

**New Hartford Inland Wetlands Commission
TOWN OF NEW HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
Wednesday, May 3, 2023 - 7:00 PM
Sessions Conference Room**

PRESENT: Chairman James Hall, Anne Hall, Steve Unger, Gerald Tabaka, Wayne Ryznar, Charles Blow, Wetlands Agent Mike Lucas, First Selectman Dan Jerram

ABSENT: Ira Kline

Chairman James Hall called the meeting to order at 7:00PM.

1. NEW APPLICATIONS:

A. Kara & Christopher Oneglia /Owner – Map 006 – Block 003 – Lot 5-2 – 296 Ramstein Road – Proposed 60'x80' Barn & Pumped Septic System. Wayne Zirolli and Dave Petroccia present a new proposal revised from an earlier application that had been denied by the commission. Revisions include moving the building completely out of the wetlands closer to the existing driveway, rotating the building 90 degrees and moving a bit more southerly and a bit more behind the house so now it's exactly 40' off the garage and 15' into the existing driveway. There is a small buffer from the proposed northeast corner 5' off wetlands flagging line but within the upland review area. With these changes made to the location, had to move roof drains, proposed septic system and propane tanks. The entire building is now outside the wetlands. Mr. Petroccia voices agreement. Mr. Hall reminds the commission that this is viewed as a new application, but as it's a different situation considering the previous application, need to decide on how to handle it. Typically, normal action would be accept and act on it at the following meeting, accept and request the enforcement officer make a determination, or accept and act on it this meeting. Mr. Blow says they certainly could accept it. Ms. Hall says it would be appropriate to accept it for action at the next meeting, elaborating that it is in the upland review area. Mr. Hall and Mr. Ryznar agree.

MOTION: Made by Mr. Ryznar to accept the application and set it for consideration at the next meeting, second by Ms. Hall: all approve.

2. PENDING APPLICATIONS:

A. Ed and Catherine McCann/ Owner – Map 04A – Block 112 – Lot 11 / 608A West Hill Road. Tear down and rebuild single family home / new septic system. Tom Grimaudi, project engineer, representing the owners this evening speaks to the specifics of the project. Owners have a parcel and existing home noting location of existing driveway, home and septic system. States that the septic and leeching system will be replaced as it would be hard to do once the new house is built as access would be limited. The existing septic is 63' from the lake. Mr. Grimaudi details the demolition plan including silt fences and what will be removed. Also shows the location of a temporary access drive to be used during construction only. On the site layout plan it shows that they will shift about a foot and a half back to meet current set back requirements. The new proposed septic system is a new proprietary mantis system, and being a non-compliant repair, means it requires a sand-filter system which has to extend 25' downslope to allow for treatment. This proposed system is 112' from the lake, so will be

over 40- to almost 50' farther away. Ms. Hall asks to clarify if that means the sand as well or just the system, to which Mr. Grimaudi replies he is referring to just the system. Proposed dwelling is now 23.5' away from wetlands on the high side, about 35' from the low side to the proposed patio, and maintained 7.5' and 14.8' on the other sides. For grading, with the new septic system taken into consideration, elected to add bolder retaining walls to maintain buffer so the area behind would be left undisturbed. Also have a proposed rain garden, sized to store and treat the water quality volume for all the impervious that is proposed on site. Around water garden would be native wetland plants that have been used around the lake previously. Also notes the erosion and sediment control plan to detail the silt fence and hay bales, with the future rain garden to serve as a temporary sediment trap during construction. Highlights the erosion and sediment control measures to be placed during construction. Due to the disturbance area being small, elected to use erosion control blankets on everything. Mr. Grimaudi states that his concern using other methods could end with issues if heavy rainstorms were to occur, while the blankets would continue to keep everything in place. Provided options if dewatering is ever required during construction in the event of heavy rains. Also mentions there is a maintenance plan for these areas to ensure they remain effective. Mr. Ryznar clarifies the location of the new septic system in relation to the old to confirm that the new one is farther from the lake.

MOTION: Made to approve the application by Mr. Unger, second by Mr. Blow: all approve.

3. PUBLIC HEARINGS:

A. New Hartford Village, LLC / Tim Bobroske / Applicant – Owner: New Hartford Market Place – Map 044 – Block 013 – Lot 020 / 173C Main Street. Development of 291 rental residential dwelling units, garages, a community center, a landscape / nursery facility, maintenance facility, and barn.

Mr. Hall reminds the community and commissioners that it is only the wetlands aspects that should be commented on this evening as tempting as it would be to comment on others.

Mr. Clint Webb, the environmental consultant for the project, opens the hearing discussing the previously requested testing before, during, and after completion of the project. Due to being a large site, the flow path of how the water travels long distances before reaching the Farmington River, which the goal is to make the conditions even better than they are currently. Notes the current paths that have been observed. The wetland area of most concern is where they would be building the road and access, which was historically farmland, so the soil has just been tilled numerous times. Have identified 3 offsite areas they would like to sample before the water goes under Route 44, but after the project and wetlands. Mr. Webb details the locations of each testing site selected, and that any that are on adjacent properties, permission was received from the land owners. Ms. Hall confirms that it means the maintenance of the inlet and outlet can be addressed, Mr. Webb confirms this is the case. Testing is being done now, intention is to get enough testing in to have a baseline to compare to. Ms. Hall believes his plan is reasonable for the testing, but asks what the plan is going forward as in how frequently would retesting occur. Mr. Webb states after every major storm of ½" or greater rain, and seasonally, but not sure about winter as everything is clearly cold then. Mr. Hall reminds the commission that they are looking for what the conditions are, and what changes occur, but don't believe the commission is looking for improvement. If it does, wonderful, but not a requirement. Ms. Hall states the concern from the previous meeting was the need for continuous frequent testing during construction so if something goes seriously wrong with erosion control or anything, they can address it as soon as possible. Mr. Webb states that he will get into more thorough testing once a permit is issued in late May or early June perhaps, when weather becomes more normal to give an early summer baseline. In summer, expects the offsite one to be anywhere from 15-25 degrees warmer. Mr. Ryznar requests that when he (Mr. Webb) does put this in writing, he could put the basic components of this water testing that will be

done, the frequency through the phases, and also list an acceptable limit of changes for each of the components. Mr. Webb states that the data sheet will be brief and concise so that whoever is doing the testing will know exactly what to do. On the backside/second page of that sheet will be the testing results and a chart to compare. Mr. Bobroske points out that Mr. Webb was referring to sheet flow and now will be talking about the storm water management plan.

Wayne Zirolli (Consulting Engineer for Mr. Bobroske) speaks on the storm water management plan, and that in order to manage the storm water from the whole project they had to come up with one or two small detention basins and goal is to store any water that comes off the site, including roof drains, and meter that out at redevelopment conditions. Over the whole site there are numerous systems for every set of buildings to be able to store all the water. All the water gets infiltrated into the ground.

Hydrologists have designed the systems to accept the water off the roofs, roads and driveways and be able to store it in the groundwater chambers and meter it out at predevelopment conditions and also have some of the exfiltration be able to recharge into the earth meet the ground water quality volume as required by code. Questions from previous meetings, clarification is asked to what happens to the drainage in the large wetlands area, also what further detail has been provided on how during and after construction possible erosion would be dealt with.

Todd Clark (Consulting Surveyor/Engineer for Mr. Bobroske) has detailed, especially in the first section of the plan, how to deal with conditions as development begins and then moves into the actual construction phase to protect the site from any erosion and having proper sediment and erosion controls like silt fence, tracking pads, temporary sediment basins, stockpile areas, swales and berms. The plan also details maintenance as well as installation instructions for these measures. Expected to continue these measures until site is completely stabilized even after construction, which is likely to take a few years to complete. Another concern was long term effects of the proposed development on this site. Project is slated to be constructed in seven phases now, with each phase being relatively complete before beginning work on the next phase. Disturbed areas will have established vegetation and landscape plantings, and existing trees and vegetation that do not need to be disturbed or moved. Ms. Hall requests clarification on this, and Mr. Zirolli responds that the area of expected construction disturbance is marked on the map provided they don't expect to touch it at all. Tim Bobroske states that they were able to get feedback from the independent engineer, and storm water management being very important to them (Mr. Bobroske's team), was they want to be sure the detention systems work. So, 45 test pits were monitored by Mr. Zirolli to do permeability tests to show exactly what is being presented will work. The town engineer still needs to review the results, but they are taking this very seriously to be sure the system works for this development. Mr. Zirolli states they've been out on the site over the past week taking samples from the test pits and running the tests currently and will compile a report for the commission and reviewing engineer to read through. They are also working to address the preliminary comments from the reviewing engineer, and that had been one of them and wanted to know about permeability testing. That is important because it tells you about the rate at which water can percolate through the soil, how far it travels, how much the system can accept for that exfiltration/infiltration. Ms. Hall requests an explanation on how the system works as he pointed out it's a new system. Mr. Zirolli states a conventional system is the drainage collected from the road that travels through the road piping out into the detention basin in a culvert. Depending on how much rain falls, the water will rise in the basin, and each basin is designed to hold the required amount without overtopping. So, with each detention basin, have an outlet structure that looks like a catch basin, and has a couple openings to be able to meter out that water at a predevelopment rate, with an emergency overflow if you ever had more extreme storms. Mr. Bobroske adds to the record that they are implementing this new system in the Town of Wolcott where it can be seen how it is structured. Ms. Hall questions how this is a new system then, and Mr. Zirolli responds that the difference is that they are now they can be either concrete or plastic chambers that are placed underground instead of an open

detention basin and will be quite large storage chambers and are so large because of the amount of water from the whole project that will be stored. All that will be seen from the surface is the lawn. Mr. Hall reminds the commission that this is very like the system that the commission recently approved for under the Waring building parking lot. Mr. Zirolli continues on saying that it will have inspection ports, and has a hydro-dynamic separator to remove sediment to avoid it entering the chamber making it difficult to clean. If sediment makes it past that, there are other ports that allow access to vacuum out any sediment that has made it through. Expect this to be checked on a regular schedule, at least once a year, but depending on the recommendation of the reviewing engineers, designing engineers and the commission. That water stored in that unit must go out to daylight, and a portion of that water would infiltrate the ground to recharge. Ms. Hall voices that she does believe that she has heard the system installed at Waring does work quite well, Mr. Lucas states he believes it has been in operation since 2019. Mr. Zirolli states that there are figures out there, estimating that the system could last up to 100 years with the proper maintenance. Mr. Tabaka questions the length of the underground portion to which Mr. Zirolli says it varies, with some being over 100' long. Mr. Bobroske points out that every system is designed specifically for that area based on what the engineers come up with. Mr. Zirolli says the length is determined by the volume of water to be dealt with. Ms. Hall questions which storm event is this designed for, and Mr. Zirolli states 2, 5, 10, 50 and 100 year storms that this system has to be designed for. There is a whole hydrology report of 100 pages for review, so compartmentalized phasing in construction will aid in keeping property disturbance to a minimum while also helping to maintain the integrity of the area. Of course, a project of this magnitude will require dedicated attention to detail throughout the duration of the project and beyond. Mr. Zirolli states that he and Mr. Clark will possibly even be participating in the periodic inspections themselves. Mr. Bobroske reminds the commission that he is the agent on record claiming responsibility, putting up the bond and his construction company doing the work. Mr. Zirolli says it is the diligence of the developer and the eventual maintenance team to take proper care of the site during construction and will be an important component to ensure the proper assimilation of this whole project into the existing environment. A site monitor for the project will also be an important component of the overall construction stages to protect the environment. Oversight of the town land use commission will also be expected to monitor and let the project team know of any issues noted.

Todd Clark, of Clark Land Surveying in Bristol, CT mentions that the system will be compartmentalized into various sized systems throughout the development as it is built out. Larger ones are for the roads, and smaller ones for each rooftop is going to drain directly underground. Ms. Hall questions, in terms of sequence, when will each of these be going in, and Mr. Clark states with each unit that goes in as the earth is being moved anyway. Ms. Hall states her concern was that with things done in stages that the systems were put in place in the beginning, so these going in early alleviates that concern. Mr. Clark continues saying that each of the construction entrances is fully protected by the temporary siltation basins and throughout the site. One spot where this wasn't possible, so a water diversion bar with catch points that will be cleaned after every storm will be in place instead. Anywhere near wetlands there will be silt fence and hay bales in place. Most units are set up to walk out to grade. Adding extra parking, which had been a concern of the Planning and Zoning Commission, the green line on the maps indicate the amount of space left to open space. When the project was initially introduced, Mr. Bobroske wanted to enter via the traffic lights for safety, but realized that they would have to do a 50' road, it put the wetland crossing at an unacceptable level for them, so looked for alternatives to that. Result was to use the entrance by Dollar General and the warehouse, though the abutters were given 50' easements for their storm water management, fire tank and such so didn't leave enough room to put a 50' road in. As a result left with two 26' roads so they could start their boulevard. Road is no more than a 6% grade. Mr. Clark mentions that the P&Z commission had been concerned about walking paths, and they have found a space from the barn area for about a ½ mile. Mr. Webb comments that they have the ability to

direct the sheet flow everywhere where it goes today, except for the roadway. So will bleed it off, minimize the amount you get down a long stretch of road as well as the velocity at which it flows. Mr. Hall asks if the commission members or the general public have any questions. Shelley Lloyd of Pioneer Dr. compliments the back and forth that the applicants and commission have been having to learn and make adjustments as needed. Polly Pobuda of Church St comments that she is very enthused about the project and thinks the applicants have done wonderfully trying to meet all the regulations as required. Comments that the public sewer being added will be an asset, preventing any sewer run-off getting into the wetlands. Ken Krohner, owner of an abutting property, has a well near the wetlands that supplies the restaurant, to which Mr. Hall asks if monitoring the well level could be done. Mr. Bobroske asks Mr. Krohner if he would allow Mr. Webb to monitor, to which he agrees. Mr. Hall states that they do need to leave the hearing open as they are looking to receive a couple additional documents, including the report from the reviewing engineers, as well as Mr. Clark or Mr. Webb may possibly change a few small things. He does believe that at the next meeting they should plan to close and take action. Mr. Ryznar voices his agreement, stating that it gives more time to get some test results for review.

MOTION: Made to continue to the next meeting on June 7th by Mr. Ryznar, second by Ms. Hall: all approve.

4. MEETING MINUTES: April 4, 2023: Motion made by Ms. Hall to approve, Second by Mr. Blow, all approve.

5. INLAND WETLANDS OFFICER'S ENFORCEMENT REPORT: None

7. COORESPONDENCE: None

MOTION: Made by Ms. Hall to adjourn, Second by Mr. Hall, all approve. Meeting adjourned at 8:39pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Chris Rhoades