THE INLAND WETLANDS COMMISSION OF THE TOWN OF AVON HELD A MEETING ON TUESDAY, DECEMBER 4, 2018.

Present were Clifford Thier, Chair; Michael Beauchamp, Vice-Chair; and Commissioners

Bob Breckinridge, Michael Feldman, Martha Dean and Dean Applefield. Absent was Commissioner Jed Usich. Also present was John McCahill, Planning and Community Development Specialist/Wetlands Agent.

Mr. Thier called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

**NEW APPLICATION**

**APPL. #757 -** James and Carla Bridgewater, owners/applicants: Request activities within the wetlands/watercourse and within the 100-foot upland review area: 1) construction of a single-family dwelling, related grading, driveway, septic system and pump chamber, and installation of utilities (in regulated setbacks); 2) installation of a sewer force (temporary disturbance in wetlands/watercourse); and 3) installation of septic system and related grading (in regulated setbacks). Location: 159 New Road, Parcel 3280159.

Present were Brian Cunningham, PE, Robert Green Surveying Associates; and James McManus, Certified Soil Scientist, JMW Wetland Consulting Services LLC; and James and Carla Bridgewater, owners.

Mr. Cunningham displayed a map of the site explaining that the proposal is to build a house on the 1.3 acre parcel. An intermittent watercourse runs through the site and the associated wetlands have been mapped by the soil scientist and shown on the survey map. The house location is proposed near the front part of the site, near the road, and they will use a pump chamber to pump the sewage to the leaching fields located in the back corner of the site. There is minor sloping to the rear of the site (affecting drainage) which comes to within 10 feet of the closest part of the wetlands.

In response to Mr. Thier’s question, Mr. Cunningham pointed out the wetlands on the site explaining that there are three (3) wetland areas and an intermittent watercourse that meanders through the site. There is a small wetland area that continues off the property to the south (back corner) that is located about 50 feet from the proposed grading associated with the reserve area for the septic system.

In response to Mr. Applefield’s question, Mr. Cunningham confirmed that the wetland delineation lines on the map are the actual wetlands and pointed out on the map the location of the 100-foot review line, noting that it is way up by the driveway. He confirmed that all proposed activity would be within the upland review area.

In response to Mr. Feldman’s questions, Mr. Cunningham explained that the Farmington River is located approximately a couple of hundred feet to the west of the site, noting that he doesn’t have that level of detail on the map. He explained that he has been told that the intermittent stream/watercourse is not wet all the time, and that it picks up drainage from across New Road which is coming from the higher ridges located above this property.

James Bridgewater, owner, stated that while he doesn’t know the exact distance he indicated that the Farmington River is quite a distance away from his property, adding that he has walked the area.

In response to Mr. Thier’s questions, Mr. Cunningham explained that there is an existing bridge on this property that is approximately 12 feet wide and 6 feet long and there is an 18-inch pipe located underneath the bridge. He added that the bridge is made of concrete (a photo has been included).

Mr. Cunningham addressed the proposed septic system explaining that the septic tank and pump chamber are located on the house side of the intermittent watercourse in between some of the flagged wetlands. There is about 10 feet on either side of the proposed septic tank to the wetlands noting that there is also a pump chamber and he stated that both would have water tight components. A two-inch pressure pipe is used from the chamber pump to the leach field. He explained that there would be a temporary impact to install the aforementioned pipe under the intermittent watercourse. Mr. Cunningham indicated that the Town has requested that the aforementioned two-inch pipe be sleeved with a larger pipe to make future maintenance easier, should a new pipe be needed at some point. He explained that his experience has been that these pipes are pretty solid and last for a long time. He noted that there is a wetland pocket that extends in the flatter area behind the house, near the garage, which is about 30 feet from the wetland. A column supporting the deck which is proposed off the back of the house is about 19 feet from the nearest wetland, which is a little tighter to the intermittent watercourse. He explained that a 21-foot variance was granted to permit the proposed house to be moved forward to get it away from the wetlands; a 40-foot front yard setback is proposed. Driveway access is proposed via the existing shared driveway with 161 New Road. Very little grading is proposed with the house construction.

In response to Mr. Cunningham’s question, Mr. McCahill confirmed that a site walk map was provided to the Commission but explained that he does not know if the Commission members went to the site, as that decision is left to their discretion.

Mr. Cunningham explained that for the most part the site is a big mowed grassy field on both sides of the intermittent watercourse, adding that there are a couple of trees on the south side of the brook. Not much grading would be needed but explained that sedimentation and erosion control measures would be installed.

In response to Mr. Beauchamp’s questions/comments, Mr. Cunningham confirmed that the lot slopes away from the road to the Brook and then it slopes across the lot rather than straight back. Mr. Beauchamp noted that he drove by the lot and noticed that it looks like it slopes back towards the Town of Burlington and the Farmington River, then it drops down quite a bit. Mr. Cunningham stated that he is showing that the property to the rear is owned by the State of CT. He also confirmed that the land in the location of the proposed house slopes gradually downward towards the intermittent watercourse. The driveway is pretty flat at 2%. He explained that it would be tough to find another location to build the house because the wetland limits go away from the watercourse and get closer to the road, and the lot is narrow in the rear; the area chosen is the largest contiguous area on the site and the best place for a house.

In response to Mr. Feldman’s question, Mr. Cunningham explained that he has not seen any evidence of this area being prone to flooding, noting that there is quite a grade change (20 feet or so) from the Brook to the road. He added that he did not see anything on the FEMA maps.

James McManus explained that he delineated the wetlands on the site in April 2018. There is an intermittent watercourse north of the aforementioned (farm) bridge. He noted that the area is more of a shrub and forested wetland, with some areas of low wet meadow.

In response to Mr. Thier’s question, Mr. McManus explained that he delineated the wetlands by using a soil auger and spade, probing the soil, looking for two (2) Chroma colors within 20 inches, meaning that we’re looking for gray colors within 20 inches. He further explained that if this two (2) Chroma color condition is found, coupled with wetland plants and their landscape position, in the State of CT, it is a regulated wetland. The wetland soils on the site are very poorly drained.

Mr. McManus continued by explaining that the area south of the aforementioned bridge has similar conditions to that of the northern area (the forest component is more dominant than shrubs growth and mowed wet meadow). A small part of the offsite forested wetland extends a bit into the western part of this site, and that area is downgradient from the proposed septic system. Soils on site are till and the wetland soils which would fall into the Ridgebury/ Leicester mapping complex. The soils are mostly Leicester on the site but it is mapped as a complex soil because early mappers did it. There’s really no difference, other than drainage class, but when you look at development/land use they map them all together. It’s a regulated area and he further explained that he broke it out because there are different drainage classes. Functionality was also looked at; the area has been an agricultural use and it has been disturbed, including the intermittent watercourse which has been man-made or enhanced with large rocks and boulders which are lining the banks. Mr. McManus indicated that the main function here is nutrient removal with the principal function happening near the “B” series. He explained that as you head south the wetland function increases; and as you get closer to the Farmington River there are some critical habitat endangered species that are not on site but are close. He noted that there will be a temporary impact from the piping going from the pump chamber to the septic system, adding that this activity is not deemed significant as it is temporary and hopefully the proposed erosion control measures will be ample enough to avoid any issues.

In response to Mr. Applefield’s question, Mr. McManus explained that the pipe will be trenched across the watercourse to extend from the septic system to the pump chamber. He reiterated that it is a temporary impact.

In response to Mr. Thier’s question, Mr. Cunningham explained that generally the pressure pipes are approximately 3 ½ feet deep; in this case the pipe would be located under the stream.

Mr. McManus continued by noting that the functions and values of the offsite wetland located to the south increase the further south you go. He explained that it is not a nutrient sensitive resource meaning that it can take excess nutrients and the plant community and soils are able to absorb excess nitrates and other things such that this is not an issue with regard to the septic system and location; there is over 210 feet between the proposed septic system and the intermittent watercourse. He noted that he doesn’t feel there is an issue with the septic area. He then addressed the CT DEEP’s NDDB Maps (Natural Diversity Data Base) explaining that a hatched area associated with the Farmington River is shown on the NDDB mapping but noted that it does not extend onto the subject site and that there are not any listed species or critical habitats associated with this project.

In response to Mr. Applefield’s question about which map shows the NDDB information,

Mr. McManus explained that due to a computer glitch the entire report was not provided to the Commission. He presented his copy of the map and discussed the area containing the NDDB information. He confirmed that the Commission will receive a copy of the entire report.

In response to Mr. Thier’s question, Mr. McManus explained that the map containing the NDDB information tells you where the natural database area is located; the subject site is outlined in black and it is close but not within it. He added that he would guess that the line down the middle of the Farmington River is the town line between Avon and Burlington.

In response to Mr. Beauchamp’s question, Mr. McManus referenced the map and explained that the area towards the rear of this property is not a road but rather is an old railroad bed which is now used as a walking and biking trail.

Mr. McManus concluded his presentation stating that no significant adverse impacts are anticipated with the proposed project, either from the regulated resources located on the site or from adjacent offsite resources.

In response to concerns by the Commission about missing pages/maps in the report, Mr. McManus confirmed that the Commission will be receiving a complete report. He apologized for the confusion due to the computer glitch.

Mr. Thier commented that the Commission does not know which report pages they are missing and asked if it makes sense to proceed since they would be getting a more complete presentation at the next meeting.

Mr. McManus explained that the presentation is not going to change noting that questions could be asked tonight. He reiterated that the full report will be provided to the Commission and explained that everything he presented tonight is in the report.

Ms. Dean commented that Mr. McManus indicated that the project does not anticipate any significant impacts and asked where in the report this can be found. Mr. McManus confirmed that that information is in the part of his report that the Commission does not have.

Mr. Thier commented that no vote would occur until the full report is received and therefore it makes sense to continue this item to the next meeting.

Mr. McCahill requested that the applicant review his comments with the Commission, should they need direction and input. Mr. Thier agreed.

In response to Mr. Breckinridge’s question, Mr. Cunningham explained that there is an existing house on the south side of the site and noted that the existing septic system and well are to be abandoned. He further explained that he has been in contact with the Farmington Valley Health District regarding the process to follow.

In response to Mr. Breckinridge’s questions, Carla Bridgewater (owner) confirmed that there is an old septic tank on the property, adding that it was pumped a couple of weeks ago and it will be abandoned (meaning it gets crushed and filled in). Ms. Bridgewater said that the septic tank is located next to the existing house.

Mr. Cunningham indicated that he does not have information relative to the location of the septic tank with him.

Mr. Breckinridge noted that he would like to see information confirming the location of the existing septic tank, adding that the Commission will require evidence that the area is filled in.

Mr. McCahill noted that the Farmington Valley Health District will oversee the appropriate disposal and filling of the septic tank area and also the abandonment of the onsite well, adding that the locations of these items should be provided to the Commission.

Mr. Thier asked that the resubmitted corrected report include the location of the existing house, as well as, clearly delineated upland review areas on the maps.

Mr. Cunningham explained that the upland review area is shown on the maps, adding that it is shown as a line along the driveway.

Mr. McCahill referenced an earlier conversation noting that the upland review area spans almost the entire property.

Mr. Cunningham explained that the only part of the site outside the 100-foot upland review area is the hammerhead part of the existing driveway.

Mr. Thier clarified that he wants to see how far various points on the site (such as the house) are located from the actual wetlands, not just from the upland review area.

Mr. McManus confirmed that the distances from the wetlands vary and confirmed that this information is already shown on the maps.

Mr. Cunningham noted that the distances from the wetlands are already available on the maps adding that the information could be made clearer if need be. He added that he could clearly show the distances from the corners of the house to the wetlands.

In response to Mr. Thier’s question, Mr. McCahill indicated that the distance from the wetlands to the proposed septic system and proposed house are shown in green on the site walk map.

In response to Mr. Feldman’s question about the margin of error on mapping wetlands, Mr. McManus explained that he likes to say it’s right on but added that there’s always a bit of a “zone” because we’re looking for the areas that fall into regulated wetlands and don’t fall out, and then we tie or hang ribbons, so there’s less than five (5) feet of error. Mr. Feldman commented that there is some estimating involved. Mr. McManus agreed that there is a little bit of estimating but explained that he’s doing this process every 35 feet or so; he added that he digs a lot of holes to ensure its right.

In response to Mr. Thier’s question, Mr. McManus explained that the number of holes dug depends on the complexity of the soils. He further explained that, on this site, he dug a couple of holes per flag to make sure, totaling maybe 100 holes.

In response to Mr. Applefield’s questions, Mr. Cunningham explained that the installation of utilities for this project is the proposed two-inch pipe from the septic tank and the pump out to the septic system. He further explained that the installation of a sewer force main is the same thing as the aforementioned two-inch pipe installation.

Mr. Applefield asked why those items are listed separately if they are the same thing.

Mr. McCahill indicated that the term installation of “utilities” encompasses the aforementioned pipe and sewer force main but also includes installation of a water line in front of the house.

Mr. Cunningham explained that a private water supply exists in the street and a connection is shown to the front of the house; it is located within the upland review area but on the east side of the house away from all the wetlands.

In response to Mr. Applefield’s question, Mr. Cunningham explained that installation of the water line would require a small excavator to dig a trench four to five feet deep to install a one-inch copper pipe from a special connection to the water main itself to the house to provide water service. The connection to the house is coming from the road and it is located within the upland review area.

In response to Mr. Thier’s question, Mr. Cunningham explained that the water main connection is shown on the map (northeast corner of the house) and marked as WS (water service).

Mr. Applefield referenced the installation of the septic system and related grading and asked if that means just the two (2) boxes shown near the house.

Mr. Cunningham responded by saying yes and no, explaining that there is very little grading because they are set below existing grade; there are just the covers for maintenance and for pumping. He further explained that most of the grading will take place to the rear of the property where the land has to be leveled out for the leaching field. He pointed out on the map that the septic tank and the pump chamber are two (2) different structures that will be placed underground and each has an access hole or two (2). The septic tank gets pumped out when the septic company comes in and runs a line to the back, usually every two (2) years. The next chamber includes a pump because the leach fields are set higher than the piping coming out of the house. They will have to pump the sewage from a chamber through the two-inch pipe which is to be installed under the Brook. The pressure line pushes it to a distribution box at the top side of the leach fields and then from there it flows by gravity into the leaching fields and into the ground and disperses. He explained that a reserve area has been shown, should the initial fields fail at some point. This helps the Health District know that there is room to put in another leach field to handle sewage from the property. Mr. Cunningham indicated that this is typical of any proposed septic system that you see.

Mr. Applefield asked if the only activity within the watercourse is the trenching underneath the stream.

Mr. Cunningham confirmed that that is correct.

Mr. Applefield referenced the activity description for App. #757 commenting that Item #1 talks about construction of the home, related grading, driveway, septic system, and pump chamber and asked if this is different somehow.

Mr. Cunningham explained that those items are located in the upland review area.

Mr. Applefield referenced Item #3 the installation of a septic system and related grading in regulated setbacks asking if this is somehow different from what’s in Item #1. He commented that he is just trying to understand the nature of the activities.

Mr. McCahill explained that Item #3 refers to the lower system adding that Item #1 describes all the activities north of the Brook, itself, related to the house and activities around the house.

Mr. Applefield said so it’s the pump chamber and the septic chamber.

Mr. McCahill said correct adding that Item #2 is a specific “call out” because it is activity in the wetlands and Item #3 is the installation of the septic system and related grading down below the brook in the far corner. He noted that the site walk map could be numbered if that would help.

Ms. Dean asked when the lot was created, how old the house is, and why aren’t you building on top of the existing footprint; she asked for background information.

Mr. McCahill indicated that the existing house was built in the 1940s and it is located very close to the property line, which is nonconforming at this time.

Ms. Dean said right but it could be built on, it is an alternative for a house site.

Mr. McCahill said it could be but it’s actually fairly close to the wetlands where it is currently located.

Ms. Dean commented that she’s just wondering what the options are.

Mr. Cunningham explained that the property was subdivided; there was a larger piece and that this piece was broken out from the larger piece.

Ms. Dean asked when the subdivision occurred.

Mr. Cunningham stated that he doesn’t recall what he read this afternoon and apologized. He noted that his client purchased the lot this spring (2018).

Carla Bridgewater, owner, noted that they were told that the family that owns 161 New Road, and the next one, owned all those lots and this was actually a barn that was converted into a house; it was once a barn for the people that live there now. She added that the two houses are very, very close to each other.

Ms. Dean asked when this was approved for a building lot.

Messrs. McCahill and Cunningham noted that they don’t have that information.

Mr. Applefield asked if the map could be revised to show the existing structure.

Mr. Cunningham noted that that was asked for earlier and pointed out that it is located about six (6) feet off the property line. He confirmed that the house location will be shown on the revised plans for January.

Ms. Dean asked when it was approved for the barn to be transformed into a house.

Mr. Cunningham said that he doesn’t have that information.

Mr. Beauchamp pointed out the existing house in the photos.

Mr. Cunningham said yes it’s the one right on the property line.

Mr. McManus explained that photo/picture #2 shows the existing house (also known as Figure 1). He added that photo/picture #4 shows a portion of it in the corner.

Ms. Dean said that it must have been approved at some point for a septic and a well or asked if it was just done.

Mr. Breckinridge said who knows.

Mr. Breckinridge referenced Photo #1 (watercourse) and commented that it looks like there has been quite a bit of overflow of that watercourse, especially on the left side of the photo/picture.

Mr. McManus said it’s just a bad picture/photo and there is dead vegetation in the photo.

Mr. Breckinridge asked if it ever really floods past the watercourse itself.

Mr. McManus acknowledged he doesn’t know that answer but added that there was no evidence in the soil that we have significant overflow. He added that it is intermittent and not that big.

Mr. Breckinridge commented that the watercourse in the diagram really fans out just above the bridge, as if it does flood out at the base.

Mr. McManus explained that that area is a wetland and we have a seep that is not due to the overflow of the wetland; there is groundwater seeping out of the ground that is discharging from the slope. He noted that this is not the same thing as the possible over flow of the watercourse.

Mr. Breckinridge asked how that could be known.

Mr. McManus explained that this is not associated with the River, this area is upgradient of the stream and this is a groundwater seep coming out of the soils. He commented that we see groundwater seeps all over the Town of Avon. This is not associated with the intermittent watercourse; it flows to it but this is a groundwater seep that has nothing to do with the intermittent watercourse.

Mr. Breckinridge noted that his point is he is wondering if that is being created periodically because of overflow from the brook.

Mr. McManus said no and it has everything to do with groundwater discharge.

Mr. Cunningham referenced the plans noting that the 570 contour runs up along the stream. He also pointed out the contours at 572, 574, and 576 noting that you don’t get six feet of water above the brook, adding his agreement with Mr. McManus that it’s just groundwater seepage.

Mr. Breckinridge said that he is going to take their word for it and asked if there are plans to remove the bridge.

Mr. Cunningham said the bridge will remain as it allows access to the back half of the property.

Mr. McManus noted that a better picture/photo of the bridge will be supplied with the revised report.

Mr. Breckinridge noted his understanding and gratitude for the information.

Ms. Dean asked if the report explains how the determination that the primary function of the wetlands is nutrient removal was arrived at, and asked what is meant by that.

Mr. McManus explained that the watercourse and adjacent wetlands have been altered or disturbed throughout the decades. The functionality and the values of the watercourse and the adjacent wetlands have been diminished. He noted that there are functions that are present but not principal; being principal means that’s what it really does. Nothing really happens here other than the conveyance of water through the watercourse. The wetland offsite definitely has a wooded swamp. He explained that he always describes wetlands as the liver and kidneys of the earth because they filter water before it gets to your rivers, lakes, ponds, and eventually to the ocean. Wetlands clean it up prior to when it discharges to a watercourse or eventually the ocean. That’s what wetlands do, they are “sinks” and they grab things and clean them up. He explained that, for instance, 25% of Connecticut is a wetland meaning 75% is an upland. All the water that comes off the uplands goes into the wetlands where all the nutrients get sucked up by plants, which goes into the soils and then it is filtered through; nitrogen is denitrified in wetlands. Mr. McManus explained that the offsite wetland mainly grabs nutrients and sediments.

Ms. Dean asked whether it was a habitat for anything or if it’s just cleaning up.

Mr. McManus explained that there is always some habitat value but it is pretty diminished. You can see from the pictures/photos that what you have is essentially a mowed hay field and a man-enhanced watercourse; offsite there is a nice wooded swamp.

Mr. Applefield commented that he cannot tell from the pictures/photos that it is a mowed hay field.

Mr. McManus said that you can’t tell that that is a mowed field.

Mr. Thier commented that it doesn’t matter and said that his free advice is if you’re getting feedback that something is not adequate to convey the information, please bolster it for the next presentation.

Mr. McManus noted his understanding adding that he recommends a site walk be scheduled because a lot would be learned and the information presented would make a lot more sense. It is difficult to talk about wetlands, flags and locations when it’s nine o’clock at night. It helps when we’re in the field.

Mr. Feldman asked what is meant by functions of wetlands.

Mr. McManus explained that wetlands have functions; they are not protected because they are wet they are protected because they provide functions. For example, the biggest function of the Farmington River is flood control. If you fill in the floodplain someone is going to be flooded out. There are other functions such as wildlife and nutrient removal and that is why we protect wetlands but, not all wetlands are created equal and that is why a functionality assessment is done.

Mr. Feldman asked which of the functions are present and missing.

Mr. McManus explained that the principal function is nutrient removal; there’s some that are present that are not principal like wildlife habitat and it has some aesthetic value because it is a watercourse. He noted that every time he has seen it, it’s been flowing but the USGS calls it an intermittent watercourse. He referenced that the revised report to be provided to the Commission contains a little table that tells you what is principal; and also what’s not there and what is there. The things that I said were there are groundwater discharge and recharge, seasonally anyway. Sediment toxic retention is not a principal function but it is there and does happen, to some degree, and there is some wildlife value, adding there is some visual quality and aesthetics. He explained that these are mainly the things in the onsite wetlands; noting that the offsite wetlands is different. We’re describing the onsite wetlands that could potentially be impacted from the proposed development. He concluded by explaining that he tried to address all this information in his report, which the Commission will see when they read the revised report to be provided.

Mr. Thier asked that the maps be made larger so that the letters (W and S) are readable and not missed. He asked that the maps be made large enough to be able to walk around with in the woods; the maps could be blown up by 50% more and highlighted.

Messrs. McManus and Cunningham noted their understanding and agreement.

Mr. Applefield asked if the abandonment of the existing septic system is a regulated activity.

Mr. McCahill commented that from his view it is not, adding that it is done quite often under the direction of the Farmington Valley Health District. Normally it entails crushing of the tank in place and then the area is filled in with sandy soils. The tank is cleaned out, emptied and drained beforehand.

Mr. Applefield asked what occurs to the actual tank when we have to dig to get to the tank.

Mr. McCahill explained that normally the tank gets pumped and the concrete that is there gets crushed and then the area is backfilled with clean sandy soils.

Mr. Applefield asked why this isn’t a regulated activity because it’s similar to grading.

Mr. McCahill noted that the aforementioned procedure is often done as a maintenance protocol, as well, which is typically permitted under the Regulations as maintenance.

Mr. Applefield said that he would not consider this maintenance of a system; this is cessation of the use of a system. It’s not being maintained, the use is being stopped.

Mr. McCahill commented that we don’t know how much of a system there is; there could be a metal drum buried in the ground.

Mr. Applefield said he doesn’t think so because the women just said it was pumped.

Mr. McCahill noted that we will need to get more information.

Mr. Cunningham explained that two different things are being discussed here. He explained that Carla Bridgewater (owner) was talking about the tank being pumped and Mr. McCahill is talking about the old days when they didn’t always use big pipe trenches for leach fields.

In response to Mr. Thier’s question, Mr. Cunningham confirmed that equipment will be brought in to crush the tank. Mr. Thier noted his understanding and referenced Mr. Applefield’s comments noting that it should be listed as a regulated activity.

Mr. Applefield commented that he doesn’t know if it’s a 55-gallon drum and whether it has been concluded that the use of the existing system is not feasible. He asked why they would propose to pump material all the way to the backside if there is an existing system nearby that can be used.

Carla Bridgewater explained that she is pretty sure that the Farmington Valley Health District has already deemed the existing system as a failed system.

Mr. Thier commented that that may be true but noted that the Commission must still decide on all regulated activities.

Mr. Applefield commented that he doesn’t have any information in front of him that indicates the system is failed and cannot be repaired. You are asking for authorization to dig under a stream and pump to another side and this activity might not be feasible from an engineering standpoint. He noted that he would be interested to understand if this is not a feasible alternative and also why it is not feasible. This would eliminate having to dig a trench under the watercourse.

Jim Bridgewater, owner, explained that the septic system that is sitting there would be located under the foundation of the proposed house; it is right behind the house. He further explained that he submitted the application for demolition through Farmington Valley Health District (FVHD) and it is a regulated operation, who sent it into the State of CT with all the appropriate paperwork. He noted that is why the system was pumped and added that he has talked with the FVHD about the tank being crushed when the house is demolished. A certified letter was obtained from Suburban Sanitation regarding the septic system; it was deemed not usable.

In response to Mr. Applefield’s question, Mr. Bridgewater explained that the proposal is to remove the existing house, as it is about ready to fall down; all applications have been applied for.

Mr. Applefield commented that he doesn’t know what the nature of that activity is and whether it would be a separate regulated activity. He commented that you may want to consider whether the demolition of the house, clearly located in the upland review area, should be included as one of the regulated activities being conducted.

Mr. Thier commented that when you come back, instead of three (3) regulated activities we are up to five (5).

Mr. Cunningham said fair enough.

Ms. Dean asked that when we get the reports back that you make an extra effort to say with more precision what it is you’re talking about. We got an answer today about the pipe that will go under the intermittent watercourse is a pipe that lasts for a good long time but just how long we do not know. You’re coming from Newtown, and it’s probably the same, but you’re before a wetlands commission that struggles with a foot of driveway going into an upland review area and here you’re asking to put a whole house, a pipe, and a septic system right in the upland review area and under the wetlands. We typically see a lot more details and information that would anticipate the kinds of questions we would have and a lot of support for opinions that you might be drawing.

Mr. McManus noted his understanding and again apologized for not having his six-page report, adding that it contains many of the answers, or at least addresses the questions being asked.

Ms. Dean said, ok but I don’t know that and wanted information about the tanks and information about their failure rates, how long they last. Piping typically lasts seven (7) to eight (8) years and tanks might last 30 years but if the piping and connections are a problem you’re right in a wetland or right next to a wetland. We’re going to have those kinds of questions, so if they’re not in your report they need to be.

Mr. Cunningham explained that he had received the comments from Mr. McCahill, that are addressed to the Commission. This all started when I was going to explain how we’re going to address those comments; a lot of what we’re talking about are contained in his comments. He confirmed that a set of updated plans will be submitted in a week and a half or two weeks, in time for the January meeting.

Mr. Thier asked for the updated plans as soon as possible such that the Commission has a pre-snow opportunity to do a site walk.

Mr. Cunningham noted his understanding. He referenced Mr. McCahill’s comments noting that there were questions on the septic system and comments about conservation restrictions and permanent demarcation features for some of the wetland areas. He suggested that they meet with Mr. McCahill to review the best way to address these items on the plans. He noted more items such as a specific sequence of construction and a cross-section details of the forced main.

Mr. Their commented that he thinks what Ms. Dean was getting at is if the forced main were to fail, we would get sewage not just local on the property but it’s going to do downstream. He noted that the pipe is our concern and that’s why we need more information as to why the pipe is not a 10-year or even a 20-year pipe. It’s got to be really sturdy because the potential there is horrible.

Mr. Cunningham noted his understanding, reiterating that he will get more information.

Mr. Thier said we need information on the fittings also, because it if fails somewhere under dirt, the dirt will clean it up but, if it fails there the sewage will go downstream to other property.

Mr. Cunningham explained that the proposed pipe comes in a coil and there are not joints; it goes from the pump chamber up to the area of the wetlands.

Mr. Their said that you should give us the reasons why the proposed pipe was chosen, such as minimum lifetime and failure rate.

Mr. Beauchamp said that if the power goes out nothing is being pumped and therefore the tank would fill with sewage and overflow, correct.

Mr. Bridgewater, owner, noted that his house plans propose a standby generator to address that specific issue.

In response to Ms. Dean’s question, Mr. McCahill noted that public sewer is not available.

Mr. Applefield said that he is interested to hear more about how the construction underneath the watercourse is going to occur and what measures are going to be taken.

Mr. Cunningham explained that there are procedures and State DEEP guidelines for construction activities in a watercourse.

Mr. Applefield addressed Mr. McManus noting that his comments suggest that there are some potential offsite impacts to wetlands but, no impacts to wetlands on the site. He asked if there are potential impacts to offsite wetland areas.

Mr. McManus referenced his earlier comments and stated, for the record, that he doesn’t anticipate any impacts to any onsite or offsite wetland areas.

There was no further discussion on App. #757 and was tabled to the next meeting.

**OTHER BUSINESS**

Mr. McCahill provided a hand out to each Commissioner, at the request of the author, Paul Kramer. The document entitled *“The Timeless Soul of a Town”* provides “historical perspective” relative to Nod Road.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:**

Mr. Beauchamp motioned to approve the minutes of the October 2, 2018, meeting, as submitted. The motion seconded by Mr. Breckinridge, received unanimous approval.

**NEXT MEETING:**

The next regularly scheduled meeting is Tuesday, January 8, 2019.

There being no further business the meeting adjourned at 8:05 p.m.

Linda Sadlon

Inland Wetlands Commission

Planning and Community Development