

**COVENTRY INLAND WETLANDS AGENCY
MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING OF WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 24, 2022
TOWN HALL ANNEX AND ZOOM TELECONFERENCING**

By: Mathieu

Time: 7:03 p.m.

Place: Hybrid

1. ROLL CALL:

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

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

No one wished to speak on non-agenda business.

3. OLD BUSINESS:

A. #22-34W – 159 Woodland Road – Applicant/Agent: Andrew Bushnell, Bushnell Associates LLC; Owner: Ilze Taylor – Proposed 153 SF permeable patio, stone stairs and retaining wall on Coventry Lake.

Andrew Bushnell, Bushnell Associates, present with Michael Taylor (rep. for Ilze Taylor) and Masonry Contractor.

Bushnell: Since last time there were issues with the sewer line, and it was questioned if there will be any interference. He was informed, there will be no problems from the town’s sewer technician – Mike Ruef. The Taylor’s were asked to consider removing their concrete ramp, which they will not as it is in use. It would cause more of a disturbance to take it out. Additionally, an Arborist was out to review the trees in question. They spray painted a box on the ground, and said that if the new construction

stays within that boundary, it will not have impact on the tree's root systems. Plan was modified to keep the construction within that box, and patio was downsized.

Mathieu: Confirmed with Bushnell regarding the downsize and shifting of the patio location from the plan presented at last meeting. Also thanked Bushnell for the work he did with the arborist.

Bushnell: Added that there is a fieldstone walkway, that the patio was going to be built to. With the new dimensions, the fieldstone walkway will need to be extended/adjusted. Also elaborated on the base of the patio, as there were questions regarding it last meeting. He informed it will be a natural flagstone patio, minimum ¼ in. gap between the stones, and random size stones.

Adam, the masonry contractor was introduced to explain what will be used underneath.

Adam: 1st layer will be ¾ inch crushed stone, which is very permeable, then ¾ inch processed gravel aggregate, and lastly will be an inch of stone dust. These materials are very permeable and most patios are laid with these materials. He confirmed he does not want water under the patio, as much as anyone else. He also added, as far as he knows, those are the most permeable substrates he can use, that are also stable.

Choate: Questioned if there was a drain behind the wall. Bushnell confirmed there is a drain at the base of the wall. He added that they will most likely add some stones and other drainage aids back there as well, but noted there was no ground water issue there.

Gosselin: The biggest issue was the design spacing of the fieldstone, so if this were to be approved tonight, we would want to have that noted on the plan, as it is not stated, as well as the patio substrate layers. Mathieu: Asked if there was a narrative regarding the stone water run-off. Bushnell informed that is still needed. Mathieu asked Briggs if he has any questions or concerns.

Briggs: Commented that he was still getting caught up on it, but it looks like most everything has been addressed, and adjustments have been made as needed.

Mathieu: Asked for clarification that the concrete ramp will stay and questioned why it was asked to be removed. Gosselin: Noted it was an impermeable structure on the lake. Mathieu: Ramp is in use and it has been an existing structure for years, since it's there, it's there and will stay. The masonry contractor confirmed they will have to see if anything further needs to be done once they dig down and add the substrate layers. Mathieu reviewed the bullets that needed to be addressed from last month's meeting and informed that the fieldstone information and substrate layer information are to be added to the plan.

Motion: I move that the Coventry Inland Wetlands Agency approve application #22-34W – 159 Woodland Road – Applicant/Agent: Andrew Bushnell, Bushnell Associates LLC; Owner: Ilze Taylor – Proposed 153 SF permeable patio, stone stairs and retaining wall on Coventry Lake.

With the following conditions:

- Provide a detail for the permeable patio

- Develop cross section from edge of water line of Coventry Lake to 28” oak tree for existing and proposed
- The proposed area is currently mulched with landscaping. Provide a narrative from your Agent on the stormwater runoff between existing and proposed o What impact can be expected to the existing stone retaining wall with polyethylene barrier during winter freeze/thaw? Can you have a structural engineer opine?
- Change “Town Erosion Control Officer” with “Wetlands Agent” in E&S construction sequencing notes
- 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.
- Have a licensed land surveyor flag the location, and provide verification of the flagging.

By: Choate

Seconded: Briggs

Voting:

For: Mathieu, Choate, Briggs

Against: None

Abstain: None

B. #22-35W – Goose Lane R06043 – Applicant/Agent: Andrew Bushnell, Bushnell Associates LLC; Owner: Zachary Studenroth – Free split subdivision and construction of gravel driveway.

Mathieu asked Gosselin if there was anything on file for review. Gosselin: Informed there was a staff review memo based on initially proposed plans. Based on those comments, we received a wetlands function and value assessment report from a soil scientist, Rick Zulick. We also received wetlands photos of the wetland area in the vicinity of the activity, and revised site plans.

Andrew Bushnell, Bushnell Associates present, and representing for Owner Zachary Studenroth.

Bushnell: Asked the committee to recall from last meeting, they had discussed some of the issues and did a little brainstorming. One thing they decided, was that they were going to move the well from the North side of the barn to the South side of the proposed driveway. Felt it was more important to protect the larger Wetland than to encroach on the smaller, less important Wetland. He noted there is a little disturbance in that area to accommodate for the well. He added sight-line information into the plan for the driveway as requested. Established a conservation easement around the larger wetland to the North, detail and boundary as been added to the plan. Took photos of the area of some invasive vines and vegetation. He informed the Agency that these take over and kill the trees, and there is already one dead tree that they will take down.

Mathieu: Questioned the POV of the photos. Bushnell responded they are labeled and one is from the road, and one is from behind the invasive material. With this material

removed, it would give a better sight-line for the driveway. A lot of it is growing by the road, and it will save the town from having to go back every year to cut it down.

Choate: Questioned if the removal of the invasive vegetation is listed on the plan, which Gosselin confirmed and read an excerpt from the plan.

Bushnell: Commented on how existing driveway to the barn is not safe, and you can't really get a car off the road there. There is a hairpin intersection, that has a limited sight-line and is a safety concern. Future plans are to turn the barn into a residential structure, which will address the other driveway. Everything else being proposed is outside the regulated area. Other option would be to divide the property into 2 lots.

Mathieu: Confirmed that the only activity now is the new driveway construction.

Bushnell: That and the relocation of the well, running a well line from the house, and clearing the invasive vegetation at the end of the driveway

Gosselin: All of my questions were addressed.

Choate: Looking at the comment letter, 2nd bullet, is the bar scale OK? Gosselin: That was the only thing not addressed, but everything else is OK. The 1"-30" is correct but the intervals on the actual scale are not. Bushnell: Is going to look at it. Choate: Brought up last bullet from the memo regarding drainage for the easements. Bushnell: Commented they use this drainage for the culverts, but the head walls are not on the property and it is something to talk about in the next stage of this.

Choate: It seems from last meeting that you definitely addressed our concerns. Some of the activity moved away from the well-functioning wetlands, thanked Bushnell for that. The upland review area is minimized by the changes you have made.

Mathieu: The conservation easement is a great idea, good addition. No further questions/comments.

Briggs: No additional comments, with everything going on, the concerns were reasonably addressed.

Motion: I move that the Coventry Inland Wetlands Agency approve application #22-35W – Goose Lane R06043 – Applicant/Agent: Andrew Bushnell, Bushnell Associates LLC; Owner: Zachary Studenroth – Free split subdivision and construction of gravel driveway.

With the following conditions:

- Ensure the graphic scale is correct.
- Hold a preconstruction meeting with the applicant and any other subcontractors prior to the start of activities to review construction sequencing.
- The Applicant/Owner shall submit to the Wetlands agent a proof of inspection for each storm water mitigation feature once a year during the Spring and a form to be provided by the Town of Coventry.
- Have a licensed land surveyor flag the driveway location, and provide verification of the flagging.

- Additional erosion and sedimentation controls maybe required as site conditions/weather changes warrant by the Wetlands Agent staff.

By: Choate

Seconded: Briggs

Voting:

For: Mathieu, Choate, Briggs

Against: None

Abstain: None

C. #22-36W – 377 Hop River Road – Applicant/Agent: Scott Lagace, Lagace Construction LLC; Owner: Greg Howe – 10’x16’ addition with foundation.

Owner Greg Howe joined via Zoom.

Gosselin: In our packet we have the staff review memo that I provided to the applicant/agent, and then a double-sided piece of paper with a narrative from Lagace Construction and a revised site plan on the back.

Mathieu: Had a few pictures last meeting of sun room, and they really help. Asked Gosselin to go through her memo.

Gosselin: Reviewed comments.

Item #1, provide revised plan that depicts the septic system location and the other drain pipes in that area of the house and the location of the water course to the existing house and proposed addition. This was addressed in revised site plan. Also, in the narrative explains that the existing septic line exits the building at a different location than shown on the plan. The septic line actually exits 18’’ from the rear corner of the building and goes to the septic tank which is 30’ from the swale. You can see it in the drawing provided. Also, the location from the proposed addition to the water course is 20’ and 19’. Item #2, documentation of the existing conditions, what is the existing footprint of the existing greenhouse, was not provided. Howe: Had the information, and provided the greenhouse is 8’x13’. Gosselin: continued, in the narrative it states that the addition is 2’ closer to the existing swale. Item #3 in consideration of storm water mitigation, consider adding rain barrels, and mitigation was not addressed.

Howe: Explained that there are gutters there and expected the gutters to remain/extend to the existing location on the left side of the house, where the water drains now. Added there is a gutter with a downspout at the left side of the building. Gosselin: expressed she does not want the water to run off the new roof on the addition, directly into the water course. As long as the water is being captured into gutters and directed to a different direction, just so it is not providing a sheet blow into the resource. Howe accepted. Gosselin: continued with item #4, provide an erosion and sedimentation control plan. She stated in the narrative it explained they would install silt fence with hay bales during excavation and construction to prevent any run off into the swale. After the construction is complete they will stabilize the area with a straw mat and while vegetation grows. The limits of the silt fence were not outlined, but expect to go over that information at the preconstruction meeting as it would be a good in-person decision together. Last item,

identify the limits of disturbance and the amount of upland review area disturbed, was not addressed.

Mathieu: Confirmed that Item #3 and #5 from the memo have not been addressed and need to be. Questioned if the idea of rain barrels off the roof leaders would work.

Gosselin: Stated if they do put the gutters so they don't run directly off into the water course. Mathieu asked Howe to confirm current gutter/downspout location. Howe informed it is at the far side of the house and can be seen in the photo provided, and runs on the side of the house and assumes new construction would tie into that.

Choate: What is the pitch of the new roof? Howe: Stated it is a gable roof, and expects it to be similar, but does not know the exact pitch. Choate continues that she was asking to know where the new gutters will be, as that location will determine the downspout location. Mathieu: asked Greg if he would consider rain barrels. Howe: Yeah, whatever it takes. Choate: Thinks he may end up with 2 new gutters, on either side. Suggestion is rain barrels. Howe: Not a problem.

Mathieu: Next item is identifying the disturbance. Gosselin: When we lay out the silt fence out there with the contractor, it can be identified then. Mathieu informed Howe that at the preconstruction meeting, the erosion and sedimentation controls are to be discussed and what Gosselin thinks will need to be solved will need to be addressed. Added that Gosselin could chat about the rain barrels and share any information she finds helpful. Gosselin will bring materials to the preconstruction meeting. Mathieu said that she is fine moving forward as long as these 2 items are addressed. Howe: Understands, and will have it addressed.

Choate: Has no further comments and appreciates the actions that were taken. Felt the remaining issues could be condition.

Briggs: Looking for more specifics on the gutter system and wants to be informed following the preconstruction meeting, as the new addition will be close to the water course, but it seems reasonable given the existing footprint.

Motion : I move that the Coventry Inland Wetlands Agency approve application #22-36W – 377 Hop River Road – Applicant/Agent: Scott Lagace, Lagace Construction LLC; Owner: Greg Howe – 10'x16' addition with foundation.

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.
- Determine sediment and erosion control location with contractor and Wetland Agent during preconstruction meeting.
- Install rain barrels to be connected to gutters on new addition, so any new downspouts should go into rain barrels.
- Additional erosion and sedimentation controls maybe required as site conditions/weather changes warrant by the Wetlands Agent staff.

By: Choate

Seconded: Briggs

Voting:
For: Mathieu, Choate, Briggs
Against: None
Abstain: None

- D. #22-38W – 162 Grant Hill Road – Applicant/Agent: Eric Peterson, Gardner & Peterson LLC; Agent: Rick Zulick – Soil Scientist; Owner: Derek Pacheco - Create new wetland area adjacent to existing wetlands and remove fill from wetland area. Previously an enforcement item.**

Postponed to next meeting.

Gosselin: received an email from Eric Peterson, from Gardner & Peterson, that they won't have anything for this meeting and hope to have it for the September meeting. Asked that we keep the timeline in their minds, as this has been a violation. Mathieu agreed, and the maximum date is September 30th, so they need to come in next month. Is happy they have come in, in previous months with a lot of information, but need to keep the momentum rolling.

- E. #22-40W – 1295 Main Street, Teleflex Medical – Applicant/Owner: Deborah McCarthy- Platz - Repair of stone wall and asphalt road.**

Mathieu: Saw this item at last meeting, now have more information from Earth Dynamics. Provided hand drawn map.

Owner did not join meeting, and Gosselin thought an agent from Earth Dynamics was going to be on. She had sent Teleflex the agenda by has not heard back.

Todd Penney, P.E. in the State of Connecticut, and Town Engineer for Town of Coventry: Took over this item. Asked for agency members to have Earth Dynamics plan and narrative in front of them, as he reviewed. Reviewed sketch first. Reminded them of the pictures from last month in the quick presentation. The retaining wall in the sketch, previously pictured, failed back in the storms of Ida and Elsa in July of 2021. Teleflex lost part of the retaining wall, which contains part of the Mill Brook through their building on Monument Hill. All that retaining wall is on their property, part of the road is Town of Coventry property, as are some of the road repairs. They were looking on plans to repair the wall, and if you look back at the pictures of last July and this July, the whole retaining wall has been lost. What they proposed to do, is to armor the existing slope with a new detail instead of it being a dry state, dry laid stone wall, they are going to grout a 12"-24" rip rap. That will be stacked up to a height of about 30", for the height of the wall. They will set the grout and let it cure, then release the water. Earth Dynamics came up with the construction narrative as they will do the work for Teleflex. These narratives include traffic control. Up until 2 days ago, we had no flow in that channel or it was very small. Not aware of what it is doing right now. They would sandbag the portion of the stream to keep the water away from the work activity. They would remove the existing pavement and stones, about 36 sq. ft. They will use a lot of those stones for their modified rip rap. Install a base for the wall, and construct the new double stone

wall/embankment. They will also have to grout underneath the foundation of the building. Voids were found under the foundation that need to be filled. Once they are done with all the concrete, they will back fill the backside of the wall on the embankment with processed aggregate, we will then repair our road and they will remove their coffer dam. The work will take approximately 2-3 days to finish. So, one of the things we have talked about is we will work with public works and we will close the gate at the lake to cut off flow for the duration of this work.

Mathieu: How does that interfere with the lake function, if at all? Penney: Right now, given the short duration of closing the lake, I don't think it would have much of an effect. If we were going to close the gate for 2 to 3 weeks, it may have some downstream effects, but this will not have much issue with the lake. The water will come up a little bit, we have a Summer level weir that allows the water to spill over, if needed. As long as the water is not at Summer level, and I don't think we will be, we should be fine. October is about the time we start to lower the lake anyways. Mathieu: When do you anticipate this work? Penney: Based on approval, I believe Earth Dynamic has a contract. Teleflex is waiting to get a permit approval. Mathieu: So, they could start immediately then? Penney: Technically, you have to wait 14 days, for an appeal period. We typically advise applicants to wait that 14 days, they can proceed at their own risk. If they waited 14 days, it would bring them to mid-September, so they would be ready to go by then.

Mathieu: You don't have any other release requirements do you? Penney: We don't have any significant releases. The only release we have is Teleflex. By deed, we have to maintain water in their fire pond, which is immediately upgradient from this work. It is only at their detriment if we were to close the Lake. We don't have any deed requirements, there's environmental issues, but 3-5 days of having the lake closed shouldn't have significant environmental issues. We are about 6 weeks without rain, so there has already been a substantial environmental impact downstream. Mathieu: Confirmed there is no deed release that is needed. Penny informed the only deed release that is required is for Teleflex, and they are OK for them to do this work. Once you get down gradient in the Mill Brook, you have a feeder that comes in from Stonehouse Road that comes down through Bidwell Village. There is a tributary that comes into the Mill Brook there. Then you have the water shed that attributes down gradient, but there's going to be work done anyways so there is a small water shed that would be locked off for the 2-3 days.

Choate: No questions/comments, it has been fully explained and will have minimal impact.

Briggs: Has nothing further. Noted the supply behind Bidwell seems to be always running. Penney: Added the water shed comes all the way from the High School and down Main St., crosses a large water shed that feeds that area, and goes underneath Main Street, behind the old "Daisy's" and there is an intermittent water course that runs behind there, and behind Panda Palace and the Post Office Plaza. So, it is not necessarily spring fed and there is a decent sized water shed that feeds that tributary. Briggs: Always wondered about that. Mathieu: Noted it goes under Rte. 275.

Motion : I move that the Coventry Inland Wetlands Agency approve application #22-40W – 1295 Main Street, Teleflex Medical – Applicant/Owner: Deborah McCarthy-Platz - Repair of stone wall and asphalt road

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.
- Notify Town Wetlands Agent when the dewatering/lake gate closure commences.
- Additional erosion and sedimentation controls may be required as site conditions/weather changes warrant by the Wetlands Agent staff.

By: Choate

Seconded: Briggs

Voting:

For: Mathieu, Choate, Briggs

Against: None

Abstain: None

- F. #22-41W – Nathan Hale and Bear Swamp Recreational Trail – Applicant/Agent: Todd Penney, P.E. Town Engineer; Owner: Town of Coventry - Improve the old road beds of Nathan Hale Road and Bear Swamp Road through the Nathan Hale Forest.**

Postponed to next meeting.

Penney: Town Engineer has been busy, and needs to do some field work out there still.

4. NEW BUSINESS:

- A. #22-43W – Rolling Woods Subdivision Open Space – Applicant/Agent: Eric Thomas – Protected Spaces Committee; Owner: Town of Coventry – Installation of three low profile bog bridges for recreational use on Town Open Space.**

Gosselin: Introduced the application, and that Eric Thomas will be at the September meeting for potential approval. Myself, and Lesley from Parks and Rec. Dept. applied for a grant from the Eastern Highlands Health District for an active living project and we were awarded the grant. This is to purchase materials for (1)-36' long bog bridge, 3 different sections and its through a Wetland area and the Rolling Woods open space. So that's an active trail on the Woodmont/Mockingbird Lane roads uses, and now with the Windy Hill sub-division that covers about 60 properties. Gosselin shared screen of area that outlines phase 1. Photos showed where trail is blazed and another showed where people are walking instead. You can see they put some sort of makeshift corduroy down. There is a potential intermittent stream that runs through this area where people are walking now, however the way that they are planning on spanning the bridge, it should not impede the flow whatsoever.

Mathieu: Asked if that had been in place for a long time. Gosselin: Yes, these trails and the sub-division was approved in 1993. This was our first open subdivision, so with this part of the Rolling Woods subdivision approval, came this open space that had this walking trail advertised. Then, the Windy Hill subdivision added on to that as well and it connects to the Laidlaw recreational complex. This is bridge location #1. Bridge location

#2 is also within the Rolling Woods Subdivision. You can see here in the photos, there were rocks placed for people to skip and hop over. There is seasonal standing water pictured that the bridge would go over. That would be 72 linear feet of bridge. These would be similarly constructed to the ones we reviewed for the Williams Preserve. There is rebar fixing the bridge into the ground, otherwise it is just the wood on top of cement patio blocks and the rebar is for stability so it doesn't slide around. Photos were shown of what was implemented at the Williams Preserve and the proposed 2-board path. It is only a 2-board path as it will not be used as much and it won't be for long spans. The subdivision map was shown, and the locations of the bridges are roughly identified and how the trail connects. We have trail posts approved as well, as part of the grant application, but that is not going to be in any Wetland areas. We are also getting a trail kiosk funded at the Laidlaw park which will have the trail maps for both the Windy Hill, Laidlaw and Rolling Woods property.

Mathieu: How long are these trails? Gosselin: I'm not sure, and haven't gotten that far yet but will be making a brochure.

Mathieu: Thinks project are excellent. How much were the grants? Gosselin: The Kiosk was \$2,000 and the wood was approximately another \$2,000. The Protected Spaces Stewardship Committee (PSSC) puts these projects/bridges together, Eric Thomas is the PSSC chair and will be here next time.

B. Preliminary Discussion – 300 Cedar Swamp Road – Agent: George Logan; Owner: Jeffery Nodden – Fill in man-made pond and enhance other ponds on property.

Logan joined meeting via Zoom, and shared screen with important documents and project information.

Logan informed he was approached by Owner about a year ago and Andrew Bushnell produced plans to be used, back in 2019. Property owner wants to add 2 additional single-family homes on their 7-acre property. There are 3 Wetland isolations on the property (South, Central, and Northern).

The plan was shown and reviewed. Asking to fill in isolated wet meadow (central Wetland) with man-made pond and mitigate the resource. It has been maintained and mowed as a meadow for time. Pond was made sometime in-between 1992-2005. Plan is to expand existing Southern and Northern wetlands so the resources keep same square footage if wet meadow and pond are mitigated. Clarified that there are no fish in the pond, but there are water insects, frogs, toads, etc. Explained the locations of proposed homes, driveways, etc. Wanted to bring the plan before the agency as a preliminary discussion to see what thoughts and questions are brought up by the plan, before we start permit and application processes.

Mathieu: questioned the size of the lot. Logan found the total lot is 7.39 acres. Lot is to be split into 2 other lots, for a total of 2 lots on the property. Additional lot #1, will be 1.8 acres, and additional lot #2 would be larger.

The directions of the homes and location on the lots were discussed. Purpose of filling in the meadow could be for a potential back yard. The plans indicated appropriate spots for septic too.

Choate: Asked for explanation of the hydraulic activity and where it all goes. Logan: guessed the Northern pond is isolated because it is man-made, and to the East of it is agricultural lands. Central meadow with excavated pond is isolated, and the Southern Wetland resource extends more to the South and may connect to some water source. Has not gone as far as figuring out the drainage system on the lot, or where things go.

Mathieu: We would need to see that for the next meeting. Choate agreed as they want to understand what you are losing and what you are gaining. That is hard to understand at this point. Logan: What do I need to provide? Mathieu: There is a number of concerns. Changes are being made to the plot, and does that interfere with any off-site Wetland areas. Logan: Does not believe so, at all. When he comes with full application, he will be looking more into stone water, etc. Mathieu: Asked if they were to dig into any of the Wetlands, if it would impact the Wetland off-site seen on the plan/map. Logan: Does not believe so. He will look at that, and provide more information. The idea is to compensate for the filling of the isolated central wetland by expanding the other 2 resources on the site.

Gosselin: Had questions as she explained that the project is more than filling in the circular man-made pond at the center of the lot, that the whole central isolated Wetland would be filled. Logan confirmed. The plan is to fill in approx. 8600 sq. ft. of Wetland, compensate for such with the expansion of the other 2 Wetlands on the property.

Choate: Concerned that it is an awful lot, and that they would actually be filling in Wetlands. The proposal doesn't include the digging out of the other 2 areas, so concerned that it is not actually creating more habitat and more Wetlands. She would want to see that will happen. Logan explained that the plan is to add and extension of a wet meadow on the Wetlands to replace what would be lost, but he has not included any grading. We could potentially excavate, as the site is pretty flat. Thinks that if graded properly, and excavated, they could recreate the marsh/pond, just in a different area. The Northern Wetland would be a simple expansion, not as involved as what they could do on the Southern Wetland, as it is a man-made pond. What you don't see on the plans is the edge of the pond which is very close to the delineated Wetland boundary, and it veers off. A meadow is already existing. With the expansion, it would create a similar habitat.

Choate: Have you done an inventory of what exists in the wetland? Logan: Not to any great extent. Choate: Confirmed no fish. Logan: Looked at the area that would be impacted and guesses amphibian reproduction, other kinds of species you would see in an open area/open field. He's sure that there is similar inventory at the other 2 Wetlands. Can do a much more detailed inventory of what is out there, and will create an inventory form for each Wetland and will provide that data at next steps. Then he could give more information on how they would do the Wetland re-creation.

Mathieu: Thinks there is a lot of impact here and would like to better understand the gains. Wants to see an impact vs. gains report both on-site and off-site. Also curious about public hearing. Logan confirmed there would be a public hearing, as it is a proposal to fill a wetland. Mathieu reiterated she is concerned about off-site impact, and concerned about the Southern Wetland addition impacting the off-site Wetland and neighbor's property. Wants to see a lot of good detail on the impact, and you think you can create it, but will it work. Also wants to see the thoughts on mitigation, and a written report on

that. Logan: Will do a function value analysis and compare the existing function with what is being taken out, with the functions that are being proposed. Logan also wants Owner to provide better topography of the area, for Wetland production. Can also do hand dug test to 3-4 ft. to get a better idea of the soil strata here, which would give us a better understanding of the hydrology and what the Wetlands could be, because you want to rely on ground water. He does not foresee a problem here as it is a till dominated area.

Penney: Had the following comments:

- We would need soil data.
- Want to understand the Wetland soils here and the area to be filled and how that would be reutilized in the other areas.
- Better topographic info in necessary.
- Abutter to the North has a driveway immediately adjacent to the property line, 10 ft off. Expanding Wetland complex, and logistically what will that mean for that abutter, and having the need for more regulatory oversight on their property that does not already exist, with the 75ft and up area, may be something to consider.
- Additionally, for the property to the South, has same situation. Expanding that pond and in the Westerly direction on the property, moving that regulatory authority into their property, will require more regulatory oversight here as well, that does not exist already.
- These ponds are very much ground water influenced. What you see out there is the amount of ground water in these ponds in my opinion. Influenced to form these Wetlands.

Penney asked Logan about when the middle Wetland was created. Logan: Not there in 1990s, but did not look at archival photos. Penney: Went back to 2009 and it is there. You would think most of these are man-made areas are used for whatever reason, irrigation, farming, aesthetic value.

There is a pond to the South of the property as well, that might have some connectivity to the Wetland body that you can see in the contour mapping that Andrew Bushnell put together. Spoke to applicant in 2019, and Owner/Applicant was told to get soil scientist. Now a couple years later, they are revisiting with a professional soil scientist. Application should have full complex of Wetland and at least some sort of semblance of the connectivity of those 2 Wetlands on the Southerly side and whatever happens to the North. If we are eliminating 8,000 sq. ft. and gaining 13,000 sq. ft. and we can get a higher value, is that a benefit? That's the goal of the Wetlands Agency to make that determination.

Mathieu: Wants to see other ideas or alternatives that you would look at, to try and place 3 houses on that lot. To Penney's point, we need to look at alternatives to all of these. If there are other ideas that can be shared next month, that would be helpful. Penney would say to applicant and Logan, we have this 3-lot configuration that we discussed back in Feb. in 2020, in early days of Zoom. Is this configuration going to stay the same? Can you change the configuration and therefor change the mitigation? Mathieu: Wants to know more about that middle Wetland on the property. Seems established, and has purpose. Biggest thing is impact off-site and to neighbors, if the re-creation would work, and alternative options.

Briggs: Asked if it was necessary to fill this wetland? Is it because of where they want the houses, or is it more of aesthetic and want to have lawn? Could they build house where they want without filling in the Wetland? Logan: Thinks they are looking for connectivity between the 3 lots. The central wetland seems to be in the way, but can't speak to the owner's thoughts. Briggs: Understands the want for connectivity, but even though the small pond is man-made, the rest of the wetland is natural. There is probably a seasonal importance of this and it is hard to get that data now, especially during a drought. Will not be able to fully capture the importance of the wet meadow if this is not done in the Spring time. This may be of importance for the pond's value, which would not be seen by doing an inventory in the near term. Logan: For the most part, with the Spring ephemerals, we have the whole compliment of species that will be able to be inventoried before frost, so he thinks we could grab most of them. He can't tell you the abundance of the amphibians in the spring, but expects them to be the same as what would be seen in the bigger ponds in the Spring.

Agency had concerns for turtles and salamander species as well, Logan hasn't seen them, but expects they could be there. Logan will work on it, and see if he can address the questions and concerns. Also sending more information to Gosselin as requested per her email. Logan also commented that Cedar Swamp is a critical habitat. Logan will be present at the September 28th meeting.

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: Observed more activity on the property, contacted the town attorney to send a letter ASAP as Town Council already approved the letter. Informed the agency that upon receiving the letter from the Town of Coventry's attorney, the Owner/Co-Owner came into Town Hall the same day. They had a discussion that was not proper office conduct, treated the staff poorly and with attitude.

Will present Agency with a memo that she typed up for the Town Manager and attorney about the 8/4/22 office meeting. Melinda Gosselin and Eric Trott (Director of land use), and interim Zoning Enforcement Officer are scheduling a site visit and will be going out to the property to review violations. There are violations on the property against the Wetlands and Zoning regulations. Business has no permits, nor do they have permits for the land use for farming.

Mathieu: Asked if they are allowed on the property. Gosselin informed that Trott wants to go when Owner Josh Beebe is present. Mathieu asked if the Owner is who they got into the altercation with. Gosselin confirmed it was with him, the co-owner and an employee.

Mathieu: Questioned if police officers need to be present for their safety? Gosselin: We will inform the Owner at the time of the meeting of some ground rules, and that if there is any altercation or improper conduct that the meeting will immediately be over and the Owner will need to strictly communicate with the Town's attorney. Mathieu: Suggests they ensure their safety, as there is no reason to be treated this way for doing their job.

Gosselin: Will keep everyone updated, and will send them a report.

6. ADOPTION OF MINUTES:

A. July 27, 2022 – Regular Meeting Minutes

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

With the following corrections: Upon review of the minutes, there are no corrections or comments.

By: Mathieu
Voting:
For: Mathieu, Choate
Against: None
Abstain: Briggs

Seconded: Choate

7. CORRESPONDENCE:

No correspondence was presented or discussed.

8. DISCUSSION:

A. Coventry Lake Health

Coventry Lake is doing better, since it was closed in July. Bacteria has gone down; all readings are better. Gosselin presented a report on the bacteria and conditions. Threshold estimates were developed. All reports attached to the agenda.

Dr. Kortmann offered to meet with us before the state of the lake forum, traditionally held in mid-September. Mathieu questioned if he could attend the next meeting. Gosselin informed their next meeting would be after the forum, and he wants to meet with us prior.

Discussed holding a special meeting 1st week of September, with proposed dates of the 7th or 8th. Gosselin reaching out via email to find the availability of the Annex for those dates and proposed times. Gosselin will get a meeting scheduled.

Town had done a good job controlling the nutrients coming from the water shed. Lake is currently open. It will begin churning again in the Fall, making it vulnerable to another bloom.

B. Violations Framework

Gosselin: Reviewed DEEP's enforcement flowchart. Gosselin followed it, and outlined path she normally takes. Flowchart attached to agenda. Explained that each step taken needs to happen ASAP. Choate: Does it need to be adopted, or become part of regulations? Already in state statute with DEEP's.

C. Beach Sand/Lakefront Activities

Gosselin: Reviewed some programs for Lake front activities, and programs should be broken down into 2 parts. First part, taking water shed pledge, higher lever would be a Lake Steward. Will need to work with the Lake Advisory Committee. Mathieu asked for this to be added to agenda for special meeting. Good to have these standards for people who come before us, in regards to language and what we want to see on the property. There were concerns with how things would change when the sewers were put in, good or bad. How did things change? Mathieu believed Dr. Kortmann was involved in Bolton Lake, thinks he could add his ideas and thoughts at the special meeting.

9. ADJOURNMENT:

Mathieu adjourned the meeting at 8:50 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

Nicole Archambault

Nicole Archambault, Minutes 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.