



MINUTES

April 9, 2015

PRESENT: John Hall (Chair), Liz Craig, Tom Burgess, Nick Lee, Dan Falta, Rick Stow

ALSO PRESENT: Patricia Sesto, Director, Environmental Affairs; Liz Larkin, Recording Secretary; Darin Overton, P.E. Milone & MacBroom; Casey Healy, Gregory & Adams; Steve Trinkaus, P.E. Trinkaus Engineering, LLC; Joe Canas, Tighe & Bond; Barry Blades, Blades & Goven; Tom Nelson, McChord Engineers; Will Patty, Property Owner; Anthony LoFrisco, Property Owner; Kate Throckmorton, Environmental Land Solutions; Bill Flick, Leggette, Brashears & Graham

I. CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Hall called the meeting to order at 7:32 p.m.

II. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. WET#2295(S) – WILTON YOUTH FOOTBALL – 131 School Road – renovation of existing grass field to an artificial turf field at Middlebrook School (cont.)

Ms. Sesto read the new documents into the record.

Mr. Healy confirmed that he submitted a letter and additional information answering the questions raised from the last public hearing. These materials include details of the construction access to the scour hole, a maintenance plan that includes the maintenance of this access path, and plans for the raised manhole as suggested by Milone & MacBroom. Site Details provide the specifications for the proposed retaining walls and stone layers under the turf field. In accordance with Milone and MacBroom's recommendation, the drainage calculations were re figured using a curve number of 86. Even with this change, the design yields a no net increase in peak runoff. Healy also noted the catch basin grate will be replaced with a manhole cover per Milone & MacBroom's recommendation.

Mr. Overton confirmed the newly submitted information addressed his concerns. Mr. Burgess asked Mr. Overton if he felt the soil testing was inadequate as stated by Mr. Trinkaus. Mr. Overton responded that the testing completed by the applicant was adequate as three differing soil types were found and he believes those same types will be found in other areas under the detention structure. He added, if unsuitable soils found when digging, and these will be removed per the testimony from the applicant.

Ms. Craig asked if Mr. Overton expects any type of compaction or permeability issues with the soils. Mr. Overton responded that soil permeability depends on the type and the use. He then explained that frost expands the soil and regenerates it in the winter months. Mr. Hall then asked if there is sufficient data to know the soil will work as the applicant states. Mr. Overton responded the testing done correlates to the soils under the infiltration area and he understands why the applicant does not want to disturb the field at this time. Mr. Healy then confirmed additional testing will be done prior to the placement of the turf although the commission's expert did not believe it was necessary. Mr. Blades added the underlying soils are not as important as what is on the field. Mr. Hall stated he thought some testing should be done once the natural field is removed for construction. Mr. Nelson stated he has a high level of confidence that similar soils will be found and noted he would be required to come back to the commission if there are any modifications that need to be made.

Ms. Craig asked how long the field would be disturbed if the additional testing was done now. Mr. Nelson confirmed they would need to get a machine in during dry conditions, test, and then replace the excavated soil. Referring to the crumb rubber infill, Ms. Craig asked why the applicant would put something on the school field that is not allowed in landfills. Mr. Healy stated that tires are in fact allowed in landfills. Mr. Blades responded it is a benefit that this material is recycled and added this crumb rubber is the best infill material for this use.

Ms. Craig raised concern that the DEEP study, as it only included 3 fields which were tested twice with the temperature at 70 degrees, was not enough data. Mr. Healy countered the pollutant renovation analysis shows there are no pollutants that will affect the wetlands. Mr. Falta inquired if there are any wetland issues happening with the existing turf fields in town. Ms. Sesto confirmed that NRWI completes testing in the Norwalk River and they have not identified any pollutants attributable to the turf fields.

Mr. Burgess asked about the velocity vs. the volume of stormwater with the new system. He understands that the scour hole dissipates the velocity of the discharge but questioned the volume. Mr. Overton explained there is a certain level of storage with the system and then it discharges the excess. He described the velocity as how the water is moving. When the system provides enough volume storage, there is no peak flow or volume increase. Mr. Overton also noted that the current pipe is steeply sloped with nothing to slow the flow. He explained the newly revised manhole allows the water to drop and discharge out of a flatter pipe and then to the scour hole which slows the flow. Ms. Craig inquired if smaller rain events work the same way for infiltration. Mr. Overton confirmed there may be times of no discharge as there is natural infiltration. Mr. Healy reiterated that there will be no increased runoff volume from the site.

Ms. Craig questioned the maintenance of the crumb rubber that comes off the field as she has experienced issues on the track by the existing turf field where snow and debris was pushed. Mr. Healy confirmed the lacrosse team paid to have the snow removed from the existing turf for a game and some of the crumbs may have been pushed over as well. Ms. Craig confirmed that the crumbs move around and she is concerned about the health of the area. Ms. Sesto stated that the Parks & Recreation Department is now obligated to keep the area clean as it is part of the record of the application.

Mr. Trinkaus stated the applicant only completed 4 test pits and 3 infiltration tests while the testing protocol states testing should be conducted at 50 feet intervals. He stated the soils on the

field and under the field can be substantially different. He commented that the field is unusable because it is compacted and does not drain. While testing the model is for a 3 inch rainfall at a rate of 1.5 inches per hour, and he added that putting the soil back in there changes the soil profile. If the stormwater does not infiltrate, it will worsen the current condition by creating a plunge pool which will reconsolidate and erode. He then stated small storms are not being detained and the runoff volume is extended.

Mr. Trinkaus stated the curve number is a function of converting rainfall to runoff with a 1 to 1 relationship so 98 is appropriate. The 86 curve number will produce an undersized system and there is not enough information available to know that it will work. Mr. Hall asked why the applicant would not be able to test right before the turf is installed. Mr. Trinkaus responded he thinks it is too risky and suggested witnesses as this is a substantial aspect of the plan. He added humans compact the soil more so than heavy equipment.

Mr. LoFrisco, of Cider Mill Place, stated this commission would be acting improperly if an approval was issued and then the design is reconsidered without public input. He asked the commission not to put the town through the expense of litigation as an approval would be reversed in court. Mr. LoFrisco stated the Patty's are willing to pay for the additional testing and said the applicant's refusal to accept this offer is proof they know it will not be in their favor. He also noted Mr. Healy talks about how these systems work and said it is inappropriate for him to be speaking about it as he is not an expert. Mr. Hall noted that Mr. Overton's letter carries an educated assumption that the system will work as designed. Mr. LoFrisco countered he could not find a downside to additional testing. Ms. Sesto added if a new design is required, the applicant would have to re-apply with the changes. Mr. LoFrisco countered that if they know the possibility exists, why would they refuse the neighbors offer to pay. Mr. Lee stated it is the applicant's decision and risk to present the application as they deem appropriate.

Mr. Patty noted his continued concern of increased water coming off the property. He indicated he has experienced property damage with the existing runoff and if volumes increase, they will need to repair more than 100 yards of his accessway. Mr. Patty questioned why no test holes are being done due to the wide range of infiltration that is possible in the area and noted the proposed system is based on the upper range of capability. There are rules on test holes and what motivation is there to avoid the correct infiltration rates. He added the commission cannot approve the system without the proper data.

With no further questions or comments, the public hearing was closed.

B. WET#2307(S) – ASML – 77 Danbury Road – excavation of petroleum impacted soil including backfilling and restoration adjacent to the Norwalk River

Mr. Hall, Ms. Craig, Mr. Burgess, Mr. Lee and Mr. Falta indicated they visited the site. Ms. Sesto read the documents into the record.

Mr. Flick stated there is a property transfer at this site so the site must be tested to ensure site compliance with CT DEEP standards prior to the sale. His firm, Leggette, Brashears & Graham (LBG), was hired to complete three phases of this investigation. He described 21 areas of concern that were fully characterized in 2014 with site modeling.

LBG was contacted in October of last year about petroleum and sawdust found during

excavations at the riprap wall, 4 – 5 feet below grade. LBG delineated the extent of the fill material by making 32 borings. The depth of the contamination is 3 – 6 feet on average and samples were collected from above and below the target area.

The proposal calls for removing 3 ft. of the topsoil for reuse. The area will be staged and more material will be brought on site for restoration purposes. The composition of the contaminant is lubricating oil most likely from the old lumber yard back in the 1950s.

Prior to starting the work they will work along the excavation lines to see if the soil is clean. They will ensure any spoils will be live-loaded and removed from the site. They will start the project closest to the river and work their way backward. The entire project is expected to last for four weeks.

Ms. Craig asked if there is high groundwater in the area of the excavation. Mr. Flick responded that the groundwater is below 6 ft. and he does not expect to encounter any issues. He then added the sawdust binds the contamination. Ms. Craig asked what the rationale is for working backwards from the river. Mr. Flick stated it is an opportunity to create a berm for the river.

Ms. Throckmorton stated the mitigation for this project mirrors the previous approvals. The area is currently scrubby and will be replanted with shade trees, understory trees, and shrubs after the contamination is removed. She also confirmed the 36 in. elm tree will be protected during the project.

With no further questions or comments from the public, the hearing was closed.

III. APPLICATIONS READY TO BE REVIEWED

A. WET#2307(S) – ASML – 77 Danbury Road – excavation of petroleum impacted soil including backfilling and restoration adjacent to the Norwalk River

Mr. Lee MOVED to APPROVE WET#2307 with the General and normal Special Conditions, SECONDED by Mr. Falta and CARRIED 6-0-0.

IV. APPLICATIONS TO BE ACCEPTED

A. WET#2310(S) – DAHLEN – 136 Old Kings Highway – construct pool and level backyard

Mr. Lee MOVED to ACCEPT WET#2310, SECONDED by Mr. Burgess and CARRIED 6-0-0.

V. APPROVED MINOR ACTIVITIES

A. WET#2308(M) – LUCHETTA – 36 Ambler Lane – residence additions 65 ft. from a wetland and a new walkway

B. WET#2309(M) – HEISSENBUTTEL – 424 Belden Hill Road – construct a breezeway with laundry room 40 ft. from a wetland

Ms. Sesto provided a brief summary of the approved minor activities.

VI. CORRESPONDENCE - None

VII. OTHER APPROPRIATE BUSINESS

A. VIOLATIONS

- 1. DeVito – 40 Honey Hill**

- 2. English – 189 Westport Road**

- 3. Leska – 50 Sunset Pass**

Ms. Sesto stated a perspective consultant for the Leskas was been in contact with the office.

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES – March 26, 2015

Mr. Falta MOVED to APPROVE the minutes for March 26, 2015, SECONDED by Ms. Craig, and CARRIED 6-0-0.

VIII. APPLICATIONS READY TO BE REVIEWED

A. WET#2295(S) – WILTON YOUTH FOOTBALL – 131 School Road – renovation of existing grass field to an artificial turf field at Middlebrook School (cont.)

The commissioners discussed the lack of test holes and wanted to know if the approval can take place without this information. Ms. Sesto stated she can understand why the school would not want the testing to take place during the school year, the field is not just for football; it is also used by the school.

In response to the commission's questions, Ms. Sesto stated there is sufficient data in the record to substantiate an approval or denial for the application. Mr. Lee noted the commission's own consultant stated the system as proposed will work. Mr. Falta noted his agreement that he would be concerned for the safety of the children if the field is tested now. Mr. Hall realized and pointed out that the testing was completed immediately adjacent to the detention/infiltration system so the rest of the field would not require testing. He reiterated the third party expert confirmed the system will work as planned. He then added that there were some alternate locations for the field that did not fit as well and did not alleviate the issues Middlebrook experiences with their field.

Mr. Stow moved for a DRAFT APPROVAL of WET#2295, with the General and normal Special Conditions and the additional Special Condition that the applicant will complete additional soil testing and will notify the neighbors and the town of such testing a week in advance, SECONDED by Mr. Burgess and CARRIED 6-0-0.

IX. ADJOURN

Mr. Burgess MOVED to ADJOURN at 10:00 pm, SECONDED by Mr. Lee and CARRIED 6-0-0.

Respectfully Submitted,
Liz Larkin
Recording Secretary, Environmental Affairs