

**COVENTRY INLAND WETLANDS AGENCY
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25, 2025**

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL:

By: Glenney

Time: 6:56 p.m.

Place: Town Hall Annex/Zoom

		PRESENT	ABSENT
REGULAR MEMBERS:	Lori Mathieu, Vice-Chair	X	
	William Glenney, Chairperson	X	
	William Johnson	X	
	Richard Pearson	X	
	Stefanie Wierszchalek	X	
ALTERNATE MEMBERS:	David Epstein		X
	Laura Heemskerk	X	
STAFF:	Todd Penney, Town Engineer/Wetlands Agent	X	
STAFF:	Lindsay Beutler, Wetlands Agent	X	
STAFF:	Natalia Yeschick, Recording Clerk	X	

2. Audience of Citizens (2-minute time limit) - None

3. Additions/ Changes to Agenda -

Glenney added to the agenda item #25-17 to 5D under New Business.

4. Old Business

A. #25-11 – Plains Road and South Street Extension – Owner: Town of Coventry; Applicant/Agent: GZA GeoEnvironmental, Inc. – Install a six (6) inch water main extending from the existing system on Upton Drive, east along South Street Extension and south down to 225 Plains Road. (e) The 65-day deadline to act on this application is 8/1/2025

Mathieu recused herself from #25-11.

Penney explained the application, the water main extension has disturbed five homes whose domestic wells are impaired due to high sodium and high chloride. The Town of Coventry hired GZA Environmental to do the engineering and permitting for this project. Steve D'Ambrosio is the project manager/engineer and is in attendance. Also in attendance is Robin Casioppo is the Wetlands Scientist with GZA who is also in attendance.

Casioppo presented the wetland delineation. She mentioned GZA was on site in September 2024 and May 2025 to delineate wetlands and watercourses on the site. Two unnamed intermittent water courses were identified. The first is between the two ends of the South Street Extension where there is a break in the road. It was flagged with A series flag ID's. That stream originates offsite and flows into the site. Casioppo observed flow within the channel longer than a duration after a storm event, well defined channels, evidence of scour, a good amount of Japanese stiltgrass in the channel. There is enough evidence to consider it a stream according to the Connecticut Wetland Regulations. Casioppo mentioned they also looked into the Army Corp jurisdiction for the stream to see if it was water of the United States, it eventually flows into the Willimantic river and therefore does fall into the Army Corps jurisdiction and would be considered water of the US. Also noted in the wetland report it is shown on the map with a different line type than the D stream which is a solid blue line, it is shown as estimated because when in the field they were unable to collect data with good accuracy because of the canopy cover. A survey crew eventually went out and picked up those flags so we do have the actual stream boundary. The channel becomes more diffuse as it enters the wetland, D4, D3, and D2 it evens out more as it is flowing more of a sheet flow than a channelized flow into the scrub shrub wetland. The b series and c series flagging on the North of the South Street Extension is a large wetland system and those two systems are connected through a culvert that flows beneath South Street Extension.

Penney asked D'Ambrosio to walk through the limits of the project and adjustments that have been made to the South Street corridor relative to obtain the easement on the private property to get out of the wetland corridor, as well as E&S controls.

D'Ambrosio with GZA presented the water main extension project. They are looking to extend 6 inch diameter water main from a connection on Upton Drive continuing East on South Street Extension and going over land on an abutters property to avoid the wetland system. Continuing on into the eastern section of South Street Extension over to Plains Road and ultimately connecting to the houses that are impacted to get them off of their wells and onto clean, potable water. D'Ambrosio explained they are proposing 5,000 linear feet of 6 inch diameter pipe starting from a connection on Upton Drive. They are looking for a minimum depth of 4 feet of cover over the pipe and expect a trench to be about 5 feet wide

which is the extent of the work. South Street Extension continues to the East however there is a wetland system they are looking to avoid. Penney has been working with a homeowner for an easement for the utility extension to avoid impact to the wetlands. D'Ambrosio explained they are proposing sediment and erosion control on the downstream edge of the access drive, the contours are pitching to the East and the North on the wetlands system. D'Ambrosio pointed out where they are crossing the stream with a 78 inch diameter corrugated metal pipe, that size pipe embedded 39 inches gives us the requisite stream crossing standards. There will be some direct impact to the wetland system to install the 78 inch pipe, once it is embedded and installed the area outside of the proposed pipe will be restored immediately. In the event the stream is running when the work is happening the contractor will have to coffer damn off the area so they can work in the dry and they will pump the water around their work area. No sediment laden water will be allowed to float downstream areas during that work. The way they expect the work to happen is if the contractor will open the trench and install the pipe, whatever they can get in in a day and backfill. Then leave the site buttoned up before they work the next day. We want to make sure we provide access to the residences along the South Street Extension. Because of the resource area along the southern edge we are proposing sediment and erosion control installed in the section of the road the contractors are working in and will progressively be moved as they progress with their work. The sediment and erosion control will extend along the B series at the north edge of the road as the utility is being installed.

Penney added we are hiring a full time inspector as to be oversight for both contract compliance and sediment and erosion control compliance. The anticipation is we will start construction potentially this winter and get some clearing done, then buttoning up for winter and doing some water main installation. They do not always go in the order you think they would, they could potentially put in the section on Plains road first and patch that road. Water mains do not get tested all at once. Penney's goal is to get these people water. At the wetland flat at the bottom of South Street Extension is adjacent to Miller Richardson is flood plain so we need to get a flood management certification for digging a trench, putting in a water main, and putting the trench back with no changes to the elevation. Penney needs to get a permit, the permit was given to DPH 6 weeks ago and it was just signed to go to DEEP, it will take 90 days for DEEP to issue the permit. Once the flood management certification is received we can get authorized to go out to bid.

Beutler mentioned we have an email from the property owner that granted us the easement so you can see we have permission to file the application. The review from the conservation district is favorable and they are happy to see we have so many VMP's being implemented, specifically the proposed culvert that spans 1.2 times the width of the watercourse. Beutler does not have any concerns overall.

Penney mentioned one of their recommendations is to work this culvert in the dry. If they are out in the wintertime it is less expensive and less impact to do it in the dry. However if it is running for three months, we cannot wait and will have to do it as those properties are without potable water. We have everything accounted for if we do need to work with it running. We will wait for a little bit of a trickle if it is full flowing.

Wierszchalek clarified for the Army Corps Jurisdiction they did not go for a full permit but did get their input. D'Ambrosio responded because they are able to span the 1.2 times bank full width they are eligible

for a self notification verification form which was sent in.

Johnson asked if Plains Road is pavement and asked if the contractor will restore whatever they take out for full pavement. Penney responded yes. Johnson also asked if South Street Extension is dirt. Penney explained the section from Upton to the dead end before the area where they go off road is pavement. From the transmission line, that section of South Street Extension is a millings surface and it is relatively hard pack, millings will go back on that trench.

Heemskerk asked Penney if the overlay pipe will preclude any building. Penney responded that with the funding nobody can tie into the watermain for 20 years unless they have a compromised well. Once the loan is paid off we are more than likely going to give it to the Connecticut Water Company to add into their infrastructure. Heemskerk is concerned someone would want to put a driveway where there is waterpipe. Penney explained there is going to be a gravel road for access to the watermain. Penney explained the culvert pipe will be under the driveway, there will be nothing above ground except for the restoration of the surface.

MOTION: Move to approve 25-11, Plains Road and South Street Extension with the standard conditions.

By: Johnson

Seconded: Pearson

Discussion: None

Voting:

For: Johnson, Wierszchalek, Pearson, Glenney

Against: None

Abstain: None

Motion Unanimously Approved

B. #25-12 – CT Route 44/ Boston Turnpike – List No: R04733 – Owner: Margaret Reid; Applicant: Charles Brown; Agent: Andrew Bushnell, P.E. – Construction of driveway and associated stormwater controls for new home site (e) The 65-day deadline to act on this application is 8/1/2025

Brown is in attendance to discuss the application. Brown explained there is a 15 acre parcel on the north side of route 44. There is one location that is suitable to have a house.

Beutler passed out plans, notes from herself and Penney, and responses to the comments. Additionally the revised construction sequence was passed out.

doing that there is an existing garage that is close to the road that they would like to take down and move adjacent to the house. The house currently sits about 1 foot over the sideline to the adjacent property, so they propose rotating it so it is off of that line and give better delineation between them and the neighbors. The other piece is a proposed deck.

Bushnell explained raising the house up 8 feet from where it is now and set up on the foundation and have a walkout basement to have a front to the lake. Remove the existing garage and have the proposed attached garage. Remove the existing pavement and replace with permeable pavement and make all of the walkways permeable. The lot coverage is at 27.01%, we are above the 15% but are grandfathered in. We are reducing the lot coverage to 24.82%. There is an existing well next to the house on the south side that would be abandoned and a new well would be drilled up closer to the road. They are on sewer service. It is all within the regulated area, we have an area of 7,700 square feet. It is about a 10,000 square foot lot in total. There is a double row of silt fence to protect the lake.

Beutler asked what the dimensions are of the existing garage that is going to be removed. Bushnell responded the square footage is 499 square feet, he does not have the dimensions.

Beutler asked if there were additional opportunities to get the 24.82% down further. Bushnell responded this would have to be discussed.

Mathieu asked where the roof drainage is going to go. Bushnell responded it will go in the ground like it does now. Mathieu asked if there will be vegetative buffer between the house and the lake. Bushnell responded that is up to Guardino and briefly explained the rain garden to Guardino.

Heemskerk asked if there is a setback for no deck in the front, a minimum distance to the lake. Bushnell responded it would be 20 feet. Penney also mentioned there is no defined setback between the lake and a structure.

Heemskerk asked how deep are we digging for the new foundation. Bushnell responded it would be almost 4 feet.

Mathieu asked if all of the walkways and driveways will be pervious, is there a maintenance plan. Bushnell responded yes. Mathieu asked if the owner is aware of the work involved in maintenance. Bushnell responded he hasn't been spoken to but he has hopefully read the plans. Mathieu explained there are low impact development techniques to be able to institute a rain garden to infiltrate the storm water back into the lawn.

Johnson asked if there are any trees that have to come down. Bushnell responded no.

Wierszchalek asked if there are any changes to the footprint of the house aside from lifting and angling it differently. Bushnell responded yes. Wierszchalek presumes the sequencing for construction would have the garage taken down first. Bushnell responded yes. Wierszchalek asked if the concrete retaining wall near the existing garage that shows an L, assuming you will be removing the portion that will be under the proposed garage, will you be removing any more of that, and leaving the property line wall. Guardino responded there is only 6-8 inches sticking up on the side.

Johnson asked if it was a jersey barrier or a mafia block wall. Bushnell responded no.

Wierszchalek requested more detail on the construction sequencing for the next meeting.

Glenney mentioned water mitigations, mini rain garden, construction sequence this we would like to see next time. The cross section with the lake and how the house is going to be and how the slope plays out, mitigation features will be the cross section.

Glenney accepted the application.

B. #25-15 – CT Route 44/ Boston Turnpike – List No: R04732 – Owner: Margaret Reid; Applicant: Charles Brown; Agent: Andrew Bushnell, P.E. – Proposed 3-lot subdivision. (e)

Johnson recused himself from #25-15.

Bushnell and Brown are in attendance. Bushnell explained they are proposing a three lot subdivision. One lot is 1.5 acres, another is 1.17 acres, and the third is 1.88 acres and we should meet the zoning requirements, setbacks, and body areas. We have some work in the upland review area.

Bushnell explained there is going to be a common driveway for the three lots. There is an easement on the first sheet delineated. You can see where the wetlands are on the sheet that Bushnell provided. There are wetlands on route 44. There is a cross culvert coming across Boston Turnpike that feeds part of the wetlands, the rest is natural groundwater runoff. The wetland continues down into the bay properties. There is another wetland complex that is the same that runs off behind lot 1.

Bushnell showed what they are proposing on the three lots as far as house placements, septics, wells, and driveway. Lot 1 has an area of disturbance on the right side. Lot 1 has 1,290 square feet of disturbance for the septic area, a little part of the leaching field is inside of the regulated area. The rest of it is the required grading for the system and the tree clearing. There is silt fence on all of the lots for erosion control. The other disturbances are on lots 1, 2, and 3 for the driveway installation. Lot 1 is 4,090 square feet, lot 2 is 3,876 square feet, lot 3 is 380 square feet of disturbance in the upland review area. The common driveway requires a 12 foot wide bay and 4 foot wide gravel shoulders. It would be paved to the point where it splits at lot 2. It would no longer be considered a common driveway at that point because it only feeds one lot, so it can be gravel beyond there. The silt fence for erosion control would protect the wetland. For stormwater mitigation we have a proposed infiltration trench on each side of the driveway coming in.

Beutler commented with it being a subdivision you may want to consider whether or not this is going to be a public interest warranting a public hearing. It is going to go to a public hearing for zoning anyway, but Beutler did want to mention it.

Penney walked the site with Brown a few months ago and it is relatively consistent with the plans. The plans would need to be reviewed more closely. Penney clarified if the grey shade on the plans are 25%. Beutler responded it is 20%. Penney mentioned it needs to be shown from a subdivision standpoint for planning and zoning. Penney asked if they are trying to push driveway 1 onto the slope a bit. Bushnell explained the driveway entrance is partly sightline. They are trying to stay out of the wetlands. Penney and Beutler will collaborate on a memo.

Mathieu asked Bushnell about the water that flows between two houses and she cannot picture it. Bushnell responded the water is grading toward the septic now. Bushnell also mentioned there is a grass swale off of the driveway too. It is not that much water and it is just what is on the driveway. Mathieu mentioned there is a slope to be concerned about and managing the water is something to take a good look at. Mathieu asked if the wetlands are connected. Bushnell believes they are and they go into a

bigger wetland complex on the bay property. Penney mentioned the water goes into the skunk and explained where the water flows. Mathieu would like to see a more detailed discussion, flow of water management, and runoff of the driveways to protect the septic field.

Heemskerk asked if the proposed houses that are being built will be spec houses built by the owner or will it be decided when someone buys the lot. Brown responded it could go either way. Heemskerk clarified if these houses are not representative of size of what someone wants to build. Brown confirmed they are just placeholders. Heemskerk mentioned that could impact waterflow. Heemskerk also asked about lot 3, it looks like the driveway is over a large wetland. Bushnell responded that is not a wetland. Bushnell mentioned they are proposing a conservation easement.

Glenney mentioned from a wetland standpoint he does not see us having a public hearing as the impact on the wetlands is no bigger than anything else we've approved recently.

Glenney asked when they present this plan to the zoning board with the proposed house sizes, how much flexibility do they have. The concern is someone may come in to buy the lot then double the footprint of the house. Bushnell responded they are putting the pieces of the puzzle together such as separation from the well to the septic and septic to the house, building setbacks, and we will probably not get much bigger than we have here. There are so many separating distance requirements it may not get bigger but you may get a different shape.

Heemskerk asked about the permeable driveway on lot 3 and clarified it is up to them whether or not to pave the driveway. Bushnell responded that is correct, it is shown as paved but they are not required to pave it per the zoning regulation as it is not part of the common driveway.

Glenney accepted the application.

C. #25-16 – Brewster St – List No: R01683 – Owner/Applicant: Bonnie Edmondson; Agent: Andrew Bushnell, P.E. – Construction of gravel driveway in upland review area for single family home. (e)

Bushnell explained the application. It is for a parcel the Edmondsons own on Brewster Street adjacent to 57 Brewster Street. This property is about 6.72 acres. There is no frontage on Brewster Street and it is currently vacant. They wish to be able to develop it for one single family house. Part of the issue is getting access to the property. The owners of 57 Brewster Street have agreed to an easement once a driveway is approved and a location is finalized and we have gone through the approval process. The proposal shows the driveway and underground utility installation. There is a wetland in the regulated area involved on the south westerly side of the property. Bushnell showed where the wetlands are. Bushnell explained Rick Zulick, Soil Scientist, was on the property and he flagged 1-13, and he gave an approximate line. The wetlands run downhill towards Ashbrook. We are proposing a 12 foot wide gravel driveway starting at Brewster Street. We will use the existing apron on the existing driveway. The apron will probably have to get replaced as it will get beat up during construction. There will be underground utility conduits on the north side of the driveway to stay as far away from the wetlands as possible. Bushnell is proposing a 25 foot wide access utility easement. The driveway will be along the existing treeline so we wouldn't need to remove any trees.

Bushnell explained the proposed area of disturbance is 6,375 square feet. We have the silt fence on the downhill gradient of the driveway along the wetlands. Some testing was done at eastern highland health

district, we have a septic area that is outside of the regulated area. There is another wetland that runs in the back, but all other proposed activity is outside of the upland review area. There is an existing foundation drain that would be maintained.

Beutler has not done a full review yet, but has one edit for the project narrative. She believes Bushnell meant the wetlands impacts section meant "there will be no short or long term impacts" but noted there is no "no." Beutler understands the intent and wanted to make it known to the agency.

Wierszchalek asked about the relationship between the properties, and asked if there is already a mutual agreement in place that they can use the other property to access the rear lot. Bushnell responded yes. The vacant parcel in the back had an access easement across 57 that was only 10 feet wide. The easement got dropped a couple of transactions ago, after speaking with the attorney, the attorney said it is still in place. There has always been an easement for access. Penney addressed there should be clarification for this application and something should be documented stating there is an existing 10 foot easement, that it is not well defined and the property owners are agreeing to the application. Glenney agreed there should be something that shows a formal agreement that will allow us to continue.

Johnson asked if for the gravel driveway will they dig out the soil that is there and put in gravel. Bushnell responded yes, it will be 3 inch minus. Johnson asked for clarification on the drain and asked if it was a footing drain for the house. Bushnell responded yes. Johnson asked if there was a lot of water and if any scouring was noticed. Bushnell responded there was not a lot of water when he was there last week and he did not notice any scouring.

Mathieu believes this permit should be coming from the Sandbergs and wonders if they should be a co-applicant. Bushnell responded they can still apply for a permit as long as it is signed off by the owner. Penney responded they do not need to be a co-applicant. Mathieu wants to make sure that what we are approving is technically correct.

Glenney accepted this application.

D. #25-17 - 145 Edgewater Drive.

Rich Rotundo is the property owner. Andrew Bushnell is in attendance to discuss this application. Bushnell explained this house was built in 2018/2019. It was constructed and there was stormwater mitigation in place and rain gardens and infiltrators. There is a 150 foot upland review area that cuts up at the back of the existing driveway towards the street. There is an existing paved driveway that was there when the house was built. The driveway is shared with the neighbor at 135 Edgewater. They have an existing house and a gravel driveway that is crushed stone material. They would like to place a 22 X 22 shed. The existing lot coverage is 14.69%. The shed as it is now would be at 18.36%. They are going to need a zoning variance for that because they will be over 15%. From a wetlands perspective we are in a 150 foot upland review area from the lake.

Beutler asked that the rest of the plans have been signed and stamped by Bushnell, is there a reason why

this one is not. Bushnell responded he does not know, it was forgotten. Beutler asked about erosion control, and mentioned it does not seem very important since they are just going to drop the shed into place. Bushnell agreed and mentioned the stone is already there. Beutler asked to see what the building plans would look like or the spec sheet from Kloter Farms. Bushnell responded the owner would have to get it from the salesman.

Penney mentioned he will get a memo out. Mitigation needs to be added for the structure. There is no landscape hardship in the Town Engineer's opinion. They are coming back after the fact with additional impervious coverage. If anything it meets above and beyond stormwater control, this agency will want confirmation that all of that stormwater is in and functioning and that additional stormwater infrastructure is added.

Mathieu asked if there are pictures. Bushnell responded he will get pictures for next time. Mathieu mentioned that to Penney's point the rain gardens confirm they are operational as well as the existing stone, is that operational as a pervious surface. Mathieu mentioned there are ways to mitigate it. It is a fairly sizeable shed. Penney stated it will be a garage, Bushnell said it could be a garage. Mathieu mentioned the application can take a hard look and be well prepared to address the issue with being over 15%.

Glenney asked if the existing crushed stone parking area shown on the initial. Bushnell responded yes. Penney stated if the crushed stone is washed stone it can permeate well. Glenney is wondering if they sized the crushed stone area to be just below 15%. Bushnell responded the driveway was there and the house was sized to get to the 15%. Penney remembers having a hard time getting to 15% with this application.

Mathieu asked if ZBA can overstep Inlands Wetlands law. Penney responded no. Mathieu asked hypothetically if we do not approve this based on wetland impacts and impacts to the lake, can they go to ZBA and overstep our denial. Penney responded no, ZBA cannot overturn our denial only their appeal can overturn your denial. Mathieu asked if ZBA can overstep any conditions we put on an approval. Penney responded no. Penney explained ZBA is there to explain the hardship based on the lot configuration.

Glenney requested for the next packet Beutler pull the permit that got the house built in the first place and all of the conditions with it.

Glenney accepted the application.

6. Enforcement

A. 77 Tall Oak Drive – Owner: David Frechette - Material Deposition in Regulated Area. Letter requesting site visit sent 6/21/24. Site visit to be conducted 7/22/2024. Cease and Desist verbally issued by IWA 7/29/24, mailed Certified Mail 8/1/2024. (e)

Dory Reiser with KKC Law is in attendance to provide an update. Reiser emailed Beutler with regard to

where they are at. Reiser spoke with Bruce Hunsaker who is the surveyor and engineer who is preparing the survey for the areas of concern of this property. Hunsaker told Reiser she would have the survey by the end of the day on the 24th, however she does not have it. Reiser spoke with him again and he said he ran into a snag. Reiser was told she would have the survey in the next day or so. It should not push back any dates previously stated in her email. In Reiser's email she mentioned the timeline, which is the survey in by the 24th, George would finalize the draft mitigation plan by the end of next week. Once we have the draft mitigation plan we can get it to Beutler and coordinate a meeting with Town Staff and Hank Gruner, who is the Town's consultant. We are hoping to have that meeting mid to late week of July 7th or at the latest the 14th. This would put us in a good spot to be back before the agency on the 23rd to go over the survey and details of remediation draft, then we can button things up with input from the agency on the 23rd and then submit an actual wetlands application to do the remediation for the after the fact permit. Reiser will contact the surveyor first thing in the morning if she does not have the survey in her inbox. Reiser mentioned they will do their best to meet all of the dates even though they are 2-3 days behind on the survey.

Heemskerk clarified we are not doing anything tonight and will have everything by July 23rd. Does that give us time to resolve remediation of the land before the fall. Glenney responded the agency is not on a timeline. Heemskerk recalled the creatures are going to be leaving and coming back in the spring, so all of this needs to be done. Gruner is in attendance and responded that ideally all of this will be done by March so the animals can come back to that pool. Penney added that if an application of plan comes in July it is doubtful that it would be approved in July and would probably pushed into August. Reiser responded we may not have an application in July. Her hope is to have the July meeting a draft remediation plan that has been reviewed with Beutler and Gruner, and then the agency as well as the survey. The plan is to review all of that, get more feedback and fine tune the plan. Then have an application in August. Reiser is hoping that come August we will be well positioned when we submit the application and would have time between September and spring to implement the remediation before the critters come back to the new pool.

Heemskerk asked if it would be possible to line up contractors to take action at a moments notice once we approve the application. Reiser responded she does not have the answer to that but will discuss with the client and with George to stress the timeframe so when they are poised for a decision that we are lined up and ready to go.

Heemskerk asked Beutler if she has a sense of what needs to be done. Beutler commented we do not want to get to a situation where the ground is frozen and they do not want to do it because the ground is frozen. Penney responded frost does not get into the ground typically until January.

Mathieu asked Gruner to make this successful for next spring, when does this absolutely need to be installed and ready to go. Gruner responded March 1st. Mathieu responded this is where we need to start, make sure everything is done and ready to go, equipment out of the area so the critters can come back. Mathieu asked Reiser to start from that date and work their way backwards. Reiser agreed she will bring it to the owner and George's attention and come up with a plan they can present more thoroughly to you in July.

Mathieu would like to see a detailed week by week definitive plan that shows what they are going to do from now until March 1st. If we wait another couple of months it is not going to work. Progress should be reported on a week to week basis. Reiser responded the timeline she can give at the moment is what she has already provided and when she comes to the meeting on the 23rd and she has more information she can at that point develop the timeline so the agency can see exactly what they will be doing to prepare the application and implement the plan. Mathieu reiterated the applicant needs to know how critical March 1st is. Reiser confirmed she will communicate the critical date to the applicant.

Glenney mentioned we have to be careful when we get into the restoration process. Glenney does not want to say it has to be done by March 1st because the last year of experience says we will miss the March 1st deadline. Glenney addressed Reiser and mentioned the plan should be assuming a September 1st start date week by week until it is done and if it goes past December 30 we will be asking some hard questions because Frechette's experience to date is that he cannot meet a deadline. Reiser understands the concern and will convey to Frechette that he needs to come up with a detailed plan and be held accountable for it.

Johnson asked Beutler that on 6/11 she went and inspected the erosion and sediment controls that additional E&S controls are necessary, and on the 8th you reiterated that stake and haybales are still necessary. Did Beutler get a chance to go out this week and is it done. Beutler responded she went out today and the stake and haybales are there.

Wierszchalek commented about who should do the work and she highly suggests it not be someone who is not informed as to how these types of restoration activities need to be created and constructed. She suggested a professional with wetland restoration experience. Wierszchalek also asked on June 2nd it seems Frechette indicated he had a preliminary site plan. Reiser does not know exactly what he was referring to, the only thing she has seen is a general topography that was shared. Beutler pointed out the email between Beutler and Reiser dated June 19th and attached is the topography Reiser is referencing. Reiser is not sure if that is the preliminary survey Frechette was referencing but it is obviously not.

Beutler asked if Hunsaker is aware of the cease and desist requirements. Reiser responded he was emailed all of the correspondence.

Wierszchalek asked if we are receiving the site plan in the next day or so is it worth considering a special meeting to start reviewing it. Glenney responded the chair will not entertain a special meeting as we have already bent over backwards and have given a timeline. Beutler responded the only special meeting we should entertain is a site visit.

Pearson asked what would happen on July 23rd. Glenney responded that when the packages are received we have the full site plan, full restorations plans, all of the details we can look for and review the July 23rd meeting. Theoretically we would review the plans, get our questions answered and feedback to Frechette and his team. The next step is requesting a permit in August because a permit as a way to resolve this violation.

Glenney mentioned to Reiser that in the letter to Frechette we told him to attend tonight's meeting.

Glenney is frustrated he is not present in these discussions. Reiser responded he is out of State at the moment and Reiser will make him fully aware of what was discussed this evening. When Reiser spoke to Frechette he was told the tentative timeline was communicated with Beutler. Reiser had a discussion with Beutler and asked if the email can be shared or is it important for someone to be there. Beutler let her know someone needs to be there and Reiser had the most open schedule so she agreed to attend and report back to the team. Reiser mentioned Frechette is aware his attendance is required when we have the discussion of the draft plan and during the application process.

Glenney mentioned Reiser indicated in the email the draft plan will be given to Beutler the week of July 7th or the 14th. The materials are needed no later than the 16th of July and if we do not have them at the end of the 16th we do not have the materials it will be problematic on the 23rd. Mathieu asked which letter this is consistent with. Glenney responded this is the letter to Frechette dated June 6th. Glenney reiterated to have the materials to Beutler by the 16th. Beutler mentioned the progress letter was sent to Reiser, the date of the email was June 6th.

Reiser asked for clarification on the site meeting and is not sure if it was just about the wetlands, Reiser was not there, she believes it is because Frechette was communicating with the Town Manager about some drainage issues that are coming from the Town road that he is alleging are impacting his property and exacerbating the wetland situation on site. It wasn't having to do with the specific wetlands we are talking about right now, although it is somewhat related. Frechette does need to pay attention to not just the drainage issues he is having right now but also to the remediation application. Reiser will do everything in her power to make sure Frechette makes this a priority. Beutler responded it was also about this restoration, Frechette said to the Town Manager there was no evidence there was a vernal pool there and he should only have to plant grass. Beutler stated that this is why it is important Frechette be present at these meetings. Glenney expressed this is why the timeline is important.

7. Adoption of Minutes

A. May 28, 2025 - Regular Meeting Minutes (e)

Glenney requested to Yeschick to not have the excused column. The minutes will reflect the seating and the fact there is an excused absence.

On page 6 there was discussion about the next steps for the violation and direction was given to Beutler about drafting a letter and sending it, none of which was reflected in the minutes. Comments were sent to Beutler to be relayed to Yeschick. A decision was made and corrected action and that has to be captured in the minutes. Yeschick mentioned the comments were received and edits have been made.

The minutes review has been pushed to July. Glenney requested if there are any comments to send them to Beutler so she can get them to Yeschick.

8. Correspondence

A. Town of Coventry Handbook for Elected and Appointed Officials and Volunteers (e)

Glenney mentioned the book was received at the last meeting and he recommended everyone read it before the form gets filled out. Glenney requested if any member has not yet given Beutler a signed form, which is an acknowledgment to please provide her with a signed form tonight.

9. Discussion

A. IWA - Low Impact Development Working Group Update

Mathieu handed out the latest draft work plan and FAQ which has been separated into two documents. Mathieu wanted to share everything will be put online eventually. She shared we have had 4 meetings, April 29th, May 19th, June 18th, and June 24th. The first meeting, time was spent on introductions and talking about the initiative. The May 19th meeting, we listened to Dr. Kortmann present on his science and data. We spent time asking question on his almost 40 years of water quality information for Coventry Lake. His expertise is immense. On June 18th we were able to get into the details of the workplan which is the roll, vision, and mission and the three goals in great detail, and also got into the FAQ's. What was shared with the agency back in April you will see similar wording and tones. Roberson and Dr. Kortmann have been providing a lot of great input. Mathieu would like to share the most up to date which is called the workplan that was updated just yesterday. We talked about a lot of what we are going to accomplish. There was a lot of discussion about recommending procedures and studying other areas. Mathieu shared the agenda of yesterday's meeting, they met with Dr. Michael Deets and Dave Dixon at UConn and spent a lot of time discussing Low Impact Development, and they showed their installs around the Young Building. We spoke to them about possible intern assistance. They want to continue to work together and be an interested group, and we may be able to get some assistance for performance and tracking. The last page is an FAQ, we incorporated Wierszchalek's comments. Mathieu wanted to share this and get your input. We will be presenting at the Land Use Forum on the 30th.

Pearson mentioned Dr. Kortmann we should be looking at the entire watershed not the lake. He is suggesting the way we get the result is promoting best practices. Part of the goal is to figure out how to encourage and incentivize.

Mathieu mentioned Dr. Kortmann talks a lot about a design criteria and performance standards which we can work on.

Penney mentioned Patriots Park is closed. Mathieu mentioned it is because of bacteria.

Glenney requested if they are going to be under the Wetlands umbrella to use a similar approach and post notes.

10. Adjournment

Meeting adjourned at 9:46 p.m. by Glenney.

Respectfully Submitted,
Natalia Yeschick

Natalia Yeschick, Recording Clerk

PLEASE NOTE: These minutes are not official until approved by the Inland Wetlands Agency at the next meeting. Please see the next meeting minutes for approval or changes.