

TOWN HALL \* PO BOX 150 \* 1019 MAIN ST. \* BRANFORD, CT 06405 203-315-0675 \* FAX 203-889-3172 \* inlandwetlands@branford-ct.gov



# **Special Meeting Minutes**

Tuesday, March 17, 2020, 4:00 PM Joseph Trapasso Community House 46 Church Street, Branford, CT

#### 1. CALL TO ORDER:

**Chairman Peter Bassermann** called the Special Meeting of Branford's Inland Wetlands & Watercourses Agency to order at 4:00 P.M.

### 2. ROLL CALL:

<u>Commissioners Present:</u> Chair Peter Bassermann, Chris Traugh, Suzanne Botta, Richard Greenalch

<u>Commissioners Absent:</u> Rick Ross, Sandra Kraus, Clarice Begemann, Steve Sullivan <u>Representatives of the Application Present:</u> Chris Gagnon (BL Companies), Albert Secondino

**Staff Present:** Inland Wetland Enforcement Officer Jaymie Frederick

#### 3. **DELIBERATIONS:**

## IW# 19.10.02 | 779-803 East Main St. & 21 Sycamore Way | Laboratory Building

- **Comm. Greenalch** stated that he listened to the recordings of the meeting deleberations that he was not able to attend, that he feels up to speed, and comfortable proceeding.
- **The Commission** reviewed the draft resolution as prepared by Town Staff.
- **EO Frederick** encouraged those Commissioners, who haven't thoroughly read the draft resolution and its supportive documents, to do so as to concur with how the past deliberations were interpreted.
- **Chairman Peter Bassermann** sought clarity on top of page 2 "the Commission finds that the proposed regulated activity is not reasonably likely to cause unreasonable pollution..." Because there were concerns and speculations, could we be stronger and say that there was no evidence submitted?
- The Commission and Town Staff discussed the line.
- **EO Frederick** noted that this language is a standard used when there is an intervenor and that Town Council reviewed the draft and she believes that Town Council inserted this line.
- **Comm. Traugh:** we did hear direct testimony to substantiate this line.
- **The Commission discussed** the inspection of the culvert and requested to have it as item C and bump the rest down.
- **EO Frederick:** The bond is for everything, but the applicant will submit an itemized estimate. There will be a line item associated with each item. As things get done, the Commission can consider releasing portions of the bond.

- **The Commission** discussed the bond.
- **EO Frederick** asked the Commission whether they'd consider having the bond also include the restoration of the streambed area.
- **Comm. Botta:** let's insert the restoration of the streambed area impacted by the box culvert along with the list of activities covered by the bond. Page 4: after the word "controls," before the word, "and."
- **EO Frederick** noted that:
  - o Everything that the bond covered was itemized in the first sentence
  - o The second sentence informs the Permit holder that they have to submit an estimate
  - o The third sentence (where the language is proposed) is clarifying that the erosion controls are the entire site's erosion controls.
- The Commission and EO Frederick discussed the language, and it's placement: "further, the bond shall include the restoration of the streambed impacted by the installation of the box culvert."
- **EO Frederick** noted that staff worked with Town Council on number 4.
- **The Commission** reviewed and discussed number 4.
- **EO Frederick** shared that David McCarthy asked to have the Commission reconsider its preliminary thought to have a pre and post NTU test conducted to be able to determine if the water is clear of sediment.
- **The Commission** discussed this recommendation and concurred that it would be beneficial to establish an NTU baseline. However it noted that there was a lack of discussion on this matter at the Public Hearing, and while it would like this baseline identified for a point of reference, it does not feel comfortable holding the developer to an established NTU. That said, the Commission noted that this would be a good idea for all applications moving forward and that it would like to see this in the Regulations.
- **The Commission** reviewed and discussed item 9.
- The Commission reviewed and discussed item 5, and the inclusion of NTU readings taken at the dewatering outfall and stormwater discharge points. This language will follow the end of 9's first sentence.
- **The Commission** reviewed and discussed item 7.i that was based on comments made by the Town Planner, it was in support of the Condition.
- **Comm. Botta** made a Motion to approve Application IW#19.10.02 based on the draft resolution (dated 03.17.2020) including the amendments made today, and that the Agency is making this decision by following section 22a-36 through 22a-45 [of the CT State Statues], and that the Commission has considered the facts and circumstances relevant to the impact as prudent and feasible alternatives, Comm. Greenalch seconded, with no further discussion the Commission took a vote, the Motion passed unanimously (4-0-0).

#### 4. **ADJOURNMENT:**

- **Comm. Botta** made a Motion to adjourn the Special Meeting of the Inland Wetlands Commission at 04:39 P.M, Chairman Bassermann seconded, Motion Carried (4-0-0).

Respectfully Submitted,

David E. McCarthy