

**COVENTRY INLAND WETLANDS AGENCY  
REGULAR MEETING MINUTES  
WEDNESDAY, MAY 28, 2025**

**1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL:**

By: Mathieu

Time: 7:00 p.m.

Place: Town Hall Annex/Zoom

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

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

**3. Additions/ Changes to Agenda - None**

**4. Old Business - None**

## 5. New Business

- A. 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.**

Penney shared the project with the committee. Steven D’Ambrosio is also in attendance.

Mathieu recused herself.

Penney explained that 3-4 years ago there was notification of a domestic well being contaminated with high sodium and chloride levels. After looking into it, there are five homes in the Plains Road vicinity they have been looking at different funding source to get clean and potable water to these five homes. As of last year a grant was secured from the Department of Public Health, a loan forgiveness program where up to 50% of that loan will be forgiven. We also have another \$300,000 - \$750,000 federal grant. We are able to come up with funding. For those who may have voted in the last referendum approved the vote to have the town extend the water to these five homes. We are in the process of getting a flood management certification, doing construction documents, and obtaining a private easement as a way of trying to minimize wetlands disturbance. Penney showed a localized map from the 2016 aerials and showed where the homes are. Penney also showed where DPW used to store its salt which was on a paved pad that was covered that followed best management practices at the time. It is not 100% certain that storage caused the high contamination of the sodium and chloride but it seems to be a probable explanation. Penney explained we hired GZA to do a lot of the consulting on this project. They have done the survey work, the wetlands delineation, they are doing the permitting applications, they are developing the contract documents, and they will be here in June. Penney showed a map with the delineated wetlands, the 75 foot upland review area, and the limit of disturbance. There is a wetland associated with the marsh area. Penney explained they will be working within the floodplain showed on the map and will be needing a flood management certification from the Department of Energy Environmental Protection, which will be a separate permit. We will be working in the upland review area and there will be one crossing.

Penney explained the proposal in detail with the committee which is to tap off of a water main in the Nathan Hale Subdivision. The line will be running in the paved section of South Street Extension in the Easterly direction. To be sensitive to the wetlands, we approached the abutter and they agreed to allow a water main on their property. The waterline will run parallel to the street line.

Penney mentioned they will be proposing to put a culvert in to allow for vehicular access to maintain the water main. That will be a direct disturbance and is about 300 square feet of direct wetland impact.

Penney briefly recapped the plan and showed the proposed water main showing that it continues

down the South Street Extension. The flood plain area was shown along with the existing cross culvert that conveys flow from the north side to the south, we will be going either under or over that culvert. It will then continue to the Plains Road intersection. It will be roughly 5,000 feet of 6 inch water main we are looking to install. Most of that work is within the existing ROW. We have gone outside of the ROW for constructability and for preserving the wetland. We are proposing erosion and sediment control measures which include catch basins, silt sacks, hay bales, straw wattles, silt fencing as necessary. We will be hiring a construction inspector and engineer to handle some of the paperwork for inspection and a full time inspector to ensure the work is being complied with. Penney went on to explain there has been many public meetings with the neighbors. We also do a biannual testing of the 14 wells that are out there. Contamination is staying local to the five homes that are there and there is no progression to the plume. If the plume does start to expand, any of the properties in front of the water main will be able to tie in. How the funding mechanism is set up, only the five homes with contaminated wells can tie in. If your well was not impaired, you are not allowed to tie in.

Beutler mentioned she has been monitoring the entire process and has been in contact with the property owners and has no concerns.

Johnson asked if we know when the intermittent water course is not flowing? Penney responded we will handle the water when we are constructing it. It is groundwater fed and intermittent.

Wierszchalek asked if it was not a viable option to put in well treatment systems in each home? Penney responded that part of the funding they have to do a preliminary engineering analysis and they came up with five options and we felt this option was the most environmentally sensitive.

Wierszchalek asked if the other properties that are not contaminated will be continually monitored? Penney responded they will check indefinitely how things are progressing or not.

Glenney confirmed they are running between the wetlands? Penney responded that is correct.

Glenney asked if the pipe is only sized for five? Penney responded there is a balance for having too big of a pipe size and having residency and having water get contaminated residing in the line. We are proposing a 6 inch line that will have less of a residence time in the pipe as opposed to an 8 inch. There is no plan to expand the area and promote development so the water company has said it can handle the twenty or so homes on that frontage if need be.

Glenney stated we are accepting #25-11. Penney said the GZA will be here with the wetlands scientist.

**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.**

Charles Brown is in attendance.

Johnson recused himself at 7:27pm

Mathieu returned at 7:27pm

Brown explained he has this property under option to purchase and is submitting plans to verify it is a buildable lot. There is one spot where the house is that tests out for septic and meets all dimensional standards for zoning. The driveway has been threaded between the existing pockets of wetlands along the road. Brown mentioned they would install a sedimentation fringe to the edge of the wetlands in the buffer to pick up any extra water the impervious surfaces will collect and treat those by infiltration. We would meet standards for water quality. We would approach it with getting the driveway and sedimentation trench done first and get that stabilized. It would be a phased approach with silt fence along the perimeter and standard job site precautions.

Beutler asked if this is specific just for the driveway? Brown responded he is not sure how zoning treats it. It is an existing lot of record we are shown soil testing and full septic design. Beutler just wanted clarification because the proposed activity description only specifies the construction of the driveway so we want to know what we're permitting. If you want to have a full permit with the driveway and house we would need a full site plan for that.

Epstein asked if the proposed culvert is in the entryway area? Brown confirmed it is.

Wierszchalek asked about the culvert and asked how the location was decided? Is it going to be evaluated through the soil evaluation to see where potential intermittent water could run? Brown responded it is a better question for the engineer. Brown noted the property boundary and explained the culvert is in the DOT ROW, they are the ones who go through it and size it.

Epstein asked if DOT will maintain it once built? Brown confirmed yes.

Mathieu asked what erosion control will be had up the slope? Brown responded there will be silt fence.

Glenney advised Brown come back with a full site plan. Glenney asked if Brown had reached out to the DOT yet? Brown responded he had not yet but does not foresee an issue with the DOT.

Penney explained the State needs all Land Use approvals first.

## 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)**

Beutler explained Gruner has been joining on their site visits. Gruner is in attendance for an update. Gruner explained he is working pro bono on this from an advisory capacity. They have been inspecting the property weekly. We were able to document by the species that tried to breed in the wetlands that are remaining. They have been following the egg masses that have hatched and not many of them made it, especially the wood frogs. The spotted salamanders have hatched and it remains to be seen how they survive, it is difficult to assess due to the pollen and we do not want to disturb it as much. We will wait until sometime in mid June to see the progress of the animals. Colonization of the site has continued by other species and in Gruner's opinion they are used to going there. Even though the pool has been filled, the organisms are responding as if it is still there. There has been additional evidence of ground water discharge coming through the surface. There is evidence of a flow coming through. If the vernal pool were still intact it would be starting to draw down.

Beutler showed pictures of where the water is coming from, it is from where the pallets were stored.

Mathieu asked how long the wood and pavers have been on the property? Beutler said the wood has been there the entire time and the pavers were recently moved in the last couple of months. Beutler explained Frechette had been storing things encroaching on his neighbors property. It has been established in previous meetings he is not to do that again.

Mathieu asked where the owner is and what the status is of the work? Beutler responded he was supposed to be on Zoom but she does not see him online. As far as the status of the work goes he does not have a survey yet. Beutler mentioned the surveyors have been out there because Beutler has been out at the same time as them. Frechette has been hounding the surveyor to get the site plan in front of the commission. We do not know the name of the surveyor. Penney mentioned Logan needs the survey to do his restoration plan.

Mathieu asked if the location of the pickleball court will be in review. Penney responded he is hoping it will be in the site plan review. Mathieu is curious if the pickleball court was not there would it be better for restoration? Beutler has an aerial that shows the pickleball court and the pool. Mathieu wonders how the pickleball court has interfered with the flow of water where it should be? Beutler showed the aerial photos. Epstein believes we have to make sure if Frechette understands these issues have to be remedied asap.

Heemskerk asked if we are going to restore the wetlands that are filled, do we run the risk of disturbing the creatures that are there now? Gruner responded that nothing is disturbed and expanded on his explanation. Penney also responded to Heemskerk about where he takes the fill and explained he would have to pay to haul it off.

Glenney asked how long it would be before the creatures stop coming back? Gruner responded it is







incorporate more protective mechanisms.

Mathieu mentioned that Alyssa from the North Central CT Conservation District has joined the group. We are looking to get someone to represent Planning and Zoning. Also, one of the work items individual people are making are field visits to discuss at the next meeting on June 25. There is a planned site visit at UCONN to catch up with Michael Dietz who is a low impact development expert on June 24 from 10:00 am - 12:00 pm. We are also preparing for a presentation discussion at the land use forum on June 30 at The Lodge at 5:00pm.

Glenney has an emergent item to share regarding Uconn's relocation boathouse project is having a rethink to talk about where they are going to do it this coming Monday. You have to register beforehand. Penney explained this permit will not come to Inlands Wetlands because it is State property and they are exempt from local permitting. They will get their permits from DEEP. The only say Penney has is how they are going to impact Woodland Road, there are traffic concerns and stormwater management concerns.

## **10. Adjournment**

Meeting adjourned at 9:28 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.*