

**INLAND WETLANDS & WATERCOURSES AGENCY
OF THE CONSERVATION COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF BRISTOL
MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING MONDAY FEBRUARY 2, 2026**

By: Chairman Fisk

Time: 6:30 P.M.

Place: City Hall
Council Chambers
111 North Main St.
First Floor

ROLL CALL:

MEMBERS	NAME:	PRESENT	ABSENT
REGULAR MEMBERS	Zachary Fisk (Chairman)	X	
	Michael Robinson (Vice Chairman)	X	
	David Rooks (Secretary)	X	
	James Carros	X	
	Daniel Massaro, Jr.	X	
	Faye Duquette	X	
	Laura Valentino	X	
ALTERNATE MEMBERS	Greg Klimek	X	
	Joseph Longo	X	
	Justin Bridges	X	
STAFF	Raymond Rogozinski P.E., Director of PW	X	
	Janet Little, Recording secretary	X	

1. Call to Order

Per the order of Chairman Fisk, the meeting was called to order at 6:30 P.M.

2. Public Participation

None

3. Approval of Minutes

a. Regular Meeting – January 5, 2026

MOTION: Move to approve the minutes of the January 5, 2026, regular meeting, with correction on the adjournment commissioners Valentino and Duquette were not present.

By: Robinson

Seconded: Carros

For: Robinson, Massaro, Carros, and Fisk.

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

Minutes were approved.

Chairman Fisk proposed we amend the agenda to hear application #2065 from New Applications first.

MOTION: To move Application #2065 from New Applications up.

By: Massaro

Seconded: Robinson

For: Robinson, Massaro, Carros, Duquette, Valentino and Fisk.

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

Motion passed.

Item #5.a., under Receipt of New Applications, Application #2065, was taken out of order.

5. Receipt of New Applications

- a. Application #2065- Wetlands application for a 400 s.f. addition to an existing home within the upland review area at 78 Bonnie Court; Map 10, Lot 6; Michael Getchell, owner; DCS Construction, applicant.

The Commission received the following items in their electronic packets:

- a. application form
- b. mapping: floodplain, topography, location, aerial, wetlands, wetlands & upland review area
- c. GIS map
- d. Staff Aerials: aerial map
- e. Site plan dated 12-30-25
- f. Stormwater management plan 123025 Larry Edwards, P.E.

Chairman Fisk asked the Director of Public works if he reviewed the application and if it is complete.

Director Rogozinski stated that the Department of Public Works Engineering has reviewed the and find that the application is complete. We would recommend that the application be declared not a significant activity.

MOTION: Move to receive #Application #2065.

By: Robinson

Seconded: Carros

For: Duquette, Valentino, Robinson, Carros, Massaro, and Fisk.

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

The application is received.

Dave Slate, DCS Construction, present on zoom, representing the applicant stated that they are putting an addition onto the back of the house for an in-law apartment.

Commissioner Robinson asked this application is in the upland review area, correct? It's not going anywhere near the inland wetlands.

Director Rogozinski clarified that it is within the upland review area, the activity is not proposed within the wetlands themselves. Staff would recommend approval of the application subject to our standard stipulations.

Chairman Fisk designated regular Commissioners Valentino, Duquette, Robinson, Carros, Massaro, and Fisk with alternate Commissioner Longo in place of Commissioner Rooks, to vote on Application #2065.

MOTION: Move to approve Application #2065 — Wetlands application for a 400 s.f. addition to an existing home within the upland review area at 78 Bonnie Court; Map 10, Lot 6; Michael Getchell, owner; DCS Construction, applicant, in accordance with the plot plan and information submitted with standard stipulations.

By: Carros

Seconded: Massaro

For: Duquette, Valentino, Robinson, Carros, Massaro, Longo and Fisk.

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

The application is approved.

4. Public Hearings

Chairman Fisk asked that the oldest application be heard first, Application #2056 which was under new business. It's part of the Public Hearings from last month. The Public hearing is closed. A few commissioners were absent last month did you get a chance to review the evidence?

Commissioners Duquette and Valentino confirmed they had.

Item #7.a., under New Business, Application #2056, was relocated to under Item #4, under Public Hearings.

- a. Application #2056 – Wetlands application for earth removal activity within the upland review area associated with the development of two residential dwelling units at 45 & 51 Grassy Road; Lot 216 & Lot 217 Ambler Road; Assessor's Map 20, Lots 214, 215, 216 and 217. H&T Holdings of Bristol, LLC, applicant - PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED.

The Commission received the following items in their electronic packets: (No new items received for 02-02-2026 Mtg.):

The Commission received the following items in their electronic packets: PREVIOUSLY (01-05-2026 Mtg.):

- a. application form
- b. mapping: floodplain, wetlands, topo and aerial
- c. hoppers email_soils scientist/na, statement dated 12-28-25
- d. wd revised hoppers open space report near 45 Grassy Rd., from Aleksandra Moch
- e. wd hoppers open space report near 45 Grassy Rd._Rev.date12-11-25, from Aleksandra Moch
- f. revised wetlands intervention soils report_Rev. date 12-28-25
- g. original wetlands intervention soils report, _Rev. date 11-28-25
- h. (Links to Materials submitted on 12-01-2025 – previous packet)
- i. resume – Aleksandra Moch
- j. (scenario 1, scenario 2, w/report from r_green associates – previous packet)
- k. applicant's soils report dated 11-17-25
- l. JMM – company info 2025
- m. emails – undocumented wetlands in the hoppers, from Raymond Rogozinski, P.E., Director of Public Works dated from 11-18-25 to 11-08-25
- n. intervene document dated 10-19-25
- o. referral memo dated December 16, 2025, from Bristol planning commission to Bristol zoning commission, regarding applications # 2547 & 2548

- p. site plan, dated 07-01-2025
- q. (photos – previous packet)

The Commission received the following items in their electronic packets PREVIOUSLY (12-01-25 Mtg.):

- a. application form
- b. stormwater report dated September 2, 2025, from Robert Green Associates, LLC
- c. mapping: floodplain, wetlands, topo and aerial
- d. email dated November 18, 2025, from Raymond Rogozinski, P.E., Director of Public Works, regarding Undocumented Wetlands in the Hoppers
- e. intervenor status letter dated October 19, 2025
- f. site plan

The Commission received the following items in their electronic packets PREVIOUSLY (11-03-25 Mtg.):

- a. Intervener Status Letter dated October 19, 2019
- b. Supporting Documents for Special Permit for Earth Removal, dated September 2, 2025
- c. Revised application

The Commission received the following items in their electronic packets PREVIOUSLY (10-06-25 Mtg.):

- a. Intervener Status Letter dated October 19, 2019
- b. Supporting Documents for Special Permit for Earth Removal, dated September 2, 2025
- c. Revised application
- d. Assessor's Map with Inland Wetlands Watercourse Layers
- e. Application
- f. Plan (Electronic Copy Only)
- g. Report, dated September 2, 2025, Hydrology Report (28 Pages.)

The Commission received the following items in their electronic packets PREVIOUSLY:

- a. Intervener Status Letter dated October 19, 2019
- b. Supporting Documents for Special Permit for Earth Removal, dated September 2, 2025
- c. Revised application
- d. Assessor's Map with Inland Wetlands Watercourse Layers
- e. Application
- f. Plan (Electronic Copy Only)
- g. Report, dated September 2, 2025, Hydrology Report (28 Pages.)

Chairman Fisk designated regular Commissioners Valentino, Duquette, Robinson, Carros, Massaro, and Fisk with alternate Commissioner Bridges to vote on Application #2056.

Chairman Fisk I wanted to just note that, for the record, the public hearing has been closed. The Commission is now in deliberation and possible action. No new testimony or evidence will be taken. We will be discussing the record as it exists and determining whether the application meets the requirements of our regulations. Does the Commission have any comments on this application?

Commissioner Robinson, I have concerns on just exactly where the wetlands are. I have concerns on just exactly where the wetlands are. I know that, one soil scientist found them extremely quite a bit lower from Grassy Road than the other did. On the walk, it was kind of interesting, because, one of the Soil scientists didn't use the auger, so the, stand-in did. The unique thing about this whole area is the riparian buffer that, is present for Birge Pound is quite extensive. And there's quite a bit of leaf cover in that area. Alexandria found some

flags that were closer, and she found some plants that were wetlands.

Chairman Fisk shared his thoughts, I want to explain how I'm thinking about this application and why I'm struggling to support an approval. First, I find the wetland delineation prepared by the applicant soil scientist, Mr. McManus, to be the most persuasive in the record. Importantly, that delineation identifies a larger wetland area than the city wetlands map. I also want to acknowledge the interveners whose participation raised the initial concern and led to a more careful evaluation of the wetland boundary than would have otherwise occurred. Once we accept a larger wetland boundary, even one that is less expansive than what the interveners proposed. The regulatory framework changes, the associated upland review area expands, and the record does not clearly demonstrate that the proposed grading, excavation, stormwater controls, and groundwater impacts were evaluated under that expanded review area. The same issue carries through to groundwater. The intervener's concerns helped focus attention on subsurface conditions. While the applicant's groundwater investigation was helpful, it did not fully evaluate impacts within the expanded review area. Associated with the accepted wetland boundary. One point that stood out to me in the testimony by Mr. McManus during the December 1st meeting with the acknowledgement that the project area is not the only contributor to the wetland system. I agree with that. However, it also underscores that the project area is a contributor to the... to some extent. Once we accept that premise, I am left looking for an analysis in the record that evaluates how the proposed grading and of excavation within that contributing area would affect the down gradient wetland feature identified by Mr. McManus. Dr. Neff's testimony relied on groundwater modeling and analysis of site topography and soils, which are standard tools in hydrogeology. While I am not adopting every conclusion of that model, it raises a credible question about how groundwater moves through the site and where it discharges. In particular, the model suggests that excavation within the recharge area could alter groundwater discharge to the downgraded wetland feature identified by Mr. McManus. I also note that the applicant's hydrology report does not address groundwater flow or recharge, leaving that question unresolved in the record. In December, the Commission requested a groundwater study. We received four borings, but those borings were all located within the proposed excavation area, and did not adequately address how groundwater conditions relate to the proposed grading or the expanded upland review area. At the January meeting, the applicant was unable to clearly explain how the boring results relate to the proposed activity. While we allowed additional clarification for deliberations, I don't know if we received that. That allowance itself highlights a gap in the original analysis. I also want to address the alternate proposals that were presented. Those alternatives were developed at a time when the applicant believed the proposed activity was fully outside the upland review area. Based on the wetland boundary I find persuasive, that assumption is no longer certain. Once the upland review area extends into the project area, and given our authority to consider upland impacts beyond 100 feet where site conditions warrant. The record does not demonstrate that the alternate proposals were evaluated under the regulatory framework that now applies. In other words, while the alternate proposals show different grading configurations, they do not address avoidance or minimization of impacts to wetlands and groundwater within the expended upland review area. For that reason, I do not find the applicant has demonstrated feasible and prudent alternatives as required by our regulations. Taken together, I do not believe the record demonstrates that the applicant has met its burden to show that the proposed activity avoids or minimizes impacts to wetlands and groundwater under the wetland boundary and upland review area the commission is prepared to accept.

Director Rogozinski stated that even though this is in the deliberation phase and he is City Staff he can point factual information. The wetlands commission should base its decision on the actual wetlands in the state of Connecticut, based on soil characteristics. It's the ground water may have an impact on wetlands and certainly that may be part of your consideration, but the groundwater are not wetlands. Wetlands are a specific type of soil as defined.

Commissioner Robinson, the problem here is where are the wetlands, we have a map that was generated by GIS and we have flags from two different soil scientist that challenged those maps. And I think it's a good challenge.

Commissioner Massaro, regardless of what boundary was established by the soil scientists, the low one by Mr. McManus, or the higher one by the intervener's scientist? Even if we went with a higher border for wetlands. I mean, it doesn't really change the application all that much. I think we would have to have a stipulation that they would use that border to amend their construction, but not by much. I don't think it changes a whole lot of other things in the application. I think it's just a matter of establishing which boundary we're going to use.

Commissioner Robinson disagreed saying it will, you're now going to start to move your upland review and your upland review area is going to go into some of the areas where they want to do some work.

Commissioner Massaro, right, so it may attenuate what they're project a little bit.

Commissioner Duquette, I agree with Commissioner Danny

Commissioner Massaro, do we ask the applicant to amend their plans? That's a big change for them, too.

Chairman Fisk for that situation, as my mind, what we're doing is we would deny this application and they would be free to open another application.

The commission continued to discuss.

Director Rogozinski reminded the commission to go by the information provided during the public hearing, there was no third-party soil scientist. The commission can not take anymore additional testimony and should base its decision on the information provided with the public hearing.

Commissioner Carros, personally I don't think we have a choice but to accept it, but that's my opinion. Based on everything we've see or heard. We had the second soil scientist. We were up there on the site walk and they did samples. They found or showed us some places that were classified as wetland soil. But my experience, just finding wetland soil doesn't mean its wetlands, that area is a disturbed area.

Chairman Fisk, disagrees that it should be approved as in his mind it is not a complete application. With a motion to approve, that would be a place where I want to take an extra time to table this, so we can assess what stipulations would be in there, with approval. Maybe that's the best choice.

MOTION: Move that deliberations be continued for – Application #2056 Wetlands application for earth removal activity within the upland review area associated with the development of two residential dwelling units at 45 & 51 Grassy Road; Lot 216 & Lot 217 Ambler Road; Assessor's Map 20, Lots 214, 215, 216 and 217. H&T Holdings of Bristol, LLC, applicant, to the February 5, 2026, special meeting of the Agency.

By: Robinson

Seconded: Valentino

For: Duquette, Valentino, Robinson, Carros, Massaro, Rooks and Fisk.

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

The application is continued.

- a. Application #2064 - Wetlands application for the construction of a new multi-tenant industrial development, parking areas, and other associated improvements within the upland review boundary at 894 Middle Street; Assessor's Map 4, Lot 17-3 & 17-4-1; Carrier Construction Incorporated, applicant

The Commission received the following items in their electronic packets (No new items received):

- a. letter dated December 1, 2025, from Attorney Timothy Furey requesting to postpone the application
- b. letter dated January 5, 2026, from Attorney Timothy Furey requesting to postpone the application

The Commission received the following items in their electronic packets PREVIOUSLY (12-01-25 Mtg.):

- a. application form
- b. supporting documents:
- c. concept plan
- d. boundary & topo survey

- e. engineering report 10-23-2025
- f. aerial map
- g. iwwa map
- h. location map

The Commission received the following items in their electronic packets PREVIOUSLY (11-03-25 Mtg.):

- a. Assessor's Map with Inland Wetlands Watercourse Layers
- b. Application
- c. Supporting Documents, Bristol Business Hub report, dated October 23, 2025

The Commission received the following items in their electronic packets PREVIOUSLY (10-06-25 Mtg.):

- a. application form
- b. supporting documents
- c. concept plan
- d. boundary & topo survey

MOTION: Move to open the public hearing for Application #2064

By: Robinson

Seconded: Carros

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

For: Robinson, Duquette, Valentino, Carros, Massaro, and Fisk.

The Public Hearing was opened.

Chairman Fisk designated regular Commissioners Valentino, Duquette, Robinson, Carros, Massaro, and Fisk with alternate Commissioner Klimek to vote on Application #2064.

Attorney Timothy Furey, 43 Bellevue Ave, Bristol, representing the applicant addressed the commission introduced his team. The city acquired the land after foreclosure. It is a severely impacted parcel. The city did a remediation of the site and worked with DEEP. There are 6 or 7 monitoring wells currently on the site that are being monitored and will be for a substantial period of time for DEEP to watch the heavy metal levels going down hopefully. Along the street you see an easement to the city of Bristol that goes all the way through the property and impacts what we can develop there. CL & P also has a 150 ft easement through the property and there's big towers. This site is open generally to anyone who wants to go on it, people are living on it, people are certainly dumping on it, and there's a lot of impacts, which Sagan will talk about, from people dirt biking out there. When they're dirt biking, they're opening the soils and creating opportunities for erosion into the inland wetland's soils. So, these things, all of these many things, have impacted the wetlands resource. So our plan Works around the easements, but also protects them.

Charlie Talmadge, President of Development Planning Solutions, 225 North Main Street, the subject property is a property listed in the IP-1 zone, and as such, we are envisioning this to be more of an industrial development, but with a park-like flair. They're calling it a multi-tenant, industrial park, but that is, somewhat open for discussion based on the approved list of uses in our zoning regulations. So, we envision, light manufacturing tenants, E-Trade contractors, HVAC techs and electricians who need shop space. The door is also open for indoor sports facilities, dance studios, gymnastics schools, things of that nature.

Sagan Simko certified professional Soil Scientist, B & L Companies 355 Research Parkway, Meriden CT, just a quick background of the wetlands. I think we're all pretty familiar with them. There are two main areas, one along the western boundary includes the 8 Mile River, also Wetland A is a fringe wetland that goes along it, and then on the southeast. There is, Stream 2 and Wetland B. The functions and values of the 8 Mile River and Wetland A, they include, groundwater recharge and discharge, flood flow alteration, potential fish habitat,

nutrient retention, and wildlife habitat. And similarly, for Stream 2 and Wetland B on the southeastern side, pretty much the same thing, groundwater recharge, discharge, flood flow alteration. Potential fish habitat, nutrient retention, and also wildlife habitat. There are four main areas that we want to, do some work at to improve the wetlands as they are standing now. They're labeled, Area 1, which is located along the, the 8 Mile River. There's also an area of, erosion repair down here to the southwest of the stormwater basin. And then also Area 2 and Area 3 are on the northern side of Wetland B. Area 1 is a relatively small area. It includes erosion repair. There's quite a bit, a big gully down there, if you remember from the site visit. We're going to fill that area and seed it with the proper seed mixture, and we're also proposing just a couple of trees at the base of that area to help further stabilize it. The erosion area will be repaired and seeded.

Ryan Carrier of Carrier Construction, Inc., 161 Birch St., Southington, representing the applicant,

MOTION: Move to close the public hearing for Application #2064

By: Robinson

Seconded: Carros

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

For: Robinson, Duquette, Valentino, Carros, Massaro, Klimek and Fisk.

The Public hearing was closed.

MOTION: Move to approve Application #2064 –Wetlands application for the construction of a new multi-tenant industrial development, parking areas, and other associated improvements within the upland review boundary at 894 Middle Street; Assessor's Map 4, Lot 17-3 & 17-4-1; Carrier Construction Incorporated, applicant, in accordance with the plot plan and information submitted with the following stipulations:

1. Standard stipulations 1 through 21 absent the stipulation for the subsurface retention would not be applicable.
2. The Engineering Department shall review the plan to confirm the sizing of the storm drainage system.
3. The stormwater management plan shall be filed with the City Land Records.
4. An evasive species management plan shall be submitted for the site.

By: Robinson

Seconded: Massaro

For: Robinson, Duquette, Valentino, Carros, Massaro, Klimek and Fisk.

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

The application is approved.

6. Old Business

There was no old business.

7. New Business

Moved to Public Hearings, under Item #4, as Application #2056 was from past Public Hearings.

8. Staff Reports

a. IWWA Report – January 2026

The Commission received the following items in their electronic packets:

- a. Inland Wetlands Enforcement Officer report, dated January 2026, from Zachary Norton, Zoning Enforcement Officer, (Environmental Protection Technician)

MOTION Move to file the report from the Inland Wetlands Zoning Enforcement Officer.

By: Massaro

Seconded: Valentino

For: Robinson, Duquette, Valentino, Carros, Massaro, and Fisk.

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

The report is filed.

9. Communications

There were no communications.

10. Conservation Topics

- a. Public and Commissioner Concerns

There were no Conservation topics.

11. Adjournment

MOTION: Move to adjourn at 8:12 P.M.

By: Robinson

Seconded: Massaro

For: Robinson, Duquette, Valentino, Carros, Massaro, and Fisk.

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

This meeting was recorded.

Respectfully submitted,
Janet Little

Zachary Fisk, Chairman
Inland Wetlands & Watercourses Agency
of the Conservation Commission of the City of Bristol

David Rooks, Secretary