

**INLAND WETLANDS & WATERCOURSES AGENCY
OF THE CONSERVATION COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF BRISTOL
MINUTES
REGULAR MEETING OF MONDAY November 3, 2025**

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	Anthony Lorenzetti, P.E., City Staff	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.

Chairman Fisk reminded the Agency the next Regular Meeting of the Inland Wetlands & Watercourses Agency of the Conservation Commission of the City of Bristol is Monday, December 1, 2025.

Chairman Fisk designated himself, regular Commissioners Duquette, Robinson, Carros, Massaro, Valentino, Rooks to vote on all items.

2. Public Participation

None

3. Approval of Minutes

a. Regular Meeting – October 6, 2025

MOTION: Move to approve the minutes of the October 6, 2025, regular meeting, as written.

By: Robinson

Seconded: Carros

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

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

b. On-Site Inspection-October 25, 2025

Chairman Fisk read the onsite minutes into record.

MOTION: Move to approve the minutes of the On-Site Inspection-October 25, 2025 as written.

By: Robinson

Seconded: Carros

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

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

4. 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.

The Commission received the following items in their electronic packets:

- 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:

- a. Assessor's Map with Inland Wetlands Watercourse Layers
- b. Application
- c. Plan (Electronic Copy Only)
- d. Report, dated September 2, 2025, Hydrology Report (28 Pages.)

Chairman Fisk, before we begin. I just want to make a brief disclosure. I had a short conversation with a member of Friends of the Hoppers who had some questions. Our discussion was limited to explaining the application that came before the Commission, and that the new regulations expanded the upland review area, which brought the project to our attention. I did not discuss the merits of the application or any potential outcome. As always, I'll remain impartial and continue to participate in the review. With that, is there a motion to open the public hearing?

MOTION: Move to open the public hearing for Application #2056

By: Robinson

Seconded: Carros

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

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

The Public Hearing was opened.

Attorney James Ziogas, 104 Bellevue Ave, Bristol, representing the applicant addressed the Commission sharing that there are no sewer or water capabilities to the site. In the final analysis, the proposal will result in the

construction of residential homes in this location that will require wells and septic systems. The need for redevelopment in this area is critical, as was presented on the on-site walk. Attorney Ziogas shared photos of debris and blight on the property. The homes on this site were not serviced by septic systems at all they had cesspools. The cesspool locations are unknown but they need to be taken care of and removed, that would be done in conjunction with the Health Department. As well as removal of 7 or 8 abandoned cars, trailers and equipment. Once all debris has been removed, we would develop 4-5 homes on this location. Due to the deep slopes that are on this property, we plan on removing about 145,000 Yards of material from the site. There are two areas that are within the 150-foot upland review area which is shown on the plans. Which were delineated by Mr. Green. One area is in the very corner of the property, within the 30-foot setback lines of the property. No construction or development or earth removal will take place in those areas. It will not be disturbed at all. The second area is in the southwest corner of the property. the approximate location of the Uplands Review area of 150 feet, and you'll notice that there again, it's in an area that is going to be mildly disturbed, and we believe that there's about 250 Cubic yards of material that would be disturbed in this area. It's important to note and reiterate that the sloping of this property is going away from the watercourse, so that the disturbance is going to be sloped towards the center of the property, and the runoff will be adjusted and handled by our storm system, which is being developed by Mr. Green. So, in looking at this project, there were options, and we thought that a reasonable and prudent alternative would be the plan that's being presented to you today. In addition to that, you'll see that it's, being buffered by sedimentation control fences, and construction safety fences as well. We expect that a permit in this area will last about 2 years. That's all the zoning regulations will allow. And again, as I stated, approximately 145,000 cubic yards of material would be removed. The purview of this commission, obviously, is just the upland review area on the northeast and the southwest portions of the property, so that's basically what we have in terms of the application.

Chairman Fisk asked Attorney Ziogas to walk him through the Southwest corner again.

Attorney Ziogas showed the limits of the upland review area at 150 feet. He showed the erosion fencing lower.

Chairman Fisk asked if there was work occurring on the other side of the fencing?

Attorney Ziogas stated that it is sloped the other way and the fencing is there for protection. They are not sloping towards the brook. They are sloping in the opposite direction, it's there as a safeguard around the whole perimeter of the property.

Chairman Fisk asked is their work that is going to affect the buffer, the wetland area?

Attorney Ziogas stated that about 250 Cubic Yards of material will be disturbed and regraded in the upland review in the north directions on a 3 to 1 slope.

Bob Green, Robert Green Associates, 6 Old Waterbury Rd, stated there is a swale that will be excavated, everything is draining northeast. It will be excavated and regraded so all the drainage from the hill will go that way.

Commissioner Robinson stated that he would like all the area to be marked as conservation so that everyone is aware in the present and the future.

Attorney Ziogas agreed, stated there is a 30-foot buffer around the whole property and we can make that whole area a conservation easement and there may be some additional space available for conservation.

Chairman Fisk invited anyone from the public to speak on this.

Michelle Rudy, 102 Henderson St, along with Erik Madsen, 70 Oak Hill Dr, representing the Friends of the Hoppers nonprofit group shared a two-packet presentation to the commission. And read into record the presentation titled Assessment of Undocumented Springs, Proposed Development Wetland Impacts. And proposed development concerns. This presentation begins with a review of our arguments as interveners, so notified. So noted in the verified petition to intervene, Under CGS Section 22A-19. A view of the applicant's development property in context of the surrounding 250 Acre Hoppers Preserve. This presentation provides an overview of newly documented perennial springs near the site of the proposed development, and documents the springs in close proximity to the proposed development. The negative impacts of the proposed development

upon both the documented and newly discovered wetlands will be provided herein. Associated environmental damages to the negatively impacted wetlands will also be noted, deficiencies in the current proposed development application regarding wetland identification. Impact analysis, and self-monitoring of stormwater controls will be revealed. So going back to the regulations, the Connecticut Environmental Protection Act of 1971 provides, in pertinent part, at General Statute Section 22A-19, that in any administrative proceeding, and in any judicial review made thereof.

Erik Madsen, 70 Oak Hill Dr, it is our assertion, that the applicant's proposed development will unreasonably pollute, impair, and destroy the public trust in the water of the state of Connecticut.

Michelle Rudy, 102 Henderson St, going back to the Bristol Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Agency regulations, the Bristol Agency, is the town agency authorized to review applications to conduct regulated activities pursuant to the general statutes of the Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Regulations of the Town of Bristol. On or about September 10th, 2025, H&T Holdings LLC submitted an application to the Commission for a wetlands permit, such proposed activity could consist of clearing the area of trees and shrubs from the land, removing 145,000 cubic yards of sand and gravel, construction of a temporary stormwater management system. Construction of driveways, parking areas, two housing units, and associated garages. The applicant's map shows that these activities, with the exception of some grading and temporary fencing activity will take place outside of the 100-foot wetland buffer zone. The applicant, therefore, asserts there will be zero square feet of impact to the nearby wetland known as Carter Spring, and associated tributary Carter Brook to the Birch Pond.

Erik Madsen, 70 Oak Hill Dr, it is our assertion that all of the applicant's proposed activities within 100 feet of the wetland have a negative impact on the wetland. These activities include, but are not limited to, tree and brush clearing, soil removal. Sand and gravel mining, heavy equipment usage, installing fencing, and silt fencing installation. The applicant does not provide sufficient detail to assure that these activities of the proposed development do not have a negative impact on the wetland. As it is our assertion that all of the applicant's proposed activities within 100 feet of the wetland have a negative impact on the wetland, the applicant in the development proposal must state the area in square feet of the activity within 100 feet of the wetland. The applicant did not state in the development proposal the square feet of the activity within 100 feet of the wetland.

Michelle Rudy, 102 Henderson St, moving on to the definition of regulated... regulated activity, which is defined in the section 2.1 of the agency's regulations. It includes, in pertinent part, any operation within or use of a wetland or watercourse involving removal or deposition of material, or any obstruction, construction, alteration, or pollution of such wetlands or watercourses. And any earth moving, filling, construction, clear cutting of trees, or installation of septic systems within 100 feet of wetlands or watercourses. However, under Connecticut law, set forth in *River Sound Development LLC v. Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Commission* in 2010, Activities which impact the physical properties of a wetland may be considered by the Commission regardless of where the activities are located.

Erik Madsen, 70 Oak Hill Dr, it is our assertion that all of the applicants' proposed activities within 100 feet of the wetlands. Our regulated activities, including, but not limited to, tree and brush clearing, soil removal, sand and gravel mining, heavy equipment usage, soil stockpiling, driveway construction, installing fencing, silt fencing installation, and street sweeping. It is our assertion that the applicant's use of the city's Official wetlands map as the sole determinant of the 100-foot wetlands buffer was an error of judgment. Our fieldwork shows two perennial springs, so named Eric Spring and Madsen Spring, along with outflowing Eric Brook and Madsen Brook. These two springs and brooks are not identified as wetland features by the applicant. Furthermore, the actual extent of the wetland soils associated to these wetlands is not identified by the applicant. Once the applicant has accurate wetland maps, the 100-foot wetland buffers will need to be redrawn on the plan of development. It is our assertion that the applicant's proposed activities more than 100 feet from the wetlands will also negatively impact the physical properties of a wetland. These activities include tree and brush clearing, soil removal, sand and gravel mining, heavy equipment usage, soil stockpiling, driveway construction, installing fencing, silt fencing installation, and street sweeping.

Michelle Rudy, 102 Henderson St, the proposed activity is also, a significant impact activity, as defined in 2.1V of the regulations. Significant activity is in pertinent part, means any activity, including but not limited to. The substantial impact on the area for which an application has been filed, or on another part of an inland wetland or watercourse system. As follows. Any activity involving deposition or removal which may or will have a substantial

effect or significant impact as follows; any activity involving deposition or removal which may or will have a substantial effect or significant impact on the regulated area, or on another part of the inland wetland or watercourse system.

Erik Madsen, 70 Oak Hill Dr, it is our assertion that the applicant's activity of removing topsoil is a significant impact activity as stormwater runoff will cause damaging sedimentation and nutrient loading in the wetlands. It is our assertion that the applicant's activity of removing sand and gravel is a significant impact activity, as stormwater runoff will cause damaging sedimentation and nutrient loading in the wetlands. It is our assertion that the applicant's activity of stockpiling topsoil is a significant impact activity as stormwater runoff will cause damaging sedimentation and nutrient loading in the wetlands. It is particularly concerning that the stockpiling of soil less than 100 feet from Madsen Spring and Madsen Brook. It is our assertion that the applicant's activity of bringing vehicles to and from the proposed development will result in topsoil, sand, and gravel on the driveways and roadways. This is a significant impact activity, as stormwater runoff will cause damaging sedimentation and nutrient loading in the wetlands. It is particularly concerning that stormwater runoff from adjacent Grassy Road and Ambler Road goes directly into wetlands. It is our assertion that the applicant's activity of sand and gravel mining is a significant impact activity, as it will lower groundwater levels at the proposed development, nearby to the proposed development, and downslope for a significant distance from the proposed development. Groundwater is considered part of the inland wetlands and water course system.

Michelle Rudy, 102 Henderson St, another definition of a significant impact activity is any activity which substantially diminishes the natural capacity of an inland wetland or watercourse to support desirable fisheries, wildlife, or other biological life, prevent flooding. Supply water, assimilate waste, facilitate drainage, provide recreation, or open space, or other functions.

Erik Madsen, 70 Oak Hill Dr, it is our assertion that the applicant's activity of sand and gravel mining will lower groundwater levels at the proposed development, nearby to the proposed development, and downslope for significant distance from the proposed development. It is particularly concerning that the lowering of groundwater at perennial Madsen Spring will mean an end to its flow. Thus, Madsen Spring, for the first time, will go dry, in addition to Madsen Brook running dry, too. The further consequences of Madsen Brook running dry will be the significant loss of cool running surface water and its chemical makeup recharging the fresh water of Birge Pond. Less cool, fresh water change over in Birge Pond means a warmer and more stagnant Birge pond. These changes will diminish the overall health and population of the Birge Pond fishery. It is our assertion that the applicant's activity of sand and gravel mining will lower groundwater levels at the proposed development, nearby to the proposed development, and downslope for a significant distance from the proposed development. It is particularly concerning that the lowering of groundwater at perennial Carter Spring and Erik Spring will mean reduced flow. The further consequences of reduced flow of Carter brook and Erik Brook will be the significant loss of cool running surface waters and its chemical makeup recharging the fresh water of Birge Pond. Less cool, fresh water changeover at Birge Pond means a warmer and more stagnant Birge Pond. These changes will diminish the overall health and population of the Birge Pond fishery.

Michelle Rudy, 102 Henderson St, another definition of significant activity is any activity which causes substantial turbidity, siltation, or sedimentation in a wetland or watercourse.

Erik Madsen, 70 Oak Hill Dr, it is our assertion that the applicant's activity of removing sand and gravel will result in stormwater runoff that will cause damaging siltation, turbidity, and sedimentation in the wetlands and watercourses. It is our assertion that the applicant's activity of stockpiling topsoil will result in stormwater runoff that will cause damaging siltation, turbidity, and sedimentation in the wetlands and watercourses. It is particularly concerning that the stockpiling of soil is less than 100 feet from Madsen Spring and Madsen Brook. It is our assertion that the applicant's activity of bringing vehicles to and from the proposed development will result in topsoil, sand, and gravel on the driveways and roadways. This will result in stormwater runoff that will cause damaging siltation, turbidity, and sedimentation in the wetlands and watercourses. It is particularly concerning that stormwater runoff from adjacent Grassy Road and Ambler Road goes directly into wetlands. It is our assertion that the applicant's activity of bringing vehicles to and from the proposed development will result in topsoil, sand, and gravel on the driveways and roadways. This will result in windblown dust that will cause damaging siltation, turbidity, and sedimentation in the wetlands and watercourses. It is particularly concerning that windblown particulates from adjacent Grassy Road and Ambler Road may go directly to wetlands. Kings

Mark Environmental Review, team of the Kings Mark Resource Conservation and Development Area incorporated a study for the City Council and Parks and Recreation Department, of Bristol, Connecticut. The study was completed September 2003. The report number was 320, the Normandew study states that Birge ponds, small watershed area to pond area ratio, almost dictates that the pond will be utopic, given any development at all in the watershed. Further, it goes on, it will be important to continue monitoring construction sites carefully, since potential impacts water quality can be large and direct. Birge Pond has long been identified as suffering from excessive sedimentation, in large part due to the various sand and gravel operations within the area. After so much effort has been spent on restoring Birge Pond, it would seem to be counterproductive to undertake an activity that may increase sedimentation and thereby threaten the pond's new recreational opportunities, besides being harmful to the environment.

Michelle Rudy, 102 Henderson St, another activity, which can be considered a significant activity is any activity which causes a substantial diminution of flow of a natural watercourse or groundwater levels of the regulated area.

Erik Madsen, 70 Oak Hill Dr, it is our assertion that the applicant's activity of sand and gravel mining will lower the groundwater levels of the regulated area.

Michelle Rudy, 102 Henderson St, any activity which causes or has the potential to cause pollution of groundwater, a wetland, or water course.

Erik Madsen, 70 Oak Hill Dr, it is our assertion that the applicant's activity of bringing vehicles to and from the proposed development will result in the vehicle pollutants of motor oil, diesel fuel, gasoline, radiator coal, and brake fluid, and hydraulic fluid being leaked or spilt on the ground. These pollutants will then percolate down to the groundwater and pollute it. It is our assertion that the applicant's activity of bringing vehicles to and from the proposed development will result in the vehicle pollutants of motor oil, diesel fuel, gasoline, radiator coolant, brake fluid, hydraulic fluid, brake dust, and pulverized automotive tire rubber being deposited on the impervious driveway and roads. Stormwater runoff from adjacent Grassy Road and Ambler Road will then wash these pollutants directly into wetlands of Madsen brook and Carter brook.

Michelle Rudy, 102 Henderson St, and finally, another activity which is considered significant is any activity which destroys a wetland or watercourse.

Erik Madsen, 70 Oak Hill Dr, it is our assertion that the applicant's activity of sand and gravel mining will lower groundwater levels at the proposed development, nearby to the proposed development, and downslope for a significant distance from the proposed development. It is particularly concerning that the lowering of groundwater at perennial Madsen Spring will mean an end to its flow. Thus, Madsen Spring, for the first time, will go dry, in addition to Madsen Brook running dry, too. The drying out of the wetland soils means the applicant has destroyed the wetland. The drying out of the perennial flow, flowing Madsen Spring and Madsen Brook means the applicant has destroyed this watercourse.

Michelle Rudy, 102 Henderson St, So, moving on to the, what we're showing on the map Section 3.1 of the regulation states that in all cases, the precise location of regulated areas shall be determined by the actual character of the land. The distribution of wetland soil types, and the location of watercourses. And Michael Panet is going to, discuss where the springs are located that we found? And what their characteristics are.

Michael Panet, 327 Perkins Street, thank you for allowing us to speak. It is our assertion that the applicant's use of the city's official wetlands map as a sole determinant of the 100-foot wetlands buffer, was an error of judgment. Our fieldwork shows that there's two perennial springs, Erik Spring and Madsen Spring, along with the outflowing. Erik Brook and Madsen Brook, see the attachments. These two springs and brooks are not identified as wetland features by the applicant. Furthermore, the actual extent of the wetland soils associated to these wetlands is not identified accurately by the applicant through field testing. It's our assertion that these exist, that they exist significant wetland resources outside what is depicted on the inlands Inland Wetlands and Watercourse, Bristol, Connecticut maps, with 100 foot of the property. Erik Spring is a perennial spring located approximately 80 feet north of the applicant's proposed development property. An earth spring emerges at the upward break of the slope, creating a small rivulet, an area of ponding which feeds into the adjacent and complex series of depressional wetlands that ultimately flow into Birge Pond through defined channel, Erik Brook. Madsen Spring is a perennial spring located east of the subjected property across Grassy Roads and

downslope of the site. The visual documentation and coordinate the data in the map for the precise spatial referencing. Madsen Spring emerges at the upward break of the slope and generates surface flow that traverses through the swale. Ultimately, this running directly into Birge Pond and Madsen Brook. Our observations indicate Carter Spring and Carter Brook are depicted accurately in the Wetlands and Watercourse Agency's map. Carter Spring is a famous historical spring that communities in the area once regularly gathered around to collect pure, fresh drinking water. Carter Spring holds cultural and historical value on its hydraulic function, serving as an important local resource. Carter Spring generates surface flow that traverses through the ravine and the swale, ultimately discharging directly into Birge Pond as Carter Brook. Soils in the immediate area of Carter Spring, Madsen Spring, and Erik Spring, exhibit hydric characteristics indicating persistent saturation and supporting jurisdictional wetland status. Field observations confirm wetland soils consistent with national wetlands inventory criteria. Perennial Carter Springs, Madsen Spring and Erik Spring indicate complex hydrology and potential wetland connectivity that is not captured in the current regulatory maps. Three springs, Erik Spring, Madsen Spring, and Carter Spring are very sensitive. They have very low flow discharge, but remain perennial. They maintain the hydraulic functions of feeding the western edge of Birch Ponds fresh water through the associated Eric Brook, Madsen Brook, and Carter Brook. In reference to the spring within the area of Hoppers Preserve, the King Mark Environmental Review Team in 2003 said members of the team followed the stream course that enters the pond from the west-northwest those are the wetlands north of the site. For the entire length from its headwaters seep into the mouth. Given the city has a suburban wetland treasure. Rarely in this part of the state. And often, not at all. Can you find a stream? And its watershed that can be studied from its headquarters to its mouth, nearly unimpacted. I just want to talk about the elephant in the room. The elephant in the room is 145,000 cubic yards of sand and gravel being moved from this site. That in and of itself is a travesty. When you look at that, and try to put it in context visually it's probably about the size of 19 Olympic-sized swimming pools, or 20, maybe 40 of this room's capacity. That's a significant amount of sand and gravel. And I do believe that that holds a value. And that's the ultimate driver here. It's the mighty buck. We want to sell that sand and gravel. We can't do that to this preserve just today. Today alone, The mayor of this town posted something on Facebook about the Birge Pond Reserve and how we were granted the OSHA grant. to protect that property from the same exact thing that's going on here. We're pleading with all of you to do the right thing. We don't have any qualms with the builder. I think he's been doing a great job trying to clean the place up. That's important. It's a mess up there, and to his point I don't know how it got there. But it is there, and he's cleaning it up. But to move 145,000 cubic yards of sand and gravel. Just seems it doesn't really need to happen. There's already houses that existed there. Thank you.

Commissioner Klimek asked What is your credentials, sir? Are you a soil scientist? Are you a professional engineer?

Michael Panet, 327 Perkins Street, responded stating he is someone who cares deeply about the community.

Commissioner Klimek: Ok so you are not so you are not a soil scientist, you are not an engineer?

Michael Panet, 327 Perkins Street, no I am not

Commissioner Klimek: So, you do not have any credentials in that respect?

Michael Panet, 327 Perkins Street, No I don't. I'm a concerned citizen, like the people that are sitting right behind me.

Michelle Rudy, 102 Henderson St, we are trying to call for a soil analysis of the area, because we have documented these springs. And, the commission can actually go out there with these coordinates and locate the springs. So, this is a question of surface water, which doesn't need a soil analysis, but... the surrounding wetlands need to be characterized. And that's something that still needs to be done in order to meet the definition of the wetlands, in the regulations.

Commissioner Robinson asked what you're basically stating is when they did the survey last year, where they determined the wetlands that either they didn't do a soil sample in that area? Are you saying that no soil samples have ever been taken?

Michelle Rudy, 102 Henderson St, I don't know if they've ever been taken, but we did find a spring, that's the Madsen Spring, which is not on the map. So that's right under the road, down below the property.

And it's well within 100 feet of the property. And you can go out there and just observe it. It's a surface perennial spring.

Commissioner Robinson so you are saying Erik Spring was on the map when the city mapped the wetlands? What you're asking us is to have them come out with a certified soil scientist, and do a soil test, and maybe Perhaps with what they find, then the inland wetland maps are going to have to be readjusted.

Michelle Rudy, 102 Henderson St, Correct. So, Erik Spring is a little spring that moves into a wetland that is on the map. But it is closer to the property than what the map states.

Commissioner Robinson so the map has errors?

Michelle Rudy, 102 Henderson St, yes it does. What we want to do is go into the fact that, groundwater is often depressed by sand and gravel mining operations. And there's a lot of evidence for that in the scientific literature, which we want to just explain a little bit about. There's a summary article Authored by Pichaya P.S. It's called Impacts of Sand Mining on Environment, a Review. And it's from the International Journal of Geoinformatics and Geological Science. You know, additionally, research published in the journal Earth... Environmental Earth Science found that excessive sand mining results in the lowering of the water table and can cause the drying up of wells and wetlands. The earth removal for the proposed site is significant, and has a reasonable certainty of lowering the groundwater table. Such that the two springs being of very low volume, may become intermittent or dry up altogether, irreparably altering their biological and ecological functions. Furthermore, the eastern spring, Madsen Spring, is situated downslope of the property, such as to receive stormwater runoff causing sedimentation and nutrient loading. These happenings would greatly impinge upon the environmental assets of the hoppers. In such, the application fails to identify all the wetlands within 100 feet of the regulated activities, and fails to adequately analyze the impacts of the proposed activity on the wetlands.

Erik Madsen, 70 Oak Hill Dr, it is our assertion that significant harm will come to Erik Spring, Madsen Spring, and the Carter Spring, and their wetlands through the mechanism of sand and gravel mining. The mining will lower the water table, which will cause the springs to become intermittent or dry out altogether. Scientific studies and regulatory communications consistently warn that sand and gravel extraction can significantly disrupt local groundwater regimes, leading to lowered or depressed water tables, both at the mining extraction site and considerable distances beyond. Scientific consensus in the field of hydrology has made common the concepts of hydrologic connectivity, wetland connectivity, indirect groundwater connectivity, direct groundwater connectivity, and groundwater-surface water interactions. Long gone is the view that surface wetlands are independent of one another or independent of groundwater. Hydrologic science makes clear that surface wetlands are negatively impacted by depression of the groundwater. The negative effects of depressed groundwater on a surface wetland may include lowering of surface water depths, decrease in size of the wetland, decrease in import water flow, intermittency of the wetland, and disappearance of the wetland. While the purview of the Wetlands Commission is primarily surface water protection, it is apparent from the above that in certain circumstances, jurisdiction must extend to oversight of groundwater in order to safeguard surface water wetland features. Spring viability, lowering of the groundwater table can entirely dry out springs or render perennial springs intermittent, reducing or eliminating their ecological and hydrological functions. Ecological consequences, loss of spring flow will completely change the morphology of the wetlands. These changes threaten wetlands-dependent flora and fauna, alter habitat connectivity, and reduce water quality downstream. Some related references that I'll touch on. The author, Green, in 2005, Hydraulic Impacts of Quarries and Gravel Pits, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, Division of Waters. A key takeaway of this article was, in the complex geology of glacial beach ridge settings, the removal of sand and gravel can alter groundwater flow paths and affect the supply of water available to wetlands that are fed by discharge from the sand and gravel. the author, to Chaya Article 2017 in Impact, the title is Impacts of Sand Mining on Environment, a Review SSRG International Journal of Geoinformatics and Geological Science, dated January to April 2017. A key takeaway regarding groundwater depletion in this article was sand aquifer helps in recharging the water table, and sand mining causes sinking of water tables in the nearby areas. A local groundwater modeling study was conducted in the next town over, titled, Hydrology of Sand and Gravel Deposits Near the Nepaug Reservoir, New Hartford and Burlington, Connecticut, by Author Stone JR et al. The year was 2001, with the USGS, and the article states. Sand and gravel deposits near the Nepaug Reservoir in New Hartford and Burlington, Connecticut were studied to provide a basis for ongoing investigations that will evaluate water quality conditions in the watershed and the effects of sand and gravel mining on the quality of water in the reservoir. Stream flow during floods and droughts at Burlington Brook and Clearbrook, a tributary to the Nepaug Reservoir, were compared to determine

how the volume of sand and gravel in a watershed affects groundwater storage, and the way water is released from storage. Removal of the sand and gravel would likely result in increased streamflow peaks associated with storms and decreased streamflow period. The article, written by the author Neff in 2019, Entitled, A Hydrologic Landscapes Perspective on Groundwater Connectivity of Depressional Wetlands in the journal *Water*, has these, highlights, we define hydrologic connectivity to be the flow of water through various features of a landscape, such as uplands, lowlands, wetlands, and other service water bodies and the ground. Our focus is primarily on groundwater flow and how groundwater interacts with surface waters. The hydrologic Landscape Theoretical framework describes the flow of water through fundamental hydrologic landscape units, FHLUs. C, attachment C, in your handout. each, FHLU has three components, a landform, climate, and geology. Land form is the physical shape of the land and consists of an upland and a lowland connected by a slope. Climate is represented as the combined effect of precipitation and evapotranspiration. Geology controls how water flows across or through the landscape in response to climate. When considered together, landform, climate, and geology comprise a FHLU. C figure, number 1. the attach, also in attachment D, Figure 2, If you look at that, you'll see a depiction of models comprised of FHLUs. It is our assertion that the Plateau III model best represents a simulation of groundwater flows for Madsen Spring. All simulations were performed by the author using the variability saturated two-dimensional numerical model, so named VS2DI. VS2DI is a fully distributed model and uses finite difference approaches to solve the Richards equations for two-dimensional flow through unsaturated and saturated sediments. I apologize that the mathematical formula there didn't print well, but it can provide that for you if you wish to use that formula. And I'm not going to go on, defining all the variables for the model. But I will further state from the author Much of the groundwater discharge to Spring Brooks may originate as regional groundwater flowing from nearby uplands, often flowing over long distances. In addition, embedding depressional wetlands within a broader landscape introduces additional upward break flow that serve to amplify groundwater flow towards the surface and restrict regional groundwater flow. The presence of depressional wetlands within a broader landscape also introduces additional downward breaks in slope that serve to lower the water table locally. In some cases, particularly on the downgradient side of a depressional wetland. A landform occurs that rises to the top of the depression, then falls to the lowland. The water table in this area is especially prone to not following the contours of the land surface, and instead slopes monotonically away from the depressional wetland, causing it to be groundwater-connected to ground downgradient water bodies. With regard to water resource management, we explain how applying a hydrologic landscape approach to developing a hypothesis of groundwater connectivity can be used to improve practitioners' understanding of a wetland connectivity and guide more resource-efficient measurement and modeling efforts to support decision-making. Finally, this work provides a framework for using the hydrologic landscape theory to understand wetland connectivity and groundwater.

Michelle Rudy, 102 Henderson St, shared a contour map with the parcels and springs listed on the map. She shared that the developer is going to create a basin within the parcel which is supposed to be a temporary stormwater basin. She discussed the difference in grades between the basin and the Madsen Spring. And our recommended actions are to require, detailed mapping and documentation of all springs and wetlands within 100 feet of the project area. To commission an independent hydrological impact assessment specific to local springs and wetland functions. Require the applicant to adequately hypothesize, observe, measure, model, and analyze the potential impacts undocumented and undocumented wetlands, springs, brooks, and their downstream ecological functions. To mandate third-party monitoring of stormwater controls and compliance with environmental protection standards. To defer wetland application approval until wetland resources and potential impacts are fully identified and addressed. And to vote no on approval of the wetland application, if there is any potential that the proposed development's significant activity impacts might negatively affect the surrounding wetlands. The Hoppers Preserve is the only remaining natural wildlife habitat in downtown Bristol. It deserves the utmost level of protection. So that it may remain our legacy for future generations. Thank you.

Tom Doyle, 181 Sherwood Road, Toxicity leads to sickness and disease. I have had cancer for 20 years; I have had a heart attack and now dementia. Everyone pays for toxicity. Pollution hurts pollution kills. I am not against the development I just hope they find somewhere else to put it.

Chairman Fisk asked if anyone else wanted to address the commission. Questions from the Commission?

Commissioner Duquette-who was the source of creating the chart of Attachment F?

Michelle Rudy, 102 Henderson St, it is from the Applicant's proposal, and we just drew the black line as his own line of the existing grade, and the red line is his own line of the proposed grade. And we just superimposed

hypothetical groundwater, pathways. That we are kind of modeling from the articles that we read. But the elevation of Madsen Spring is accurate on the drawing. So, it does show that the elevation of Madison Spring is very, very close to the bottom of the temporary stormwater Pit that they're going to make

Commissioner Klimek So basically these map... the superimposing of the map was not done by a soil scientist, not done by an engineer. This is just something you decided to go ahead and create, am I correct?
Michelle Rudy, 102 Henderson St, that's correct.

Commissioner Klimek Again, there's no engineering study in your rebuttal to this application. You have not hired a soil scientist, you have not hired an engineer, am I correct?

Michelle Rudy, 102 Henderson St, so we're calling for that to be done.

Commissioner Klimek So you have no plans to do this as a rebuttal to this application on your own? Am I correct?

Michelle Rudy, 102 Henderson St, we could do that If the Commission wanted.

Commissioner Klimek So basically, everything you've shown us tonight is just articles that you've dug up from Minnesota, other areas, which have some legitimacy. Not total, but some. So, you feel by doing this, again, on no real scientific basis, that, you feel that you're correct in what you've done.

Michelle Rudy, 102 Henderson St, we feel that there is a very strong scientific basis that, excavations of this stature, do create a drawdown of the groundwater. And it's been proven over and over that this happens.

Commissioner Klimek Okay, but again, you have no real scientific, because you have not hired an engineer, you have not hired a soil scientist to do soil delineation on this piece of property. Correct?

Michelle Rudy, 102 Henderson St, not thus far.

Commissioner Robinson Commissioner Klimek has summed it up, my concerns. I would hope that, and you could do some kind of a soil scientist to come out and look at the springs. And, you know, it's possible that they may come up with something that can refute what was discovered. You know, when they did the mapping of the wetlands, they did have some boots on the ground. I don't know what, where or when. I don't know whether they went into that area. Yeah, I'm very interested to learn a little bit more about the two springs, but, you know, I'd like to have a soil scientist just kind of back it up. We can sit here and make all sorts of accusations and assumptions, but you know in a court of law, it's not going to stand.

Michelle Rudy, 102 Henderson St, Correct. So that's why we're calling for the applicant to do their due diligence and proving that the wetland soils are where they are supposed to be on the map, because you can actually go out there yourself with our coordinates and locate the springs.

Commissioners Rooks and Robinson reiterated to the intervener Michelle that what they have provided are their assumptions and to get a soil scientist to investigate and back up their assumptions and claims with scientific backing.

Commissioner Robinson what I would ask you to do right now, as the intervener is to ask us to give you the opportunity to go out and have a certified soil scientist come into the area and do their due diligence, and then present their findings to us. Because basically what you're doing, and it's a good thing, is you're challenging the current wetlands map and I don't have a problem with that, because if the springs are there, then the springs are there, and it's our duty as Inland Wetlands and Conservation Committee to try and preserve that. If this were to go to a court of law, we don't have a thing to stand on. If you have a certified person, come out and say, okay, this is what we found, and, you know, we can even take a walk out there and have them do their auger and show us the soils, and show us everything, then we've got something to work with. And we could walk out there now and see water, as you're showing us in these pictures, but we're not qualified to make that decision that this is a wetland. We can say this is a good area to look to a soil scientist.

Michelle Rudy, 102 Henderson St, stated they are willing to hire a Soil Scientist as long as the commission is willing to give them the time to do so.

Attorney Ziogas, 104 Bellevue Ave, there are two things that I've heard was we thought the applicant was going to pay for it, and we thought the applicant was going to clean it up. And what I missed in the whole thing is how the property got into the condition that it's in, in a highly sensitive area, and no complaints. And no action has taken over a number of years. I mean, this didn't happen overnight. When you talk about, they're worried about the trucks and the dust. What about the 8 or 10 vehicles that have been stranded up there? We don't know if there's fuel in the tanks, we don't know if there's oil in the tanks, we don't know if there's hydraulic fluids. There are so many question marks, when you go up there. And to me, the arguments don't pass the eye test. What I saw is what we all saw, and it needs to be fixed. And, again the people from the Hoppers. want the applicant to go up there and clean the property up at their expense, and then do nothing with it. That's not how it works. the 145,000 cubic yards of material is not excessive. It will make the place developable; it'll clean it up, it'll make it residential, and in the final analysis, I think it's going to be an improvement. I know it'll be an improvement to the neighborhood. And the people who live there are going to be better off in the long run.

Commissioner Robinson, I think we're kind of at the point where we're going to have to give the interveners a chance to you know, get a soil scientist. And like I said, I don't think they're going to be able to pick up the phone in the morning and have a soil scientist at their beck and call. Let the soil scientists do what soil scientists do.

Attorney Ziogas, 104 Bellevue Ave, and that's the Commission's discretion, and I'm not going to sit here and argue against it. In the final analysis, even if he goes out there and he finds that there's a brook there. it doesn't answer the question of what becomes of the property to the west, and how does it get cleaned up, and how does it get renovated. That is still going to be before this commission.

Commissioner Robinson, well, that's scientific information that'll probably come forth as the soil scientist does their initial report, and then we'll just have to go forward from there. We don't know what the soil scientist is going to find.

John Benoit, 1 Ambler Road, I own the property pretty close to where this, **this wetland permission is being**. And there's some concerns, and they're not very scientific, but there's some concerns. One, I have heard that they are going to take anything from 1,000 acre a thousand cubic yards to a million cubic yards of soil, so I don't know how much they're going to take out. If they take out the 1,000 cubic yards, that's 7,000 truckloads. That are going to come through a very residential area, small houses. Kids are out in the morning waiting for school buses. And that's there to be a concern for me. Also, Carter brook runs through my property. And, all that land kind of slopes down to Carter brook. Every day, I walk 2 miles through the Hoppers, and when you walk through the Hoppers. Every once in a while, you'll see a pipe sticking up. And we're talking about surface water. But underneath the Hoppers are a huge aquifer. And the city did a big study on that aquifer that is below the Hoppers. And I would question, again, I'm not scientific about it, I would question Does this, mining affect the underground aquifers that we have? If you look at, Birge Pond, there's a, a spillway. And the spillway is constantly running. And that spillway is fed mostly by springs. There's a lot of springs that are feeding that. And if you walk down Grassy, some of you have been there, down Grassy, there's a gate there. And it's when you cross over that gate, and at one time it was Grassy, or a continuum of Grassy. And you look to the right-hand side, That's all wet. It's all wet. I mean, there's, fiddleheads growing there. There's, all types of vegetation that grows only in water. And, from there to where Manchester's development is, I would imagine there's five or six places that have water running right down through it. I have two concerns, well, probably three. 1) if you're going to take the sand out going through a residential area, 2) the surface water 3)- Water underground. I had the water tested on the brook that comes through my property. I brought it to Plainville, and they tested that water, and they said, you can take a cup. And drink right from that water. My house, which is on one end of the road, it was built in 1900, used to have to dam that brook up and the house was fed by gravity water from that brook. It comes out of the ground, maybe 100 yards up from my property.

Commissioner Robinson: Actually, you bring up a good point about the, Fiddleheads and like that. And these are some of the things that, again, a soil scientist, when they're out there, is going to look at that, and they're going to say, hey, you know, not only do we find, with our borings in the soil, but we find by the vegetation around us

that it's wetlands. I'm a strong person that would say we need to get a soil scientist out there and give us some scientific information.

John Benoit, 1 Ambler Road, I've got two little ponds. They're filled in, kind of now. But my ponds are filled with, watercress. And watercress only grows in pure water. So, it's pure water. The other thing is, all through that area to the right of Grassy are a thing called Ramps, which are wild onions, and those only grow in pure water. All that water is coming from the aquifers that are below It's not surface water.

Commissioner Klimek: Mr. Benoit, you bring up some good points. But again, what this commission is driving at is that without actual documentation from either an engineer or a soil scientist, delineating their soils. We really have no scientific data. I'm not disputing what you're saying, but we're asking the, interveners to come up with actual scientific data.

Chairman Fisk: I think one thing to keep in mind, too, his property is the one that was mapped for the wetland in the upland review area.

Commissioner Robinson: Yes. The Carter Brooks, that's what's being shown here? What's up on the screen.

Chairman Fisk I believe we are all feeling the same thing, that this will be tabled to allow the interveners time to hire a soil scientist

MOTION: Move to table 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.

By: Robinson

Seconded: Rooks

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

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

The application is continued.

The Meeting was recessed for a 5-minute break at 8:20 pm

The Meeting resumed at 8:26pm

- b. Application #2057 – Wetlands application for the repair of an existing culvert including replacement of concrete slabs/decks, stabilization of abutments, installation of rip-rap and other repairs at 197, 211, 213, 215, 219 and 225 Park Street; Assessor's Map 12, Lots 111, 112, 113, 114, 115 and 116; Curt Michael Freedman, P.E., applicant.
- c. Application # 25-462F-312 – Floodplain application for the repair of an existing culvert including replacement of concrete slabs/decks, stabilization of abutments, installation of rip-rap and other repairs within the floodplain at 197, 211, 213, 215, 219 and 225 Park Street; Assessor's Map 12, Lots 111, 112, 113, 114, 115 and 116; Curt Michael Freedman, P.E., applicant.

The Commission received the following items in their electronic packets for Application #2057:

- a. Application (attached hyperlinks)
- b. Photographs (Pgs. 1 – 31)
- c. Park Street photographs (Pgs. 1-12)
- d. Email RE: Video Park St. Storm Photos (Pgs. 1-12) from CMF Engineering, Inc.

The Commission received the following items in their electronic packets PREVIOUSLY for Application #2057:

- a. Assessor's Map with Inland Wetlands Watercourse Layers
- b. Application
- c. Site photos (Exterior), from Curt Freedman, P.E., regarding 213 Park St., Et Al. (21 Pgs.)
- d. Site photos (Culvert Photos), from Curt Freedman, P.E., regarding 213 Park St., Et Al. (17 Pgs.)

The Commission received the following items in their electronic packets PREVIOUSLY for Application #25-462F-312:

- a. Assessor's Map with Inland Wetlands Watercourse Layers
- b. Application
- c. List of Property Owners

MOTION: Move to open the public hearing for Application #2057.

By: Robinson

Seconded: Duquette

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

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

The Public Hearing was opened.

Chairman Fisk, before you start Mr. Freedman have all the property owners signed off on this?

Curt Freedman, P.E., 24 Ridge Rd., Longmeadow, MA 01106, representing the applicant, we have four signatures I am waiting on more signatures.

Anthony Lorenzetti, City Staff, you have people whose property this represents that have never signed off as an applicant on the application? Have they all signed off on this application? Because it's their properties you're dealing with.

Curt Freedman, P.E., 24 Ridge Rd., Longmeadow, MA 01106, where we're looking to start, they have further upstream. We're still waiting for some additional signatures to come in.

Anthony Lorenzetti, City Staff, So, the answer is no.

Chairman Fisk, how many do you need? How many property owners are involved?

Curt Freedman, P.E., 24 Ridge Rd., Longmeadow, MA 01106, For the work that we're looking to do. Right away, we have everyone signed off. There's a total of 7 property owners involved. But that active work will be done next spring through summer. The work that we're looking to do now, we have everybody signed off

Commissioner Rooks, but this commission does not have a completed application in front of us. This commission, when we were out on the site walk. Not to have any wetlands marked or flagged is a big issue. There is no survey done, there's no plans on what you plan on doing. There are property owners that about these people that probably don't even know how much it's going to run, if they're going to be charged. I mean, there's a lot of questions here that you're coming in front of us for an emergency fix. And this emergency's been going on for 4 years since the flood. Why is this an emergency now in front of us as a commission? How did you get involved in this?

Curt Freedman, P.E., 24 Ridge Rd., Longmeadow, MA 01106, I was contacted much more recently. To put together a plan for the repair. And we have done that. Everyone has been notified, we've been in communication with everyone. There's a release form, which we prepared. We're waiting for a few people. Oh, well, let's... I want to go off... I want to go first thing is the property owners. So, for the plans that we have, you just said you have four property owners that are signed off.

Chairman Fisk I want to go first thing is the property owners. So, for the plans that we have, you just said you have four property owners that are signed off. And I think we visited 5 properties when we were out there, so it seems like there's one that's missing. But for the plans that you're going forward with tonight. You're stating that all property owners have been represented? And they're all signed off on that?

Curt Freedman, P.E., 24 Ridge Rd., Longmeadow, MA 01106, Yes

Chairman Fisk Then there's additional property owners for another phase in the future. And those plans are not in front of us yet?

Curt Freedman, P.E., 24 Ridge Rd., Longmeadow, MA 01106 The plans are, we're not looking to do the work until spring or summer through fall of 2026. Same application.

Chairman Fisk it's just, that at some point, yeah, that's a part that needs to be clarified.

Commissioner Robinson the other thing that this commission and Commissioner Rooks brought up is I haven't seen any kind of a survey, nor have I seen any kind of a, again, inland wetlands, so we haven't had a soil scientist out. Because they're the ones that would delineate or identify the wetlands. There're two major issues. These are very nice blue prints and all this other stuff, but I don't see where an engineer has signed off on this. I don't see where their surveyor has signed off on this. This commissioner, between the lack of all the engineers, you know, all the scientific that we want, plus the fact you don't have all the signatures, you don't have an application. You don't have a complete application.

Chairman Fisk clarified You are an engineer? Are you also a surveyor?

Curt Freedman, P.E., 24 Ridge Rd., Longmeadow, MA 01106, I am an engineer I am not a surveyor. But we're making repairs to a pre-existing structure. We're not changing its footprint. This is not a proposed or new culvert. This is a pre-existing. We're simply just looking to do repairs to the existing. There's a lot of exemptions for doing repairs to existing, where you don't change the footprint at all. The repairs are not going to have any incremental environmental impact whatsoever. We're not looking to change the course of the stream; we're not looking to change the dimensions of the culvert. Everything is staying the same. There is some mitigation work we're looking to do, like installing some riprap, which is just obvious because the photographs clearly show that Having some undermining and scouring taking place inside the culvert, and we're looking to mitigate that so that it doesn't elapse. If it does collapse, it would have very significant, situations. There's also a gas pipe running perpendicular through the culvert, which needs to be removed it previously, we believed. contributed to the obstructions that occurred in the past, and we're looking to remove that. We've had discussions with Eversource, and so we're looking to take necessary steps to stabilize the existing situation, and so based on that we're just doing repairs of the existing that we're not changing it we're just doing repairs. That comes into a different category as far as the codes call out.

Commissioner Klimek-Just to back up on Commissioner Rooks and Commissioner Robinson basically, you don't have everybody signed off on this. You don't have actual data to show us that a complete engineering study has taken place. This is just what you're telling us.

Curt Freedman, P.E., 24 Ridge Rd., Longmeadow, MA 01106, We're just doing repairs to the pre-existing, we're not changing it in any way.

Commissioner Klimek- You don't have any engineering data to back yourself up.

Curt Freedman, P.E., 24 Ridge Rd., Longmeadow, MA 01106, What engineering data are you seeking, sir?

Anthony Lorenzetti, City Staff, There's no hydraulic analysis at all. You don't have surveyed elevations for sizes, sizes of all the cross-sections that you're going through. I mean, I'm just looking at what you submitted. You've got a culvert that you're showing starts off at 60 inches, goes up to 60 inches... 66 inches high. By the time you're at the end, it's down at 45 inches. I don't see that there's even adequate information here to be able to do any type of hydraulic analysis on this culvert system.

Curt Freedman, P.E., 24 Ridge Rd., Longmeadow, MA 01106, My question is, why would a hydraulic analysis be necessary? We're just doing a fundamental

Anthony Lorenzetti, City Staff, you want to put material in this watercourse. you want to repair a scour; you want to do something inside this watercourse. How can the city or the city engineer approve something like this that doesn't have any hydraulic analysis or capacity in it?

Curt Freedman, P.E., 24 Ridge Rd., Longmeadow, MA 01106, The work is not going to effect or make any changes in the pre-existing flows.

Anthony Lorenzetti, City Staff, how can you prove that? Where's the calculations that prove that?

Curt Freedman, P.E., 24 Ridge Rd., Longmeadow, MA 01106, Because we're restoring the interior of the culvert to the pre-existing conditions.

Anthony Lorenzetti, City Staff, so you're assuming that that was all proper?

Curt Freedman, P.E., 24 Ridge Rd., Longmeadow, MA 01106, We're not looking to rebuild the culvert, we're just looking to restore it to its pre-existing, and, for example, in those areas which were scoured. It's directly observable Where the previous dimensions. And it's shown in the photographs. We're not looking to change it.

Anthony Lorenzetti, City Staff, well, we went out there and we looked out in the field, and you have a steel plate over a portion of the culvert. So, you have plans for that area where the steel plate is, or do you not?

Curt Freedman, P.E., 24 Ridge Rd., Longmeadow, MA 01106, Yeah, the details call for the slab with the top deck of the culvert to be removed. And then be restored in place as kind, as it is. Now, we're not looking to change those dimensions at all.

Anthony Lorenzetti, City Staff, you have a design for the slab? I've never seen it.

Curt Freedman, P.E., 24 Ridge Rd., Longmeadow, MA 01106, Yes, It's part of the engineering. In that literature that you have.

Anthony Lorenzetti, City Staff, so the packet you handed us tonight?

Curt Freedman, P.E., 24 Ridge Rd., Longmeadow, MA 01106, Yes and I have the calculations here. Chairman Fisk, this has not been properly vetted with the ten days we usually require.

Commissioner Rooks, at the site walk you said that for the back houses to be services the top of the culvert needs to be a certain thickness of concrete. Was the original cover of that culvert, that thickness, or no?

Curt Freedman, P.E., 24 Ridge Rd., Longmeadow, MA 01106, Current thickness is about 7 inches, it is very deteriorated and the new thickness will be approximately 10 inches.

Commissioner Rooks, so the side walls are going to hold 10 inches and not have a problem?

Curt Freedman, P.E., 24 Ridge Rd., Longmeadow, MA 01106, Yes, they are about 2 feet thick

Commissioner Rooks, I am asking you because I do not see plans in front of me. Well, if you're repairing it, I would say, you know. If you're repairing it, you should be repairing it with a 7-inch thick, and we'll deal with that later down the road, but I understand what you're trying to do is fix it properly, but the sidewalls, you put something heavier on it, it could fall in.

Curt Freedman, P.E., 24 Ridge Rd., Longmeadow, MA 01106, The side walls are stone and the stone on the inside are all of them, right? In some of that culvert? But what's fallen in is approximately 4 inches of poured concrete, which lined the stone. And the photographs show that's what was scoured away in that location. We're going to, install anchors, and then put a new inner lining concrete in that location to restore it to where it previously was.

Anthony Lorenzetti, City Staff, is that in the plans you submitted tonight?

Curt Freedman, P.E., 24 Ridge Rd., Longmeadow, MA 01106, Yes

Anthony Lorenzetti, City Staff, I'm just looking at what you submitted. You submitted a typical section of a slab cross-section. You don't say how big the slab is.

Curt Freedman, P.E., 24 Ridge Rd., Longmeadow, MA 01106, I can show exactly where that is. And the area where the driveway is, where the vehicles are going across. The other areas... have much less load. We're not looking to do work on those until the spring. We're looking to restore the driveway area so it can sustain.

Commissioner Robinson, and that's going to be a separate application? What's that? And that's going to be a separate application? Are you asking us for the whole ball of wax tonight?

Chairman Fisk, I think that's what we heard, the whole ball of wax. Which includes property owners that are not represented in this.

Commissioner Robinson, there's a lot of concerns that I have, and I think, you know, that.

Curt Freedman, P.E., 24 Ridge Rd., Longmeadow, MA 01106, stated there are multiple issues going on inside this culvert and there's a history of repairs. We've documented where it's been previously repaired, where it's in need of repair now, both in the walls, the bottom and also the concrete slabs. So, yes, it is a multifaceted issue, and I've marked those as best I can on the drawings. The idea was to... would be to flip through the photos and then point out each of these different areas on the blueprint, and indicate what we're looking to accomplish this fall, and then what we'd be looking to accomplish in the spring through fall of 2026.

Chairman Fisk, understanding that we just received the plans tonight, that this fall has already been ruled out.

Commissioner Rooks we need to see that your fix is going to survive and last 20 years, we don't want to be kicking the can down the road.

Commissioner Klimek, the bottom line of this whole thing is, Mr. Lorenzetti's already stated that. You don't have a complete application here. You don't have a complete study done. What you're trying to do, and to back up on Commissioner Robinson and Rooks. You're just trying to piecemeal this thing. We don't know what really needs to be done here.

William Stango, City Engineer, to all the Commissioner's points, I do agree with your general consensus. Whenever you have an application with many property owners, it is my opinion that you need proper survey to tell whose property's affected, where the property line's at, and also to make sure consent and signature from all those property owners. At this point in time, we do not have a survey on this. As well as from someone who will be reviewing these plans. We don't have any existing condition plans to tell what the existing condition of the structure was. So, without existing cross-sections and proposed cross-sections, we cannot accurately describe or judge this project, because we don't know how it's going to be changing. I know the applicant is saying they will be putting a concrete face with some wedge anchors into the existing walls. How will that be changing the existing hydraulic opening? How are we supposed to be able to tell, without any existing plans, what was quote-unquote existing? How much will be changed? In the plans that were submitted tonight, we have a typical cross-section of a reinforced concrete deck that does not include the work to be done to the existing abutments, the abutments of the walls supporting the deck. How far will the deck span onto the abutment? I would like to see a more comprehensive engineering plan that accurately shows the Commission, as well as engineering staff, what the total level of impact to the proposed project area will be. At this point in time, is my opinion, we do not have that. That would include Structural details. cross-sections, grades, as well as propose an existing low cord

elevation so we can ensure the hydraulic opening is not changed in the repairs of this project. I don't have problems with repairs. What I do have a problem with is changing the hydraulic opening of this structure, which we already have significant evidence that is undersized. We have that evidence because we just replaced where we had, engineers design Field Street Culvert and Divinity Street Culvert, which are both upstream, and they're larger than what we have existing.

Commissioner Klimek, so you do not have a hydraulic study neither?

William Stango, City Engineer, Correct, that is going to be needed. That's... that's something to determine, at the very least, a typical section. What are we doing in the waterway? Where's the riprap? What will the proposed hydraulic opening look like? Correct. How can we enforce that? and this is my opinion, if we don't know what will be proposed, how can we say this is approved, we don't have a proposed cross-section of the work?

Chairman Fisk, Bill, can you just restate your six or seven, whatever, five, six points again.

William Stango, City Engineer, I can do my best to reiterate all those. Just quickly reiterate them. The most important... Because I think these will be used in our determination. The most important is a typical cross-section of the proposed work. What is existing, and how will it be affected? How will the hydraulic opening be impacted, if any? We also need survey to show who the property owners, and signature, to show that all the affected property owners have signed off on this application. s well as elevation and grade of channel invert and low cord elevation of the culvert. That will tell us the hydraulic opening. It is the cross section, the invert. and the low cord elevation of the culvert. That's what we need to determine the impact of the existing channel.

Commissioner Klimek, because you have an incomplete application.

This should be tabled till at least the December meeting, Mr. Chairman. I agree. I mean, our engineer is...

Commissioner Brooks, Commissioner Robinson, our engineer, have all proven their points. City Engineer Bill, you've more than proven your point.

Anthony Lorenzetti, City Staff, I do have one other thing that hasn't been brought up that needs to be addressed. Do you have any idea what the existing capacity is of this culvert, and what storm it will handle? And if not, how are you determining how to properly face the walls so you can prevent scour? Without knowing what the velocities are. The reality is, I'm just asking what the capacity is. And how you are determining the repairs that you're doing, so the velocities do not rip out whatever you're doing. Things like riprap sizing are done based upon velocities. I'm just intrigued about how you're dealing with that. We looked at the downstream side of that culvert, and there certainly was a lot of stone and material that had blown downstream over the years. I'm just asking how you're determining that.

Curt Freedman, P.E., 24 Ridge Rd., Longmeadow, MA 01106, You can see that other parts of the culvert have survived over the years, even though we've had rather extreme conditions.

MOTION: Move to table the public hearing for Application #2057 until enough information is given to the City Engineering Department to satisfy them, and we've also come up with our own list of answers that we'd like. And when all those are present and proposed, and we have all the necessary signatures, then we can take it forward. But until then, I propose that 2057 be tabled until we have further information.

By: Robinson

Seconded: Massaro

Against: Rooks.

Abstained: None.

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

The Public Hearing was continued.

MOTION: Move to table the public hearing for Application #25-462F-312 until enough information is given to the City Engineering Department to satisfy them, and we've also come up with our own list of answers that we'd like. And when all those are present and proposed, and we have all the necessary signatures, then we can take it forward. But until then, I propose that #25-462F-312 be tabled until we have further information.

By: Rooks

Seconded: Massaro

Against: Rooks.

Abstained: None.

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

Commissioner Rooks please provide survey and engineering plans to the City and the Commission, Applicant must verify all property owners be properly notified and have all signatures. Cost Estimate to be provided by the applicant and approved by engineering. The applicant must provide a performance bond to the City of Bristol equal to the estimated cost of work, or as recommended by the engineering department. And, under no circumstances should the proposed repairs reduce the existing hydraulic opening.

MOTION: Move to amended Motion for application #2057 and to include the above stipulations.

By: Robinson

Seconded: Carros

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

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

Chairman Fisk, For the record, we are recognizing the public even though the application has been tabled.

Deanna DeJesus, 43 Poplar Street, representing her uncle at 211 Park Street, addressed the commission, I'm trying to understand exactly what we're doing, since this has been going on for a very long time. This didn't just happen, those floods didn't just happen in 2 years ago, this has been something you guys have known that has been voiced for almost 4 years and nothing has been done. Now, you're saying that you're working with the owners, and if you had to replace the whole culvert repair. You're just looking to band-aid fix it at this point. And the tenants that live there, I understand what you're saying, but I'm just letting you know that the tenants that are there are the ones who are suffering whatever we can't resolve here. But to say that the culvert, it's got to be that old, and it's collapsing. The floods that my uncle provided pictures for 2 years ago, that didn't just happen. This is something that's been happening, and what I'm trying to understand is the city from my understanding, the city took over the project because they couldn't get the landlords on board to who was responsible for this problem. So, what I'm trying to understand is how much longer is it going to take just for anybody to figure out anything. And how long is this going to impact the residents? Because, again, if this is going to collapse, or it could collapse, what is the other things that it's going to cause? So, we're trying to understand how it's going to affect my uncle going forward, in terms of him living there, if we can't get a resolution to this, or we're not understanding where it began.

Bill Stango, City Engineer, So, thank you for your questions. The project is the culvert is a privately owned culvert, and it is the responsibility of the owners of the culvert to repair and maintain it. The City's involvement at this point in time, at this commission, is to make sure that the applicant is doing all proper planning to mitigate any effect to the wetlands and the watercourse and the floodplain. The city is not going to be financially supporting this project. We are going to be reviewing the project to make sure that repairs that go in are not band-aid fixes. That is what I will be doing, it's what Mr. Lorenzetti will be doing, as well as taking safeguards to make sure that, moving forward, it is sustainable. So, but it is a private matter. The culvert is privately owned. The city is not going to financially support this project. It is the responsibility of the owners for repairs and maintenance to the existing culvert.

- d. Application #2059 Wetlands application for drainage improvements and other related construction activities with a disturbance within the upland review area and wetland proper at East Road; Assessor's Map 31, Lot ROW 1; City of Bristol Department of Public Works, applicant.

The Commission received the following items in their electronic packets PREVIOUSLY for Application #2059:

- a. Assessor's Map with Inland Wetlands Watercourse Layers
- b. Application
- c. Plan (Electronic Copy Only)

The Commission received the following items in their electronic packets:

- a. Plan (Existing Conditions)
- b. Plan (Roadway Plan)

MOTION: Move to open the public hearing for Application #2059.

By: Robinson

Seconded: Rooks

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

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

The Public Hearing was opened.

Bill Stango, City Engineer, City of Bristol, 111 North Main St., this is for the application of the drainage approval, to reduce the flooding we've seen in the past. we're going to be connecting into the existing drainage system at the corner of Pleasant View Ave and East Road. We will be adding capacity to the existing system, which we have seen to be surcharged. We will be running new piping to the west, and discharging an existing unnamed brook. Piping will consist of 42-inch RCP. The area will be protected with silt fencing and hay bales. And a construction entrance will be installed, and maintained throughout all phases of construction. The area of impact, is to both the wetlands and the upland review area, as shown on the plan, and is delineated with the dotted hatch. Do any commission members have any questions?

No questions from the commission, Chairman Fisk invited anyone from the public to speak.

Rhoda Lange, 85 East Rd and 6 Greystone Ave, I saw that the review area goes substantially through both properties, both on the east side and on the west side of 85 East Road. And I just wanted to understand what the impact would be when this project gets underway. And, how that would We were a little concerned, because we didn't know how deep in you go in to reconstruct these things, and would there be erosion, because we have level land on both of those properties, 6 Greystone, and we didn't know if there was going to be any construction that would affect the erosion that could happen on those steep slopes.

Bill Stango, City Engineer, City of Bristol, 111 North Main St., We have a stockade fence line type. See, it's a line with little squares on it, and it is surrounding the project area. That is our silt fencing. So that is the area which they will be installing the new 42-inch pipe. It is a deeper excavation required by the contractor, whomever is selected. After installation, grades will be restored to existing. They will not be modified, no swales, no fill and capacity will be maintaining and the areas will be finished with topsoil. So, you won't have any erosion if you did notice erosion a year after the project, you can call me directly.

Rhoda Lange, 85 East Rd and 6 Greystone Ave, it's only going to affect the 85 East Road property, right?

Bill Stango, City Engineer, City of Bristol, 111 North Main St., it will not touch Greystone, just East Rd and the pipe will go underneath the sidewalks. Everything will be dug up and you will get brand new sidewalks.

Rhoda Lange, 85 East Rd and 6 Greystone Ave, how long will this project take?

Bill Stango, City Engineer, City of Bristol, 111 North Main St., So installation will start on the downhill side. Where it says the N plus 0, 0. Rough estimate, a couple weeks, three weeks. And that would be from the outfall, to pass your property, I'd say it's about 3 weeks. And then they have some utility work, so the total project may be 3 months, and I'd say about, they'll be out of your hair, at least. It's not going to start till spring.

Commissioner Klimek, so Bill you are estimating 3 months on this?

Bill Stango, City Engineer, City of Bristol, 111 North Main St., ballpark yes, with the big pipe, no, it is challenging. But we don't have too many major utility crossings in the road. This is, again, along East Road, not particularly, the area of concern, but total project, talking total project time. I think we have two major utility crossings, so as long as those don't slow us up, it should be a pretty straightforward.

Commissioner Klimek, is this going to be outsourced?

Bill Stango, City Engineer, City of Bristol, 111 North Main St., yes it will be going out to public bid.

Chairman Fisk, so you said 3 weeks for the regulated area?

Bill Stango, City Engineer, City of Bristol, 111 North Main St., It is steep slopes, it's dependent on the material. I think 3 to 4 weeks within the regulated area, I think that's conservative. Yeah, I believe that'll be conservative, about 3 to 4 weeks within that area, and once they're out, you know, it's pretty much just road work at that point.

Commissioner Klimek, all proper fencing and everything will be put in?

Bill Stango, City Engineer, City of Bristol, 111 North Main St., Yeah, we'll be, installing sill fencing as well as, hay bales at the outfall. And they'll be maintained and inspected, on major rain events. We'll send someone out in minor rain events to make sure that everything is holding in place. And cleaned out as needed. This one will probably have city forces, do the inspection, so I'll have direct oversight as far as, inspecting the S&E controls.

Chairman Fisk, Is there any safety concerns with that slope while during that 3-week period?

Bill Stango, City Engineer, City of Bristol, 111 North Main St., In my opinion, I'm a safety guy, you know? Can never be too safe. Shoring's always an issue, but, you know, proper trench boxes, and construction methods.

Chairman Fisk, I just mean for, like, weekends when it's unintended for neighborhood children, things of that nature?

Bill Stango, City Engineer, City of Bristol, 111 North Main St., With all the pipe projects, we make sure our contractors, you know, if they're in the road, they're not leaving road plates over weekends. Any open trenches, they're closed up properly, and especially if you have, a residential neighbor, so close to the project, we'd be extra cautious and make sure they're taking any proper precautions to make sure that little kid didn't fall in the whole.

MOTION: Move to close the public hearing for Application #2059.

By: Robinson

Seconded: Rooks

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

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

The Public Hearing was opened.

MOTION: Move to approve Application #2059 - – Wetlands application for drainage improvements and other related construction activities with a disturbance within the upland review area and wetland proper at East Road; Assessor's Map 31, Lot ROW 1; City of Bristol Department of Public Works, applicant, in accordance with the plot plan and information submitted with standard stipulations.

By: Robinson

Seconded: Rooks

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

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

The application is approved.

5. Receipt of New Applications

- a. Application #2061 - Wetlands application for the demolition of an existing structure and filling of excavation to grade at 1001 Stafford Avenue; Assessor's Map 53, Lot 48; Hartford RC Diocesan Corporation, applicant.

The Commission received the following items in their electronic packets:

- a. Assessor's Map with Inland Wetlands Watercourse Layers
- b. Application (attached map)
- c. Photograph (oblique view)
- d. Plan (Electronic Copy Only)

Chairman Fisk, is this a complete application? The application was declared a complete application.

Anthony Lorenzetti, yes, it is, this is simply a demolition of a property that's located solely in the Upland review. And the wetlands are on the opposite side of the street and on the other side of the parking lot from where this building is.

MOTION: Move to receive Application #2061.

By: Massaro

Seconded: Carros

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

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

The application is received.

Anthony D'Amato, 10 Main Street, representing the applicant, it's a standard demolition of an existing structure, C&D, to be, disposed of, Based on type. We're going to remove, the existing foundation walls, fill and compact the existing basement and grade site, level. So, everything is to be removed.

Commissioner Klimek, how soon do you want to start this?

Anthony D'Amato, 10 Main Street, to be honest with you, we have equipment mobilized now. We've been concentrating on just an interior building clean-out until we have an approved, application.

Which, our demolition permit, outside of this one item, is, you know, is still outstanding. So, somewhat immediately upon approval and issuance of our, Building department demolition permit. Chairman Fisk, does it include the driveway or just the building?

Anthony D'Amato, 10 Main Street, we are going to remove the driveway as well.

Commissioner Klimek, what's the plan just to grass it over when you're done?

Anthony D'Amato, 10 Main Street, Yeah, just a restoration to mimic what's existing, which is basically grass.

Commissioner Rooks, are you going to be putting silt fence up along the let side of the building?

Anthony D'Amato, 10 Main Street, Yeah, we're going to do whatever S&E controls require based on the expectation of the city permit process.

Chairman Fisk, Tony is there anything in there now to include erosion control?

Anthony Lorenzetti, City Staff, no, I don't think there's anything shown for erosion controls. So, I would suggest the erosion controls would go on the westerly side by the driveway, and then along the southerly side along Maltby Street, where the driveways are being removed.

Anthony D'Amato, 10 Main Street, yes, that would be appropriate.

MOTION: Move to declare Application #2061 a non-significant activity.

By: Rooks

Seconded: Robinson

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

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

The application was declared a non-significant activity.

No one else spoke in favor of the application.

No one spoke against the application.

MOTION: Move to approve Application #2061 - Wetlands application for the demolition of an existing structure and filling of excavation to grade at 1001 Stafford Avenue; Assessor's Map 53, Lot 48; Hartford RC Diocesan Corporation, applicant, in accordance with the plot plan and information submitted with standard stipulations and with the aforementioned erosion control conditions.

By: Massaro

Seconded: Robinson

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

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

The application is approved.

- a. Application #2062 - Wetlands application for the reconfiguration of existing pavement areas to accommodate additional parking spaces for a total of 161 spaces. Additional improvements include a 45' wide drive-in-door to Building A and multiple stormwater basin/floodplain compensation areas for proposed and future parking at 300 Broad Street; Assessor's Map 43, Lot 100; 300 Broad Street Property LLC, applicant.
- b. Application #25-466F-314 - Floodplain application for the reconfiguration of existing pavement areas to accommodate additional parking spaces for a total of 161 spaces. Additional improvements include a 45' wide drive-in-door to Building A and multiple stormwater basin/floodplain compensation areas for proposed and future parking at 300 Broad Street; Assessor's Map 43, Lot 100; 300 Broad Street Property LLC, applicant.

Chairman Fisk explained Applications #2062 And #25-466F-314 would be heard concurrently but voted on separately.

The Commission received the following items in their electronic packets:

- a. Assessor's Map with Inland Wetlands Watercourse Layers
- b. Applications
- c. Soil Scientist Report and Impact Assessment report, from SLR International Corporation dated October 21, 2025.
- d. Proposed Site Improvements, Drainage Report, dated October 23, 2025
- e. Plan (Electronic Copy Only)

The application was declared complete.

MOTION: Move to receive Application #2062.

By: Robinson

Seconded: Carros

For: Duquette, Valentino, Robinson, Carros, Massaro, Rooks and Fisk.
Against: None.
Abstained: None.

The application is received.

MOTION: Move to receive Application #25-466F-314.

By: Robinson

Seconded: Carros

For: Duquette, Valentino, Robinson, Carros, Massaro, Rooks and Fisk.
Against: None.
Abstained: None.

The application is received.

Attorney Tim Furey, 43 Bellevue Ave, representing the applicant, this property, you, all know is the industrial site Adjacent to the Tice Precision Steel, tower. Several industrial buildings. You may want to go right down to one of the drawings on Broad Street. Some of you have been out there previously, many years ago, when they were starting to do some clean-outs. Before they did the environmental work. The owners have already spent over a million dollars doing environmental work. The property's clean. They've been inside these buildings doing extensive, remediation of some you know, bad soils under the slab of all the PCBs, all the asbestos, all of a sudden works done. And they've actually begun, done a substantial work to the actual buildings themselves, and they have a couple very good tenants. And they have a couple potential very good tenants. So, surprisingly, you know, they've been investing and it's been paying off. But in order to have these buildings to be occupied under

modern standards. We have to meet modern zoning standards, which has different parking requirements. What we're wishing to do in the substance of this application. I think we can save you a lot of time, you won't have an extra two hearings next month. Is to build some proposed parking, and you may want to go to the... one of the map drawings. So, the proposal is to add, the parking at the top of the drawing here, which I think is north. And, in fact, we plan on presenting to the Zoning Commission as showing the ability to construct it, but a lot of what we're proposing for parking we won't show is futuristic parking. The zoning regulations of the City of Bristol allow you to show the parking as long as you engineer the parking, and don't require you to build it if you don't think you need it, and they agree. If at some point in the future we decide we need the additional parking, or if the city believes we need the additional parking, they can we can build it, or they can ask us to build it. The improvements that impact the, the upland review area. Nothing is being done within a wetland. Are the parking spaces along the north and on the, on the east? The area where there's a loading dock to be built on the east, which is, in deep gray, and then the parking closer down along Broad Street. on the far east side there. The only net result, it's being built, or proposed to be built along the existing pavement, it's in the view area. The advantage here, which Barak will review the figures, is behind the parking, we are building shallow swales, if you will, or environmental retention areas. There is really a grass area that will increase the, capabilities for water retention, which is your flood application. We're actually increasing the retention. And we're actually creating a better buffer between the pavement that's there and the river, because we're going to have these depressions, which act as a, a filter, if you will. We're hoping That you can see this, given the nature of the property, given the improvements that we've made, is not a significant activity, does not affect the wetlands themselves, and in fact, has some improvement.

Chairman Fisk, what are you proposing with some parking spaces that can be built when, if needed? We have, like, a 5-year term on our permits, so if these are not built in 5 years, I'm just trying to understand.

Attorney Tim Furey, 43 Bellevue Ave, we may have to come back if we felt they were needed. From a wetlands point of view, if we don't need to build the, you shouldn't want us to build them. But if they're not needed, and odds are in the current world, we won't need them. We'll just leave them as future spaces, and if we have to come back in the future to the Wetlands Commission to get a new permit, we'll do it.

Chairman Fisk, so what you're proposing may not be built, and if it's needed in the future, another new application will be required.

Attorney Tim Furey, 43 Bellevue Ave, and I believe, regardless, we would probably build the swale structures just because they're a good buffer. But I'll let Rock explain that. Okay, thank you.

Rock Emmond and Matt Orman of SLR International Corporation, 99 Realty Drive, Cheshire, representing the applicant, to give more context, the futures are... we're trying to meet the minimum zoning requirements for, essentially, redeveloping this site so it can get the proper uses within these certain spaces. So, the idea is kind of the same. We're getting more trucks, we're getting more kind of, you know, municipal, or I guess not municipal, but more industrial-esque vehicles coming to using it as storage. Parking really isn't that much of a thing, so our future demand isn't too much, but in order to meet the zoning requirements, and also looking at the zoning requirements. That allow for the future parking, we've kind of come up with this scheme. One thing that is part of this is we need to make sure that they can be built, they can be fully engineered, they can mitigate all the stormwater requirements. The parking spaces may not be built, but the stormwater mitigations for them are most likely required to be built, because it's not technically the parking space. The parking space, under the legality of the regulation. Would probably just be the future. It's a little bit in the weeds. So, what we're going to be proposing are these long, linear swales along each grouping of these parking spaces. One, we want to make sure that we're maintaining the mature trees that are kind of located here, so we're not going to be impacting the root systems, as well as making sure that we're mitigating stormwater, as well as the floodplain management aspect. What we're going to be proposing here along, the Pequabuck River, which is within the Upland review area, as well as technically this portion is within the 500-year floodplain, it's going to be parking space with a curb stop. That goes through a 2-foot filter strip, gravel, some way that we can make sure it's, you know, filtering whatever particulates are going through, which then goes to a depression, which also has a filter strip in it that allows for some, infiltration. Whenever they're parking in these areas, because it's going to be funneling towards the, the depressions. As well as, it's a natural buffer that we're going to be establishing to the Pequabuck River, you know, we're kind of blocking that water directly going to the Pequabuck River, obviously, until it reaches the 500-year floodplain in this particular area that we're kind of focusing around right now, in other areas within the 100-year. So, that will flood, that's kind of just the nature of this area. And because we're

providing these basins, we are also providing cut and additional volume in the Just under 600 cubic yards. Of additional foot stores, not a lot. The site itself is 22-some-odd acres. We're increasing the amount of impervious by a little over half an acre. So, it's really not that much when it comes to the grand scheme of the whole site as a total. But obviously, we need to make sure that we're providing some sort of mitigations where we see is necessary. So, this area still focuses on the health and review area, actually. kind of curve. Also, clearing a portion of the area just beyond the upland review area, obviously not within your jurisdiction, just kind of letting you know, because you are technically the Conservation Commission as well. Going to be clearing some of that area, so they can provide some more space for work that they're doing inside the building. That's all kind of temporary, that'll be restored, at some date, when we go through planning and zoning and figure out what the real logistics of that is. there are two reports. There's the, the drainage report, which articulates, hey, this is how we're dealing with the stormwater mitigation. We're providing these LID practices; we're providing a hydrodynamic separator where we can't buy this particular practice that's on the south side. Because there's just not enough room to enable this to occur and be functional. That occurs within the, 100, more you're reflected. I think that, from your perspective, you know, we're providing, you know, sediment erosion controls to make sure that we're, you know, not causing any adverse impacts to the surrounding areas. It's, because we're dealing with the upland review area, I typically make sure that there's a silt fence along with straw waddles or a hay bale, to make sure that all water that's coming off the site is filtered. As long as it's within the upland review, I always just make sure that that's occurring.

Attorney Tim Furey, 43 Bellevue Ave, and in the end, these low-income... these low-impact development swales they're an accentuation even to the existing pavement, right?

Rock Emmond of SLR International Corporation, 99 Realty Drive, Cheshire, Oh, yeah. I didn't even touch on that, actually. there is the existing truck loop that runs around the property that's currently all going to the existing catch basins that discharge directly into the Pequabuck River. You know, there is a couple that go along this north side. Those outfalls will not be changed. That's not what we're proposing. We're proposing just to change the tops to make sure that it's clean. But that water is still going to get picked up by the swales that we're providing, and that is going to be future mitigation and future cleaning for existing conditions.

Commissioner Klimek, are you putting new separators in?

Rock Emmond of SLR International Corporation, 99 Realty Drive, Cheshire, Yeah, there's going to be one separator on the south side. So, just because the, stormwater quality manual allows for, you know, kind of meats and bones practices for LID, so we're essentially creating those with these swales, but the one area that we can't, we're providing a separator.

Commissioner Klimek, how big will the separator be? I mean, a parking lot like that, this is not going to be residential style, obviously.

Rock Emmond of SLR International Corporation, 99 Realty Drive, Cheshire, that's just a 4-foot cascade unit, that we're proposing, so it's this I think it's second from the bottom.

Commissioner Klimek, how is this going to be maintained?

Rock Emmond of SLR International Corporation, 99 Realty Drive, Cheshire, so they have a maintenance plan that's articulated on the plans, so basically, they have to vac Every... I think it's biannually for a, hydrodynamic separator now. And then they have to obviously maintain their existing infrastructure. You know, if you accumulate anything beyond 6 inches of silt inside of a catch basin. You kind of want to make sure that's clean. There is also, because this is an industrial complex, SLR has done a vast amount of environmental work, and there's a stormwater pollution control plan. I think I articulated this the last time that we were here for the, loading dock. And essentially, it calls for the maintaining of all these... all this infrastructure. And they have a specific maintenance plan that they deal with on a yearly basis.

Chairman Fisk, A moment ago, you were just describing the existing Truck loop? Yep. And the proposed work, is what you're describing is going to have some improvements to the water quality leaving those culverts?

Rock Emmond of SLR International Corporation, 99 Realty Drive, Cheshire, that's kind of the name of the game when it comes to this, so we're providing both water quality and peak flow retention in all these basins. to existing, as well as the proposed whatever catchment area is going to the basin areas is what we're treating.

Chairman Fisk, Typically, I do understand your reasoning for non-significant, but typically it was a floodplain application, I would, want to be out there.

MOTION: Move to declare Application #2062 a significant activity and set a public hearing for the December 1st 2025, meeting and schedule an onsite inspection for November 22, 2025, at 8:00 am, with November 29 as snow date.

By: Robinson

Seconded: Rooks

For: Duquette, Valentino, Robinson, Carros, Massaro, Rooks and Fisk.
Against: None.
Abstained: None.

The application was declared a significant activity.

No one else spoke in favor of the application.
No one spoke against the application.

MOTION: Move to declare Application #25-466F-314 a significant activity and set a public hearing for the December 1, 2025, meeting and schedule an onsite inspection for November 22, 2025, at 8:00 am, with November 29 as snow date.

By: Robinson

Seconded: Rooks

For: Duquette, Valentino, Robinson, Carros, Massaro, Rooks and Fisk.
Against: None.
Abstained: None.

The application was declared a significant activity.

No one else spoke in favor of the application.
No one spoke against the application.

- d. Application #2063- Wetlands application to install 3 new sonotubes 2' in diameter to support house at 355 Fall Mountain Road; Assessor's Map 10, Lot 66/3; Matthew Betti, applicant.

The Commission received the following items in their electronic packets:

- a. Assessor's Map with Inland Wetlands Watercourse Layers
- b. Application

Anthony Lorenzetti, city staff, stated that the application was incomplete and the applicant has withdrawn it until next month.

- e. 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:

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

MOTION: Move to receive Application #2064, understanding it's not complete and we're expecting more data to come in between now and the next meeting.

By: Robinson

Seconded: Carros

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

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

The application is received.

Attorney Timothy Furey, 43 Bellevue Ave, representing the applicant, Carrier Construction, Inc. Carriers have a contract with the City of Bristol to potentially develop this, the old Laviero property. Which is, just on the, west side of what was the original Friendly's in the industrial park. There's 20-something acres. On the south side is the entry to the Covanta plant and the, entry to Lake Compounce. The property, has wetlands along the, southerly side. And Carrier's proposing to build a, storage, if you will, but with smaller units with offices for many different uses.

Commissioner Klimek, isn't it 40 units?

Attorney Timothy Furey, 43 Bellevue Ave, I think there's about 40. They're currently evaluating the plans Again, we have submitted preliminary plans to the engineering department and a preliminary engineering report is being finalized based on, what would be the final building locations. The property was studied by BL on behalf of the City of Bristol, the wetlands boundaries outlined there were set by BL in 2021. BL did a, wetlands evaluation of the site, which the city has, which we have been working with. I talked to Kevin Hickson at BL today, because we probably are going to need to get them back out to re-flag it.

Commissioner Klimek, wasn't this property cleaned on a brownfield grant?

Attorney Timothy Furey, 43 Bellevue Ave, the property is cleaned under a brownfield grant that was obtained by the City of Bristol after they foreclosed on it. There are monitoring wells, 6 or 7 monitoring wells on the site. when we were out there a few weeks ago, I wanted to see the wetlands, walk it, get the nature of it myself. I was a little bit alarmed that monitoring wells didn't have locks on them, they were accessible, so that was supposed to have changed. And what gave me pause was there's a whole homeless encampment out there. Got to be 10 people living out there with generators and tents and cars and tires and trash and whatever, so I think the city's starting to do something about that. We're trying to get the application accepted. We're trying to get the application scheduled for a public hearing. We're trying to move it along. If we have to give extensions to the Commission because you need additional information after you've walked it and BL flags it, or wherever we get to flag it. We have a due diligence period with the city. Carriers under some time restraints to get it moving from both the contractual obligations to the city, and some other considerations they have to try to close the property in a timely manner.

Chairman Fisk, I would recommend that we accept it. We're going to schedule this as a public hearing. And if we don't have the proper documentation next month that we needed, we'll deny it based on that. Sounds like a fair way to move forward.

MOTION: Move to receive Application #2064, understanding it's not complete and we're expecting more data to come in between now and the next meeting.

By: Robinson

Seconded: Carros

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

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

The application is received.

MOTION: Move to declare Application #2064 a significant activity and set a public hearing for the December 1, 2025, meeting and schedule an onsite inspection for November 22, 2025, at 9:00am with a snow date set for November 29, 2025.

By: Robinson

Seconded: Carros

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

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

The application was declared a significant activity.

No one else spoke in favor of the application.

No one spoke against the application.

6. Old Business

a. Cease & Correct - 360 King Street & Map 47, Lot 5-1 King Street

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

- a. Map "entitled Skytop Enterprises, LLC, revised date July 21, 2025, prepared by Cole Civil + Survey.
- b. Map "entitled Skytop Enterprises, LLC, dated June 26, 2025, prepared by Cole Civil + Survey.

Chairman Fisk designated himself, regular Commissioners Duquette, Robinson, Carros, Massaro, Valentino, Rooks with alternate Commissioners Klimek, Longo and Bridges to vote on Cease & Correct - 360 King Street & Map 47, Lot 5-1 King Street.

Anthony Lorenzetti, City Staff, stated he hasn't heard anything from the applicant suggested it be referred and hand it over to Corporation Counsel.

MOTION Move to refer this to Corporation Counsel.

By: Robinson

Seconded: Rooks

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

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

Cease and Correct will be referred to Corporation Counsel.

7. New Business

Commissioner Rooks mentioned while on the site walk on Grassy Rd looking down towards. The waterway, the wetlands area. There was a house that had some Bulldog and it looked like they were burning stuff. I don't know if we can send the city out to see what that is, if it's a compost pile or a burn pit.

Anthony Lorenzetti, city staff, said he will have Zack Norton go out and check it out.

8. Staff Reports

a. IWWA Report - October 2025

The Commission received the following items in their electronic packets:

- a. Inland Wetlands Enforcement Officer report, dated October 24, 2025, from Zachary Norton, Zoning Enforcement Officer, (Environmental Protection Technician)

Chairman Fisk designated himself, regular Commissioners Duquette, Robinson, Carros, Massaro, Valentino, Rooks with alternate Commissioners Klimek, Longo and Bridges to vote on IWWA Report - October 2025.

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

By: Massaro

Seconded: Robinson

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

Against: None.

Abstained: None.

The report is filed.

9. Communications

a. Alternate Appointment – Commissioner Bridges

The Commission received the following items in their electronic packets:

- a. Letter dated October 15, 2025, from Erica Cabiya, CCTC, Town and City Clerk, regarding the appointment of alternative member to the Agency.
- b. State DEEP Training Requirement

The Commission received the following items in their electronic packets:

- a. E-mail dated October 15, 2025, from Andrew Armstrong, regarding IWWA CT DEEP Commissioner Training Required
- b. Farmington River Association Newsletter - Fall 2025

The Commission received the following items in their electronic packets:

- c. Flyer regarding Farmington River Association Newsletter dated Fall 2025

10. Conservation Topics

a. Public and Commissioner Concerns

11. Adjournment

Chairman Fisk designated himself, regular Commissioners Duquette, Robinson, Carros, Massaro, Valentino, Rooks with alternate Commissioners Klimek, Longo and Bridges to vote on the adjournment.

MOTION: Move to adjourn at 10:26 P.M.

By: Klimek

Seconded: Rooks

For: Duquette, Valentino, Robinson, Carros, Massaro, Rooks 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