a shutoff point. You're leaving an open end for conditions.

Chair Vitali said, The Applicant is agreeing to that, right, Mr. Cody?

Mr. Cody said, If it's somewhere in the written documents that's all right. But if it's something new—

Chair Vitali said, On Erin O'Hare's April 1 Conditions of Approval, in Condition #1, I read it that it allows things that were discussed tonight, that you brought to the table today, and things in the future will be included in the final conditions. Is that correct?

Mr. Cody said, I'm not sure what you mean by "things in the future." The idea was that it could take a day or two to assemble what was discussed tonight.

Chair Vitali said, And if it's something that wasn't discussed tonight?

Mr. Cody said, If it's somewhere in the written documents that we discussed and agreed to, then that's fair game. But something new, that is not being voted on tonight?

Chair Vitali said, I don't disagree with you on that. I'm rereading. O.K. I think you're covered because it satisfies tonight's meeting. I think we're in agreement to that.

Commissioner Kern said, I was uncomfortable with long-term add-ons.

Chair Vitali said, I agree with you, Nick. I'll ask for a Motion that should simply say, "to approve the Conditions that Erin has written in her memos of April 1st and April 7th."

Ms. O'Hare added, And "As modified tonight." We made a lot a lot of little changes tonight.

MR. KERN: MOTION THAT SIGNIFICANT IMPACT APPLICATION #A20-10.3 / 5 RESEARCH PARKWAY / MUDDY RIVER – MONTANTE CONSTRUCTION, LLC – (INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT) BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED WITH ERIN O'HARE'S COMMENTS OF APRIL 1 AND APRIL 7, 2021, AND THE MODIFICATIONS DONE TONIGHT.

MS. PHILLIPS: SECOND

VOTE: MS. PASSARETTI – YES; MS. MCKEEN – YES; MS. PHILLIPS – YES; MR. KERN – YES; CHAIR VITALI – YES.

Chair Vitali said, I appreciate the work of the Town of Wallingford staff, the Water Division, and the Town Engineer on this application.

Mr. Cody expressed his thanks to any omitted Town staff and to the Peer Reviewers.

Chair Vitali said, I know you have Amazon people on board listening. I'd tell you that where the new parking is and where trailer trucks on Barnes Park go as a staging area, their trucks and trailers there throw garbage out the window. It's down beyond what's still there and it doesn't get looked at very often.

Mr. Michael Keleher from Amazon acknowledged Chair Vitali's remarks.

Chair Vitali noted to Mr. Cody that at Barnes Park it's the last building on the left. The property owner has been based there and cooperative, but he really has nothing to do with the garbage and paper that has been strewn about.

Chair Vitali proceeded to Agenda item L. Violations.

L. VIOLATIONS

- 1. Notice of Violation – 1245 Old Colony Road & Quinnipiac River – Jerzy Pytel – (unpermitted clearing & filling near river)**
- 2. Notice of Violation – 950 South Colony Road – 1NRSJ, LLC – carwash facility – (filling)**
- 3. #A20-2.1 / 12 & 16 Northfield Road – (over-clearing in floodplain wetlands & URA issue)**

- 4. Notice of Violation – 11 Trumbull Drive – Jill Kobrin – (unpermitted grading, deposition, and structures within URA, rerouting of flows & alteration of drainageway/stream on Town land)**

Ms. O'Hare referred to the supporting documents for this Violation Item #4, 11 Trumbull Drive, which had been posted on the Town website. She clarified that her "April 2" memo date was a typo; it was actually written on April 1. Ms. O'Hare explained briefly about this situation involving encroachment onto Town land. Then Ms. O'Hare asked the Commissioners to affirm the Notice of Violation that staff issued on this site. Affirming verbally on this matter were Commissioners Passaretti, Phillips, Kern, Simon and Chair Vitali. Chair Vitali indicated the Notice is Affirmed. Also, reference is made to Item H.2, New Application #A21-3.2 / 11 Trumbull Drive, which was received below. The owner/violator had been directed to file an application in the Notice.

These Items #1-3 (above) were not taken up. All will be carried forward to the May 5 Regular Meeting.

H. RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS

- 1. #A21-3.1 / 121 Quigley Road – Paul & Margot Kawecki – (installation of shed, drainageway, and fill & removal of one dead tree in upper URA) – approved administratively on 3/8/21**

Ms. O'Hare noted that this application was approved administratively.

Then Ms. O'Hare asked Chair Vitali and the Commissioners to receive the following New Applications #2 and #3 tonight, which they did.

- 2. #A21-3.2 / 11 Trumbull Drive – Jill Kobrin – ('after-the-fact' proposed drainage improvements, relocation of shed, play scape installation & regrading)**

See at Violations, L.4. above.

- 3. #A21-3.3 / 475 Williams Road – Scott & Sandy Cavallaro – (in-ground pool, patio & rain garden)**

4. Receipt of additional applications filed by close of day, April 6, 2021

Ms. O'Hare informed the Commission that two applications were filed and are to be received tonight. The Commission formally received these, as follows:

- Application at 119 Quigley Road for a shed.
- Application at 4A Research Parkway (combines the properties at 4A and 6 Research Parkway, as requested by the owner).

Note: All the remaining agenda items were not taken up tonight and may be on the May 5 Regular Meeting agenda:

F. OLD BUSINESS

G. NEW BUSINESS

I. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

J. BUDGET FY21-22

1. (Remote) Town Council Public Hearing for the public, April 12, 2021, 6:00 p.m. (noted)
2. (Remote) Town Council Public Hearing for Council, May 4, 2021, 6:30 p.m. (noted)

K. REPORTS & COMMUNICATIONS (Note: below includes some correspondence for March IWWC Meeting which was cancelled)

1. Discussion of proposal to adopt fines for violations
2. Farm Hill Road Detention Basin
3. DEEP Permit Application for the Use of Pesticides in State: pond, 719 Maltby Lane, owner Margo; applicator: Stahl Holdings, LLC dba The Pond and Lake Connection; received 2/8/21
4. SWCA Environmental Consultants re: Algonquin Gas Transmission, LLC re: 12-inch C-7 System Anomaly Investigation Project, on Oliver Creek Road within AGT R.O.W., dated 2/8/21; received 2/9/21.
5. TEC Associates re: 2021 Vegetation Management Plan for National Railroad Passenger Corporation (Amtrak); dated 1/25/21, received 2/9/21
6. DEEP Webinar notice, 'Avenza Maps' (GPS app.), Mar. 5, 10-11:30 a.m., received 2/11/21
7. TEC Associates re: 2021 Vegetation Management Plan for Providence & Worcester Railroad, dated 1/28/21, received 2/11/21
8. DEEP Permit Application for the Use of Pesticides in State: ponds, 180 Cheshire Road, owner: The Farms Country Club; applicator: Stahl Holdings, LLC dba The Pond and Lake Connection; received 2/16/21
9. DEEP Permit Application for the Use of Pesticides in State: Spring Lake – 6 Martin Trail, owner: "Spring Lake Association"; applicator: Stahl Holdings, LLC dba The Pond and Lake Connection; received 2/16/21
10. DEEP Permit Application for the Use of Pesticides in State: 181 Maltby Lane; owner: Levine; applicator: Stahl Holdings, LLC dba The Pond and Lake Connection; received 2/25/21
11. Eversource Energy notification of submittal to CT Siting Council – Sub-Petition 1293-CW-02 re: 1610 Transmission Line Replacement Project – upgrades to infrastructure within Eversource R.O.W. – access roads to impact wetlands, Church Street, Highland Ave., Chimney Hill Rd.
12. Eversource Energy letter to neighbors regarding notification of work on the "Colony to North Wallingford Upgrade project", dated Jan. 2021, received copy from Mayor's Office,

3/23/21

13. #A20-3.2 / 52, 58 & 88 Woodhouse Avenue – Sunwood Development Corp. – (apartment complex) – submittal re: permit conditions of approval regarding dewatering plan and handling of construction flows; received 3/25/21

M. ADJOURNMENT

MS. PHILLIPS: MOTION TO ADJOURN THE MEETING.

MR. SIMON: SECOND

VOTE: THE MOTION WAS APPROVED UNANIMOUSLY IN A VOICE VOTE.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:04 p.m.

N. NEXT SCHEDULED REGULAR MEETING: May 5, 2021

Respectfully submitted,

Kathleen L. Burns
Recording Secretary