

April 8, 2014

MINUTES: THE INLAND WETLANDS COMMISSION, Town of Hamden, held a Regular Meeting on Wednesday, April 2, 2014 with the following results:

Commissioners in attendance:

Nancy Rosenbaum, Chairperson
 Mike Montgomery
 Joan Lakin
 Andy Brand
 Kirsten Jensen
 Mike Milazzo
 Mike Stone arrived at 7:13 p.m.
 Bob Gnida
 Alan Piscitelli
 Stephanie Wilson

Staff in attendance:

Dan Kops, Assistant Town Planner
 Tim Lee, Assistant Town Attorney
 Tom Vocelli, IW Enforcement Officer
 Stacy Shellard, Commission Clerk
 Genevieve Bertolini, Stenographer

Ms. Rosenbaum called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m. Mr. Brand called the roll and there was a quorum. Ms. Rosenbaum introduced the Commission and Staff and explained the Public Hearing procedure.

1. Pending Applications

- a. 13-1196** 275 & 475 Mt Carmel Avenue - reconstruction of athletic fields
 Quinnipiac University, Applicant

Ms. Wilson and Mr. Piscitelli will abstain from voting for this application.

Mr. Gnida stated that removing the buffer zone from this project will leave no buffer zone. His main concern is for wetland number two. There was discussions about prudent and feasible alternatives; however, he feels that they were not substantial. Mr. Gnida would have suggested moving some of the buildings and the fields. His concern is that erroneous and false information was given on the site plans for bore holes 115,116, 117, and 118. Mr. Gnida does not feel that it was adequately addressed as to why the bore holes are depicted on the site plan, because there were no boring samples or field data collected on the holes. This information would be essential right to the natural turf field and in the middle of the field because most of the holes (5-10) from the previous project were tested and ground water was found for the data tested in the field. Mr. Gnida stated that there was no water found during the test period in July 2013 when the 14 bore holes were drilled. This finding shows that the ground water was altered from the last project. With no ground water being found in the 14 test bores after 10.76 inches of rain in June of 2013(recorded at the CT Agriculture Experiment Station) there should have been some water found. This leaves Mr. Gnida to believe that the compaction from the first project resulted in the loss of ground water recharge into the wetlands. Mr. Gnida feels that

eliminating the buffer and putting up a retaining wall would further alter the little ground water that is recharging into the stream.

Mr. Gnida stated his main reasons for denial of this application were the following:

1) There would be no buffer along the southern wall and the construction would be going right into the wetland area. In the application and supporting documentation the applicant has not proven that a buffer for the purpose of bio-remediation of any surface/subsurface pollution (i.e. cryo-rubber playing fields) is not needed. Having the buffer there is very important in a circumstance where artificial materials will be used right up to the borders of wetlands. Any kind of buffer is better than zero. The buffer will become non-existent with underlying soil compaction and a retaining wall. 2) No prudent and feasible alternatives were given in the application and supporting documentation. An example would be to move the buildings, allowing for at least a 25 foot buffer to exist on the southern playing field abutting the wetlands, or building the fields elsewhere on campus as depictions of prudent and feasible alternatives. 3) Page 15 of the Geo-technical report by GNCB does not clarify what chemicals will be used if needed for rock removal. Mr. Pfrommer had addressed by stating at a previous meeting that "chemicals" is a strong word to use for something like that. Mr. Gnida further stated that expansive clay is being injected into flature rocks; he would like this to be specified, also if there will be chemicals used for removal of rocks. Mr. Pfrommer's statement was general and could mean a lot of things, not just expansive clays to spread the rocks. It was stated that there would be no blasting which Mr. Gnida felt was a good thing. 4) Back in December Mr. Gnida had stated that he would be looking at the bore logs. Especially when looking for where the ground water is flowing. Erroneous and false information was given on the site plan regarding bore holes 115, 116, 117 & 118 and another bore hole which was corrected but had been mislabeled as 114 and it was 110. This one was the only one where water was found in the July sampling. No field data was collected for these four centrally located bore holes in the middle of the natural turf field to the south, which will give the Commission the impression that adequate field data was collected. In fact, data was not collected for these holes and no explanation in writing was given for the lack of information. These wells were dug partially to determine the depth to groundwater, to find the subsurface geology to see if it would hold up with all the playing fields and all the stadia proposed. The groundwater observation wells you would think would have been dug until ground water was found when there was no ground water found in the reports. None had any observed standing water in them. In a 1991 study, water was observed in five out of 10 test pits. Some of the wells and the test pits from 1991 were close to the test bores that were dug in July, 2013. The results were quite dramatic because they were dry even after a wet June. On page 7 of the geo-technical report the applicant states through his contractor that "Well readings at the four groundwater observation wells, along with the water levels observed at the 1991 test pits, suggest that groundwater slopes downward across the site from about elevation 130 at the north end, to about elevation 115 at the south end." Then the excuse came for non-accurate analysis of the groundwater & why, because the holes were so dry that a lot of assumptions were made. Mr. Gnida feels that with a retaining wall that will be long and it can substantially inhibit the flow of groundwater and compaction is a reason the buffer should be preserved.

Mr. Montgomery stated that he has prepared a draft of comments that includes a motion for denial. He asked that the Commissioners have time to review the draft and provide feedback on comments or omissions they would like to make. Mr. Milazzo asked if the decision could be tabled to allow the members to review Mr. Montgomery's comments. Mr. Lee advised the Commission that if this item were to be tabled to allow them time to review Mr. Montgomery's comments there could not be any discussion amongst themselves. Mr. Montgomery stated that this would be his last meeting because he would be resigning at the end of the month when his term expires. The Commission discussed Mr. Montgomery's comments and it was determined that they would be read.

Mr. Montgomery asked Ms. Rosenbaum to begin reading his comments and Ms. Rosenbaum read the following:

The applicant proposes to develop two existing athletic fields to include a stadium for each field with team rooms (lockers, showers, equipment, etc) beneath the seating area and electric lighting for late evening and nighttime activities. Currently, there is a synthetic turf field, used for field hockey and men's and women's lacrosse (hereafter called the North Field), and a natural turf field, used for women's rugby (hereafter called the South Field) with aluminum bleachers moved between the two fields on a stoned driveway. The North Field playing surface will be enlarged northerly towards Mt. Carmel Ave and easterly 47 feet in order to

accommodate the proposed future use for men's and women's lacrosse and soccer. In order to accommodate the estimated 10,000 SF team room/stadium for this field, a concrete wall and fill will be placed within 7' of the wetland. The natural grass turf of the South Field will be replaced with a synthetic turf suitable for field hockey and a team room/ stadium of ~5,000 SF. One-half acre of new impervious area is proposed, which will increase the impervious surface area of the 294.24 acre main campus to 19.96% (the maximum allowed by P&Z regulations is 20%).

This project requires substantial changes in the landscape. Some 5.4 acres of upland review area will be altered including removal of 14,200 CY of earth from the site (estimated 420 truck loads), two drainage swales will be relocated, drainage patterns altered, and 30 linear feet of a watercourse disturbed. Additionally, this proposal will greatly diminish the size of the wetland buffer and its protective function. The applicant has not honored permit conditions first established in 1991 and reaffirmed in 2004 that established a 25 foot wide buffer around the playing fields. This has resulted in the invasion of non-native plants into the wetlands that surround the playing fields.

Considering the testimony and other information presented, **the Commission finds that the proposal will have a significant impact, that the application is incomplete, and that feasible alternatives of lesser impact were not provided; therefore, the application for a permit is denied.**

As per Section 2 of our Regulations, the following are specific examples and supporting evidence of activities the Commission believes will have significant impacts on the wetlands and watercourses "Significant impact" is defined in the Regulations as several activities which may have major effects on wetlands and watercourses and their associated flora and fauna.

1) The artificial night lighting will diminish the ability of the wetland habitat to support animal life. The spillage of light used to illuminate the fields at both the levels required for varsity contests and practice sessions exceeds thresholds shown to alter animal behavior. The applicant's representative, Ms. Chase, statements did not establish that significant effects will not occur and incorrectly interpreted factual evidence, especially the scientific literature. For example, her January 8 testimony said that the Wise study (Exhibit Z) used extreme light conditions up to 24 hours at 100 lux. On March 5, Ms. Chase said that the proposed lighting will have a low impact because it will be low intensity. The Wise study did indeed report significant effects on wildlife of continuous illumination during the night (but less than 24 hours!) at 100 lux, but also provided examples of adverse effects that occurred at 0.05 lux for the hour after dusk. The latter study was done with red-backed salamanders, a common species in Connecticut in moist areas and is regarded as a key species in ecological food webs. The information provided by the applicant's lighting experts (Exhibits X, sheet SL1.01 and sheet SL1.01 indicates that the level of light spilling into the wetlands is between 300 lux (30 foot-candles) and 2 lux (0.2 foot-candles). Indeed, light spillage is above 1 lux far into Sleeping Giant Park, and hence may be affecting wildlife in that area also. The point is that the levels of light in the wetlands range from the equivalent of a dark day and to 10 times greater than a full moon and there is substantial evidence that these levels of light alter the normal behavior of nocturnal animals, including species likely in these wetlands. Perhaps, Ms Chase overlooked that the scientific literature measures the illuminance of light in lux while industry used foot-candles. Ms Chase and Mr. Pelligrino argued that the lighting will be used only during the fall and spring sport season and for a few hours each evening; hence, may cause less impact. The written testimony in letters dated December 4, 2013 and January 27, 2014 from Environmental Planning Services point out that a single incident can disrupt breeding and other activities essential for wildlife survival. They contain several other examples of how night lighting affects wildlife that indicate greater expertise in this subject. Although the potential impacts were pointed out to the applicant and its lighting expert, no attempt was made to modify the lighting to reduce impacts or explain why this was not possible. The applicant specifically assessed impacts only for the box turtle, a diurnal species.

2) Installation of the concrete walls adjacent to the wetlands will likely result in sediment entering the wetlands during their construction. To do this, excavation of the footing would extend into the wetlands. The permanent wall ~~will~~ within 5' or less from wetland flags WF 74-76 (sheet C6.1) 2 feet from WF 73. This matter was carefully reviewed by Loureiro Engineering Associates in a letter dated January 24, 2014 and the applicant's engineer seemed to concur that some impacts could occur. Ms. Chase indicates that the soils disturbed between the wall and the wetland will be seeded and become densely vegetated much like existing conditions. This is undesirable because the existing condition consists of invasive species.

Mr. Montgomery continued the reading of his comments:

The excavation and crossing of a watercourse in two places will result in permanent changes to the stream banks. This watercourse is a tributary to the Mill River, which is a Public Water Supply. Ms. Chase indicated that crossing the watercourse west of Hogan Road would cause only a temporary impact and that original conditions would be restored. However, photographs and sheets on the site plans show that trees and wetland plants will be replaced with rip-rap; thus, wetland values would be permanently diminished. Feasible alternatives should be considered such as using reinforcement mats and using plant plugs for rapid establishment and/or boring underneath the channel.

3) Drainage patterns will be altered. Water will be diverted from Wetland 1 to the drainage ditch on the opposite end of the field. The entry of runoff from Mt. Carmel road into Wetland #1 will be altered. Runoff from the fields is changed from sheet flow to the wetlands to discharge at a point source. The consequences of these changes were not explained adequately by the engineer and the application is considered incomplete in this respect.

4) The decrease of buffer width from 25' to as little as 2' will increase the entry of sediments, nutrients and chemicals into the Wetland labeled #2 along the southerly edge of the proposed fields. Runoff would flow across a stone driveway and over a wall and directly into the wetland.

5) The buffer area for Wetland #1 is not well defined. What markers are to remain and what markers are to be added is unclear because some are shaded (old locations to be removed?) and some bold **representing new markers?** The old markers **that** were arbitrarily installed by the applicant within (~~narrowing~~) the approved buffer boundary sometime after 2005 are to remain and apparently 3 additional markers added. Thus, the buffer area proposed is not clear to the commission and seems to be a reduction of the previous condition of approval. The application is incomplete in this respect. Restoration of this area ~~is inadequate~~ and unlikely to be successful, as pointed out by the intervener, is inadequate and does not remedy changes in topography and removal of water and drainage pipes. The soil scientist did **not** conduct a soil survey, which should be the first step in developing a remediation plan.

6) Under **our** Section 7.6 the applicant is required to provide additional information including a description of the ecological communities and the effects of the proposed activities on these communities. While a report of plant species was provided the animal survey was limited to reporting that no vernal pool species were present and that there were lots of deer and rabbit browsing.

7) Ms Chase states that "the existing athletic fields have no impact on the wetland today and will not following development as proposed". Yet, her report, Mr. Snarski's report, the intervener's report and our site inspection all remarked on the dense growth of invasive species in the wetlands adjacent to the playing fields. Our inspections also noted the deposition of trash, gravel, brush, grass clippings, athletic equipment, balls and other items in the buffer and wetlands themselves. Further, the discharge of water collected from the rugby field and area north of it has channelized and altered the wetlands. Considering the proposed increased activity, increase

in impervious area, moving of active areas closer to the wetlands, and the addition of intense artificial lighting it is not unreasonable to expect that the cumulative effects on both of the wetlands will be major and significant causing an acceleration in deterioration of wetland functions and values

Section 10.3 of the Town's Regulations require that if its IWC Agency finds "that the proposed activity may have a significant impact on wetlands or watercourses, a permit shall not be issued unless the Agency finds on the basis of the record that a feasible and prudent alternative does not exist".

The applicant's attorney stated that there will be minimal impact on the wetlands; therefore, feasible and prudent alternatives need not be vetted. He stated that this is the option that the University considered to be the best for it and that it is the most prudent option because the fields already exist. More accurate is that only the lacrosse field will remain in about its present location. The soccer field is on the other side of Hogan Road (Exhibit A). This playing field has the largest dimension. As a member of the public suggested it seems more prudent and feasible to develop a soccer/lacrosse field in the present location of the soccer field and use an adjacent parking lot for a stadium/team room than to shoe-horn a larger field and two stadia between two wetlands. Other alternatives such as converting the Public Affairs Building to team rooms should also be considered. As required by Section 10.4, these suggestions represent the types of alternatives which the applicant may investigate and should not be construed to shift the burden from the applicant to seriously and thoroughly address alternatives and otherwise demonstrate that the applicant is entitled to a permit.

Mr. Montgomery stated that there had been a lot of discussion that is not part of the motion about the influence of zinc and other chemicals used as leaking out of the turf fields. He would have liked Mr. Shadle's opinion because he is more of an expert regarding this topic and is not present. Mr. Montgomery stated that after looking at the evidence, it is his opinion that while there is considerable concern about this, the information about the harm it may cause to the wetlands is inconclusive. He would like the Commission to follow the DEEP's 2010 report. He reviewed the DEEP's findings. Mr. Montgomery noted that the applicant did provide an alternative bio-infiltration basin in the north field. Mr. Montgomery is concerned about the use of an underground retention chamber for the south field and it will not have a bio-infiltration basin. The underground retention chamber will basically only retain runoff rain water that comes from roofs. The bio retention chamber will handle a mix of runoff from the field, stadium, parking lot, and would not be clean water. It would be better if the water ran through a bio-infiltration system. Except for the addition of the turf field, basically the runoff passes through the wetland without any cleansing and without any retention, and they are increasing the impervious surface. Mr. Montgomery stated that this was not included in the reasons for denial.

Mr. Brand stated that Mr. Montgomery did cover the concerns that he has for denying the application. Specifically, points 6, 7 and 8 dealing with the buffer area around wetland number one. He said that what is troublesome is that little activity would be focused on invasive species, particularly in wetland number one. The proposal to put in 90 native plants is like a band aid to mask the invasive species in the area, and possibly to forget about them. Much more can be addressed in the future about invasive species and controls. Mr. Brand feels that doing a minimal amount of work is troublesome.

Mr. Lee reviewed comments made by Mr. Gnida and asked if Mr. Montgomery would be willing to accept his comments into the motion. Mr. Montgomery stated yes and discussed the motion with Mr. Lee.

Mr. Montgomery stated that the applicant has recognized the need to improve their stewardship of the property and to restore because of past damages. The discussions included what was done and what was permitted going back to 1991. It was not clear if things should be suspended and address the issues. It took several months for the applicant, the Town Engineer and the Commission to review the records to determine what and what was not done.

Mr. Montgomery noted that the issues were found when he was reviewing previous applications to determine what the original drainage on the property was. He feels that the applicant recognizes the desire to improve their stewardship. The applicant needs help from the Commission to devise a plan to bring about a better stewardship of the wetlands on the Quinnipiac University property. A new person is in charge of the property for the last year. There is a lack of recognition of what needs to be done with the stewardship of wetland resources. Mr. Montgomery continues to be impressed with the property. Previously, he had gone to the site at night and there was nice, soft low light levels. By putting the fields back in the woods they would put the intensive field lights onto the neighboring properties and the wetlands. Mr. Montgomery recognizes the trend for universities and colleges to have artificial lighting and synthetic turf fields. However, he does not know of any universities of this size that have two synthetic turf fields. He understands the dilemma the University is in.

Mr. Gnida seconded the motion.

Mr. Gnida said that he will submit his notes. He referenced the Geo-Technical report by GNCB. Mr. Gnida was concerned that the applicant did not clarify what chemicals for rock removal on the north side of the project. Mr. Pfrommer had stated that it would be expanding clay and Mr. Gnida felt this was vague. Also the erroneous and false information given on the site plans for bore holes 115, 116, 117, and 118. They are listed as having been done in the field on sheets c3.1, c4.1, c5.1, c6.1 and c7.1. There is no data on the geotechnical report as to why they were omitted and no data taken. They are centrally located bore holes near wetland number 2, and there is no data. This gave the impression that adequate field data was collected when no one looked at the geotechnical report to determine that no data was collected. The reason the applicant had dug the wells was to determine the depth of groundwater. At the four observation wells a pvc pipe was put down for bore holes 102,108,110 and 113. None had observed standing water. In a 1991 study water was observed in 5 out of 10 that are close to bore holes that were dug in 2013. This indicates that something has happened to the groundwater between the project in 1991 and the proposed project now. In 2013 10.76 inches of rain had fallen.

Mr. Lee reviewed the amendment to include the following in the motion: 1) The boring logs contained erroneous, false and inadequate information as explained by Commissioner Gnida, 2) The applicant failed to detail the use and type of chemicals for the removal of the rock. 3) Geo-technical report contained a lack of information as depicted by Mr. Gnida in his statement.

Mr. Montgomery accepted the changes to the motion.

Mr. Gnida, Mr. Stone, Mr. Brand, Mr. Montgomery, Ms. Lakin, Ms. Jensen and Ms. Rosenbaum voted in favor of the motion. Mr. Milazzo voted against the motion. Ms. Wilson and Mr. Piscitelli abstained. Therefore, the motion passed 7-1-2.

Ms. Rosenbaum stated that the application is denied.

- b. 14-1200** 801 Main St-construction of a single family house.
Brian Banning, Applicant

Mr. Dave Nafis, Professional Engineer, addressed the Commission and stated that the site is approved for a single family home. The restrictions for the septic system do not allow the proposed house to be brought forward. Mr. Nafis reviewed the site.

Ms. Lakin asked if Mr. Nafis had responded to the Town Engineer's comments. Mr. Nafis said that the sewer easement was rescinded and he will forward the document to the Planning Office. The remaining comments have been addressed.

Mr. Brand asked Mr. David Lord, Soil Scientist, what he proposes to use on the steep slope to stop any erosion. Mr. Lord replied that he is proposing the use of New England Conservation/Wildlife Mix. He submitted and reviewed the description to the Commission.

Mr. Dan Kops, Assistant Town Planner, stated that during the site inspection there was a discussion about adding a deck onto the back of the house. However, it is not on the plan. Mr. Nafis stated that there is a 10 x 16 deck at the corner of the house and it is included in the plan. Mr. Nafis discussed the location of the deck and the house with the Commission and Planning Staff.

Mr. Montgomery reviewed the proposed planting plan with Mr. Lord. Mr. Lord will investigate seed mixtures further to determine what will work best in the area. He will submit a description of what will be used to Mr. Tom Vocelli, Wetland Enforcement Officer. Mr. Montgomery discussed the pros and cons of developing an access way down to the wetland area with Mr. Lord.

Mr. Brand made the motion to approve Application 14-1200 with the following conditions: 1) Town Engineer comments be followed. 2) The soil scientist will investigate possible alternatives of shade tolerant seed mix and consider purchasing additional switch grass seed to supplement the seed mixture. Subject to approval of seed mix by Mr. Tom Vocelli, Wetland Enforcement Officer. Mr. Milazzo seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

- c. 14-1201** 0 Putnam Avenue & 22 Hamden Park Drive Ext.(corner of Putnam & Gallagher)-construction of a self-storage facility.
Casey Real Estate Investment, LLC, Applicant

Mr. Patrick O’Leary, Professional Engineer, submitted copies of the Site Plan Exhibit to the Commission. He reviewed the location of the proposed storage facility and the site. He reviewed the existing stormwater detention system and proposed stormwater management plan. Mr. O’Leary reviewed the proposed site plan. He explained that the proposed lighting plan should not have any impacts on the wetlands. Mr. O’Leary reviewed the pending variance that will be heard by the ZBA. He explained if there are to be any changes in the elevations or the placement of the buildings on the site, he would come back before the IWC if necessary. Mr. Vocelli noted that minor elevation or building changes might be approved by the wetlands officer as a de minimis modification.

Mr. O’Leary stated that the Town Engineer’s comments will be addressed. If the proposed plan is approved as a condition of approval the stormwater basin will be inspected prior to construction and post construction. A report will be submitted to the Planning Staff. Mr. O’Leary reviewed the maintenance to be done around the basin and would accept it as a condition of approval.

Ms. Lakin asked if the RWA comments will be addressed. Mr. O’Leary stated that he has received the RWA comments and he will incorporate the comments into the plan.

Mr. O’Leary discussed the planting plan and maintenance plan with the Commission.

Mr. Kops recommended that there be fencing and a gate that leads to the back area to allow for maintenance. He also recommended that there be an emergency gate installed on the Gallagher Road side of the property. Mr. Kops explained that the original subdivision approval states that the Town is responsible for the stormwater management system. However it would be helpful if the applicant has a general maintenance agreement that would include letting the Public Works Department know if there are any issues. Mr. O’Leary would accept this as a condition of approval. Mr. O’Leary reviewed the stormwater management plan.

Ms. Jensen asked if the proposed units will have rollup doors. Also, if there are restrictions on the use and what is stored in the units. Mr. O’Leary stated that the units would not be used for commercial purposes. He submitted and reviewed the rental agreement signed by the renters of the units. Section 14 outlines the prohibition of storing hazardous materials. He stated that the units are intended for personal storage.

Ms. Jensen asked what the historical use of the property was. Mr. Lee stated that historically the sites were used for farming. Approximately five years ago the properties were subdivided.

Mr. Montgomery made the motion to approve Application 14-1201 with the following conditions: 1) The Town Engineer's comments dated 3/25/14 be incorporated into the plans. 2) Note on the plan that the applicant accepts the responsibility to maintain the area around the detention basin.

Mr. O'Leary suggested that the grass and area within the chain link fence be maintained two times a year.

Condition 2 was amended to read: Note on the plan that the applicant accepts the responsibility to maintain the area around the detention basin inside the chain link fence two times a year.

Mr. Montgomery said that there should be a clarification of the storm water management plan as to which parties will be responsible and be noted on the plan. Ms. Rosenbaum stated that the Town is ultimately responsibility belongs to the Town and is on the original site plan. The Commission discussed

Mr. Montgomery amended the motion to include the RWA comments dated March 13, 2014: 3) the inspection and maintenance plan for the stormwater basin should be included on the site plan. The basin should be inspected on a regular basis and maintained as needed. The parties responsible for implementing the plan should also be identified on the site plan.

Mr. O'Leary stated that as part of the wetland application he will note on the plan the following: The responsibility for maintenance of the detention base and associated facilities is the responsibility of the Town of Hamden per the original subdivision approvals. The applicant Casey Real Estate Investment, LLC, has agreed to clearing inside the fence line, and will name all parties and identify who is responsible for the respective tasks. The Commission discussed that the Town of Hamden is ultimately responsible to maintain the detention basin.

Ms. Lakin seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

2. Notices-of-Violation, Cease & Desist & Restore Orders, Notices-to-Appear

- a. N.O.V.** 64 Rocky Top Road – clearing of trees & removal of vegetation

Mr. Lee explained that per the court there is an injunction on this site. No work can be done on this site without the approval of the IWC.

- b. N.O.V.** 251 Welton Street – oil spill or discharge

Mr. Vocelli stated that the DEEP is overseeing this site. However, the IWC does have jurisdiction because it is a tidal watercourse rather than just a tidal wetland.

Ms. Rosenbaum stated that the above two N.O.V.'s can be removed from future agenda's until further action is needed.

- c. N.O.V.** Lot 10-Benham Hill Estates (aka 0 Benham Hill Place)
Failure to repair & maintain stormwater detention basin

Mr. Lee stated that he is still waiting for the owner to complete and sign the easement for Town access to the lot.

3. Review Site Inspection Schedule

Ms. Rosenbaum stated that a complaint was received about work being done near the pond at Brooksvale Park. The Commission discussed with staff scheduling a site inspection. Ms. Rosenbaum suggested that the Brooksvale Park employees should take the DEEP Course "Municipal Inland Wetlands Agency Comprehensive Training Program". Mr. Vocelli will contact Ranger Vinny Lavorgna to schedule a site inspection.

4. Review of March 5, 2014 Meeting Minutes

Ms. Rosenbaum stated that on page 2, paragraph 3, line 4 should be amended to read: the 50 foot-candles lighting will be used for practices and the 75 foot-candles for varsity games only. Also on page 5, 9 lines up from the bottom, "draine" should be "drain". Mr. Montgomery stated that on page 4, 2nd paragraph, 9th sentence, "a disruption" should be changed to "an interruption". Also, page 4, 2nd paragraph, 4 line from the end, should read. Mr. Montgomery asked if the stream will be crossed. On page 5, 8th paragraph, 1st sentence, should read: Mr. Montgomery clarified that the basalt underneath can bind zinc. Mr. Gnida on page 6, 3rd paragraph, 1st sentence, "Ms." should be changed to "Mr."

Mr. Brand made the motion to approve the minutes as amended. Ms. Lakin seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

5. Other Business

Ms. Rosenbaum discussed Earth Day which will be held on April 12, 2014.

Ms. Rosenbaum extended her appreciation to Ms. Lakin and Mr. Brand for their Site Inspection reports.

Mr. Kops explained that the Town website has been updated to include pending applications which can be found under the individual commissions or the Planning & Zoning Department.

Mr. Brand thanked Mr. Montgomery for his commitment to the IWC and said that he will be missed. Mr. Montgomery thanked the Planning Staff for their support during his time on the Commission. He is pleased to see the new appointees and hopes they enjoy their time on the Commission. Mr. Montgomery will miss all the members of the Commission. He stated that it was his pleasure to serve on the Commission.

Ms. Lakin stated that the Art League has set up exhibits in the Senior Center as part of the Golden Bells festival.

6. Adjournment

A motion to adjourn was made by Ms. Lakin and seconded by Mr. Milazzo. It passed with no dissenting votes. The meeting ended at 9:15 p.m.

Submitted by: _____
Stacy Shellard-Clerk of the Commission