

INLAND WETLANDS & WATERCOURSES COMMISSION
January 22, 2020 Special Meeting Minutes

These minutes are not official until approved at a subsequent meeting.

Commission Members Present: Bob Crochetiere, Mary Jane Perrier, Lacinda VanGieson, Richard Pease, Jay Farrelly, Darry Ruitter, James Guthrie, Roy Zettlemoyer, Jonathan Savino, and Patrick Roy (Alternate)

Commission Members Absent: none

Town Staff Present: Jennifer Rodriguez (Zoning and Wetland Agent), and Dana Steele (Town Engineer)

I. Call to Order

Chairman Crochetiere called the special meeting to order at 7:07 pm.

II. Roll Call

All regular commission members and the alternate member were present.

III. Approval of Minutes from the December 4, 2019 Regular Meeting and the January 13, 2020 Special Meeting

It was **MOVED** (Perrier) and **SECONDED** (Farrelly) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 9-0) that the Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Commission approves the December 4, 2019 and the January 13, 2020 minutes as published.

IV. Public Hearings

Chairman Crochetiere read the rules for conducting a public hearing.

A. Land Development Plans for the Thrall property on Old County Road/Route 20 for a proposed sports village (property owner OJ Thrall, Inc./Joseph B. Thrall II)

Attorney Paul Smith, 27 South Main Street, representing the applicant, JABS Sports Management, LLC; Andy Borgia, managing member for JABS Sports Management; Jessica Bates and John Mancini of BL Engineering; and Matt Davison, Soil Scientist of Davison Engineering, addressed the commission. Attorney Smith gave a brief overview. This is an 84 acre agricultural parcel of land located on the east side of Old County Road just before the Route 20 connector. JABS Sports Management's intent is to develop a world class sports facility for youth participation which will include a basketball and volleyball facility, dormitories, a retail and hotel complex, and athletic fields for soccer, lacrosse, and flag football. They have received approval from Planning and Zoning for a General Plan of Development in an AIOZ. This was also approved by way of a referendum as a Tax Incremental Finance (TIF) district. They are now going through the final development and design process, coming to this

commission with wetland impact issues, then will be moving to a final site plan development before the Planning and Zoning Commission. At the same time they have also been going through access issues and approvals with the State DOT.

Of the 84 acres there is about 2,700 square feet (SF) of natural wetlands that are being impacted by the development, and there is 17,000 SF of a shallow manmade pond on the property that was dug out by the Thralls. It looks to be about 10 or 12 years old and is located in an area for sedimentation and erosion control purposes. The natural wetlands are some fingers of wetlands that extend into the property.

Jessica Bates, Senior Civil Engineer and Registered Professional Engineer in Connecticut with BL Companies, described in greater detail the location of this parcel. The property is outside of any FIMA mapped flood zones. This site has been historically used as an agricultural field. The runoff from the site varies based on the time of year and the crops growing on it. As seen on the Existing Conditions plan, there are a few instances in which the wetlands along Waterworks Brook enters the site itself. Using the EC1 map (the second sheet in), Ms. Bates pointed out these wetlands which are flagged and identified. Due to the historic use of the land, there are eroded channels that lead down to Waterworks Brook. There is no stormwater system on site. There is a small portion of land that drains down to the DOT right of way which is captured by their closed drainage system.

The development of this parcel will include various retail shops, restaurants, hotels, a fitness center, a sports center, medical offices, a theater, dormitory buildings, a gym facility, outdoor championship fields, and turf fields with concessions and restrooms. There will be a parking lot which will service them all, and the site will be served by water, sewer, electric, gas, and telecommunications. They have designed a full stormwater management system which is in compliance with state regulations. This is designed to keep the drainage patterns as close as possible to what they are in the existing conditions to the proposed conditions. Currently they have five subservice detention systems on site which she described in detail. The water quality from stormwater treatment is achieved through the use of a formal street sweeping, deep sump footed catch basins, hydrodynamic separators, and a subservice detention system, all of which will give you more than 80% TSS (total suspended solids) removal, on par with the state DEEP regulations.

Mr. Zettlemoyer asked where the artificial turf fields drain to. Ms. Bates replied that they drain down, are caught by finger drains coming under all the turf fields, and then they drain into the stormwater management system. Mr. Zettlemoyer asked if that water is tested. Ms. Bates responded that the fields themselves are surrounded with a curb system so it keeps all the stormwater on it. It's all captured and nothing can flow directly off the fields. Mr. Ruiter asked if the dorms also drain into this. Ms. Bates answered that the dormitories are captured independently and they have their own system.

Matt Davison, a Professional Soil Scientist, Professional Wetland Scientist, and Certified Professional in Erosion and Sediment Control from Davison Environmental, addressed the commission. He did the natural resources report for the site and has now prepared the wetland impact assessment and mitigation plan for the site. He proceeded to discuss the resources on the site and the three wetland impact areas described in his report. It is notable that the wetlands that are on the site and even off to the north in one spot are in the form of seriously eroded gullies, or in the case of the farm pond, a constructed wetland. These wetlands formed because there is a substantial amount of runoff from the farm field that drains down towards Waterworks Brook. The soils in the site are very well draining but also susceptible to erosion. The water that is draining off the farm fields is eroding that well-drained sandy material off the top down to the point where it gets to the silty material below, and it's stopping, so you get these very pronounced gullies.

Mr. Davison discussed the three wetland impact areas which he is calling Wetland Impact Areas 1, 2, and 3. Wetland Impact Area 1 is the very southern tip of a wetland finger that drains down to Waterworks Brook. This is essentially an eroded gully and would be subject to approximately 141 square feet of fill. The principal function of that wetland is ground water discharge. With the understanding that the existing drainage patterns on the site will remain the same post construction, there is an underground infiltration system that discharges just to the west of that. He believes that the hydrology of that wetland will be maintained and will continue to discharge there. Because of the erosion issues there he did discuss with BL making sure that the outlets are oversized so you don't get erosion issues in the future.

Wetland Impact Area 2 is a constructed farm pond. He believes it was constructed around 2008 to alleviate erosion issues that are downstream of that. In addition to the farm pond, a berm was constructed along the side which directs water into that pond. That farm pond is the vast majority of the wetland impact for the project. The total wetland impact is just over 19,000 SF, but 17,000 of that is for the farm pond. It is a high functioning wetland in the sense that it was constructed to capture and contain stormwater, so it provides water quality functions. Losing that farm pond is not an issue because that stormwater will be redirected to underground infiltration system #5.

Wetland Impact Area 3 is the historically disturbed wetland. There is a berm upgradient here that was probably constructed to address the stormwater issues on the property. If you follow that wetland area down to the property corner there is very severe erosion there as well, and that is draining towards Waterworks Brook. He suspects that this erosion issue has been alleviated to some degree by the construction of the berm upgradient in the farm pond.

Mr. Davison discussed why he is proposing wetland enhancement rather than wetland creation. He felt that more meaningful mitigation could be gained by doing enhancement within the wetland area where there is some severe erosion just above Waterworks Brook. The purpose of the wetland enhancement is to essentially

alleviate the erosion issues that are there now. They are proposing a total of 480 shrubs and 60 trees. Willow and dogwood trees are notorious for producing a dense root system that can prevent erosion and are traditionally used for bank stabilization, so they are proposing live stake plantings along two eroded watercourse areas. The purpose of this is to alleviate the erosion issues that are there now and to prevent any future erosion down in the Waterworks Brook. The issue that is affecting Waterworks Brook now is the amount of erosion sedimentation of that resource area from the farm.

Mr. Davison went on to say that normally you don't look at structural stormwater controls from raw land as improving a site, but in this case it actually does. If you look at this development as a whole, the raw land condition of this site and the erosion issues that you have, the vast majority of those issues will be alleviated by actually developing it and implementing these structural stormwater controls. Having a robust maintenance plan for these underground infiltration systems is critical. This site has very good infiltration potential because of the types of soils it has. He also recommends that some low impact development techniques like rain gardens and fire retention be incorporated into the plan. This site is very well suited for this type of thing.

Mr. Davison mentioned one other thing: he stated that Ms. Rodriguez brought this up, and he apologized for missing this. There is a critical habitat polygon just to the north. It looks like it's dry acidic forest on the western side of the site in the forest to the north of the site. The development will not be impacting that forest area. There is clearing on the site, but not in that area. It essentially stops at the treeline.

Ms. Bates stated that as part of the application process, they need to prove Feasible and Prudent Alternatives of the various site plans and how they got to where they are right now. It has been a process going through the various entities in how they can make this site work well and still be cognizant of the natural resources behind it. She proceeded to discuss six Feasible Prudent Alternatives. (1) This is one of the first site plans that they had worked on prior to the Master Plan approval. The site itself is largely the same development size. In this site they are utilizing 10.6 acres of town land with 33,000 SF of wetland impact, of which 17,000 SF is the man-made farm pond. They connected up through the assisted living facility on the north side of the site with the driveway with no connection to the town road along their frontage. (2) With this alternative they scaled back the utilization of the land which is owned by the town and it is now 7.6 acres. This is closer to numerous fingers of the wetlands and had 19,700 SF of wetland impact, of which 17,000 was still the man-made farm pond, and about 2,700 SF of it was natural wetlands naturally occurring on the site. They created a quick ramp from the Route 20 off ramp onto the site and they were exiting and entering onto Old County Road on the frontage of the site. (3) This alternative is still using the 7.6 acres of town land. Of this, they still have roughly the same wetland impacts as previously, but they reconfigured the drive to have an inbound from Old County and everyone else exits by the assisted living facility. (4) They further refined the site plan. They still use the 7.6 acres of town land; there

is a single entrance and exit onto Old County Road; and there is a little more wetland impact with 17,000 still for the farm pond and just shy of 3,000 of natural wetlands they would be impacting. (5) This is the Master Plan approval that has gone to the town already. There is no use of town land at all; they have 8 athletic fields and 2,700 SF of natural wetland impact and 17,000 SF of the farm pond impacts. *(These figures are incorrect. See below the discussion regarding this with Ms. Bates and Mr. Steele.)* There is a single entrance onto Old County Road out at the frontage, and they have reoriented the dormitory buildings to the east side of the site up against the residential buildings to work as a bumper or a noise attenuation from the fields to the area to the east of it. Through discussions with the various departments of the town they listened to what everyone had to say and tried to get everything that everyone wanted in this plan. One of the features is a complete access road around this site for emergency vehicles so vehicles can go around all 360 degrees of this site. (6) The application in front of you tonight has the following site plan: the dormitory buildings are still along the eastern side of the site; they still have the 8 fields; they still have all the remaining uses for restaurants, retail, the championship fields, the dormitories, the hotel, and everything else. This plan has 17,000 SF of the farm pond that they are impacting and 2,700 SF of natural wetland resources that they are impacting. *(These figures are incorrect. See below the discussion regarding this with Ms. Bates and Mr. Steele.)* The large change between this plan and the Master Plan approval is the back fire road access corner. They will construct this first so they have access around the entire site. All of the fields and everything else will be constructed, and the dormitories will be going in as the last stage of construction to allow the fire department and all the emergency services to be able to access the site and get around the complete back of the site. They needed to give the construction crews some extra room for their equipment so they can still maintain the roadway going around the site.

Per the regulations, you need Feasible and Prudent Alternatives, of which their plan is the most feasible and prudent alternative for the development of this site. The current site plan is the best alternative. The initial site plan had approximately 30,000 SF of wetland fill. They continued to scale it back to come up with a plan that is useable and maintainable. Emergency services are able to get around the site safely. The current site plan has a little over 19,000 SF of wetland impacts of which that 17,000 SF is the man-made farm pond.

Ms. Bates stated that, per the regulations and mentioned in the letter from Ms. Rodriguez, they have provided a graphic showing a colored plan which fulfills the requirement of Section 7.5H. Per the regulations, Sections 7.6G, 7.6J, 7.7D and E, and 7.7J were all discussed by Mr. Davison and are in his reports. Criteria for Section 7.7H has been met and is in both Mr. Davison's report and BL's stormwater management report. For Low Impact Development, they can incorporate some of those in their plans. Per the state requirements, the stormwater general permit will be registered with the state. Ms. Bates discussed all the actions that are required in the stormwater general permit.

Attorney Smith asked Ms. Bates to talk about the composition of the turf and how that drains out and interfaces on the fields. The turf that has been selected for this site is a FIFA certified turf that is about 70% sand and 30% rubber. There will be a six-inch curb that bounds all of the fields that will keep anything in the field on the field. All the fields drain down; they don't drain out. Runoff will permeate down through this highly sandy soil, go down through a closed drainage system, and then go through the hydrodynamic separator and the subsurface stormwater basin before discharging out. The stormwater management system with the hydrodynamic separator will remove any of the minimal rubber or sand contaminants that could possibly get through the sand and through the pipes to the subsurface stormwater basin. Attorney Smith added that his understanding is that it doesn't drain into the wetlands. Ms. Bates confirmed that it drains into a closed drainage system. It's closed piping. The other drains are captured in piping systems down through this concrete walkway and it goes around and then it goes into the subsurface detention systems that are here and eventually discharges out into the surrounding areas. The discharge points have been approved by the DOT, and it does remove 80% of the TSS (total suspended solids) per the CT stormwater management quality manual.

Attorney Smith stated that he wanted to emphasize three things in terms of their presentation. The first thing is that the turf fields are not going to impact the wetlands at all in terms of where they drain. It drains into the DOT system on the other side of the property. This has all been reviewed by DOT and meets their standards in terms of filtering out particles. The turf fields themselves are designed not to have runoff through a pipe. They'll drain down, not out because these soils and the ground cover on top are so permeable. The second thing is, in terms of the wetland impact, that 80 or 90% of what is being impacted is the artificial pond that was dug recently for sedimentation and erosion control purposes, and they are substituting their own erosion control system which is better than what is there now, so it's not like a significant amount of native natural wetlands is being impacted by this project. The third thing is alternatives. With these types of large scale projects, their economic feasibility has been looked at. Keeping in mind what they're trying to accomplish economically, they have looked at all the alternatives they reasonably can to make this project work, and this works the best and won't negatively impact the Waterworks Brook to the north. Attorney Smith noted that he has not had time to read the report that was just received from the North Central District. Chairman Crochetiere said they will discuss it at the next IWWC meeting.

Dana Steele, Town Engineer, discussed his report to the commission dated January 22, 2020. He explained that his review focuses on aspects of the design that relate to wetlands, so if it doesn't relate to wetlands he doesn't address it in a report to this commission. *Mr. Steele had one question for Ms. Bates. He said the Master Plan showed a retaining wall in a corner that was closer to the dorms and they're now showing it further, so there is more wetland impact because that wall was moved. However, in her presentation she said that the Master Plan had 2,700 SF of wetlands and 17,000 of the farm pond, and her current proposal was exactly the same. Ms. Bates apologized and said if she gave those numbers she misspoke. She*

believes the original Master Plan approval was 1,200, of which 17,000 is the farm pond, and now they are at 1,979, of which 17,000 is the farm pond. Mr. Mancini stated he would get that statistic to Mr. Steele and that there is a change and they will make sure the map is correct.

Mr. Steele stated, “So if I understood correctly what you are saying, conceptually, it’s that you recognize that the current proposal has more wetland impact than the Master Plan showed, but the reason your current proposal doesn’t match the Master Plan is because you decided that you needed more room for construction staging.” There was a brief discussion about why the current proposal has more wetland impact than the Master Plan and why the emergency access road needs to be built first. Mr. Steele asked, “So the Master Plan that was submitted originally, after further consideration, you don’t feel that it is feasible?” Mr. Mancini explained that the Fire Marshall wanted full circulation around all the dormitories. They will not have full sewage capacity for Day 1, and it is highly likely that there will be improvements to the sewer mains, so as a result they may have to phase in the last two dorm buildings. They wanted to be transparent and ask for that approval now.

Mr. Steele remarked that he, Ms. Rodriguez, and the conservation district will continue to work through these issues with the applicant and understand them so that they can provide their comments and recommendations. This is something that still needs a little more documentation and explanation so that they can understand how this staging of the different dormitories has affected the constructability of the Master Plan.

Jennifer Rodriguez, Wetland Agent, discussed her report dated January 20, 2020. For the record, at this point the applicant did submit evidence of mailing of notices to all abutters. Per Section 7.5 d, the applicant did present alternatives at tonight’s meeting, and per Section 7.5 h, the applicant distributed a set of color coded plans to the commission. Ms. Rodriguez asked if this could also be sent digitally. She also asked the applicant for a more thorough evaluation with more details related to plant species for the next meeting, per Section 7.7 j.

Chairman Crochetiere asked if it was possible to have a site walk review next Wednesday in the morning with some of the representatives or engineers of the project. Attorney Smith replied that they will coordinate it with Ms. Rodriguez.

At this point the Recording Secretary read the legal notice that was published in the *Journal Inquirer* on January 11, 2020 and January 17, 2020.

Chairman Crochetiere asked if any commission members had questions. Mr. Pease pointed out that Section 7.5 d of the regulations states that Alternatives with Less or No Wetland Impact should be discussed and diagrammed. Many of the comments from the applicant seem to have a common thread that talks about alternative building designs, mixed use building, reduced building footprints, redesigning of the site layout, reducing the number of dormitories, and construction of stormwater wetland

basin, and he wishes that more of those issues were addressed and diagrammed. Ms. Perrier had a question about runoff in the parking lots, noting that there is a lot of asphalt and parking in this proposal. She said that some commission members attended a workshop for permeable asphalt and asked if there were any thoughts of having it more environmentally friendly so the water goes down into the soil instead of running off into the parking lots. The commission did not make this a requirement, but it was a suggested practice for the future. Chairman Crochetiere asked if there were any areas where pavers could be used for penetration into the soil instead of asphalt around the buildings. Ms. Bates responded that here in New England it is hard to maintain a smooth ADA compliant surface because it's a small area and it's susceptible to movement from plowing and freeze/thaw. Chairman Crochetiere asked if there are areas where it could possibly enhance the look of the project. Ms. Bates replied that they could look into it to see if there are any areas that would be better suited to that type of application. Mr. Ruitter had a question about the elongated wetland finger to the north, #1 in the middle of the site. Most of the water would be taken care of by infiltration, but in case of a monsoon, it would come out into the Waterworks. How would the water come out, through a pipe? Ms. Bates replied that in the retaining wall there will be a pipe, and the wall will be constructed around it, and there will be a scour hole. They will work with Mr. Steele to see if they can widen it and do more level spreading to give the flow more of a long gentle cascading flow from the pipe. Mr. Ruitter asked where on the property these apparatuses would be. Ms. Bates responded that the scour holes and the wall would be on their property. Mr. Ruitter reminded the applicant about the conservation easement for Waterworks. Mr. Savino asked if the retaining wall would be high enough so it doesn't go into the wetlands. Ms. Bates answered yes. The pipe is at the bottom of the wall and the parking lot is at the top of the wall. They are working with Mr. Steele for the sizing to make sure it can handle all the flows, even up to the 100-year. Mr. Roy asked if the scour holes will be put in when the emergency access road is being put in. Ms. Bates replied that the scour holes will be one of the first things constructed, so before the pavement is laid. Mr. Roy asked, "So there is no concern with runoff during the construction period?" Ms. Bates replied that everything that is runoff during construction will be treated by erosion and sedimentation control measures. She explained that the E&SC plans are a living, breathing document that will evolve over time. As construction happens things will change, and they will constantly give updates to the Town Engineer, to DEEP, and everyone else involved. They have a full gamut of things available to battle E&SC based on the conditions that are out there even if they're not called for in their plans. Ms. Perrier asked where the snow and salt are going to go in the winter. Ms. Bates responded that the snow will be stockpiled in areas that they designate on the plan, and when it gets to be too much they will haul it out.

At this time Chairman Crochetiere asked for comments from the public about this application.

Lauren Quagliaroli, 4 Norman Avenue, expressed a concern that what happened with Walgreens, where abutting properties were affected, would happen with this project, and suggested that if this property were to change hands this information of who the new owners are should be made public so then the abutters wouldn't bear the responsibility of maintaining the drainage, etc.

Ned Arquette, 38 Woodridge Drive, was very concerned about the toxic pesticides and herbicides that were used on this property where tobacco was grown since these chemicals are still in the ground. He has not heard anything about any environmental testing of preconstruction activity of that soil. Chairman Crochetiere agreed with Mr. Arquette, but reminded him that this commission is not responsible for testing for contamination and suggested that he contact DEEP and make a formal request to get the soil tested. Mr. Arquette pointed out that the hydrodynamic separator they would be using to capture runoff from the fields was 80% effective, but he asked about the other 20% that would be releasing carcinogenic bearing chrome rubber pellets into the system, and where would they go? Mr. Pease asked if there was any way to test that. Mr. Arquette said he feels it is reckless and a danger to the population to let this project go forward without first testing the soil. Mr. Pease pointed out that the state has a 24-hour number hotline. Mr. Arquette also stated that he believes there is a vernal pool at the bottom of where his home is on the association's property, to the extent that it's defined in the commission's literature. Chairman Crochetiere confirmed that this is in the southeast corner and said they will look at it next week when they do the site walkthrough.

Kathleen Montemerlo, Woodridge Drive, had questions about the end of the retaining wall and where the water would go. Mr. Steele explained where this water flows. It does not go onto her property but follows along the boundary of her property. She said that the Waterworks property is right behind her house and there is a lot of wildlife out there. She was also concerned about being able to see the dormitories.

Attorney Smith and Ms. Bates responded to some of the above comments. Ms. Bates clarified that in the Stormwater report, the Operations and Maintenance portion, Appendix F, it specifically states that it's the property owner who has to maintain all of those things, so it stays with the property itself regardless of whoever the owner is. Ms. Bates said they will modify the wording to mean "now and forever," or whatever the legal term is. Attorney Smith noted that he has worked on many developments that involve tobacco land, and most of the time they want you to maintain the soil on the property, so there's usually not an issue. Ms. Bates stated that all runoff from the parking lot will still be captured even once it starts to melt. Any other rain/moisture/water event will still have the same treatment regardless if it's snow melting or precipitation from the sky, so even when there are stock piles on site they will still maintain the same treatment drain. Attorney Smith added that none of their activities puts water on any of the residential units or their common elements; it all flows naturally into the Waterworks property.

It was **MOVED** (Perrier) and **SECONDED** (VanGieson) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 9-0) that the Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Commission continues the public hearing on the Land Development Plans for the Thrall property on Old County Road/Route 20 for a proposed sports village to February 5, 2020.

It was **MOVED** (Perrier) and **SECONDED** (Savino) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 9-0) that the Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Commission holds a special meeting on January 29, 2020 at 10:00 am at the proposed property for the development of a sports village.

V. Reviews (none)

VI. Action on Closed Public Hearing Items (none)

VII. Old Business

A. Discussion with Commission and Staff (none)

B. Action Items (none)

VIII. New Business

A. Public Input (none)

B. Receive New Applications (none)

C. Informal Discussions

i. Application packet revision

Ms. Rodriguez said the application packet was discussed at the last meeting and carried over to tonight's meeting because some of the commission members wanted to take a look at it. She doesn't have any updates right now but she would be glad to talk about it now or carry it over to next month's meeting. Mr. Guthrie asked if he could get a packet to look at. Ms. Rodriguez said she would send one to him. Chairman Crochetiere asked if there is an application packet with revisions. Ms. Rodriguez replied yes. They talked about it before the holidays and she sent out a revision to everyone. She will try to summarize the changes and resend it. It's really ready to go.

ii. Certified mailing vs. certificate of mailing

Ms. Rodriguez stated that this is on the agenda because our regulations require certified mailing which is \$4 per letter, so with this application and Lucas Pond, the applicants spent almost \$1,000 notifying the abutters. The statute does not require certified mailing; the statute requires a certificate of mailing, which is a

receipt of the bulk mailing that was sent. A certified mailing takes a lot of time, is very expensive, and is burdensome. She has been asked twice now in the past several weeks to please consider changing this to be in line with what the statute requires. The text amendment would be very easy to do, essentially changing three words to three other words. Chairman Crochetiere asked if an applicant could send it uncertified with return receipt, which would be cheaper? Mr. Steele said the statute requires it to be certified. The advantage with the green cards is that you know that they received it. With a certified mailing, all you know is it was sent out, and you don't know if they received it. The cards are considered a confirmation, but the statute does not require that extra step. Mr. Pease pointed out that Ms. Rodriguez did send commission members the statute. Chairman Crochetiere asked Ms. Rodriguez to rewrite this for the next meeting.

D. Action Items

i. Budget review

Chairman Crochetiere asked Ms. Rodriguez if she has the final form to fill out. She said she did not, but if the commission agrees on numbers tonight she can fill it out and give it to Finance.

(At 9:35 pm Ms. VanGieson had to leave the meeting.)

A discussion was held regarding the budget items.

Education/Training: Ms. Rodriguez commented that we have a number of new members on this commission, so it makes a lot of sense to increase the Education/Training line item. She offered to provide a list of typical trainings and their cost. It makes sense for four members to go to a \$75 seminar, at a minimum. A Land Use training session with an attorney could cost \$500 but could be shared with other commissions. Chairman Crochetiere said they will shoot for \$500 for this line item. Ms. Rodriguez said she will prepare a list of typical trainings and something in writing to justify this request.

S&W Part Time (Recording Secretary Salary): Chairman Crochetiere doesn't know what other secretaries make and asked if Ms. Rodriguez could get him a number. She said she'll get a number to plug in there and will ask if the process for an increase is through this budget process or if it's a separate request.

Advertising: Chairman Crochetiere pointed out the budget starts July 1 and they will have a heck of a shortfall in this category because of all the big bills from the *Journal Inquirer*. He added that he felt they should shoot for \$350 again because they probably would not go through this again next year. He asked Ms. Rodriguez if she could foresee anything happening in town. Ms. Rodriguez commented that it could cost hundreds of dollars for one advertisement, and you

really could have a couple of public hearings. The \$350 covers maybe one and a half applications. Chairman Crochetiere suggested they shoot for \$500. Ms. Perrier agreed.

Printing & Binding: Chairman Crochetiere suggested they shoot for the same amount of \$100.

General Supplies/Office: \$100 was suggested for this line item.

IX. Communications and Bills

Chairman Crochetiere said a letter was received from the Commissioner of the Department of Energy and DEEP regarding approving Hamilton Sunstrand's application for certification for activities including the construction or operation of facilities that may result in any discharge into the waters of the state associated with construction of a plunge pool and a bank stabilization. Ms. Rodriguez commented that it is common for us to get notification for properties like that at Hamilton and they will take comments, but typically it's just a law that they notify the municipality.

Ms. Rodriguez passed out packets with interesting articles about case law to commission members.

X. Adjournment

It was **MOVED** (Perrier) and **SECONDED** (Guthrie) and **PASSED** (Unanimous, 8-0) that the Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Commission adjourns the January 22, 2020 special meeting at 9:50 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

*Debbie Seymour
Recording Secretary*