

**COVENTRY INLAND WETLANDS AGENCY
MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, JUNE 22, 2022
HYBRID MEETING**

By: Mathieu

Time: 7:01 p.m.

Place: Hybrid

1. ROLL CALL:

		PRESENT	ABSENT
REGULAR MEMBERS:	Martin Briggs - remote	X	
	Suzanne Choate, Vice Chairperson	X	
	Patricia Laramee - remote	X	
	Lori Mathieu, Chairperson - remote	X	
	Becca Norman		X
ALTERNATE MEMBERS:	Open		
	Mike Powers		X
STAFF:	Todd Penney, Town Engineer/Wetlands Agent- remote	X	
STAFF:	Mindy Gosselin, Wetlands Agent Assistant	X	

2. AUDIENCE OF CITIZENS (2-minute time limit):

No one wished to speak on non-agenda business.

3. OLD BUSINESS:

A. #22-26AR – 289 Wrights Mill Road – Applicant/Owner: Richie Pleasant; Agent: None – Gravel driveway improvement to access hay field within the upland review area. Previously an enforcement item.

Richard Pleasant (in person) and his Richard Zulick (remote), Soil Scientist, were present. Since the last meeting Pleasant used a laser to determine grades. He would like to move forward with installing the pipe and the two plunge pools during the dry. One plunge pool will be in a wetlands determined area. The pipe crossing area is not in delineated wetlands.

Gosselin: There is a sketch by Penney about the neighborly concern. Rick Zulick who delineated the area is on the call.

Richard Zulick, Soil Scientist: Has been out to the site a number of times. These have been ag fields for a very long time. The wetland area is very small and delineated north of the

roadway. The wetland area is the low point coming down from the north. An abutter expressed concern about Pleasant's activities making her backyard wet. Her backyard is ~12' higher than where the crossing is. It was a tremendously wet year in 2021. He does not see how the lawn mower is going to make a difference.

Mathieu: Are the ruts still there? Gosselin: He can rake out those areas to eliminate the ruts. Zulick: Pleasant did not do any compaction of the soils out there and the ruts are not very deep, in his opinion. In starting of the construction of the road last summer you created a dam and the field was so wet. If the installation of the pipe is permitted, that will be eliminated.

Penney: His concern was to have Zulick opine on the ruts might have had on the up gradient. He goes not think the ruts are creating up gradient issues. The abutter's backyard is 5-6' higher than the road and it is flat. There are wetlands that continue further up gradient. A larger culvert will help convey the flow and eliminate the damming that has been caused by this gravel road.

Choate: Sizing of the pipe? Pleasant: A 12" pipe is proposed.

Briggs: Sounds like this all makes sense to eliminate the damming.

Laramée: Understands putting the pipe in there to have the water flow and move it out of there. Sounds like a plan so the water doesn't sit there and will flow better.

Penney: The flared inlet is proposed in the southerly limits of the wetlands flagging. That is a permanent impact. Improvement to the property to access the farm field is why the culvert is being proposed. There is an elevation from the roadway and to the property line that is 2-3' and further back it continues to go up. This is a poorly drained area. The culvert will drain this better.

Zulick: Pleasant has not caused adverse impacts that have not happened for the past fifty years as an ag field. The culvert will make this field what it used to be.

Gosselin: The abutter is present and submitted something in writing as did the former owner of 289 Wrights Mill Road. Gosselin read the letter from the owner, Kathy Santoro, of 237 Wrights Mill Road. Mathieu: What are Penney's thoughts regarding the statement in the last paragraph that an engineer can determine the impact. Penney: There may be some impedance with the driveway that may back up into the wetlands that this culvert will help to correct. There is a total gradient of 6' or so in elevation. His opinion there is no significant impact caused by this activity. The culvert will convey this flow out of the area. The applicant and his expert proposed the culvert be at grade. We will not impede the wetland complex any further with the down gradient plunge pool. Do we need a topo plan? Perhaps not if we hold that grade and come up two feet. Mathieu: Do you believe the applicant needs to hire an engineer to do this design? Penney: This is farm access. If he is misrepresenting the purpose of the gravel driveway Inland Wetlands staff will be out there. Pleasant: His plan is to maintain the hay field. There is a proposed structure that he will be putting up but not on the field. He is going to obtain haying equipment. In the meantime, he is trying to maintaining the field with his mower. There is no structure going up in that hayfield at all. Penney: He does not need an engineer. Get this pipe in. It is for farm access; he does not need to overengineer this. Zulick is a Soil Scientist and has been in

construction. He is the applicant's expert.

Zulick: Agrees with the elevations that Penney mentioned. The area of concern it is more like Penney says. It is definitely upgradient.

Choate: In her opinion the proposed activity will be an improvement and there will have no inverse impacts. She is in favor. Briggs: He agrees; no further comment. This is going in the right direction. Laramée: Fixing it is the best solution with the pipe.

Motion: I move that the Coventry Inland Wetlands Agency approve application #22-26AR – 289 Wrights Mill Road – Applicant/Owner: Richie Pleasant; Agent: None – Gravel driveway improvement to access hay field within the upland review area. Previously an enforcement item.

With the following conditions:

- Hold a preconstruction meeting with the applicant and any other subcontractors prior to the start of activities to review construction sequencing.
- The property owner shall rake out the ruts caused by his lawn mower.
- Additional erosion and sedimentation controls maybe required as site conditions/weather warrant by the Wetlands Agent staff.

By: Choate

Seconded: Briggs

Discussion: Mathieu: The purpose has been stated a number of times tonight that this gravel driveway is to access the hay field and there will be no other activity as has been stated by Mr. Pleasant this evening.

Voting:

For: Laramée, Mathieu, Choate, Briggs

Against: None

Abstain: None

B. #22-28W – Lewis Hill Road R06900 – Applicant/Agent: Andrew Bushnell, Bushnell Associates LLC; Owner: Garrett Rooke – Installation of driveway and culvert for new single family residence.

Andrew Bushnell, Bushnell Associates LLC, and Richard Zulick, Soil Scientist, were present remotely. Gosselin: The drainage calculations are in the packet. Also included is a page showing the extent of the wetlands. Inland Wetlands staff shared the memo of their review that was shared at the site visit with the applicant/agent.

Bushnell: Made revisions to the plan based on the comments dated June 15, 2022. We are proposing a standard outlet with rip rap protection. The inlet side will be flared with rip rap. Rick Zulick delineated the wetlands.

Richard Zulick, Soil Scientist: Delineated the wetlands on the property. The wetlands on the north side of the proposed home is really a watercourse. The wetland line is the edge of the watercourse. There are a historic crossings at WF9-10 and WF14-15. The wetland turns at WF18 and moves southerly. That would be the crossing. The wetlands east of WF18 to the crossing or as it parallels Lewis Hill Road are valuable wetlands. The wetland that parallels

is a nice wetlands providing nutrient uptake, habitat, food, and he saw some critters in there. This is a nice wetlands. Seems this is an old crossing where the crossing is proposed. That is not a wetlands. Bushnell: The wood deck of the bridge was rotted and has been removed. The beams remain in good shape. The wooden bridge is the crossing now with some abutments and girders and beams. It would hold the weight of a vehicle with new decking. The pipe would be put in the same spot where the bridge crossing is now.

Choate: That is a natural bottom. Is there a change in function or value by putting in a pipe?
Zulick; There will be no change in function or value.

Mathieu: It looks like a decent amount of water could come down here. Bushnell: There is a culvert with a 24" pipe up gradient; here a 30" pipe is being proposed. Mathieu: Have you ever seen the water backing up and changing the function in that area? Zulick: That will not happen with a 30" pipe.

Penney: He has not looked at all of the comps that Bushnell showed for the upgradient culvert. He was onsite with Gosselin. They are improving an existing crossing for an everyday residential use. They made some accommodations to reduce the footprint. He thinks this is the best location based on the information received for a single-family residence with a detached garage. Providing a good width and shoulders to the driveway so there is passage. The IWA must determine if this is a significant impact that requires a public hearing. Penney does not think a public hearing is needed; this is improving an existing crossing.

Gosselin: Went over some of the public hearings that were determined to be needed over the past ten years. Mainly these were for multi-lot subdivisions and bridges. Mathieu: Does not see this of significant impact restating what Penney said. There is no reason for a public hearing for this application. Choate: Agrees with Mathieu and Penney. Briggs: It is helpful to have some contexts. Agrees with Mathieu and Penney's opinion. Consensus of the IWA is that a public hearing is not needed.

Laramie recused herself from application #22-28W.

Choate: Appreciate the changes made to the plan especially with the boulder headwall reducing the impact. No issues with the design presented. Briggs: No further comment.

Mathieu: Reducing the amount of fill than proposed previously. Bushnell: That was in the memo. The boulder wall reduces the amount of fill needed. There is existing stones that are now in the channel that also reduces the disturbance.

4. Disturbance

- Upland review area: 6,788 sq. ft. → revised plan 6,088 sq. ft.
- Wetlands: 1,611 sq. ft. → revised plan 1,183 sq. ft.

Motion: I move that the Coventry Inland Wetlands Agency approve application #22-28W – Lewis Hill Road R06900– Applicant/Agent: Andrew Bushnell, Bushnell Associates LLC; Owner: Garrett Rooke – Installation of driveway and culvert for new single family residence.

With the following conditions:

- Hold a preconstruction meeting with the applicant and any other subcontractors prior to the start of activities to review construction sequencing.
- Additional erosion and sedimentation controls maybe required as site conditions/weather warrant by the Wetlands Agent staff.
- Conduct culvert work during the ‘dry season’.

By: Choate

Seconded: Briggs

Discussion: Mathieu: This is a very good design. Increasing the pipe to 30” helps.

Voting:

For: Mathieu, Choate, Briggs

Against: None

Abstain: None

Laramie was reseated.

4. **NEW BUSINESS:**

A. #22-33W – 325 Main Street – Applicant/Owner: Town of Coventry; Agent: Kevin Grindle, Barton & Loguidice and Todd Penney, P.E. Town Engineer – Installation of recreational softball field.

Gosselin: The town is proposing this plan for the second softball field. As Penney mentioned they are applying for a STEAP grant. They need a permit to be ready for the grant application. We are receiving this today.

Distance in Feet from Regulated Wetlands/Watercourse:	Square feet of Wetlands, Watercourse and/or Regulated Area Impacted:
51	Total URA disturbance: ~4,750SF. Closest disturbance to Wetland delineation: ~50FT

This application is being accepted by the IWA this evening.

5. **ENFORCEMENT:**

A. Violation - 89 Flanders Road - Owner: Joshua Beebe - Unpermitted work in the upland review area and wetlands. Violation letter sent on: 5/12/2021.

Gosselin: Beebe is not present. Suggest IWA discuss item 5.B. first as those people are present remotely.

Gosselin: Shared her most recent email to Joshua Beebe on June 22, 2022. He was previously told he was expected to attend the IWA meeting this evening and was recently emailed the agenda. She has not been on site in 3 months. His file from the zoning standpoint has been referred to the Town Council because he does not have any permits for the property.

Mathieu: We have an outstanding violation. Gosselin: She provided a background summary of what has been discussed at the IWA meetings and her efforts to get this resolved. Beebe last attended the December 2021 IWA meeting. She will continue to try to contact him. He is being requested to attend the July meeting. The data to the Town Council is coming from zoning with the IWA violation being part of the data.

Mathieu: Keep documenting and trying to contact Beebe. Continue to keep zoning updated. Provide an update from the Town Council at the next meeting.

B. Violation - 162 Grant Hill Road – Owner: Derek Pacheco; Agent: None – unpermitted work in upland review and wetlands related to recreational motocross.

Derek Pacheco and Richard Zulick, Soil Scientist, were present remotely. Gosselin: Gave a background of this enforcement issue.

Pacheco: Over approximately 15 years some trails were developed. There were a couple of huge trees that were uplifted. He did not think they were in the wetlands. Taking those out created a hole. Sediment would come down and settle in the hole and not go into the wetlands.

Zulick: Working with Eric Peterson, Gardner & Peterson Associates LLC, who is the engineer on the project. The area shown in pink are small wetlands areas that were filled. They are the headwater to other wetland complexes. This is a small area but the wetlands did not provide a lot of function with borderline soils. The area to the south where the detention pond exists and fills with sediment is a more functional wetlands. The wetland to the south has remained untouched. The area to the north is filled. The filling that exists is estimated to be 2,055 sq. feet and 1,480 sq. feet filling to the south. The plan proposes mitigation for the filling. He strongly feels the area to the north should be left as is. Create a higher value and higher functioning wetlands to the south. There are wetlands to the east that are untouched; they don't provide a lot of function and value. This area is not connected to anything else. North is totally isolated; there is very little function. The mitigation plan is to leave the northern area and concentrate on the southern area. Creation of wetland area of 8,200 sq. feet in upland soils. This is offering up a 4:1 mitigation. Removal of the material that was filled in is 1,480 sq. feet. Restore the wetland functions and values that existed. Proposing removal of soils to the elevation that exists on the western edge of the wetland. Topsoil will be put back in place with wetlands plantings proposed. Some mature trees will be outside the mitigation areas.

WETLAND MITIGATION CONSTRUCTION NOTES:

1. NORTHERLY WETLAND DISTURBANCE TO REMAIN.
2. EXISTING SEDIMENT POND TO REMAIN.
3. MITIGATION AREA IS LOCATED TO THE WEST OF THE SOUTHERLY WETLAND DISTURBANCE AND IS DELINEATED WITH FLAGS LABELED "WMA".
4. MATURE TREES ARE NOT PRESENT WITHIN MITIGATION AREA.
5. SCHEDULE PRE-CONSTRUCTION MEETING WITH THE TOWN OF COVENTRY.
6. INSTALL SILT FENCE BARRIER OR COIR LOG ALONG WESTERLY EDGE OF EXISTING WETLAND, ALONG SOUTHERLY EDGE OF MITIGATION AREA, AND ALONG THE SOUTHERLY EDGE OF THE FILL WITHIN THE WETLAND.
7. REMOVE AND STOCKPILE TOPSOIL FROM MITIGATION AREA.
8. FURTHER EXCAVATE MITIGATION AREA TO 4-6" BELOW THE ELEVATION OF THE CENTER OF THE WETLAND IMMEDIATELY TO THE EAST. STOCKPILE AREA SHALL BE LOCATED OUTSIDE THE UPLAND REVIEW AREA (SEE DETAIL).
9. SIDE SLOPES OF EXCAVATION SHALL NOT EXCEED 2:1.
10. REMOVE FILL WITHIN SOUTHERLY WETLAND AND STOCKPILE PER NOTE 8.
11. PLACE 4-6" OF ORGANIC TOPSOIL WITHIN EXCAVATED AREA.
12. SEED MITIGATION AREA AND PRIOR FILLED AREA WITH NEW ENGLAND WETLAND PLANTS "NEW ENGLAND WETMIX (WETLAND SEED MIX).
13. WITHIN MITIGATION AREA PLANT WETLAND SHRUBS 15-FT O/C FROM WETLAND SHRUB LIST.
14. WETLAND SHRUBS MAY BE SUBSTITUTED ALONG THE WESTERLY PERIMETER OF THE MITIGATION AREA (SEE SUBSTITUTE PLANTING LIST).
15. WITHIN 1-YEAR OF ESTABLISHMENT REMOVE INVASIVES BY BURN WEEDING.

Choate and Mathieu: This is a violation. This will have to come back as an application?

Gosselin: That is a great question. Mathieu: They are doing work in the wetlands so a permit would be needed. Zulick: The mitigation area abuts and joins the very edge of the existing wetland. We will be going into the wetland area that has been filled. We are in the regulated area. Choate: Restoring the high functioning wetlands is desirable. The mitigation amount is generous. She would like to see a topography and planting plan.

Gosselin: From this meeting a review memo will be provided with the IWA comments and Wetlands staff comments.

Mathieu: When you restore this does it restore the function that was lost? Zulick: Yes, that is the goal. Wetland mitigation is expensive and extensive. Hopes this will work out quite well. It will replace the function and value plus. Mathieu: You install this and you come back in one year to inspect the results. Is there anything beyond that to be done? Zulick: It is just time. The northern end of the mitigation area requires a pretty significant cut to get to the elevation needed. The elevation on the western edge should be the same as the eastern edge. Provide function and value is the goal to bring back what was removed. It can have standing water during the wet part of the spring.

Briggs: Nice to see how well thought out this is so far. Mathieu: Agrees. The next step is an application.

6. ADOPTION OF MINUTES:

A. April 27, 2022 – Public Hearing and Regular Meeting Minutes

Correction:

- Page 9, item 5.A., first paragraph, third sentence and fourth sentences – change to read “There is a newly deposited dirt pile upgradient of the wetland possibly in the upland review area without prior notice to the Wetlands Agent. Beebe did grade out some of the dirt piles; she asked for silt fence be put on.”

Motion: I move that the Coventry Inland Wetlands Agency accept the meeting minutes of April 27, 2022, as corrected.

By: Choate

Seconded: Laramee

Voting:

For: Laramee, Choate, Briggs

Against: None

Abstain: Mathieu

B. May 25, 2022 – Public Hearing and Regular Meeting Minutes

Correction:

- Page 5, item 4.A., fifth paragraph, third sentence – add “trees” after “area”.
- Page 6, item 4.B., fourth paragraph – change “Katherine” to “Kathleen”; change “201” to “237”.

- Page 10, first paragraph – move the fourth sentence after the third sentence; change to read “Gosselin observed potential filling of wetlands at 716 Main Street when she visited the neighboring property; the third sentence becomes the fourth sentence.

Motion: I move that the Coventry Inland Wetlands Agency accept the meeting minutes of May 25, 2022, as corrected.

By: Choate

Seconded: Laramee

Voting:

For: Laramee, Mathieu, Choate

Against: None

Abstain: Briggs

7. CORRESPONDENCE:

None

8. DISCUSSION:

A. DPW General Permit

Gosselin: Darcy Winter of DEEP recommends not doing a blanket permit for DPW. Technically only DEEP can issue a blanket permit. She recommended a permit issued to DPW for routine maintenance for upland and a permit issued to DPW for wetlands area - Department of Public Work Permit for Routine Maintenance. She will talk to DPW more and see if the routine maintenance permit help them.

Mathieu: How does that affect everyone else that wants to do routine maintenance vs. the town. Gosselin: We can specify how many times these can come to us. DPW would have to specify ongoing projects. Mathieu: She would not want to give special allowance for the town when we will hassle independent citizens. Gosselin: She will discuss this matter with Penney and DPW. Our main driver was for the emergency situations.

B. Violations Framework

Gosselin: Also spoke to Darcy Winter about this. There is a enforcement section from the 2012 Municipal Inland Wetlands Commissioners Training Program. She is thinking of creating a enforcement flow chart such as in the training program. The violations framework from East Windsor is very in depth; this also has a flow chart. She is thinking of creating our own flow chart based on what we have been doing for our practice.

C. Beach Sand/Lakefront Activities

Gosselin: No update on this item.

9. ADJOURNMENT:

Motion: I move that the Coventry Inland Wetlands Agency adjourn this meeting at 9:43 p.m.

By: Choate

Seconded: Briggs

Respectfully Submitted,

Yvonne B. Filip

Yvonne B. Filip, IWA Clerk

PLEASE NOTE: The minutes are not official until approved by the Inland Wetland Agency at the next Agency meeting. Please see the next Agency meeting minutes for approval or changes to these minutes.