

**Inland Wetlands & Watercourses Commission
(Remote) Regular Meeting
Wednesday, May 5, 2021, 7:00 p.m.
Town Hall, 45 South Main Street
Wallingford, CT**

MINUTES

Chair James Vitali called this (Remote) Regular Meeting of the Wallingford Inland Wetlands & Watercourses Commission to order at 7:00 p.m. This Meeting was publicly noticed and held entirely remotely. [A YouTube recording was produced and posted on the Wallingford Town Website by Government Access Television.]

A. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Pledge was recited.

B. ROLL CALL

PRESENT: Chair James Vitali, Secretary Nick Kern, Commissioners Deborah Phillips, Jennifer Passaretti and Michael Caruso, and Alternates Aili McKeen and Robert Simon.

There were 11 callers in the remote audience, including the speakers below.

C. CONSIDERATION OF MINUTES

1. Regular Meeting (Remote), Apr.7, 2021

**MS. PHILLIPS: MOTION THAT THE MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF APRIL 7, 2021
BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED.**

MR. SIMON: SECOND.

**VOTE: MS. MCKEEN – YES; MR. KERN – YES; MS. PHILLIPS – YES; MR. SIMON – YES;
MS. PASSARETTI – YES; CHAIR VITALI – YES.**

D. OLD BUSINESS

1. #A21-3.2 / 11 Trumbull Drive – Jill Kobrin – ('after-the-fact' proposed drainage improvements, relocation of shed, play scape installation & regrading)
See also Agenda J.4. for this property, which was addressed below.

Applicant Ms. Jill Kobrin was in the remote audience.

Ms. O'Hare said a Notice of Violation for this property went out on March 23rd. The Applicant's land alterations had strayed onto Town property, but she is cooperating with my office, the Water Division, the Engineering Department, and the Department of Law. A meeting was held in the Mayor's Office, and the Town does not want a pipe onto its property next door on Shoebox Road, which is a paper street. The Applicant brought in a new proposal yesterday, which I posted on the Town website for this agenda and e-mailed to the Commissioners with my three proposed Conditions of Approval. They will remediate anything that was done on Town property. They are willing to do gentle grading to let flows travel to the southwest corner of their land to fix the drainage problem. This should solve the problem, and it is acceptable to the Town departments.

Chair Vitali asked, Are you wanting to continue this?

Ms. O'Hare said, There are three parts. I am asking you to Affirm the Notice of Violation to remain in place until all of this is done in a month or two. Their proposal yesterday includes grading the back yard for drainage improvement within the Upland Review Area plus a request to approve a split-rail fence, a raised garden bed, a play scape and a trampoline. They're going to relocate a shed that's half on Town property. So I'd like you to approve the proposal that came in yesterday with my three Conditions of Approval in my e-mail. Those are:

1) Proposed amenities to be installed only after the remediation of unpermitted alteration on Town land on Shoebox Road and the regrading of 11 Trumbull Drive to reroute the drainage has been satisfactorily completed and stabilized.

2) Environmental Planner is to be contacted in advance if the work is commencing, and she will check if erosion controls have been installed satisfactorily for the work.

3) An Excavation Permit is obtained from the Engineering Department a.s.a.p. to allow entrance onto the Town land to perform the remediation work on Town land.

Ms. O'Hare said, So the contractor has to be licensed and there's a small bond with Engineering Department. Separately, I'd like you to Affirm the Notice of Violation.

Chair Vitali asked Applicant Ms. Kobrin to speak.

Ms. Kobrin said, Ms. O'Hare misspoke by saying "southwest", but it's shown on the diagram correctly to be on the northwest.

Chair Vitali asked Ms. Kobrin if she is in agreement with the Conditions of Approval.

Ms. Kobrin said, Yes.

Chair Vitali asked for Commissioners' questions. There were none from Commissioners McKeen, Passaretti, or Phillips.

Commissioner Kern asked, Does the Engineering Department approve for Ms. Kobrin to go onto Town land and regrade it?

Ms. O'Hare said, Yes, permission for a contractor.

Commissioner Kern said, I don't understand why it has to be an insured contractor and to get a permit.

Ms. O'Hare said, It's because there is a water main involved. The Law Department wanted that.

Commissioner Kern said, Hopefully, she won't excavate to 16 inches in the ground.

There were no questions from Commissioners Caruso or Simon.

Chair Vitali asked, Is this an 'after-the-fact' application?

Ms. O'Hare said, Yes.

Chair Vitali asked, For a Remediation permit, would it be a Significant Activity or not?

Ms. O'Hare said, You're going to handle Application #A21-3.2 first; and then separately I want you to Affirm that the Violation remains in place.

Chair Vitali asked, So do we have to deem it a Significant Activity?

Ms. O'Hare said, You can do that, following tradition.

MS. PHILLIPS: MOTION THAT APPLICATION #A21-3.2 / 11 TRUMBULL DRIVE – JILL KOBRIN – BE DEEMED NOT A SIGNIFICANT ACTIVITY.

MR. SIMON: SECOND.

VOTE: MS. PHILLIPS – YES; MR. SIMON – YES; MS. MCKEEN – YES; MR. KERN – YES; CHAIR VITALI – YES.

Chair Vitali then asked for a Motion to Approve or Deny the Application.

MS. PHILLIPS: MOTION THAT APPLICATION #A21-3.2 / 11 TRUMBULL DRIVE – JILL KOBRIN – BE APPROVED WITH THE THREE CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL DISCUSSED TONIGHT.

MR. SIMON: SECOND.

In discussion, Commissioner Kern requested that Ms. O'Hare should place wetland plaques on the properties involved in this Application. Chair Vitali agreed with his request.

VOTE: MS. PHILLIPS – YES; MR. SIMON – YES; MS. PASSARETTI – YES; MR. CARUSO - YES; CHAIR VITALI – YES.

Next, Ms. O'Hare asked for a Motion to say that the Notice of Violation remains in effect until after the work is done and stabilized.

MS. PHILLIPS: MOTION THAT THE NOTICE OF VIOLATION ON 11 TRUMBULL DRIVE REMAIN IN EFFECT.

MR. SIMON: SECOND.

VOTE: MS. PHILLIPS – YES; MR. SIMON – YES; MR. KERN – YES; MR. CARUSO – YES; CHAIR VITALI – YES.

2. #A21-3.3 / 475 Williams Road – Scott & Sandy Cavallaro – (installation of in-ground pool, low wall, patio-surround & compensatory flood storage area/rain garden)

Applicants Scott and Sandy Cavallaro were in the remote audience.

Ms. O'Hare said, This Application was formally received at the April meeting, and Commissioners had information in the April 1 packet. I have been to the site. The Cavallaros want to put in an in-ground pool behind their house. The issue is that it's in a 100-year floodplain, so they will have to provide compensatory storage. There's a history on this property from prior ownership, with a violation in 2009. The tenant had pushed wetlands back and filled edges. Some Commissioners were out there before. There are 11.6 acres, but most of it is wet. The Engineering Department gave a map outlining the floodplain, which matches what the Applicant submitted now. There are 8.6 acres of wetlands. Three acres are non-wetlands--of that, two acres are in the URA under your jurisdiction. Scott and Sandy are Applicants and the new Owners since seven years ago. They wanted to smooth the lawn and install sod. He was given Administrative Approval a year ago 'after-the-fact' only because he hadn't gone into the wetlands. I sent out photos from a year ago, showing unpermitted improvements of installing sod around the house, and I sent photos from two weeks ago. You have my Environmental Planner's Report. I'm waiting for the Engineering Department to review calculations for the floodplain issues.

Mr. David Carson, Principal, OCC Group, said that David Lord did new mapping this December, but we do not have a Wetlands Report.

Ms. O'Hare noted that Mr. Cavallaro did some filling. I'm waiting to compare the previous Soils Scientist Report by Tom Petrus with the new Report to say what soils are there. This pool and patio and low wall are proposed on the wetlands side. It's about 10 feet with a silt fence on the wetlands. I would like to see the pool set back 10 feet toward the house.

Chair Vitali asked for Commissioners' questions.

Commissioners Phillips and Caruso had no questions.

Commissioner McKeen wanted to know about the 11 acres of property.

Commissioner Simon asked, Could the pool be set back?

Ms. O'Hare said, I was hoping their engineer could look at that because there's certain parameters. They have to stay about 25 feet from the well. And they can come back some toward the firepit. Maybe they can push it back 20 feet.

Commissioner Kern asked, Erin, you talked about the septic reserve area. Did they address that?

Ms. O'Hare said, I haven't heard back from the Applicant since I sent the report out Friday.

Commissioner Kern asked Ms. O'Hare's reason for moving it back. Is it because it's too close to the wetlands?

Ms. O'Hare said, Yes, it's too close to the wetlands. They have room. The low wall is 10 feet from the wetlands. We don't typically approve an inground pool that close to wetlands. If they dig down, it might be wet down there. They might need a footing drain.

Commissioner Kern asked, Where are they going to put the spoils from the pool when they clean the pool?

Ms. O'Hare said, They proposed to put it, temporarily, on the other side of the property in a hole that they're digging for the compensatory flood storage. I think it's to be taken off afterward.

Commissioner Kern said, I understand that pool spoils are supposed to be contaminants, to be stored separately and taken away because of the chlorine in the pool water.

Ms. O'Hare said her letter asked about drainage from the pool water when it is in use.

Mr. Carson spoke for Scott and Sandy Cavallaro: This is somewhat less than a 12-acre lot with a home on it on an island of upland soil in the center. The proposal is for an in-ground pool, to fall within the 50-foot buffer, and also partially within the 100-year floodplain. Because of that we're proposing a compensatory rain garden in order to provide a shallow area for enhancement and diversity to the existing buffer plus flood storage. We haven't responded to any of the comments because we'd like the Commission to do a site walk and discuss the pool location and the feasibility of a rain garden. The pool low wall is 25 feet upgradient from the wetlands. The proposed rain garden is also 25 feet from the wetlands. Both locations were specifically chosen because of grading. The pool might be slid closer to the house. Right now, the pool surround is 10 feet from the existing patio area that has a fire pit in it. So the pool could be moved possibly 5 feet. And the rain garden could be reshaped. We'd like you to see those locations in the field. There's a couple of things in Erin's report: a pile of debris, which has been there and has pushed the wetlands line out. And there's a small triangle of lawn by the pool that is flagged as wetlands. I don't know how long it's been there. You could see where the flagging is. On the pool water discharge, I researched that. When you backflush a pool, you have to stop the chlorination process for three days. And then the pool water is clear water, which can be discharged on the front lawn area.

Chair Vitali said, The real issue is that they're looking to build a pool in the Upland Review Area. How is looking at the site going to change it?

Mr. Carson said, I'd like to see if the Commissioners have concerns on what they would like us to do. Conceivably, the pool could be moved 5 feet. The pool surround has a three-foot-high wall.

So the Commissioners agreed to meet at the property for a site visit. Chair Vitali set Monday, May 10, 5:30 p.m., as a Special Meeting site walk. Attending will be Chair Vitali and Commissioners Kern, Phillips, Passaretti, McKeen, Caruso and Simon. Also, Mr. David Carson of OCC Group and Ms. O'Hare will be present.

Commissioner Kern asked, Could the Applicant put lime down to show where the pool could be set? Or some stakes?

Mr. Carson agreed to do that.

Chair Vitali said, This Application is tabled to the June 2 Regular Meeting.

3. #A21-4.1 / 119 Quigley Road – Matt Turner – (shed) – Approved administratively on 4/13/21

Chair Vitali and Ms. O'Hare had reviewed this request. He noted this Administrative Approval.

4. #A21-4.2 / 4A Research Parkway – Six Research, LLC – (industrial development – automotive storage)

Appearing for the Applicant were Attorney Dennis Ceneviva of Meriden, Mr. Kenneth Quartuccio, Site Manager, and Mr. Michael Ott, Project Engineer from Summerhill Civil Engineers.

Attorney Ceneviva said, This is a vacant 3.2-acre parcel in the IX zone. We were here before you two years ago for the abutting parcel, 6 Research Parkway. The Application is to build a building for automobile storage. Number 6 Research Parkway has been developed already. My client has purchased 4A Research Parkway, and he wants to build another building here entirely for expanded automobile storage and no office space in this new building. In the Environmental Planner's Report of 4/30/21, it describes that there are no wetlands or watercourses here. But there is to be the new impervious area, which exceeds the 20,000-square-foot threshold. But there is a vernal pool across the street at 5 Research Parkway. So Mr. Ott will explain how the water flows here, the new impervious area that exceeds the 20,000 square-foot of impervious area, and how the water will be leaving this site. There are no wetlands on this site. This is an expansion of 6 Research. There is no separate curb cut, and we would be merging it with #6 on approvals from Inland Wetlands and from Planning and Zoning. You approved recently the new application at 5 Research Parkway across the street. Number 6 Research Parkway is in the watershed, and there was discussion about the Applicant could construct a sand filter, and Michael Ott will address how the water flows and how we're improving the quality of the water leaving the site. We are waiting for a Water & Sewer report. So this is a basic expansion of 6 Research.

Mr. Michael Ott, L.P.E., L.S., with Summerhill Civil Engineers, Madison, CT, shared his screen. Mr. Ott said: This is an aerial Google image of the site. I-91 is at the left and Research Parkway is here on the right. This exposed soil area at 6 Research Parkway, taken when it was under construction, and this green area, vegetated, is the current site, 4A Research Parkway. My next screen shows the aerial image from 2016 before construction started on 6 Research Parkway—our site is here. I-91 is on the left, and Research Parkway is in the center. So I brought this up to show you that in the approval for 5 Research Parkway was identified a vernal pool where I'm circling with my cursor. I'll come back to this.

Mr. Ott next showed the plan set. Our proposal is to construct a 6,000-square-foot storage building on the site and 55,700 square feet of pavement area. Car carriers will be parked in this area, and employees vehicles will park along this edge of pavement. The size of the pavement is needed for the car carriers, about 80 feet in length, to maneuver.

Mr. Ken Quartuccio said, The tractor trailers are 80 to 85 feet long.

Mr. Ott said the storage building in the corner will have just power and communications—no water or sanitary sewer. There will be an 8-foot chain-link fence around it, but a decorative fence toward Research Parkway. There will be parking area lighting the same as at 6 Research Parkway. Now the Stormwater Management System consists of two catch basins and storm sewer directing runoff to a flow diversion manhole and through an oil/grit separator, into a stormwater sand filter and into this large stormwater management basin. That arrangement is a requirement of the Water Department because we are in the Watershed Protection Overlay District. Higher rates of flow, above the water quality flow, at this diversion manhole will be directed away from the oil/grit separator and the sand filter and directly into the Stormwater Management basin. So the oil/grit separator and sand filter sizes and its storage volume have been designed to treat just under an inch of rainfall runoff over the 55,700-square-foot pavement area.

He continued: The building roof runoff is not directed to the stormwater management system. It will be directed to the west over a relatively flat-grade area toward Thorpe Avenue and allowed to infiltrate. The Water Department review comments say that the building roof water should not be connected to the stormwater management system, just as at 6 Research Parkway. So the oil/grit separator and the sand filter take care of water quality; and the larger stormwater management basin controls peak rates

of discharge, to attenuate or reduce the peak rates of discharge at equal to or less than existing conditions. The peak rate presently is relatively small. In the developed condition, we're giving an increase in discharge, so that's why the stormwater management basin is so large. And the discharge point is right at the southeast corner of the property. So all storm runoff will be directed into the stormwater discharge basin at the southeast corner of the property. I'll show you the flow path of the water on the aerial photo. Our discharge point is right about here, southeast. When water leaves the site today, and as developed in the future, it flows southerly into this lawn area which is the current stormwater discharge for this property. So stormwater will go into their detention system and flow into the system on Research Parkway and into the two dark catch basins that I'm showing here and here. Erin had raised whether our stormwater discharge is within 50 feet of the wetland on the east side of Research Parkway. It is not. Today it discharges between 50 and 75 feet away from the area of the vernal pool on Erin's sketch. Our runoff will be treated for water quality according to the Water Department's requirements, and the peak discharges will be equal to or below existing conditions.

Chair Vitali asked for Commissioners' questions.

Commissioners Phillips and Caruso had no questions.

Commissioner Kern asked about the water running west toward Thorpe Road or Avenue. Is that going off your property or staying on yours?

Mr. Ott said, It drains today toward Thorpe Avenue and it will do that. The roof water will travel from the building to the Thorpe Avenue street pump.

Commissioner Kern said, But is it property that the Applicant owns?

Mr. Ott said, Yes. This is a through lot which has frontage on Thorpe Avenue and on Research Parkway. So the water travels over 100 feet before it enters the Right-Of-Way of Thorpe Avenue.

Commissioner Kern said, On the other lot, there would be no cars parked other than transport trucks. Is it going to be the same here?

Mr. Ott said, There will not be any cars parked on the pavement at all. That was the reason for the additional building, so that any cars could be parked inside that warehouse.

Chair Vitali asked for additional questions.

Commissioners Simon, Passaretti, and McKeen had no questions.

Ms. O'Hare said, Mr. Ott, I think the roof flow is dispersed to the west toward Thorpe Avenue. Is it going over stone or grass? How does it travel that 100 feet? Is there a swale?

Mr. Ott said, No, we don't want a swale. It's a uniform slope, partially lawn and partially brush and woods. That will remain. So it will travel over 100 feet over a slightly vegetated slope before it reaches the property.

Ms. O'Hare asked, To clarify, you're going to direct your stormwater onto the present Right-Of-Way on Research Parkway. But for the water going to the property to the south, isn't it going to overcharge the system that was developed for there?

Mr. Ott said, You can see our stormwater management basin is designed to attenuate or reduce stormwater discharge from this property to be equal to or less than. On existing conditions, the two-year flow is 0.6 cubic feet per second existing and 0.7 in the developed condition on the bottom row. That tenth of difference has no significance. But in all other storm events, the developed condition is lower. You can read the top row versus the bottom row. In a 100-year storm, existing condition peak discharge rate is 4.7. In the developed condition, with the pavement, it would be 12.6 . But, because it goes through the outlet storage structure, when it leaves it discharges at a rate of 1.5, significantly lower than the existing condition flow. So we know that we won't overtax the neighboring property's stormwater system. If we did not do this, we could overtax their system.

Ms. O'Hare said, To be clear, today when it rains, a certain portion of the rain from 4A Research Parkway travels into the Research Parkway Right-Of-Way and travels to the south?

Mr. Ott said, Yes. This is the existing condition drainage area map, with the southeast corner of the property. This is the blue line, where rain drains from the site today. But in the developed condition that drainage area gets much larger (in red), and it's going to the same analysis point. So that's why we put this large stormwater detention basin, to reduce down to the existing condition.

Ms. O'Hare said, We don't have those drainage pattern maps yet. Will you submit them?

Mr. Ott said, I submitted to the Water Department and the Town Engineer. I'll submit them to you, also.

Chair Vitali asked, Erin, you have an extensive list of Proposed Conditions for the Applicant?

Ms. O'Hare said, They owe me stormwater calculations, a stormwater narrative, a stormwater maintenance management plan. Mike?

Mr. Ott said, Between the pavement and the building it's 61,740 square feet of impervious area, and 6,000 of that is the building.

Chair Vitali said, So I think this Application is going to be tabled until next month to get Erin O'Hare what she's looking for. I see your blue line and the red line. Are we starving water from one side to the other? Are we shifting water from the western side to the eastern side of the property?

Mr. Ott said, Building roof drainage will go to the west. And there's another piece of the Stormwater Management System that I forgot to describe. It's in the Connecticut DEEP Stormwater Quality Manual with design criteria for groundwater recharge volume during rain events over the year, to replenish the groundwater. We dealt with that in our calculations by setting the outlet control structure 6 inches above the bottom of the basin. So water will seep and recharge the required groundwater as in the Manual, and the sand filter will discharge some water to the ground. So between the two and the building runoff, that's how we plan to recharge the stormwater ground system. I believe in addressing the Water comments, the Town Engineer's comments and Erin's Planner's comment; we'll get those to Erin O'Hare.

Chair Vitali said, So this will be tabled until the next meeting on June 2.

Attorney Ceneviva said, Thank you for giving us some direction. We'll be ready for a vote next month.

E. NEW BUSINESS

1. #D21-5.1 – Emily Picard – Lyman Hall High School, 70 Pond Hill Road – Request for Determination of Exemption for Environmental Education Projects – (Removal of Invasives and Replanting)

Ms. O'Hare explained that this is a request by Ms. Emily Picard, a Lyman Hall High School Science teacher, to do an environmental project.

Ms. Picard said, This is a request to use the open space between the high school athletic fields and Pat Wall Field on the side by Wharton Brook. It is Town property on one side and the other side is Board of Education property. She had met with Conservation Commission Chair Mary Heffernon and Mr. Kenny Michaels, Director of Parks and Recreation, and representatives from the Board of Education. We would like to use this as a wildlife biology wet lab for the Wildlife Science program, where the students can be more active and learn about ecology. We're focusing on the invasive plants, the amount of erosion that's been happening, and we wanted to take a more active role in the management of this property. I reached out to the Southwest Conservation District, who were interested in managing some of the invasives. There's a large patch of Japanese knotweed. We would cover it to stop growth and then replant with native riparian species, and later to manage native plants up off the riverbank and into the floodplain forest. Someday we might add a nature trail. We did Mr. Kenny Michaels' suggestion of adding kiosk signs at Pat Wall Field and at Lyman Hall High School to educate people who go there.

Chair Vitali asked, Erin, why would they need a permit?

Ms. O'Hare said, Because most of the work will happen in the wetlands—half wetland and half on URA.

Chair Vitali asked, Emily, have you done a plan?

Ms. Picard said, By June/July to map and later tarp the Japanese knotweed. I have a meeting with the director of Southwest Conservation District to discuss that.

Ms. O'Hare said, The mapping needs to be fleshed out with locations for perhaps a kiosk and stairs. But right now my primary concern is to do the invasives. A trail would be a permitted thing. This is a floodplain.

Chair Vitali said, I don't think she needs a permit for the invasives control. Anything with construction, she'd have enough time to get together on those. And maybe Erosion Control would be necessary if they dig them deeper.

Chair Vitali asked for a Motion to make this a Determination of Exemption for removal of invasives.

MS. PHILLIPS: MOTION THAT THE REQUEST FOR DETERMINATION OF EXEMPTION BE ALLOWED IF IT ONLY INVOLVES REMOVAL OF THE INVASIVE SPECIES.

MR. SIMON: SECOND.

In discussion, Ms. O'Hare said, I'd suggest or request the planting back of plants in that spot. They don't need a permit for that. They could do that.

Chair Vitali said, We can add that. I think it's important to get started, Ms. Picard. And it's going to be in contact with Ms. O'Hare.

Ms. Picard said, Yes. I already volunteer with the Conservation Commission.

Ms. Phillips amended the Motion as follows: **“AND TO INCLUDE REPLACEMENT WITH NATIVE PLANTS IN THAT SPOT.”**

Mr. Simon restated his Second. There was no further discussion.

VOTE: MS. PHILLIPS – YES; MR. SIMON – YES; MR. KERN – YES; MS. MCKEEN – YES; CHAIR VITALI – YES.

Commissioner Kern said, I'm also concerned that the Town would have a maintenance program or management program to keep an open environment. People trash the place now by the brook. Maybe the students don't have to do it, but what authority will that be if it comes to be developed?

Ms. Picard said, It's mostly area used by middle school students and people who walk their dogs. I'll ask for a blue trash barrel.

Commissioner Passaretti asked, How much is the grant?

Ms. Picard said, It's for \$3,000.

Commissioner Ms. Passaretti stated that she is an educator at the University of New Haven Department of Biology and Environmental Science, so please reach out to us.

Ms. Picard said that she will do that.

F. RECEIPT OF NEW APPLICATIONS – (filed before close of day May 4)

Ms. O'Hare listed one Application filed:

1. #A21-5.1 / 5 Nathan's Path / Michelle Kravitz – (above-ground pool in URA)
– Approved administratively 5/4/21.

Ms. O'Hare said that Chair Vitali had looked at this Application, and it was approved administratively yesterday, May 4.

G. ELECTION OF OFFICERS

Chair Vitali confirmed that three officers are to be elected for the Inland Wetlands & Watercourses Commission: Chair, Vice Chair and Secretary.

It was noted that in February, the Town Council had appointed Ms. Passaretti as a full Commissioner.

Chair Vitali opened nominations, and he stated that Alternate Commissioners could make motions as well.

Commissioners Kern and Caruso nominated James Vitali to be Chair.

Commissioners Kern and Caruso moved to close nominations and called for a vote. The voice vote was unanimous to elect James Vitali as Chair.

Next, Alternate Ms. McKeen nominated Deborah Phillips as Vice Chair, seconded by Commissioner Caruso.

There were no other nominations.

Commissioner Kern moved to close nominations for Vice Chair. The voice vote was unanimous to elect Deborah Phillips as Vice Chair. Ms. Phillips did not vote here.

Then Alternate Ms. McKeen nominated Nick Kern to be Secretary, seconded by Commissioner Phillips. The voice vote was unanimous to elect Nick Kern as Secretary.

H. BUDGET FY21-22 – (Remote) Town Council Public Hearing for Council, May 4, 6:30 p.m.

Ms. O'Hare stated that the fiscal 2021-22 budget for Inland Wetlands & Watercourses Commission is proposed to remain the same amount as the 2020-21 budget.

I. REPORTS & COMMUNICATIONS

1. Discussion of proposal to adopt fines for violations – Not discussed.
2. Farm Hill Road Detention Basin – Not discussed.

J. VIOLATIONS

Ms. O'Hare said there has been no movement on Items #1-3.

1. **Notice of Violation – 1245 Old Colony Road & Quinnipiac River – Jerzy Pytel – (unpermitted clearing & filling near river)**
2. **Notice of Violation – 950 South Colony Road – 1NRSJ, LLC – carwash facility – (filling)**
3. **#A20-2.1 / 12 & 16 Northfield Road – (over-clearing in floodplain wetlands & URA issue)**

4. **Notice of Violation – 11 Trumbull Drive – Jill Kobrin – (unpermitted grading, deposition, and structures within URA, rerouting of flows & alteration of drainageway/stream on Town land)**

This NOV was taken up in connection with Agenda D.1. tonight, above, and the Commissioners had voted to keep this Violation in place.

Then Ms. O'Hare announced to the Commissioners that Mr. Kevin Pagini has begun serving as the new Town Planner. Soon she will review the outstanding IWWC Violations with Mr. Pagini. Chair Vitali supported that action.

K. ADJOURNMENT

MS. PHILLIPS: MOTION TO ADJOURN THE MEETING.

MR. SIMON: SECOND.

VOTE: UNANIMOUS.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.

L. NEXT SCHEDULED REGULAR MEETING: June 2, 2021

Respectfully submitted,
Kathleen L. Burns, Recording Secretary