

**GLASTONBURY CONSERVATION COMMISSION
(INLAND WETLANDS & WATERCOURSES AGENCY)
SPECIAL MEETING MINUTES OF MONDAY, JULY 1, 2019**

The Glastonbury Conservation Commission (Inland Wetlands & Watercourses Agency), along with Mr. Tom Mocko, Town Environmental Planner, in attendance held a Special Meeting in Meeting Room A, second floor of Town Hall located at 2155 Main Street, Glastonbury, Connecticut.

ROLL CALL

Commission Members – Present

Mrs. Judy Harper, Chairperson

Ms. Kim McClain, Secretary

Mr. Frank Kaputa

Mr. Mark Temple

Mr. Brian Davis

Vacancy

Commission Members – Excused

Dennis McInerney, Vice-Chairman

Chairperson Harper called the meeting to order at 4:00 P.M.

I. FORMAL ACTION & RECOMMENDATION

Application of the Town of Glastonbury for: an inland wetlands and watercourses permit; and a recommendation to the Town Plan & Zoning Commission concerning a Section 4.11 (Flood Zone) Special Permit for the Fisher Hill Road’s Replacement Bridge over Roaring Brook - east of intersection with Manchester Road/Route 83 - GM2 Associates, Inc. C.E. - Daniel A. Pennington, Town Engineer

Mr. Pennington explained the Town’s application to replace Fisher Hill Road’s bridge over Roaring Brook. He noted that no major issues were brought forward by the public, and a replacement alternative was chosen at that meeting, which is being presented here tonight. A federal Bridge Program is funding 80% of the costs, and the Town is covering the remaining 20%.

Mr. Dennis Garceau, P.E. for GM2 projects, discussed the engineering aspects of the bridge. He noted the history of the bridge, stating that it is in poor condition and needs to be replaced. He explained that they looked at 2 rehabilitation alternatives and 4 replacement alternatives. The cost is \$2.2 million, so the Town will pay about \$440,000. There will be approximately 300 linear feet of roadway construction and an additional 700 square feet of impervious material. He explained that they will put silt fence and other sedimentation controls along the disturbed areas, during construction. He continued that they will put a debris containment system when the abutments and existing deck are removed. There will be no direct impact to the brook or the wetlands. He noted that they are on schedule for the final design plans to be completed at the end of July 2019, with construction to start April 1, 2020. The road will be closed during that period, and the project is expected to be completed by November 30, 2020.

Mr. Pennington noted that this type of construction is very similar to the type of construction the Town used on the Eastern Boulevard Bridge replacement, though he acknowledged that this bridge will have a more rustic look and a lesser impact on the regulated area due to less utilities relocation.

Commissioner Davis asked what the lifespan is of the existing abutment. Mr. Garceau said about 75 years. Commissioner Kaputa asked how the removal of the existing bridge is going to work. Mr. Garceau explained that the details of that are not specifically defined yet. Commissioner Temple inquired if all the existing abutments are concrete. Mr. Garceau said yes.

Commissioner Kaputa asked if there will be some kind of a reuse of those pieces, so that they could keep a piece of history. Mr. Pennington explained that when they went before the Town Council, they were told to retain the plaque and devise an additional plaque to embed into the parapet wall. Kaputa suggested saving the "W.P.A." and the date on the pieces because they are a piece of history. Mr. Pennington noted the suggestion and explained that they can write it into the specifications for the contractor to preserve certain pieces for use at a later date.

Mr. Mocko asked if riprap will be used. Mr. Garceau said yes. The riprap areas are to stabilize the banks and also as a shelf for the inspectors. Mr. Mocko asked if any approach has been taken into consideration with incremental fill in the flood zone. Mr. Pennington stated that they have to generate the calculation. Mr. Mocko clarified that they will aim for a no-incremental fill. Mr. Pennington said yes. Mr. Mocko said that this is a premiere trout stream, so a lot of fishermen will be using this. He asked if the inspector could be the person that questions are directed to, not the Town Environmental Planner. Mr. Garceau said yes. Mr. Pennington said that they can generate an information sheet for questions related to the fisheries resource that may be impacted.

Secretary McClain suggested having a camera there in real-time so that people could see the construction process and where their tax dollars are going. Commissioner Davis asked how similar the appearance would be to the bridge on Country Club Road. Mr. Pennington stated that they will look similar, but there will be some key differences, such as the following: this bridge's parapets are solid, not see-through; it also has a curvature on the top and has a stained finish.

Motion by: Secretary McClain

Seconded by: Commissioner Kaputa

MOVED, that the Inland Wetlands and Watercourse issues an inland wetlands and watercourses permit to the Town of Glastonbury for its Fisher Hill Road replacement bridge over Roaring Brook project, in accordance with the following conditions:

1. Healthy mature trees shall be preserved and saved when possible. Said trees shall be protected with the use of high visibility construction fence during construction or otherwise protected as required by staff.
2. Installation of soil erosion and sedimentation control and stabilization measures shall be the Permittee's responsibility. Once installed, these measures shall then be inspected by the Environmental Planner prior to land disturbance activities. Afterwards, it then shall be the Permittee's responsibility to inspect these control measures during, and immediately following, substantial storm events and maintain and/or replace the control measures, when needed, on a

regular basis until the site is vegetatively stabilized. Hay bales shall be replaced every 60 days. The Environmental Planner is hereby authorized to require additional soil erosion and sediment controls and stabilization measures to address situations that arise on the site.

Result: Motion passed unanimously (5-0-0).

Motion by: Secretary McClain

Seconded by: Commissioner Kaputa

MOVED, that the Conservation Commission recommends to the Town Plan & Zoning Commission approval of a Section 4.11 (Flood Zone) Special Permit for the Town of Glastonbury's proposed Fisher Hill Road replacement bridge over Roaring Brook, in accordance with plans on file in the Office of Community Development, and in compliance with the following conditions:

1. Healthy mature trees shall be preserved and saved when possible. Said trees shall be protected with the use of high visibility construction fence during construction or otherwise protected as required by staff.
2. Installation of soil erosion and sedimentation control and stabilization measures shall be the Permittee's responsibility. Once installed, these measures shall then be inspected by the Environmental Planner prior to land disturbance activities. Afterwards, it then shall be the Permittee's responsibility to inspect these control measures during, and immediately following, substantial storm events and maintain and/or replace the control measures, when needed, on a regular basis until the site is vegetatively stabilized. Hay bales shall be replaced every 60 days. The Environmental Planner is hereby authorized to require additional soil erosion and sediment controls and stabilization measures to address situations that arise on the site.
3. Upon completion of the project, a Professional Engineer shall provide certification that the project met the requirements of the applicable flood zone regulations.
4. **The preservation of the original identifying elements shall be incorporated into the new structure.**

Disc: Commissioner Davis asked if they should request that the TPZ create a plaque. The Commission unanimously agreed, so #4 was added to the original motion.

Result: Motion passed unanimously (5-0-0).

II. INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS

1. **Sidewalk Construction Along Main Street proposal - 4,400 linear feet along west side of Main Street/Route 17, along with a pedestrian bridge, drainage improvements/eroded gully restoration, and retaining wall construction - generally south of Mallard Drive and north of Stockade Road - Daniel A. Pennington, Town Engineer/Manager of Physical Services**

Mr. Pennington discussed the proposal, noting that it has long been on the Town's radar to have continuous pedestrian access from the Town Center to South Glastonbury. He explained that the Town

will be receiving a \$300,000 grant from the state-sponsored Community Connectivity Grant Program (CCGP). He noted that the bridge is about 4,400 feet in its entirety. He briefed the Commission on the discussion during the Town Council meeting, which pertained to whether they should go forward with a concrete sidewalk or incorporate a wider multi-use, blacktop-paved trail. Ultimately, the Council voted to continue with the design of a traditional concrete sidewalk.

Mr. Pennington stated that they are installing a 50-foot long pedestrian bridge over the roadway. The underlying soil is poor, so they are looking at using helical piles that are screwed into the ground.

Another component of the project is that there are steep slopes along a long section of Main Street which are fairly heavily wooded. In order to construct the retaining wall, they have to devise a way to construct from the top down. He noted that no matter which type of wall they choose, it will require the removal of trees. Secretary McClain also stated that retaining walls are unattractive and suggested the possibility of making it a living wall so that wildflowers could be integrated into the design. Commissioner Davis contended that the bike path invites cyclists and strollers more so than that.

Mr. Pennington said that in the northerly end of the project, there is a portion of the drainage system that discharges to a ditch, which has eroded considerably over time. The Town proposes to alleviate that issue by extending that pipe into a drop manhole and then going out at the lower elevation. Commissioner Temple asked what the existing pipe is under Main Street that will connect to this proposal. The Town Engineer explained that this is a 24-inch RCP that runs underneath Main Street and discharges to daylight. Commissioner Temple asked if the new drop hole will be precast. Mr. Pennington said yes. Commissioner Kaputa asked if that will be exposed. Mr. Pennington said no, they will cover it back up, but surface water could still be contained wherever it wants to go. Commissioner Kaputa noted that this is a conservation easement, and remarked that in the past, the Commission has considered this to be a utility, but in this case, that is a bit of a stretch. Secretary McClain asked if they could do some planting to mitigate the loss of easement. Mr. Pennington suggested using a 6-inch layer of wood chips. Mr. Mocko argued against that, stating that it will decompose. He suggested they use something shade-exposed or rock-tolerant.

Mr. Pennington noted that it is all proposed to be piped but, on the surface, they would be filling in over to stabilize it. Commissioner Temple asked if this will have some sort of easement there. The Town Engineer said yes. He clarified that the Commission would like a ground cover or surface structure that maintains stability of the soil and allows plants to grow over it, without incurring a high cost and that would be low maintenance.

Mr. Mocko asked if the Town Engineer has considered impervious concrete. Secretary McClain agreed with that suggestion, stating that she would love to know if there is any grant money to address that because there are a lot of areas that are impervious around sidewalks. Mr. Pennington stated that having water infiltrate through concrete then freeze and expand will move a lot more. Secretary McClain noted that the research would say otherwise. She explained that impervious surfaces actually had less hazard and ice over the top because they melt faster due to the sun.

Commissioner Temple asked if the Town is concerned about any unknown buried utilities with which they may have a conflict. Mr. Pennington responded that they are digging some test pits to make sure that they do not have to shift the location of the pedestrian bridge. Chairman Harper asked if they will be

reaching out to neighbors. Mr. Pennington said that during construction of a sidewalk, there will be a public hearing to notify the neighbors.

Chairman Harper noted the following requests that the Commission is informally recommending tonight to the applicant:

- Construction of a living wall
- Fences on top of tall walls that need front lawns as a liability and safety issue
 - Commissioner Davis noted that fencing is only as required. They need to investigate the code requirements.
- Restore the stabilization work within the conservation easement to as level as possible condition
- Public hearings for neighbors
- Commissioner Temple added: With regard to the steeper section to be stabilized, that is not within the conservation easement: How are they going to treat (aka permanently stabilize) the land surface?

Chairman Harper asked if there will there be any signalizes crosswalks when this is done. Mr. Pennington explained that they have approached the State of Connecticut about it, since it is a state road, but there are no pedestrian phases to those signals right now. It would require extensive analyses to assess the benefits of adding a pedestrian phase there. He did note that the State is considering moving towards implementing crosswalks that will allow pedestrians to cross during non-conflicting vehicular traffic.

Mr. Mocko stated that the applicant does not absolutely require a wetlands permit because there is no direct impact on wetlands. The sidewalk is only 4 feet wide, so there is not a lot of disturbance. The Commission agreed and directed Mr. Mocko to issue a staff-administered wetlands permit.

2. Demolition and Removal of Historical Petroleum Terminal Piping Dock proposal - 300 Welles Street (southwest of Riverfront Community Center) - Daniel A. Pennington, Town Engineer

Mr. Pennington presented the proposal to demolish and remove the historical petroleum terminal piping dock by the Riverfront Community Center. He explained that the reason they have remained for all these years was because if the Town ever wanted to reuse or reconstruct the old dock in any way, then the permitting at the state level would go smoother if the old dock were still in place. He noted that this turned out to be incorrect thinking, and the piping dock has reached a point of potential deterioration where it poses a hazard. They need to take steps to remove it in its entirety.

He explained that the Town discussed what type of State permitting process is appropriate for that type of function and what would be involved. It was determined that it could fall under a general permit issued by the state, which would be subjected to certain restrictions, such as an exclusionary time from June 1 to September 30. He noted that they have retained a contractor to do the work and will talk about his intended means and methods before they come back for a permit. They are looking to bring in a crane over a load-bearing path, which would be suited to remove the entire dock from the top of the river bank. The remnants of the old piping need to be dealt with. It has lead paint on the outside that needs to be dealt with appropriately, and there might be asbestos and residual petroleum, too. The wood piles for the dock will be cut-flush, with no intention to pull them out of the river.

Commissioner Davis asked about the notion of leaving the piping dock there to, at some point, build it back in the future. Mr. Pennington explained that the Town has shown an interest in creating a fishing-type of dock, so should they build another dock there again in the future, they would have to permit it. Secretary McClain suggested consideration of a water taxi, too.

Commissioner Davis asked if any trees will be removed. Mr. Pennington said only what is absolutely necessary. Secretary McClain and Commissioner Temple inquired about the cold cut for the piping. Mr. Pennington stated that he will get clarification on what the contractor means by a cold cut for the piping. He noted that the Town does not anticipate this project taking more than a few days, with the end of September as the anticipated project date. Commissioner Davis suggested having some kind of monument or interpretive sign to commemorate what used to be on the site, especially since that area gets a lot of foot traffic. The Commission agreed.

Chairman Harper clarified that this application will have a wetlands motion, as well as a conservation motion.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - Regular Meeting of June 13, 2019

The minutes were accepted as presented.

II. COMMENTS BY CITIZENS ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS - NONE

III. OTHER BUSINESS

1. Chairman's Report **NONE**
2. Environmental Planner Report **NONE**

With no other business to discuss, Chairman Harper adjourned the meeting at 5:50 pm.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lilly Torosyan

Lilly Torosyan
Recording Clerk